New York City Council
Housing & Buildings Committee
Intro 1056; Construction Code Revision
Testimony by Commissioner Robert D. LiMandri
June 25, 2013

Good afternoon, Chairman Dilan and members of the Housing and Buildings Committee. I am Robert LiMandri, Commissioner of the New York City Department of Buildings. I am joined by First Deputy Commissioner Thomas Fariello and Assistant Commissioner James Colgate. I'm also joined by the Department's project managers, architects, engineers, lawyers, and other experts from our Code development team. Thank you for this opportunity to testify today in support of Intro 1056, regarding the revisions to the Construction Codes. We are pleased to work with you as you consider these amendments to the Codes that reflect technological advances and facilitate operational changes for the Department.

Building codes are the foundation of a city. We may take them for granted, but their shape and content is critical to so many aspects of our infrastructure and of our lives. From the way a home is built in Queens, to the way a hotel is designed in downtown Brooklyn, or a high-rise in Manhattan, it's all in the Code.

In 2007, Local Law 33 was passed by the Council, which enacted the new NYC Construction Codes, based on the ICC family of Codes. It was historic not only because it revised the 40 year old building code, but it also committed the Department to working with the Council, industry stakeholders and field of study experts, on periodic updates. The purpose of the updates is to ensure that the Codes include and allow the

latest standards and technology. The Bill before you fulfills our commitment to continue the mandated updating of the Codes. As you may recall, the NYC Construction Code revisions began with the passing of the NYC Plumbing Code last year by the Council as Local Law 41. The Plumbing Code will become effective at the same time this bill is enacted. Intro 1056 contains the revisions to NYC Building Code, the NYC Fuel Gas Code, the NYC Mechanical Code, and the Administrative Code (Title 28), which contains permitting, licensing, and other provisions that apply universally to the four technical volumes. If enacted these amendments will bring the New York city codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the International Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Fuel Gas Codes published by the International Code Council, with differences to accommodate the unique nature of construction in the City.

The Department began the latest revision and updating process of the Construction Codes in 2011. This effort continues the collaborative process we began in 2005, which involved more than 325 professionals on 11 technical, advisory and managing committees. Committee members included architects, engineers, and representatives of the construction industry, labor, real estate and government. In forming these committees, the Department aimed to include stakeholders from every aspect of the industry to ensure a balanced discussion and consideration of all the issues. Over the past 2 and 1/2 years, these committees worked together to resolve issues and craft revisions to the code that reflect the needs of this City. They contributed more than 48,500 hours attending more than 255 technical, advisory, and managing committee meetings, as they extensively reviewed and developed new text

ensuring its content is appropriate for the City's special dense urban environment. It was truly an extraordinary undertaking, and we greatly appreciate their contribution.

I should note that the code revision process forces debate and compromise, because it is a 'consensus-based' approach. Items move through the process first by the technical committee members and managing committee members reaching consensus, or second, if the committee chair declares an impasse, the item is then forwarded to the Department for mediation. This is all explained in the "Code Revision Handbook" which may be found on our website. Except for 5 items, the committees achieved consensus on all of the changes contained in these 2400+ pages.

The proposed legislation improves building construction standards for new buildings and resolves issues relating to the application of some provisions of the new codes to the alteration of existing buildings.

First and foremost, the proposed revisions will take safety requirements to a new level in high-rise buildings, fire protection systems, structural integrity, and flood resistant construction. If enacted, the proposed amendments will:

- Ensure that automatic turnstiles do not become obstructions during emergencies.
- Codify requirements for environmental loads, such as wind loads, on temporary structures including tents, scaffolds, and cranes to improve safety.
- Introduce construction standards within coastal A-zones which will become effective when new FEMA maps are released in 2014. These new provisions will increase the resiliency of new and substantially improved buildings located in coastal A-zones.

- Enhance fire protection and life safety system requirements in ambulatory health care facilities benefitting patients undergoing minor surgeries or operations who may be incapacitated during an emergency.

This bill also implements five important recommendations made by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in the World Trade Center investigation report. The first three of these achieved consensus—a requirement to increase the bond strength for spray-on fireproofing in buildings more than 75 feet in height, a requirement to increase the fire rating of the materials used in the structural elements in buildings over 420 feet in height, and a requirement that exit stairs be located further apart in buildings over 75 feet in height.

The other two NIST recommendations are proposed as the results of our mediation process. They require the provision of a firefighter access elevator in buildings more than 120 feet in height and an additional stair or occupant evacuation elevators in buildings over 420 feet in height – which will increase exit capacity and provide alternative escape routes in an emergency.

I consider these measures to be important investments in the safety of those who live and work in our City's buildings.

The proposed amendments will also make building construction easier, faster, and less expensive. If enacted the proposed amendments will:

- Clarify when prior code provisions may be utilized in alterations to buildings constructed under prior codes.
- Eliminate the redundant locations for smoke detection in ductwork, resulting in significant cost savings with no reduction in fire safety.
- Update design requirements of exterior mechanical equipment to comply with the noise requirements of both the NYC Mechanical Code and the NYC Noise Control Code.
- Update earthquake requirements to match latest ASCE 7 national standard; results in substantial savings in construction costs.

In closing, updating to the latest ICC codes will ensure that New York City utilizes standards for products and materials, and the latest technologies, used throughout the country. This reduces costs and increases predictability in construction practices.

I would like to reiterate my appreciation for your support, and I look forward to working together, to help make New York a better place to build, work and live. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Written Comments Submitted to the City of New York
in Support of Specific Proposed Changes to the Local Building Code

Jason D. Averill
Fire Protection Engineer, National Institute of Standards and Technology

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) conducted a technical investigation into the causes of the collapses of World Trade Center Buildings 1, 2 and 7 that resulted from the September 11, 2001 attacks. The City of New York was a partner to NIST, assisting with access to critical records and personnel during the course of our investigation. The resulting reports total roughly 10,000 pages and are available at http://wtc.nist.gov. Included in the summary report are recommendations, which were derived directly from our technical findings. In all, NIST issued 30 recommendations intended to identify, as specifically as possible, areas in current building and fire codes, standards, and practices that warranted revision.

New York City has commendably spent the past few years engaged in a consensus-based, deliberative process to update the local building code governing new construction. NIST strongly endorses continuous improvement of building codes and standards, as well as use of consensus regulatory processes. Upon review, the 2009 International Building Code (IBC) contained several significant changes that were consistent with the recommendations within the NIST WTC investigation reports and we are pleased to see that the majority have been moved forward for the City Council to consider for passage into local law. These requirements include:

- Continuation of requirements for photoluminescent markings in high-rise stairwells. It is commendable that these safety provisions were pioneered in New York City, a leadership position that was noted during the deliberations of the International Building Code development participants.
- Enhanced fire resistance requirements for structural members in tall buildings, including adoption of the structural frame approach, upgrades to the minimum hourly fire ratings of key members, and increased bond-strength and improved inspection requirements for fireproofing.
- Increased redundancy in the design of fire sprinkler systems to enhance the likelihood of operational effectiveness during building fires.
- Hardening and minimum separation requirements for exit stairwells in tall buildings.

Some IBC provisions related to NIST WTC recommendations were significantly amended during the NYC adoption process, including provisions for occupant evacuation elevators and fire service access elevators, as well as minimum size requirements for fire command centers. These provisions deserve separate consideration. As background for this issue, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), in partnership with NIST, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the International Code Council (ICC), the National Fire Protection Association, the U.S. Access Board, as well as participants from the elevator industry, academia, and building authorities, conducted a comprehensive hazard analysis spanning hundreds of pages in order to enable the use of elevators during building fires by fire service personnel and building occupants. The hazard analysis, which was conducted by open-

participation task groups established by ASME between 2004 and 2010, resulted in task group recommendations that prescribed key building code and elevator standard requirements, the majority of which were adopted into the ICC's International Building Code and ASME's A17.1 standard during their respective codes and standards development processes.

Subsequent to the ASME task group activities and ICC hearings, the New York City proposal includes modifications to the requirements for fire service access elevators and occupant evacuation elevators. These changes were proposed by the NYC mediator consequent to the consensus process. After reviewing the proposed changes in view of NIST's recommendations, NIST observes that the changes reduce the overall fire safety performance of elevator and stair access enclosures for occupant evacuation elevators and reduce fire service access capacity and redundancy requirements by allowing only one fire service access elevator to serve each floor. Despite NIST's reservations, NIST notes that the proposed changes nevertheless provide a greater level of public safety to building occupants and operational effectiveness to firefighters and other responders during a building emergency requiring evacuation and/or emergency access than was previously required by NYC local law.

New York City has a long history with fire command centers as a tool for managing the flow of incident information in high-rise buildings. While space is undoubtedly at a premium in New York City, NIST continues to support a minimum dimension for the fire command center, and urges jurisdictions to consider the 200 square foot minimum area and 10 foot minimum thresholds contained in Section 911.1.3 of the IBC.

In conclusion, while work remains to fully implement the recommendations from the WTC investigation reports, NIST feels that the aforementioned proposed code changes related to NIST WTC recommendations will improve the overall safety of occupants in tall buildings during emergencies (including fire emergencies), as well as improve the safety and effectiveness of our first responder community during emergency response operations. NIST remains ready to assist New York City and other state or local jurisdictions with the challenges of improving the safety of the public through adoption and maintenance of science-based, consensus building codes and standards.

National Elevator Industry, Inc.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS OFFICE
5537 SW Urish Road • Topeka, Kansas 66610 • Office: 785.286.7599 • Cell: 785.580.5070 • Fax: 785.408.796
www.neii.org • e-mail: ajblankenbiller@neii.org

Hearing on Draft Elevator Code Changes
Committee on Housing & Buildings, New York City Council
June 25, 2013

In support of Elevator Code Changes, with modification

Good afternoon Chairman Dilan and members of the City Council. My name is Debbie Keane. I am the Project Manager – DOB Compliance at Schindler Elevator here in New York City, but testify today as a representative of the National Elevator Industry Inc. (*NEII®*). *NEII®* is the premier national trade association representing the interest of firms that install, maintain and/or manufacture elevators, escalators and other building transportation products, including parts or components. Its membership includes the major elevator companies in the U.S. and report more than 85 percent of the hours worked in the industry. On behalf of NEII, I am presenting this testimony to outline the industry's position on the New York City proposed code changes.

NEII® wishes to thank the Housing and Building Committee and Department of Buildings for their efforts to update the NYC elevator codes. We also want to thank the Committee for this opportunity to present the industry's testimony on our most significant concerns related to the draft code changes, including specific proposals to address these issues.

As *NEII®* has discussed with Chairman Dilan previously, the industry is very interested in addressing the remediation timeline associated with Category 1 ("CAT1") tests. Specifically, the industry needs more time to address deficiencies and the new code revisions provide more time to do that. However, counter to that intent, other provisions in the proposed code revisions have the real potential of shortening rather than enhancing the new CAT1 timeframe for violation correction.

Currently, the average time for witness agencies to deliver violations is five to six weeks, and it often comes with additional violations not discussed at the time of the test. This process makes it nearly impossible for the maintenance firms to meet the remediation deadlines, and the code revisions, as they currently stand, would allow this problem to continue. Under the proposed code, witnessing agencies would have up to 30 days to notify the owner of the violating conditions, and then the owner must then notify the maintenance firm. There is no guarantee that the maintenance firm will be notified until shortly before expiration of the 60 day period in which the ELV3 is due to the DOB.

NEII® proposes that by making a few small changes to the proposed code, the City Council can, without compromising safety, provide significant relief to the elevator industry in New York City and improve its ability to meet the current CAT1 remediation deadlines. Attached is a copy of the draft code revisions with our handwritten proposed changes for your review.

Below, is an explanation of the logic behind each of *NEII's*® proposed edits. The proposed edits are only those minimally necessary to address the most significant flaw in the elevator code and our most pressing need: the Category 1 timeframe for compliance.

- 28-304.6.4: *Add "on the day of":*

  The purpose of this revision is to clarify that the word "after" means that the list of violating conditions is provided on the day of the test, as described in the rest of the provision. This is what we discussed in our meeting with Assistant Commissioner Santulli as the intent of the Cat1 inspection program. However, the use of the word "after" in the current code revision draft allows for ambiguity as to when the violating conditions must be confirmed and communicated. NEII's revision merely confirms the intent of requiring all violations to be presented on the day of the test.

- 28-304.6.4: *Alter the second sentence to read: "By affixing such signature, the witnessing inspector confirms with the performing inspector that all violating conditions have been identified and documented."*

  The purpose of this addition is to clarify that the performing inspector agency's role is to properly do the inspection and determine, with finality, all violating conditions on the day of the inspection. The witnessing agency then is to eyewitness and observe to ensure that the inspecting agency performs its role properly in identifying all violating conditions.

  This conforms to the current practice and ELV3 requirements as per the language on the ELV3 under the signature block for the inspecting agency (maintenance firm): "As the above name Approved Elevator Inspection Agency, I have inspected/tested the elevator(s) described above and on the attached sheets in accordance with all NYC Administrative Code and other applicable laws and rules. The results of these inspections/tests are indicated above and a copy of this report has been provided to the owner."

- 28-304.6.1: *Add "the Owner or..."*
  - While the timeline issues are extremely pressing for our industry, we wanted to bring another important issue to your attention so that you have all of our suggested recommendations. This suggestion addresses the conflict that can arise with owners and their consultants. Just as the current proposed code identifies a potential conflict of interest between the witnessing agency and the inspecting agency, we think it is a natural extension to include the building owners as also being independent of influence or conflict of interest from witnessing agencies. In practice, the maintenance firm rarely meets with the building owners on elevator matters. Rather, they meet with the building owners' elevator consultant. This proposed change makes a fair and level playing field for an independent and true detection of legitimate safety violations.

These minor changes to the proposed code would enable members of our industry to receive the notification of the violating conditions in a timely fashion and expeditiously commence repairs. Delaying the receipt of the violating conditions frustrates our industry's attempts to address conditions in a diligent manner, and results in continued exorbitant fines that have become an unwarranted and punitive cost of doing business in New York City.

Thank you for your attention to these important industry concerns. *NEII®* requests that our proposed changes be incorporated into the proposed code revisions at this time.

CONTACT:
Amy J. Blankenbiller
NEII® Government Affairs Director
(785) 286-7599
ajblankenbiller@neii.org

3/11/13
NEW Changes

ARTICLE 304
[PERIODIC] NSPECTION OF] ELEVATORS AND CONVEYING SYSTEMS§28-

304.1 Genera . Elevators and conveying systems shall be maintained in a safe condition and in accordance with ASME A17.1, as modified by Appendix K of the New York ci y building code. Every new and existing elevator or conveying system shall be inspec ed and tested in accordance with [the schedule set forth in] this article.

§28-304.2 E evators, escalators, moving walkways, material lifts,[vertical reciprocating conveyors (VRC)] man lifts and dumbwaiters. Elevators, escalators, moving walkw ays, material lifts, [VRC's] man lifts and dumbwaiters shall be inspected and tested in accordance with the schedule set forth in Table N1 of ASME 17.1 as referenced in hapter 35 and as [may be] modified in chapter 30 and appendix K of the New York city building code ("Table N1").

Exceptio n Elevators located in [owner-occupied] one-family, two-family or multiple-f mily dwellings that service only [the]a single owner-occupied dwelling nit [and]which is [that are]not occupied by boarders, roomers or lodgers, a d elevators located within convents and rectories that are not open to non-occup nts on a regular basis are not subject to periodic inspection requirement of such refer nce standard. Inspections and tests shall be performed in accordance with Table N1.

§28-304.3 Ch ir lifts [and], stairway chair lifts and vertical reciprocating conveyors (VRC). Chair lifts, [and] stairway chair lifts and VRC's shall be inspected and tested at intervals not e ceeding one year. Inspections and tests shall be performed in accordance with Table N1

§28-304.4 Am usement devices. Amusement devices shall be inspected and tested [at intervals not exceeding six months except that for seasonally operated amusement devices, the c mmissioner may extend the periodic inspection and test for an additional two months]in accordance with department rules.

§28-304.5 Fr quency of inspection and testing. Elevators and other conveying systems may be subj ct to more frequent inspection and testing as the commissioner finds necessary to p otect public safety.

§28-304.6 In pection and testing process. All devices shall be inspected and tested in accordance wi h Table N1 and, where applicable, department rules [the schedule set forth in Table N1 a id with] sections 28-304.6.1 through 28-304.6.6.

§28-304.6 1 Inspection and testing entities. [The required periodic inspections shall be made y the department, except that one inspection and test for elevators and escalators shall be made between January first and December thirty-first of each year on behalf of the owner by an approved agency in accordance with this code and with rules pro ulgated by the commissioner. Required inspections and tests performed on

3/11/13
Nell change

behalf of the owner shall be performed by an approved agency in accordance with rules of the department and witnessed by an approved agency not affiliated with the one performing the test. The department shall be notified at least 10 days prior to the owner's periodic inspection and testing pursuant to rule of the department.] The required periodic inspections in Table N1 shall be made by the department. The other tests and inspections in Table N1 shall be performed on behalf of the owner by an approved agency in accordance with this code and department rules. Where indicated in Table N1, tests and inspections shall be witnessed by an approved agency not affiliated with the agency performing the test. Affiliated, as used in this section, shall mean the approved agency owners, directors and inspectors shall be independent of all relative approved agencies, maintenance firms or other entities providing any associated services to the device owner. Such other tests and inspections shall comply with the timeframes established as follows:

the or owner

1. Category 1 inspections and tests shall be performed between January 1st and December 31st of each year at a minimal time interval of six months from the date of the previous Category 1 testing. Category 1 tests are required on new installations the calendar year following final acceptance test.

2. Category 3 inspections and tests for water hydraulics shall be performed every three years on or before the anniversary month of the last Category 3 testing.

3. Category 5 inspections and tests shall be performed every five years on or before the month of the final acceptance test for new elevators or the anniversary month of the last Category 5 testing.

§28-304.6.1.1 Department notification. The department shall be notified by the performing agency at least seven days prior to the Category 1 testing of escalators. Category 3 testing of water hydraulic elevators and Category 5 testing of elevators pursuant to the rules of the department.

§28-304.6.2 Scope. During periodic inspection and testing, in addition to any other requirements prescribed by this code, all parts of the equipment shall be inspected to determine that they are in safe operating condition and that parts subject to wear have not worn to such an extent as to affect the safe and reliable operation of the installation.

§28-304.6.3 Reporting an unsafe or hazardous condition. If an inspection or test reveals that any elevator or other conveying system is unsafe or hazardous to life and safety the device is to be taken out of service immediately by the agency performing the inspection or test and the building owner notified immediately. The performing agency shall notify the department [shall be notified] by telephone, [or fax] electronically or in writing within 24 hours.

§28-304.6.4 Notation of inspection[or]and test. When a witnessing agency is required under Table N1, the witnessing inspector shall, [After] after each inspection

on the day of

3/11/13 NEW Change

confirms with → have been identified and documented.

to be consistent with LV3

[or] and test, [the inspector shall]affix the inspection date and his or her signature over a stamp identifying his or her approved agency and his or her approval number on the inspection certificate issued by the department. By affixing such signature, the witnessing inspector ~~attests that he or she has notified~~ the performing inspector that of all violating conditions. Where a witnessing agency is not required, the performing inspector shall comply with the requirements of this section.

§28-304.5 Inspection and test reports submission. Inspection and test reports shall be submitted to the department on such forms and in such manner as required by the commissioner.[Copies of each report (each copy originally signed by the inspector performing the inspection and test and by the inspector witnessing the inspection and test, the agency director, and the building owner) listing all violations of any of the provisions of this code for each device inspected and/or tested, shall be delivered to the owner within 30 calendar days of the inspection or test and filed with the department within 45 calendar days of the inspection or test.] Such reports shall comply with the following and department rules:

1. The inspection and test reports shall contain signatures of (i) the performing agency inspector and director, (ii) the witnessing agency inspector and director, and (iii) the building owner.

2. The reports shall be delivered to the owner by the approved performing and/or witnessing agency within 30 days of the test listing all violating conditions for each device tested, and filed with the department within 60 days after the date of the test by the owner or its authorized designee.

Exception: Inspection and test reports are not required to be submitted to the department for private residence wheelchair lifts and private residence dumbwaiters devices. However, the owner shall maintain an inspection and test log to be available to the department upon request.

§28-304.6 Repair. All defects as found [and reported] in such inspection and test reports shall be corrected within [45 days of the filing of the report]120 days after the date of inspection and test, except all hazardous conditions shall be corrected immediately. An affirmation of correction shall be filed within 60 days of the date of correction.

§28-304.7 Required contract. The owner of all new and existing passenger elevators and escalators shall have a contract with an approved agency to perform elevator and escalator maintenance, repair and replacement work [repair work and maintenance] as defined by ASME A17.1 as modified by Chapter K1 of Appendix K of the New York city building code. The name, address and telephone number of such agency shall be maintained at each premises, on the mainline disconnect switch and in a location readily accessible to employees of the department and to maintenance and custodial staff at the premises.

3/11/13
NEW Change

§28-304.8 Fe s. Every owner of elevators and other devices shall pay to the department an inspectic n fee and a report filing fee for each elevator or device in the amount prescribed by [this code] the commissioner.

§28-304.9 A ldition al inspections. The commissioner may make such additional inspections a required to enforce the provisions of this code. No fee shall be charged for such addit onal inspections.

28-304.10 Oc upant notification. In occupancy groups R1 and R2 when an elevator is to be out of s rvice for alteration work, notice shall be given to the residential occupants no fewer thu 10 days before the start of the work, except in the case of emergency repairs. This otification requirement does not apply to minor alterations and ordinary repairs.

REBNY®
REAL ESTATE BOARD OF NEW YORK

Testimony before the Committee on Housing and Buildings
of the New York City Council on Int. No. 1056-2013
By Angela Sung Pinsky
Senior Vice President, Management Services and Government Affairs
Real Estate Board of New York
June 25, 2013

Good afternoon Chairperson Dilan and members of the Committee on Housing and Buildings. The Real Estate Board of New York, representing over 14,000 owners, developers, managers and brokers of real property in New York City, thanks you for the opportunity to testify about the triennial review of the New York City Building Code. This review has been a tremendous effort, and represents thousands of hours volunteered by industry professionals, and we are supportive of the Administration and the Council's efforts to renew and improve the Building Code regularly.

REBNY is supportive of almost all of the provisions in the code, with the exception of a new requirement for a redundant stairwell and fire service access elevator. This provision is from the 2009 IBC, which adopted the provision in response to a U.S. Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards and Technology ("NIST") study on the evacuation times conducted after the events of September 11th. It requires commercial buildings taller than 420 feet to put in a redundant stairwell, or to make every tenant elevator an Occupant Evacuation Elevator ("OEE"), or to provide one elevator per bank as an OEE with an additional 44 inches of stairwell along with a timed egress study to demonstrate superior egress times to the three stairwells option.

REBNY objects strongly to this provision. The Department of Buildings has stated that we would be remiss to not apply the redundant stairwell requirement to the City where the events of September 11th occurred. However, we do not believe it to be suitable as written. First, this provision disproportionately penalizes high-rise construction, of which New York City commercial construction is largely comprised. Second, it disproportionately penalizes constrained building footprints, which again New York City construction is exclusively constrained. Complying would take away a tremendous amount of rentable square footage, create a complex and inefficient building core, and would add a tremendous cost to commercial construction. Furthermore, the Department of Buildings has not justified the chosen thresholds given New York City's unique conditions.

Additionally, there is a lack of demonstrated need for new safety requirements. After September 11th, New York City passed Local Law 26, a well-thought out response that required the retroactive sprinklerization of all buildings, and the implementation of Emergency Action Plans with Fire Safety Directors, as well as fire, emergency, and full evacuation drills. The need for a redundant stairwell envisions a building's full evacuation, which - with the exception of 9/11 - has never occurred in New York City's recent history. In every other emergency - fire, biologic, earthquake, etc. - the Fire and Police Departments suggest shelter-in-place, partial evacuation, or a managed evacuation to avoid chaotic and hazardous crowding and impediments to emergency response personnel.

Similar to the Real Estate Board's position, the IBC technical committee that reviewed this provision agreed that the associated costs and difficulties outweighed any potential benefit when they rejected this proposal. It was only at the general board of the ICC, which is comprised of only government representatives and no private industry, where the rejection of this provision was overruled.

Moreover, the Bloomberg Administration has actively sought ways to increase the amount of office space in the City in order to attract businesses and create viable spaces to house new employers, including the rezoning of Hudson Yards, Downtown Brooklyn, 125th Street, and the new proposed rezoning of Midtown East. Even with all of those efforts, Manhattan has only seen the construction of 23 commercial buildings in the decade beginning in 2001, compared to 483 residential projects in the same period. Many of those office buildings required heavy public investment or tenant commitments such as at the World Trade Center and Long Island City. The takeaway is that commercial construction in New York is very expensive, very difficult, and should not be burdened with unnecessary costs.

Below are our specific concerns:

Outstanding Issues

Redundant Stairwell/Occupant Evacuation Elevators

1. The 420 ft. height trigger for the mandate is too low for New York City.
    a. The criterion was developed to apply to tall buildings as defined by national data. National Data in the NIST Report show that nationally only 0.16% of commercial buildings are over 500,000 square feet - of New York City construction between 2001-2011 68% were over 500,000 square feet.
    b. Additionally, international buildings currently implementing a redundant stairwell or an occupant evacuation elevator range start at 800 feet tall, which is the height REBNY agrees is appropriate.

2. The phase in period of 18 months is far too short to include buildings currently in the design, financing, and assemblage process and would provide a serious hardship on commercial building construction. A 3 year period would exclude buildings currently in process, and a 4-year grace period would also mirror the precedent set by DOB's Stalled Construction Sites program.

3. There needs to be a minimum floorplate size threshold for the mandate to exempt sliver buildings and high-rise hotels. Both of these building types have very rigid design needs that cannot readily accept a redundant stairwell. REBNY's calculations based on the parameters DOB has outlined for egress suggest that the minimum floorplate for the base building and for the specific floor should be approximately 30,000 sq. ft..

4. The premise of this proposal is that a 3rd stairwell would improve egress times and would provide redundancy should a stairwell be blocked or smoky. However, the original NIST study that the proposal was based off of is faulty in that it assumed that all tenants were "able bodied" and did not account for any disabled, aged, youth, or otherwise mobility impaired individuals, which New York City would be ill informed to adopt. When taking into account that roughly 7% of the population would require some additional time or assistance, an independent study by Code Consultants shows that the redundant stairwell is *slower* than a 25% increase width in two stairwells. Additionally, two 44 inch stairwells with limited occupant egress elevators are faster than either three 44-inch stairwells or two wider stairwells. Therefore, there are much more efficient means of meeting this egress timing requirement while meeting the regress redundancy requirement than the initial proposal.

5. The City should provide Floor Area Ratio and zoning relief for height, set back, and sky exposure plane, which should be certified concurrently with the adoption of this provision

6. REBNY believes that a minimum of one elevator car serving every floor of a building would provide redundant egress capacity while a combination of increased stair width or additional OEEs would meet the same egress capacity as a third stair.

Fire Service Access Elevators

Code proposes a Fire Service Access Elevator in all commercial, residential and hotel buildings over 120 feet tall.

1. The proposal requires a fire rated lobby for the FSAE, which residential and hotels do not have and it would cause design issues to incorporate. DOB allows using the corridor of residential buildings as the lobby as long as each apartment has a fire rated doors. However, converting hotel hallways into smoke-rated corridors would interfere with primary ventilation to rooms in some instances.

2. The current code proposal requires a minimum lobby size of 150 sq. ft. with a minimum dimension of 8 feet. The Fire Department has indicated that they do not require a minimum fire-rated lobby as they exit elevators 1 or 2 floors below a fire. DOB has subsequently proposed reducing the minimum lobby size to 120 sq. ft., however, based off of FDNY comments, REBNY feels that the lobby enclosure imposes difficult design compliance implications while providing no fire safety benefit.

Conclusion

Given the substantial impact this proposal will have on commercial development, the complex nature of the proposal, and the administration's and REBNY's desire to maintain the Building Code's approval schedule, REBNY recommends separating the redundant stair mandate from the rest of the Building Code to be proposed as an independent introduction – along with recommendations from the BRTF and SIRR - at a later date.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continuing our conversation with the Administration and the City Council to create legislation that benefits both the City and its inhabitants through cooperation.

Simulation Findings:
A computer egress simulation was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of providing a redundant exit stairway in a "spec" office building using the Pathfinder evacuation modeling software, which is capable of simulating the escape movement of large numbers of people from buildings.

- 40 stories with 171' by 171' footprint (29,200sf)
- 14' floor to floor
- 292 occupants per floor (1 person per 100sf)

For this model, the building occupants were assigned characteristics based on two different distinct characteristics which are identified as average "able-bodied" and average "mobility impaired."

- Population A: 93% of occupants being average "able-bodied" occupants and 7% of occupants being "mobility aired".
- Population B: 93% percent of occupants being average "able-bodied" occupants (0% "mobility impaired as they are assumed to use an elevator)

The results are as follows for full building evacuation:

	Population A	Population B
Scenario 1: Three 44" stairs	95 min.	54 min.
Scenario 2: Two 55" stairs	93 min.	71 min.
Scenario 3: Two 66" stairs	79 min.	66 min.
Scenario 4: Two 44" stairs	135 min	80 min.

NIST Study
Table 1: No fire in the building, full building evacuation (baseline)

Scenario Occupant Evacuation	Time (min)
Two 44 in stairs	179
Two 66 in stairs	141
Three 44 in stairs	119

JBB
JAROS BAUM & BOLLES

Philip F. Parisi Jr., PE

Testimony before the Housing and Buildings Committee Meeting

Tuesday, June 25, 2013

Intro 1056-2013 A local law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the New York City Plumbing Code, the New York City Building Code, the New York City Mechanical Code and the New York City Fuel Gas Code in relation to bringing such codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the International Building, Mechanical, Fuel Gas and Plumbing Codes, incorporating differences that reflect the unique character of the city and clarifying and updating administration and enforcement of such codes and the 1968 code.

My name is Philip F. Parisi Jr, PE, and I am here to support Intro 1056, the proposed updated Construction Codes for the City of New York. I am the Director of the Plumbing and Fire Protection Department at Jaros, Baum & Bolles Consulting Engineers, located here in New York City. JB&B is considered to be one of the foremost consulting engineering firms in the world, and has provided the design of the mechanical and electrical systems for some of the most prestigious buildings in New York City and the world, including the original World Trade Center, the Willis Tower (formerly the Sears Tower), the new 7 World Trade Center, Times Square Tower (7 Times Square), One Bryant Park, Beekman Tower (7 Spruce Street) and many others. We are currently the Design Engineers for Towers 1, 2, 3 and 4 at the new World Trade Center site as well as the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, the Manhattan West and the Hudson Yards projects, Columbia University's new Manhattanville campus, and the new Kimmel Pavilion and Science Building on the NYU Langone Medical Center campus. I am currently the Co-Chairman of the New York City Code Revisions Plumbing Technical Committee, a member of the New York City Code Revisions Managing Committee, and a member of the New York City Master Plumbers and Master Fire Suppression Contractors Licensing Board.

During the previous code revisions, which began in 2006 and resulted in the current 2008 NYC Construction Codes, I participated on the Technical Committee for the New York City Plumbing Code revising Chapter 11, focusing on the stormwater design requirements. During this time, I worked with numerous other committee members over the 1-1/2 years to adapt the 2003 International Plumbing Code to meet the special needs of New York City and form the 2008 New York City Plumbing Code, which is currently in use. Moving forward, the goal of New York City was to keep up with the same code update procedure as the International Code Council, 3+ years. In the last 4+ years that the 2008 New York City Building code has been in existence, I believe that the time and effort put into the 2008 New York City Building Code has been shown to be of great benefit to New York City based on ease of use and community response. We have found the Plumbing Code simplified, still maintaining high standards, yet easier to apply in practice. This code revision has also opened a pathway for the industry to

better communicate and interact with the Department of Buildings in addressing special situations and complex designs in new and existing construction.

In January of 2011, I was again asked to volunteer my time on the Plumbing Technical Committee to update the 2008 New York City Plumbing Code and portions of the 2008 New York City Fuel Gas Code. The Plumbing Technical Committee began working on March 29, 2011, and was comprised of 22 members, including representatives from the engineering community, Contractors, representatives of the Real Estate Board (REBNY) and the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA). Representatives from the DOB, the DEP, the FDNY, the SCA and the NYCHA were also included to form a broad and diverse consensus group. During this process, the Building Department provided a proposed code, which incorporated the 2006 and 2009 revisions of the International Codes into the 2008 New York City codes, as a base document for review. We worked for approximately two (2) years and over one thousand (1,000) hours, in 20+ committee meetings, reviewing and implementing changes that would improve upon the current New York City Construction Codes, remove ambiguity and improve the safety and performance for new and existing construction.

To highlight some of the significant updates in the Plumbing Code: We added and refined the definitions within the code to better reflect today's technology and terminology. We coordinated multiple sections among the administrative sections for Licensing, Plumbing, Fuel Gas and Fire Codes to simplify and make them consistent across the construction codes. A significant achievement was the creation of Appendix C, "Water Recycling Systems", which provides high standards for the safety, performance and operation of recycled water systems in the City of New York. We also created another new appendix, Appendix H, "Individual On-Site Sewage Treatment Systems", which incorporates both existing and new technology to significantly improve the requirements and performance of private on-site sewage disposal systems serving one- and two- family dwellings. We coordinated the Plumbing Code with the NYC DEP Storm Detention Facility requirements for clarity and to eliminate any conflicts that may have existed in previous years. We updated the reference standards to be consistent with the national reference standards such as ASME, AWWA and NFPA, to name just a few.

To highlight some of the significant updates in portions of the Fuel Gas Code, in which the Plumbing Technical Committee was involved: We added and refined the definitions within the code to better reflect today's technology and terminology. We coordinated the welding requirements for fuel gas piping across multiple disciplines, including sections among the administrative sections for Licensing, Mechanical and Fuel Gas Codes making it consistent across the construction codes. We also clarified the sections of the 2008 New York City Fuel Gas Code that were not as clear as originally envisioned. A significant achievement was the creation of Appendix G, "High-Pressure Gas Installations", which provides high safety standards, performance and installation requirements for high-pressure gas systems in the City of New York. In addition, we also clarified Appendix E, "Meters and Gas Service Piping", which coordinates gas utility requirements and Fuel Gas Code requirements to eliminate any ambiguity between the codes, Con Edison and National Grid requirements. We improved Chapter 4,

covering gas piping installation requirements focusing on safety and efficiency in regard to new and existing construction. We updated the reference standards to be consistent with the national reference standards such as ASME and NFPA as well as the other reference standards used across the New York City Building Codes.

The results of our hard work are the code changes presented in Intro 1056. I believe that these changes to the Plumbing Code and Fuel Gas Code will make significant improvements to the current two codes. The proposed changes will allow our codes to remain current with the construction industry, eliminate ambiguity and keep our codes updated and consistent with the New York State and the International Building Codes. On behalf of the New York City Plumbing Technical Committee and the engineering community, I urge the Housings and Building Committee to accept and approve Intro 1056.

GILSANZ . MURRAY . STEFICEK . LLP

Structural Engineers & Building Envelope Consultants
129 West 27th Street, 5th Floor
New York . NY . 10001
Tel 212 . 254 . 0030
Fax 212 . 477 . 5978
www.gmsllp.com

Testimony of Ramon Gilsanz S.E., Partner, Gilsanz Murray Steficek, LLP to the Committee on Housing and Buildings for Intro 1056

June 25, 2013

Good afternoon committee members. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on Intro 1056, the proposed revisions to the NYC Construction Codes. My name is Ramon Gilsanz and I am a structural engineer and founding partner at the firm Gilsanz Murray Steficek, LLP. I am speaking to you as the Chair of the Structural Technical Committee for the Department of Buildings' revision of the New York City Building Code, and as a member of the DOB's Managing Committee for the code revision effort. I am also the Chair of the Structural Code Committee of the New York Metropolitan section of the American Council of Engineering Companies, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers ASCE 7 Committee on Design Loads, an honorary member of the Structural Engineers Association of New York (SEAoNY), and a Structural Engineering Institute (SEI) Fellow.

I am here on behalf of the structural design professionals that have invested their time *(more than 6,000 person hours at committee meetings alone)* to produce the proposed legislation before you which aims to update the New York City building code. My testimony today is in support of Intro 1056, which is a comprehensive revision of the New York City Construction Codes. In two days, I will testify before you again in support of the work product of the Building Resiliency Task Force. Both of these code revision efforts are important to ensure safe construction in our city. They are not mutually exclusive and when combined will put New York City at the forefront of innovation, resiliency, and safety in construction.

Intro 1056 revises the 2008 Construction Codes, as part of the three year code revision cycle set up by the council. This effort began in 2011 and involved more than 18 months of diligent attention by many stakeholders and experts in the construction industry. The result of this effort is a significant improvement over the present building code which will bring the city and the code up-to-date with the latest standards, resulting in safety enhancements and providing the ability to utilize innovative methods that will result in cost and/or time savings. As you may be aware, the 2008 New York City building code presently in use by the City is based on the 2003 edition of the International Building Code (IBC). The proposal before you would update the New York City building code to be based on the 2009 edition of the IBC with some elements drawn from the 2012 IBC, thereby incorporating advances that have occurred in the profession within the past six to nine years.

Many of these proposed amendments are based on the latest national standards, but some are unique to New York City and address our specific needs as a dense, urban environment.

Some key improvements include:

- Codifying requirements for environmental loads (such as wind loads) on temporary structures including tents, scaffolds, and cranes to improve safety. Requirements include provisions for providing annual inspections and action plans for added safety in case of extreme weather events.
- Prohibiting aggregate, gravel, and stone from being used as a roof covering or from being used as ballast on roofs. This implements recommendations of the National Council of Structural Engineers Associations (NCSEA) that such materials not be placed on roofs as they can be blown off during storms and cause damage to adjacent structures.
- Updating wind exposure requirements to match the national standard, the American Society of Civil Engineers "Minimum Loads for Buildings and Other Structures" (ASCE 7), which improves wind safety in new buildings. Updated exposure maps are provided so that the practitioners will be able to identify which wind exposure requirements apply based on the building location by borough.
- Updating earthquake requirements to match the ASCE 7 national standard which results in substantial savings in construction costs. For example: using the latest earthquake risk-based design maps allows buildings supported on rock to be more appropriately classified into a less hazardous earthquake risk category.
- Updating structural integrity definitions to include more critical elements, such as long-span roof members of arenas. This will increase safety by requiring additional load requirements for those critical members or redundancy in the structural design to improve building safety in an extreme event.
- Requiring new buildings with 3,000 or more occupants in one area, such as theaters or arenas, to comply with structural integrity requirements for critical structural members to improve safety and undergo a structural peer review of the design by a qualified independent structural engineer.
- Increasing maximum limits of fly ash and other pozzolans as a cement substitute in concrete exposed to deicing chemicals allowing for the use of less cement in concrete. This proposed change is in line with the recommendations of the Mayor's Green Codes Task Force.

Because the safety enhancements are so significant, we urge the committee and council to support and pass Intro 1056 quickly. It is a comprehensive code that deals with the entire spectrum of construction in our city- including situations encountered every day on a construction site. My testimony on Thursday will focus on resiliency proposals with specific improvements to address emergency situations; we are all aware that this issue is also critical to construction standards in our city.

I have been honored to participate for the past two years in this code revision effort and as a structural engineer I look forward to utilizing this modern, up-to-date code.

I urge your support and quick approval of intro 1056.

Tuesday, June 25, 2013

The New York City Council - Committee on Housing and Buildings
Hearing on Intro 1056 – A Local Law to amend the Building Code of the City of New York

Good afternoon. My name is David May. I am a registered architect, and I am here this afternoon to speak in support of Intro 1056, an important bill to update the NYC Construction Codes.

I am a founding partner of the firm SUPERSTRUCTURES Engineers + Architects. SUPERSTRUCTURES, founded in 1981 is a 90 person firm of architects, structural engineers and material scientists, specializing in matters related to the building envelope. We are an accredited Class 1 Special Inspection Agency. We have received the prestigious Lucy Moses Award from the NYC Landmarks Conservancy for 4 projects in the past 3 years.

SUPERSTRUCTURES has been awarded repeat requirements contracts by many of the City's agencies including: Department of Design and Construction (DDC), Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC), Housing Authority (NYCHA), School Construction Authority (SCA), The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and numerous others (DASNY, OGS, SUCF).

Over the past 35 years, I have served as a building code consultant to major NYC-based architectural firms, as well as developers and attorneys. I am conversant with the complex and often contradictory requirements of prior NYC building codes including the 1968, 1938 and even the 1916 code. In 2005, I served on the Administration – Enforcement Committee in the DOB's initiative to adapt the 2003 International Construction Codes for NYC. That monumental effort involving several hundred professional volunteers, resulted in the ground-breaking 2008 NYC Construction Codes.

The purpose of that initiative, as you may recall, was to update the 40 year old NYC building code and bring it in line with modern codes, making it clearer to NYC-based design firms, which based on my own experience, had a tendency to treat the code as a "black-box" and run the other way, leaving the code to expediters and consultants. Another by-product of that initiative was to make the NYC code accessible to design firms nation-wide, with the intent of making it easier to do business here in NYC. I believe the 2005 project achieved its goals.

Another critical element in adopting the International Construction Codes, was the commitment to update the NYC Codes on a three-year cycle, similar to the national codes. That brings us to the reason we are here this afternoon. In the summer of 2011, the DOB assembled a team of outside professionals to tackle the first planned update of the 2008 NYC Construction Codes. The mandate was to bring the code in line with the 2009 International Construction Code to take advantage of advances in technology, new materials, as well as lessons learned by industry in the intervening years. The other purpose of the current initiative was to clean-up the NYC Codes, clarifying and correcting items unavoidably passed over in the Herculean first effort in 2005.

In the current initiative, I served as co-chair of the Construction Requirements and Materials Committee. This committee was charged with reviewing and updating 12 technical chapters of the building code, and consulting on numerous others. The committee consisted of 15 knowledgeable and fully-committed professionals, giving freely of their time, during close to 40 bi-weekly meetings as well as spending hours of research and preparation between meetings. Our committee also benefitted from input of industry experts and product manufacturers, when necessary, to educate us on the specifics of new materials.

I also had the honor of serving on the Managing Committee, consisting of the sub-committee chairs as well as major NYC stake-holders, representing City agencies (DOB, FD, DEP, SCA, NYCHA, and the PANY&NJ), real estate (REBNY), industry, labor and professional organizations.

The Managing Committee met monthly, and then weekly as our deadline approached. This committee was charged with review and approval of the work of the technical sub-committees with the goal of reaching consensus. Every word of the code was parsed. (Hours were spent codifying the numerous uses of the word "approved.") The output of Managing Committee was converted to legislative form by the DOB legal staff, and is before you today in the form of Intro 1056.

There are several important things you need to be aware of in considering Intro 1056:

- The organization and intelligence brought to the process by the staff of the DOB, has been extraordinary. The DOB staff provided the technical sub-committees with annotated working materials, indicating corrections, and cross-referenced with other applicable sections of the code. The DOB provided competent administrative and technical support, insuring that the committee members could focus on the subject matter. After providing materials, the DOB staff stepped back and let the committees do their work, supported, but un-hindered.

- Our process was one of consensus. Everyone in the room had to agree on the text. This was true of the technical sub-committees as well as the managing committee. Being part of such a dynamic and selfless process at the City-level was both exciting and humbling.

- NYC is a place like no other. The population density and development forces at play in the City require that the highest level of attention be paid to its construction codes. In this current revision, NYC gets the benefit of the nation-wide code development and triennial revision effort of the International Building Code - introducing new materials and technologies, and referencing updated national standards. Then, during a rigorous review by the technical and managing committees, this national code is adapted to the more stringent fire-safety, structural, accessibility, as well as energy-efficiency requirements necessitated to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the City's residents and businesses. For example, the current revision provides reference standards for the installation of green-roofs. With the professional fire-power brought to bear in this effort, NYC earns its place as the industry leader in code development.

- You can have confidence that Intro 1056 embodies a code that is clear, well-organized, and sets the standard for construction codes in other jurisdictions. The current revision guarantees access to current technologies at competitive prices.

I have reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Building Resiliency Task Force. The adoption of many of these recommendations will be crucial to the future well-being of the City's residents and businesses. I believe the Building Resiliency code revisions that will eventually be adopted can be reasonably knit into the fabric of the codes as revised by Intro 1056. I also firmly believe that the revisions to the construction codes contained in Intro 1056, need to be enacted NOW, without delay.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee on Housing and Buildings to accept and approve Intro 1056.

Respectfully Submitted,

David May, RA, LEED AP
Principal
SUPERSTRUCTURES Engineers + Architects
t: 212-505-1133 x1313
dmay@superstructures.com
www.superstructures.com

Dedicated to the Preservation of Buildings and Infrastructure

For the Record

TESTIMONY TO THE NEW YORK CITY

COUNCIL/HOUSING AND BUILDINGS COMMITTEE

RE: INTRO. 1056-2013 (BUILDING CODE)

JUNE 25, 2013

SUBIMITTED BY HENRY KITA/SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

BUILDING TRADES EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK CITY

Chairman Dilan, Members of the Housing and Buildings Committee of the New York City Council…

My name is Henry C. Kita. I am Senior Vice President of the Building Trades Employers' Association of New York City (BTEA). The BTEA is a 108 year old umbrella organization representing 27 union affiliated construction trade associations comprised of 1,800 construction managers, general contractors and specialty trade subcontractors doing business in New York City. BTEA construction contractors employ approximately 25,000 project management and office personnel as well as the 100,000 skilled tradesmen and tradeswomen of the Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater New York.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on Intro 1056-2013… a revision and update of the New York City Building Code. I, along with various members of the BTEA have been deeply involved in various aspects of the review, development and revision of the Building Code over these past 21 months.

I personally served as Co-Chairman of the Chapter 33 Demolition and Construction Safety Committee, and it is that section of the Building Code on which I will specifically comment. The Demolition and Construction Safety Committee was comprised of 27 individuals representing a variety of segments of the New York City construction industry...architects, engineers, safety professionals and consultants, contractor association reps, contractors, construction managers, real estate, unions, utility companies as well as the public sector. The committee literally went word by word through Chapter 33 in order to review every aspect of the New York City Construction Safety Code. There was often spirited debate but always a sense of collegiality that guided the reaching of "consensus" decisions on the various parts of the Safety Code. In all, the Safety Code Committee held more meetings, 34, than any other technical committee in this process, spending a total 1,836 hours amongst all members. In the end, there were four items within Chapter 33 that went through the Department of Buildings mediation process. The results of those mediations are contained within the final iteration of Chapter 33 that you have before you.

The BTEA generally supports the final draft of Chapter 33, but reserves the right of any of its individual association members, to object or disagree with this portion of Intro. 1056-2013.

Likewise, the BTEA reserves judgment on the other approximately 2,400 pages of Intro. 1056-2013 pending a further examination by our members.

With that said, we support the process employed by the Department of Buildings in revising the entire Building Code. By and large, the process was transparent and encouraged the inclusion of a variety of opinions in reaching the final document. The Code Revision Team at the Department of Buildings is to be commended for their work in coordinating the review of this voluminous document. The amount of time spent by DOB staff and their attention to the details of the Building Code was nothing short of incredible.

The BTEA thanks you for the opportunity to offer this testimony on Intro. 1056-2013.

For the Record

TESTIMONY OF TERENCE O'BRIEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE PLUMBING FOUNDATION CITY OF NEW YORK, INC. BEFORE THE HOUSING AND BUILDINGS COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL ON INTRO. 1056
JUNE 25, 2013

I am Terence O'Brien, Deputy Director of the Plumbing Foundation City of New York. The Plumbing Foundation is the umbrella organization for the plumbing industry. We include large licensed plumbing firms, small firms, union firms, non-union firms, Plumbers Union Local 1, representatives of engineering societies, manufacturers and supply houses. The Administrative Code Committee spent scores of hours developing, reviewing, and clarifying a significant portion of the Code before you today. Accordingly, the Foundation supports this bill. However there are a few issues which I suggest still need to be clarified and/or amended before this Code Revision is enacted.

The three topics which the Housing and Buildings Committee should address are: 1. clarifying the definition of 51% "ownership and control" of licensed plumbing and fire suppression firms as per sections 28-408.6 subsection 1and 28-410.8 subsection 1, 2- changes to the public posting of disciplinary actions as per section 28- 401.19.1 subsection 2, and 3- the revisions of Limited Alteration Applications as per the definitions in section 28- 101.5.

(We point out that the Administrative Code Committee did not operate under the "consensus" dispute resolution process of the technical committees. Final decisions of the Administrative Code Committee was not the result of consensus.)

1. Public Posting of Disciplinary Actions:

The proposal to add section 28-401.19.2 to the Administrative Code is a good example of a transparent government. This proposed section states that the DOB will post the names of licensees who have had their license(s) suspended or revoked but only following an administrative trial or OATH hearing. Two comments: One, this Code language changes the current practice of posting the results of ALL disciplinary actions (fines, probations, suspensions etc.) to disciplinary actions resulting JUST in suspensions and revocations. Second, most disciplinary actions are the result of negotiated settlements ("plea deals") that are not the result of an administrative trial or OATH hearing. The proposed language would NOT require DOB to post three negotiated settlements. Results of negotiated settlements should be posted on DOB's website. Listings of all disciplinary actions fines, OATHs and negotiated plea settlements are public documents. This section should be amended to include that the results of ALL disciplinary actions be posted.

2. Limited Plumbing Alterations:

Limited Alteration Application is a way for owners and tenants to avoid the cost and hassle of paying for the preparation of plans and the government review process for small jobs. For these small plumbing jobs the permit is pulled directly by the licensed plumber avoiding the cost of hiring an architect and going through DOB's plan review process. This direct filing

by a licensee has been around for over 50 years in New York (previous names were ARA, PRS) and is used in almost every jurisdiction in the country as a method of reducing costs on small jobs.

Presently the Code limits the use of LAAs to $25,000 per building for a 12 month period. The increase from $25,000 to $35,000, listed under the "Category 1" LAA plumbing work, should be commended. Without this increase many small scale jobs would have additional unneeded red tape and have additional costs. Second, the creation of "Category 2" work which is not subject to the $35,000 restriction per Building for a 12 month period as required in "Category 1" is also a great addition to the Building Code and will help owners/tenants keep costs down when working on small plumbing alterations. However, the work described in "Category 2" # 2 ("The relocation and mounting of new plumbing fixtures on existing roughing, other than replacement of existing fixtures...") is far too restrictive and really makes no sense. It is not possible to relocate a bathtub from one side of a bathroom to the other side WITHOUT CHANGING the roughing. Under the proposed definition, by changing a bathroom's roughing this small job is now not a "Category 2" job but a "Category 1" with all of the "Category 1" restrictions. For example, this means that if a tenant in apartment 2B decides to renovate his/her bathroom at a cost of $30,000 and relocate the same number of fixtures to different locations, (which requires altering the room's roughing,) the LMP would be able to file this work under

a LAA. However, the tenant in apartment 11E who wants to do the same exact work in their bathroom a few months later would not be allowed to use a LAA since 2 LAAs within the same building are not permitted within a 12 month period. The apartment 11E tenant would need to hire an architect and file plans and THEN the LMP would obtain a plumbing permit. This $30,000 bathroom change involving no new fixtures now has increased costs and will take much longer than the job in apartment 2B. To solve this problem "Category 2" #2 should read: "The relocation and mounting of plumbing fixtures and the associated roughing, other than the mere replacement of existing fixtures constituting a minor alteration or ordinary repair und this code;"

3. 51% "Ownership and Control":

In order to help assure safe plumbing and fire suppression practices the Building Code has long required that licensed firms be 51% owned and controlled by individuals who are licensed ("51% Rule). The business practices and legal responsibility of each profession are predicated on this 51% Rule which is codified in Administrative Code Sections 28-408.6 and 410.8. (No one wants for, example a lawyer to own or control a licensed plumbing firm which performs natural and medical gas work). This is a bedrock principle the industry has followed for decades. Recently, non-licensed entities have sought to circumvent the long standing Code

requirement because there is no definition of "control" in the Code. Accordingly we proposed that the 51% Rule be clarified to ensure that licensed firms are only controlled by individuals who are licensed. We therefore propose the following new definition: 28-408.6(5) For the purposes of this section "control" shall mean that a licensed master plumber or plumbers who own 51% or more of the voting capital stock of licensed firm cannot be terminated from the licensed business by any other person or entity. A similar provision is proposed for the fire suppression contractor in Section 410.8. The addition of such language would prevent unlicensed entities from controlling licensed firms and also provide DOB with an easy test to apply if control issues arise.

Other than these 3 comments, the Plumbing Foundation is in full support of Intro. 1056.

AIA New York Chapter

FOR THE RECORD

Testimony in support of Int. No. 1056-2013

New York City Council
Committee on Housing and Buildings
June 25, 2013

On behalf of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and its nearly 5,000 architect and affiliate members based in Manhattan we offer testimony on Int. No. 1056. It is a distinct pleasure to offer support of this legislation which will update the New York City Construction Codes as part of the required triennial review. These amendments will bring the New York City codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the International Plumbing, Building, Mechanical and Fuel Gas Codes published by the International Code Council, with local differences to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public and accommodate the unique nature of construction in the City.

Every three years, the New York City Construction Codes must be updated based upon the latest version of the International Code Council Codes (I-Codes). To this end, the Department of Buildings organized a series of technical committees, advisory committees and a managing committee to develop and review changes made in the 2009 I-Codes, as well as clarifications to the 2008 NYC Construction Codes, with the goal of determining how and if these changes should be incorporated into the New York City Construction Codes. For nearly two years members of our chapter have participated on technical, advisory and management committees along-side others from the industry to review and tailor the I-Codes to New York City's needs and to preserve and enhance life and building safety while reflecting the unique, dense environment that makes up New York.

These changes agreed upon by the technical committees and put forth by the administration provide reasonable minimum requirements and standards, based upon current scientific and engineering knowledge, experience and techniques, and the utilization of modern equipment, materials and forms and methods of construction in the City of New York in the interest of public safety while at the same time enabling the flexibility for the design of forward thinking efficient buildings. We believe that these revisions will keep our Codes current with national practices and help NYC remain in the forefront of safe and effective design, development and construction.

We recommend that the committee consider amending the effective date of this legislation to allow for a one year transition period as was the case for the adoption of the 2008 Code. As there are a variety of other code changes anticipated, including those subject to hearing later this week, and also recommendations coming out of the Mayor's Special Initiative for Rebuilding and Resiliency and the Building Resiliency Task Force Report undertaken by Urban Green Council at the request of the Mayor and the City Council.

In closing, we applaud the administration and the Department of Buildings for the efficient, inclusive, effective and consensus-based process to bring us to this day and we urge the Committee on Housing and Buildings to vote in favor of Int. No. 1056. We appreciate your time and consideration and hope that you will call upon us in the future if we can be of assistance.

Thank you,

Jill N. Lerner, FAIA, 2013 President

Rick Bell, FAIA, Executive Director

536 LaGuardia Place
New York, NY 10012
212 683 0023
info@aiany.org
www.aiany.org

International Code Council
48 Dublin Drive
Niskayuna, NY 12309
tel: 888.icc.safe (422.7233)
fax: 518.783.4570
www.iccsafe.org

Good afternoon Chairman Dilan, Members and Staff of the City Council Committee on Housing and Buildings. My name is Dorothy Harris. I am the Vice President of State & Local Government Relations and your liaison to the International Code Council. The International Code Council (ICC), a member-focused association dedicated to helping building safety community and the construction industry provide safe and sustainable construction through the development of codes and standards used in the design, build and compliance process. Most U.S. communities and many global markets choose the International Codes. The mission of the ICC is to provide the highest quality codes, standards, products, and services for all concerned with the safety and performance of the building environment.

I would like to commend the City of New York for its outstanding work to ensure the safety, health and well being of its citizens. Int. No. 1056, A Local Law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the New York City Plumbing Code, the New York City Building Code, the New York City Mechanical Code and the New York City Fuel Gas Code in relation to bringing such Codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the International Building, Mechanical, Fuel Gas and Plumbing Codes, with differences that reflect the unique character of the city and clarifying and updating administration and enforcement of such codes and the 1968 code. Therefore I offer the following testimony in support of the legislation before you today.

The International Codes are currently adopted at the state or local level in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands and the Northern Marianas Islands. The International Codes are revised and updated every three years by a national consensus process that strikes a balance between the latest technology and new building products, economics and cost while providing for most recent advances in public and first responder safety and installation techniques. The International Codes (I-Codes) are correlated to work together without conflicts so as to eliminate confusion in building design or inconsistent code enforcement among different jurisdictions. The ICC Code Development Process is an open, inclusive process that encourages input from all individuals and groups and allows those governmental members, including representatives from NYC, to determine the final code provisions. I am pleased that several NYC building and fire department staff and other organizations in the City participated in the 2009 ICC Code Hearings, and as a result, several provisions of the current NYC Construction Codes and other Local Laws have been incorporated into the 2009 I-Codes – the Codes before you today. This involvement and participation by personnel from the Department of Buildings and FDNY is critical to the success of future versions of the I-Codes. The technical and practical expertise of NYC building and fire officials, design professionals, builders, contractors, labor representatives and all organizations interested in building safety are vital to your adoption efforts as well as ours.

New York City is one of many jurisdictions that values public and first responder safety and the protection of our built environment by updating building, fire, plumbing and energy codes every three years. By regularly adopting your construction and fire safety codes every three years, the City provides the safest and economically prudent climate for its citizens since it will allow the use of new construction standards or methods. Accordingly, Int. No. 1056 will update the City's Plumbing, Building, Mechanical and Fuel Gas Codes to reflect recent building, safety and efficiency standards developed by the nation's leading building scientists, building, plumbing and fire department officials, builders, general and plumbing contractors, architects, engineers, product manufacturers and discipline specific associations with modifications unique to the City.

The International Code Council is honored to partner with the City of New York and we look forward to continuing to serve your needs. The next code update will be legislation to adopt the 2009 International Fire Code (IFC) with NYC modifications. This bill will be heard by the Fire and Criminal Justice Committee later this year. Additionally, one of the recommendations outlined in the Building Resiliency Task Force Report is for the City to next adopt an Existing Building Code based on the International Existing Building Code (IEBC). Therefore, I stand ready to assist the City in any way as it moves forward with the adoption of these additional codes in the near future. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony to you today in support of Int. No.1056. I am happy to answer any questions you may have or provide additional documentation.

JBB
JAROS BAUM & BOLLES

Mitchel W. Simpler, PE

Testimony before the Housing and Buildings Committee Meeting

Tuesday, June 25, 2013

Intro 1056-2013 A local law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the New York City Plumbing Code, the New York City Building Code, the New York City Mechanical Code and the New York City Fuel Gas Code in relation to bringing such codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the International Building, Mechanical, Fuel Gas and Plumbing Codes, incorporating differences that reflect the unique character of the city and clarifying and updating administration and enforcement of such codes and the 1968 code.

My name is Mitchel W. Simpler, PE, and I am here to support Intro 1056, specifically, the proposed updated 2012 Construction Codes for the City of New York. I am the Managing Partner at Jaros, Baum & Bolles Consulting Engineers, located here in New York City. JB&B is considered to be one of the foremost consulting engineering firms in the world, and has provided the design of the mechanical and electrical systems for some of the most prestigious buildings in the world, including the original World Trade Center, the Moscow World Trade Center, the Bank of China buildings in both Hong Kong and Beijing, and the Willis Tower (formerly the Sears Tower) in Chicago, to name just a few. We are currently the Design Engineers for Towers 1, 2, 3 and 4 at the new World Trade Center site as well as the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, the Manhattan West project, the Hudson Yards project, Columbia University's new Manhattanville campus, and the new Kimmel Pavilion building on the NYU Langone Medical Center campus. We were also the Engineers for One Bryant Park, the headquarters of Bank of America, completed in 2008 and bestowed a LEED Platinum certification. I represent the American Council of Engineering Companies of New York (ACECNY) and serve as the ACEC Chairman for New York State. I am also Chairman of the New York City Code Revisions Mechanical, HVAC and Boiler Technical Committee and am a member of the New York City Code Revisions Managing Committee.

For the previous code revision, which resulted in the current 2008 NYC Construction Codes, I chaired three (3) subcommittees, working approximately eighteen (18) months along with dozens of other subcommittee members at adapting the 2003 International Mechanical Code to the special needs of New York City and forming the 2008 Mechanical Code which is currently in use. As you may recall, the code prior to the New York City 2008 Building Code was adopted in 1968 and in the intervening of 42 years had become technically outdated, voluminous, and unwieldy for both practitioners and those assigned to administer it. For those reasons, then Building Commissioner Patricia Lancaster formed a Managing Committee as well as associated technical committees to adopt and modify the International Building Code and its corresponding I-Codes to meet the unique needs of New York City. As a secondary, but perhaps equally important feature of the International Code Council, the administrator of the International Building Code, was its

commitment to review and update the codes on a three- (3-) year cycle. New York City would follow the same update procedure. In the intervening 3+ years that the 2008 New York City Building code has been in existence, I believe that the building community has generally been pleased with the outcome of the new code. We have found the Mechanical Code easy to understand and apply and, more importantly, we are better able to work with the Department of Buildings personnel in addressing some of the more complex problems that arise in new building designs.

Due to the complexity of adopting and formulating the Building Code and the other I-Codes, we missed the 2006 update. However, in December of 2011, I was asked again to chair the Mechanical, HVAC & Boiler Technical Committee to update both the 2008 New York City Mechanical Code and portions of the 2008 New York City Fuel Gas Code. The process that was followed was one in which Buildings Department personnel first reviewed both the 2006 and the 2009 versions of the International Mechanical Code and the International Fuel Gas Code and then gave the integrated composite draft to the New York City Mechanical, HVAC & Boiler Technical Committee as a base document for review. In addition, the Technical Committee was expanded to include members representing the engineering community, union workers, Contractors, representatives of the Real Estate Board (REBNY) and the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA). Representatives of the DOB, the DEP, the FDNY, the SCA and the NYCHA were part of the committee, thus forming a broad and balanced consensus group. We worked for approximately eighteen (18) months and literally thousands of volunteer hours, reviewing and implementing the changes within the International Mechanical Code and Fuel Gas Code, determining how and where the changes should be applied within our code.

To highlight some of the updates: We added and refined the definitions within the code to better reflect today's technology and equipment uses. We coordinated the multiple overlapping sections between the Mechanical and Fuel Gas Codes to simplify requirements and make them consistent. More significantly, we updated the 2008 ventilation standards to be consistent with national standards (ASHRAE) and with generally accepted practices that clarify the ventilation requirements for a multitude of occupancy types and foster as well significant energy savings. We significantly improved the requirements for the many types of exhaust systems found throughout the city to make it easier for the design community as well as the code enforcement agencies to understand the requirements and the letter of the code. We clarified the use and application of smoke detectors in mechanical systems and coordinated these clarifications with all of the related code sections as well as with the FDNY. We coordinated the Mechanical Code with the NYC DEP Noise Code to eliminate any conflicts. We updated the boiler sections of the code to be consistent with the ASME National Codes as well as NFPA Codes governing the same. We updated the refrigeration section of the code to recognize current refrigerants in use today and to be consistent with FDNY regulations governing refrigerant use. We added appropriate code language for high-temperature water heating systems that are being used more often in New York, systems not previously covered by the code, and we clarified several key sections in the fuel oil piping section to improve safety and simplify the code's intent. We also clarified the sections of the 2008 New York City Mechanical Code and the 2008 New York City Fuel Gas Code that were

not as clear as originally envisioned. In addition, Building Bulletins issued in the intervening years that were used to clarify sections of the code were researched, vetted and brought into the body of this proposed code. The results of our work are the code changes before you in Intro 1056. I believe that these changes to the Mechanical Code and Fuel Gas Code will make these two great codes even better. These changes will allow our codes to remain current with the rest of the building industry, clarify points that were not entirely clear as originally written, and it will put New York City back on track to keep our codes updated on the 3-year review cycle, consistent with New York State and the International Building Code. Therefore, on behalf of ACEC New York, the New York City Mechanical, HVAC & Boiler Technical Committee and the design engineering community as a whole, I urge this committee to accept and approve Intro 1056.

FOR THE RECORD

The Cement League
Member of Building Trades Employers' Association

49 West 45th Street, Suite 900, NY NY 10036 Phone (212) 575-0950 Fax (212) 575-4844
www.thecementleague.com email: thecementleague@verizon.net

June 21, 2013

Hon. Erik Martin Dilan
Chairman
Committee on Housing and Buildings
New York City Council
387 Arlington Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11208

Re: City Council Bill Int. No. 1056/Revisions to the New York City Building Code

Dear Chairman Dilan:

The Cement League will be providing specific recommendations and revisions to the Intro No. 1056/Revisions. The Intro is voluminous and requires our more attentive review than as possible for the Bill's first hearing, Tuesday, June 25, 2013. The Cement League appreciates the opportunity the Department of Buildings provided to comment on portions of this proposal as being developed by the Department. The Building Department representatives were professional and courteous, but unfortunately repressed by a bureaucratic format.

The Cement League has specific objections to portions of the Code particularly those relating to the design and installation of concrete and the Department's oversight of the construction process. Concrete is the wonder product of New York construction, strong, durable, impact and noise resistant, antiseptic, impermeable and flexible in application. The Cement League believes the Department fails to marshal and utilize the talent of New York City's Union base construction industry to minimize cost while achieving the best construction. The 2500 plus page text complicates what was previously represented to be the most effective, performance based international building standards. The revisions render construction more costly with the prospect that the Code will be applied bureaucratically, unresponsive to the manner in which the best modern construction proceeds.

We will be submitting specific comments but here wish to alert the Council to the proposal's limitations. The Cement League would have much preferred the Council to have participated in the Department's Code revision formulation process. The Council's presence and participation would have been most beneficial. Your responsibilities are now more complicated. The Cement League is confident that you will rise much above the task.

Respectfully,

The Cement League

ARCHITECTS COUNCIL OF NEW YORK CITY INC.

14 EAST 38TH STREET, 11TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY 10016

www.acny.org

ACNY Legislation Impact Statement on Int. No. 1056 June 25, 2013

The Architects Council of New York is the umbrella group that represents Architectural organizations in the five boroughs of New York City. The Council (ACNY) represents the New York Society of Architects, Society of American Registered Architects and the Brooklyn, Queens, S.I, & Bronx Chapters of the American Institute of Architects. Our officers have been in consultation with the Department of Buildings on committees in review of the proposed changes to the 2008 Building code.

We support all efforts to update the NYC Administrative Building code. But we have not had sufficient time to review and comment on the drastic changes proposed to the Building Code. This Int. has 2446 pages of revised code with many sections problematic. The Architect's Council of New York feels there should be hearings on Int. No. 1056 Section by Section to fully review this massive Int.

There needs to be an economic impact review of the provisions of the Int. that effects existing building adversely and creates confusion. As an example, the Architect's Council of New York points to the impact on Not for Profit Clubs and Churches with Public Assemblies that serve the constituents and the public of New York City. Many of these long existing institutions of New York City will be required to file new Public Assembly applications for their currently legal venues. With no current reasonable avenue for reconsiderations in the Department of Building, these community organizations will find they can no longer provide vital services to the Public.

The nomenclature of adding sections and then changing the numbering system going forward will create unending confusion. The City of New York should be the leader in building code innovation, not the follower. We have approximately 80% of the tallest building in the world and the experience and expertise to draft clear and concise codes. However, this current Int. is not fully reviewed and can not be fully examined in one hearing within one week of publishing of the 2445 page int.

As the economic impact to the city is monumental, the Architects practicing in New York City beg the City Council to permit extensive review of this proposed change to the New York City Administrative Building Code Section by Section.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Vauss, RA, Vice President of ACNY
Robert Strong, RA, ACNY Director of Legislative Impact
Architect's Council of New York
14 East 38th Street, Floor 11
New York, NY 10016-005

ACEC New York

American Council of Engineering Companies of New York

The New York City Council

Committee on Housing and Buildings

Hearing on Int. No. 1056. A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, the New York city plumbing code, the New York city building code, the New York city mechanical code and the New York city fuel gas code in relation to bringing such codes up to date with the 2009 editions of the international building, mechanical, fuel gas and plumbing codes, with differences that reflect the unique character of the city and clarifying and updating administration and enforcement of such codes and the 1968 code.

Testimony by Hannah O'Grady, Vice President
American Council of Engineering Companies of New York (ACEC New York)

Tuesday, June 25, 2013 at 1:00 p.m.

On behalf of the the American Council of Engineering Companies of New York, I'd like to thank Chairman Dilan and the members of the Committee for their efforts over the years to update the City's construction codes. I am here today to testify in support of the proposed amendments to the New York City Building Codes.

Founded in New York City in 1921, ACEC New York is one of the oldest continuing organizations of professional consulting engineers in the U.S. We represent over 220 engineering firms throughout New York State that collectively employ more than 20,000 people statewide, with a concentrated presence of firms located in New York City.

Since September of 2011, 54 members of ACEC New York have donated thousands of hours chairing and/or serving on the city's technical committees, reviewing specific chapters of the New York City Construction Codes and updating it based upon the 2009 edition of the International Building Codes.

We applaud the work of the Department of Building's Technical Code Committees and the Managing Committee which is composed of representatives from all sectors of industry and government. The end result is a true consensus document that reflects the on-the-ground issues encountered by our engineers, architects and builders every day as well as best practices for safety and sustainability.

We respectfully offer our support for this current round of amendments which reflect those objectives and urge the council to swiftly pass this bill.

FOR THE RECORD

Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums
INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND ADVOCACY

250 West 57 Street • Suite 730 • New York, NY 10107-0700

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF 2013 REVISIONS TO THE BUILDING CODE

Presented by Mary Ann Rothman, Executive Director

June 25, 2013

My name is Mary Ann Rothman. I am the executive director of the Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums, a membership organization for housing cooperatives and condominiums located throughout the five boroughs of New York City and beyond. More than 170,000 New York families make their homes in our member buildings, which span the full economic spectrum from very modest housing to some very upscale dwellings.

I was pleased to be invited to serve on the Advisory Group that reviewed the many sections of the revised code. Fortunately, others on in the group had the diverse expertise necessary to raise and solve technical questions. My role was to raise issues that might cause concern to cooperatives and condominiums, and I also believe I was helpful in making sure that text was understandable to the lay person.

I can attest to the fact that the Department of Buildings has sought input from a vast array of experts in every aspect of the Code, and that the document before you is a concerted effort to keep the Code a readily understandable document that is in tune with current technology.

Maintaining a Code that is comprehensive, transparent and flexible is a task without end. I congratulate the Department of Buildings for this ongoing effort and I offer the full support of the Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums for Int. 1056.

Thank you.

Phone 212 496-7400 • Fax 212 580-7801 • e-mail info@CNYC.coop • Website: www.CNYC.coop

James C. Bifulco (jbifulco@totalsafety.org), Co-chairman, Construction Safety Committee

Testimony before Housing and Buildings
Tuesday June 25, 2013

Good afternoon. My name is James Bifulco. I am the Managing Consultant with TSC North America, Past President of the Safety Executives of New York, and Past President of the NYC American Society of Safety Engineers. I am a practicing safety professional Licensed as Site Safety Manager, Master Rigger, and certified by the Board of Certified Safety Professionals as a Safety Professional. I have acted as a senior advisor for the implementation of comprehensive safety programs for many notable projects including: the WTC Transportation HUB, Columbia Manhattanville Campus, Goldman Sachs Headquarters, East Side Access, Second Avenue Subway, and Madison Square Garden upgrades.

I am proud to have co-chaired the Committee on Construction Safety with Hank Kita Vice President of the Building Trades Employers Association. The committee was made up from a diverse group of 27 dedicated professionals that worked over an 18-month period, with over 34 separate meetings. The group make-up included representatives from the Building Trades Employers Association, Owners and Developers, Safety Professionals, Organized Labor (including The Mason Tenders Training Fund, Ironworkers Local 40 and 361, Operating Engineers Local 14), Construction Trade Organizations, Union and Non-Union Contractors, Agencies and Authorities (including the DOB, DEP, FDNY, SCA, and Housing Authority).

The group worked tirelessly. Members presented their positions forcefully but the opinions of others in the group were respected. In the end, we came to consensus on the overwhelming majority of the items. Where a consensus was not possible, the suggested corrections where based on input from all stakeholders and an acceptable and workable compromise was achieved.

Highlights of the accomplishments of the suggested changes include:

Overall Enhancements:

- Added best practices where safety will be improved, but no additional cost to the building industry will be created.
- Corrections and clarifications made after inadvertent changes that occurred during the passage of the 2008 IBC/Building code
- Improvements to Fire and Life Safety during construction based on findings and recommendations that came after Deutche Bank Fire.
- Improvements recommended during the High Risk Construction Oversight Committee
- Practices reflecting new and improved technology.

Specific Changes Include:

BC Chapter 33: Construction and Demolition Safety

- Enhances fire protection during the construction of large footprint buildings (100,000+ square feet) by mandating that hydrants be installed and located in close proximity to the building's perimeter during construction: one within 50 feet of the main entrance, and at least one hydrant along every 250 feet of building perimeter. No hydrant may be located more than 50 feet from the exterior wall. (BC 3303.7.1.1)
- Clarifies the current requirements that when a standpipe is required during construction it means a fully code compliant standpipe system that serves all floors where the permanent stairs are installed, thus eliminating confusion in industry as to the intent of the current standpipe requirements. (BC 3303.8 Item 1)
- Enhances fire protection during the construction of below grade spaces by requiring the installation of a standpipe system during underground construction work in buildings that will have occupiable space at a depth of 75 feet or greater. (BC 3303.8,Item 3)
- Codifies current interpretation of requirements for standpipes during alteration or partial demolition operations. This will eliminate confusion in industry regarding the intent of the current standpipe requirements. (BC 3303.8 #4)
- Clarifies that where a dry standpipe is provided during construction, alteration or demolition, an air pressurized alarm system is also required. (BC 3303.8.1 Items 1 and 2)
- Improves fire-fighter access during underground construction by requiring the installation of a hoist during underground construction work in buildings that will have occupiable space at a depth of 75 feet or greater. (BC 3303.12.3)

- Improves ease of use by relocating the provisions of steel, concrete, and aluminum construction that relate to site safety to this chapter. (BC 3305.2, BC 3305.3, and BC 3305.4)
- Adds a new exception to clarify that the use of an excavator to remove a foundation after the building has been reduced to grade does not trigger requirements for mechanical demolition. This will speed project approval and reduce cost. (BC 3306.5)
- Eliminates requirement to show "means and methods" on demolition submittal documents. "Means and methods" cover the specific work required to execute the design, including the types of tools used. This level of detail is typically not covered by the professional insurance carried by a registered design professional. Removing the requirement will eliminate a costly burden without compromising safety. (BC 3305.3.3.2)
- Enhances safety by mandating a daily inspection of sidewalk sheds to check for common hazards. (BC 3307.6.5.10)
- Adopts the latest technology and enhances safety by incorporating current national standards concerning the design, testing, installation, inspection, and use of safety netting. (BC 3308)
- Establishes minimum guardrail requirements. This will provide clarity to contractors and inspectors and promote safety. (BC 3308.7.3)
- Establishes a new requirement to notify adjoining property owners at least 60 days in advance of projects that will require access to their property. (BC 3309.1.1)
- Codifies the monitoring of historic sites during construction when required. Currently in TPPN 10/88. (BC 3309.4.4 Item 2)
- Clarifies responsibilities of site safety managers/coordinators, including when they must be onsite, standpipe inspection, site safety logs, and large jobs where multiple site safety managers/coordinators are present. (BC 3310)
- Codifies best practice concerning scaffold design drawings; this clarifies requirements for industry and streamlines the submittal and review process. (BC 3314.3)
- Clarifies current requirements and codifies best practice regarding scaffolding including design, installation, use, repair, supervision and inspection. (BC 3314.4)
- Requires that concrete formwork be periodically inspected by the formwork designer or someone retained by the formwork designer, except for small projects where formwork design is not otherwise required. This will ensure public safety and prevent construction accidents related to formwork. (BC 3316.9)
- Requires rigging operations on a construction site that are not already supervised by a licensed rigger be supervised by trained persons. Requires critical picks on a construction site that are not already supervised by a licensed rigger be performed pursuant to a plan designed by a registered design professional or licensed rigger. (BC 3316.9)

  Authorizes persons to inspect façades by ascending or descending the building by rope provided the person uses accepted methods and has adequate training. This will provide an alternative to suspended scaffolds and is a practical solution for ornamental buildings, towers and spires. This codifies the Department's current practices. (BC 3316.9.3.)

The modifications made will undoubtedly improve safety to the public, property and workers. I, therefore, urge this committee to accept and approve this intro.

VIDARIS

Tuesday June 25, 2013, 1:00p.m.

The New York City Council
Committee on Housing and Buildings
Hearing on Intro 1056 – A Local Law to amend the Building Code of the City of New York

Good afternoon Chairman Dilan and Members and Staff of the City Council Committee on Housing and Buildings. My name is Marc Weissbach. I am a Registered Architect, and I am the President and Chief Operating Officer of Vidaris, Inc. I come before you today in support of Intro 1056; an important bill to update The Construction Code of the City of New York.

Vidaris is a consulting group with more than 125 experts from the architectural, engineering, and construction community, specializing in building envelope and energy efficiency construction and technologies. We are known worldwide and have worked on some of the most prestigious projects our city has completed or is currently undertaking. Projects include: all of the buildings as well as the memorial and plaza on the World Trade Center site, the three major new sports arenas, revitalization of the Jacob Javits Center, restoration of historically significant landmarks such as Carnegie Hall, and countless numbers of buildings and apartments throughout all five boroughs. Our company was the first entity in New York City to become accredited for Special Inspection of building exteriors as required by the 2008 Building Code, and performs roughly 100,000 hours of inspection on projects throughout our City annually. Vidaris is often called upon in instances where building failures or disasters occur such as water leaks, façade collapses, and most recently damage and flooding resulting from Super Storm Sandy. It is critical that our Codes are current, relevant, and most importantly, clear, so that users can comply effectively and efficiently to maintain the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

I am honored to have been selected, and served as the Chair for the Construction Requirement and Materials Committee (CRM). This committee was charged with reviewing several chapters of the 2008 Building Code to ensure its content was consistent with the 2009 International Building Code (IBC) and relevant to New York City. 35 States have already put into effect the 2009 or 2012 IBC. NYC is presently using the 2003 IBC, as modified; a code that has since been updated three times to reflect current knowledge, trends, and standards. The Construction Requirements and Materials committee was well balanced and included members representing various stakeholders of our City; designers, developers, manufacturers, contractors, and residents. We held more than 38 meetings over a period of 18 months totaling 100's of hours, vetting specific Code language for impact and improvement on the existing code as well as the residents and businesses of New York City. Each of the committee members volunteered additional time beyond the meetings to further research code provisions to ensure our work was focused on moving New York City forward, and to maintain New York City's position as a leader and innovator. Our focus was not simply directed towards cost or construction detailing, but was sensitive and sensible towards occupant comfort, safety, durability, and energy efficiency. The committee included some of the most hardworking, dedicated, and sophisticated individuals I have had the pleasure to work with and I am again honored to have been a part of this important Department of Buildings initiative. The product of the CRM was the result of consensus, a process whereby every member of the committee agreed that the Code provisions are well balanced, reasonable, and necessary.

Above and beyond the Construction Requirements and Materials Committee, I served as a member of the Managing Committee. This expanded group included members of governing agencies including the Department of Buildings, design, engineering, development, construction, and labor stakeholders, and again, reached consensus on proposed modifications to The Construction Code of the City of New York that are reflected in Intro 1056.

Incorporation of pertinent IBC provisions into the Construction Code of the City of New York is critical for several reasons. Among them, learning from natural disasters and building failures that have impacted cities throughout our country, and recently our own, allows users to capitalize on best practices and provisions, and stay current. Consistent text and provisions encourages manufacturers and suppliers to work within New York City and affords the City's employees and employers to do the same elsewhere, thereby affording us access to the most current technologies and competitive prices, as well as opening up commerce and opportunities. Maintenance and monitoring of the Code will occur on a three year cycle and NYC will avoid finding itself with outdated provisions as was true when we used the 1968 Code until 2008. Ongoing participation in code review at the National level will ensure that we remain current, relevant, and an industry leader, supporting provisions that capitalize on available technologies, efficiencies, and lessons learned.

In a few days, The Committee on Housing and Buildings will meet to discuss Rebuilding after Sandy and Improving the Resiliency of the City's Infrastructure. Much of the recent product available on this topic was produced by the Building Resiliency Task Force. I participated on the Structure, Façade, and Interior Working Group, and congratulate the BRTF for their efforts. The work of the BRTF and Intro 1056 are mutually exclusive; each deserves its respective consideration. While the BRTF offers insight and suggestions into resiliency and sustainability considerations for today and the future, The Construction Code of the City of New York provides the guidelines, parameters, and tools to implement provisions which have been deemed necessary for the governance of our built environment. The Building Code establishes the threshold to maintain health, safety, and welfare of our residents and building occupants, and needs to reflect current technologies, standards, and thinking.

I therefore urge the Committee on Housing and Buildings to accept and approve Intro 1056.

ASLA

Board of Directors

President
Laura Starr

President Elect
Nette Compton

Secretary
Ora Berman

Treasurer
Kenneth Keltai

Trustee
Adrian Smith

Past President
Denisha Williams

Celine Armstrong
Alison Duncan
Amy T. Gavaris
Marcha C. Johnson
Jennifer Nitzky
David Russo
Frank J. Varro
Curtis F. Velsor, Jr.
Amy C. Verel

Emeritus
Anthony Walmsley, FASLA

Ex-Officio

CCNY Landscape Architecture Program Director
Denise Hoffman Brandt

CCNY Landscape Architecture Faculty Representative
Catherine Seavitt Nordenson

CCNY Student Chapter President
Michael Mason

Executive Director
Kathy Shea

New York Chapter
American Society of
Landscape Architects
148 West 37th Street
13th Floor
New York, NY
10018-6909
212.269.2984
www.nyasla.org

Testimony for City Council, Housing & Buildings Committee
16th Floor Committee Room at 250 Broadway
Tuesday June 25, 2013 at 1pm

Subject: Suggested Revisions to the 2008 NYC Building Code

Good afternoon. My name is Adrian Smith. I am a landscape architect and I am before you today representing the New York Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. We have been working with the Department of Buildings for over a year on this effort and we are here to support the code revision language in this current version that now includes a definition of landscape architect, and a brief description of the tasks that landscape architects are professionally and technically licensed to perform.

I would like to explain why this is so important to me and my fellow licensed landscape architects who practice in this great city: Currently, the Department of Buildings does not accept applications from Landscape Architects since they are not recognized as "design professionals" in the current code language. The new language before you today still does not include landscape architects in that category of "design professional" but it does take an important step in that direction by including a definition of our profession that has been absent from the code until now.

Landscape Architects are uniquely qualified to lead teams of fellow design professionals including architects and engineers, to design vital projects for our city like parks, playgrounds, and other civic spaces, as well as the green infrastructure that will help New York protect itself from the effects of climate change. The fact that the DOB does not recognize landscape architects prevents us – and the design/construction industry – from working efficiently and effectively. This policy is in direct conflict with what the licensing law permits licensed landscape architects to do. Additionally, landscape architects are currently forced to enter into odd agreements with architects or engineers to sign and seal their documents for submission to the DOB. These other design professionals sign the forms and drawings as the Applicant even though this work strictly deals with landscape design developed under the professional responsibility granted to landscape architects by state law. This puts all parties in a legally awkward situation that drives up costs. ~~The proposed changes to the Building Code will help ensure the DOB can engage directly with a licensed professional landscape architect, thus eliminating the double layering of consultants and improving public safety.~~

We believe that if DOB engages directly with the licensed professional Landscape Architect, it will eliminate the double layering of consultants, improving public safety, since we are covered by a state licensing law, similar to the law that covers architects and engineers, with a focus on health, safety and welfare.

In conclusion, we agree that this code language revision is a good first step. However, we encourage your body to support additional future changes to correct the remaining problems outlined above. Our group stands ready to assist the city to achieve those results. We look forward to that collaboration.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Adrian Smith, ASLA, RLA
Trustee and Chair DOB Task Force
New York Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects

For the Record

June 25, 2013

WILLIAM STEIN FAIA
TESTIMONY TO THE NYC COUNCIL HOUSING & BUILDINGS COMMITTEE
IN SUPPORT OF INTRO. 1056-2013

My name is William Stein. I am a principal of Dattner Architects, a NYC architectural firm. I have over 30 years experience as a practicing architect in New York City. My firm designs a wide variety of public and private projects throughout New York City, including schools, libraries, recreation facilities and affordable housing. I served as Chair of the Egress Committee for the adoption of the 2008 New York City Construction Codes and currently serve as Co-Chair of the Use, Occupancy, Classification and Egress (UOCE) Committee for revisions to the 2008 NYC Construction Codes which have been incorporated in Intro. 1056-2013 – the 2013 Construction Codes Revision Bill.

I strongly support passage of Intro. 1056-2013. The 2008 NYC Construction Codes represented NYC's adoption of the International Codes with appropriate modifications which reflected unique local conditions. The 2008 Codes have benefited the City in numerous ways. They have facilitated development and construction by providing a set of clear, predictable, nationally accepted code provisions. The extensive resources of the International Code Council have helped with training, use and interpretation of the Codes. New York is the nation's largest city, and many jurisdictions are very interested in our approach to code and life safety issues. Adoption of the International Codes has enabled New York City to take a leadership role in code development efforts nationally and internationally.

An integral part of the code development process is the periodic revision to the Codes, to keep them up to date and to benefit from current developments in safety standards, design and construction practices. This bill proposes adoption of the 2009 International Codes with appropriate modifications for New York City. The Department of Buildings established a broadly based committee structure consisting of technical committees, advisory committees and a managing committee, to review proposed revisions to the codes, as well as clarifications to the 2008 NYC Construction Codes. Committee members included representatives from public agencies, architects, engineers, contractors, unions, developers and other industry representatives.

The UOCE Committee, which I co-chaired, exemplifies the inclusive, consensus-based process which the Department of Buildings implemented for the revision to the 2008 Codes. The Committee met regularly for over a year to review Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 10 of the Building Code. The Committee carefully considered appropriate modifications to the IBC and clarifications to the Building Code in response to the specific needs of New York City's urban environment. The Committee's review focused on the following goals: ensuring a high level of safety; facilitating design and construction; and making the codes clearer and easier to use. The Committee's recommendations are consensus based and reflect the views of all stakeholders.

As a member of the Managing Committee, I also participated in the review and acceptance of the recommendations of the technical committees, also by a consensus process. I saw the thoughtful deliberation with which committee members considered the proposed revisions and clarifications to the codes. I believe that these revisions will keep our Codes current with national practices and help NYC remain in the forefront of safe and effective design, development and construction.

For these reasons I urge the committee to approve Intro. 1056-2013.

For the Record

YORK SCAFFOLD EQUIPMENT CORP.

37-20 Twelfth Street
Long Island City, New York 11101

FAX: (718) 482-9016
(718) 784-6666 ■ (516) 222-2552 ■ (914) 328-7777

June 19, 2013

Councilmember Erik Martin Dilan
Committee on Housing and Buildings, Chairman
New York City Council
250 Broadway
New York, NY

Re: Intro 1056

Dear Chairman Dilan,

I have had the pleasure of being a Member of the Construction & Demolition Safety Technical Committee for the 2011 Construction Codes Revision.

For eighteen (18) months, I have worked with other stakeholders from the construction industry and with representatives of the New York City Department of Buildings to review the current Building Code and to make recommendations to improve it.

The result of our hard work is included in Intro 1056, along with that of other Technical Committees. It represents a true consensus that was reached after much serious deliberation on the part of all participants.

While I cannot offer comment on the parts of Intro 1056 which are beyond the area of our Technical Committee, I am happy to offer my support for the adoption of the final product which our Committee turned out.

Yours truly,

Kenneth J. Buettner
President
York Scaffold Equipment Corp.

For the Record

PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

One Penn Plaza
New York, NY 10119
Main: 212-465-5000
Fax: 212-465-5096

www.pbworld.com

June 25, 2013

To: Members of the New York City Council

RE: Support for Intro 1056
NYC Building Codes Update, 2013

I fully support the adoption in Intro 1056, 2013 Update of the New York City Building Code.

This legislation will update the current 2008 Building Code, to incorporate updates from the 2009 International Building Code (IBC). This update also includes clarifications which have been requested by the NYC Building Department, and other City departments.

As a member of the Fire Protection Technical Committee, the updated code maintains the level of fire safety which New Yorkers expect. In addition, the features which address the unique construction practices in NYC, and the FDNY operations procedures have been preserved. In the Smoke Control section, system testing procedures have been clarified, as well as DOB/FDNY documentation.

Our technical committee members have been working diligently since September 2011. We carefully reviewed each proposed change to verify that it was required, clearly worded, and applicable to the special needs of NYC.

I urge you to vote **FOR** the proposed INTRO 1056.

Sincerely,

James W. Guinan

James W. Guinan, P.E.
Member, Fire Protection Technical Committee
Chairman, Smoke Control Subcommittee
212-465-5533
Guinan@PBworld.com

FOR THE RECORD

Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums
INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND ADVOCACY

250 West 57 Street • Suite 730 • New York, NY 10107-0700

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF 2013 REVISIONS TO THE BUILDING CODE

Presented by Mary Ann Rothman, Executive Director

June 25, 2013

My name is Mary Ann Rothman. I am the executive director of the Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums, a membership organization for housing cooperatives and condominiums located throughout the five boroughs of New York City and beyond. More than 170,000 New York families make their homes in our member buildings, which span the full economic spectrum from very modest housing to some very upscale dwellings.

I was pleased to be invited to serve on the Advisory Group that reviewed the many sections of the revised code. Fortunately, others on in the group had the diverse expertise necessary to raise and solve technical questions. My role was to raise issues that might cause concern to cooperatives and condominiums, and I also believe I was helpful in making sure that text was understandable to the lay person.

I can attest to the fact that the Department of Buildings has sought input from a vast array of experts in every aspect of the Code, and that the document before you is a concerted effort to keep the Code a readily understandable document that is in tune with current technology.

Maintaining a Code that is comprehensive, transparent and flexible is a task without end. I congratulate the Department of Buildings for this ongoing effort and I offer the full support of the Council of New York Cooperatives & Condominiums for Int. 1056.

Thank you.

Phone 212 496-7400 • Fax 212 580-7801 • e-mail info@CNYC.coop • Website: www.CNYC.coop

FOR THE RECORD

Goldstein, Arthur

I am General Counsel for the Master Plumbers Council of New York.
They are in the process of studying this legislation and will be commenting on the LAA changes, licensing requirements and the requirements for installing gas piping in particular as soon as possible.

Arthur Goldstein, Esq.
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP
605 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, New York 10158
646-428-3280

For The Record

Patino, Guillermo

From:	Sean Brennan <sbrennan@mttf.org>
Sent:	Tuesday, June 25, 2013 2:53 PM
To:	Patino, Guillermo
Subject:	Public Comment on Building Code Revision
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

In the revised Building Code section 3314.4.5.7 regarding scaffold training, and entitled Exam, it states:

> *Successful completion of the training program or course that is more than 4 hours in length shall be based upon passage of a written exam. For courses that are 16 hours or greater in length, successful completion shall also be based upon passage of a practical exam.*

I am recommending a language change for this section from "passage of a practical exam" to "a satisfactory performance assessment of practical skills"

My name is Sean Brennan, and I serve as the Training Director for the Mason Tenders' District Council Training Fund.

Since scaffold erection and installation training became a requirement in 2006 we have provided scaffold training courses 16 hours or more in length to more than 8000 NYC Union Laborers.

While I agree that a written exam is appropriate for each course in order to ascertain a student's degree of understanding of the pertinent course material, application of a practical exam is problematic for a number of reasons.

The term exam implies an individualized evaluation of a person's ability. As scaffolds are large multi-component pieces of equipment, it is entirely impractical for anyone to erect a supported scaffold, or install a suspended scaffold alone. Even while working with only one other individual, it would be impossible for all steps involved in erection or installation to be performed by a single individual. Testing, then, would be subjective as best.

If every student in a class were required to individually erect or install a scaffold, a minimum of 30-45 minutes would be necessary to devote to that one person's exam. This would mean a full 8 hour day would be needed to test just 10-16 students. This is simply not practicable with the demand for safety and skills training necessary for today's construction workforce being what it is.

Additionally, some training providers do not have access to genuine suspended scaffolds, or in some cases the room necessary to build actual supported scaffolds. In these cases, miniature models or mock-ups are used. How does a trainer create a legitimate practical exam using such equipment?

In closing, it is my recommendation that an objective visual assessment by the course instructor during the hands-on portion of these courses be used to determine a student's ability. This both incorporates the assessment into the course itself, but also offers the instructor the opportunity to address and correct any flawed practices being employed by students.

Thank you,

Sean Brennan - Director
Mason Tenders' District Council Training Fund
42-53 21st Street
Long Island City, NY 11101
Ph: 718-383-6863
Fax: 718-383-6942

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ANGELA PINSKY

Address: 570 Lexington Ave., 2nd Floor, NY, NY, 10022

I represent: REBNY

Address: Above

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☒ in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Robert Storey

Address: 120 E 34 St

I represent: Architect Council NY

Address: 14 E 38 st NYC 10016

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: 25 June 2013

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ELI GOTTLIEB

Address: 73 WARREN ST BROOKLYN, NY 11201

I represent: SEAoNY

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. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 25 June 2013

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ramon Gilsanz

Address: 129 West 27th St NY NY 10001

I represent: ACEC

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: PHILIP PARISI JR

Address: 80 PINE STREET NY NY 10005

I represent: ENGINEER COMMUNITY & PLUMBING CODE COMMITTEE

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: MITCHEL W. SIMPLEY, PE

Address: 80 PINE STREET, NYC, NY

I represent: ACECNY & MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE NYC

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. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ryan Baxter

Address: 570 Lexington Avenue, 2nd Fl NY, NY 10022

I represent: REBNY

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: Mitchell Simplex

Address: A.C.E.C

I represent:

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: Jason Averill

Address:

I represent: National Institute of

Address: Standards & Technology (NIST)

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. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/16

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Mary Ann Rothman

Address: 110 RSD NYC

I represent: CNYC

Address: 250 W 57 St

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: ADRIAN SMITH

Address: 130 W. 79th St., #9A

I represent: American Society of Landscape Architects

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: James Colgate

Address: Assistant Commissioner

I represent: Dept of Buildings

Address: 280 Broadway

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: Thomas Farinello

Address: First Deputy Commissioner

I represent: Dept of Buildings

Address: 280 Broadway

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: Robert LiMandri

Address: Commissioner

I represent: Dept of Buildings

Address: 280 Broadway

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

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

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

w/ suggested minor modification *Date:* 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Debbie Keane

Address: 620 12th Ave, NY, NY 10036

I represent: NEIT

Address: 5537 SW Urish Rd, Topeka, KS 66610

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. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: DAVID MAY

Address: (32 AVE OF AMERICAS) 137E36

I represent: SUPERSTRUCTURES

Address: 32 AVE OF AMERICAS

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☐ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: 6/25/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Hannah O'Grady

Address: 28 W 38 Street Ste 1101

I represent: ACEC New York

Address: 294 W 92 St 3D NYC 10025

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1056 Res. No. _____

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: JUNE 25, 2013

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: MARC WEISSBACH

Address: 360 PARK AVENUE SOUTH

I represent: VIDARIS, INC

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: ________

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: JAMES P. CONWAY

Address: 37-31 14th Street 1a

I represent: IUOE L14

Address: 141-57 No Old Flushing

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: Jason Averill

Address: 100 Bureau Dr. Gaithersburg MD 20899

I represent: NIST

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. 1056 Res. No. ______

☑ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: ______

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: James Bifulco

Address: 1 Portsmouth Ave

I represent: Safety Executives of NY

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. 1056 Res. No. ______

☒ in favor ☐ in opposition

Date: ______

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Dorothy Harris

Address: 48 Dublin Drive

I represent: International Civic Council

Address: [illegible]

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