

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT B. TIERNEY, LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CHAIR, BEFORE THE LAND USE COMMITTEE OF
THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL
MARCH 6, 2014**

Good morning Chair Greenfield and Honorable Council Members. I am Bob Tierney, Chair of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before your Committee about the Commission and its FY 2015 preliminary budget.

The Landmarks Commission is the mayoral agency responsible for protecting and preserving New York City's architecturally, historically and culturally significant buildings and sites. Under the City's landmarks law the Commission must be comprised of at least three architects, a historian, a realtor, a planner or landscape architect, and must include a representative of each Borough.

LPC's Fiscal Year 2015 preliminary budget is \$5,023,557, which comprises \$4,465,565 in City funds and \$557,992 in Community Development Block Grant funding. Of the CD funding, 21% is allocated for our grant program for low-income homeowners and non-profits, and the remainder is used to support agency community development-related functions such as surveys, archaeology, community outreach and education.

There are a total of approximately 31,650 designated properties throughout the City, including 110 historic districts and 20 historic district extensions; 1,338 individual landmarks, 117 interior landmarks and 10 scenic landmarks.

The Commission places a high priority on working with owners of historic properties. From the first letter to an owner communicating our interest in a potential landmark, to an ultimate designation vote, we communicate the Commission's actions at every step through evening information session and meetings, and are always available to answer calls and meet with owners who have questions or concerns about designation or who wish to discuss a potential project with our staff. The Commission works with this body to ensure that the relevant council member has all the pertinent information about a potential landmark and what feedback we've received from the owner. We solicit the views of the council member as we move forward in the process and address any potential issues prior to a designation vote.

The Commission continues to expand outreach efforts to already landmarked communities throughout the city as well as to those who are interested in organizing efforts to pursue designation for their neighborhoods. Commission staff holds evening meetings with community boards and neighborhood groups on a regular basis to provide them information and answer questions. We have planned numerous meetings in the field and several workshops for targeted audiences this fiscal year. In addition to regular meetings with homeowners, our staff continues to lead discussions before real estate brokers and lawyers, and other groups interested in learning more about landmarks and our process.

Last fiscal year, LPC designated three historic districts and extensions as well as 17 individual structures, adding a total of 1,400 buildings to the City's inventory of historic sites. In the current fiscal year, we have already designated one historic district, the South Village Historic District, and 10 individual landmarks, and we will vote on the designation of the Park Avenue Historic District in April, and the Central Ridgewood Historic District in June, bringing the total number of projected building designations for this fiscal year to 1,337.

In the case of historic districts, the Commission spends months and sometimes years with community groups and property owners, providing education and outreach and gauging the level of support for designation in these communities.

An important part of this process is establishing district boundaries. This is one of the most challenging aspects of designating a historic district. When considering the boundaries, the Commission's expert staff makes careful decisions about which properties should be included, in order to meet the legal requirement that the district must be cohesive and have a sense of place. We consult with community groups, Council Members and other interested parties concerning the boundary proposals, and the Commission carefully considers this input and often revisits draft boundaries in order to arrive at the most cohesive and meritorious historic district. This successful collaboration results from the deliberate and careful approach employed by myself and my staff to ensure that the Commission achieves its mission of protecting the city's historic resources while fostering partnerships with neighborhoods and property owners who wish to protect their investments and maintain the stability and value of historic neighborhoods that draw so many visitors to our great city.

The Commission receives hundreds of requests for potential historic districts and individual landmarks each year, and many of these proposals do not meet the threshold criteria for designation. Therefore, the Commission concentrates its resources on the work of designating those buildings and districts that are not only most meritorious, but also where community support has been clearly expressed, while balancing the Commission's priorities of protecting historic resources in all five boroughs.

As the demand for designation increased, the need for the Commission to protect and regulate landmark buildings has also increased. The Commission does not seek to stop change, but rather to ensure that adaptations and changes over time are appropriate.

In Fiscal Year 2012 the Commission issued 11,238 permits, more than twice the number of permits issued in the mid-1990s. So far in Fiscal Year 2014, we have received 8,346 applications which is a 12% increase in the number of applications we received by this date last year (7,339). We've landmarked more buildings, we're receiving more applications, and we are issuing more permits. We've always been able to meet the demand for permits by constantly reviewing our processes, improving our workflow, and streamlining our agency. To maximize efficiency, we expedite approximately 30 percent of our permits through our FasTrack Service. We've also designed materials to help applicants get through our process more quickly. We have recently added 6 new full time permit-issuing staff members. We are always looking for new ways to increase efficiency and enhance our agency's interaction with applicants, including further expanding the FasTrack program and streamlining the application intake process. Additionally, the Commission continues to conduct research on green technology to learn how new, greener materials can fit appropriately within the context of historic buildings.

Our goal remains to provide a faster, improved, easier process for property owners and field professionals. By providing technical assistance and clear instructions on how to get through the landmark process as quickly as possible, we help those who are performing work on a designated property complete their projects more efficiently. Our Permit Application Guide, published on-line last year, has proven to be an invaluable tool for those seeking to do work on landmark properties. It is an easy to follow, simplified instruction manual on how to file a permit application for the most common types of work on a building. By providing this manual and offering workshops to applicants, we provide property owners and professionals with the tools to be able to complete the LPC process expeditiously. When

applicants need additional assistance, our staff meets with them to go over their projects and explore how they can achieve their project goals.

The Commission is pleased that the Mayor's Executive Budget provided additional funding for fiscal year 2014 and has maintained that level of funding for Fiscal Year 2015. The additional funding was used to increase the number of permit-issuing staff at the Commission. As a result of our increased landmark designations and increased construction city-wide, there has been (as stated) an increase of 12 percent in permit applications throughout the five boroughs of the City. The Commission has maintained permit issuance levels in response to this increase. So we believe that the recent addition of these critical permit-issuing personnel will ensure that we continue to meet or exceed our targets while fulfilling our mission.

Ensuring that historic buildings are protected, the City carefully reviews proposed work for restoration, renovation, additions and new buildings within historic districts. LPC reviews applications ranging from minor repairs to an individual landmarked home to full-scale adaptive reuse projects. In the Commission's view, the best preserved buildings are those that are in active use. As such, the Commission constantly considers applications for reusing historic building that may involve additions, accessibility changes, and other changes. Some of the most successful adaptive reuse projects the Commission approved this year include the Kingsbridge Armory adaptive re-use as an ice hockey rink, combining careful restoration with the necessary changes to bring New York City one of the largest, most modern ice skating / hockey rinks in the region. Similarly, the former Child's Restaurant on Coney Island received approval for alteration to allow several new uses and to connect it to a new amphitheatre. There are many other examples of adaptive reuse and restoration to facilitate residential conversions including, 70 Pine Street, the Woolworth Building, Barclay-Vesey Building and Old St. Patrick's Convent and Girls' School. The Domino Sugar Factory redevelopment included the restoration and adaptive reuse of the landmark factory building and the entire project will include a significant number of affordable housing units.

As part of its mission of preserving and protecting the City's architectural treasures, the Commission has an award-winning grant program that offers a variety of grants to low and moderate-income home owners and 501(c) (3) not-for-profit organizations to help to restore or repair the facades of their landmarked buildings. Since its inception in 1977, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission's Historic Preservation Grant Program has awarded more than 450 grants to homeowners and non-profits to

help them restore many of New York City's treasured streetscapes and architectural gems. The eligibility of homeowners and non-profits for grants is determined by HUD's National Objective, including an applicant's income and the benefit the restoration work would have in providing relief for blighted conditions in low and moderate income areas. The program has an annual budget of **\$114,790**, which is awarded in Community Development Block Grant (CD) funds. Our program staff works closely with applicants to assess eligibility and explain how an owner or non-profit can qualify for the program. The Historic Preservation Grant Program receives approximately 15 complete grant applications per year. Grants awards typically range from **\$5,000 to \$20,000**, with the average grant amount being **\$15,000**. The program offers 8 or 9 grants per year – to about 60 percent of its eligible applicants. Once a grant is awarded our staff provides assistance every step of the way,

In the past, the Historic Preservation Grant Program has funded the restoration of homes in the Alice and Agate Courts Historic District, Stuyvesant Heights Historic District, Crown Heights North, Fort Greene and Prospect Lefferts Historic District, Mott Haven Historic District, Addisleigh Park Historic District and others. In addition, the grants program has funded the façade restoration of a low-income Housing Development Finance Corporation (HDFC) building in the Audubon Park Historic District.

Finally, the agency continues its vigorous enforcement of the Landmarks Law. Our Enforcement Department has resolved **475** complaints so far this fiscal year. In this same time period, we have issued **449** warning letters and **102** Notices of Violation. The Commission seeks to work in partnership with property owners, and approximately two-thirds of the warning letters result in owners applying expeditiously to the Commission to address their violations with no fine or penalty. As an example of LPC's commitment to helping property owners and businesses in historic districts, the Commission continues its collaboration with the 82nd Street Partnership, a BID in the Jackson Heights Historic District to help business owners address violations and improve their storefronts. The partnership was previously awarded a \$50,000 grant from Small Business Services to provide technical and financial assistance to these businesses. The LPC has met on site with business owners and landlords, has provided guidance and fast turnaround for these projects, and joined with the Partnership and SBS to mark the restoration of several storefronts on a prominent corner of 82nd Street.

Working with the Law Department, the Commission continues to actively bring forward Demolition by

Neglect lawsuits, which have been an important and effective enforcement tool to address neglected buildings and respond to community concerns about the issues they can cause. These legal actions are brought when landmarks are in serious disrepair and owners have not responded to repeated Commission requests for repairs to be voluntarily undertaken. There are currently 4 active demolition by neglect lawsuits -- 3 in Brooklyn, and one on Staten Island. In most cases, the Commission is successful in working with an owner to address the issues with their property, or the owner has chosen to sell the property to a new owner who can perform the necessary repairs.

I believe the Commission's actions continue to meet the challenge of balancing the need to preserve the fabric that gives New York City its character and defines its rich cultural and historic appeal, while encouraging growth and adaptive use over time. I'm proud of the agency's work ensuring that the places most important to the collective story of New York City are preserved for generations to come.

I would like to thank you all again for your continued support of the Landmarks Preservation Commission's mission. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

TESTIMONY

ON

**CAPACITY BUILDING ASSISTANCE AND COMMUNITY
BENEFITS AGREEMENTS**

PRESENTED BEFORE:

**THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL
COMMITTEE ON LAND USE**

PRESENTED BY:

Kelly Glenn

**DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR
URBAN JUSTICE CENTER
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

MARCH 6, 2014

Good afternoon. My name is Kelly Glenn, and I am speaking on behalf of the Community Development Project (CDP) at the Urban Justice Center about the need for city-wide Capacity Building and Technical Assistance for Nonprofits and Small Businesses, with a focus on community benefits agreements and their role in land use matters. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this afternoon.

The Community Development Project formed in September 2001 to strengthen the impact of grassroots organizations in New York City's low-income and other excluded communities by winning legal cases, publishing community-driven research reports, assisting with the formation of new organizations, and providing technical and transactional assistance in support of their work towards social justice. Our work is informed by the belief that real and lasting change in low-income, urban neighborhoods is often rooted in the empowerment of grassroots, community institutions.

For more than ten years, CDP has offered capacity building services to community non-profits, cooperatives and small businesses in low-income NYC neighborhoods. The services that we offer these groups include such work as incorporation; developing bylaws, employment manuals and organizational policies; negotiating commercial leases; advising on land use matters; and negotiating Community Benefits Agreements. CDP provides these critical services free of charge in both English and Spanish because the groups that we work with could not meet these needs any other way.

I would like to highlight our work helping community groups negotiate Community Benefits Agreements, or CBAs, which are agreements that help communities reap some of the benefits of private development. In a CBA, a developer and community groups negotiate an agreement together in which the developer agrees to provide certain benefits to the community while the community groups agree to support the development in the process of seeking government approval (which may or may not include ULURP). The CBA may require community benefits of many types, such as local, unionized labor involved in construction, low-income housing or parks and amenities in the neighborhood, and restrictions on the project itself such as LEED certification. Our attorneys have been essential in negotiating and crafting the language in many of these agreements on behalf of community groups. Some recent examples of our successes include:

- *Kingsbridge Alliance Redevelopment Alliance (KARA)* – A coalition of dozens of community-based organizations in the Northwest Bronx came together to work toward a CBA for the redevelopment of the Kingsbridge Armory. KARA negotiated an agreement with the developer of the new Kingsbridge National Ice Center for an ice center with 80,000 square feet of community space and these community benefits: \$1 million will be set aside annually in free ice time for local children and community groups; jobs will go to local workers earning at least \$10 per hour; and the developer will help fund new school and park renovation, among others.

- *10 Stanton Street Tenant Association* – CDP helped this association of low-income Section 8 tenants in 147 apartments on the Lower East Side negotiate a CBA with their landlord, who agreed to preserve their building as affordable housing for several decades and provide money for a rooftop recreation space on an adjoining parcel in exchange for their support on a future development project on that parcel. Many of the tenants are elderly and have been living in the building since the 1980s, and with CDP's help tenant leaders were able to negotiate an enforceable agreement that provides them with long-term affordability so that they will not have to leave the place they've lived for 30 years.

These are just a couple examples of the ways that capacity building services strengthen communities and contribute to sustainable change. CDP is requesting a new Speaker Initiative, Capacity Building and Technical Assistance for Nonprofits and Small Businesses, to provide \$250,000 in funding so we can continue these projects and conduct educational workshops citywide to locate and assist many other groups in need of similar assistance. With this funding, we can create or preserve 500 living-wage jobs and provide 10-15 community organizations and 100-300 low-income NYC residents with capacity-building services.

CDP's capacity-building and technical assistance services fill a niche for cooperatives and small businesses that no other organization is providing. Our work helps create and preserve living-wage jobs in low-income NYC communities, strengthens community organizations through organizational, cooperative and small business development, educates low-income NYC residents through workshops about how capacity building services can benefit them and their communities, and connects organizations to additional legal and research support provided by CDP. When litigation is necessary, organizations can access our teams of housing and employment law litigators. These services are vital to the success of our small business, cooperative, and community organization clients who cannot afford these types of services on their own. CDP is committed to continuing this work in NYC's low-income communities and we respectfully request your support in the year to come.

**Testimony
New York City Council Budget Hearing
Committees on Land Use and Technology
March 6, 2014**

**By Ralph Palladino
2nd Vice President Clerical-Administrative Employees Local 1549**

Local 1549 represents over 200 members at the 311 Call Center in the following titles: Communication Call Representatives (CCR); Community Information Representatives (CIR), Clerical Associates; Office Machine Aides; Secretaries at the 311 Call Center. Our members play a key role in disseminating vital information to the public.

In 2009 we had 350 members serving the public. 311 has lost 150 of the staff they had over the past five years. Most of them handle phone calls. There has been a steady increase annual in the number of calls received.

We are responsible for giving out important information to the public. This is especially true during disasters and potential disasters.

CUNY Students Performing Civil Service Jobs

Call Center Representatives are Civil Service employees who must take and pass a test, then go through an interview process, then are vetted and finger printed. Our Clerical Collective Bargaining Contract guarantees proper supervision and training of our members.

311 management though uses CUNY Students on a part time basis to perform the functions of Call Center Representatives. It is not clear who trains them and how. It is not clear what quality and absentee controls are in place for these students. Currently there are 91 such students currently working at 311 at roughly minimum wage and no benefits. Note that this program was in effect five years ago so these students do not compensate for the employees lost.

King Contract

The city contracted with King Teleservices for \$50 million. This is a back-up system only with more Call Representatives (making roughly minimum wage with no benefits) than the primary system. Calls are re-routed to King after about 45 seconds.

Our Call Representatives report that people calling 311 can wait anywhere from 9 to 20 minutes before speaking to a person. This is unacceptable. Especially given that the excessive waits no doubt have to do with staff reductions.

There is no guarantee by King of proper training and supervision of their employees. In addition King has not been forthcoming with information in regards to the contracting that the union has posed to them.

If the number of Civil Servants in the primary center were to double it would put it close to the number of workers five years ago and cost the city less than the King Contract.

City Council Ask

We ask that the City Council:
Seek funding for additional Civil Service Call Center Representatives and back up staff. This can be paid for by seeking to stop the end the King Teleservices contract. It can also be paid in part by ending the CUNY Student Program that is not a training program and is a low paying jobs program that threatens civil service.
THANK YOU

Statement of the Honorable Carl Weisbrod, Chairman of the NYC Planning Commission and Director of the Department of City Planning, before the Land Use Committee of the City Council, on the Mayor's Fiscal Year 2015 Preliminary Budget and Four Year Financial Plan

Good afternoon Chair Greenfield, Subcommittee Chairs Weprin, Dickens and Koo, and distinguished members of the Land Use Committee. I thank you for the opportunity to be here today to discuss the Department of City Planning's Preliminary Fiscal Year 2015 budget.

I am excited to have rejoined the Department of City Planning after almost a 30-year absence, and to be taking the helm at a time of both incredible challenge, but also tremendous opportunity to use the tools of government to achieve a new progressive vision for the city. City Planning has always been at the crossroads of growth and change and it must be a major driver in transforming the goals of this administration into reality.

While this is literally my fourth day at City Planning, let me discuss briefly what I see as our priorities going forward. To address the crisis of inequality in this city, the administration has set an ambitious agenda, which at City Planning we will be fully dedicated to achieving. First and foremost, to address affordability all of us in the city must work together to create and preserve affordable housing --200,000 units over the next ten years. We are actively engaged under the direction of Deputy Mayor Alicia Glen in developing a plan to achieve this ambitious goal, and as the Mayor announced

in his state of the city, we will be reporting back in May to discuss the specifics of the plan.

Second, we have to develop strong mixed-use communities that support New Yorkers with a broad range of incomes - neighborhoods that provide not only housing, but also jobs, schools, grocery stores, and access to public transit that make a neighborhood sustainable and livable. We at City Planning will be working with our partners in government to make sure that we are planning from the ground up and investing in neighborhoods that are sustainable for the long term. I am a strong believer of working with and in neighborhoods. My entire professional life – Times Square, Lower Manhattan, Hudson Square- has been spent doing exactly that.

And speaking of sustainability, we all know that neighborhoods affected by Hurricane Sandy have the doubly challenging task of rebuilding and addressing the long term challenges of climate change and sea level rise.

And finally, we need to do a better job of making sure that the machinery of government is working for us – faster, better, and focusing on results. The Department has begun, through its Blueprint initiative, to reduce the bureaucracy associated with moving through the ULURP process, and we will continue to invest in upgrading the process, including in new technology that allows for online filing and more transparent review tracking.

Let me turn to the budget. The Department began FY14 with an Expense budget appropriation of \$21 million, which consisted of 35%, or \$7.3 million in City tax levy funds, and 65%, or \$13.5 million in Federal and other funds.

Of this, \$18.1 million (87 percent) is allocated for Personal Services and supports a budgeted headcount of 234 full-time staff and 12 members of the City Planning Commission. For the full-time staff, 60 are tax levy funded, and 174 are funded by federal and other grants. The balance of \$2.7 million (13 percent) is allocated to OTPS.

Since Adoption, the Department has undergone two modest financial plan changes pursuant to direction from OMB:

- First, as in the past, due to staggered federal, city and state budget cycles, the FY14 budget at adoption reflects only a portion of the anticipated total Federal and State grant funding for the fiscal year. As part of the November Financial Plan, the Department's Federal and State grants budget was updated to include \$1.2 million in funding along with seven positions, bringing the agency's active full-time headcount to 241.
- Second, the January Plan also includes an additional \$198,000 in technical adjustments related to Brooklyn Office rent and certain fringe adjustments.

The Department's FY15 Preliminary Budget calls for a total allocation of \$20.3 million. Compared to the FY14 adopted budget, the FY Preliminary Budget is reduced by \$571 Thousand and the budgeted staff is reduced from 234 to 231. These changes reflect the net reduction of \$211,000 that represented three positions funded on a temporary basis, and a net reduction of \$359,000 in BluePrint Training funds.

The Department has a revenue target of \$2.6 million for FY14. The combined ULURP and CEQR fee portion of the revenue target is \$2.5 million. To date, we've collected \$2.1 million in ULURP and CEQR fee revenue.

In my review of these existing and prior budgets, I am concerned about the sharp reductions in funding and staffing experienced by the Department over the past several years. Since FY08, the Department has lost 68 staff, and together with OTPS reductions, the Department's budget has declined by approximately 30 percent. All

areas of the Department have experienced significant reductions, including a loss of 21 staff in the borough offices, and 18 staff in the functional planning divisions. Technical and support staff throughout the agency have also declined. Moreover, these reductions are exacerbated because the agency has had to increasingly rely on grant funding to support a portion of the staff. As a result, certain staff cannot be flexibly assigned to work on priority projects and needs, and up to 11 existing staff risk losing their jobs if we cannot find alternative funding sources.

The Department has dealt with these reductions in part by increased use of technology, cross-training to allow for more flexible assignment of staff where possible, and significant efficiencies created through the BluePRint process reform effort. The downturn in the economy and related decrease in the quantity of private land use applications also helped alleviate the impacts of these reductions. As the economy has improved and the application workload has increased, the impact of these reductions is becoming more evident.

The Mayor has made it clear that he sees a central role for City Planning in addressing inequality in the city, from achieving 200,000 affordable homes over the next 10 years, to creating good jobs and strengthening neighborhoods. In the coming weeks I will be taking a careful look at how we are using resources today, how we can use them more effectively, and how we might be able to add new resources in order to achieve the agenda laid out by the Mayor. Given the overall constraints on the city's budget, we will have to make hard choices about where to prioritize our efforts, and we will make sure that our resources remain focused on meeting our primary agenda of tackling inequality and affordability throughout the city. And to achieve that, I look forward to hearing from

each of you and leaders across the city about the challenges facing your communities on the ground, and how we can work together to improve the lives for all New Yorkers.

**DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEES ON LAND USE AND TECHNOLOGY
FISCAL YEAR 2015 PRELIMINARY BUDGET
THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014**

Good afternoon Chairs Greenfield and Vacca, and members of the City Council Committees on Land Use and Technology. My name is Evan Hines and I am Acting Commissioner of the Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DoITT), and New York City's Acting Chief Information and Innovation Officer. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today about DoITT's Fiscal 2015 Preliminary Budget. With me are Annette Heintz, Deputy Commissioner for Financial Management and Administration; John Winker, our Associate Commissioner for Financial Services; and Charles Fraser, our General Counsel.

DoITT's Fiscal 2015 Preliminary Budget provides for operating expenses of approximately \$457 million. The budget provides for \$93 million in Personal Services to support 1,243 full-time positions and \$364 million for Other than Personal Services. Of the \$364 million, 31 percent, or \$113 million represents Intra-City funds that have been transferred from other agencies to DoITT for services it provides. Telecommunications costs represent the largest portion of the Intra-City expense. Fiscal 2014 Intra-City telecommunications expenditures are budgeted at \$86 million, while total telecommunications costs are budgeted at \$123 million.

This budget represents an increase of \$10 million from the Fiscal 2015 November Budget and an overall net decrease of \$50 million from the Fiscal 2014 current modified budget. The \$10 million increase to the Fiscal 2015 November Budget is mostly attributable to OTPS funding associated with ongoing maintenance costs required to support recently approved capially-funded initiatives. DoITT also received some funding to convert inter-fund agreement positions to tax levy funded positions. The net decrease between the Fiscal 2014 current modified and the Fiscal 2015 Preliminary Budget allocations represents a drop in Inter-fund agreement funding after 2014 and one-time grant funding that was only allocated in the Fiscal 2014 current modified budget. Any unspent Fiscal 2014 grant funding will be rolled over into Fiscal 2015.

DoITT, the City's technology leader and IT utility, is responsible for providing core IT assets – scalable, critical infrastructure and a backbone for City operations. We operate data centers, independent fiber and wireless networks, and digital services like *NYC.gov* and NYC 311 that ensure uninterrupted access for New Yorkers in times of emergency and non-emergencies alike.

With a focus on people, processes, technology platforms, and partnerships DoITT is making progress toward ensuring that New York City continues to lead in public sector service delivery and technology innovation. Some recent achievements, as well as critical initiatives that DoITT will be pursuing in Fiscal 2015 include:

NYC.gov, the City's official website, receives more than 35 million unique visitors each year. DoITT recently upgraded and modernized the site, including the design and build of key portal pages, as well as the introduction of new information architecture, content taxonomy, user functionality, interface and interaction design, and visual branding. This significantly improves the City's ability to serve the public. The new platform also upgrades existing City Clerk online forms, 311Online, Taxi and Limousine Commission License Application Renewals, and Department of Records online forms.

NYC 311, the City's destination for government information and services, has received more than 178 million calls and has been the main source for New York City non-emergency government information

since 2003. Today, NYC 311 is available in nearly 180 languages. Each day it serves 50,000 customers, filing 7,700 requests by telephone, smart phone apps, online self-service, text messaging, and Twitter. DoITT is continually expanding how its customers can interact with 311 through innovative technology. The latest additions include: an interactive Frequently Asked Questions, a trial program for online chat and predictive answers, expanded mobile capability, and greater social media interaction.

CITIServ, the City's IT Infrastructure consolidation effort, will centralize more than 40 data centers when complete. CITIServ provides unified data center operations, business continuity, and other shared services. To date, DoITT has migrated 27 agencies to the CITIServ environment and centralized email systems for 53 agencies – more than 66,000 email accounts.

CityNet, the City's institutional fiber network, provides voice and data services to City employees and hundreds of municipal facilities. All 27 network locations have been upgraded, increasing the network's bandwidth, capability, and resiliency to ensure rapid data transmission internally and externally.

Citywide VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol), a more resilient telephony solution, allowed the City to maintain a network uptime of 99.97 percent for Fiscal 2013. In 2012-2013, in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, DoITT expedited the migration of approximately 5,000 City telephones to VoIP. In Fiscal 2014, DoITT will continue transitioning agencies from the traditional phone system to VoIP to realize the functional and financial benefits of the new technology. In total, DoITT provides voice services for more than 108,000 desk telephones and mobile devices.

NYC Open Data, a major piece of the City's open government effort, is enabling greater innovation, engagement, efficiency, and transparency. Local Law 11 of 2012 – the most progressive open data law in the country – mandates that all qualifying City-managed data be made available to the public through a single web portal at nyc.gov/data by 2018. There are now more than 1,100 unique datasets on the portal, offering powerful insights into government operations. The next milestone comes in July 2014, when DoITT and the Mayor's Office of Data Analytics provide the annual update to the NYC Open Data Plan, detailing the City's progress in opening public data since the previous report.

NYC Connected Communities, a variety of interrelated technology initiatives, increases public access to and adoption of broadband in underserved communities. Over the last three years New Yorkers have participated in more than three million sessions of NYC Connected Communities programming. From accessing computers, printers and Internet service via NYCHA's traveling Digital Van to computer classes available in over 100 public computer centers, these initiatives are narrowing the digital divide across all five boroughs. Funding was added to DoITT's Fiscal 2015 budget to sustain this program moving forward and DoITT is working with partner agencies to continue providing critical broadband technology access.

These programs are in addition to the public technology benefits the City has ensured by working with cable franchise providers. Cablevision has provided free, commercial-grade Internet service to all 77 public libraries in its service area in Brooklyn and the Bronx, and Time Warner Cable has launched 12 Internet-ready public computer centers in partnership with local not-for-profit organizations, with 28 more to come by 2020.

Public WiFi is now available in more than 60 parks and public spaces across the five boroughs, with hotspots in Coney Island and Far Rockaway Beach boardwalks to launch by summer 2014. And in Harlem, DoITT and partners are building the country's largest continuous free outdoor WiFi network. This network is currently live from 110th to 120th streets between Frederick Douglass Boulevard and Madison Avenue. When fully built out, the network will extend to 138th street offering seamless

coverage to 95 city blocks and 80,000 local residents, 13,000 of whom live in public housing. Over the last month, more than 9,000 people used the wireless network.

Through these initiatives driven by our dedicated employees, DoITT is modernizing government technology platforms, initiating new processes that enable a more efficient and effective government, and setting the groundwork for more innovation in Fiscal 2015 and beyond.

Thank you again for the time this afternoon. We will now be pleased to answer your questions.

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6/12

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Kelly Glenn

Address: _____

I represent: Urban Justice Center

Address: 123 William St, 16th floor, 10038

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: CARL WEISBROD

Address: _____

I represent: DCP

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: CAROL GROSSMAN

Address: _____

I represent: DCP

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: RICHARD BANTY

Address: _____

I represent: DCP

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6/14

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: JOHN WINKER

Address: 255 Greenwich St. N.Y.

I represent: DATT

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Charles R. Fraser

Address: _____

I represent: DATT

Address: 255 Greenwich St. NY NY

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Annette Heintz

Address: 255 Greenwich Street 10007

I represent: Dept. of Info. Tech & Telecom

Address: 255 Greenwich St. 10007

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: Mar 6/14

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Evan Hines

Address: 255 Greenwich St. 9th Fl NY NY 10007

I represent: DOTT

Address: same as above

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 3/6/14

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ralph Palladino

Address: 125 Barclay St NY NY 10007

I represent: 2nd Vice President C.1548.9037

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms