CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

----- X

March 21, 2024 Start: 12:00 p.m. Recess: 3:19 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 BROADWAY - COMMITTEE ROOM, 16TH

FLOOR

B E F O R E: Rafael Salamanca, Jr., Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Shaun Abreu Joseph Borelli

Selvena N. Brooks-Powers

Amanda Farías Kamillah Hanks Crystal Hudson Kevin C. Riley Carlina Rivera

Pierina Ana Sanchez

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Rita C. Joseph Christopher Marte

APPEARANCES

Sarah Carroll, Chairperson of the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission

Lisa Kersavage, Executive Director at the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission

Akeem Bashiru, Director of Fiscal Management at the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission

Daniel Garodnick, Chairperson and Director of the New York City Department of City Planning

David Parish, Chief Operating Officer of the New York City Department of City Planning

Edith Hsu-Chen, Executive Director of the New York City Department of City Planning

Sarita Subramanian, Senior Research and Strategy Officer at the New York City Independent Budget Office

Paula Segel, Senior Staff Attorney in the TakeRoot Justice Equitable Neighborhoods Unit

Emily Goldstein, Director of Organizing and Advocacy at the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development

Kevin Wolfe, Center for New York City Neighborhoods Budget Hearing on Land Use.

_	COMMITTEE ON LAND USE 3
2	SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Good morning. This is a
3	microphone check for the Committee on Land Use.
4	Today's date is March 21, 2024. Located in the 16th
5	Floor Committee Room. Recording done by Pedro Lugo.
6	SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Good morning and
7	welcome to the New York City Council Preliminary

At this time, can everybody please silence your cell phones?

If you wish to submit testimony, you may do so at landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. Again, that is landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov.

At this time and going forward, no one is to approach the dais. I repeat, no one is to approach the dais.

Chair, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: [GAVEL] All right, good afternoon and thank you for attending today's hearing on the Committee on Land Use regarding the Fiscal 2025 Preliminary Budget and the Fiscal 2024 Preliminary Mayor's Management Report. I am Council Member Salamanca, Chair of this Committee on Land Use. I am pleased to be joined in this hearing by the Chair of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchise,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Council Member Kevin Riley, and the Chair of the
Subcommittee on Landmarks, Public Siting and
Disposition, Council Member Hanks.

I would like to acknowledge members who have joined us today. We've been joined by Council Member Chair Riley, Majority Leader Farías, and Council Member Chair Hanks.

At today's Preliminary Budget hearing, we will hear from the Landmarks Preservation Commission and then the Department of City Planning afterwards, and finally the public after we hear from City Planning. The Landmarks Preservation Commission, or LPC, is responsible for protecting New York City's architectural, historical, and cultural significant buildings and sites by granting them landmark status and regulating them after designation. There are over 37,000 designated buildings and sites in the city and 156 historic districts. LPC reviews applications for work on designated properties, issues permits, investigates complaints, and initiates actions to ensure compliance with the Landmarks Law. LPC also administers a federally funded historic Preservation Grant Program that we look forward to discussing today. At the outset, I want to thank LPC for their

2.2

2.3

efforts this year at breaking out of the traditional preservation mold and into communities of color like mine. The Commission proposed designation of the Joseph Rodman Drake Park and Enslaved People's Burial Ground will help raise public awareness about slavery in colonial America, preserve and protect the sites, and honor the legacy of enslaved people. This is ambitious and important work, and I applaud the focus here.

When evaluating LPC's budget, its Fiscal 2025 Preliminary total is 7.4 million, about 173,000 lower than at Fiscal 2024 budget adoption. The net reduction results from increases in collective bargaining adjustments for LPC staff, offset by two rounds of Program to Eliminate the Gap or PEGs. The PEGs in November and Preliminary Plans include both PS and OTPS savings. LPC increased its baseline revenue forecast for permit revenue by 250,000 in November Plan to help meet its PEG target and avoid headcount reduction. Generally, staffing at LPC has been stronger than at other City agencies. There have been no real needs so far in Fiscal 2024, although we hope to hear from the agency about its budget needs today.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I would to now turn it over to the Subcommittee Chair Hanks to share her opening remarks.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Chair Salamanca, and welcome once again to the Landmarks Preservation Committee leadership and members of the public who are watching this hearing. For six decades, LPC has sought to use the power of preservation to revitalize communities, drive investment into existing buildings, and tell the story of New York. Importantly, over the past few years, LPC has taken a more holistic view of the importance of ensuring equity in its work. This means that telling the many stories of New York, including stories that are buried, sometimes quite literally in the ground, requiring LPC urban archaeologists to excavate them and other times stories build by historical under-presentation, racism, or other factors. It is positive to see LPC taking a broader view of what requires preservation and historical designation in the city and, today, the Committees hope to learn much more about what the ongoing progress around New York making equitable designations across the five boroughs. That, of

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair

24 Hanks.

23

Before we hear from LPC and Chair
Carroll, I would like to thank the Committee Staff
who helped prepare this hearing, Daniel Krupp,
Principal Financial Analyst; Jack Storey, Finance
Unit Head; Chima Obichere, Finance Deputy Director;
Arthur Huh, William Vidal, and Debra Zerner, Land Use
Counsels; Brian Paul and Perris Straughter, Land Use
Deputy Director and Director; and my Chief-of-Staff,
Shanna Knotts, and all of the Staff working in my
office for my two co-Chairs today.

After LPC, we will hear from the Department of City Planning.

A reminder that the public will testify after the City Planning hearing. If you are here to testify in person, please fill out a witness slip at the Sergeant-at-Arms so that we can put you in the speaker's list.

Additionally, if you would like to testify remotely, please note that you must sign up at www.council.nyc.gov/testify.

I will now pass it over to our Committee Counsel to swear in LPC leadership before turning it over for their testimony.

1	COMMITTEE ON LAND USE 9
2	COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Thank you, Chair.
3	Appearing today for the LPC are Chairperson Sarah
4	Carroll; Executive Director Lisa Kersavage; Akeem
5	Bashiru, Director of Fiscal Management. Panelists,
6	would you please raise your right hands?
7	Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth,
8	the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your
9	testimony before this Committee and in answer to all
10	Council Member questions?
11	CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: I do.
12	ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER ORTIZ: I do.
13	DIRECTOR BASHIRU: Yes, I do.
14	COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Okay. All right.
16	Thank you, Chair Salamanca and Chair Hanks. Good
17	morning to you and the Members of the Land Use
18	Committee and the Subcommittee on Landmarks, Sitings

morning to you and the Members of the Land Use

Committee and the Subcommittee on Landmarks, Sitings

and Dispositions. I'm pleased to be here today to

speak about the Landmarks Preservation Commission's

Fiscal Year 2025 Preliminary Budget. I am joined

today by Lisa Kersavage, our Executive Director, and

Akeem Bashiro, our Director of Financial Management.

The Commission's mission is to protect the significant architectural, historical, and

2.2

2.3

cultural resources of our city. The preservation of historic resources revitalizes communities, supports economic development, and contributes to the vitality of New York City. It is my honor to lead the agency in its successful efforts to realize these important public policy and quality-of-life goals. To date, the Commission has designated and regulates almost 38,000 buildings and sites throughout the five boroughs. As Chair, one of my primary goals is to incorporate equity and diversity in all aspects of the agency's work. to ensure diversity and inclusion in our designations and fairness, transparency, and efficiency in our regulations so that all property owners have equal access to resources, technical assistance, and expertise.

Since I last testified on our agency's budget, LPC has been focused on several key initiatives: Designating buildings and districts that reflect the City's diversity and tell the story of all New Yorkers, transforming the permit process to make it more accessible, and developing programs to support small businesses and educate property owners about permit processes and grant opportunities.

Importantly, we are also working with other agencies

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to advance Mayor Adams' Get Stuff Built Plan and have identified steps to improve efficiency and

4 transparency in our permitting process.

I will begin my testimony today by giving a brief overview of LPC's budget and how resources are allocated. LPC's Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2025 is 7.4 million dollars, which consists of 6. 6 million dollars in City funds and 668,874 dollars in federal community development block grant funds. LPC is fundamentally an agency of professionals. Almost 90 percent of the Preliminary Budget is allocated to personal services, and 10 percent is allocated to other-than-personal services. Our budget supports the agency's five departments that include: the research department responsible for evaluating and advancing properties for designation; the Preservation Department, which reviews the permit applications for work on designated properties; the Enforcement Department, which investigates complaints of potential violations and helps owners correct noncompliances; and the Archaeology and Environmental Review Departments, which assist city, state, and federal agencies in their environmental review process. The agency's total headcount in the Fiscal

2.2

2.3

Year 2025 Preliminary Budget is 74 full-time staff and 6 part-time staff. Of the CDBG funding, about 82 percent is allocated to personnel supporting critical community development related functions such as surveys, environmental review, archaeology, community outreach, and education while about 18 percent, or approximately 122,900, is allocated for our historic preservation grant program for low-income homeowners and not-for-profit organizations.

I will now discuss the work of the

Commission that these resources support. For research
and designations, LPC's equity framework guides our
priorities, and the agency has focused on places that
represent New York City's diversity and in areas less
represented by landmarks. In the first half of Fiscal
Year 2024, LPC designated the Joseph Rodman Drake
Park and Enslaved People's Burial Ground in Hunts
Point, the Bronx, which raises public awareness about
the practice of slavery in colonial New York, honors
the legacy of the enslaved people who were central to
the area's history, and ensures the burial ground is
preserved and protected. Also, in the first half of
Fiscal Year '24, LPC designated the Barkin, Levin,
and Company Office Pavilion in Long Island City,

2.2

2.3

Queens, an area with few designated buildings, and the New York Public Library Tremont Branch in Tremont, the Bronx, which recognizes the library's central role serving generations of immigrants through innovative community programming and multilingual education. We also anticipate the Commission to vote soon on a proposed designation of the Old Croton Aqueduct Walk as a scenic landmark in University Heights and, this week, the Commission voted to calendar the Frederick Douglass Memorial Park in Staten Island, which is New York City's only African American cemetery, and was established at a time in which members of the African American community were excluded from the city's burial grounds.

I will now turn to our preservation and permitting operations. I believe it is imperative to support property owners of designated landmark buildings. The key to success in preservation is effective regulation, which requires an efficient, transparent, and accessible process for applicants. Buildings are living, thriving contributors to the dynamism of New York City. Our job is not to prevent change but to manage it so that we can ensure these

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

significant buildings and sites are protected and allowed to remain a vital part of New York City's continued growth. Our Preservation Department is the regulatory arm of the Commission and it is the largest department within the agency. Our staff are professionally trained preservationists who work with property and business owners to help them obtain approval for the work that meets their needs and is sensitive to the historic building and context each year. Approximately 94 to 97 percent of permits are issued by the staff pursuant to the Commission's rules. The remaining 3 to 6 percent of the applications are reviewed by the full Commission. LPC staff works closely with property owners, including meetings and other communications, to ensure they understand the criteria and the review process and to help them put together a complete application and presentation. In Fiscal Year '23, the Commission received 12,211 permit applications and took action on 11,489 applications, ranging from restoration and repairs to windows and storefronts to additions and new buildings. Through February of this Fiscal Year, we have received about 7,353 applications and are roughly on track to match the Fiscal Year '23 total.

2.2

2.3

LPC has worked with OTI to advance a major technology upgrade, an e-filing portal that we just launched this month, streamlining our permit process and improving customer experience. Applicants and property owners are now able to upload supporting documentation, view the status of applications at every step in the process, and receive their final permits directly through the portal. Our staff are currently conducting training sessions on how to use the new system for our diverse constituency, ranging from homeowners to seasoned professionals.

Our Preservation Department continues to develop and maintain resources to help applicants and owners put together complete applications and process permits quickly. In the summer of 2023, the

Commission voted to approve new rules to make the LPC application and review process faster and easier for business owners and homeowners seeking approval for specific types of work, including building updates that would improve the climate resiliency and sustainability of landmark properties. These changes allow LPC to support adoption of climate resiliency and sustainability measures for landmark buildings and better serve New Yorkers through a more efficient

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

process, empowering them to focus on the success of their small businesses and maintaining their homes and, in turn, increasing employment opportunities and housing stability for the city's diverse workforce.

I want to take a moment to talk about our at-risk building initiative. While the risk of demolition or deconstruction of designated buildings is very low, LPC and DOB have enacted our Vulnerable Buildings Action Plan to strengthen enforcement tools that preserve the City's most vulnerable historic buildings intended to protect designated buildings that are at-risk due to hidden pre-existing conditions, owner neglect, and contractor negligence. The plan has guided our agency in preserving numerous at-risk buildings through a focus on earlier detection of risks to designated buildings, more robust engineering oversight, increased coordination between the agencies and comprehensive community outreach, employing new digital tools and stakeholder outreach. Thus far, we have referred, or in the process of referring, about 20 buildings to the Department of Buildings for Enhanced Engineering. We have reviewed dozens of buildings based on the new data we are receiving from DOB.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

about the outreach and education work LPC conducts. Outreach and education are also essential to our success. My goal is to make information accessible to everyone and, in a city as diverse as New York, we need to make sure that we are as effectively communicating with property owners across the city, especially since a substantial number of owners directly file for permits with LPC. Since my tenure began, we have increased community outreach efforts and now place special emphasis on reaching out to communities across all five boroughs that have not traditionally been well represented by LPC. We have also published new educational materials to improve access to LPC. This is important for our regulatory work and generates support for designations. With the recent launch of our e-filing portal, Portico, we are enacting a plan for robust community outreach to ensure that property owners in historic districts across all five boroughs know how to use the system.

I will now share some further details

Turning to our Community Development

Block Grant funding and, before I conclude, I want to
return to the Historic Preservation Grant Program, a

modest, federally funded program targeted for low-

2.2

and moderate-income nomeowners and not-for-profit
organizations to help restore or repair the façades
of their landmark buildings. In Fiscal Year '23, the
program awarded five grants to homeowners and one
grant to a not-for-profit institution ranging from
25,000 to 35,000. The homes are in Addisleigh Park,
Queens; Greenpoint, Brooklyn; Manida Street in the
Bronx; and Central Harlem. The not-for-profit
institution is the New Amsterdam Music Association
located in Central Harlem. In Fiscal Year '24 thus
far, LPC voted to award five homeowner grants and one
not-for-profit grant for the Greenpoint Reformed
Church.

In summary, we are excited for the future of preservation in New York City and thank the Administration and the City Council for your continued support and the resources provided in this budget. We are a small agency and nearly the entirety of our budget is personnel based. This is a hardworking, dedicated, and professional staff with an outsized impact on our city, responsible for the protection and the preservation of its most significant buildings, districts, and sites. Our commitment is that we will continue to do so with the

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 resources provided and strive to do so equitably,

3 efficiently, and transparently. Thank you, again, for

4 allowing me to testify, and I'm happy to answer any

5 questions you have.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair, for your testimony. Before I begin with my questioning, I just want to thank you and your staff for working hand-in-hand with my office this last year and a half. We landmarked Manida Street, which was something extremely popular in the Hunts Point community, and my constituents and the homeowners were very thankful and grateful, and I want to thank you also your team for helping and getting the Joseph Rodman Drake Park and Enslaved People's Burial Ground landmarked. Prior to being a Council Member, I was a District Manager, and I remember back in 2010, I was working with then State Senator Jeff Klein trying to landmark it federally, but there was a struggle there, but I'm happy that the City of New York got it done so thank you for that.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. So going to our line of questioning. I just have a few questions and then I'll pass it over to Chair Hanks.

2.2

2.3

In terms of staffing, at the end of February, there were 73 active staff at LPC and just one vacancy. LPC's current budget headcount of 74 is three positions lower than it has been in recent years. Do you feel that you have the appropriate number of staff?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: We do, and I will note that one vacancy in February has now been filled so we are fully staffed now. We did lose three positions in an earlier PEG, but that actually did not impact our staff at the time because they were based on vacancies. They were vacancies that we had not filled, and so it didn't impact the staff that were working for us and it didn't impact our mission or our ability to fulfill our mandate. We're fully staffed now. We're excited about that and anticipate being able to meet all of our strategic goals.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Were those three positions that were PEG'd, were they returned back or are they still offline, I would say?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: They're still offline at this time. We continue to talk to OMB about our needs, and we'll continue to have those conversations.

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: What type of 3 positions were those?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: There were two

Landmarks Preservationists titles and one Community

Coordinator.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Yeah. I would think that having enough community coordinators is important so I want to work with you on getting you those three slots open again so that you can hire.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: The LPC appears to have regained the headcounts lost during the COVID-19 pandemic. What has contributed to staff recruitment and retention?

thing I can say is that we are a small staff and a very committed and dedicated staff. I'm amazed every day at how talented and how dedicated our staff is, and I think that they truly believe in the mission, everyone does, and I think there is something rewarding in that, in doing something that you believe in and that you feel you're making a difference in the city, and so I think there's great support. In addition to that, we work very hard to

2	provide	а	very	inclusive	and	collegial	work

3 environment, and we do that through trying to provide

4 opportunities for professional development training.

5 We provide space and opportunity for employee

6 resource groups where employee-led groups, staff can

7 gather together to discuss issues, and we also

8 provide opportunities to attend conferences when

9 possible so I think we do try to provide

10 pportunities for staff to engage with each other and

11 to professionally grow.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. Thank you. Just want to recognize that we've been joined by Council Member Abreu and Council Member Joseph.

Going back to staffing, does staff at LPC have flexible time schedules or hybrid schedules?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yes, all of the staff have the opportunity to work in hybrid if they follow the guidelines outlined by the City, and so they must submit a form outlining their commitment and their hours and the place of location when they're not working in the office and so we do have that ability to offer that to staff.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

25

2	CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: What percentage of
3	your staff are working in the office compared to
4	working from home?
5	CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Everybody works in
6	the office a minimum of three days a week, and they
7	have the ability to work remotely two days a week,
8	and that is the majority of the staff. There's a
9	limited number of staff who need to be present
10	because they're public facing every day, and there
11	aren't multiple people in that department.
12	CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: How many staff
13	oversee LPC's 215.9 million in contracts, and how do
14	you ensure a fair pricing for preservation
15	maintenance work?
16	CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: The 215 in
17	maintenance contracts
18	DIRECTOR BASHIRU: We don't really have
19	that kind of bandwidth for our budget.
20	CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Sorry, they gave
21	me 215,000. So how many staff oversee the 215,000
22	dollars in contracts, and how do staff ensure fair
23	pricing for preservation maintenance work?

 $\hbox{{\tt CHAIRPERSON CARROLL:} In our Budget and}\\$

Administration Departments, I think that's the

2.2

2.3

process.

question, we have Akeem Bashiro, who is our Director of Financial Management. We also have a Director of Administration and a Director of Operations and Facility Management and, under the Director of Financial Management, we have the Procurement Officer and the Timekeeper, and we strive hard to ensure fair practices in all of our efforts in our procurement

to the federal grants, the federal funding for the restoration project, so I know that LPC administers federally funded historic preservation grant program that provides financial assistance to low- to moderate-income landmark property owners to help fund restoration work on their designated properties. Now, this is something that I've asked for the past couple of years in terms of how that funding is used and who has access to that funding. What's the total amount of this grant in Fiscal 2025?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: The total amount of money that we have in CDBG money for '25 is 668,874, and that, what that does is that...

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Sorry, can you just repeat that number?

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yeah, 668, 874.

3 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Okay.

employees who are really critical to our survey and outreach work and our archaeology work, and also 122,900 dollars of that is allocated to the Historic Preservation Grant Program and we, as you know, award grants to the income-eligible property owners and not-for-profits that range from 25,000 to 35,000 dollars each, and they fund repairs and restoration work and maintenance for properties.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Of that 668,874, you have five employees that you're paying salaries for, correct? You deduct the salary, what's the total amount that's left over for the grant?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: It's the 122,900, and that is for the grant program, and we accept applications on a rolling basis, but we do try to award as many grants as possible when we have applicants that meet the income eligibility requirements that are set up by HUD.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: In terms of the funding that you receive every year, the Fiscal Year

for-profit?

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: So there is no
income limit for a non-profit. The requirement is
that they own their property and that they are a
501(c)3. For homeowners, there are different
categories. There's extremely low income, low income,
and moderate income. Just to give you an example, for
a four-person household in the moderate-income
category, I think it's 70,000 is the maximum for low-
income in a four-person household, and it's 113,000
is the maximum amount for a four-person household in
a moderate-income situation, and then also for
moderate-income households, if there is an
opportunity to provide a matching grant, the income
cap is raised to 141,000, I believe, right? 141,000.
CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Who sets the
income requirements?
CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: The federal
government.
CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: And what agency is
that?
CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: That's HUD.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: HUD. Now, HUD is also responsible for our AMIs, area median income, where we are negotiating and discussing housing. Do

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: That I couldn't answer. We'd have to defer to OMB, I think, to understand that.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: And the reason is because I know that HUD, the frustration that we have with AMI is that we feel that the average median income in New York City, the way they calculate it, they use the outside counties and they mix it all in, including Westchester County, and so I think that, at this moment, our AMI for the City of New York is somewhere in the 90,000s, right, and I'm just curious if HUD is using that number for affordable housing. We would love to see them use that same number so that homeowners, you have a bigger avenue of homeowners that can have access to that grant money. Has LPC ever lobbied or sent a letter or a request to HUD asking that they review the income requirements and increase them?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: I think the

Landmarks Commission hasn't separately. We have

worked with OMB, and OMB obviously communicates with

HUD on these matters.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: But I don't think that's an OMB priority, so LPC has never really requested an increase or that HUD review.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: I think it's a challenging thing and we do wish it was higher. We wish we had more candidates also but, luckily, we are able to target candidates who are eligible and we are able to award the money and we are prioritizing the low- and moderate-income, which is important to us, but I think that the eligibility requirements really affect kind of policy and funding on a federal, national level, and I think it's challenging for the Landmarks Commission to be able to affect change there.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: I think that it's, and, after this line of questioning, I'm going to go over to Chair Hanks but, Chair Hanks, I think that this is a conversation when you have further hearings on asking LPC to reach out to HUD and make a formal request increasing the income eligibility. My concerns here is that I have I have historic districts as well. For example, the Lowell Historic District. Townhouses, they're beautiful, but these are working families, but because they're working

2.2

2.3

families does not mean that they have the funds necessary to make repairs, and they cannot access the avenue of grants that's being provided, and I think that it's unfair to them that they cannot access that funding.

All right, with that, I'm going to hand it over to Chair Hanks for her Land questioning.

Much, Chair Salamanca, and that was part of also my line of questioning but, firstly, I just want to thank you for your testimony. Being from Staten Island, it's very important that we have our historic preservation. It's no secret that I like, that I'm a builder, I love to build, and we have to find that happy medium, and so I'm very happy that we're able to ask these questions to you today.

I'm actually going to give you an opportunity to explain what the federal role is and what the LPC's role is in setting those limits so can you explain to the public how the limits are set and, just so everyone understands, this is the grant process in which we grant homeowners funding to complete some of the repairs on their historic buildings. I'll have you explain a little bit about

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

who sets the limits and how that goes just for clarity.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Again, HUD sets that limit and it is, I imagine, based on sort of a national standard that they have applied. I really can't speak any more to how they are set or how they are determined because we have no role in that, but we certainly do support increasing opportunities for our designated building owners to take advantage of any financial benefits that are available to them, and so we do work really hard to try to bring awareness about our grant program and we actually have partnered with Chair Salamanca to do outreach in your District to make that information available to people and we can talk about our grant program and opportunities there, but we also can make people aware of other financial benefits or opportunities through the non-profit, the New York Landmarks Conservancy, which has a historic properties fund and a sacred sites fund, which provides funding for homeowners and houses of worship and also homeowners in many of certain census tracts are eligible for a state homeowners tax credit for restoration and repair work, and so we work hard to make sure that

2.2

our property owners that are in those census tracts are aware of that opportunity as well, so we agree that it's important to help property owners with maintaining their homes, which are designated buildings and always looking for ways to increase those opportunities.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you so much. For the purpose of the Committee and for the public, can you just give an example of what the income limits are for a family of four?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: So for a family of four in the low-income category, the maximum household income is 70,559 dollars and then for the moderate-income category, a household of four, the maximum income is 113,000 dollars but, again, again if they are able to do a 20 percent matching grant, the income cap becomes 141,000 dollars, and so we do try to help our grant awardees leverage the grants that we are able to award them to find other loans or grants that they can use as a match.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you so much. Is there a repository of information so like a one-sheet fact sheet so the public is not going to a

2.2

2.3

2 myriad of places to find out what it means because 3 I'm really big on information and outreach.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yes, we have a fact sheet on the financial incentives or benefits of designation and we can certainly provide you with that.

 $\label{eq:SUBCOMMITTEE} \mbox{ CHAIR HANKS: I would love} \\ that. Thank you so much.$

In this same line of questioning for federal funding for restoration projects, can you tell us a little bit more of how not-for-profits partner with homeowners in these restoration projects?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: I'm sorry.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Can you tell us more about how non-profits sometimes partner with homeowners in these restoration projects? I apologize if it wasn't clear.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: As I was saying,
when we award grants, often we will partner and share
information about the New York Landmarks Conservancy,
which is a non-profit that also provides funding, and
so we will often try to make those connections and
work together to be able to provide more funding and,

2.2

2.3

in either case, whether it's a grant that we're awarding or a low-interest loan that the non-profit is awarding what comes with that is, of course, the staff's expertise and also the staff's project management so they file for all the necessary permits. They are putting out the projects out to bid. They are working with the contractors and overseeing the work and managing the project from beginning to end, and so that comes with the funding.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Oh, thank you.

In Staten Island, we have a major development on a site where there are about four or five historic buildings so my question is there space or an appetite for public/private partnerships with development when it comes to restoration of...

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: I think we're always open to opportunities. I'd be happy to talk to you further about that.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you so much. What are the key projects LPC has completed so far under this grant?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Some of the recent grants that we approved, actually two were in Manida Street in Chair Salamanca's District, and let me get

you some of the others. We have also awarded three
grants in Staten Island as well, one to a homeowner
in the St. Paul's Stapleton Heights Historic
District, one to a homeowner in the St. George
Historic District, and one not-profit, let me just
get to it, the non-profit was Casa Belvedere, so
three in Staten Island. Of course, the two that we
recently awarded on Manida Street and then, in
Council Member Abreu's District, we did also award a
homeowner grant for a home on 152nd Street and, of
course, our too recent not-for-profits were the New
Amsterdam Music Association, the Bushwick Reformed
Church, and the Greenpoint Reformed Church.

much. I'd like to return a little bit with the landmarking designations and equity so this is central to the LPC's responsibilities and ensuring that it's relevant to the City and, what I mean by that is the equitable component, so what plans and/or outreach do you have this year to continue to work on recognizing designated sites related to underrepresented groups such as LGBTQ people and women, and what would that plan entail?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: All of our work is really Commission-led and Commission-initiated, but we also do hear from different communities with requests to evaluate or requests to designate, and so those community dialogues are very important to guiding our work as well, and our research department surveys thousands of properties every year to maintain our survey inventory and they do many thematic studies and so they will do studies related to LGBTQ history, they will do studies related to African American history or Latino history. We just recently designated the Bronx Opera House with incredible cultural significance related to the Latino, Latinx music scene. We do thematic studies, and we also have been prioritizing large surveys in areas that have been less well-represented, such as we did a comprehensive survey of the Bronx, and we've been working on a large survey in Queens as well, and then, once we have identified areas that we find merit and are our areas that we'd like to pursue, we then begin outreach and, especially in areas where there is less representation by landmarks, there's less familiarity, so some of that outreach takes much longer but we are committed to reaching out to those

2.2

2.3

neighborhoods and talking to them about the

importance of the history of the neighborhood or

district or building and what the benefits and

responsibilities are in order to raise awareness and

garner attention.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you so much. What type of work is underway to continue the work of recognizing African American and black cultural significance, such as the African burial grounds and through these designations and landmarks.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yeah, it's ongoing.

As I said, our staff is constantly, that's what they do most of the time is do this survey work, and we've designated important sites that represent African

American history over the last couple of years that

I'm very proud of and then, as we mentioned, we just last week calendared for consideration the Frederick

Douglass Memorial Park which was incredibly exciting moment, but also we've worked closely with the board of trustees there and they're just incredible stewards of the cemetery and the history so it's been very exciting so that work is ongoing. Oh, and we are also, this is breaking news, in addition to the designation work that we do, we are also trying to

make these stories more accessible to the public, and
so we have created a number of tools that take these
sort of themes and highlight designations that tell
these stories, and so we have a really fabulous
digital tool that speaks to significant places of
African American history, and I totally recommend
going to our website and looking at it. It's just
it's a multimedia sort of history and layout of all
of the sites across the city related to that history.
We have another one called the New York City and Its
Path to Freedom, which highlights sites that are
important in terms of the story of abolition, and the
sort of breaking news is that we have been working
with Black Gotham Experience on a new immersive
experience to understand the story of abolition
through a trail of the landmarks in downtown
Brooklyn, and so I'm really excited about that being
launched in the coming weeks I think.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: That is fantastic news. Thank you for breaking the news with us.

My last question just before I pass it back to Chair Salamanca really goes back to at-risk buildings, and I only had one small question. Does

2.2

2.3

the LPC have at-risk buildings that are owned by the City.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: There are some buildings that are we are monitoring that are owned by the City, so we designate buildings owned by the City and we designate buildings owned by private property owners and, while the processes can be slightly different, ultimately, we review the same kinds of work, and we also monitor buildings that are in need of maintenance and, yes, we work closely with sister agencies who are responsible for buildings that need to be sealed or maintained.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR HANKS: Thank you so much. I appreciate your answers today. I'll give it back to Chair Salamanca. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair Hanks. I want to recognize that we've been joined by Council Members Rivera, Sanchez, Hudson, and Marte.

I will now hand it over to Council Member Rivera for some questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Hello. Nice to see you all. Sorry about the angle. I'm very happy that you're here, and I want to for your testimony and all your work, realizing how big your budget is.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Just a few questions. What mechanisms are in place to protect landmarks during construction so if there's maybe a building going up directly beside a landmark building, and are those mechanisms or programs fully funded and staffed?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: They are fully funded and staffed, and I can walk you through them. As you know, last year, we launched a Vulnerable Buildings Action Plan just for this purpose and, while we did coordinate well with the Department of Buildings on structural issues in the past, we did really dig down to try to understand what underlying causes that put buildings at risk were, and we met with a roundtable of engineers, we met with community and advocacy groups, we met with big cities across the country, we're part of a network of other preservation municipal agencies, and we looked at issues that we had recently seen, and we really identified sort of three major causes. One is previously unknown hidden conditions behind walls that were structural concerns, structural issues may not have been evident. We also found that owner neglect was another cause and contractor error or work in violation was another cause, and so we

developed a plan to try to ensure that we are	
protecting our oldest and most delicate building	gs,
and that plan really was focused on addressing	those
three causes with three sort of major pillars.	One
was earlier detection, which is really important	t.
That was a key because when a building is negle-	cted,
it can take a long time even to work through the	е
court system if you're initiating a lawsuit so	early
detection was important, and we are coordinating	g much
more with the Department of Buildings on sharing	g data
to be able to flag buildings earlier before the	y're
in a state where they're at risk. We also increa	ased
engineering oversight of proposed work and ongo	ing
work, working with our own consulting engineer	and
the Department of Buildings Forensic Engineering	g
Unit, and the third pillar was working closely	with
communities, providing them more tools and acces	ss to
our information and communicating with them on	a
regular basis. They're our eyes and ears on the	
ground, so they're very important to us, but in	terms
of the	

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: You have 20 buildings in the program, it says in your testimony?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Oh, 20 buildings
that are getting this enhanced engineering. So back
to the second pillar, which is the enhanced
engineering and oversight. The way that now works is
that any work that is on a building or in a building
that may have the potential, and our staff has been
trained to identify this now, to have a structural
impact, we are requiring enhanced submissions from
the applicants and also enhanced review by our
consultant and/or by the Department of Buildings
Forensic Engineering Unit, and so right now there are
20 sites that we've referred to DOB for them to do
the enhanced engineering, and that also includes new
construction next to historic buildings. Then, of
course, in your District we recently had a proposal
adjacent to the Merchant's House where we did require
10 independent measures to ensure the structural
stability of the building as well as the stability of
the interior plaster.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Yeah. That was important to us, and it remains a priority, the Merchant's House. I was going to bring that up if you did not. Please take care of it. For those who don't

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 know, it's landmarked inside and outside. It's a 3 lovely building on 4th Street.

You also mentioned you do these large surveys of places that have been under-represented and I think that's great. I know that there has been a lot of discussion that maybe the outer boroughs didn't receive as much attention from LPC and I see here you have the Bronx and Queens and Brooklyn in terms of some research and designation. How do you prioritize proposals? Is it the size? Is it the scope? Is it just, I don't know how popular it is, how much history, and does the size and scope of resources ever become a factor in how you prioritize designations? I only ask because when you come back to Manhattan, I'd really love for you to look at Union Square South again, please, New York Eye and Ear Infirmary and 50 West 13th Street, but I'll be sure to follow up with you outside of that. How do you prioritize these proposals, and does size, scope, and how many resources go into those proposals ever factor in how you prioritize? Thank you for the questions, Mr. and Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Thank you. As I said, we have a vast inventory of sites that we have

2.2

2.3

surveyed, and we prioritize designations based on merit first but also many other factors including significance, architectural, cultural, and historical significance, how it compares to other sites that are designated with similar significance, where we have gaps in designations that tell a specific story so we look to see if it aligns with our priority of ensuring equitable representation both to geographic and cultural communities and across all five boroughs, so there are many factors that we consider. We work closely, of course, with the Council Members in each District, and so I'm happy to continue to talk to you about those sites.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Council Member Rivera.

I just want to recognize that we've been joined by Council Member Borelli.

A few questions, Chair, regarding the work permit applications. There were 3,873 work permit applications during the first four months of 2024, down 8.5 percent from the same period in Fiscal Year 2023. LPC hit its target by issuing expedited certificates of no effect but narrowly missed its target for certificates of no effect. What factors do

2.2

2.3

you believe led to the 8.5 percent decrease in the number of work permit applications during the first four months of Fiscal Year 2024?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yeah, we narrowly missed those targets, and that is somewhat consistent. We've seen that in the previous Fiscal Years as well, and what I would say is that I think one major reason for that is that there are outliers that bring those percentages down, and really the average number of certificates of no effect that are approved and issued within 10 days is, the average number of days of a certificate of no effect being approved is six days, and the average number of days for a permit for minor work to be issued is 6.3 days so we do really strive hard to meet those targets, but I think there are on occasion some outliers that are just more complicated, and that has probably caused the narrow miss of that target.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: In light of the revenue raising PEG from the November Plan, can you share how much revenue LPC expects to generate from permits issued to building owners in Fiscal Year '25 versus Fiscal Year '24?

2.2

2.3

Year '25, our revenue target is 6.9 million dollars, and that is also our revenue target at this point, 6.9 million dollars at this point in Fiscal Year 2024. So far we have generated 5.5 million dollars, which is 80 percent of our targets so we do expect to meet our target of 6.9 million dollars.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: How much are typically the LPC permits?

is set up to be relatively modest because we do recognize that the property owners of the designated buildings are a very small subset in the larger city with only 38,000 buildings under our jurisdiction so we are mindful of sort of the equity issues around that so we do have a modest fee schedule, which is 95 dollars for the first 25,000 dollars of work, and then 5 for every 1,000 dollars of work after that. It's based on the DOB schedule and it's administered through DOB, and we have found that we are nearly self-sustaining and so that does seem to be the right balance of equity for those property owners and sufficiently maintaining our budget.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: How does LPC
3 navigate interactions with owners who do not want
4 their buildings to be landmarked?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: So this is a really important part of our work, and we spend considerable time doing outreach to property owners. Sometimes we hear from property owners that they're very supportive, and that's always the best outcome. Sometimes people have concerns and questions, and those are completely valid questions and concerns, and so we work really hard to talk to them, to answer all of those questions, address those concerns because if a building is, and I should say, under the Landmark's law, the Landmark's law does not require owner consent in order to designate a property, but it is really important to us to try to have some support, particularly in larger historic districts, and it's really important that owners are informed and understand the process and what's happening, because if the building in our district is designated, we have a relationship in perpetuity so it's really important to us that we start that relationship out on the right foot and especially that everybody is informed as we move through the

2.2

2.3

2 process so we spend a considerable amount of time and 3 effort on those outreach efforts.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you. I'm going to hand it over to Council Member Joseph for questioning.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you, Chairs. Good morning. How are you?

In 2019, we found the African burial ground on Church and Bedford Avenue. We're in the middle of doing community engagement right now so we wanted to know, whatever the community decide on how to memorialize the space, do we apply for designation before or after? That was one of the biggest questions.

would say is that these are really important sites and sometimes they're evident and sometimes they're not. They're under paved streets or under new buildings but they're very, very important, and so we work very diligently with communities to help them recognize those sites and, if there is evidence that is something that the LPC can regulate designation, maybe a good option but, if not, one thing I want to point out is that our archaeologist is available to

it's in my District.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 | landmarks throughout the city with this sufficient 3 | amount of officers on my staff?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: First, I would say we actually did just increase our enforcement department by two so we actually have six people who are working in the enforcement division, and it is a complaint-driven process so we evaluate every complaint that comes in and, just to give you a sense of sort of proportion, in terms of the applications we get for work permits, we get about 13,000 applications a year for people applying for permits. In terms of complaints, we get between sort of 200 and 400 complaints a year so the complaints, hopefully that's a sign that people are actually doing work legally and with permits, and the complaints are a much smaller number so with the six people on staff, we are able to investigate every complaint and in a timely manner.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTE: Great. I was wondering, is there a tracker for, we talked about eligible buildings and buildings that have been landmarked and their status when it comes to demolition. Do we have a tracker for buildings that should be eligible for landmarks under your criteria

2.2

2.3

I just wanted to ask about procedures to remove landmarking designation, is that possible and has it ever happened?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: As you know, when we designate a building or a district, we go through our process to designate it and then there is a post-designation process, where the designation goes to the City Planning Commission for an advisory review to understand how it may relate to planning goals and then ultimately it goes to the City Council so, at the City Council, the City Council can uphold or affirm the designation, they can rescind the designation, or in the case of a historic district, they can modify the boundaries to make them smaller so the City Council certainly has a role shortly after designation. After that, I think we have not had any applications to...

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: But there is an application process for removing a designation?

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: There is no application process for removing that but, as part of the Landmarks Law, there is a hardship provision, which is a safety valve when designation may cause an undue hardship or burden to a property owner and so

2.2

2.3

that's a really important part of the Landmarks Law, and it strengthens the Landmarks Law, and it does require robust analysis, including an economic analysis. They're very rare. We've had less than 20 in our 60 years of existence, and they really don't happen that often, but we do take them very seriously. Other than that, we might... In the case of a fire or sort of a catastrophic event that results in the demolition or collapse of a building, we have in those cases de-designated the site, and a dedesignation process is the same as the designation process. We initiate it and, ultimately, it would come to the City Council.

asking this because we're faced with a situation in the city where we don't seem to be able to build housing. Some of these landmarkings, as you know because you hear public testimony, you can get a sense of reading between the lines when you speak to people, that some of these landmarkings over the years were done not just to preserve a particular house but also to prevent development on a site. Is it something that's in your wheelhouse or an idea to ever just re-evaluate some of the sites that have

2.2

2.3

been landmarked to see if there's something worth landmarking there still to keep the designation? I'll give you an example. In Staten Island, in Prince's Bay, there's a house and, granted, this is one of the oldest houses in the City of New York, I think it's called the Manee House, but it was purchased by a developer legally, above the board, was going to knock it down, put up some houses, or whatever he was going to put up, and people said, we don't want houses here. As the only historian, maybe I cared about the house, not many other people cared about the house. Now the house is dilapidated, and it's just a pile of rubble.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: What is the point of maintaining a house like that, and I'm using this as a hypothetical. I think it's an interesting history, but there are other houses where the history is not significant, where they're just piles of dilapidated rubble, and we could be doing something innovative with that property.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Just with that specific property, that was a situation where the building was being neglected and we initiated a

lawsuit and prevailed and, unfortunately, it is still
in a sealed but neglected state, and we did approve
new housing on that site in front of the landmark
building, which included restoration of the landmark
building. That project didn't go forward, but we
certainly look for opportunities where we can
incorporate new housing in historic districts or on

landmark sites, and we understand that housing is...

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: To be clear, it didn't go forward because the developer bought the property legally, was unaware that this was going to be a landmark property, had some financial rubric that indicated he could knock the building down, build a certain number of townhouses or whatever, and the landmarking was the catalyst of why this did not happen.

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: No, it's a very early designation. This owner bought the building after it was designated so I think that...

 $\label{eq:council_member_borelli:} Council \mbox{ Member BORELLI: Okay, a different owner than the guy...}$

CHAIRPERSON CARROLL: Maybe different facts, or maybe they somehow weren't aware, but it's, as you said, an important site and very early

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

designation, and we did approve housing and I think we do recognize that there's a critical need for housing in the city, and we think that there is a way to find a balance between preserving really important places and allowing for development to happen. We support housing, additional housing, and especially affordable housing in our historic districts. We are in support of the City of Yes Housing for Opportunity Plan, and we have worked very hard in historic districts and on sites of individual landmarks to allow for significant housing. For example, actually on the Lower East Side recently for St. Augustine's Church, we approved a tower on the back of their lot, which will be a large residential tower. Similarly, we partnered with a church in the Bronx as well, St. James's Episcopal Church, to do an affordable housing project on their property, which is also a large building and, in our historic districts, we work really hard to ensure that we're allowing for that flexibility and growth in historic districts, and we'll always be looking at our policies to find more ways to allow for growth in historic districts. Thank you.

24

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Council
3 Member Borelli.

With that, Madam Chair, I want to thank you for your testimony (INAUDIBLE) questions, and I want to thank your staff as well for being present today.

We will take a five-minute recess and, up next, we will have DCP, the Department of City Planning, for testimony.

All right. Good afternoon. Thank you again to LPC and welcome back to today's Preliminary Budget hearing for the Committee on Land Use. We will now continue with the Department of City Planning.

I want to recognize that we've been joined by Councilwoman Selvena Brooks-Powers as well.

Now, we will continue with the Department of City Planning.

I want to recognize we are joined by

Chair of Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises, Chair

Kevin Riley, and Chair of the Subcommittee on

Landmarks, Public Siting and Dispositions, Council

Member Hanks.

The Department of City Planning, or DCP, plans for New York City's overall growth and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

development. Working with communities and elected officials, it aims to shape and align planning needs to improve our neighborhoods and make them more equitable and resilient. Recent data suggests a critical role for DCP at this moment in our city's history. This week, the Citizens Budget Commission released the results of its 2023 resident survey. The survey showed that New Yorkers generally rate the quality of life and the quality of core City services much worse than they did in 2017. CBC points out that long shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic continues to hover over the city, including with high office vacancies, low housing affordability, and an increase in low-paying jobs. While the Administration's verbal commitment to housing and public safety are welcome, there is a significant gap between how New Yorkers rate the quality of life and city services now versus how they did in 2017 or 2008. A great deal of progress needs to be achieved to return to prior levels of satisfaction. For DCP, this will require at least three key components. First, proper staffing to assess and implement necessary zoning and planning changes, second, full engagement with communities and, third, capital funding.

2	However, when we review DCP's budget,
3	there is a disconnect between its central role and
4	its limited capacity. DCP has a Fiscal 2025
5	Preliminary Budget of 44.1 million, about 4.6 million
6	lower than at Fiscal 2024 budget adoption. In Fiscal
7	2025, budget includes 32.9 million for personal
8	services to support 353 full-time positions and 11.1
9	million for other-than-personal services. DCP has
10	received two rounds of Programs to Eliminate the Gap,
11	or PEGs, so far in Fiscal 2024. The PEGs in the
12	November and Preliminary Plans include both PS and
13	OTPS savings, including an environmental review like
14	CEQR and other studies. While there were no headcount
15	reductions, DCP has struggled to fill its ranks. The
16	Department has a relatively high vacancy rate of 13.9
17	percent overall and vacancy rates of 30 percent and
18	25 percent respectfully in its Queens and Bronx
19	borough offices. These vacancies are much too high
20	and need to come down. The Committee seeks to learn
21	much more about what actions DCP has taken in the
22	budget to increase staffing and ensure all five
23	boroughs have the appropriate staffing for rezonings.
24	There are currently five active neighborhood
25	rezonings, but Council Members have heard that

2.2

2.3

decade.

capacity restrictions limits DCP's ability to expand its scope to other communities. These rezonings are necessary to create new opportunities and achieve the Administration's own City of Yes agenda with its moonshot goal of 500,000 new units of housing over a

I will pause here and turn it over to our Subcommittee Chair, Chair Riley, to share his opening remarks for the Department.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you,
Chair Salamanca, and welcome once again to DCP's
leadership and Director Garodnik. Thank you for being
here today.

I would like to pick up the importance of DCP to the City of Yes agenda. Whether for aspiring homeowners or entrepreneurs, DCP is seeking to modify the City's Zoning Laws to drive change. We have heard a lot from our constituents and our community boards about the scale of the City of Yes proposal, particularly Zoning for Economic Opportunity and Zoning for Housing Opportunity, which are making their way through the City's process now. The feeling of a rushed presentation or misinformation threatens to make moving forward more difficult. Certainly, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

deserve.

high vacancy rates in the borough's office,

previously discussed, poses an obstacle to robust

engagement. I look forward to hearing more about

DCP's outreach and engagement functions and how they

are making sure that both neighborhood rezonings and

the City of Yes are receiving the support they

In addition, new capital funds are urgently needed. In March 2022, the Administration launched its Rebuild, Renew, and Reinvent Blueprint for the City's Economic Recovery, which launched the NYC Strategy for Equity and Economic Development, or SEED, fund. SEED was intended to invest City dollars into neighborhood-wide capital improvements, forming a new framework. However, we've only heard of three SEED investments in two years. In some key respects, SEED appeared posed to replace the previous Administration's tool for guiding investments in communities, which was called the Neighborhood Development Fund. We look forward to hearing more about the status and size of the SEED fund, next steps for both it and the NDF and which neighborhoods are expected to benefit from upcoming investments.

2.2

Other topics that the Committee hopes to cover this afternoon include how DCP is supporting office conversion and climate change resiliency, proposing homes to City Planning Commission, conducting timely land use reviews, planning for fair housing and more manufacturing industrial jobs, and so much more.

With that, I look forward to hearing from Director Garodnik, and we'll pass it back over to Chair Salamanca. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair Riley.

Before we hear from DCP and the Director,

I would like to thank once again the Committee Staff
who helped prepare this hearing in the Finance and
Language Division as well as the hard-working staff
in my office and my co-Chair's office.

A reminder that the public will take testify after DCP after we have finished hearing from the Administration.

If you are here to testify in person, please fill out a witness slip with the Sergeant-at-Arms so that we can put you in the speaker's list.

2.2

2.3

Additionally, if you would like to testify remotely, please note that you must sign up at www.council.nyc.gov/testify.

Thank you to DCP in advance for keeping

your oral testimony to around 10 minutes, and I will now pass it on to our Committee Counsel to swear in DCP's leadership before they testify.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: The DCP panel will include Chairperson and Director of the Department,

Dan Garodnick, Chief Operating Officer David Parish,

and Executive Director Edith Hsu-Chen. Panelists,

would you please raise your right hands?

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and in answer to all Council Member questions?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I do.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HSU-CHEN: Yes.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: Yes.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Thank you.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Good afternoon, Chair Salamanca, Subcommittee Chairs Hanks and Riley, and distinguished Members of the Land Use Committee. As you heard, my name is Dan Garodnik, and I certainly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

will keep my remarks to under ten minutes. I'm joined by City Planning's Executive Director Edith Hsu Chen, and our Chief Operating Officer, as you heard, David Parrish. Thank you all very much for the opportunity to discuss the Department of City Planning's

Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2025.

Before we discuss the budget, I want to outline the work that City Planning has been doing over the past year to help make our city a more affordable, equitable, and prosperous place to live. Key to our pursuit of these ambitious goals, and I thank you for your reference to them in your introductory remarks, is the City of Yes proposals, three citywide initiatives to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, to support small businesses, and to tackle our mounting housing crisis. The first of these three proposals, as you all know, is City of Yes for Carbon Neutrality which the Council adopted in December, thank you. These changes have made it much easier for New Yorkers to install solar panels, to retrofit aging buildings, or charge their electric vehicles, and we thank you very much for your partnership and for your support. The second is City of Yes for Economic Opportunity, which began its

2.2

2.3

public review in October and seeks to update decades old zoning rules to bolster the City's industrial sector, to revitalize commercial corridors, and boost growing industries. Earlier this month, the City Planning Commission approved the proposal by a vote of 11 to 1 after an extended period of public engagement, over 175 public meetings with Community Boards in just a few months. Community boards raised some specific concerns during this process, and I want you to know that the Commission made modifications to be responsive to those Community Board concerns so I hope you will look at those and, of course we'll have plenty of time to talk about Economic Opportunity in the coming weeks as it will be before the City Council.

Housing Opportunity, a plan to tackle our growing housing shortage by building a little more housing in every neighborhood. I know we all recognize the gravity of this crisis. We have seen how rental apartment vacancy rates are at their lowest rate since the 1960s at 1.41 percent and the imbalance of power between landlords and tenants in this city.

There simply are not enough homes for New Yorkers to

live in and it is driving lents nigher and nigher.	
City of Yes for Housing Opportunity helps alleviate	
that crunch with a balanced approach that includes	
allowing more affordable housing in dense, high-cos	t
neighborhoods, allowing modest apartment buildings	
close to transit, and legalizing backyard cottages	to
give homeowners extra income to allow them to stay	
close to family. I applaud Speaker Adams for her	
recent Daily News op-ed with the Mayor that calls f	or
government action at all levels, including here in	
New York City with City of Yes for Housing	
Opportunity. I appreciate Council Members Brannan,	
Powers, and Bottcher for their vocal support of key	
elements of this plan, and I want to note that City	
of Yes for Housing Opportunity is driven by the sam	е
fair housing goals that animated the City Council's	
recently approved fair housing framework so we look	
forward to continuing to work closely with all of y	ou
as this plan advances to public review.	

City of Yes isn't the only way we have been advancing our housing and climate goals. In December, we launched Green Fast Track, which is a rulemaking process that will enable a streamlined environmental review process for small- and medium-

2.2

2.3

sized housing projects that use all electric heating.The changes would cut up to two years and lots of red

4 tape for these projects, getting homes built faster

5 and greener and, just yesterday, the City Planning

6 Commission voted to approve this initiative.

Alongside these citywide initiatives, we've been working on neighborhood plans across the boroughs tailored to meet specific community needs. In the East Bronx, we have a plan to complement the new Metro North stations that are coming in 2027, with 7,500 new homes, 10,000 jobs. This plan entered ULURP in January, and I want to thank you Chair Salamanca, Chair Riley, Majority Leader Farías, and Council Member Marmorato for your consistent engagement throughout the process. We really appreciate it and very much enjoy working with you on this project.

We've also been active in Queens
launching a neighborhood planning process for Jamaica
in May and Long Island City in October. We're
coordinating closely with Council Members and Natasha
Williams and Julie Won to arrive at strategic longterm visions for these neighborhoods that support
housing and economic opportunity and reflect resident

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

2.2

2.3

needs and, of course, Borough President Donovan
Richards, who is always our partner in all of the
matters in the Borough of Queens.

In October, we also kicked off the
Midtown South Mixed-Use Plan, which seeks to foster a
vibrant mixed-use neighborhood across 42 Manhattan
blocks, where housing is currently not permitted.

Earlier this month, we released the draft zoning plan
for Midtown South and we're working diligently toward
a formal land use proposal. Our thanks to Council

Members Eric Bottcher and Keith Powers as well as
Borough President Levine who have been close partners
on this project.

With guidance and collaboration from

Council Member Crystal Hudson, progress has continued
on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan to bring
housing and jobs to Central Brooklyn and we are
looking to begin ULURP later this year.

I also want to mention that we are grateful that the City Council adopted South Richmond Zoning Relief on Staten Island which eases burdens for homeowners by simplifying zoning and planning procedures, supports natural preservation, and strengthens community oversight. Thank you, Minority

2.2

2.3

2 Leader Joe Borelli, for working with us on these 3 sensible reforms.

We're very active across the boroughs and I know that I'm getting close to my time limit, but I will turn now in a moment to the budget. I do want to note that another area of focus has been creating new tools that help New Yorkers to understand their city and its demographics. In the past year, we released the Population Fact Finder and Map Viewer tools to visualize census data, the DCP Housing Database to see where new housing is being built, the most comprehensive data set ever of building elevations and flood risk, and much more. As these examples should demonstrate, we are committed to making the data that we collect transparent and putting it at the fingertips of New Yorkers.

Now for a financial overview, DCP entered Fiscal Year 2024 with an adopted budget of 48.7 million, an authorized headcount of 353 full-time staff positions, of which 32.8 million dollars and 182 positions are funded with City tax levy dollars. DCP's remaining 15.8 million budget allocation and 171 positions are funded by state and federal grants, primarily through HUD's Community Development Block

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Grant Program. The 48.7 million of Fiscal Year 2024 adopted budget allocated 32.9 million dollars to agency-wide personal services, which include parttime staff, interns, and members of the City Planning Commission, and the remaining 15.7 million to otherthan-personal services.

In comparison to the Fiscal Year '24 adopted budget, the Fiscal Year '25 Prelim of 44.1 million and 353 full-time staff lines represents a net 4.6-million-dollar decrease, largely attributed to the expiration of one-time project funds and the City's Program to Eliminate the Gap that mandated a 5 percent reduction in agency spending in the last two financial plans, including a reduction for our environmental consulting budget. The vast majority of the 4.6-million-dollar decrease relates to otherthan-personal services, OTPS, and came through EIS savings from realigned priorities. The rest of the decrease is due to OTPS efficiencies that we achieved in such areas as travel, copier rentals, printing. building maintenance, training, telecom subscriptions, things like that. Looking ahead, EIS needs will continue to be assessed to determine any necessary budget adjustments.

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

2.2

2.3

With personal services, there was no headcount change and a net decrease of 28,000 dollars. This was a result of cuts to personnel funding and was offset by increased funding for collective bargaining. Overall, these combined PS and OTPS budget changes result in a decrease of 4.6 million dollars and a zero headcount change to DCP's budget, establishing a Fiscal Year '25 Prelim Plan of 353 full-time authorized positions and 44.1 million dollars.

The Department of City Planning will continue to distribute its resources in the most effective way possible to advance the Department's work program and to meet the needs of New Yorkers all while striving for bigger, better, and a brighter future for our beloved city. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to say a few words at the beginning and I'm all yours.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for your testimony.

I am going to break protocol very quickly, and I'm just going to allow Council Member Sanchez to ask a few questions.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER SANCHEZ: Thank you so much, Chair. Really appreciate it. Hi, good to see you all.

My first question is on City of Yes for Housing Opportunity. When does the Department anticipate certifying the application and beginning public review?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Let's see, today is the 21st of March. I'd say it's coming soon. We are finishing up our environmental review, and this is a matter of weeks, not months so I would expect it before the summer.

COUNCIL MEMBER SANCHEZ: Great. Is the environmental review process the only limiting factor for the timeline.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Once that is done, we will be ready to refer it over to you and, of course, to Community Boards.

COUNCIL MEMBER SANCHEZ: Okay, and then a sort of technical question, so we understand that the text amendment does not go through the ULURP process, but what is the process that it goes through and what are the differences?

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: It's very similar. A text amendment starts with a referral by the Department of City Planning to Community Boards and to Borough Presidents then it comes back to the City Planning Commission for a public hearing, followed by a public vote. If it approved by the City Planning Commission, then it moves on to the City Council for consideration, where the Council has, as you know, the ability to approve, disapprove, or modify.

COUNCIL MEMBER SANCHEZ: Okay, thank you.

The reason that I'm asking about the timeline is just a concern for Community Boards. We know that they are offline in the summer and just making sure that they have ample time to review all of that substance, but I, for one, am very excited to get our hands on the meat, on the details behind a lot of these proposals, a lot of which I personally agree with.

The second question is a broader one. We know that there is a longstanding criticism that the Department has faced about being more of a department of zoning than a Department of City Planning and so throwing you, maybe this is, anyway, won't editorialize, but wondering how you would respond to that criticism today and what changes has the

2.2

2.3

Administration and the Department made to move more
in the direction of a comprehensive planning
framework for the City of New York and second part to
that question, last one, Chair, thank you for the
time, is in the wake of hopefully being successful on
all of the City of Yes amendments, how will the City
be approaching large parcels of land opportunity
sites such as, and I will be selfish, Fordham Landing
in the Bronx, which is a proposed development of over
3,000 units. Thank you.

much for those questions and, Council Member Sanchez,
I did want to note that on the subject of Community
Boards and giving them ample time to be able to
really process a detailed text amendment like housing
and also as we did with economic opportunity, we
intend to give them extra time and also we were very
clear on the last go around for Economic Opportunity
that we were not going to bind ourselves at the City
Planning Commission or at the Department of City
Planning to the specific 50 or 60 Day limitations
that Community Boards officially have to give their
recommendations. We were accepting comments from
Community Boards right up to and including the day of

2.2

2.3

the vote from the City Planning Commission because we want to hear their voices and we also know that these are complicated proposals, and we know that it takes time. I also will note, and then I'll get to your actual questions, that we had on the last go around on City of Yes for Economic Opportunity, some 175 meetings between the Department of City Planning and Community Boards on that proposal. I'll remind everybody there's 59 Community Boards so it comes out to almost an average of three meetings per Board and that's key to our role. We see that as central to the function of the Department, and we want to continue to do that. I just wanted to make that point. I certainly agree.

As for the ways we're looking at things more comprehensively, these proposals that we're talking about right here, where we're looking at things on a citywide scale and thinking about ways to thoughtfully advance change for the environment, for economic opportunity, and for housing are all of an effort for us to do more thoughtful citywide planning and also to think about the way that we're doing infrastructure investments in connection with planning in a way that makes sense, and I know Chair

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Riley is going to ask me about it because he said it in his opening statement so we're going to talk about the way that we allocate funds and the way that we intend to support neighborhood plans and the way that we intend to do citywide efforts on this front but, most importantly, we are trying not to do just site by site by site, but rather to look at this on a citywide basis.

The last thing on Fordham Landing North and other, as you say, large opportunity sites, there are sites in the city like that one and there are others which in many places in this country would be entire cities on their own and deserve that level of attention and focus, and so we are already working with your team to make sure that they and your community have the tools to be able to shape that proposal. It's a private application, as you note. It has to have zoning approvals. It's going to be a large-scale plan. That means there's lots of opportunity for the community, the Council, Community Board, Department of City Planning, City Planning Commission to shape that in a way that that we want to see it shaped so we really look forward to working

2.2

2.3

with you on that one. We know that's an important one to you and to the Bronx and to the whole city.

COUNCIL MEMBER SANCHEZ: Thank you so much, Chair. Thank you, Chair Salamanca.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Council Member Sanchez.

In terms of my questioning, I'm going to start off with staffing and attrition. The Department of City Planning plays a central role in advancing the Administration's growth and zoning goals, including the City of Yes agenda. Currently, the Department has a 13.9 percent vacancy rate, about half of the rate it had in July of 2022. Although that progress is welcome, DCP's borough offices still are struggling with staffing. The Bronx and Queens boroughs offices have vacancy rates of 25 and 30 percent respectfully. I'm a Bronx kid, Mr. Chair, question, what are we doing to increase staffing in the Borough of the Bronx and Queens, respectfully?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: First of all, let me just note on the vacancy, because I appreciate that we're making progress, we have a way to go, but there are also a couple of additional details baked in there that are worth the Council knowing about, that

2.2

2.3

right now there are 49 vacancies, the ones that create that for 13.9 percent number that you noted but, of those, 14 of them are right now pending OMB approval, seven of them are grant-funded through other sources and are not funded so if you take out the ones that are in the process of approval at OMB and the ones for which there's no separate grant funding, we're actually at an 8 percent vacancy rate, but I know your number is accurate though. It is 49 vacancies over the total number that we have, but I did want to note that if you were to take out the ones that are currently in the process and the ones for which there is no federal or state funding available, it's more like an 8 percent vacancy.

Put that aside, most importantly, we have lost staff and we do have some vacancies in some of our borough offices. What we do when that happens is we make sure that our borough offices are staffed sufficiently with central staff from the Agency's main headquarters here in Manhattan. We shift resources around to make sure that our work program in the Bronx and Queens continues unabated. We have some very big initiatives, as you know, Chairman, in the Bronx that we care about very much. We want to

2.2

2.3

make sure that the Bronx Community Boards are wellserved by the agency. That's part of our Chartermandated function. We are committed to that. We don't
believe we've lost a step, but I know that you, Mr.
Chairman and your Colleagues, will tell us if we do,
but we are working very hard to fill those vacancies,
make sure that we are fully staffed up.

By the way, there are some ways in which we have done that. We have already been out to meet with the deans of all of the planning schools. We have a fellowship program that we started last fall, which is a two-year program designed to give people a foot in the door with an eye toward hiring them at the end, an internship program. We also are losing people at a much lower rate. Our attrition is much, much lower. We only lost two percent in quarter two so we feel like we are in a much, much stronger position than we have been previously, but I certainly understand your point and we are very much focused on filling vacancies that we have, particularly in the borough offices where we know that we have some vacancies.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: I want to start by saying that the Bronx Director for City Planning, we

2.2

2.3

have a great relationship, open dialogue, he's accessible, he was the right choice for the position, but I want to make sure he has the resources that he needs as well, right, because we're going to hold him accountable and, if he does not have the resources necessary or staffing necessary, we cannot hold him to that level of accountability, and we need to ensure that he has staffing so that he can address our zoning concerns.

Now, how do the high number of vacancies impact timelines for the processing of applications at DCP?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: We are making changes in our processes to find ways to move applications a whole lot faster than we have historically. As I noted in my introductory comments, we are advancing new tools and procedures that will speed up some of these applications to make it easier, particularly smaller housing developments that are all electric and don't have other sensitive concerns like the length of time on construction or in flood areas. We are trying to streamline a lot of these procedures so that those projects can move faster. Our timelines on neighborhood plans, our timelines on the City of Yes

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

for Housing and Economic Opportunity have remained consistent throughout. We are we are working very hard to provide a very positive user experience for private applicants who are coming to engage with us at the Department. We have changed the procedure by which they engage. They come in, we get them to a preliminary application statement as quickly as possible, start the clock, measure the amount of time that it is taking from start to finish for these applications and not go through multiple back and forths with agency personnel, borough offices or otherwise. We're trying to make this a lot easier, and we're trying to eliminate redundancies that are unnecessary, that take up a lot of staff time, and are frequently working to the great frustration of people who are looking to do important things in the city like create housing and economic opportunities so we are we are creatively making changes here to try to be better and more efficient at what we do, all the while filling key vacancies to make sure that we can do even more at the same time.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: In terms of the applications that are submitted, maybe you could give us a percentage. How many applications are focused on

2.2

2.3

housing projects to address the housing crisis

opposed to just rezonings for anything other than

housing.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: So housing projects versus something else, like a change in a manufacturing district or commercial, that sounds like a Chief Operating Officer question to me so I'm going to turn to David Parish and see if he has those readily available.

to say that Council Member, Chair, we're going to have to get back to you with the details, but I will say in my experience, the vast majority of rezonings and the vast majority of all of our other actions are really about some type of housing creation. A small minority are for things like public facilities, daycare approvals, things like that. The vast majority relate to housing, but we'll get you that.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Got it. I think you answered my other line of questioning in terms of what challenges is DCP still facing to backfill some of these vacancies in your agency, but you did state what you're doing to address it in terms of going to schools and trying to recruit graduates. Now, are low

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 salaries or other uncompetitive features making it
3 harder to hire staff?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I think that we are really moving in a positive direction here, judging by our attrition rate, which is very low, and the collective bargaining agreements that were reached which brought up to 9 percent raises from longer serving staff and changes to the work from home dynamic that have been instituted. I do think people who are considering working at a city agency, they've got lots of great options, of course, in New York but see this one is one that is taking big strides, very mission-driven group of people, very talented. We do extensive professional development at the Department of City Planning. We have a Land Use Academy. We have a speaker series. We've got employee resource groups. We really do try to make this a very positive experience for our team, and I think that is bearing out so we feel really good about where we're headed, and we certainly continue to make the case that a professional experience at the Department of City Planning is good, positive, and will be very satisfying.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

On to questions in terms of the City of Yes Zoning for Economic Opportunity and Housing Opportunity. I know that in terms of this amendment, City Planning went to all 59 Community Boards. How many Community Boards supported the plan versus how many Community Boards voted it down?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: We'll get you the final number. It was something along the lines of 30 noes and 21 yeses, but I would have to I want to impress upon you, Mr. Chairman and the Council, to have a close look at what those responses were because in both the yeses and the noes, for those Community Boards that gave us a proposal-by-proposal evaluation of what we had sent them, the vast majority of these proposals got majority support from Community Boards. When you all are in a position to look at the 18 proposals that we're sending you in our City of Yes for Economic Opportunity plan, it has 18 subparts, and we asked Community Boards, give it to us every 18, tell us what you think, we want to know what you think. You like 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9, but you don't like 2, 8, 12, 14, and 18, let us know that, let us know what we can do. Even in their

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

initial recommendations when they gave us those tallies, almost all of these proposals got more than 50 percent support. I will also note that we made changes at the City Planning Commission to address the concerns that were raised at the community board level so when the time comes for the Council to evaluate this proposal, I would strongly encourage you to take a look at the changes that we made and see whether you believe that we have addressed them to your satisfaction. I think that we have gotten this proposal to a really a good place and really hope that Community Boards see that not only did we give them more time than what is defined in the process, but we also were very, very careful in meeting them where they were for those 175-plus meetings and also evaluating what they sent us and making changes, and I will let you know, Chair, that I did report back to Community Boards on the changes that we made in response to the Community Board process and have also forwarded that on to your offices so that you have that as a point of reference.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: In terms of the 18 proposals for this Economic Opportunity and Housing

Opportunity, I was a former District Manager before I
became a Council Member and I went through the
process of MIH and ZQA within the previous
Administration, this was about 2016, I believe, and
the confusion was it was just too much information
for Community Boards and the individuals who were
presenting to the Community Boards too were a little
confused as to what they were actually presenting,
and so all 12 Community Boards in the Bronx voted it
down and so did the Borough President at the time,
then I came here as a Council Member and I voted for
it because I understood, I sat down with the Land Use
Staff, and they gave me a detailed explanation of
what exactly MIH and ZQA actually does. Do you not
think that in terms of the Economic Opportunity and
Housing Opportunity, the 18 proposals, it was just
too much information that you provided or the
proposal was just too big that was presented to the
Community Boards?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thank you for that question. First, let me just make one distinction because the 18 is only Economic Opportunity. Housing Opportunity will come next. The 18 is just for Economic Opportunity. And, yes, you're right to say

2 it's a big proposal and, yes, you're right to observe that this is the process that we have so if the only 3 4 way to do something big in New York City in the 5 context of making citywide changes the way we're proposing is to send a lot of information to 6 Community Boards, that's what we have to do, but we 8 also need to meet them where they are, like your point is right. This is hard. This is complicated. People's eyes glaze over on this stuff frequently if 10 11 you're not engaging them properly, if you're not 12 talking in a language which makes sense. I remember 13 this too, even as a Council Member, sitting on the 14 receiving end of the briefings on ZQA and MIH, 15 finding it to be very, very confusing stuff if you're 16 not steeped in it on a daily basis so we have worked 17 really hard and, again, this is not perfect because 18 it's very hard. You have a limited amount of time in 19 the context for the Community Board. We have staff 20 that is out there. They're trying to engage and they 21 are. We are training them internally to go and make these presentations as accessible as they possibly 2.2 2.3 can be, and we are trying to serve our function as a quide and support to Community Boards in this context 24 but, no, I don't think that we should shy away from 25

2.2

2.3

the big things on that account. I think that we should embrace the big things but provide the necessary support to the people who are there to evaluate them like Community Boards, Borough Presidents and, of course, you all in the Council, and you can certainly count on that from us as you now take up Economic Opportunity, the Land Use Division, they've done a phenomenal job. They are experts in in the subject matter. We're here to support them, to support you in whatever you need. We know that this has a lot of complexity to it but, when you do something important, it's going to be hard and complex, and so we are here for the duration to see how we can support you in that.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. In terms of the Zoning for Economic Opportunity, the proposal will create clear and more enforceable rules about music venues and home occupations, but these new rules will not benefit communities unless they are actually enforced. The Department of Buildings is notoriously understaffed, and the Administration has removed nearly all of its inspector vacancies. What is the Administration proposing to increase enforcement for zoning and quality-of-life officials?

2 DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I will let the 3 Department of Buildings speak for themselves on their 4 enforcement capacity, but one of the things that is important to us is we have been working very closely with our partner agencies because we know that we're 6 7 not the enforcer of the zoning rules. That ends up being the Department of Buildings. Of course, it has 8 implications for the Department of Environmental Protection and everybody else. We've been working 10 11 very closely with those partner agencies, and one of the things that is an important note here on Economic 12 13 Opportunity is that the Department of Buildings 14 frequently looks at the zoning resolution, zoning 15 text, and sees questions and ambiguities, which makes 16 it very hard for them to actually enforce so if they have the personnel, sometimes our own zoning rules 17 18 are creating complexities for them or ambiguities for 19 them which are making it very hard for them to 20 enforce. Central to City of Yes for Economic 21 Opportunity is to eliminate a lot of those ambiguities that exist in zoning today. Ambiguities 2.2 in zoning are not the friend of innovators and of 2.3 business, and they are not the friend of enforcement 24 so by clearing those up and clarifying use groups and 25

2.2

2.3

better defining where you can do what, when, and where, we think that this will be easier for the Department of Buildings. I can't speak to your point about vacancies over there, but I can tell you that we have worked very closely with them to try to make this as clean and as easy an enforcement tool as they need to have.

asking communities to approve, which the majority of Community Boards voted down, to approve this plan, yet the Administration is aware that the Department of Buildings is understaffed, I know that's another agency, but City Planning is asking us to approve a plan dependent on another agency and that other agency is understaffed. Why should communities support it knowing that the enforcement component of it, there will be no enforcement because there's no staff to enforce?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I certainly
understand your question, and I understand the
concern. What I would say is communities should
support this proposal because it is creating real
opportunities for New Yorkers and that our zoning
resolution today is laughably outdated in the way

that it addresses innovation, the way people live an	ıd
work, light manufacturing, definitions of typewriter	
repair shops instead of, and airline ticketing	
offices instead of virtual reality and more modern	
things like cell phone repair stores. The zoning is	
prolonging storefront vacancies. It's creating walls	;
of lacks of activity in our commercial and	
residential corridors. It's impossible in some cases	;
to locate a corner store where people want to. It's	
difficult for film studios to have flexibility to be	ì
able to create a building structure that works for	
them and, of course, in response to the Speaker and	
this Council's advocacy, we also are including new	
tools for manufacturing zones and districts as part	
of this proposal. I understand the point that you ar	`e
raising. My response in the zoning context is, we've	<u>;</u>
tried to clarify things to make it easier for the	
enforcement agencies, but the reason why people	
should support it, and I will note, again, that of	
those 18 proposals, almost all of them were met with	L
majority support by the folks who gave us the layout	
and that's the reason why I think people should	
support it	

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. Zoning for Housing Opportunity strives for a more inclusive and affordable city, and the proposed Zoning Text Amendment is hoped to unlock upwards of 100,000 of the Administration's target of 500,000 new homes over a decade. Is there an overall breakout of which tools the City hopes to use to generate half a million units of housing in a decade?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thank you for that. Obviously to get to that moonshot goal, it's going to take everybody pitching in, not just us at the city, but also state and federal. The biggest thing that we're doing, of course, is the City of Yes for Housing Opportunity, which is, in sum, the most pro housing set of changes in the history of New York City zoning. Other moves at the city level to hit that goal include our Get Stuff Built reforms, like cutting red tape to unlock more housing. We have an affordable housing pipeline to build tens of thousands of units over the next decade and, of course, as I noted in my opening, we have five neighborhood rezonings in the works that can add thousands of units each and, of course, it's critically important that the state act to create a

2.2

2.3

successor tax incentive program for new development. Federal factors around financing, interest rate, also really important here so this is a sort of everybody needs to be pulling the boat in the same direction for us to be able to get there, and I will also note that your question was about 10 years but, when we make these zoning changes, we're looking backward to rules that were established in 1961 so the things that we do today will guide us over a long period of time to the 2080s and beyond, and so we believe that it will continue to enable housing over the long term.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right.

I'm going to hand it over to Chair Riley for questioning.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you, Chair Salamanca. How you doing, Director Garodnik?

I'm just going to start my line of questioning first with the PEG restorations. For Fiscal Year 2025, the PEG institutes a 1.5 million on the environmental impact studies, which will reduce DCP's capacity to conduct neighborhood rezonings and achieve additional planning goals. However, DCP has indicated that this cut will be restored in the

2.2

2.3

Fiscal Year 2025 Executive Budget. With that being stated, can you please confirm that the PEG will be reversed in the Executive Budget, and will the whole PEG be reversed across all years of the financial plan?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thanks, Chair Riley.

We're working very closely with OMB with our actual projections of need so that, whether the whole PEG is restored or less is restored, we're working with them to get the funding we need to advance our citywide initiatives and our five neighborhood plans so we feel very confident about that and have had great support from the Administration.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: If this funding is restored, will DCP take on additional neighborhood plans?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes, the answer is yes. We intend to take on more neighborhood plans.

It's central to our mission to do neighborhood plans.

There are five live right now, and there will be more to come and, yes, that's critical for us and for our mission.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you.

Going into the SEED program. I'd like to focus on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

capital funding requirement to make rezonings a success. In March 2022, the Administration launched its Rebuild, Renew, and Reinvent Blueprint for the City's Economic Recovery. In it, it included the launch of the New York City Strategy for Equity and Economic Development, the SEED fund. What is DCP's role in the SEED fund and what is the total size of the SEED fund in the budget?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Okay, so let me tell you a little bit about how we view SEED and how we view capital funding in connection with neighborhood plans because I think that is really the core of this issue. So SEED is the initiative, Strategy for Equity and Economic Development, that's going to be used to support capital investments related to neighborhood plans so when we do a neighborhood plan, it is our intention to make associated capital investments as part of that neighborhood plan. To do that, we will look at the scale of the change that's being proposed, historic disinvestment, resiliency, both climate for economic growth for each neighborhood. This is a different approach than what had been done previously, and we think that it is the right route for us to take a look at the needs in an individual

2.2

2.3

neighborhood where we have focused a neighborhood plan, look at Community Board statements of needs, look at agencies' priorities and what is actionable, listen to Council Members about what they want to see done in their own turf, and talk about what is the biggest needs that are created by our own neighborhood plan and opportunities and, once we throw that in the mix, that will define the projects that are funded so it's really a process which is defining the projects, and the projects will be

funded as part of that initiative.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: During that process, usually the typical, I know in my Community Board usually about schools, parks, libraries, roads, traffic, what about sewage? Being that proposed, a lot of this is increasing density within these communities, and we're seeing a lot of our stormwater issues when it's raining. Is sewage, I guess, investment looked at during the SEED process.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes, we have to be all-inclusive here when we're thinking about a neighborhood plan and, some neighborhoods, that's more of an issue than others, and we see that and so our goal here is to be thoughtful about the needs

2.2

2.3

that are presented and make commensurate capital investments and, Bronx Metro North, that's underway, and that will be the first real example of this so I've got three local Council Members right here on the dais and we'll look forward to working with you to deliver that.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you. A recent analysis by the IBO shows that the prior Administration's capital commitments were funded by a mix of funds from the NDF and overall capital budget. However, the NDF is almost entirely accounted for by prior commitments. If the NDF remains depleted or is being phased out, how does DCP intend to budget for neighborhood capital investments alongside neighborhood rezoning?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Right, the way we do it is the way that I just described, and one of the things I will note though is on that IBO report of the capital projects funding, you're correct to say NDF, that's a thing of the past, that was an old administration approach to doing this work. We intend to also deliver significant capital investments as part of our neighborhood plan, but we'll do it through a process that is built up through thoughtful

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

community-based priorities, Council Members and factors that include the size of the change and historic disinvestment, but the outcome will be equally, if not more significant.

As for the IBO's conclusion about 70 percent, I did want to note that some of the programs that had been committed to through points of agreement and past neighborhood plans, they were funded through a variety of different sources, not only through the historic NDF, but also through agency general capital budgets and that's not so easily visible to the IBO or others so when the IBO found that 70 percent of planned commitments had been spent or budgeted to date, they were only looking at NDF projects and other large, very specific projects that they could identify in the budget. The Department of City Planning made efforts with the IBO for the other 30 percent of projects to show them where they were funded, but they did not adopt that in their report because they could not precisely match our data and identify the projects in the city system. We understand that. We would have preferred if they had just put an asterisk and noted that they could not specifically identify the other 30 percent

commitments.

2	because, in fact, 100 percent of those projects are
3	funded or completed or underway so that's a
1	significant difference in conclusion and it's an
5	important one because we want to make sure that you,
5	Mr. Chairman, and your Colleagues understand that
7	when commitments are made, they need to be kept, and
3	it is central to our work to do neighborhood planning
9	to do capital planning alongside and meet those

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: This current

Preliminary Fiscal from 2024 to 2028 Capital

Commitment Plan has 216 million for NDF. Is any of that money still available?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yeah, that is money that has been planned to be spent for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 as part of those past commitments.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: So that's still available.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: It's still there, and that's part of the 100 percent funded that I was referring to a moment ago.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you. What is the next SEED investment under consideration?

2.2

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Bronx Metro North. 3 That's it. That's actually the first, it really is. 4 We've piloted the SEED program to test the way that we're evaluating projects and we have executed some 5 pilots in East New York, some streetscape 6 7 improvements on Steinway Street and St. Andrew's 8 Playground in Bed-Stuy and the Davidson Community Center in the Bronx. We've piloted it, but Bronx Metro North is the first neighborhood plan where this 10 11 will be applicable, and we're really excited because we know that this is an important piece of the 12 13 puzzle, and we're looking forward to working with you 14 and your Colleagues to get a great result here.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you. Just going to get some questions around the City of Yes so can you share how the City of Yes will extend home ownership opportunities for the working-class New Yorker struggling for higher housing costs?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Zoning is neutral on rental versus home ownership but, by creating opportunities and particularly in the sorts of typologies that are so limited today from existing zoning, we believe we're opening the door significantly to homeownership opportunities along

2.2

2.3

with everything else. By creating a little more housing in every neighborhood, we break down what were otherwise these artificial barriers which have limited housing from being created in all but a small handful of areas of the city. We need to do that. The impacts of not doing that are real. It is not only limited homeownership opportunities for people, but it has pushed rents way up. Our vacancy rate at 1.41 percent. Thank you to the Council, recognizing that declaring housing emergency yesterday. We are in it. We've got problems at all levels. Homeownership is certainly limited by the absence of supply and the absence of opportunity so the big picture answer there is let's create more opportunities and with it will come more home ownership opportunities.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Do you believe 500 new units can happen without active and major office conversions to residential?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Part of the proposal for our City of Yes for Housing Opportunity, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is to enable more liberal rules for office-to-residential conversion. We think that will yield some 20,000 units of housing by changing the date of eligibility from 1961 to 1990, expanding

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the geographic eligibility from what is functionally Midtown and Downtown Manhattan plus Long Island City and Downtown Brooklyn to citywide, we will allow for another 136 million square feet of commercial office space to be eligible for conversion. That's more office space than exists in the entire city of Philadelphia. We don't expect all of it to convert because it's complicated, it's expensive, but we do think that some of it will take advantage of it. We have made that estimate on housing. It's a piece of the puzzle. It is not the piece of the puzzle, it is a piece of the puzzle, but it's important because we have a lot of commercial office buildings that today are struggling. We need to help them and we also need to create housing in the process.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: What data and metrics will the Department use to track the progress of the City of Yes initiatives?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: First, we got to get the thing passed so I don't want to get ahead of myself, Mr. Chairman, so thank you. If we fast forward to next year, the Council has approved this proposal in full without a single edit, then we will, thank you, it was a laugh line, thank you. We will

2.2

2.3

- measure, of course, and we always do measure where we see housing starts, permanent housing, that's just something that is part of our routine oversight of what's happening in the city. We do it, HPD does it, and we, of course, will look forward to reporting
 - SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you.

 Chair, I have a second round of questions, but I would like to see if the Colleagues have any questions.

back to you on the success of all that.

- CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- I will now hand it over to Majority Leader Farías for questions.
- MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Thank you so much. Chairs. Hi, folks. I will compliment you in that as soon as this started, your Twitter account already had a great photo of all three of you on here so kudos to your comms team for being on top of transparency to the people of New York.
- I'd like to jump into some questions around industrial development strategic plans. As we worked really diligently on Local Law 172 of 2023 sponsored by myself in the Council requiring the

Local Law 172.

2.2

2.3

Department of City Planning and Small Business

Services along with the Economic Development

Corporation to develop an industrial development

strategic plan for industrial business zones

throughout the city so does DCP have the adequate

staffing and resources to undertake the citywide

industrial development strategic plan as required by

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: We certainly do, and we're looking forward to working with you on all that. We know what our deadlines are, and we've already begun thinking about how best to deliver this to you.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Amazing, and what so far is the progress of implementing the law?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: It's early. At this stage, as you know, deadlines don't even start until middle late of 2025.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Yes.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: But we have started thinking about how we are going to do engagement, how we're going to do the measurement of the questions that were asked in the law, how we're going to best identify opportunities. The first thing and most

2	important I would say for the purposes of today is
3	that we have forwarded to the City Council a piece of
4	the puzzle in the economic opportunity text in that
5	we're sending you three new manufacturing districts,
6	which could be mapped so and very much thanks to you
7	and your Colleagues and the Speaker for asking us to
8	do that, and we anticipate making recommendations
9	about where those sorts of tools should be used, and
10	we look forward to developing all of this in
11	partnership with you.
12	MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: That's amazing.
13	Thank you so much. The speaker and I will take all

Do you have any scope or any idea of how many jobs could the industrial action plan generate, maybe any anticipated

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{And should we expect any } \underline{\text{(INAUDIBLE)}} \\ \\ \text{workforce?} \end{array}$

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I'm sorry. Not yet.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Should we expect any new needs related to the industrial development strategic plans in the Executive Budget? The best answer is no for me.

credit.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yeah. I'm going to turn it over to David on this one.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: We have not heard back on budget needs for the Executive Budget. We did submit a proposal to OMB.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Okay, great. Does the proposal include any new needs specifically to these strategic plans?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes, it does.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Okay, thank you.

I have a couple questions on freight and last mile
warehouses. As we know, the growth of e-commerce has
brought a new model of enormous last mile
distribution facilities to our industrial areas,
particularly Red Hook and Hunts Point. Communities
are raising important concerns about the impacts of
truck traffic and the over-concentration of
facilities in certain neighborhoods. Has DCP studied
the growth of these facilities and is the agency
planning to address them?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: This is a really important issue, and we are looking at this very closely because we have seen concentrations of last mile facilities in specific corners of the city and

real issue.

2.2

2.3

it has an impact that is concerning so, yes, we are looking at it. There are other agencies that are also looking at this question, of course, DOT primarily, and so we're looking forward to working with them to continue that conversation because we see this as a

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Are you folks working cohesively? Is there a different format of how you're aggregating data or doing analysis?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: The Department of
Transportation is thinking about the ways to advance
more sustainable and truly last mile operations for
goods delivery here. Because we're talking about
movement of trucks, they would be the primary agency
to do that, but I will note that we have been working
with DOT in the Red Hook study to analyze truck and
traffic patterns in that area, and we're also
considering some possible solutions that could
potentially mitigate some of the impacts here. I also
will note, not to be a broken record and bring it
back to City of Yes for Economic Opportunity, but
also in this proposal is an opportunity to do microdistribution, which would allow for some of this to
be done actually in the neighborhoods where packages

with your support.

2.2

2.3

are being delivered so have small discrete places to move in and out so that there's not so much of a demand on a last mile facility and to do it in a way where you don't have either extra truck trips that are not necessary or loading and unloading of boxes on sidewalks, which is what too frequently is happening right now, so this is not the cure all to this problem, but this is a piece which I hope meets

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Thank you. I'd like to make a last plug just as often as you folks can both your agency and DOT to work with the EDC. We just passed the bill in the Committee on Economic Development on shore power. One of the main problems that we're seeing in Red Hook is the traffic mitigation.

Chair, I have a couple of questions left if I may.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Thank you. Just quickly on the environmental impacts from these facilities having on pollution, traffic congestion, and others at the neighborhood level, have we looked at that? Do we know what those are other than public

2.2

2.3

testimony we've received or even the availability of industrial land for job-intensive industrial manufacturing uses?

part of the question of what is available, what is being used where. We view as central to the law that you passed and that we are now beginning to engage on, there really has not been this level of hard look at manufacturing uses as you know, and we totally support it and we think that it is the responsible thing for us to be doing at this moment and also perhaps will help us answer some of the questions that you're asking me right now, which I think are excellent questions. We need to get into it.

MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Okay, great. And then I just have a last question. I'm excited that we made manufacturing in New York City sexy. We're trying our hardest here. Since 1961, we brought it back.

Just really quickly to lean in a bit on the Metro North Rezoning and the community concerns that we've seen come up through our many, many community engagement processes that both the Council have put together and DCP. Firstly, thank you so much

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

for working so diligently with us on all of that. I'd like to know if there's a specific point budget or if we've figured out how we're going to specifically fund or set aside funding for Metro North infrastructure improvements, safety improvements, even items like the community center, park space, or the police center that has come up within these rezonings?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: The short answer is we are we are amassing all of the opportunities right now. We are consulting with sister agencies. We're looking at community district needs that have been stated by Community Boards. We're looking to the priorities that you and your Colleagues have set out, and we will come back to you all to talk about what we view as the primary opportunities here, and that is all going to be put in through the process that I described to Chair Riley of look at the size of the change, look at historic disinvestment, find projects that are actionable, find things that directly address the needs that are identified as part of the neighborhood plan, but that's coming soon and we look forward to having that conversation with you.

1 MAJORITY LEADER FARÍAS: Okay, great. 2 3 Really look forward to seeing where in the budget or 4 if there's a specific budget on some of these things, specifically in the Parkchester component. I just want to make a last and final 6 7 comment. With ZHO oncoming, we really just want to stress, we worked really hard on net neutrality, 8 worked really hard on economic opportunity. I really want to impress on the Administration and DCP to make 10 11 sure that the community is engaged fully in ZHO. It's 12 smaller amounts of proposals but really big 13 proposals, and we want the community engaged as often 14 and frequently as possible so please continue doing 15 that with us. Thank you for the additional time, 16 Chairs. 17 DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thank you, and we 18 agree that's critically important here and we will. 19 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, 20 Majority Leader. 21 For questions, I will hand it over to 2.2 Council Member Joseph. 2.3 COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you, Chairs.

Council Member Rita Joseph, representing the 40th

I'm just going to read the brief statement. I'm

24

25

2 District. Coney Island Avenue runs through a portion 3 of my District but stretches from Prospect Park to 4 Brighton Beach. Over the years, we've had numerous tragedies along the street with pedestrians, cyclists 5 killed by motor vehicles. The zoning along the avenue 6 has not been updated for decades, as you mentioned, since 1961, and fosters a landscape of self-storage, 8 gas stations, fast food. We've seen individual rezoning application, but we need more comprehensive 10 11 and community-led approach that facilitates affordable housing, street improvements, 12 13 infrastructure investments, and economic development. I urge the Department of City Planning to work with 14 15 partner City agencies to focus on a plan for Coney 16 Island Avenue. The Department has taken on this task in other areas of the City, and I call on them to do 17 18 the same here. I look forward to working with the 19 Administration and making this a reality with the 20 community which deserve these improvements and 21 investments. However, DCP recently indicated to us that for the time being all further neighborhood 2.2 2.3 planning efforts are on hold due to budget constraints. Neighborhood planning is one of our best 24 tools to simultaneously deliver on both the City 25

2.2

2.3

2 housing goals and local investments to uplift

3 communities. With delays on neighborhood planning for

4 | Coney Island Avenue, I'm concerned we may be missing

5 an opportunity and will be left with scattered

6 private development application without coordinated

7 City investments.

When the Council approved my first project, 534 Coney Island Avenue application, I called for DCP to consider a neighborhood rezoning plan instead of further private application. Has there been any progress with this ask?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: First of all, thank you for your clarity and for your advocacy for us to do a neighborhood-wide plan on Coney Island Avenue. We hear you loud and clear, and we agree that this is a really important area and deserves our attention. I don't know what precisely was relayed to you, but what should be conveyed to you is that we believe that for the purposes of completing a neighborhood plan in this Mayoral term and this Council term, we think that we are at our max so we've got five that are underway. They're all coming to you all we hope in due course. That does not mean, however, that we cannot advance a neighborhood plan to continue beyond

2.2

that goalpost and, in fact, we are right now in the process of evaluating that very question of what's next. These things don't all happen at once. They come one at a time so as to manage our own workflow, environmental, technical review, borough office staff time, etc. We're very interested in this one, as you know, Council Member, and you should not have taken whatever was said, I don't know what was actually said, as a no. It's not a no. It is a we want to We're trying to figure out where this one fits in our plan, but we're very interested in it and we really appreciate that you are advocating for us to do it. It's really important so thank you for that.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you. How does DCP intend to accomplish our city housing production goals without adding additional neighborhoods? That plan cannot happen, especially, for example, this corridor on Coney Island Avenue. Ever since I was a kid, this is my neighborhood, I grew up there, that's Kensington, I grew up in Ditmas Park right down the street. It's always been that way. Storage, restaurants, auto shops, but nothing else.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: The short answer is

we can't. We can't.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Okay.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: We can't. We have to do more neighborhood plans. We've got five that are live and underway. More will come. We are right now looking at the questions, including Coney Island Avenue, as to what's next, but we love partnering with Council Members to advance thoughtful change in their neighborhoods and we love it when we have great partners so, again, this would be a very exciting one for us so we look forward to coming back to you soon.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: Thank you. Is there a timeline I could count on.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I appreciate that.

Over the coming months, we're going to be figuring out what's next. We have not launched a new neighborhood plan. We have several which are going to be voted on on a timeline that pushes us toward the end of 2025 that haven't yet even been certified. As you know, they take some time to develop and to and to mature here a little bit to a point where they can be certified, but we hope to be able to give you real direction on that in the coming months.

1 118 2 COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: And you're going 3 to have all the resources you need to get this done? DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes. 4 COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH: You heard that. 5 Thank you so much, Chairs. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Council Member Joseph. 8 9 Now we'll get questions from Council 10 Member Rivera. 11 COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Hi, thank you for 12 your testimony. 13 Just to follow up on Council Member 14 Joseph's question, how do you prioritize the 15 rezoning? I see here you have a few projects that are 16 very exciting and in Queens and in the Bronx that 17 you've mentioned a couple times, but is it that 18 Council Members reach out to you, is it that you look 19 at certain parts of the city, like how does that 20 work? 21 DIRECTOR GARODNICK: It's a great question, and the answer is it's a mix. It's 2.2 2.3 obviously very influential to us when a Council Member like Council Member Joseph in a public forum 24

says, hey, I want to be your partner and I want you

to work with me to do something that's very hard,
okay, so to me, that's a very big deal and, of
course, that's the level of partnership that we have
enjoyed with all of the neighborhood plans that are
presently ongoing, and we appreciate that, but it's
not only that. There are some neighborhoods that have
long been recognized as needing rejuvenation or that
they are struggling in a variety of different ways,
opportunity for housing. The Bronx Metro North plan,
which, yes, I have mentioned a number of times and
not just because I've got three local Council Members
here on the panel, two of them are Chairs of this
hearing, not just for that reason, but it's also our
first, but that one has been around for quite some
time as a concept and the MTA and the fact that
they're adding new Metro North stations in the East
Bronx, that obviously becomes a very significant
precipitating factor for that conversation so there's
no one thing, but we certainly do, and I certainly do
as a former Member of the Council, recognize the
importance of having a serious partnership with a
Member who can work with us who can do all the hard
things necessary to accomplish this difficult task.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Yeah, because you
3	ushered in the East Midtown rezoning, which I know is
4	more commercial-based which was a big deal and
5	there's Midtown South on here, which are 42 Manhattan
6	blocks, so just making sure there's equity in what
7	you're looking at. I like Midtown and I certainly
8	have some ideas for my district, but I want to ensure
9	that my Colleagues receive the same sort of
10	attention. The other thing that also affects my
11	district disproportionately, I can't help but mention
12	it, are resiliency measures and what you're doing
13	around that work. I know you released the building
14	elevation and subgrade data sets just late last year.
15	That's the most comprehensive data yet available on
16	building elevations of New York City buildings. The
17	data should help the City assess flood risk and
18	improve emergency management and, of course, direct
19	funding for local climate resilience efforts, which
20	is very exciting. How has the building elevation data
21	set been used so far? Are any building code or zoning
22	changes expected from the data and, if so, where?
23	DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yeah, I think that's
24	an excellent question, and it was recently released,

and the people who would be making those changes are

2.2

2.3

not our agency, but I will say that being able to identify in the context of Department of Buildings or Emergency Management to be able to communicate the areas where there's likely to be flooding in the future is a really important tool. I know that they are all looking at this actively right now and thinking about how best to put it to work for New Yorkers because, this came, as you know, from a terrible tragedy with Hurricane Ida and the City didn't really have this information. We will further evaluate what we have released to better understand the overall risks and inform the changes that you're mentioning, but I do know that our sister agencies are looking at this right now and thinking about how best to put it to use.

you're considering climate change and vulnerability with respect to some of the long-term development plans and patterns. Certainly, I know in some parts of my District, not all, but it's important, but I'm very much looking forward to working with you all on increasing housing production and supply and ensuring that the rezonings that have transpired in the past and the work that we've done in places like SoHo and

2.2

2.3

NoHo that we continue to follow up and implement that
successfully because now we're seeing that in other
transit-rich areas, which I think is a phrase that we
all like to use very much and I think it's very
smart, but we want to ensure that's implemented as
successfully as possible so it could be a model, but

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Fair enough. Thank you.

we could also do a lot better.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Council Member Rivera.

Mr. Chair, I want to ask you a few questions about prior rezonings, rezonings that occurred prior to this Administration. Now, Local Law 175 of 2006 requires DCP to publish a list of capital and programmatic commitments associated with neighborhood scale rezonings in an annual progress report detailing the status of each initiative. However, DCP's website for this requirement dictates that the last update was done in June of 2022. Why did DCP not provide any updates in 2023?

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes, thank you for that. There was a gap in COVID. We're fixing that, but understand that is something that is not okay and needs to be addressed so I appreciate you raising that and we will fix it.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. I take it that you there will be a tracker for 2024.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes, the Mayor's

Office of Operations, which updates that tracker, is

in the process of addressing this and, yes, it will

be fixed and fixed on an ongoing basis.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. In addition to tracking points of agreement, the commitments, does DCP monitor the success of the prior neighborhood rezoning in meeting their affordable housing and housing production goals?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Go ahead, David.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: So yes, we take a look at that. Sorry for the back and forth. We take a look at that and also, as it relates to the points of agreement, I wanted to point out that we, particularly for NDF funded projects, we routinely track them with deep collaboration with OMB so that we are aware of all the dollars being spent, where

2.2

2.3

they're being allocated, what years they go to, and
status updates, which we collect twice a year, and
then we work regularly with OMB on the budget data
so, while we do these look backs to understand what's
actually being done pursuant to our commitments, we

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Are you tracking how those rezonings, the impact it's had on that community in terms of displacement and

want to make sure that our commitments are held up.

11 gentrification?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: One of the tools that
we have that is an ongoing basis and that we look at
regularly at the City Planning Commission is a
displacement risk index that was activated through a
local law, and it's something that we scrutinize very
closely at the Commission. Racial equity report,
displacement risk, and it is something that
Commissioners look at closely any time anything is
happening in a neighborhood. I will, not to again
make another plug, but one of the biggest factors for
displacement risk is absence of supply here and,
Chair Salamanca, this is an important stat, which you
may know already, but in 2022 of the 59 Community

2.2

2.3

2 Boards in New York City, nine of them produced as 3 much housing as the other 50 combined.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Yep.

and so, when we're talking about displacement risk, gentrification, that is a direct feature of building walls around entire parts of the city where we can't functionally build any housing so I just wanted to note that because displacement risk, it's a real thing obviously and it's something that we need to deal with and, by creating more supply, we have a chance to actually deal with it significantly.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. Now, current rezonings, I know we spoke about the Bronx Metro North. I want to talk just briefly on the Atlantic Avenue, what is the status of on the Atlantic Avenue rezoning, and when is DCP planning to certify on this neighborhood rezoning.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: We're precertification. We're working very closely with

Council Member Hudson. We still have a number of

months left for pre-certification in our early work.

I would say in the fall we will be live on that one.

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Has the

Administration set aside capital dollars for this critical project?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: The way we're going to do this is to identify the projects and, as part of identifying those projects, in coordination with OMB, they will be assigned a specific project identifier, which will be funded at that time so we are committed. We can't do a neighborhood plan without significant capital dollars, but what we are doing is we're identifying the projects and then we are working with OMB to directly ascribe the dollars.

years back when the City Council voted to, I think it was the end of 2019, beginning of 2020, voted for the closing of Rikers Island and building the borough-based jails, there were commitments that were made throughout the four communities in which we're going to receive a new jail or an upgraded jail. I know in the Bronx Council Member Ayala negotiated certain capital needs that the Administration committed to and also some program funding for that. Do you know the status of the commitments that were made to

2.2

2.3

2	Council	Member	Ayala,	or at	least	to	the	South	Bronx
3	and whe	re are	we with	those	commit	mer	nts?		

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Let me come back to you on that. I do not know specifically, but I will find out for you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Okay. I'm going to hand it off to Chair Riley for his second round of questions.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you, Chair Salamanca.

Director Garodnik, just for the record, can you give me the size of the SEED fund?

misnomer to call it a fund. It is a process. SEED is a strategy. It is the way that we are going to identify the projects that will be funded so, in the past Administration and over the past number of years, there was a dollar amount, specific dollar amount set aside for the purpose of neighborhood plans, and that dollar amount was drawn down and has now been drawn down functionally to zero so what we are trying to do in...

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: So it's zero

now.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yeah, it's zero.

There's nothing in there. There might be a small amount left over from one of the prior neighborhood plans. We are trying to do this in a different way. We're trying to do this in a neighborhood-focused manner that addresses some of the flaws that we saw with that pot of funds' structure because every neighborhood's needs are unique. As our planners work with each community, we're going to consider each area on its own merits and identify and prioritize the capital needs that support the scale of the change and also address historic disinvestment so that means by doing that in a neighborhood-focused approach, it means there's not a set pot so we don't intentionally put one neighborhood up against another. We got five neighborhood plans right now. You have just a pot. We don't want neighborhoods fighting with each other over that. What we want to do is we want to thoughtfully identify what neighborhoods need and deliver it so that's the way we are approaching so to call it a fund is really, it's really not right. It is a process, one that we think will more thoughtfully balance needs across neighborhoods and also allow us to get to the real

2.2

2.3

2 heart of what neighborhood capital needs are and to deliver it.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Okay. My two lines of questions are going to be regarding Get Stuff Built and office conversions for the remainder.

Budget included a new need for Get Stuff Built. We all know the Mayor loves Get Stuff Built. Eight temporary positions were added for approximately 796,000 and funded for Fiscal Year 2024 and 720,000 for Fiscal Year 2025. These staff were intended to advance Get Stuff Built initiatives and develop digital tools and service related to the City's environmental quality review, data dissemination, and reducing the complexity of analysis. With that being stated, can you provide an update on the status of last year's new need for Get Stuff Built? Are all eight positions filled and what progress has it made so far?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: Yeah, so seven of the eight positions are currently filled and the Green Fast Track that Chair Garodnick spoke about, the research that was required, the rulemaking, we built an online tool to guide people

2.2

2.3

through that Green Fast Track, which is frankly really cool, and we can share it in the next couple of weeks with you. That is all bearing fruit because of this investment the City made. We're also making other changes to our land use process to speed things up, but that process takes quite a long time, and so it will take time for those changes to shorten the overall application process.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you. One of the proposals was to report to reduce the long rounds of closed-door pre-application meetings between DCP staff and land use applicants, and instead move more quickly towards publicly available filed application. Is that still happening?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: That has happened, and I'm going to turn to David to say how it has happened but, yes, we're happy to share with you that is already underway.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: Yeah,
thanks to Edith's leadership with the borough
offices, we are now limiting those private meetings
at the very beginning of the process, and one other
change we've made is to limit applicants to one draft
application so that applications get filed sooner

2.2

2.3

and, of course, when an application gets filed, that gets shared with Community Boards, the City Council, and others, which gives all those folks a longer runway in seeing the information that applicants are proposing.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Is there a specific budget line in DCP's budget for Get Stuff Built?

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER PARISH: It's across a couple of different divisions. Our IT, our Planning Support, and there's not a specific budget line. Most of our headcount is pretty generalized.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: In August 2023, the City launched an Office Conversion Accelerator to expedite complex office to housing conversions projects, and you spoke about this before, Director Garodnik, and potential 136 million square feet, and we do understand this is going to be very challenging to obtain and complete. Can you provide an update on the work DCP is doing with office conversions right now?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Yes. The Office Accelerator is up and underway. It's receiving interest from building owners that are looking...

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: And also if you could go into the next milestone, sorry to cut you off.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: The next milestone?

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Yeah.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: People are approaching the City in the context of this accelerator and asking how the City can move them faster through the process, and there's been interest. I think some 50 buildings have showed up to say, or the buildings themselves have not come by, but their owners, let's say, or representatives have come by to express an interest in looking at an office-to-residential conversion, and that's great. That's an important tool, and it's working, but most fundamentally, there's a limitation to how far that can go so the next milestone for us is for us, at the Department of City Planning, to refer out City of Yes for Housing Opportunity to Community Boards, Borough Presidents, and ultimately to the Council because it is in that very text where we will propose to change the rules to enable this to happen more freely, so the next milestone will be in the coming months. We will send that proposal out to Community Boards, and

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 it will land on your desk, Mr. Chairman, sometime
3 later this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: I can't wait.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: I bet.

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: My last question. What budget and policy changes do the City and DCP need in order to help convert these offices into housing?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: So the biggest policy changes relate to the date of eligibility for the buildings. Today, as a practical matter, if your building is not in Midtown Manhattan and built before 1961, you're not eligible to take advantage of the rules that would enable a conversion. There are exceptions to this, of course, 1977 in Lower Manhattan, the geography is a little broader than what I just said. It also includes Long Island City and Downtown Brooklyn but, functionally, Manhattan Central, pre-1961, you're eligible, everywhere else, not possible. The first thing we want to do is we want to change that date of eligibility from 1961, 1977 Lower Manhattan to 1990. We also want to broaden the geographic eligibility so that it's not just the areas that I described but also make it citywide so

2	if you are in an area which today allows for
3	residential, we would enable you to do a conversion
4	to residential. We also want to allow for different
5	types of housing in the context of an office-to-
6	residential conversion, and these are the big policy
7	moves that we'd like to see. In addition, and this
8	one needs Albany, we would like Albany to deliver to
9	us a tax incentive so we can create affordable
10	housing in the context of an office-to-residential
11	conversion. That is a really important tool, and we
12	hope that they give us that opportunity as part of
13	this legislative session.
14	SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you,

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR RILEY: Thank you, Chair.

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair 18 Riley.

Just two more questions and we're done here, Mr. Chair.

The Administration's initiatives on ZEO and ZHO are raising a lot of concerns and confusion among communities. In response, DCP has held briefings with all the Community Boards, but this engagement is just a start. There needs to be a

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

deeper and ongoing engagement with communities. Since
the pandemic, has DCP's staffing for community

4 engagement increased or decreased?

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: It's actually increased in that we have established an entire unit designed to community engagement. That's a new initiative from this Department of City Planning, recognizing the need for us to speak the same language as New Yorkers as it relates to these complicated proposals. It's one of the reasons we were able to do 175-plus meetings with Community Boards, and it's one of the reasons we are able to train our own staff and planners that are going out to engage with the public to use more common language and to try to demystify some of these concepts, which are inherently very hard, so the short answer to your question is, yes, we have an entire team of people whose job it is to do better community engagement. To your point, this is mission critical. We need to make sure that people understand what we're after for its own sake but, also, we know that that's important to the Council Members at the end of the day who are going to be voting on this proposal.

2.2

2.3

2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HSU-CHEN: May I add to 3 that?

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Yes.

We view it absolutely our responsibility to make sure the content of our proposals are accessible and comprehensible and, in addition to the new unit that the Chair spoke of, our Community Planning Engagement Team, we're also using many more new tools of engagement so we have more public info sessions, we have open houses, we are out in libraries, we have active workshops so we are very active in developing new ways to making sure that folks understand what we're talking about. It's really important to us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank you and your team for today's budget hearing. I will be following up with your agency on the vacancies in the Bronx. I want to make sure that my Bronx Director gets the help that he needs, and please let your City Planning staffers know that we appreciate them. I know at times they may feel unappreciated, but we appreciate them. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR GARODNICK: Thank you for that,

Mr. Chairman. It's good to see you all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: All right. We're going to take a two-minute recess and we are going to start with public comments.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Mr. Chair, with your permission, we will now move to the public testimony portion.

We will begin with speakers who are present in the room with us today and so I will invite to the panel table, Sarah Internicola, Sarita Subramanian, and Paula Segal, and you may all three approach the table and get settled and sorry if I mispronounced anyone's name.

After the in-person testimony, we will take testimony from two remote Zoom participants,

Kevin Wolfe and Emily Goldstein. Thank you both very much. Thank you all for your patience. We will go to you after the in-person testimony.

SARITA SUBRAMANIAN: Good afternoon, Chair Salamanca. My name is Sarita Subramanian, and I'm Senior Research and Strategy Officer at the New York City Independent Budget Office. Thank you for the opportunity to testify at this hearing to discuss

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

IBO's recent report on capital pledges for recent neighborhood rezonings written by Zach Herman and Sarah Internicola, who joins me here today. We thank Council Member Natasha Williams for requesting this research. The bulk of my testimony, my written testimony, focuses on the capital dollars pledged as a result of a recent neighborhood rezonings and progress on those pledges, but I wanted to first discuss some of the questions around our analysis as brought to your attention by Director Garodnik, and so I thought it would be helpful to explain the process of how we identified capital projects and to clarify that we did look at both projects that were funded by the NDF as well as projects that are funded within City agency budgets, so our analysis really started with point of agreements and so we looked specifically at capital projects and used text searches to identify the specific areas specific projects within the City's Capital Commitment Plan so we looked project-by-project using data from the Adopted Capital Commitment Plan and so for the NDFspecific projects, they also followed standard naming protocols that allowed us to look comprehensively at both pots of money, both within City budgets and the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

NDF funds, and the other aspect of my testimony that I wanted to highlight was that there are three types of pledges in points of agreements. First are the capital pledges, which is what we looked at. Others are expense pledges in the expense budget, but there are also policy pledges, and those actually accounted for the majority of, if you look by number of pledges in points of agreements, and those do not have dollars stipulated in the POAs, which makes them particularly challenging to track from a transparency perspective in order for us to determine whether or not those pledges were actually committed to. I did also want to clarify, we include in the testimony and also in our larger report, a table by neighborhood so while it is true that we note that all eight rezoned areas have at least 70 percent of their pledged dollars spent or budgeted to date, there is quite a bit of variation by neighborhood so we do recognize that the amount that was budgeted is over what was initially pledged, but we do also note some that were under that amount. To Director Garodnick's comment about the difference between those that are under 100 percent and those that are at 100 percent, I think that relates to the fact that we compared to the

2.2

2.3

points of agreements, the initial agreement so it is possible that projects could come under budget just as much as projects can cost more than what was initially agreed upon so that's something that we are very much interested in gaining a better understanding of. Obviously, from the data that we have available to us, we're not able to identify the reasons why projects would come under and we're very much interested in understanding that difference between what is under versus at a hundred percent.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you. This was helpful.

PAULA SEGAL: Good afternoon, Chairperson and the rest of the Committee in absentia. My name is Paula Segel. I am here today as Senior Staff Attorney in the TakeRoot Justice Equitable Neighborhoods Unit, and I'm here to present our budget testimony, which focuses on some expenditures that we want to make sure are in the budget, particularly the continued support of this Council for Community Land Trusts, which really we've taken five years and it feels like we've done 25-years' worth of work and working with new groups that are not in the initiative yet, and we really need to expand the initiative to make sure

that there's space for them to have funded positions 2 3 that we're not relying on all volunteers to plan for 4 the future of our city. I think it was Council Member Sanchez earlier today who said that we have a 5 department of zoning instead of a Department of City 6 7 Planning and, as much as the agency is moving away 8 from that, what we have in the Community Land Trust Initiative is a grassroots planning infrastructure that is both planning for specific sites and planning 10 11 for neighborhoods and planning for policies that will 12 improve neighborhoods across the board. I saw you 13 flip to the last page. We just put out a report this 14 week where we used actually census data to have a 15 data-driven analysis that shows that the City's lien 16 sale, which was a Rudy Giuliani policy, 17 disproportionately or proportionately impacts 18 tenants. 85 percent of the units in buildings going 19 through the lien sale are actually renters and not 20 people who live in homes where they have their name 21 on the deed. That's not surprising in a city of 2.2 renters, but we need planning and policies that 2.3 protect those tenants and we want to see that put in place this year. That's going to take supporting the 24 Department of Finance and making sure that their 25

half a unit so each of those groups right now should

be getting about 98,000 through HPD. That won't

24

25

2 necessarily change if we get the increase, but 3 hopefully it will by a little bit. We really need to 4 bring some new groups on board who have been doing the same work but not getting paid. Those groups are 5 not in your District. Your District has a great 6 7 concentration of funded Community Land Trust Initiative groups, which is wonderful, but we have 8 groups that have been working for nearly as long in Ravenswood houses, actually there's a group of NYCHA 10 11 residents that have formed a Community Land Trust, 12 have been doing the organizing work through COVID, 13 focusing on a site that Department of Sanitation 14 plans to abandon when a Sanitation garage moves 15 probably in the next year or two and hoping to have that site be dedicated to a community. There's a 16 17 group in Flatbush that has been organizing actually 18 homeowners and small homes and kind of tax class one 19 rental properties and trying to put together an 20 assemblage that will create a preservation strategy for those homes There's another group in South 21 Brooklyn that's working with folks in terms of estate 2.2 2.3 planning and getting homes to go into the CLT, and they're all just volunteer or they're getting small 24 grant funding, but none of them are in the Initiative 25

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- so we would love to have the groups that are already
 funded get a little more money, and we would love to
 grow the number of groups.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: That's good. Thank 6 you. Thank you for your statement.
 - PAULA SEGAL: Thank you so much.
 - COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Okay, now we will turn to our remote testimony. First, we will hear from Emily Goldstein who will be followed by Kevin Wolfe.
- 12 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Emily, you may begin.
- EMILY GOLDSTEIN: Sorry, I have to find the unmute. Apologies.
 - Thank you very much for the opportunity
 to testify today. My name is Emily Goldstein. I'm the
 Director of Organizing and Advocacy at the
 Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development,
 or ANHD. Appreciate Chair Salamanca and the Committee
 for holding these hearings.
 - I want to specifically talk about a couple of things, and we'll submit longer testimony online. First, it became clear even in the course of your questions to the previous panel and to the Commissioner that there's a lot to grapple with with

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the City of Yes text amendments that are coming through both on the economic development side and on the housing side. We're also looking ahead to the implementation of the new Fair Housing Framework Law, which we're very excited about, and the new planning that's going to take place around industrial zones, and so it's really more important than ever for New Yorkers to be able to understand and engage in an empowered and thoughtful way with the land use and planning processes that are happening in their communities, and we know, unfortunately, that in a lot of situations that it's just not the experience that people have with the land use and rezoning process, and so we are proposing and asking for your support for a new initiative to do land use capacity building that would provide resources including trainings, both virtual and in-person, print and online popular education materials, and technical assistance to help community members, Council Members, Community Boards really engage in the zoning and planning processes that are happening in their neighborhoods. This is an area that ANHD has a robust history with. We've done a lot of this type of work, and we're getting requests for support that are

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

beyond our capacity to fulfill, and so we are hoping
to be able to work with and partner with you all to...

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Time expired.

EMILY GOLDSTEIN: Increase capacity to really give all of those who are meant to be engaged and involved in the land use process the opportunity to do that effectively.

I also want to make a quick plug, we did this with the Small Business Committee as well, but there's obviously crossover in interest for better and sustained funding for industrial business service providers. This is particularly relevant in this context because we are going to be rolling out the industrial strategic planning that was passed by law last year, and this is funding for non-profits that work every day with the 40,000 industrial firms in the city's industrial business zones and who are really going to be important and crucial on the ground to help make this new planning process work and be as effective as possible. Thank you very much for your time. I'm happy to answer any questions and, again, submitted longer testimony online.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you for your testimony.

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL HUH: Kevin Wolfe.

3 KEVIN WOLFE: Great. Thank you, Chair 4 Salamanca, and thank you to the Committee on Land Use. My name is Kevin Wolfe. I am with the Center for New York City Neighborhoods. We are one of the 6 7 largest homeowner service organizations in New York 8 City. We were actually founded by the City Council in part back in 2008, and the Council has provided annually nearly 5 million dollars in support for 10 11 homeowner services, including foreclosure prevention, 12 as well as home repair. The center, part of our role 13 is to advocate for New Yorkers at all stages of the 14 homeownership journey from buying a home to 15 maintaining the home with home repair to foreclosure 16 prevention and to estate planning and, when we look 17 at the City of Yes proposal, the Center is strongly 18 supportive of bold steps to dramatically expand 19 affordable homeownership opportunities in particular, 20 particularly for low- to moderate-income families by 21 building more homes. We're recommending that the City 2.2 make a wide-scale investment in new development of 2.3 multifamily affordable homeownership at scale, and this can include a mix of limited equity co-ops, 24 condos as well as community land trust, and we were 25

2.2

2.3

very happy to see Chair Pierina Sanchez and her 2-billion-dollar initiative towards new construction as well. Our proposal includes an ambitious plan to create 120,000 new units of permanently affordable homeownership that would house 400,000 New Yorkers over a 25-year period, and the vision really is that this homeownership would be at scale across New York City. In fact, the homeownership would be placed in geographic areas of the city that don't currently have a large homeownership population, and it would...

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Time is expired.

KEVIN WOLFE: Be really a model for what cities could do across the country. We would use a mixture, as I mentioned before, of limited equity coops, condos as well as community land trust, and this will ensure that these projects maintain affordability for future generations, and we're looking, in particular, to build on the commitment that the Administration has made of nearly 900 million dollars for additional capital dollars for the construction of new homeownership development, and also we'd look to engage unions, insurance companies to be active stakeholders that can put in equity into new homeownership.

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

2.2

2.3

Finally, when it comes to new development, New York City could also look to investing in down payment assistance programs.

Obviously, there's been a restarting of HPD's down payment assistance program but also post-purchase counseling and estate planning. We were happy to see the Speaker strongly support new estate planning investment and look forward to working with the Council Member on those items. We know that in order to make sure that we have affordable homeownership accessible to all New Yorkers, we have to increase and build new homeownership, but we also have to preserve the existing affordable homeownership that we have so thank you for the opportunity to testify today and happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON SALAMANCA: Thank you for your testimony.

All right. With that, that concludes this preliminary hearing for Land Use. I want to thank all the speakers. I want to thank the Public Land Use Staff and the Finance Staff for putting this together. I want to thank the Sergeant-at-Arms, and we're hereby adjourned. [GAVEL]

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



Date April 20, 2024