

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

----- X

June 12, 2025

Start: 1:09 p.m.

Recess: 5:18 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Room,
14th Floor

B E F O R E: Amanda Farias,
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Public Advocate Williams
Alexa Avilès
Erik D. Bottcher
Jennifer Gutiérrez
Shahana Hanif
Lincoln Restler
Kevin C. Riley
Rafael Salamanca, Jr.
Inna Vernikov

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

Andrew Kimball
NYCEDC

Mikelle Adgate
NYCEDC

Jennifer Sun
NYCEDC

Antonio Reynoso
Brooklyn Borough President Antonio Reynoso

Carlos Menchaca
Former Council Member

Eliza Davidson
Self

Tom Barry
Self

Carolina Salguero
Portside NY

Susan Povich
Red Hook Business Alliance

Victoria Alexander
Resilient Red Hook

Damon Gilbert
New York Lawyers for the Public Interest

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

Phaedra Thomas

SW Brooklyn Industrial Development Corp

Frank Clarke (NY Building Congress)

Madeline Appelbaum (NYC District Council of
Carpenters

Robert Guddahl

Guddahl & Son USA

Frank Agosta

Local 1814 ILA

David Scala

Local 1814 ILA

Michael Rosen

Columbia Waterfront District

John Leyva

Columbia Waterfront District

Layla Law Gisiko

The City Club of NY

George Fiala

Self

Melissa Saenz Goron

Self

Sharon Godon

Self

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

Jana Weill

Self

Maria Nieto

Self

Paul Briscoe

Self

James Morgan

Self

James Defilippis

Self

Lisa Meyer

Self

Michael Pope

Self

Evelyn Pope

Self

Karen Blondel

Christina Chase

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good morning. Well, good afternoon, good afternoon. This is a microphone check for the Committee on Economic Development. This recording is being done on the 14th Floor Committee Room. Today's date is June 12, 2025 and the recording is done by Chanelle Yearwood(SP?).

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Folks quiet down please. Quiet down please. Good afternoon and welcome to today's New York City Council Hearing for the Committee on Economic Development.

At this time, we ask that you please silence all electronic devices and at no time are you to approach the dais. If you have any questions throughout the hearing or would like to sign up for in person testimony, see one of the Sergeant at Arms. Chair Farias, we're ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: [GAVEL] Good afternoon and welcome to this oversight hearing of the New York City Councils Committee on Economic Development. I am Majority Leader Amanda Farias, Chair of the Economic Development Committee. I would like to thank the other Council Members present today, Council Member Avilés and Hanif. I also want to extend my appreciation to the New York City Economic

Development Corporation and other stakeholders for participating in this critical hearing. Today's hearing we'll examine the Brooklyn Marine Terminal redevelopment. A \$3 billion mixed use project that represents the largest waterfront development in recent New York City history.

This ambitious project involves 122 acres from Pier 7 to Pier 12, spanning Red Hook and the Columbia Street Waterfront district and proposes 7,000 to 9,000 housing units alongside a modernized 60 acre maritime port. While this massive infrastructure project has the potential to create thousands of jobs and revitalize our maritime infrastructure both in Brooklyn and across our city, we must ensure that the redevelopment serves the public interest and addresses the legitimate concerns raised by the communities most directly affected.

Essential issue we will be exploring today is the Brooklyn Marine Terminals Project Financing, which relies on cross subsidization where housing development revenues would finance maritime infrastructure improvements.

We need to ensure how this uncommercial financing approach would impact the long term viability of both

the port operations and the commitments that we have made to the local community.

We will also be examining the decisions to bypass the city's standard uniform land use review procedure in favor of the states expedited general project plan process. This choice has generated substantial community opposition with residents and advocates arguing that it limits meaningful public participation and circumvents important oversight mechanisms, including review by the Community Boards, the Borough President and this Council.

Additionally, we must address the significant concerns about affordable housing levels in this proposal. With only 25 percent of the units designated as affordable, many question whether this represents an appropriate use of valuable public waterfront lands particularly given the housing crisis facing working families in Red Hook and throughout our city.

The environmental and transportation impacts of redeveloping the BMT's also demand our attention. The neighborhood surrounding the Brooklyn Marine Terminal have historically faced environmental justice challenges and we must ensure that this

redevelopment addresses rather than exasperates these conditions. We need comprehensive answers on how the projected population increase will be accommodated by existing transit infrastructure and what mitigation measures are planned. We will be requesting detailed information about the community benefits package, including the \$250 million fund for NYCHA improvements, workforce development programs, and commitments to local hiring.

The community deserves binding guarantees, not just aspirational goals. Finally, we need transparency about the project timeline and next steps. With the Brooklyn Marine Terminals Taskforce scheduled for June 18th, just six days away, it is essential that this Council and the public have complete information about what is being proposed and what commitments are being made.

The Brooklyn Marine Terminal represents a once in a lifetime generation opportunity to revitalize our maritime infrastructure while addressing critical housing needs. However, we must ensure that this development truly serves the public interest and provides meaningful benefits to the communities that have long supported our working waterfront.

Before we begin, I would like to remind all those present today to please maintain decorum throughout our hearing and to stay on time. If you are here to testify, you will have two minutes to speak when your name is called. Please keep responses concise so that everyone has a chance to be heard. We have tens of people downstairs that have not yet to be let in. If you are unable to finish, please submit your complete written testimony to testimony@council.nyc.gov. I would like to thank the Economic Development Team here at the City Council, Senior Council Alex Paulenoff, Senior Policy Analyst William Hongach and Finance Analyst Glenn Martelloni alongside with my Chief of Staff Rebecca Nieves and Legislative Associate Daniel Curtin for all their hard work preparing for this hearing, speaking with advocates and stakeholders. I will now turn it over to my colleague Council Member Alexa Avilés for her opening remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Thank you. I want to start by thanking Chair Farias and the Economic Development staff here at Council for holding this hearing on the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. This project has been a significant concern to the

community of Red Hook, which I represent for about a year now and I'm thankful that all of my neighbors who turned out today to be here finally get a place to be heard on the record and hopefully their concerns to be met with dignity of clear and transparent answers.

Of course, I always want to thank concerned residents and business owners and the CBO's of Red Hook and the Columbia Waterfront for being here today. I know the enormous amount of space this project has taken up in our day to day lives and I admire your commitment to ensuring the best possible outcome for you and your neighbors.

I also do have to thank the EDC for being here and engaging in what I hope to be a truthful dialogue regarding community concerns. I am so proud to represent an activist community and know that for EDC this dynamic on past and current projects can feel like a challenge rather than an opportunity to create something remarkable in collaboration that truly serves the interest of generations to come.

From my own perspective, I want to state for the record that I became a Co-Chair of the BMT Taskforce nearly a year ago, because I was excited that the

city had finally recognized after years of advocacy from my office, the incredible opportunity we had in our ports after years of the disinvestment on behalf of the Port Authority. While our peers are quite literally falling into the water, I along with my constituents recognize that this space could be the port of the future. A port powered by green energy with thriving local industrial space creating a maritime ecosystem that would power a blue highway and create an opportunity for good, local union jobs, permanent jobs.

For Red Hook, this would be correcting environmental injustices of the past while also giving the community a well deserved spot on the map as a critical node in this maritime network. For those of you who have been following the MT story, what we have been given at this site falls deeply short of that vision. Centering instead on the needs of the real estate industry with thousands of luxury residential units proposed on public land. With a blue highway and maritime often feeling like nothing more than an afterthought.

For the purposes of this hearing, I want to highlight at the top just a few of my concerns and

there are many. First, I want to highlight that this project is being advanced through a state general project plan. GPP's have the authority to bypass citywide zoning regulations, limiting oversight of the Council and other key city agencies and unlike the city's uniform Land Use Review Process, ULURP, which mandates public review and input from Community Boards, Borough Presidents and the Council, the GPP process sidelines these critical mechanisms for accountability and transparency.

Importantly, ULURP allows projects to be evaluated in the context of the surrounding land uses and zoning districts, local zoning that reflects the city's strategic planning decisions including thoughtful separation of uses to protect neighborhood character and support, long term planning goals. Ensuring that the community has a meaningful role in shaping its future is a core priority for me.

For that reason, I remain highly concern that the GPP process as I believe it does not provide sufficient opportunity for meaningful community input and engagement. I believe major land use decisions should go through a transparent city led process that

reflects local priorities, policy directives, and balances citywide planning objectives.

Secondly, the proposal, the proposed inclusion of residential development in an industrial business zone deeply concerns me. IBZ's were established in 2005 as part of a deliberate effort to preserve industrial businesses and secure well paying jobs. These zones were meant to provide long term stability and ensure businesses and workers that industrial uses would be protected from residential and other competing uses.

Since 2015, the city has had a clear policy to preserve IBZ's for industrial and commercial use and to protect and expand industrial space and employment, allowing housing in these areas, not only contradicts the original intent of the IBZ's but threatens to destabilize a land use framework that supports economic diversity and equity across our city. In fact, very recently, we passed the City of Yes Zoning for Economic Opportunity, which again centered strengthening and protecting industrial business zone and yet this proposal is in direct contradiction to that most recent policy win for the city.

No where is it more critical than the areas like Brooklyn Marine Terminal which has long served as a hub of maritime and industrial activities and uses and continue to be a cornerstone of local economy in Sunset Park and supporting working class families and anchoring the community in the face of mounting development pressure.

I am deeply concerned that approving this proposal would set a dangerous precedent, inviting future residential encourages into other IBZ's across the city and undermining the purpose these zones were - excuse me, and undermining the purpose these zones were created to serve.

Finally, much of the housing proposed by EDC would be market rate. Failing to meet the deep affordability needs of the surrounding community, relying on high end residential development with limited affordable housing components to cross subsidize a public good industrial infrastructure presents many equity challenges. It risk prioritizing real estate interest over long term community stability. It is important that we find strategies that do not pit one critical need against the other. Our city urgently needs both deeply

affordable housing and strong, resilient industrial ecosystems that provide accessible family sustaining jobs. These goals are not mutually exclusive and we must resist land use proposals that offer a false choice between them. Instead, we should pursue planning approaches that balance these proposals and deliver both good jobs and truly affordable housing without eroding the city's industrial land base.

While there are a myriad of other concerns regarding transportation, water and sewer infrastructure and resiliency to name a few at its core, this rushed proposal appears to prioritize housing, luxury housing over long term industrial future of our terminal and the important strategic planning goal of maintaining space for future reactivation of our marine freight in New York City.

For the communities I represent, the stakes are indeed high. Redeveloping the Brooklyn Marine Terminal is as EDC says over and over again a once in a generation opportunity and it must not be driven by short term development pressures or opaque decision making.

We need a planning process that that is transparent, inclusive, and firmly grounded in long

term economic and environmental needs of the area.

One that truly centers working class communities and protects the industrial jobs and the infrastructure that have long been the backbone of our communities.

The people of District 38 deserve a seat at the table. They deserve revenues from the development that happens in their community. They deserve a vision for the waterfront that is rooted in equity, resilience and sustainability and I'm eager to hear EDC speak to their rationale for opting to bypass the city's established public review process with the GPP, why it chose to rush a complicated land use matter into mere months when anyone who has ever engaged in a rezoning or a redeveloping of a large property knows it could take years.

I look forward to a robust conversation today and to working with my colleagues and community partners to ensure that this process reflects the needs and the voices of the people that it will most impact. Thank you once again and I look forward to the discussion.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Council Member.

I'll now turn it over to Council Member Shahana Hanif for her opening remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Thank you. Good afternoon everyone and thank you for being here. I'm Council Member Shanana Hanif, proudly representing Cobble Hill, Carroll Gardens and the Columbia Waterfront. Thank you to Chair Farias, to the EDC and most importantly to the Community Members who are here and who have been showing up because you know that what happens at the Brookly Marine Terminal will shape the future of the neighborhoods for generations.

Earlier this spring, the Economic Development Corporation was prepared to move forward with a vote on a final BMP proposal without first bringing that proposal to the very people who would be most impacted.

We push back. We demanded transparency, accountability, and a real public engagement process. We want to delay. Let's be clear, the communities I represent, especially in the Columbia Waterfront, have all dirty borne the brunt of environmental harms from the daily truck traffic to the dust and noise of a concrete recycling facility that's operated in plain view of families and small businesses. My constituents know what it feels like to be treated as

an after thought in development decisions. This cannot happen here, not again.

As a voting member of the BMT Taskforce, I am not here to rubberstamp a predetermined outcome. I'm here to keep listening to residents, local stakeholders, and advocates and to fight for a plan that is grounded in community vision and delivers tangible lasting benefits. That means, timely creation of truly accessible waterfront space, open park land and green infrastructure that protects us from the climate crisis.

Deeply affordable housing both onsite and offsite including pathways to affordable homeownership for long time New Yorkers. Real investment in local transit, good paying union jobs and protections for the small businesses that make our neighborhood strong.

I urge the EDC and every project partner to do more than just check the box on engagement. Work with us, stay transparent, show us on paper and in practice how you will keep the public informed, how you will center community input and how every commitment made will be enforced. We will not accept anything less. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Council Member.

I'll now turn it over to Public Advocate Jumaane Williams for his opening remarks.

PUBLIC ADVOCATE WILLIAMS: Thank you very much Madam Chair. Good afternoon. My name is Jumaane Williams. It was mentioned, the Public Advocate of the City of New York. Thank you Majority Leader Farias and members of the community for allowing me to provide testimony at today's hearing.

The Brooklyn Marine Terminal, also known as BMT is a vital resource to our city and we cannot afford to mismanage. At one point in our city's history, New York City was famous for its maritime ports as the largest market for domestic international goods in the United States.

Today, we live in a world dictated mostly by automobile and truck transport. As a result, the few ports we have left are not operating at full capacity. Generating the revenue they ought to and the undermining efforts to reduce traffic congestion and a air pollution caused by service level transportation. According to the New York City Waterfront Pathways program, spearheaded by the Economic Development Corporation EDC, the BMT is

supported to serve as a central piece in creating blue highways throughout the city. A core part of this plan is to increase opportunities for Minority and Women Owned Businesses Enterprises MWBE's in offshore wind and waterfront industries. And while I definitely support this effort, I'm interested to know what the EDC plans to market the MWBE opportunities to the people it is meant to serve.

Improving access for MWBE's present the chance to increase inclusivity, which is especially important now with the attacks against diversity, equity and inclusion by the Trump Administration. Due to the under service of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal, the EDC is seeking to turn our crucial port space into mostly market rate and luxury housing. Let me be clear, our city is also in great need of housing. However, we cannot pick housing against the ability to build the port that everyone knows is needed fully operational helping with the blue highway.

We also know that most New Yorkers know we don't need luxury and market rate housing as much as we need actual housing for the people who are the lower income. This can help generate millions of dollars in revenue and hundreds of green jobs for the city.

In addition, advocates are rightly upset about the seemingly lack of community input that EDC is allowing during this process. The proposal does not prioritize deeply income affordable - deeply income targeted housing. We knew the viability of them being terminal or protecting the working class residents who call the surrounding area home.

Today, I stand with the advocates who are asking for a very basic amendments to the process. The plans support revitalization must come first in all plans for housing should be thoroughly negotiated between EDC and the community. Our city cant afford to rush though this process and I will continue to stand with the impacted community to a fair and transparent process is implemented by EDC. I do also want to add the fact that the runaround ULURP, GPP, I don't think it's acceptable. Empire State tried that at the PENN station, it fell flat on its face. We should try to do it the right way now.

I also want to point out we're still waiting for the promise of a terminal 20 years later, so promises by themselves are not what this community needs.

So, thank you so much and I appreciate the time.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. Right before we pass it over, I want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Council Member Bottcher. I will now pass it over to Committee Counsel to swear the Admin in.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Alex Paulenoff, Senior Counsel. To all the members of the Administration testifying today, please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth today and respond honestly to Council Member questions?

PANEL: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. You may begin when ready.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Good morning, Chair Farías, and members of the Economic Development Committee. My name is Andrew Kimball, and I serve as President and Chief Executive Officer at the New York City Economic Development Corporation. I am joined today by my colleagues Jennifer Sun, Executive Vice President for Planning, and Mikelle Adgate, Senior Vice President for Government and Community Relations.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today about the vision for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. Just over a year ago, Mayor Adams, Governor Hochul,

the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and the New York City Economic Development Corporation stood together to announce a generational opportunity to transform a key site on the Brooklyn waterfront into a modern maritime port and vibrant mixed-used community, ending 50 years of disinvestment and decay.

Thank you for the opportunity to walk you through the BMT Vision Plan and the planning and engagement process that has led to its creation. This Vision Plan is the result of extensive collaboration with the in-person virtual meetings with over 4,200 participants, six Advisory Groups led by subject area experts and guided by the 28-member Brooklyn Marine Terminal Task Force Chaired by Congressman Goldman and Vice-Chaired by State Senator Gounardes and Council Member Aviles. It reflects input and collaboration with the State of New York and the New York City Departments of Transportation, Environmental Protection, Parks and Recreation, and Design and Construction.

The BMT Vision Plan charts a new future for this site with a modern, all-electric port at its core surrounded by a mixed-use community with housing,

open space, resiliency and light industrial space. BMT provides a generational opportunity to deliver a port that will be central to our Blue Highway initiative to get trucks off our streets, create thousands of new jobs, and provide waterfront access and resiliency measures that protect against climate change and sea-level rise.

The BMT Vision Plan offers a long-overdue revitalization of this vital portion of Brooklyn's waterfront and reimagines the future of New York City's Harbor to fuel 21st-century innovation and growth.

Before we dive further into the future of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal, I want to take a moment to place this project in its historical context. New York's waterfront was once a mighty engine of global commerce. Armies of longshoremen and stevedores, often new immigrants, supporting growing families, worked on the bustling piers up and down the East River. But starting in the middle of the 20th century, changing shipping patterns, bigger vessels, low-cost land with rail and highway access on the Jersey side of the harbor and new technologies like

shipping containers moved trade away from New York City's waterfront.

Factories and warehouses shuttered, workers left, and vibrant industrial neighborhoods hollowed out. The Brooklyn Marine Terminal was a casualty of this era. However, its stagnation and decay in recent decades are also the result of unique governance challenges. For many years, the site was governed by a "tri-party agreement" between the City, the State, and the Port Authority, with the Port Authority holding operating control of the vast majority of the site.

Due to the size of BMT, the lack of water depth as well as lack of rail and highway access, the Port Authority focused its attention on New Jersey ports, which handle 98 percent of the containers that come into the metro region, leaving the Brooklyn Marine Terminal as a forgotten site east of the Hudson. A lack of vision and attention meant a lack of City, State and federal support and crumbling piers and infrastructure. The lack of public investment also resulted in short-term leases to private operators meaning the property received limited private

investment and a port operator whose operations on an annual basis need to be subsidized.

At the same time, other city-controlled sites along the Brooklyn waterfront were able to pivot to the future. The Brooklyn Navy Yard turned a venerable shipyard into the nation's most successful urban industrial park. Brooklyn Bridge Park turned rotting piers into an international model of resilient, restorative green infrastructure. The Brooklyn Army Terminal continues to grow in impact while providing much-needed industrial and manufacturing jobs. And the South Brooklyn Marine Terminal is turning a vacant lot that had languished for 50 years into the country's biggest offshore wind terminal.

Finally, in May of last year, there was a breakthrough for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. The Port Authority and the city agreed to exchange Howland Hook in Staten Island for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. The land-swap agreement allowed the Port Authority to extend its existing lease of Howland Hook, supporting its ability to drive future expansions and capacity enhancements in close proximity to their New Jersey assets. EDC secured

long-term control of BMT through a lease allowing for the redevelopment of BMT into a modern, mixed-use maritime district, with an all-electric port at its core.

So now, BMT finally has a chance at its own rebirth. The Memorandum of Understanding codifying this deal was signed on April 17, 2024 by the City, State and Port Authority ending the Tri-Party Agreement and decades of dysfunction and disinvestment and lack of accountability. A key element of the agreement was that given the regional importance of Howland Hook and BMT and their role in maritime activity in the harbor that the ownership transfer of the property, Howland Hook to the Port Authority and BMT to the City of New York, be facilitated through a State General Project Plan, GPP.

Starting in May 2024, EDC began to meet biweekly with Task Force Leadership: Congressman Goldman, Council Member Avilés, and State Senator Gounardes. Task Force Leadership convened the BMT Task Force, a 28-member group with representatives from elected officials, local organizations and community leaders to provide feedback on the planning and engagement

process as well as the options presented by the EDC project team and their consultants.

At Task Force meetings, EDC shared critical information, members of the Task Force openly discussed and debated various elements of the project. The Task Force brought together a balance of perspectives that reflected interests and expertise in maritime and industrial business, labor and trade, environmental justice, sustainability, transportation, housing, planning, community development, and regional and local perspectives.

EDC and the Task Force Leadership worked together to form six Advisory Groups, led by subject area experts and composed of 90 people representing diverse community viewpoints, organized by key themes and issues.

The Advisory Groups played a key role throughout the process by reviewing and providing feedback on planning work. Leadership agreed that to move into the GPP process the Task Force would need to approve the BMT Vision Plan by a two-thirds majority vote. Upon an affirmative vote, the City and the State will continue to work closely with stakeholders to advance this project through a State GPP, a process and set

of requirements that includes a neighborhood condition study and an environmental review scoping that will take place this fall. The BMT Vision Plan and the associated commitments are contingent on an approved GPP, which requires positive votes by the Empire State Development Corporation Board and the Public Authorities Control Board.

Community and stakeholder engagement have been instrumental in creating the contours of the BMT Vision Plan. The engagement process was extensive and included: the 4,200 people I mentioned engaged and in person and virtual meetings, 915 Survey Responses, 47 public engagements including 27 workshops, 15 feedback and info sessions, 3 Town Halls, and 2 surveys; 11 Site Tours with 198 members of the public, NYCHA residents, elected officials, and city agencies; 23 Advisory Group individual and All-Hands meetings, joint Task Force meetings; 32 full Task Force Meetings, Office Hours, Small Group Discussions; 13 Stakeholder focus groups and project briefings with small businesses, community associations and organizations; 9 NYCHA Red Hook Houses East and West tabling events, focus groups, and feedback sessions; 5 Canvassing Efforts in Red

Hook with Green City Force. Over the course of the engagement process, consistent themes emerged which included a desire for a modern and sustainable port, job creation and workforce development, affordable housing, public open space and waterfront access, increased resiliency, enhanced light industrial spaces, community facilities, commercial and retail spaces and Blue Highway.

The BMT Vision Plan integrated community feedback and delivers on each of these priorities. Next week the Task Force will vote to advance a project that will deliver a 60-acre modern and sustainable all-electric port focused on water-to-water freight, removing trucks from local streets and New York City roadways and serving as a key node on the city's Blue Highways initiative, and reducing direct-to consumer vehicle trips.

To date, EDC has secured nearly \$360 million in public capital to rebuild and modernize the port. This includes an early \$80 million city commitment, \$15 million in state funding, and a \$164 million Federal Grant, the largest ever received by EDC, and a corresponding \$109 million City Capital local match.

The Vision for the port includes a new marginal pier, improved infrastructure, and new equipment that responds to market demands and industry trends, positioning the port for success. Three BMT districts, BMT North, Atlantic Basin, and BMT South, totaling a maximum of approximately 7,700 units of housing, including a minimum of 35 percent or nearly 2,700 will be permanently affordable.

If and when the BMT plan achieves full funding, any additional money raised by BMTDC will be dedicated first toward increasing on site affordability with the goal of 40 percent of all the housing units or 3,000 units being permanently affordable.

The permanently affordable housing will be rented at or below an average AMI of 60 percent to match Option 1 of the city's MIH Program, with at least 10 percent of the units at 40 percent of AMI and no units above 100 percent of AMI. A \$50 million fund will be established to support off-site preservation and/or creation of affordable housing within Community Board 6 that would preserve approximately 450 units. \$200 million in funding to NYCHA Red Hook Houses East and Red Hook Houses West that would

preserve approximately 575 units and 200 affordable units reserved at BMT for NYCHA Red Hook residents.

At least 35 acres of public open space, including new destination parks adjoining Brooklyn Bridge Park and Valentino Pier, each of which will bring the public directly to the water, as well as neighborhood parks. A mile-long greenway and new waterfront access connecting Brooklyn Bridge Park to Red Hook. A pedestrian-first traffic and transit plan that prioritizes pedestrian mobility and safety while also improving bus speeds to rider destinations and reducing the burden that trucks place on local streets including but not limited to, pedestrianized streets, parking maximums, district-wide garages, blue highways, micromobility and freight hubs, bus priority lanes, increased ferry services, and one or more electric shuttles to improve intra and inter neighborhood mobility.

Over 270,000 square feet of light-industrial space available at discounted rents, with non-profit management of a stand-alone industrial spaces at Pier 11 and BMT South. The establishment of a \$10 million industrial development fund to support the industrial sector within the broader Red Hook neighborhood.

Over 280,000 square feet of community facility and cultural space, including space for a new public school in BMT North and a destination non-profit cultural center in BMT South. Over 300,000 square feet of commercial space throughout the site, which will help to enliven and support community retail corridors.

A new Brooklyn Cruise Terminal with community integrated public open space and an adjacent approximately 400-key hotel, all of which will help to make Atlantic Basin a community amenity and connect it to Red Hook's existing commercial corridor. A comprehensive coastal protection strategy that will protect the site against sea level rise and threats from climate change and deliver the first 30 percent of a potential future Red Hook peninsula-wide resiliency system.

A comprehensive workforce strategy that includes a Project Labor Agreement, targeted community hiring, a dedicated world-class experiential learning center at Pier 11, and funding to establish an economic mobility network in Red Hook and a maritime career readiness program for NYCHA Red Hook Houses East and Red Hook Houses West residents.

Over \$21 billion in economic impact for the city and region. Approximately 39,000 temporary construction jobs. Approximately 2,400 permanent maritime, industrial, commercial, and residential related jobs.

EDC is one of New York City's largest industrial landlords, with assets supporting 1 of every 12 industrial jobs in the outer boroughs. This scale underscores our deep commitment to the city's industrial sector and BMT. That commitment is reflected in our work across key industrial sites. In the Hunts Point Food Distribution Center, where we have over \$1 billion in active redevelopment projects, including a new Produce Market and the establishment of the Hunts Point Marine Terminal, announced publicly this week; in our Sunset Park District where at the Brooklyn Army Terminal and the MADE campus, are investing over \$750 million to support modern manufacturing, creative industries, and green jobs, and at the South Brooklyn Marine Terminal, where our investment of over \$100 million has leveraged over \$1 billion in private investment onsite, and over \$5 billion in total for the development of one of the nation's largest offshore

wind port facilities, and installation that will power over 500,000 homes with green energy in Brooklyn.

The BMT Vision Plan builds on this foundation, reinforcing EDC's long-standing dedication to industrial growth and innovation. To that end, the project includes: The creation of a \$1.75 billion electrified port facility focused on getting trucks off our roads; 275,000 square feet of new, modern light-industrial space at discounted rents; more industrial space that been brought online in many, many decades; a \$10 million industrial development fund to support the construction of new industrial space, acquisition and the renovation of existing industrial space, and equipment purchases within the broader Red Hook community.

In the short term, EDC is already delivering on the city's commitments to invest in BMT, in recent months we've entered into contracts for a new \$15 million electric crane; \$2 million of fender repairs to Pier 10 allowing the continued use of that critical bulkhead for Red Hook Container Terminal; and \$1 million to demolish and remove four out of service cranes.

While developing a Blue Highway network is an idea that been around for 30 years, the Adams Administration, through the coordinated efforts of the New York City Department of Transportation and EDC, has done more to build out Blue Highway landings in the last three years than the entire 30 previous years combined.

For example, earlier this year, EDC announced a new public-private partnership at the Downtown Skyport to invest \$10 million in the build-out of a barge landing for fast ferries that would deliver cargo instead of people for delivery by e-cargo bike to Lower Manhattan destinations, getting trucks off of local streets. And earlier this week, the Administration announced that the prison barge at Hunts Point will be removed and replaced by a Hunts Point Marine Terminal that will allow for the unloading of containers with perishable goods coming by barge to the Food Distribution Center from BMT as well as from ports on the New Jersey side of the Harbor and other points along the East Coast.

The Administration made an initial \$28 million commitment toward this Hunts Point facility that is projected to remove 9,000 monthly truck trips from

our city streets and reduce roadway congestion. EDC and DOT are continuing to evaluate another 25 sites across the borough, and the feasibility of activating Blue Highway landings on those sites.

BMT will be a key node in the citywide Blue Highways initiative using barges, fast ferries, and zero emission vehicles. Blue Highways aren't just about freight and ferries; they're about people and career pathways.

Earlier this week, EDC published a first-ever "Blue Highways Workforce Assessment" to understand the labor force impacts and opportunities created by our investments in the city's Blue Highways system. The report found that Blue Highways related employment could grow by 72 percent in the next decade, creating 8,000 net new jobs in New York City by 2035 for a total of 117,000 jobs across maritime, transportation, and logistics sectors. The findings of this report will act as a blueprint for EDC's future investments in workforce development, to provide underserved and underrepresented New Yorkers access to family-sustaining Blue Highways careers.

To advance training and pathways to Blue Highways jobs, BMT will center a modern maritime port and a

Blue Highway welcome and experiential learning center that will provide workforce training, bridge and adult education to these jobs of the future. New York City is in an unprecedented housing crisis, with an identified need to construct over half a million new units, including thousands of affordable units, by 2030 to meet demand. More than half of renters in New York City are rent burdened, meaning they spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs, with a vacancy rate across rentals of 1.4 percent; the problem is particularly acute in Brooklyn and Manhattan.

In 2025, Brooklyn Community District 6 identified affordable housing and the need for additional housing among their top three most pressing priorities. The Community Board highlighted that the critical housing shortage in the district spans a range of housing types, including affordable and market-rate housing, urging city agencies to invest in building a diversity of housing options within the district.

This community has seen very little housing built over the last decade. The quarter mile area immediately around the BMT site has seen 557 new

housing units over the last decade, of which 111 were affordable, between 2014 and 2024. The Vision Plan responds to the community's housing needs by delivering approximately 7,700 new units. Notably, it preserves or creates around 4,105 affordable units, a remarkable accomplishment that underscores the plan's commitment to inclusive growth.

From the outset of the BMT Vision Plan engagement process, Task Force leadership and EDC established that any future development scenario at the site must be financially viable and self-sustaining, while creating a modern port and delivering a range of benefits that meet the needs of the community. Throughout the engagement process, Task Force members expressed strong interest in first forming a project-specific entity to govern the implementation and enforcement of the plan, and second, ongoing engagement with the community to make sure that the plan commitments are honored.

The governance entity will ensure transparency, accountability, and continued engagement with stakeholders on the project implementation. To that end, EDC is committed to establishing a Brooklyn Marine Terminal Development Corporation, a local

development corporation that will be charged with implementing the approved BMT Vision Plan. Upon the adoption of a BMT Vision Plan, a Brooklyn Marine Terminal Advisory Task Force will be established to advise and guide the refinement of the site plan for the duration of the GPP process.

After GPP approval, the purpose of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal Advisory Task Force will be to advise on ensuring consistency and follow-through on project commitments and provide a forum for continued community input.

A resounding theme of community input has been for the final project to deliver jobs for local residents, and workforce training, creating opportunities for family-sustaining wages. The redevelopment is estimated to generate over \$21 billion in economic impact and is projected to create 32,000 construction jobs and 2,400 permanent jobs, of which 295 would be maritime industrial jobs and 200 will be cruise-related jobs.

We've worked to ensure that these opportunities are available to community members. To that end, EDC will establish a Project Labor Agreement, a PLA for all city-funded construction. The PLA will

incorporate EDC's Community Hiring goals to maximize opportunities for community members, particularly NYCHA residents of NYCHA housing at Red Hook East and West.

To ensure that community members have access to future jobs at BMT, EDC will establish an economic mobility network in Red Hook, similar to ones that we've just announced in Sunset Park and in Hunts Point. The economic mobility network will be a community-led coalition of Red Hook nonprofit organizations that will partner with EDC to deliver ongoing workforce services. The coalition's objective will be to expand local resident employment and local resident internships and apprenticeships and full time jobs at BMT.

Additionally, EDC is committed to a comprehensive maritime career readiness program for young adults at NYCHA Red Hook Houses. This program will focus on introducing high schoolers to potential maritime career pathways at BMT and providing the training and credentials necessary to access those opportunities.

Finally, EDC is committed to establishing a world-class experiential learning center at Pier 11. The learning center will be a dynamic community space

with education program, interactive exhibits, and public events that welcomes families, students, and visitors to the Brooklyn Marine Terminal while teaching them about key elements of New York City's working waterfront and the role of the port in the city's Blue Highways ecosystem.

In case this testimony doesn't make it clear, I got a lot to say about the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. After decades of dysfunction and decay, EDC and this Mayor are taking action to deliver results for New Yorkers. After thousands of conversations with local residents, dozens of meetings with urban planners and community leaders, significant input and plan changes incorporated from the Task Force, and many hours walking the 122-acre site with any and all interested members of the public, I'm incredibly proud of the Vision Plan we have today.

Instead of a fenced-off, crumbling concrete lot with piers falling into the Harbor, the plan has thousands of affordable homes to meet the housing crisis. It has 35 acres of new parks and open space and major resilience upgrades. And of course, it has 60 acres of a modern, working port at its core. That's thousands of union construction jobs, hundreds

of careers for union longshoremen and union hotel workers, new spaces for local creators, artists, makers and entrepreneurs.

I'm not the only one excited about BMT. We've submitted with our testimony letters of support for the project from the maritime industry, ILA Local 1814, the Maritime Association of New York and New Jersey, Red Hook Container Terminal, the Shipping Association of New York and New Jersey, NYCHA leadership, Karen Blondel, President of Red Hook West Resident Association, and Frances Brown, President, Red Hook East Resident Association, labor Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater New York, and the Hotel Trades Council, housing advocates, Citizens Housing and Planning Council, Community Preservation Corporation, New York Housing Congress, New York State Association for Affordable Housing, and Open New York, transit advocates, Regional Plan Association, Open Plans, Brightside, The E-Mobility Project, Electric Avenue, Brooklyn Spoke Media, Transportation Alternatives, and Bike New York, among others.

As one final note. I am personally appreciative of the fierce advocacy of Council Member Avilés, her

1 leadership role on the BMT Task Force. While we
2 haven't always seen eye-to-eye, I know our debates
3 have always been rooted in a shared belief that this
4 project must deliver the maximum public benefits for
5 New Yorkers and she, like many other taskforce
6 members over the last ten months have spent countless
7 hours on this project.

8
9 With that, I'm happy to answer your questions
10 about this project. I hope you all will join me in
11 supporting our vision for a working, thriving, living
12 waterfront at the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Andrew Kimball for
15 that testimony. I want to acknowledge we've been
16 joined by Council Members Restler; Salamanca and
17 Riley and I'll just jump right in to some of the
18 process GPP versus ULURP, questions that I have. We
19 understand that there's a precedent for using a GPP
20 to facilitate a proposal of this nature. In fact, a
21 GPP was used to effectuate Brooklyn Bridge Park just
22 north of this site. However, GPP's are usually used
23 for New York State properties and led by the New York
24 State Economic Development Corporation. Is there a
25 precedent for city EDC to lead AGPP?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Uhm, I'm going to defer to my colleague. I don't think we're aware of one.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, thank you and this is a project of a citywide scale with obviously profound effects on the surrounding neighborhoods for decades to come. How does this level - how does the level and duration of outreach and community engagement undertaken as part of the GPP compared to a typical neighborhood rezoning effort that would go through ULURP for example?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I think there is no typical ULURP as you know but I think I have demonstrated in my testimony and with our actions over the last year that the level of community engagement here has been extraordinary. That we have a taskforce that will take a vote on whether to proceed in the GPP that includes critical community organizations and leaders represents regional interests like the RPA represents Community Board 6, represents the local elected officials. So, we believe this has been very comprehensive and inclusive and compares favorably to any ULURP process certainly that I have seen.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And given the Port Authorities \$518 million losses - in losses at this

site between 1991 and 2016, what analysis supports the conclusion that a smaller modernized port can be financially stable or sustainable?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, the first three or four months of this engagement uhm and task force members can attest to this, involve a significant input and debate at the taskforce about the appropriate size, shape, contours of the port operation. We brought in outside consultants with international reputation, Moffatt and Nichols. We talked to port operators all over the world, not just on the New Jersey side of the port but port operators as far away as Oslo, Lisbon and Portugal, Malmo and Sweden to understand best practice and the size for what will always be a niche port given the fact that it does not have rail access. It does not have access to highways, unlike those ports on the New Jersey side.

After enormous analysis, we came up with 60 acres as the appropriate size. That includes 20 to 30 acres for a container port, which we think can double or triple in its activity bringing perishable goods, mostly from south and central America, with ships that can fit into Brooklyn, that don't draw more than 40 feet because that's the bottom.

Even with dredging is 40 feet, that's the total depth so the kinds of ships that come into New Jersey cannot come into Brooklyn but they bring fresh produce in refrigerated containers called refers. Today, those containers unload at BMT. Some do go out in the community by truck. The vast majority get barged back to New Jersey, go into cold storage, get processed, get on another truck, go to the Bronx, get processed at the food distribution center, get on another truck, and go out to their final destination. We are changing the paradigm here by expanding that container operation with a large marginal pier. Have the ability to transload those perishable containers immediately onto a barge, float them up the East River, so no trucks, unload them at the Hunts Point Marine Terminal, have them processed, and then have it even go out by water for their final destination using fast ferries, using e-cargo trikes for that last mile delivery throughout the boroughs.

Those won't be the only barges that go up to Hunts Point. I want to be clear; there will be barges coming from New Jersey. There will be barges coming along the East Coast, what's called short sea shipping but we think that this is a transformational

moment. So, that's just part number one of the port. That's 20, 30 acres. The balance of the port space will be available for construction staging. You see construction in New York happening now from the waterside at JFK. You see it on the Battery Maritime project- excuse me on the Battery Park Project that EDC is conducting right now.

We're going to need it to rebuild the FiDi Seaport for resiliency. We're going to need it to help build the climate exchange on Governor's Island and we're going to need it - waterborn activity with construction materials to build out the port and BMT as well as the BQE. So, we need more space like that in the city. We also will have abundant space there for small package Blue Highway goods.

All of those things I just described are part of the Blue Highway Network. What most people think is just the small package, which is Fed Ex, UPS, Amazon. There will be space for that also and we'll be working very hard to get our private partners to move more goods from the New Jersey side, small packages, this is dry materials to BMT, break them down and have them go out by fast ferry or leave BMT by e-cargo bike.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, thank you for that and you folks know that I'm familiar with a lot of this. Bless you. With this Hunts Point Terminal Market and Hunts Point market. Just a question around or a clarification and just affirmation. The government structure that will oversee the long term operation and management of the redevelopment of the terminal is in your testimony, the Brooklyn Marine Terminal Development Corporation in conjunction with the Advisory Task Force, correct?

ANDREW KIMBALL: So, there are two pieces. We've had a taskforce that's had enormous input. There's going to be a two-thirds vote. There will be an ongoing advisory body during the GPPP, so as we go through the environmental review and finalize site plans, they will have input during that period of time. Post GPPP, that group then becomes an oversight body, similar to what was established on the Gowanus rezoning. We will fund the facilitator for that group during that period of time but right before completion of GPPP, we will establish the Brooklyn Marine Terminal Development Corporation, which will have responsibility for approving all contracts overseeing every financial transaction and

delivering on the financial commitments that are made in the plan.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, great. What regular reporting will EDC provide to the City Council on project progress, community benefits delivery, any financial performances?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I suspect that there will be regular hearings on the matter but we're delighted to have that conversation with you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and is there going to be any oversight mechanisms beyond the current taskforce structure or will the Council have any monitoring role in its progress?

ANDREW KIMBALL: So, the Council along with other elected officials, the Mayor and the Governor will have seats on the Brooklyn Development Corporation Board. There is provisions and we're still negotiating the final composition with the taskforce but there will be significant local representation for people who live in Community Board 6, have businesses in Community Board 6, have experience in industrial and maritime and also represent the leadership of Red Hook East and West. Those are commitments we've made.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and are there any specific performance metrics measuring the maritime and housing components that we have in place?

ANDREW KIMBALL: We have goals for each one of those, so we need a framework approved for what we can build and we have a very detailed phasing plan that we've been reviewing with the taskforce and we expect that we will be able to achieve the timeline that we have laid out.

A project like this is going to take a long time. Once the GPPP is approved and the Development Corporation is set up, it will immediately put out an RFP for a port operator. So, we, unlike the existing conditions, will give a long term lease for a Port Operator whose likely to oversee the entire port operation. So, that's container, that's construction stage and that's Blue Highway and that's the cruise terminal and they'll be given a long enough lease likely longer than 30 years to allow them to bring their own financing into the project. Just like any good economic development project, we want to leverage as much private investment as possible.

So, the \$1.75 billion for the port that I'm referring to, just comes from project proceeds.

Essentially, proceeds that might otherwise just go into the general fund that the city has agreed can stay in the project. From the equivalent value of the pilot payments over 40 years, that's about \$1.3 billion and from the public grants but we expect on top of that, that the private operator will invest \$250 to \$500 million themselves in this site for further enhancements, for top side infrastructure, electric cranes, build out of the space, warehouses, what's subsurface and what's bulkhead is the public's responsibility and we're taking care of that.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And just in line with the dialogue around shrinking the port or making it smaller, is there an industrial action plan in place to ensure the port is able to sustain operations with a smaller footprint?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Well, what you have today is a site, about 122 acres where about 60 of it maybe you could say has some industrial maritime but unfortunately because of the lack of investment, piers 9A and B have collapsed into the water. Pier 7 and 8 have a lifespan somewhere in the 8 to 10 year range.

1 If you were to rebuild each of those finger
2 piers, in the configuration that they're in today,
3 which is not what the maritime industry wants, the
4 days of finger piers are over in the maritime
5 industry. Each one of those would be \$200 million,
6 right? So, instead we are building a marginal pier
7 to build out. That work on the port will begin
8 immediately using the public grants. As we put out
9 what will be many RFP's over a ten year period,
10 starting at PMT North for housing, the proceeds from
11 that housing will not only help build out the
12 infrastructure and green space but help with some
13 cross subsidization for the port.
14

15 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'd like to switch gears
16 over to some of the questions around housing revenue
17 or funding. Can you clarify how much of the port
18 infrastructure investment is expected to be
19 subsidized through Housing Development?

20 ANDREW KIMBALL: So, uh a significant portion.
21 So, it's \$3.7 billion project, okay. Here are your
22 funding sources. You've got \$1.3 billion, which is
23 the value of the pilot payments over 40 years, which
24 the city has agreed that we can either finance
25 against the pilot payments, future pilot payments or

they will provide an upfront capital. So, that's \$1.3 billion. Then there's about \$360 million of grants today. Of course we'll continue to aggressively pursue grants, both for port and for other elements of the project but that's what we have today and we need a financially feasible plan right out of the box.

The balance, a little over \$2 billion will come from housing proceeds.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and I know a lot of the conversations or dialogue that's happened around this, actually for [INAUDIBLE 00:58:22], was this approach chosen over public or federal funding alone? This approach that you're doing?

ANDREW KIMBALL: This approach was chosen because it's a realistic approach to actually get something done. The scale and magnitude of the cost here are extraordinary and without creative financing that you've seen on many projects that are this massive and the many billions from Hudson - excuse me from Hudson Yards to the Brooklyn Bridge Park, to numerous other projects, Battery Park City. You need to have creative financing structures to get a project of this ambition done.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And were there any other alternative funding models considered beyond the market rate housing to fund the maritime infrastructure?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I am always delighted to geek out with somebody on creative financial models. We have looked at all of them but if there are others, we are delighted to pursue them. Some folks have said, why don't you go out and raise maritime bonds as an example, there are examples of those. The reality is that bond financing through the city is likely to be cheaper. We'll look at that for sure as a source. So, everything is on the table. We needed to present to the taskforce a realistic plan of what we think will be the financial sources to get this project done.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Understood and has EDC conducted stress testing in the cross subsidization model and what happens to port operations if the housing market conditions deteriorate?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, obviously with a project like this, you have to have what you believe are very realistic expectations for return. So, typically and on every EDC project, we go through a rigorous

1 financial analysis. We make sure we are very
2 conservative in our projections. You always want to
3 be surprised on the plus side, rather than the
4 negative side. We use economic modeling that's
5 reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget,
6 which is you know which is very, very rigorous to
7 make sure they are comfortable. That we're not
8 creating undo burdens financially for the city but
9 absolutely market conditions are a factor and but we
10 expect that over a ten year period, we can get this
11 build out done. Is it possible there is a downturn?
12 There's another 2,008 economic condition?
13 Absolutely, it's always possible in the city. There
14 are things out of our control. There are tariffs,
15 there's interest rates, but we believe we have come
16 up with a very responsible pragmatic plan to move
17 forward.
18

19 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And what if the like no
20 action scenario of this plan doesn't move forward?

21 ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, so the no action scenario
22 is that you will certainly have a much more
23 responsible actor in managing the site then you had
24 before. EDC has a long term lease for it right now.
25 We are committed to the investments that we said we

would make when we announced this project. Okay, so that's about \$80 million that was announced at the time of the project. I mentioned some of the investments that are already happening, buying a new \$15 million crane, \$200 million for the bulkhead at Pier 10, just to make sure Red Hook Container Terminal can continue to operate and the 175 ILA members don't lose their jobs.

But it's no where near the funding that's needed to create a modern port of the future. And so, that's why we need a creative cross subsidy plan to make this work, plus we are living in this moment of a major housing crisis. These two things can live together right? I've heard a lot of conversation about IBZ's. This is an extraordinary investment in an IBZ, close to \$2 billion in the IBZ. 270,000 square feet of light industrial space in addition to the 60 acre port. That's an incredible investment in an IBZ that should be celebrated.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I appreciate that response. I'm, you know I think this is something we have chatted about and chatted with the members around the different types of funding sources. What happens if, even with just our own electoral process that we're

going through right now and what's upcoming and what we don't know? I just appreciate the response and it's something for us to keep having dialogue around.

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'm sorry Council Member if I could just add one piece. So, you did ask about the no build scenario right? So, the reality is we are going to try to continue port operations there for as long as possible. But the reality is that without a financially viable plan, I don't see the city providing city capital to rebuild a \$2 billion port. So, pieces of it are going to fall into the river, lost forever. Of course we will try to maintain those ILA jobs and the container operation as long as possible.

What you will also get and what's on the site today on the other 60 acres that are non-maritime okay, they are the things that pay the most that are allowed in an IBZ. So, what do we have there today? We have a lot of truck parking. We have modular hotel units that were stored there temporarily that never got installed, just rotting. We have rock crushing. We have the concrete recycling facility that Council Member Hanif mentioned. You have hard to site city uses that are as of right and IBZ and

undoubtedly there will have to be some amount of those because it's not financially feasible for EDC to continue to subsidize a port operation at the tune of \$5 million a year, which is what the Port Authority did for many years and we are doing right now, and we will honor the term that the Red Hook Container Terminal has.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And are there any specific financial triggers that would require modifications to either the housing or maritime components if revenue projections are not met?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I don't think so. Is it conceivable that it might take longer to build out every section of the plan? Absolutely. You know we are going to start in the north. We're going to start on the marginal pier immediately. We're going to get a port operator in place for 30 years who's going to help with final design of that marginal pier, who's going to bring private resources to the table. We're going to move into construction on that as fast as we can.

At the same time, we're going to begin to put out to the market sites on the northern end, which we view as the most valuable sites right adjacent to

Brooklyn Bridge Park and those returns will help build out the infrastructure for the housing, the green space, the resiliency barrier that's going to run all the way from Atlantic to Valentino Park, a incredibly comprehensive resiliency plan. The first of its kind for Red Hook, which could be a model for the rest of the peninsula to really make Red Hook resilient for the long term. All of those things will start in the north and move south.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'd like to move over to the jobs and industrial uses of this site. What role will workforce development or job training programs play in ensuring the economic benefits for each people in Red Hook and surrounding communities?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, the ILA today has an apprenticeship program. We're going to want to work with them with our workforce development center that we will put on the site and the Economic Mobility Network that we will stand up. This will be a number of local not-for-profits. We'll have a competitive process to select them, just as we have in Sunset Park and in Hunts Point. We expect that will be funded at about half a million dollars a year and the goal will be to get to young people early on, get

1 them excited about careers and maritime in the Blue
2 Highway. We do this today, by the way with Horn
3 Blower that runs NYC Ferry and I have had a lot of
4 success placing young people who go to the Harbor
5 School in jobs. A number of the captains in NYC
6 Ferry come out of the Harbor School and we're really
7 proud of that. We can build on that. We will have
8 physical presence on site, which we think is really
9 important, which will have simulation equipment of
10 what it's like to be on the water, what it's like to
11 drive a boat, what's it like to work on a boat. But
12 there will also be other jobs. There will be jobs
13 that are long term, permanent jobs in that 270,000
14 square feet of light industrial space. So, there is
15 a long track record over the last 25 years at the
16 Navy Yard, at the Brooklyn Army Terminal, in private
17 sites, like Greg O'Connell's properties in Red Hook,
18 like at Industry City. We're small industrial
19 players who tend to create two to three jobs per
20 thousand square feet. That will be another number of
21 jobs.
22

23 On top of all that and on the front end, you've
24 got this massive build out of 39,000 jobs related to
25 construction of this thing, another huge opportunity

to work with the construction trades through a PLA where there are specific and community hiring provisions targeting local NYCHA residents and that's a massive opportunity that would work with Red Hook east and west.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And are there any protections that are in place to prevent long term erosion of maritime and industrial uses in favor of maybe higher revenue, residential or commercial development?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Uh, one danger is not approving this plan and I will say another danger is not moving as quickly as we can to build out this Blue Highway Network. This Administration is deeply committed to this, working with DOT and describe some of the sites that we're already spending real dollars on for the first time since we've been talking about this for 30 years, real dollars are being spent. Real real estate is being locked up. We want to move quickly to build out that infrastructure.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And what analysis was conducted regarding the loss of 60 plus acres of designated industrial waterfront and if there was

any, how does that align with the city's comprehensive waterfront plan?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'm focused on BMT and leveraging as much investment in the IBZ there to create as many jobs and develop a network for Blue Highway that works for the city.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Got it. I'd like to shift some questions over to just housing and transportation and then I'll probably break for some members. In terms of housing, what guarantees are in place to ensure long term affordability, especially in the neighborhood facing displacement pressures?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Ultimately all the contracts are going to be made through the Development Corporation, but just to be clear, our commitment that will be embedded in the GPPP commitments and embedded in the Development Corporations Plans are for permanently affordable housing, permanently. So, as you noted, we did start this plan with 25 percent affordability, an average of 60 percent AMI.

The city stepped in half way through the process with a huge additional commitment to this project was that we could keep the value of the pilots over 40 years. That has only happened a hand full of times

1 in the 30 years I've been involved in economic
2 development where the city agrees to that. Where you
3 can finance off of that and that allowed us to move
4 from 35 percent - excuse me, 25 percent to 35 percent
5 at the same time, we cut down the overall number of
6 units. We had started at 12, then we went to 9.
7 We're now at 7,700. The impact, the combined impact
8 of going from 25 to 35 and reducing the number of
9 housing units was a billion impact on the project.
10 We were able to make that commitment because we were
11 allowed to keep the future pilot payments in the
12 project or and the city has not made a final
13 determination on which way they're going to go,
14 provide those dollars in the form of capital in the
15 near term years.

17 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And is there going to be a
18 cap on luxury or market rate units to maintain
19 balance and affordability on site?

20 ANDREW KIMBALL: There's going to be a mixture in
21 all of the buildings. So, the 35 percent commitment
22 is going to run through all of our buildings.

23 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Got it.

24 ANDREW KIMBALL: We're not having a whole slew of
25 100 percent affordable buildings and a whole slew of

market rate buildings. It's going to be integrated into every site.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And have you folks looked at the phasing of the housing plan and when each of the phases will be developed?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, so again, going back to phasing starting north moving south, marginal pier plus BMT north, along Columbia Street, we think that we can get into the ground by 2029, assuming a GPP approval in 2026. You then have RFP's with the port operator, RFP's for those first few developers for the pads and construction start in 2029. It's a ten year build out for the whole site.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay. I'm sure the Council Member will have questions on that but I can follow up as well. I - in terms of transportation, what's MTA's involvement and what's the plan including enhancing the transit options? I saw a lot of different transit oriented testimony which is around bus routes and MTA.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yup, so this is absolutely a community in need of transportation options. There is no doubt about that. We are very focused on that in the plan. Number one, creating a pedestrian

forward district, with maximizing green space opportunities, pedestrian walk areas in every part of the site, making sure there's safety at crosswalks. There's enormous concern in the community; I understand about congestion at Columbia and Atlantic in terms of our transportation planning and any future trucks that depart BMT. The goal is to funnel those trucks down Hamilton Avenue onto the BQE or other locations where they may be going instead of everything being pushed towards Atlantic and Columbia. Those things can happen. We have committed in the plan to increase our New York City Ferry service significantly. In fact, we are already moving from what is a 50 minute wait time to a 40 minute wait time and we believe we can get that down to 30 minutes by the time we begin the build out of this project.

We are putting in over a mile of new green way and bike lanes. We're going to put in separate lanes for e-cargo mobility. One of the challenges with the green way that runs around the BMT today is you have both bikes and e-cargo vehicles that are in conflict with pedestrians as well.

1 So, those are all key parts of creating a
2
3 pedestrian friendly neighborhood. In addition to
4 transit up to the subways, we committed to \$25
5 million towards a electric shuttle that would run a
6 loop through the site and the ultimate exact route
7 will be decided by the development corporation but we
8 are committing project proceeds towards this to get
9 Red Hook residents and NYCHA residents up to the
10 subway lines, the F at Carroll more expeditiously.
11 We've been having very constructive conversations
12 with the MTA about a number of bus route
13 improvements, most particularly the B61.

14 The big challenge with the B61 is that it can't
15 move through traffic and so, dealing with that
16 traffic situation, creating smarter and a better
17 grid, both for pedestrians and for vehicles is part
18 of the answer there. The MTA has given us a letter
19 that they are committed to working with us on
20 improvements. It is the MTA, never in my experience
21 is committing five, seven years out to a specific
22 service but they see the opportunity.

23 In the past, a new subway stop has been studied
24 at Red Hook. That was north of \$10 billion, not
25 something that's viable under this project.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay thank you so much for responding to my questions. I'm going to pause for my questions and turn it over to Council Member Avilés followed by Hanif and Restler. And just really quickly, I want to remind the folks from the public that are here, if you want to support something being stated, you use this gesture. I will be maintaining decorum in this room and I will enforce it if necessary. So, just be mindful of that and we will have multiple rounds for members so please stay within your time if possible. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: It's not possible. So, the redevelopment of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal at this point is contingent on this land swap agreement with the Port Authority of New York, New Jersey, which is obviously memorialized in this MOU agreement between the city and the state. What other options did EDC explore if any for the redevelopment of this property?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Well, we had a unique opportunity that 40 years of mayors have tried to secure, which is to get control of this site and break out of what the dysfunctional agreement to the city and the state and the Port Authority. So that

required a month's long negotiation where as part of the deal that was made, we would swap these two parcels of land. These are sites that have regional importance because of the maritime nature by very definition, the GPPP is the appropriate mechanism for a project of regional importance and that's why we settled in this deal on the GPPP process. We will go through it together with the Port Authority such that at the end, they get full ownership of Helen Hook and the City of BMT.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, did you explore any other mechanism besides a GPPP?

ANDREW KIMBALL: That was the mechanism that was negotiated.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, so for - let me ask you a quick series of questions. You can answer yes or no. So, did the triparty agreement require that the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, that it had to maintain the Port in a state of good repair?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Uhm, I'm not aware. I just know the fact that they didn't.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You're not aware of the agreement and the responsibilities of the Port

Authority of New York New Jersey in this agreement and their obligation?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'm sure we could find language in there that does obligate them to it but I don't know every word of that agreement. What I do know is that nothing happened there.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah, that's unfortunate, that's unfortunate.

ANDREW KIMBALL: And you were a very important voice in -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, yes or no. Let's continue to move on. It does in fact require the Port Authority to maintain the property. Did the triparty agreement provide the right to the city to audit this facility?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I'm sure you reviewed this as you were deeply negotiating it. So, yes, it did provide, okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Did the EDC exercise this right to audit this facility?

ANDREW KIMBALL: We asked of the Port Authority just in the three years I was there. I can't speak beyond that. For detailed reports, condition reports

1 COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 71
2 for their audited financial statements and we
3 understood exactly the subsidy that was being paid,
4 and we did get conditions reports on bulkheads and
5 piers that showed them in really bad shape. When we
6 acquired the site, we then reviewed all those reports
7 and sent divers in the water and found out the
8 situation was even worse than what was in the reports
9 that they gave us.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, uhm, would the city
11 have been within its rights to have taken legal
12 action for the Port Authority of New York New Jersey
13 for lack of investment and meeting its basic
14 obligation to maintain this property in a state of
15 good repair.

16 ANDREW KIMBALL: It's very possible Council
17 Member but we'd be here in ten years with nothing
18 happening on that site.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I think you have a
20 fiduciary responsibility to this city to examine that
21 and of course, if you are receiving a lemon, I would
22 wonder why. This deal seems to be financially
23 feasible for the taxpayers of the City of New York.

24 So, let's move on.

25 ANDREW KIMBALL: Okay, we disagree on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: In terms of Helen Hook, Helen Hook 225 acre property, six cranes and rail access, a dream I'm sure for the Port Authority. The city has owned this land and it has leased it to a private operator CMA. Can you provide to the Council the estimated value or the capitalization of the Helen Hook site?

ANDREW KIMBALL: What I know is that uhm the Port Authority and their private operators because they have an existing lease there from the city. Have invested several hundred million dollars on this site. They recently announced an extended lease with a new operator. Them getting a long term lease, which they did through this deal, and ultimately full ownership, will allow them to leverage even more private investment.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Good for the Port Authority.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Good for the Port Authority, sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, how was the uhm what was the appraised value of this site in Helen Hook?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I don't have that. I can get back to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Was that not part of the consideration in the trade to provide the Port Authority who had neglected - let me just finish. The Port Authority who had neglected its obligation to maintain this site and then the city just happily gives over a well-capitalized, well-invested site. What is wrong with that business transaction?

ANDREW KIMBALL: When people look back on this transaction if it moves forward, decades from now, they're going to look at it as one of the best deals that the City of New York has made on economic development in recent history.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Can you provide to the Council how much capital the city invested into the Helen Hook property in the last ten years? Have they invested any?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Very little, maybe under \$100 million.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Can you provide - can you tell us what the net profits of the Helen Hook property is at this moment?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'll have to go back and check. We did look at all that during the transaction.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, in terms of this land swap, the city agreed to give up this profitable Helen Hook for deteriorating site in Brooklyn supposedly needing over a billion dollars in investment. What was the cost benefit analysis that the EDC engaged in to make sure that this swap was actually in the best interest of New York City tax payers.

ANDREW KIMBALL: The cost benefit analysis was that there is a site that is adjacent to the rest of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's Port Empire, which is Bayonne Newark and Elizabeth. So, immediately across the water from that, they can handle deep sea ships that make sense for them to manage and we had the opportunity to acquire 122 acres of incredibly valuable land on the water front and not only meet our policy goals during a housing crisis but build out a new \$1.75 billion port to get trucks off our street.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Sir, are you aware that you work for the EDC and the City of New York and not the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey? It sounds like, it sounds like they got a pretty good deal. Let's talk about the value of the land. How

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, that's where I was going. So, look you have a combination of factors here Council Member that you have to take into consideration when you calculate the value of the land. So, there's as of right, no investment, no cross subsidy. That's not a lot of value.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Under the current zoning, negative because it's falling into the water. I explained four finger piers, each falling into the water.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Not without massive subsidy and cross investment.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: That is shocking.

ANDREW KIMBALL: If you change the land use and you allow for housing and other uses, that's creates a lot of value to cross subsidize. If you build out a port facility, the private sector will actually respond to and pay you rent and invest in. That creates a lot of value.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, no value and you traded it in?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Very little.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You gave a very profitable piece of property to get one with no value?

ANDREW KIMBALL: We did because we had a mayor and a governor and some local elected officials who believed in the promise of this site as a mixed-use site.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I believe in the promise of this site in a modern port facility, what I do not believe is that you transition public property into luxury housing and you create a deal that unfortunately is a bad financial deal for New York City tax payers and unfortunately, lets the people of Red Hook suffer the burden and impacts of a property and a plan that has no solution. I know there was a

1 lot of pretty things in there. We've talked a lot
2 about this magical electrical bus but it doesn't
3 solve the transportation solution. 30 percent
4 climate resiliency does not solve at least 70 percent
5 of the neighborhood, a peninsula flood water at risk.
6 There is a lot here; that is great but there's a lot
7 here that needs real further engagement and asking
8 people to agree and asking the residents to agree to
9 a land giveaway to private luxury real estate
10 development because the city quite frankly is not
11 willing to invest or the state for that matter, fully
12 invest in this in the way that it needs to for its
13 historic regional opportunity. It's deeply
14 unfortunate. So, I'm going to stop here because I
15 know my colleagues have questions and we'll come
16 back.

18 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm going to pass it over to
19 Council Member Hanif for questions.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Thank you. Welcome. I'll
21 start off with the concrete recycling facility, our
22 favorite topic. The recycling facility has blanketed
23 Columbia Waterfront homes in dust and shattered trust
24 between residents and the city agencies. The
25 Concrete Recycling Facility needs to be shut down,

1 which is what we've been calling for to a
2
3 nonresidential area immediately. Can you commit
4 today to closing the DOT's concrete recycling
5 facility?

6 ANDREW KIMBALL: I appreciate your advocacy on
7 this. I know there are concerns. The best way to
8 make sure that we don't have that use or similar uses
9 because there have been similar uses on the site for
10 years, is to move forward with a plan that focuses on
11 creating a new port with the kinds of uses I
12 described plus the mixed use components to it.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: While it's still
14 endangering the people who live there. What you're
15 saying then is the concrete - if this doesn't pass,
16 the concrete recycling facility continues to exist
17 with other types of use that are similar.

18 ANDREW KIMBALL: What I will say is that whether
19 the concrete recycling facility closes or not, those
20 types of as of right uses in an IBZ are likely to
21 continue at some level because they are as of right.
22 There's a desperate need for uses, hard to site
23 municipal uses and that's what the current zoning
24 allows and because the peers are falling in the
25 water, there is not enough industrial maritime demand

today to fill 122 acres and there's a \$5 million a year subsidy that we got to cover.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Moving on, can you share if a proposal with more affordable housing was explored? Why was 35 percent affordable housing chosen as a target? What analysis determined this was the maximum feasible percentage? And given that this is public land, why wasn't 50 percent or higher affordable housing explored as the baseline rather than having the majority as market rate housing?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, as I described before, the initial plan where the proceeds coming into it, cross subsidizing port, cross subsidizing affordable housing, just came from the proceeds of the housing and didn't include the future pilot payments, monetizing those whether you finance off of it or you get it up front as capital, the minute that equation changed, we were able to go from 25 percent to 35 percent. That's a billion dollar move at the same time as we shrunk the total number of units because that was another request of the taskforce.

We have committed to a goal of 40 percent once project proceeds come in. We have filled any outstanding gap or additional capital commitments

come in. 40 percent is quite extraordinary. That's onsite. On top of that, we've committed to a \$200 million fund for NYCHA and a \$50 million fund to support affordable new housing and preservation in the neighborhood. We believe the combination of that would preserve over or preserve or create another 1,000 units.

So, obviously we will be working closely with HPD and with NYCHA on the deployment of those dollars and the Brooklyn Marine Development Corporation Taskforce.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I am anxious about the affordable housing being built because with Atlantic Yards, you know last year - last week, I was at a press conference calling on the state to uhm, penalize the developer \$2,000 for every unit that hasn't been built yet.

The market rate units have been built via affordable housing units are still left to be built.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: We need clear commitments on the affordable housing being treated the same as market rate and these additional outside features, money is going to Red Hook Houses and other finances to support preservation I think would need to be

very, very clear to our community that this is our money.

ANDREW KIMBALL: I understand your comment as it relates to Atlantic Yards. I will just highlight one very, very significant difference and that is that we are creating a development corporation with local representation on it. That will have the final contractual say on this deal. That does not exist at Atlantic Yards.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Can you talk about the environmental impact assessments that have been conducted for the proposed redevelopment, particularly in regard to air and water quality?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, so I will begin and I will turn it over to my colleague Jenn who is an expert on planning but to start, is a focus on an all-electric port which will substantially reduce carbon emissions in the area as it relates to the port. A focus on Blue Highways that moves good water to water. So, that those perishable goods on containers won't go out by truck.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: No, I understand that. I just want to know if -

ANDREW KIMBALL: The full environmental review happens during the general project plan process.

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, so Council Member, during the GPPP process when we start the GPPP early next year, we would also start the environmental review process in parallel. And that's consistent with the ULURP even. You have a plan and then you put it through environmental review to then study the environmental impacts of that plan, including air quality and water quality. So, that's entirely consistent as a part of the process.

And then are there other tests that need to take place, assessments?

JENNIFER SUN: Well, the full EIS will study other types of impacts like shadow impacts, for example and open space. It's a very exhaustive document that has very specific regulations for what is studied during that EIS. Moreover, when we start the scoping process in the fall, there is an opportunity for public comment on the scope of the environmental review.

So, if the community members feel that what we're proposing as a scope of environmental review, needs to consider other aspects of environmental impacts.

They will have an opportunity to share that, for that to be incorporated into the environmental review.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Great, could you say that last part one more time?

JENNIFER SUN: There's a scoping process that will start this fall. If we actually have an affirmative vote of the taskforce. We first publish the scope for public review and then there is a public hearing for members of the community, elected officials to comment on the scope and suggest whether there's additional analysis that needs to be included formerly in the environmental review.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I see. What recourse will exist for the taskforce or the community if public benefit elements are delayed or defunded?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, so this is the importance of setting up a development corporation with local representation that actually has the contractual responsibility to follow through on the commitments that are made. That's number one.

Number two is very similar to the Gowanus, which if not of a development corporation but similar to the Gowanus which has an oversight taskforce which I think generally has been well received. I think

there's concerns about funding it and we've committed to funding this oversight taskforce to the tune of a million dollars. We've also agreed to fund a legal review of those commitments for the oversight taskforce as it heads into post GPPP oversight. So, that group we're expecting will meet quarterly. I think that's the same pace as Gowanus to make sure that BMTDC is coming to the table and reporting that oversight taskforce on the delivery of commitments to coordinate with them on construction impacts and report on progress.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I totally understand that. I would want there to be something written out. What are the recourses because I think with a lot of projects that we've seen, we have lived with delays and we have lost money or we've needed more money. And I think it's really important for us to know what happens then, and then I just want to ask and this is my last question for now. What authority does - well, it's not the taskforce. The development corporation have to approve or reject project changes tied to delays or budget cuts.

ANDREW KIMBALL: It has the ultimate approval over every contract, every decision made, governing the site.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: And this is the development corporation?

ANDREW KIMBALL: The development corporation yeah. Very similar to Brooklyn Bridge Development Corporation in that regard.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm now passing it over and recognizing Council Member Restler.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you so much Chair and I want to just thank my colleagues, Council Members Avilés and Hanif for their leadership. Of course, this project is in their districts and they know best. I do want to ask about some of the ways in which it impacts District 33 as an immediately adjacent area.

Uhm, what has been the interplay with the BQE project and the Triple Cantilever project in your planning?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Thank you for the question Council Member. Really good question. We are in constant coordination with DOT both on short term -

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Are they here today?

ANDREW KIMBALL: They're not, I don't believe.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Why not?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I didn't invite people to this hearing. Both on -

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: But I mean you're the city, you're responsible for the project. You didn't think it would be relevant to have DOT here and considering the massive transportation impacts in the BMT area and the adjacent areas?

ANDREW KIMBALL: What I can speak to is how we're coordinating with DOT. So, we are in constant contact with them. They have come to the taskforce a couple of times. They have made a number of short term commitments particularly around the interchange of Atlantic and Columbia where you have a lot of backup. Long term as you know, they are looking to move into the federal NEPA process later in the year. So, the coordination between these two projects, as they move through their NEPA process later in the year. So, the coordination between these two projects as they move through their NEPA process which will follow ours and is our environmental review process overlap maybe a little bit. It's unclear exactly when their federal NEPA will begin

but we think by the end of the year will be critically important.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: So, the I mean the Triple Cantilever is failing. It's a deteriorating piece of infrastructure. Are you concerned the impacts of this project could have on DOT's ability to move forward with their plans?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'm not - they're going to have their track. We need to make sure these two projects work together and I will tell you one critically important thing about our project is having a marginal pier and bulkhead that can receive the construction materials when they are ready to rebuild. When they're ready to rebuild the BQE in the future. We don't know exactly when that will be but that one of the reasons, as I described all the different projects around the city that are now getting built from the waterside like the JFK or what will happen at Governors Island with the climate exchange. What's happening today at the Brooklyn Battery. There being staged from the waterside. What I think would be deeply impactful for your community is when construction starts and there's no

waterside access and everything is coming in by truck.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: What impacts do you anticipate on Atlantic Avenue as a - so Atlantic Avenue is on the border between Council Member Hanif's district and mine, highly congested. It's been a long standing priority of our community to close the onramp for the Queens bound BQE at Atlantic Avenue. Do you think that the BMT project makes that aspiration impossible?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I can't comment on that. That would be reviewed within the federal NEPA process.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Do you think it makes it much less likely that we'll be able to close the onramp?

JENNIFER SUN: Council Member, DOT has been very clear that they remain committed to studying the closure of that onramp. And so, the MBT project does not effect that commitment.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Their commitment to study it.

JENNIFER SUN: To study it.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: But the impact of the BMT project on our ability to close the ramp is the question I'm asking you.

JENNIFER SUN: We cannot predetermine what that impact would be. There will be a coordinated environmental review through the BMT project and through the BQE central project where we share information that will enable us to study. If and how the BMT project might impact the closure of that ramp.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I mean from my vantage point, it's extremely dangerous to walk down Atlantic Avenue to Brooklyn Bridge Park every day. We have families and strollers coming from Council Member Hanif's district and mine that can't safely get around because the streets are so congested and poorly designed and there's an onramp to an interstate highway that runs through the middle of our residential neighborhoods. And I'm concerned that you're adding 7,500 units of housing and all of these other activities. It will make it harder for us to address the congestion and changes that we have on Atlantic Avenue. You think that's an - is that an unfounded concern?

1 ANDREW KIMBALL: The best way to improve traffic
2
3 safety, pedestrian safety, bike safety, is to move
4 forward with this plan because it really is visionary
5 in terms of uhm having a pedestrian forward plan for
6 that Columbia and Red Hook Waterfront area.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: No, I'm not commenting
8 on the specifics of the plan and how it impacts those
9 neighborhoods. I'm commenting on specifically we
10 have a disaster on Atlantic Avenue and I want to
11 understand how this plan will impact it. That's why
12 I started by saying I'm concerned that DOT isn't here
13 today because the other agencies. We have other city
14 agencies that have a direct stake in your proposals,
15 and it will impact their work and they should have to
16 speak to how it effects the BQE project and the
17 redesign of Atlantic Avenue.

18 I just if I may for 30 more seconds. We're
19 approaching the end of the Adams Administration and
20 seeking a major approval and commitment from the
21 taskforce and other stakeholders for this to move
22 forward. Why should all of us believe that the
23 intentions of the Adams Administration will become a
24 reality in the future?

We all live in the real world. We know there will be an Administration that starts in January. We don't know which one. They will clearly have strong views about economic development, whose involved in economic development. What we can control is what we can control in way of this unique opportunity and time with a mayor and governor who aligned with strong community support for a plan that we think will transform this area in positive ways, create loads of local jobs and really improve our overall city infrastructure through a Blue Highways Network and that's why we're moving forward aggressively now in the GPPP.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: And I'll just say lastly on the Blue Highways Network, you know when we had Deputy Mayor Joshi her. I met with her multiple times about Blue Highways. Met with her staff multiple times. I can't point to any progress that we've seen on the Blue Highways in three plus years of the Adams Administration and I appreciate you centering it here and proposing some good things but at the end of the De Blasio Administration, EDC and DOT put out a bunch of good ideas for how we can start moving more of our freight in our waterways and

I just haven't seen any tangible movement on this despite me, Council Member Avilés and others screaming about it time and again.

And so, I'm pleased that you're focusing on it in this plan. I wish that there was any focus on it over these four years and that we had made any progress that we could point to because it would mean less trucks on our streets and it's a better way for us to be moving freight longer term, so.

ANDREW KIMBALL: I'd be happy to do a separate briefing for you Council Member. We have briefed for hours with voluminous information. The taskforce and just to be clear, in the last three years, we have made more progress than the last 30 combined. Where is that \$10 million going into the sky port, the downtown Manhattan Ella Port being renamed the Sky Port focusing on EB Tolls, all electric helicopters but also with a landing that going to be paid for jointly by public and private dollars. That is moving forward right now.

We just announced last week, sorry, last Monday that we are removing the prison barge up at Hunts Point. The Administration committed \$30 million for bulkhead improvements, for community access to the

1 water there and to begin the planning for what will
2 be a terminal to receive containers at Hunts Point.
3 We are moving forward studying all 25 of our ferry
4 landings for Blue Highway and you'll be hearing more
5 on that in the coming months. So, there is
6 substantial action happening on Blue Highways.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. I have a couple
9 additional questions and I just - just for the record
10 and for folks in the room and those watching, this is
11 an economic development committee, Department of
12 Transportation is not bound to appear here unless I
13 request them and usually we, which many of you are
14 familiar with, we end up doing a joint hearing with
15 Transportation and Infrastructure because that is the
16 agency that is overseen by that Committee.

17 And so I just want to say that for the record and
18 for the public. They are not here, though they work
19 on plenty plans with EDC and a lot of folks that
20 cover this Committee because they are not invited
21 when I have an oversight hearing.

22 Just some questions back on the housing revenue
23 and funding side. Are there specific financial
24 guarantees or backstops in place to protect the city
25

from cost overruns or even revenue shortfalls? Would taxpayers be responsible for covering shortfalls and either the maritime or housing components of the plan?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Again, this goes to financial planning and having conservative estimates of upside on 99 year leases for different housing paths. We think our projections are responsible.

Is there some sort of financial backstop that says the city comes in and pays for the housing. If it doesn't get build, no. The market will respond and we believe it will respond very positively this opportunity.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And NYC Ferry operates at significant losses as we know I am consistently talking about ferry landings and we have two landings already at BMT. Why aren't ferry operations included in the cross subsidization model if housing must be subsidized at the port operations?

ANDREW KIMBALL: We, and we talk about this from the beginning and I'm not going to compare it to other projects that maybe having challenges down the road but this is why we've harped on a financially viable plan where your inputs, your revenues, match

your expenses and they are reasonably forecasted in addition to our own internal team that does this. We had outside consultants cross checking these numbers, we've reviewed them in depth with the Office of Management and Budget. There is not access proceeds to go towards funding NYC Ferry citywide. With that said, we have committed to increasing the headways, meaning the number of stops per hour. That would be coming deep into Red Hook at the stop near Pier 11 and Pier 12.

It's at about 50 every 50 minutes now. We're going to improve that immediately to 40 minutes and we think we can get it down to 30 in the future.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I heard that in your earlier testimony and my interest peeked for Soundview as well, but I hear you.

Of the affordable units and I am sorry if you've repeated this or stated this already but I don't think we have - do we have how many will be at 30 percent AMI, 50 percent AMI and 60 percent AMI respectively in its current state of the plan and if so, can you break that down by income level?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Uhm, I do have that. Okay, Jen Sun is going to tackle this one.

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, so we're not at the level yet of specifying or prescribing how many units at each of the income bands.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay.

JENNIFER SUN: But our commitment is to deliver 35 percent affordable housing, permanently affordable housing across the site with an average AMI of 60 percent and then moreover, uhm in response to the taskforce, we have also committed that 10 percent of those permanently affordable units are at 40 percent AMI.

So, that's the specific -

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: So, what's the income levels for the 40 percent AMI and the 60 percent?

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, so 40 percent AMI, I'm going to look at my AMI table.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yeah, I don't have that in front of me either, sorry.

JENNIFER SUN: So, let's say for a family size of one, 40 percent AMI, they will be earning an annual income of about \$45,000.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and a family of three?

JENNIFER SUN: Family of three is \$58,000.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and then 60 percent AMI, family of one and family of three?

JENNIFER SUN: At 60 percent AMI for a family of one is \$68,000. For a family of three, it's \$87,000.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, thank you so much.

ANDREW KIMBALL: I will just add that we've also committed that there will be no units above 100 percent of AMI.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yeah, I saw that in the testimony as well. Thank you for that reclarification. Has the proposal with more affordable units - oh, I asked that earlier. What placement measures are planned for existing Red Hook residents as property values increase due to the waterfront development? Will rent stabilization or other tenant protections measures be implemented in Red Hook and at the Columbia Waterfront?

ANDREW KIMBALL: The most important thing that we're doing on that front is creating this \$50 million fund in partnership with HPD to support projects that they have in CB6 that are affordable housing projects. So, either preservation of affordable units or construction of new units.

In addition to that, there's the \$200 million going into NYCHA.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and the 35 percent affordable housing represents what percentage of Red Hooks current housing stock? And what impact will this have on the neighborhood character and existing residents?

ANDREW KIMBALL: That's a great question. I think we can get back to you on that. I will say that a very significant percentage and we will confirm this number but it's in the 70 percent range is Red Hook east and west. It may be even more and so, I guess your question is, 35 percent, how does that compare to the majority of affordable housing within it or within Red Hook where the blend between Red Hook houses and the rest of Red Hook?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I would say comparatively what is within it the current rate of housing stock. So, what do we know is available? I mean generally we know citywide our housing vacancy rate is low, which is a bad thing. That means we don't have available housing. So, if we're looking at 35 percent affordable housing right now, what is that

current percentage of Red Hooks current housing comparatively in terms of affordability?

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, we'll have to get back to you but I would say maybe just a really rough comparison is 35 percent of the 7,700 units at BMT would be 2,695 units. That's comparable to the approximately 3,000 units on the Red Hook houses campus, just to give you a sense of scale.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, thank you for that. I'd like to ask some questions surrounding the UPS site. Why is the city proposing to acquire the UPS site for what is essentially a private waterfront housing development with minimal affordable housing?

ANDREW KIMBALL: So, the UPS site is a 13 acre roughly site at the southern end connected to you know touching the BMT boundary. So, in our plan today, that site would critically, importantly include a continuation of our resiliency plan. So, raising that site out of the floodplain. Typically, our storm surge barrier going all the way from Atlantic down to Valentino is 21 feet above sea level. That is at a resiliency level of the 100 year storm at 2,100. So, very, very resilient. On addition on that site would be seven acres of green

space. Part of the 35 acres of total green space in park would be delivering in this plan. There would be about 1,700 units of housing on that site. 35 percent of which would be permanently affordable. So, just like the rest of the site, 35 percent permanently affordable. Just the history of that site, UPS acquired buildings there, I don't know eight, ten years ago. They took those buildings down. They did significantly environmental remediation. Their plan had to be to put up a last mile distribution facility. I'm not sure which one it is. It would be the 7th or 8th last mile distribution facility in Sunset Park and Red Hook. Uhm, they ultimately decided that for their own reasons, that was not in their plan at least for today.

We approached them because of the adjacent nature of the site. The storm surge resiliency benefits, the housing benefits, the green space benefits. They are interested in going through GPPP with us and so, when we come out the other side of GPPP, those sites, like the other sites, going north to south will get put out on the market. Our general deal with them is that they will get reimbursed after subsurface

1 infrastructure has been paid for. So, connecting
2 that site, storm, sewer, electric, and the park for
3 what they originally paid for the site if there are
4 proceeds. That will be at their option at that point
5 in the process.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, and this site is
8 within both IMZ and the city's designated significant
9 maritime industrial area. How did you folks
10 determine the site to be appropriate for housing
11 rather than industrial uses?

12 ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, again, critically
13 important from the resiliency front, the housing
14 front. We have a 50,000 square foot two story
15 subsidized light industrial building plan for the
16 site. You know the question is if that site is
17 removed, what happens? I don't think anybody can
18 tell you for sure. My guess is that it probably
19 remains a pile of dirt for many years. It's possible
20 they come back and decide to do a last mile
21 distribution facility. I personally don't think that
22 will be a great outcome in terms of trucks in the
23 community but that's possible.

24 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And why not maritime
25 industrial use or expansion of the port?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Because it will not be financially viable for them to pay themselves back for what they paid on the site. So, they are a publicly traded company. They're just going to wait it out.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: So, this is not a financially viable option for UPS?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay. I'm going to pause here. Yes and see if I have second round questions. Council Member Avilés?

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Oh yes. Let's go here. Okay uhm so many questions, we could be here for a very long time. Back to the original deal. Did the EDC require or ask for any compensation from the Port Authority of New York or New Jersey during these negotiations?

ANDREW KIMBALL: There was lots of discussion about investment made in the past or not made in the past. Ultimately to get to the deal and have this unique opportunity, we struck the deal that's articulated in that MOU.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So for clarity on the record, you did not ask for any compensation for an

asset that was failing and in a very poor state of repair that may need up to a billion in investment?

ANDREW KIMBALL: That was many months long negotiation.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, so no. That's fine.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Where all of those things were discussed. I am saying yes, all of those things were discussed. Ultimately we made the deal -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: And you decided -

ANDREW KIMBALL: That we made in order to have this extraordinary opportunity.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: For the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Okay, uhm, let's see. As a public benefit corporation working for the public interest of New York City taxpayers, what was the role of the EDC board in scrutinizing these pretty awful financial deal?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I disagree that it's an awful financial deal. People are going to look back on this as a great deal for the City of New York at a point of time and we had a housing crisis and needed a port to deliver on our Blue Highway goals.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I'm sure -

ANDREW KIMBALL: Our board approves all financial expenditures that we make including the expenditures around the planning work and study on this site.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Could you provide all the authorizing resolution and accompanying financials of what the board scrutinized in order to agree to this deal?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Sure, I think it's all public information.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Great. What are the enforcement mechanisms to ensure that this MOU is binding?

ANDREW KIMBALL: The MOU requires both projects to go through ULURP together, to get to full ownership for both parties and for some reason that doesn't happen, we have a 50 year lease for BMT as it stands and the Port Authority has a comparable term for Helen Hook.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: And how many years are you into the 50 year lease?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, it was just started.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Oh it restarted. It restarted when you did the agreement on the MOU.

Okay, so 49 year lease and did that lease go through SBS and did it not require Council approval?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I am not aware of it needed Council approval.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay so if the - if the parties decide that this is not in the best interest, you can't reach a yes vote, EDC retains operational control but not ownership of the BMT site. Is that correct?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay and then Port Authority retains Helen Hook in the same manner?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay. So, in terms of uhm - I realize that similar during this time, New York City committed \$2 billion to the Port Authority of New York New Jersey in pilot payments for the midtown terminal, bus terminal. Did this factor at all into your discussions and negotiations?

ANDREW KIMBALL: We have discussions with the Port Authority on numerous projects and this was one of them. We also have conversations with them about the airports all the time where we're at least for JFK and LaGuardia, we have the land lease. They

operate them. So there are numerous conversations happening at the same time, similar to the teleport in Staten Island.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Great so the \$2 billion commitment to the Midtown Bus Terminal on behalf of the city really had nothing to do with this agreement in Red Hook.

ANDREW KIMBALL: No, we are constantly in contact with the Port Authority about numerous deals.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Is the city in the practice of simply bailing out the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey on all these major projects?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Uh, no we're not and that is not what we did here, and I would argue that the bus terminal project, if you want to talk about that is a separate project that will be incredibly beneficial to New Yorkers and well worth the city making a deal around the pilot payments on that so that we can take what is a wreck and turn it into something that New Yorkers are proud about and safe.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Sure, uhm, so how do we explain to Red Hook and Columbia Waterfront residents that citywide officials continue to ensure that we provide all the subsidies possible to the port of New

York and New Jersey and requiring those same residents to sell off their public lands for a luxury development to invest in what should be a public good, a modern port of regional importance as stated by EDC and all the entities involved?

ANDREW KIMBALL: There are enormous public goods that resolve from this project for local residents from 35 acres of green space to a port that has drastically removed, reduced carbon emissions and truck traffic to new opportunities for housing. This is an area as I said before that's had about 100 units of affordable housing built in the last ten years. CB6 has called for increasing housing of all kinds. This plan does that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Clearly, it centers housing on public land and in an industrial waterfront community. So, let's go to the transportation because I think this is a true, true problem. Uhm, that we have not contended with well enough.

It is true that if further southern portion Red Hook, right, the nearest train is 1.2 miles away. It is bus dependent transit desert. This kind of pedestrian forward plan is fascinating for the almost

4,000 units that will be built in the most southern part of Red Hook with the promise of an electric shuttle bus. Understanding the concentration of last mile facilities along with the giant crew ship that brings thousands of vehicles to the car and the daily gridlock that the neighborhood faces with two entrances and exits, and thousands of new more residents and businesses. Do you think your plan is sufficient to address the realities that luxury residents will also come with cars? The businesses will also come with trucks?

ANDREW KIMBALL: I think that this plan will result in a very pedestrian forward neighborhood that is going to deemphasize the use of cars that will be parking maximums at the lowest possible level. So, there's going to be a neighborhood in which people are choosing to live, many of whom don't have cars. We believe that the kinds of investments that we're prepared to make now and that the MTA will make in the future will provide enormous benefit to the community in addition to the local bus routes. We'll be working with the MTA on studying, adding a route to take people by bus back to lower Manhattan.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah, the MTA is currently exploring cutting bus service in Red Hook, which is appalling given how awful the actual bus service for current Red Hook residents are. So, what's that phrase? We'll sell you a bridge to nowhere later on today.

Let's talk specifically about some more. Today, Columbia Hicks and Clinton Streets are traffic nightmares. As both cars and trucks are looking to avoid BQE traffic to use them as extra lanes, only to rejoin the highway at Atlantic Avenue, creating what Council Member Restler was noting a very hazardous situation. What solution has DOT provided for this situation?

ANDREW KIMBALL: So, DOT recently provided local elected officials with a list of 10 or 15 immediate term actions they are taking. It is not going to fix all of the problems but we do believe will provide some shorter term relief and better safety measures particularly as it relates to the intersection of Columbia and Atlantic, which agreed is a very challenging intersection but we believe this plan long term will result in the kind of transportation improvements that this community needs and will bring

the MTA to the table to invest because it will have the population there to do so but Jennifer, anything you would add to that?

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, so just to be more specific, DOT is in the process of implementing a street improvement project at the intersection of Atlantic Avenue Furman near Brooklyn Bridge Park. So that capital project is underway. In addition to the new commitments that they've made, following a walk through with community stakeholders and local electeds that DOT had organized and EDC had joined as well to reenforce the importance of those short term measures. DOT is also committed that after they finish the traffic modeling for the BQE Central, they will look further at potentially additional measures for addressing the need for improving pedestrian safety.

And then for the BMT plan, you know from the very beginning of our transportation planning process, we have been deliberate in making sure that when we think about the new green way alignment, our proposal of connecting that to the existing green way at Brooklyn Bridge Park, will actually help reduce pedestrian and bike conflicts at Atlantic Avenue and

the progressive parking policy that we've been talking about is also designed to reduce the car dependency of new residents including luxury condo owners. There has been examples in other city's like San Francisco that have passed parking maximums since 2019, so these have been in practice where they have been effective in really creating a transit and pedestrian oriented mixed use district. And so, we do believe that by planning this from the start through marketing and partnerships with the developers and future RFP's by planning for it to be pedestrian and transit oriented, we will be successful in reducing the effects of cars on the existing neighborhood.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, uhm so how do you all explain expecting the community to support a plan that doesn't have a completed full transportation study?

JENNIFER SUN: We actually have as you have seen in the taskforce meetings presented our transportation plan and in fact have incorporated taskforce feedback, so that there at least two options.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: We don't have - we don't - we have never been presented with a DOT Transportation study and the implications of the proposal on that. That has never been presented to the taskforce. How about - how can we justify a lack of - actually what's your understanding of the new truck routes and how that is going to impact also this plan?

JENNIFER SUN: We have been coordinating with DOT's freight division on their Red Hook truck and traffic study. We understand that that study's completion has been pushed out because in response to community feedback, they've been collecting more data.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Right, so they need more time but we're moving forward with this plan without full information.

JENNIFER SUN: Right and so we are moving forward with our BMT plan not counting on them making additional improvements.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Without full information. So, how can you - for the DEP, we're also waiting for a study for DEP. This is of grave concern to many residents around infrastructure needs. That study

will not be out till well after this vote. How do you expect this plan to be sound and people to feel confident on it when we also don't have the DEP information on infrastructure needs?

JENNIFER SUN: We are making a commitment within our control of the BMT campus in managing stormwater on site and conforming with the uniformed stormwater rule, so that there is stormwater management.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Trust us because you don't have the information.

JENNIFER SUN: It's not trust us, no, we are following - the DEP regulations to be able to -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, so now we're going to move on to industrial action plan. How are we moving forward with a proposal that does not take into account the industrial action plan that the city is currently engaged in when this is an industrial manufacturing zone?

JENNIFER SUN: The BMT plan is achieving the goals of the industrial action plan, which is that we are making a significant investment -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: We haven't finished it actually.

JENNIFER SUN: I would argue Council Member that simply protecting an area as an industrial business zone alone does not help modernize and support active viable industrial businesses.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Lastly, how do - it's clear that there is a lot of elements that are in process and in order to make sound decisions, we need the real information but we are putting the cart before the horse here. We have a lack of serious information, really important information for a true planning effort here that could inform this plan but you are asking our community to trust us with not a great track record at that.

Lastly, how do you justify this plan as it relates to meeting the mandates of the CLCPA for an environmental justice community?

ANDREW KIMBALL: This plan has enormous environmental justice components. One, you're taking an area that has very little storm surge resilience that was hit very hard by Storm Sandy and creating a comprehensive resiliency plan and network and wall -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: That covers 30 percent of the community.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Correct, because you need to start somewhere. So, is it better to just leave it as it is? I don't think so.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: It's fair but don't call it comprehensive. Call it 30 percent issue.

ANDREW KIMBALL: That creates local jobs for people who need the jobs badly. That creates an all-electric low carbon port that takes trucks off of local street. All of those are incredibly important.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, can you provide a clear breakdown of how this plan meets environmental justice measures for the community in terms of health and wellness in terms of impacts?

JENNIFER SUN: So, Council Member, the way that we understand environmental justice is that it's try to achieve two goals. One is it's reducing environmental harms and two, it's increasing access to resources. And as we have outlined in the BMT plan, we are doing both by reducing truck trips, improving air quality through an all-electric port, increasing access to permanently affordable housing, protecting the neighborhood from coastal flooding and future storm events. Increasing access to waterfront open space. Also quality jobs, so on many fronts, we

are advancing environmental justice goals and we'd be happy to outline that in more detail.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Great, great and then just the last question on this uhm, on this front. Uhm, do you think - you - I guess uhm, in several meetings, several of you have mentioned placing noxious facilities if this plan doesn't move forward on the property on maintaining them on the property. If the taskforce does not vote this out, do you think that that threat is a violation of Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Absolutely not a threat.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Threatening community members that you would keep noxious facilities.

ANDREW KIMBALL: That is a mischaracterization.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Oh okay, so you don't think it's a violation of public trust.

ANDREW KIMBALL: It is an economic reality and you know well what's been on the site for a long time and what is allowed in an IBZ. And so, in order to -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: And so as a public servant, if you know there is a noxious facility abutting a residential place, is it not in our interest as a city to make sure we find a new

location rather than threaten the residents that are faced with that noxious facility and tell them if they don't vote for this plan of luxury housing, that they would in fact be stuck with not only that facility but more.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Council Member, this is the very challenge of balancing an industrial policy and having an IBZ next to a residential community. And that is part of why we believe this plan gets it right. It creates the all-electric port. It invests in an IBZ in ways that I have never seen in 30 years. And creates jobs -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: And you're bringing an additional density of 4,000 luxury units on top of that facility. It's absurd. I mean it is such a contradiction.

ANDREW KIMBALL: With thousands of permanently affordable jobs, excuse me housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I'll pass it over to you and we'll come back.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. We have additional questions from Council Member Hanif.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Thank you. I just want more clarity around why the project isn't going

1 through ULURP? Why not utilize a narrowly tailored
2 GPPP to secure the maritime investments while
3 subjecting any housing proposals to the full ULURP
4 process?
5

6 ANDREW KIMBALL: Thank you for the question.

7 Again, in order to achieve something that hadn't been
8 achieved for 40 years and getting full site control,
9 there was a month long negotiation with the Port
10 Authority and the state to figure out how to unwind
11 this mess and the outcome of that negotiation
12 memorialized and the agreements a year ago May, was
13 to have both sites go through a GPPP together to
14 entitle the uses that were planned and we were very
15 clear about those uses that the Mayor and the
16 Governor wanted to see on this site including massive
17 investments in a new port and a mixed use community
18 at a time we have a housing crisis and that was the
19 deal that we made with the Port Authority.

20 Obviously, the GPPP is used to govern regionally
21 important projects that have regional impact. This
22 is one that has real regional impact because of the
23 Port uses in both places.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: But regarding the housing,
25 you know you raised Gowanus rezoning, that took over

ten years and if there wasn't sufficient community input, we wouldn't have arrived to the project we are building right now. So, it just feels a little short sided that we're building a neighborhood out of the ground in what feels like minutes.

ANDREW KIMBALL: I think it's been very, very comprehensive planning effort with enormous community impact over the last year. But go ahead Jenn.

JENNIFER SUN: Well, I was going to add as somebody who worked for a nonprofit housing development organization before coming back to EDC, I would argue, I would not want to wait ten years for us to deliver more permanently affordable housing. And so, you know we have found a way through this project financing to be able to you know make a strong commitment of a minimum of 35 percent permanently affordable. But also a goal of going higher to 40 percent, which would be over 3,000 units of permanently affordable housing. Plus the offsite you know, preservation and creation that we've talked about without competing for really scarce resources of HPD capital subsidy that's important for that to be invested in neighborhoods elsewhere, that may not have the ability to use this kind of financing model.

So, it supports both permanently affordable housing in this neighborhood where it's needed and elsewhere.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: But how is - can you tell me about HPD's involvement here? Because HPD has like a backlog of projects that need to be built.

JENNIFER SUN: Exactly so we're proposing a method of delivering this permanently affordable housing through cross subsidy that does not then compete with those resources and put that housing in line such that we might have to wait five, ten or more years in order for that housing to come on site.

We're continuing to work very closely with HPD to leverage their programs and to partner with them in the future to use that offsite fund in the most impactful way possible to fill gaps and being able to support their ability to preserve and create affordable housing in CB6 offsite as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I understand that the city and the state and all of the stakeholders like came together and the GPPP was like the best path forward. You know it excludes the local elected officials. I'm happy that we created a taskforce and like, we have very strong community members and leaders who

1 have helped inform this proposal but outside of that,
2 there is no local elected involvement and I think
3 when it comes to housing, with the Council Member
4 having responsibility around land use proposals, uhm,
5 there should be - there should have been a sort of
6 separate housing engagement process because of where
7 we are in the community.
8

9 We're experiencing 63 Tiffany Place, if they're
10 not bought by a nonprofit, these guys are going to
11 have pay market rate and/or leave. So, I just want
12 to bring it up again because the ULURP - it's not
13 perfect. I don't - I am calling for reforms but it
14 at least engages the community in a way that has us
15 listening to them versus us having to listen to the
16 agency representatives.

17 ANDREW KIMBALL: Yeah, just thank you for that
18 comment. I would just say respectfully on examples
19 like 63 Tiffany, having a \$50 million fund that can
20 be deployed in the community to preserve permanently
21 affordable housing or build new affordable housing is
22 a big win out of this project and it is in my
23 experience truly extraordinary that we've had all of
24 the sessions we have had together, as many hours as
25 we have all had to commit to this where you have

1 elected officials city, state and federal, mayor,
2 governor at the table with members of the ILA with
3 leadership of NYCHA, with leadership of Community
4 Board 6, with leadership of other important community
5 organizations, debating this very vision and with a
6 plan that we've made a lot of adjustments on as we've
7 gone through as a result of those discussions and
8 inputs.

9
10 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Uhm, I'd like to know the
11 projected timeline for the public spaces - public
12 access to parks, waterfronts, promenades and open
13 spaces. I don't - I think that those should not be
14 tacked on at the end.

15 JENNIFER SUN: We agree. So, one of our
16 commitments from a phasing perspective is that in the
17 initial phase, we would be prioritizing the creation
18 of an almost two acre neighborhood park. And in
19 response to a lot of taskforce feedback about both
20 creating a larger park at the corner of DeGraw Street
21 and Columbia Street, and then also delivering that
22 along with the housing as a part of the BMT North
23 Phase 1.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Great, thank you. Uhm,
25 I'm going to have to come back to the Concrete

Recycling Facility question. It was not satisfactory.

Closing the Concrete Recycling Facility should not be tied to or tethered to the Brooklyn Marine Terminal Proposal and it feels like what's happening is that we're being told well, this can get removed in days if we come to an agreement with the proposal. Meanwhile, myself, Senator Gounardes, even our congress member Goldman, Joann Simon, we have been by the Concrete Recycling Facility I would say over a dozen times in the span of a very few weeks. I don't want to go back. I would love to go back to see my constituents but I don't want to go back to see to have to rally to close this down and it feels - it's unfair that this suddenly, we can - we're figuring out how to close the Concrete Recycling Facility when there have been harm over the course of a year.

So, it's a public health concern and every elected official that overlaps has called for its closure. Will the site shut down?

ANDREW KIMBALL: Council Member, I appreciate your advocacy and that of your colleagues and I will have that discussion with the people I report to in City Hall.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Uhm, and then finally, what upfront DOT and MTA commitments exist to address the current transportation landscape?

JENNIFER SUN: So, DOT in terms of their specific commitments, they've committed to studying the closure of the on- north bound onramp at Atlantic Avenue as a part of the BQE Central Project. They've also gone through a very extensive public engagement process previously where they put forward alternatives for standardizing the Staten Island Bound ramps but also looking at new configurations that achieve a few goals, including unifying Van [INAUDIBLE 02:27:47] making that park safer to access as well as improving the Atlantic Avenue intersection for pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

So, that's a part of their BQE central project that they're still committed to advancing later this fall. And with the MTA, at the request of the taskforce of the taskforce, we have a written commitment from the MTA to continue their planning collaboration with us and DOT as a part of a cross agency group so that should there be an affirmative taskforce vote and this moves forward in the GPPP process, we continue our transit planning and earnest

and as that plan becomes more real post GPPP approval. The MTA will take you know more steps forward in making commitments toward improving bus service and extending bus routes to improve transit access.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Yeah, I would urge that we uh, we start with the transportation networking because the people need it right away and if there are immediate or like short term changes that can be made, I would urge that you take to the MTA that this is serious. Not, not - having to walk ten minutes or more to get to the train, B61 bus, forget about it. This isn't great. I don't want my constituents to have to wait for this entire project to be done for them to have a network, a better network transportation system.

JENNIFER SUN: We recognize the importance of improving that transit access, which is why we've made that \$25 million total commitment towards an electric shuttle and it's a bridge of rather than doing nothing is simultaneously what we're continuing to partner with the MTA. We put that electric shuttle service in place so that we can at an earlier time deliver some transit access improvements to

existing residents, including Red Hook houses residents.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: How soon would that be? Like is that after the GPPP?

JENNIFER SUN: As proposed it is when we have proceeds from the first phase of BMT. So, let's say you know starting in 2029 or 2030.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay thank you. For a final round of questions for Council Member Avilés and then we will move to public testimony.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You all are lucky, Chair Farias is like wrap it up. Uhm, no we have a lot of public testimony, which is really important and speaks to why this is so critical for our community. Just for the record, for clarity, there is no signed agreement with UPS currently on that property?

ANDREW KIMBALL: There is an agreement that we've been negotiating back and forth.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah but there is no signed agreement.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, it is not part of this plan. It's just in kind of rhetorical conversation but there is currently no signed

1 agreement where you could say, you vote for this
2 plan, we'll get rid of this. We won't include this
3 in the property as a bargaining chip? If it's not
4 part of the plan, it cannot be a bargaining chip is
5 what I want to understand.
6

7 ANDREW KIMBALL: It is part of this plan.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: But you have no
9 agreement.

10 ANDREW KIMBALL: There is an agreement to take it
11 into GPPP. The agreement with UPS is around proceeds
12 more than anything else.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay. I don't have a lot
14 of time so-

15 ANDREW KIMBALL: And ultimately the taskforce
16 makes the decision on the plan.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: We're going to move on.
18 Yeah, okay. So there's no agreement on the plan. It
19 is merely a not - it's in discussion. So, in terms
20 of uhm how do you justify this process that ignores
21 the city's coastal zone management and waterfront
22 revitalization programs?

23 JENNIFER SUN: This plan actually achieves goals
24 related to that plan of improving public waterfront
25 access where appropriate. While also not interfering

with a modern port, being able to function more competitively in the future.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Great, so since we can't go through that more specifically, I'd love EDC to really outline in very specific terms how this plan actually meets the goals of the waterfront revitalization plan.

Similarly, can you just explain how disregarding - DCP found that Red Hook was a viable port and the area was determined to be a significant maritime industrial area. Similarly, that was the state departments determination of a significant maritime industrial area. How does this plan comport with SMIA's?

JENNIFER SUN: Through a combination of the public funding that we've secured from the city and from the federal government through grant funding and then by putting a long term RFP and lease out to secure a future port operator that can then bring private investment to the port. We're meeting the goals of the SMIA by modernizing of course so that it is more viable.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, SMIA included luxury residential in it?

JENNIFER SUN: Again, just purely looking at the SMIA and the intention of supporting -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I think it's just a yes or no.

JENNIFER SUN: Viable industry, we are achieving those goals. Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay so yes or no. SMIA on the record, you believe SMIA includes luxury residential.

JENNIFER SUN: I'm not saying that. I'm saying that it meets the goals of the SMIA though.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: No, my question is, does SMIA designation include luxury residential development.

JENNIFER SUN: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Thank you. No, it does not. Uhm, in terms of uh let's see, uhm why did you - why did EDC think that four months was an appropriate planning timeframe for 122 acre property? And then I'd like to know why you thought that was appropriate and then why you thought eight months, nine months was an appropriate timeframe for planning for a complex property of this nature.

1 ANDREW KIMBALL: The eagerness to move forward
2 with this project Council Member is overwhelmingly
3 driven by the fact that every month that we wait,
4 there continues to be degregation to this waterfront
5 asset and you know just a year and a half ago, piers
6 9A and B got condemned.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Right but you're
8 currently repairing the Port right now for the
9 investment that the city made.

10 ANDREW KIMBALL: We don't have enough money to
11 repair the Port.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You are making repairs
13 currently.

14 ANDREW KIMBALL: We're making some very small
15 investments to make sure like \$2 million on Pier 10
16 that we don't have to close down the Container Port,
17 which would be a disaster for 175 union members.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Right and based on -
19 right and based on earlier testimony, you noted that
20 the remaining piers have an eight to ten year
21 operational window.

22 ANDREW KIMBALL: They do and we're respecting the
23 leases that are on those sites, so Manhattan Pier is
24 there -
25

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, the eagerness of eight months versus four months for a complex process and a complex property and piers that in your technical assessment could last up to ten years. There's a huge delta there that is a significant challenge that is not being explained by your justification.

ANDREW KIMBALL: So that was one factor. The second factor was the fact that we got this historically large grant with a vision and the longer you wait to follow up on that grant and get a city match to it, which is required in the city budget, right? Which we had to get in this budget.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Which we have.

ANDREW KIMBALL: Which we now have gotten, uhm meant that we wanted to move quickly. We spent many of the first months talking about the Port and that was very positive. It was clear to us at the end of us and at the urging of you and taskforce leadership, you said you needed more time for the rest of the plan and that's why we agreed to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Oh especially since the technical assessments were being done while those conversations were happening and taskforce members

1 didn't actually have much of the information. So, in
2 terms of the grant, which we are delighted. We don't
3 know if we'll get it in this Administration and
4 several members have asked for the milestones that
5 EDC needs to achieve for that grant. I believe we
6 just received a summary but not the actual
7 application milestones that - and timeframes around
8 that. Can you just provide that to Council?

10 JENNIFER SUN: We can provide that again Council
11 Member. We had provided it to the taskforce and it
12 was the same schedule and milestones that we had
13 submitted to the US DOT and Mirad(SP?) as a part of
14 our grant obligation process.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah.

16 JENNIFER SUN: It isn't a summary; it's literally
17 the same milestones.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Well, we'll look at it
19 again. In terms of - can you provide to the Council
20 an accounting of consulting contracts that you
21 developed throughout this taskforce process along
22 with the different roles of the consultants? The
23 costs that each of them had and whether or not any of
24 them were required to sign an NDA?

JENNIFER SUN: We can provide an accounting of how we spent the planning funds for the project.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Great and we'd like to see that itemized in each answer. Did you require any of your consultants on this project to sign NDA's?

JENNIFER SUN: I think we might have required them to sign an NDA initially in the procurement but I'll have to confirm.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay. Uhm, okay, I think you know just for the record before we turn it over to public comment, I think it's important to note several things. Again, we - I think there's real consensus on this taskforce around the importance of the Port and a modern Port and a working maritime. I think that is not what is in disagreement. What is in disagreement is all the other things that are being introduced here on the backs of the residents that this will directly impact with very little city investment and state investment.

Additionally, this trading that the EDC and this approach to offering trinkets to various stakeholders in exchange to their vote is appalling. Among them, the NYCHA investment, 100 percent New York City

1 should provide not only the \$200 million because the
2 physical needs assessment for just Red Hook West is
3 one billion dollars. The city 100 percent should be
4 putting that forward immediately because NYCHA
5 residents are enduring living in apartments that are
6 not well maintained and the conditions are appalling.

7 That investment should not be predicated on this
8 vote. It creates divisiveness in the community and
9 it is a very poor tactic that I wish you would stop.
10 I think there are a good number of also benefits
11 here. Again, that I would like to know how much
12 luxury residential would you have to develop just for
13 the Port alone. How many units would that be? Of
14 the 7,000 that is in your proposal, how many would
15 just subsidize the modernization of the Port? Not
16 all the other Lu Lu's of the \$250,000 this and the
17 pretty parks, just the Port itself.

18 ANDREW KIMBALL: So, to go back to the overall
19 numbers, when we were able to introduce the \$1.3
20 billion a pilot or equivalent thereof, if you just
21 think about the port, the base investment being \$1.75
22 billion, the cross subsidy then from the housing is
23 in the \$400 million range. So, if you want to look
24 at the math that way. The funds for the housing
25

remember also has to go to build the base infrastructure to lift the site out of the floodplain, create 35 acres of green space, a bike lane and all of those other public benefits.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: And I'd like you - I'm really asking a very specific question. How much housing would you need to fully fund the modernization of the Port? Not all the extra additional things. So we have one - your estimation is \$1.75 billion for the Port, which I'm sure there are many, many opinions on that cost estimate. The city has invested how much did you say for I should know this given how many times we've talked about it. The public investment. The public investment, the 163 the 10.

ANDREW KIMBALL: The city committed \$80 million when we announced this project. Added \$109 million to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Right, what's the total again? You said in your testimony.

ANDREW KIMBALL: It's 360 when you add in the federal commitments.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Alright, so we got a billion dollars. How much housing do we need to build to raise a billion dollars?

ANDREW KIMBALL: You need the housing plan that we have.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, 7,000, your contention is 7,000 units equals one billion dollars.

ANDREW KIMBALL: 7,700, with 35 percent permanently affordable and the balance of the market rate Council Member is what plugs the hole. The \$400 million I just described, the hole on the Port, plus the base infrastructure for the rest of the plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Plus a significant - plus a lot more. Many acreage of park space, building the infrastructure on a UPS site that has no infrastructure at all. There are a lot of additional costs that are not related to the Port that is embedded in this analysis, which is problematic. What I am asking and what many taskforce members have asked is, a clear financial model of what it is. What is the baseline that we require to develop the Port that we can all agree on and then, take time to develop the rest of the vision in a way that takes into account climate, transportation studies,

1 industrial business action plan, SMIA and all the
2 other policy frameworks that the city proports to
3 follow to do a plan that meets or at best tries to
4 meet as much of that as possible. So, I think - I
5 don't think you have an answer to this question.

6
7 ANDREW KIMBALL: We do and we've presented it to
8 the taskforce several times.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You have not sir.

10 ANDREW KIMBALL: And we're happy to again. We
11 have.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You have not sir.

13 ANDREW KIMBALL: And we have it in detail.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: You have not answered
15 that question and I find it appalling that you would
16 sit there and actually say that. I think with that,
17 I will turn it over.

18 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Chair. Uh, thank
19 you Council Member Avilés and Hanif for staying with
20 me during this process and for EDC for your Q&A and
21 testimony today.

22 I just want to highlight for folks, you know I
23 appreciate the engagement here and I'm as the Chair
24 of this Committee working to check a balance between
25

oversight of the agency itself but also the community voices who are waiting for almost three hours now.

It seems like the dialogue needs to continue as we approach the vote next week and I'll follow up from the Committee with additional questions and clarifying questions to you folks on the panel and the panel is now adjourned.

We are going to open up the hearing for public testimony. I remind members of the public that this is a government proceeding and that decorum shall be observed at all times, including in this transition, this room may remain silent.

As such, members of the public again shall remain silent at all times. The witness table is reserved for people who wish to testify. No video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table. Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant at Arms for inclusion in the hearing record.

If you wish to speak at today's hearing and you have not already done so, please fill out an appearance card with the Sergeant at Arms and wait to be recognized by myself. When recognized, you will

1 have two minutes to speak on today's topic, the
2 Brooklyn Marine Terminal Redevelopment Plan. If you
3 have a written statement or additional written
4 testimony, you wish to submit for the record, please
5 provide a copy of that testimony to the Sergeant at
6 Arms here in this room. You may also email written
7 testimony to testimony@council.nyc.gov within 72
8 hours of the close of this hearing. Audio and video
9 recordings are not accepted.
10

11 For in person panelists, please come up to the
12 table once your name has been called. Reminder,
13 again you have two minutes to speak only. I have
14 over 100 people in line to testify today and we want
15 to respect everyone's time for showing up and waiting
16 patiently.

17 Now, I'm going to call - Sergeants? Can you
18 please lower your voices or take the conversation
19 into the hallway? I'm not going to call our first
20 panel, a representative from Brooklyn Borough
21 President Antonio Reynoso's Office, if they are still
22 with us.

23 Great, seeing that they are not, I will now call
24 virtual panelists, Carlos Menchaca, former New York
25 City Council Member.

CARLOS MENCHACA: Hi, can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yes.

CARLOS MENCHACA: I want to say thank you to Chair Farias and members of the Committee including Avilés and Hanif.

My name is Carlos Menchaca, I'm a former New York City Council Member for District 38 and I represented Sunset Park and Red Hook. Two neighborhoods that long fought for environmental justice, good jobs and real public process.

In 2025 - sorry 2015, I helped read the redevelopment of the South Brooklyn Marine Terminal SBMT. That effort centered a public input, underwent Council oversight through a special land use action, approving a master lease on the 72 acres that was 39 years long. Which also allows the Council to review it after 39 years. This project delivered offshore wind jobs and infrastructure to Brooklyn's industrial waterfront.

What we accomplished at SBMT proves that accountability through public process and success are not mutually exclusive. Our waterfronts deserve and require City Council oversight. The kind that only ULURP can provide. The BMT redevelopment plan before

us today is blatantly circumventing that model.

Council Member Avilés rightly addressed so many issues. Big props to her and most importantly, the threats that keep coming from EDC if the plan doesn't go through but for the vote that is upcoming. This is not good faith. In fact, it's a departure from every principle of good governance. It's hard not to feel a little déjà vu honestly. Mr. Andrew Kimball, the new leader at EDC has a long history with mega projects. He started under Dan Dockeroff and worked for Bloomberg during the failed BID for the bringing the Olympics to the city.

Mr. Kimball ran the Brooklyn Navy Yard during a period of massive, billion dollar -

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time is expired.

CARLOS MENCHACA: By visionary mayor and the Council - Can I finish this, it's a minute more?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yes you can Carlos.

CARLOS MENCHACA: Then came industry city, where he pitched the largest private mega rezoning scheme in an industrial zone that collapsed under public scrutiny. Now, he returns to the city at EDC which much more wisdom dealing with the City Council, undertaking one of the most ambitious and opaque

public land transactions that you just heard in recent history. Leveraging public assets without public financing transparency or legislative accountability by going through GPPP. Asking you to trust that this time, it's going to be different. This time it will work.

Now, don't let the foxes design the chicken coop. And vividly today, EDC said the following, there's no precedent for NYC EDC, the city EDC to take a GPPP process led usually by a state agency. There's a reason for that. In a noble plan, piers will fall into the river because city investment won't come. That's not a financial issue. That's a leadership issue that we are missing in this mayoral administration. This will change with new leadership coming next. There's also an issue I see with the master lease. At SEMPT we have 39 years. It's unclear how many times this project will come back before the City Council.

EDC also made connections to their proposed plan that will look like ULURP and they gave an example of an environmental review. It's not the same thing. The state process bypasses local thresholds that are actually higher. The bottom line, the deal bypasses

1 ULURP. It cuts you, the City Council out. It places
2 critical maritime land under a General Project Plan,
3 GPP where unelected setting and season actors chosen
4 by the Mayor dictate the future of this waterfront.
5 This should be a concern for every single one of us.
6 Our communities deserve better than a taskforce built
7 by the very people that stand to profit. Public land
8 deserves a public process. This is a pivotal moment.
9 I urge the Council to assert its oversight authority,
10 demand that EDC return to a full ULURP process and
11 endorse a community led vision rooted in maritime,
12 industrial and climate resilient infrastructure.
13 Build a Port of the future but let's build it
14 together. Thank you and I'm done.

16 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much. Thank
17 you for your testimony. Do we have any questions for
18 this panelist? Seeing none, I'm going to call panels
19 up to the front. Evelyn Pope, Michael Pope, Tom
20 Barry and Eliza Davidson.

21 You can begin when you are ready. Make sure you
22 turn the microphone on okay.

23 EVELYN POPE: Hello, I am Evelyn Saylee Pope. I
24 am seven and a half years old. I go to PS2. I live
25 on Columbia Street Waterfront district. I am here

because I want to build a new park at the space across from my home as a part of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal is [INAUDIBLE 02:52:40].

Reason number one, a lot of kids live nearby, so if there was a new park, kids would be happy because there would be a new place to play.

Reason number two is we could make a garden and there would be more green. I also wish there was more opportunities for me and my friends at school to share our thoughts and opinions because every voice should be heard small or big, every voice can be heard. Thank you for your time. I hope you consider about making a park for kids in this community. Thank you Evelyn SP.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay any questions for this panelist with a big voice?

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I just want to say Evelyn, thank you so much for your testimony. Your voice is very important and will be considered and we are so proud that you are here and we want to encourage you and all your fellow students in the school to continue to weigh in around things that are important to you in your community so thank you so much.

UNIDENTIFIED: [INAUDIBLE 02:53:53].

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. I didn't grant permission for that but I'll allow it, since she's seven.

We appreciate my soft side being able to come out in a hearing. I will call the next round of panelists otherwise I have to come back in. Susan Povien(SP?), Povich. I'm reading your handwriting folks. Carolina Salguero. Once again, I'm reading from the cards that you're filling out. Victoria Alexander. Lastly, I'd like to call up Damon Gilbert. You can begin when you are ready.

SUSAN POVICH: Is it on? Okay, good morning Council Members. My name is Susan Povich, I'm Chair of the Red Hook Business Alliance serving Red Hook's manufacturing retail service arts and nonprofit community. Red Hook was built on industry and maritime activity and it is essential to our economy. The BMT is Brooklyn's last working Port, its critical infrastructure that should anchor marine logistics Blue Highways and commercial use. Stripping industrial potential undermines the city's climate and transportation goals.

1 The easiest testimony today wasn't just
2 misleading, it was fiction. They talk about
3 community engagement but there was none. No real
4 dialogue, no honest exchange, just presentations, not
5 conversations. And in the taskforce, which I happen
6 to have a seat on, it was worse. No debate, no
7 discussion, we were talked at not talked with.
8 Questions went unanswered, concerns ignored. EDC has
9 never presented a serious industrial plan for the
10 BMT. They have not gone after existing grants for -
11 they haven't gone after existing open grants and they
12 haven't given us a plan to submit for the EIS that is
13 a modern industrial use. They are just simply
14 leaving it sit there with piers falling into the
15 water.

17 This isn't responsible planning. It's not asset
18 stewardship and it's certainly not a maritime for a
19 strategy. Related companies has been lobbying the
20 mayor to convert this site to a housing since last
21 fall from where we stand, this looks like a real
22 estate deal disguised as a public good. The Council
23 must step in. Defend our IBZ, demand independent
24 governments, insist on funding for impacted
25 businesses. We haven't said that none of the

businesses that are in Red Hook will survive the construction. We are built on contaminated land fill. You have to go down 165 feet to the Bedrock. The neighborhood is barely withstanding the testing pits for the brand new public school. The maritime public school that we're building at 80 Richard Street are already showing signs of fatigue and cracking. No studies have been done. I urge you to step in and protect our neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: You can begin.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: I wish I had time to respond to what the EDC said you know. So, my name is Carolina Salguero from the Maritime nonprofit Portside New York.

I have 28 years on New York City's focus on New York City's, focus on New York City's waterfront maritime as reporter, advocate, a boater, running Portside New York was sponsored for a ship of 172 feet long. So, speaking as a former journalist, EDC is distributing misinformation and disinformation, ignoring and erasing information and this applies to the maritime concepts and the whole process at really an appalling level. On the EDC's BMT plan does conflict with DCP's waterfront revitalization

1 program. I just want to say that. I don't have
2 enough time to rebut everything that EDC said. That
3 was released in 2016 and maritime uses have surged
4 since then.

5 The EDC is erasing maritime tenants at BMT and
6 their presentations including Port side, multiple
7 other ones including Vein Brothers Fuel Barges. That
8 company, they don't have any provision for them
9 staying there. They actually fuel the ships that
10 come into the cruise terminal container port and that
11 to me like shows the incredible disconnect between
12 the promise of the Blue Highways and the Port yada
13 yada, yada and what they actually have in the plan.

14 They're also talking about the Blue Highway but
15 they're only referring to it as kind of pick up and
16 drop off and so those boats need space for home port
17 service repair areas, I mean actually port side for
18 20 years has had a plan for like short leg version
19 truck stop for tugboats. That would match perfectly
20 there but they're not putting anything in there.

21 The rendering I asked to be dropped off you know
22 to show you; this shows you how unmaritime their
23 proposal are. I mean this is just - there's no real
24 use here. So, there's just like a lot of words.

There's really acute need for maritime space and the EDC denies that. They actually rebutted me when I said that in the all hands BMT meeting last week okay, it's just false. Work boats like tugs and barbers are stuck on mornings due to the lack of pier space and home ports.

Due to lack of space, historic ships have left New York City or been scrapped okay. So, was our country prepared to celebrate its 250th birthday next year? There's been an event, since 250 they are struggling to find pier space in New York to come. So, is that my bell of out of time?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yes, your time has expired.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Can I say one thing?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Is it a line?

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Well, it's like one sentence.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yup.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Another reason not to believe EDC promises right now is the history of Portside New York. They promised a space to make a maritime center as a community give back and benefit in 2008 and have yet to do it. Were even only there because Carlos Menchaca got us out of the container board.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, thank you so much for your testimony.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: You can begin when you are ready.

VICTORIA ALEXANDER: The lights not on. Okay, there we go. Thank you Chair and members of the Committee for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Victoria Alexander and I represent Resilient Red Hook. A community organization that emerged in the wake of Super Storm Sandy. We work towards a sustainable and equitable Red Hook.

As a member of the BMAT taskforce advisory group for waterfront environmental justice and resilience. We have significant concerns about the BMT proposal. With sidelines resilient infrastructure and a community led planning to rush through a project that prioritizes a large scale of residential upzoning. This is not the Port first plan that we were all promised. Resiliency cannot be an afterthought; it must be the foundation of any city project in the face of climate change.

Currently, the BMT proposal lacks a comprehensive neighborhood wide plan for coastal resiliency,

1 instead taking piecemeal approach that creates new
2 vulnerabilities outside the project footprint.
3 Essential feature is the 16 to 21 foot elevated
4 platform that BMT parcel appears to technically
5 unfeasible and is contextually disconnected from the
6 local typography, water table and storm surge risks.
7 Planners need to incorporate more rigorous data based
8 on up to date water table maps and comprehensive
9 velocity zone analysis without evidenced based
10 planning and holistic approach this \$800 million
11 investment may balloon to \$2 billion. Placing public
12 finances and climate safety at risk at a time when
13 federal funding for climate resiliency continues to
14 be dismantled.
15

16 This plan squanders our chance to build New York
17 City's green economy. New York City's maritime
18 industrial land is a limited and invaluable resource
19 and EDC's plan promises to privatize 5 percent of the
20 remaining city owned portfolio. The development of
21 the offshore wind industry in Sunset Park and
22 citywide initiatives like the Blue Highway plan to
23 prove that these maritime sites are essential, not
24 only for a climate adaptation but also for national
25 security, local supply chain and job creation and

prepping us for something called the carbon pulse.

If you don't know it, you should look into it.

We deserve a transparent and inclusive planning process. The EDC is using a general project frame to bypass a ULURP, reducing the ability to conduct meaningful community engagement.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much. I am going to turn it over to Council Member Avilés for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I guess I'd like to hear as distinctly as possible. Given what you know about this proposal and the fact that you all are business owners, residents, nonprofit providers, what will be the impacts of this proposal as you see fit?

SUSAN POVICH: I would like to speak on behalf of the businesses of Red Hook. Red Hook was destroyed after Hurricane Sandy. I personally moved to Red Hook 30 years ago. I own the Red Hook Lobster Pound. I've had it for 16 years. In the ensuing 30 years, I've watched the effort of small business grow and thrive but we don't thrive. We only make money three months a year. We have our commercial business and our manufacturing business base that operates 12 months a year.

No one would know about Red Hook if it wasn't for the small business community. We're the ones that created the beautiful place that everybody wants to come down to. That and some of our very, very amazing land owners like the O'Conner's. The business community will not survive. We might have businesses but it's not the ones that work so hard after Sandy. We will not survive 15 years of construction. We will not survive 15 years of sewers being pulled up. Frankly, most of our buildings will suffer vulnerabilities, major vulnerabilities and they will probably fall down.

Councilwoman Hanif, I used to live on Carroll Street and I was there when the building collapsed and the family was killed. It's because of - and that happened because of the BQE rumblings next door. Our current housing stock, the charm and the beauty of Red Hook will be gone. It will not survive. The kind of piledriving that they have to do.

I personally have asked for geological surveys. I mean you all have sat in the taskforce with me. You know what I ask for. I've asked for geological surveys. I asked for a business mitigation fund to mitigate for - to mitigate what's going to happen to

these businesses. People aren't going to come to Red Hook. We only make money 12 weeks a year. It's over. This is a neighborhood killing proposal period, end of conversation.

VICTORIA ALEXANDER: I would like to add that there will be massive speculation that will happen throughout the area because of this proposal and trigger huge amounts of displacement. Red Hook is actually kind of affordable in some cases. There are still apartments you can find in the \$2,000 you know low \$2,000's which is not in most of the surrounding areas, you cannot find that right now because there are still family owned property that you know from generational you know inheritance, and they get to you know have a thriving family community there from their investments a long time and a lot of the families have been there for 20, 30, 40 years. And so, I think that we lose the fabric of our community because none of my neighbors will be there anymore. And I've also lived - Susan and I have a very long relationship and so do Carolina. I've known a lot of people in this room for over a decade because I've lived there for 22 years and that's the kind of community that Red Hook is. That will not exist

anymore. The people that I know and love will no longer be there if they are not homeowners.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: I want to agree with what Alexa said about the importance of repairing NYCHA apartments. I personally in Portside have no role in sort of inland housing. That situation distressed me so much for years. I've gone to plenty of meetings and as a society, we are overdue to fix those apartment and then to fix the Administration with all of its gaslighting and corruption and everything else. I just want to state that that's not an endorsement to this project but I mean, when I hear the mayor announce it's going to be \$402 million to improve 5th Avenue, high end shops in Midtown, I mean I'm appalled. I'm deeply appalled by that kind of thing and you Council Members, I know it's always a struggle during budget season but I implore you always you know to fight to fix this NYCHA houses.

In terms of affordability, I can't afford any apartment anywhere in Red Hook. I remember when I got pushed out of one. I was paying about \$860 in 2006. Two and a half years later, that was \$2,500. As some indication. We have plenty of volunteers and people attending our programs because there's such

1 limited rent stabilized - so few stabilized units in
2 Red Hook because the buildings aren't that big. I
3 know plenty of cases - I just asked a women because
4 of all of this. I think hers went up from \$2,500 to
5 \$4,000 when a new landlord you know bought the
6 building and flipped it and that kind of thing has
7 been going on a lot.

8
9 So, as a person having watched gentrification on
10 the city but also studying it on the waterfront, you
11 know because of my interest leading up to founding of
12 Portside. The luxury housing EDC is proposing will
13 immediately gentrify Red Hook, which will lead to
14 high displacement of people renting and Portside did
15 a story map so if you want data on who is owning and
16 renting and what actually people are paying and the
17 degree of rent burdened, we have it published. We
18 can send it to anybody.

19 But it was clear there were many more renters in
20 Red Hook that I had realized despite all the
21 gentrification. The northern part of the Columbia
22 Waterfront District, over 40 percent of people are
23 rent burdened to give you an idea. The other thing
24 that I think will happen is the industrial businesses
25 in Red Hook that are not in the footprint are at risk

1 because that has been the history in this city. So,
2 and then it starts pushing, pushing, pushing and then
3 when the EDC says, uhm oh yeah, we're going to make a
4 pedestrian focused or pedestrian whatever it is kind
5 of thing, developers or maybe the luxury condo owners
6 themselves just buy some industrial property off the
7 BMT footprint and put up some parking garages for
8 their cars. I mean, get real.

10 And the EDC is acting like they have this
11 incredible control and a little silo and we're
12 supposed to believe them. Other things I'll tell
13 you, if this goes through, Portside is dead because
14 EDC has no interest in having us survive because
15 they've been very honest about their faults for quite
16 a while and I've been saying it over and over again,
17 they promised us a home. Don't believe them because
18 they didn't deliver.

19 So, they're not actually you know delivering that
20 home, they're stupid enough really to continue to
21 deny us the space and everything we propose to do is
22 what they're claiming they're going to do now with
23 this plan.

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Can I ask a quick - a very quick question. How many of you serve on one of the Advisory groups?

CAROLINA SALGUERO: I'm advisory.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Both of you. What was your experience of the Advisory group that they touted here and the incredible engagement that happened there?

VICTORIA ALEXANDER: There was no feedback loop. They had meetings where they talked at us and there was no way to give information. We took it upon ourselves and wrote several resiliency - uhm kind of had a meeting with some experts and gave some specifics and I sent it to everybody on the taskforce. I don't know if anybody has even read it but there's no way for me to push information up. They just - it's a one way street.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Yeah, they don't - often don't request you know answer uhm regional requests for information. In one case, I emailed asking for that federal DOT mega grant that people are so often talking about. I got, I didn't know whether it was part of it or a synthesis or sort of something, an email from NEGRA copying some other people and I was

1 told not to share it. I'm like what kind of advisor
2 am I? What kind of process are we in if I can't
3 share that?
4

5 So, I immediately wrote back, I don't understand
6 why the expense of public funds can't be shared.
7 This is not a private business you know RFP response
8 and I never received an answer. You know that kind
9 of sort of thing. Also a rasher again, so when I
10 spoke up, I think it's the second advisory group
11 meeting of ours January 22 and I had some questions
12 about the free home port installation and then at two
13 points I was affirming Portside's proposals and
14 experiences onsite.

15 They had a special breakout section to answer or
16 rebut the implications of my questions about the free
17 home part but they had erased everything, did not
18 include everything I said about Portside. And I
19 actually flagged them on that.

20 The other thing I got to tell you, they called
21 them summary not minutes. They don't state the
22 speakers name, so it's really impossible to use them
23 as minutes because it says AG member said, AG member
24 said. It's reasonable when there's a whole flurry of
25 discussions say members discussed but there's no -

1 they give you an attendee list but you can't attach
2 who said what and I pointed that out too. I said, if
3 the CEO of the company running the container port
4 says something about container ports to me, I asses
5 that differently from the potted plant - I didn't say
6 potted plant, sorry I'm freelancing now. But you
7 know somebody else and so, there's a reason why you
8 state a persons name when you do meeting minutes and
9 it's just a cascade of stuff like this of erasing,
10 denying, yeah.

12 SUSAN POVICH: From the taskforce perspective,
13 I've been asking for the financial and marketing and
14 demographical studies that would support a 400 room
15 hotel. You might not be familiar with the sort of
16 cost of these cruises but the Meraviglia, our largest
17 boat, the boat that causes the traffic apocalypse,
18 it's a very, very budget conscious traveler. I am on
19 the Facebook groups. They are staying in \$69 hotel
20 rooms and they're arguing that \$200 parking for the
21 week is too much. These people are not going to stay
22 in this New York City hotel right there.

23 I'm concerned about the hotel failing and
24 becoming a shelter. I'm concerned about this entire
25 project failing. I'm concerned about my neighborhood

1 failing because of the project and I'm also concerned
2 about my personal business failing because no one is
3 going to want to come to Red Hook while this goes on
4 and our businesses don't have capital projects like
5 UPS. We can't let a site sit empty. When I fail,
6 you're going to lose 90 jobs. My servers make \$3,000
7 a week. There's not a single person in my restaurant
8 that makes less than \$25 an hour. Those jobs are
9 gone.
10

11 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Council Member Hanif.

12 CAROLINA SALGUERO: Oh can I just say one other
13 piece of information?

14 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm sorry, I'm going to have
15 to stop you. I have Council Member Hanif who has
16 questions and I have to move onto the next panel.

17 CAROLINA SALGUERO: Yup, okay, alright.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I just wanted to learn
19 more about the advisory group. Thanks Council Member
20 Avilés for touching on it but what was decision
21 making like? Just tell us what was happening in
22 these meetings.

23 SUSAN POVICH: We weren't asked to make any
24 decisions. We were never given any questions. They
25 just presented what they were doing and doing it for,

1 resiliency and waterfront and environmental justice
2 but what they're doing, there isn't any environmental
3 justice as far as I can tell in this plan, it's only
4 resiliency and there was a lot of comments about the
5 other groups saying you know, we don't have a way to
6 participate in this and then a lot of groups that
7 aren't even familiar with Red Hook saying, we're not
8 comfortable speaking for Red Hook because we're not
9 local experts on it. So, the other people like
10 [INAUDIBLE 03:12:47] project, NYCHA, NYPEL, the other
11 resiliency members of this advisory committee, didn't
12 feel comfortable speaking. And then also, we weren't
13 asked questions. We were given the LEGO and nobody
14 wanted to participate because they felt it was a
15 false premise but there wasn't a way to - they didn't
16 use our expertise at all. They didn't ask us
17 anything. I felt like it was just their first show
18 and it was a really disappointing process as somebody
19 that participates. I go to a lot of conferences and
20 part of roundtables. My husband works in restorative
21 justice and creates space to really hear people.
22 There was no space to be heard.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: And was there uhm, was
24 there somebody from BMT who was facilitating this or?
25

SUSAN POVICH: The EDC was there.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Oh okay.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Also, the structure is EDC is there and also WXY but it's extraordinarily facilitated. Like, they ask a question and please don't speak too long. I remember the first advisory group meeting and I'm in the one that's Industry Maritime Workforce, Local Small Business then they added the BMT Tenants to it, which by the way is not all the BMT tenants. But - and I remember we had this awkward discussion about workforce and then somebody and I forget which person it was honestly said, so the EDC by the way has selected all these people. The community, you can't decide that yourselves - so someone who's professionally in workforce but not maritime workforce said, "I don't really know how to discuss this because I'm not a maritime person and that to me right away, first meeting, showed the flaws of the EDC model.

So, and that's not to take anything away from their expertise or the quality of what they do at their location but they're not maritime people. And so these highly and also these siloed groups and everything else. It just - it doesn't flow and I'm

1 glad Victoria brought up in the all hands meeting
2 last week, the comparison of a different, completely
3 different, really effective state funded process,
4 which was the New York Rising process after Hurricane
5 Sandy.
6

7 That model was they funded consultants to work
8 with the community and closely and they did reports.
9 We all discussed something and they did reports based
10 on what we wanted to learn more about. We had top
11 shelf consultants working with the community to
12 figure out how to spend \$3 million and of course,
13 being a much greater, much longer list.

14 I want to say what I was trying to say earlier,
15 the question, another question I haven't had answered
16 which I think is absolutely significant to understand
17 the EDC's effectiveness or as Andrew Kimball put it,
18 crazily enough to me, "you now have a more
19 responsible manager." "You have a more responsible
20 manager now."

21 I asked for an accounting of their revenue. In
22 the 20 years they've managed Atlantic Basin, what's
23 your revenue net and gross for every year including
24 the formerly car race and they never answered that.
25 Now, I can tell you that the way they have not been a

responsible manager, they have actually driven tenants away.

So, I don't know if they're going to say this site is underutilized, definitely going to be better utilized but they have actually not been good landlords or stewards or economic developers.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Okay, thank you folks for your testimony.

CAROLINA SALGUERO: Thank you all.

VICTORIA ALEXANDER: Can I just say one thing about the New York Rising Committee? That was an amazing -

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm sorry, I really have to move on. This is panel 2 guys.

VICTORIA ALEXANDER: They did it well.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: You can support that with additional testimony. You have 72 hours to submit additional testimony. We're now going to finally move to Panel 3. I'm going to call Phaedra Thomas, Frank Clarke, Madeline Appelbaum and CH Robert Guddahl.

And while folks are sitting down, reminder, you can speak for two minutes and send us testimony

1 additionally testimony@council.nyc.gov. You may
2 begin.
3

4 UNIDENTIFIED: I am not Phaedra Thomas. I was
5 asked to read from her testimony, so I'm going to
6 read in her voice.

7 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: State your name for the
8 record.

9 BARBARA SCHULMAN: My name is Barbara Schulman;
10 I'm a resident of Red Hook.

11 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And you're speaking on
12 behalf of Phaedra Thomas.

13 BARBARA SCHULMAN: Phaedra Thomas.

14 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you.

15 BARBARA SCHULMAN: My name is Phaedra Thomas and
16 I worked in maritime and industrial development in
17 the South Brooklyn area for about 10 years, ending in
18 2008 as the former Executive Director of Southwest
19 Brooklyn Industrial Development Corporation.

20 During that time I engaged in academic and
21 government sponsored planning initiatives that dealt
22 with freight transportation planning and was part of
23 a group of stakeholders that stopped EDC from
24 developing housing at the Red Hook Port the 1st time
25 around.

The Red Hook Port and upland property is too important of a puzzle piece to the city's long term freight transportation needs and plans, to be compromised. This current EDC proposal will not only compromise this site's ability to reduce truck traffic throughout our city through its unequaled geographic location in relation to our highway system and piers, it will also set a uniquely terrible precedent in Industrial Business Zones, where the city is on record stating it will not support residential rezonings on IBZ's, as our city's remaining industrial real estate has been critically diminished.

Simply put, forcing a residential Zoning change outside of ULURP process in a city-designated Industrial Business Zone and Significant Maritime Industrial Area, SMIA, will actually hinder our ability to develop a Green Port of the future, and will certainly reduce The Red Hook Port's ability to enhance our burgeoning Blue Highway.

In fact, Red Hook's piers should be considered the Premier Local Bridge to our city's broken freight transportation system as I 278 exits and entrances at Hamilton and Atlantic Avenues can be accessed by

trucks without crossing one single residential street.

A comprehensive freight transportation plan for the City of New York must be implemented by all relevant government agencies working in partnership to advance that plan.

Brilliant Engineers and Planners at City Planning, NYC DOT, the New York -

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: You will have to submit that testimony.

BARBARA SCHULMAN: I will.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much.

BARBARA SCHULMAN: Can I read her last line?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: No, you will have to submit that testimony online.

BARBARA SCHULMAN: Thank you.

FRANK CLARKE: Good afternoon Chair Farias, Council Member Avilés, and Hanif. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Frank Clarke; I'm the Director of Government Relations at the New York Building Congress. The New York Building Congress represents over 500 organizations and \$250,000 skilled trades people and professionals committed to the growth and prosperity of our city.

The Brooklyn Marine Terminal is one of the largest publicly owned waterfront sites in the city and has gone far too long without the investment it needs to serve New Yorkers. We support the vision put forward by EDC to transform this 122 acre site into a modern maritime hub anchored by housing, open space, climate infrastructure, and job creation.

This is a one in a generation opportunity. This project proposes approximately 7,700 homes with more than 2,600 permanently affordable units and dedicated resources for NYCHA residents.

It also brings forward a clear commitment to workforce development, including tens of millions of dollars in training and education investments and a new learning center to connect New Yorkers to careers on the working waterfront. We also recognize the substantial economic impact this project will generate. It is expected to create more than 39,000 construction jobs and 2,400 permanent jobs with a long term impact of more than \$20 billion.

It also includes critical resiliency upgrades to ensure that the community is better protected from extreme weather events. As part of the broader Blue Highways vision, this plan aligns infrastructure

investment with workforce opportunity and maritime resilience.

The Building Congress applauds EDC and the members of the taskforce for their leadership and we urge continued momentum behind this transformative plan and stand ready to support its delivery. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: The next panelist may begin.

MADELINE APPELBAUM: Hi, good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Please turn on the microphone and bring it to you. They move. There you go.

MADELINE APPELBAUM: Thank you. Hi, good afternoon. I am speaking today on behalf of the 17,000 members strong New York City District Council of Carpenters in support of the redevelopment project. Modernizing our city and addressing the housing crisis we're facing will take innovative action and that's exactly what this plan represents.

This proposal would take an area that has become too dilapidated and revive it to facilitate critical maritime uses, as well as housing, waterfront access, open space, and commercial space.

1 The best city in the world should have a
2 waterfront we can be proud of that supports both
3 shipping and recreation while being environmentally
4 sustainable and flood resilient. The potential to
5 create thousands of units of housing, many of which
6 will be affordable, would be a game changer and make
7 a meaningful impact as we continue to chip away at
8 the housing crisis we're facing in this city. Which
9 I know our members feel the strain of as do so many
10 New Yorkers.
11

12 Through all of this, this plan would create
13 almost 40,000 new jobs for construction workers. The
14 parts of this project that are city funded will be
15 completed under a PLA and ensure that those are good
16 paying, family sustaining jobs, that will be done
17 safely, quickly, and efficiently.

18 This will be life changing for the many young men
19 and women who are hoping to join an apprenticeship
20 program and make their way into middle class careers
21 that will allow them to live in New York and support
22 their families. Our members are ready to get to work
23 revitalizing this area and building the homes that
24 New Yorkers need. Thanks.
25

ROBERT GUDDAHL: Robert Guddahl, Guddahl and Sons. I've been a member of the South Brooklyn Local Development Corp that goes back a pretty long time. Greg O'Connell, we used to meet weekly. One name in the group Tom Ruso, other locals, Betty Stalts, great people. We would brainstorm to see what we could do to improve Red Hook. A couple of things that happened to give you testimony here.

That brainstorming wasn't allowed to happen during this process. Our mic thrones were turned off at the last meeting to where we couldn't speak. That's censorship. It's a violation of our 1st Amendment. I'm glad to see today that this forum here allows people to speak.

Innovation, brainstorming, we've got the greatest Port in the world to truncate it by a timeline that's ridiculous and not to be able to explore the different options and not to have all the transparency. The taskforce, all the stuff that's happening there, why isn't it shared with the rest of the community? Where are the financials for this? How do you run a business like this? What bank? What city would stand behind this? It's a lack of all those things. We are here to find the highest

and best use. When I brought that up, I was told that was not appropriate question. I want to make sure that goes down on the record as to, we should always look for the highest and best use of everything and options.

I can say a lot more. I'll put it together in writing. I want to reenforce please people, put your comments. Voltaire said, I may not agree with what you say but I'll defend to the death your right to say it. This panel here, I think you guys are doing it, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you all for coming to testify. This panel is now excused.

PANEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Now, I'm going to call up our next panel. Frank Agosta, David Scala, Layla Law Gisiko, and George Fiala. David Scala, Frank Agosta, George Fiala. Well, you know good for George. Tell him to email me his testimony, okay. Okay, let's try Jana Weill, John Leyva, or Michael Rosen. How many is up there? Three. What about Dr. Rania Khalil? Okay, I got my fantastic four.

Do we have a Ryan Ferrick? Lisa Meyer? You may begin.

Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Lala Law Gisiko; I'm the President of the City Club of New York, a civic organization that focuses on good government as well as land use and zoning. I'm here to express the City Club's grave concerns about this redevelopment of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal. The scale and significance of this site demands rigorous public oversight and the transparent planning process. Unfortunately, that has not occurred.

Today, the planning process as you know has been led by the New York City Economic Development Corporation outside of the city's formal land use procedures. A taskforce was assembled through a nontransparent process with no clear public criteria. There has been no published agenda, no minutes and no public facing documentation of discussions and proposals and this lack of transparency raises serious concerns about how decisions are being made and whose interests are being served.

The proposal would reduce maritime industrial use in the port, which is really a problem in the opinion of the City Club of New York. I just want to go off script because I want to address a number of comments

that were made today. PILOT stand for Payment In Lieu of Taxes and we're told that these PILOT's are going to be levied on residential buildings and that these residential buildings are going to have affordable housing. If you have an affordable housing building, there are eligible for 485X, which means that they are tax exempt or tax abated. Where are these taxes coming from? I don't get it. I've been involved in GPPs. I have been involved in pilots for many, many years. The plan the way it was described makes literally no sense. I want to quote what was said. It will be - they will have access to \$1.3 billion in PILOT or equivalent. I've never heard that before. What is an equivalent to a pilot? So, if I can take ten more seconds of your time. I am really urging the City Council, A to retain your power. I mean don't give it up for a GPPP. This is just silly and stupid but also, what is this equivalent? A pilot must be approved by the PACB, the Public Authorities Control Board. How can they sign off on that? So, thank you for caring so deeply.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much. Next panelist. One of you has to choose. Thank you, two minutes.

JOHN LEYVA: Okay, uhm my name is John Leyva, I'm a resident of the Columbia Waterfront for the last 30 years. I'm submitting this testimony in strong opposition to the economic developments current Brooklyn Marine Terminal Redevelopment Plan.

The Columbia Waterfront has no representation on the taskforce. I repeat, the community where Pier 7 through 10 are, and contains the most housing under this plan and will feel the brunt of this redevelopment has no member on the taskforce. We offered a couple of names but they were flatly rejected with no reason why. This plan has failed to meaningfully engage the communities they will impact most. The EDC has pursued and expedited general project plan GPPP process that bypasses local review and strips the City Council of its oversight authority, denying our neighborhoods the public accountability we deserve.

Taskforce meetings have been closed during lacking transparency and treating community input as a formality rather than a foundation for planning.

1 Interestingly enough, yesterday at an event, I asked
2 Mikelle Adgate, who was here with the EDC with Mr.
3 Kimball earlier, how many GPPP's she had worked on
4 because she was talking about all these programs that
5 she - all these neighborhoods she did, Willetts
6 Point, Fordham Road and all of that. So, I said how
7 many GPPP's have you worked on? She said this is the
8 first. This is not what they do. It's just doing it
9 here but this is not the way they work.

11 I'm particularly alarmed by the plans disregard
12 for climate resilience. Red Hook is one of the most
13 flood vulnerable neighborhoods in the city. Any
14 redevelopments should begin with protecting our
15 communities from future storm surges and sea level
16 rise. Not by constructing massive luxury towers
17 along the waterfront. We need publicly accessible
18 nature based infrastructure, not - I mean such as
19 wetland, parks, not high end real estate built on a
20 flood plain.

21 The EDC's approach also could answer this mantle
22 and rare and irreplaceable part of our city, the last
23 working waterfront in Brooklyn of its kind. Maritime
24 industries and industrial jobs are not relicts; they
25 are essential to New York's economy supply chains and

future. This plan undermines the city's own water revitalization program and ignores national priorities around freight movement and industrial renewal. And I have more but I'll send it in.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Please email it in. Next panelist.

JOHN LEYVA: Vote no to all the taskforce members. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Please, somebody pick - thank you.

LISA MEYER: Hi, my name is Lisa Meyer.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Can you turn the mic on please? Thank you.

LISA MEYER: Hi, my name is Lisa Meyer. I am a resident. I am going to be - my husband and I both submitting separate statements. So, I'm just kind of responding to what had been said today. This plan as it currently stands is largely aspirational in both design and funding. The GPPP process allows for limited accountability and is not a legally enforceable contract. For starters, they're asking for the community to take a leap of faith to accept a plan that according to their own written materials and I quote, I brought my thing. "Will not address

1 local and regional effects of the BQE." And the BQE
2 Cantilever, as we all know is crumbling. They also
3 state in this that they are going to deliver uhm,
4 they are going to discourage auto use and increase
5 transit by pedestrian mobility. None of this is
6 realistic considering the vision plan is to build
7 largely luxury housing. Wealthy people like cars.
8 Wealthy people use Ubers and wealthy people get
9 Amazon deliveries.
10

11 Their solution to increase bus transit in a
12 neighborhood that is currently a parking lot with
13 even emergency vehicles unable to move is also
14 unrealistic. This is another one of my Exhibit A. I
15 wear this shirt when I walk in Red Hook and Columbia
16 Waterfront to not get hit by a truck. I literally
17 have bought my husband reflective sashes to wear to
18 navigate the streets. I have taken members of Dan
19 Goldman's Office on tours and walked through the
20 streets and in the process of the last tour on
21 Friday, we encountered a sinkhole in front of the
22 school in Ban brunt. A tractor trailer jackknifed on
23 a street that street that could not make a turn and
24 was almost taking out cars.
25

So, the last thing is that they essentially the transit logistics that they're proposing on this are the Achilles heel of this project. So, thank you.

DR. RANIA KHALIL: Hello everyone. My name is Dr. Rania Khalil. I am a 20 year rent stabilized resident of Columbia Waterfront. I'd like to say that our neighborhood has already been massively displaced. You will not find anyone in our community who does not have direct ties to real estate money in favor of this plan.

We oppose the EDC's plan on the following grounds. One, complete disregard for urban planning and infrastructure. Is Brooklyn ready to have congestion pricing too because my friend recently traveled 45 minutes in an ambulance to go less than one mile to Atlantic Avenue and that's a daily occurrence and yet the EDC has presented model after model of their luxury city as if cars can fly, especially over the crumbling cantilever.

10,000 uninhabited units of similar housing are being built in the Gowanus less than one mile away. Why not wait to see the effects of that on our city? If the law is displacement and chaos of downtown Brooklyn and Atlantic Yards is not enough, why not

1 deliver its affordable housing first? Rent
2 stabilization, not luxury housing will solve this
3 crisis of housing.
4

5 While human feces are washing into the East River
6 and every other road from our neighborhood to Grand
7 Army Plaza is split open, we can't even bicycle
8 through the streets much less use electric buses and
9 all that EDC can imagine for Brooklyn's last working
10 waterfront is a luxury tower city. We oppose all
11 real estate on this site.

12 In the 21st Century, our grandchildren on earth
13 have very different needs than our federally indicted
14 Mayor and real estate developers. Our children need
15 pollinating birds that do not crash into sky scrapers
16 by the thousands every day, clean air and clean
17 water. We demand a climate resilient urban forest on
18 this site. We demand Portside's maritime education
19 center. We demand [INAUDIBLE 03:35:29] as a primary
20 ecological consultant all of whom have been slated by
21 the EDC. We demand dignity for our communities and
22 our workers. We demand that the real estate slush
23 fund that is the current EDC be entirely removed from
24 this process now.
25

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. This panel is now excused. My attempt at names for the next panel. James Defilippis, Melissa Saenz Goron, Sharon Gordon, and James Morgan. If you have any supportive documentation, please submit it to the Sergeant at Arms to hand it to the members.

And just for panelists, before you begin, be mindful of the clock next to you. Thank you.

JAMES DEFILIPPIS: Is this on? Okay, hi. My name is James Defilippis. Thank you Chair Farias and Council Members Avilés and Hanif for being here. I've lived on the Columbia Street Waterfront since 2003 and on Henry Street in Carroll Gardens from 1996. So, I've been there a long time. My day job is I'm a Professor of urban planning at Rutgers University. I'm a founding member of NYCCLI, the New York City Community Land Initiative and have a long history of fighting for housing justice in New York City.

So many things wrong with this process and I have 90 seconds to do it. I'm only going to talk about two really quickly. The first is the speed of the process people have talked about but I would remind people that good planning takes time, right? Like

1 Brooklyn Bridge Park, they started planning that in
2 1985 okay. They broke ground on it in 2007. You
3 know the Hudson Yards, they were planning that in the
4 late 90's before Dr. Off was even in City Hall, right
5 and importantly, nine months into that process, the
6 plan included demoing the elevated - the abandoned
7 elevated rail line that would become the highline
8 later on and I'm pretty sure people are happy that
9 they didn't do what they thought they were going to
10 do nine months into the process.

12 The second thing is that there is sort of an
13 astonishing indifference to what we know we do not
14 know, right? You know we do not know the future of
15 the BQE. We do not know the future of the onramp of
16 Atlantic Avenue and apparently EDC does not care what
17 the future of - so we're going to triple the
18 population of Columbia Street Waterfront where it's
19 already a parking lot at best, right and you know
20 right at the front end, the process to close things.
21 The second thing we don't know is somebody game out
22 the future of freight demand for me over the next two
23 decades. Somebody tell me exactly what tariff
24 policies are going to be next month, let alone two
25 decades from now. We're going to decide that the

only working Port east of the Hudson is going to be shutdown now. Please vote no for this. This is not the way to plan.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Sergeant, can you grab testimony from the front of the panel? You can begin when ready.

SHARON GORDON: Okay. Dear Madam Chairwoman and members of the Committee on Economic Development. My name is Sharon Gordon. My husband Randall and I have been residents of Columbia Street Waterfront District for 20 years. We moved here when our daughter started kindergarten at PS29 and it has been a wonderful place to raise a family. But fast forward to 2025, this neighborhood does not have a voting representative on the BMT Taskforce and our lack of representation is something this Committee needs to know about.

We have attended every possible EDC meeting. We know their plan for BMT North our area. If the taskforce votes yes, our population will triple with the addition of 3,800 mostly market rate housing units. The EDC's plan offers no solution to the bottleneck that already exists at Columbia and Atlantic and of course the BQE between Hamilton and

Brooklyn Bridge is often impassable. No matter how the EDC's plan tries to deemphasize cars, common sense tells us that most buyers are market rate housing at BMT North will have cars. The EDC would have us believe a no vote has dire consequences. We were there at the June 4th meeting with the Brooklyn Borough President and the EDC and yes, the EDC Jennifer Sun really did say several times, it is not an empty threat when Reynoso challenged the EDC's BS about what happens when the taskforce does not approve the EDC's vision for the BMT.

No doubt the SIMs Concrete Recycling facility a half block away from our building and close enough to PS29 to endanger the children is an example of what Sun talked about the city inflicting on our waterfront. Parking garages, garbage trucks and the continuing presence of a facility spewing out silica dust. We hope the taskforce will reject this gambit.

For us in the CSWD, a no vote buys us something precious, time. We are actively assembling a Columbia Waterfront Association and should have it stood up by the fall and I'm going to fast forward to the end. Thank you very much and if you'd like any further information about the SIMs concrete, which I

1 have been working on for the last year, I have my
2 email on that and I would love to give further
3 information. I just note, I have - I'm a
4 professional singer and the silico dust that's coming
5 out of that has made me get sick constantly, so I'm
6 not working and I have not worked for a year and I
7 have told Dan Goldman that face to face with no
8 interaction. Thank you, sorry to go over.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you.

11 JAMES MORGAN: Hi, James Morgan, 30 year resident
12 of the effected neighborhood. I'd like to amend my
13 testimony to add that my wife would have been here to
14 deliver these remarks but she's home recovering from
15 an asthmatic condition that she did not have until
16 the EDC and the DOT's cynical ploy of dumping the
17 SIMs Concrete Recycling facility on our doorstep to
18 use as a leveraging tool.

19 I'm here representing my family and neighbors who
20 live on Columbia Street Waterfront District to
21 express our urgent opposition to the proposed project
22 that threatens to destabilize our neighborhood under
23 the guides of necessary infrastructure repair and
24 climate resiliency and affordable housing.
25

Unlike other city infrastructure initiatives, our small working family communities being told that the only way to fund long overdue port repairs and flood protection is to accept a massive luxury real estate development larger than Battery Park City a number of units in the most impractical location possible.

This plan would permanently change the fabric of our community and a danger of the safety and wellbeing of residents who live here now. This project would at least double and triple the population of two already strained neighborhood, the Columbia Street Waterfront District has 4,000 residents over 22 blocks, Cobble Hill 8,000 residents over 36 blocks.

This proposed development would add at least 12,000 residential units to that population and concentrate that population growth into a narrow seven block stretch of flood prone, waterfront land between Columbia Street and the East River. Land that lacks the infrastructure to support this kind of density and has no realistic plan for adaptation.

Meanwhile our streets are already in crisis to deteriorating BQE Cantilever has created daily traffic gridlock on Columbia, Hicks and surrounding

cross streets. Emergency lane closures have turned these roads into dangerous unpredictable bottlenecks. Residents now live in constant fear that police, fire or medical emergency services will not be able to reach them in time. Children and seniors are put at risk every day.

I just would like to close by urgently adding uh asking that you vote no and encourage other taskforce members to vote no on this ill conceived project and that the image of the EDC people walking out after we have spent three hours waiting -

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: We have a staff member from EDC that's still present.

JAMES MORGAN: Oh, I hope they're taking notes. Thank you very much because you seem to be the only people listening to the taxpayers and your constituents. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you.

MELISSA SAENZ GORON: Should I start? Okay. Hi uhm, sorry. My name is Melissa; I lived in Red Hook for four years. On Sunday's I watched gridlock traffic sit in agony while taxis and car shares tried to drop people off to the cruise terminal.

I watched Amazon pedicabs take over the streets on Ban Brunt and bike paths on Columbia. Things the proposed BMT plan will only add to with no promised public transit to ease this. I relied on the city bike to get to the subway, which was a mile from my apartment and the bus on the way home because all the docks were full in the Red Hook neighborhood, the entire neighborhood, just clearly showing that it's a transit desert.

Earlier this year, Red Hook was dubbed the most expensive neighborhood in New York City. What we're asking for is affordable housing on public lands, climate resilience, public transit. Which if you humble brag; read the Power Broker, you'd know that the usually the only opportunity for public transit to be added is before housing in place. We've pushed the EDC on this.

The gentleman said ferry service every 30 minutes. In what world class city is a 30 minute cadence of public transit celebrated? This plan is being - I'm sorry I'm like shaking. This plan is being pushed through by an outgoing disgrace and corrupt administration of a self-proclaimed real estate mayor. We're not suckers. The affordable

housing promises at Atlantic Yards went unfulfilled as we saw just a couple weeks ago, another state run project, which proves we can't trust the state process.

The residents of Long Island City are now calling for climate resilience and affordable housing for one LIC. The plan thing - I just moved to LIC, showing the citywide urgency for these amenities. Public land for public good. Do the right thing. Vote no, go through ULURP. Thank you.

One thing about the 30 year Blue Highway thing that the EDC gentleman said, in all of the public hearings I went to, the EDC never said that they had any studies or data about whether the Blue Highways would work. I just want to share that.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Sure, Council Member Avilés.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah, I guess I think it's important to note as a taskforce member and certainly as one of the Co-Chairs for the public record. I asked and duly noted very early in the process of the Columbia Waterfront community that is directly impacted by this plan was not represented on the taskforce and was voted down when I put forward submissions of residents. And so, I think - I think

that's an important piece of information and I'd just like to ask Mr. Defilippis, if you could tell us just some of the elements of the great planning disaster that is reflective of this process in your very deep expertise.

JAMES DEFILIPPIS: Oh sure, yeah. Right, well so there's a famous book. I actually asked Jennifer Sun, who has a master's degree in planning this. You know did you read Great Planning Disasters? It's a famous book in planning history that goes sort of worldwide and looks around at planning disasters around the world and the characteristics of them that they all share and there are four primary characteristics that they all hear.

One, is that they're done very quickly. Two is that they are big in scale, right? Like they cover a fairly large geography.

Three, they are not well integrated into the neighborhoods fabric around them. And four, that they're all planned in one go, right? That it's sort of like a single shot plan. Like you have right here with the 122 acres all in one go. That is quite frankly exactly how I would describe the last nine months of this planning process. Nine months to do

122 acres is breathtakingly fast, considering that there are at least five separate major land uses taking place here and building out a new street grid. You know and you know very poorly connected you know again, right?

Like the onramp, they talk about the onramp to the northbound BQE at Atlantic Avenue as though it's incidental to the plan. It is across the street from the plan, right? They are going to build 3700 housing units directly across from where this onramp is and they don't care whether or not the onramp stays open or not. That is astonishing. I mean it's hard to imagine worst public planning then that. You know, like this is sort of like the - sorry. Okay, yeah but those are the basic characteristics of great planning disasters.

Peter Hall was united in the UK for that research actually, Sir Peter Hall who wrote it but in any case - anyway, I'm not going to finish that sentence but uhm, but that would be how I would describe this process and it fits almost exactly what is being spelled out in that book.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you. This panel is now excused. I just want to give a reminder of any

folks who are here that want to speak, you must fill out an appearance card and hand it over to the Sergeant at Arms. I fear that I have more people sitting here than I do cards, so I just wanted to reiterate that.

I'd now like to call up Paul Briscoe, Maria Nieto, and LaDawn Hagland. And just for safe keeping, I'll also try to attempt to call Eliza Davidson again and Tom Barry. You may begin when ready.

PAUL BRISCOE: Thank you Council. My name is Paul Briscoe and I've lived in Cobble Hill on Warren Street between Hicks and Columbia since 1998. At one time, we were the best kept secret in all of downtown Brooklyn. Neighborhood stores run by locals, diverse close nit community where everybody knew their neighbors names. It was also a place we could actually find a parking spot any time of day. We've quickly become one of the most popular, populated and one of the most expensive neighborhoods within those 27 years. My wife and our family have owned their homes since 1921 and the struggle for us to keep up with the rising costs of homeownership here, especially for being lower income residents is very

1 real and something my wife and I face on a daily
2 basis. Property taxes are always on the rise and to
3 obtain homeowners insurance on our side of the
4 highway is an exercise in futility due to the flood
5 risks. And they want to add more luxury housing,
6 more people. The 7,500 housing units plans for this
7 project were more than double Cobble Hills entire
8 population. This BMT project is being rushed, kept
9 almost secret with zero signage and the most minimal
10 neighborhood outreach. What they are calling a
11 workshop and feedback session is nothing more than
12 shuffling a handful of residents around a room with
13 post division boards filled with maritime quotes and
14 historical content of what the area once was.

16 And if you consider giving residents color coated
17 posted sticky notes to stick on maps, asking what
18 would you like to see there? Community input, your
19 nuts. It's a glorified pen the tail on the donkey
20 and nothing ever changes on what they propose.

21 I'm yet to get an knock on my door and I'm
22 literally down the block from where this giant
23 mistake is supposed to happen. BMT's rush plans do
24 not have Cobble Hill and Red Hook's interest at
25 heart. Just call it what it is. It's a land grab.

Look at the photos, you're blocking out Columbia Street to build a brand new waterfront that those luxury housing residents can enjoy. Please vote no. Thank you.

LADAWN HAGLAND: Hello. Good afternoon. I'm glad I made it. I was out at the UN giving a talk about climate and it went on so long that I had a chance to get here. I'm an Associate Professor in the Political Science Department at City University of New York. I want to talk to you about governance and resilience. Good governance requires transparency, inclusivity, and accountability, especially on public land.

The BMT process has not met that standard. Many assumptions underlining things like cost estimates, funding models, and private sector benefits remain opaque or unavailable and potential alternative have been ignored or rejected without an airing.

I have observed community members and other experts making numerous suggestions for alternative plans, alternative funding models, processes, pacing at public meetings on websites and webinars and through direct outreach to the EDC. All of this has been largely ignored and official statements on the

website and in the media. Moreover, many promises have been made about community benefits, like some of the people giving testimony today claimed that these are not binding and there is no guarantee that any of these won't materialize.

The EDC has a long track record of failing to follow through on its promises. I saw something similar in my work in Latin America. Development agencies, holding meetings with communities, promising benefits in the exchange for the privatization of their resources. Participation convincing them that prefabricated plans were good for them and they should just trust them. That trust was rarely earned or deserved.

Activities like the Lego game are a perfect example. A much better process would be the New York rising process that was mentioned earlier. A quick note about resilience, the BMT plan prioritizes engineered elevations that support development but offers no clear protection for surrounding low lying neighborhoods.

The neighborhood should be prioritized for resilience planning, not development and I'll close there.

MARIA NIETO: Hi, I'm Maria Nieto voice to the waterfront. When the EDC first announced the BMT project and its sweeping vision for a harbor of the future and the Blue Highway we celebrated. But at the beginning, there was no mention of housing, nor did the memo of understanding reflect that either. In fact, housing was only mentioned at the end of the year, around the holidays and right before the first vote was eminent. It was only then that the EDC announced the false premise that luxury housing was needed to under right the cost of the port renovations. This type of dirty maca nations by the EDC speaks to why there are known bad faith actors in Red Hook.

The EDC places profits over people consistently, emphatically and unapologetically. Despite the fact that this false premise has been resoundly countered, the EDC and Dan Goldman and Andrew Guarnardes have never waived from this promise. The EDC has failed to consider any other alternative funding other than luxury rate housing, which includes holding the Port Authority accountable for fixing the piers which is outlined and legally binding that first - in the first triparty agreement.

They are engineering blight in order to capitalize on it. We know that 65 percent luxury housing will inevitably and predictably lead to less affordable housing in our neighborhoods and it will rapidly accelerate displacement.

Most at risk are the many NYCHA neighbors who we've talked to who have never even heard about the project. This vote will crown the EDC as kings when they are allowed to proceed with the GPPP, knowing that any promises made to the communities today are not binding but merely greasing the wheels on their latest real estate deal. We are a very clear fork in the road. We have on the one hand a plan that kills Brooklyn's industrial and maritime future, in favor of the very rich and which will devastate our communities where we can preserve the BMT for our economic future and our regional and national security.

True democracy lives or dies in moments like these in [INAUDIBLE 03:56:49] like yours. When elected officials who represent real people choose them over profits. There are 520 miles of waterfront in New York. We are asking to preserve the 122 acres of working waterfront that helped make Brooklyn and

New York what they are today. Please stand with us and vote no. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much. This panel is now excused. A last call for anyone that is currently in this hearing room to testify. If you have not been called, you can raise your hand. Okay, we will now turn it over to virtual panelists. For virtual panelists, once your name is called, a member of our staff will unmute you and the Sergeant at Arms will set the timer and give you the go ahead to begin.

I still need silence in this room in order for the virtual panelists to hear me. Please wait for the Sergeant to announce that you may begin before delivering your testimony. Now we'll call our first virtual panelists, Karen Blondel, Christina Chase, Bridgett Ode, Catherine Walsh, oh actually let me just go one by one. Karen Blondel, you can begin.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, I'll now call on Christina Chase.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'll now attempt Bridget Ode.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Bridgett. Can someone attempt to unmute Bridgett?

BRIDGETT ODE: Hi, can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yes.

BRIDGETT ODE: Hi, just so you know, I think a few people before were uhm muted, so they are here. I can see them.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'll go back to them.

BRIDGETT ODE: Okay, so good afternoon. Thanks for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Brid Ode, I live in Windsor Terrace, District 39. I'm here in solidarity with my friends and neighbors in Red Hook and at Columbia Waterfront, as well as many New Yorkers and we're deeply concerned about the direction of this project.

This is city owned land. The community in Brooklyn deserve a better vision, one that strengthens our industry in manufacturing, protects long time residents and ensures that all voices are included and shaped in this project.

What's been proposed puts essential maritime uses at risk, uses that support local jobs, freight movement in our regional supply chain. It conflicts

with the city's own waterfront revitalization project and weakens national security by displacing critical core operations.

I'm also deeply concerned about the process itself. EDC has used an expedited GPPP to bypass public oversight. Why not ULURP? Task force meetings remain closed and community engagement has been limited or entirely absent. We've seen this before. The failure of Atlantic Yards looms large. Promises were made and never enforced and that's the risk we're facing again. So, why is EDC pushing this through? Why did they threaten that if their proposal wasn't approved, the industrial option is the only alternative? That's a false choice. As Borough President Reynoso stated at last weeks public meeting, there is no scarcity of opportunities to build housing across the borough, but there is a scarcity of manufacturing and maritime opportunities. Public land must serve the public. This plan does not.

I urge the community, the Committee and the Council, the taskforce to listen to the community. Vote no. Go back to the drawing board, work transparently and with meaningful input from the

community to create a better path forward for the BMT and Brooklyn. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'll now call on Christina Chase.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHRISTINA CHASE: Okay, thank you. I'm freaking out. Hi, good afternoon. My name is Christina Chase. I am an organizer with Justice [INAUDIBLE 04:01:06] Coalition, where we work on housing justice issues in western Queens, particularly within NYCHA. I'm here today in solidarity with Red Hook community organizers and advocates that know this undemocratic okayed plan will lead to more luxury housing on our public waterfront and lead to be a racier of our industrial possibilities within our IBZ.

We implore our officials to oppose this plan. This upzoning plan reminds me a lot of what we're dealing with over things with the one OIC Neighborhood plan, a plan to gentrify our community, hand over our public land for the wealthy. We don't want - I'm sorry, my son's here. Uhm, this is why I do this so I can have a future here in New York City. We don't have much of housing, affordable housing.

Moreover, AMI and MIH is not a tool for truly affordable housing at least the majority luxury housing, right and most importantly, the kind of housing we need is for families well below 40 percent AMI now more than ever and this plan does not include that. Public land should have 100 percent deeply affordable housing and the city should have first dibs where public land is for public good, not predatory profit.

If you really want affordable housing, invest in public housing and restore the 8,000 vacant NYCHA units. The investments in NYCHA from this plan should come from the city regardless of whether or not this upzoning passes. Public housing residents have been waiting for decades for the City of New York to invest in them, to invest in us.

We shouldn't have to sell out our neighborhood and sell out our city at large for the capital investments we deserve. And that for long standing residents and the community in general. So, we ask that you oppose this plan. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'll now call on Karen Blondel.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

1 KAREN BLONDEL: Hi, thank you Chairman of the
2 Economic Development Corporation and I just want to
3 point out that I noticed the way my elected official
4 Alexa Avilés was speaking to EDC and I wrote a
5 compliant to the City Council Chair about that
6 because she speaks to me that way. I'm a Harford Low
7 fellow. I'm also a David Price winner for the work I
8 do public housing residents. Not only in my
9 community but that's a part of the Public Housing
10 Preservation Trust Board and a person who is listed
11 as a resident liaison.

12 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay Ms. Blondel, I will log
13 that and can you please stay on topic of the
14 discussion at hand.

15 KAREN BLONDEL: Yes, uhm I support because I
16 speak to 10,000 residents. Ms. Brown, who is Red
17 Hook East President and myself, we are on the
18 taskforce. We negotiated and we are pro this
19 development at the EDC. We believe that it will
20 bring not only jobs but a workforce corridor that
21 collects not only the Red Hook residents but the
22 residents who live in Gowanus.

23 I also started the Gowanus Neighborhood Coalition
24 for justice and I went back to look at that project.
25

1 That project makes Gowanus alive. Red Hook has been
2 living dead for a long time. Greg O'Connell
3 developing this area back during its time that we
4 wrote the 197A Plan was trying to help public housing
5 residents in this community. I still feel that a lot
6 of my - I'm a democrat but a lot of people acting
7 like Dixiecrats when it comes to public housing
8 residents. City of Yes we're cut out of. Every
9 single opportunity public housing has been cut out of
10 by either City Council -

12 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you for your testimony.
13 Time has expired.

14 KAREN BLONDEL: And so, yes thank you I just want
15 to end by saying I support this process. I think
16 it's going to bring a lot of opportunities to Red
17 Hook. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much. I'm now
19 going to call on Catherine Walsh.

20 KATIE WALSH: Thank you. My name is Katie Walsh
21 and I am a Sunset Park Resident and born and raised
22 and I also work in climate change and climate space.
23 I'm just providing testimony to say I do not support
24 the current proposal that has been forward by EDC. I
25 want to focus less on the process, which I have

1 attended the meetings that I have been able to that
2 EDC has hosted as a Sunset Park resident and I care
3 deeply because Sunset Park, we want to preserve as a
4 working waterfront and it's extremely important what
5 happens in Red Hook for the entire working waterfront
6 in South Brooklyn. So, if there are implications
7 about luxury housing and housing going in and the
8 loss of the port space in Red Hook, this is
9 ramifications for us regionally in Sunset Park. But
10 what I wanted to share is the point around climate
11 change specifically and the proposals that I've seen
12 so far and the responses that I've seen to the
13 questions.

14
15 I, in my job, I work with hundreds of city's all
16 around the world, here in the US who are committed to
17 addressing climate action and there's two ways that
18 I'm seeing things play out right now. One is that
19 they're doubling down in engaging and working with
20 their ports. And so, the proposal to minimize the
21 size of the port is actually going against what is
22 common practice because there's a big push to be able
23 to double down on the resilience and also the actual
24 infrastructure and planning for the port.

1 The second point of this is managed retreat and
2 that is a large conversation that's happening. We
3 need more housing in New York but we need to have a
4 conversation about new building and new housing stock
5 along the waterfront and I don't think that there's
6 been a strategic, thoughtful and actual you know
7 engaged process on understanding how climate change
8 is going to impact. You know we know how it will
9 impact New York City but in particular in this
10 project.
11

12 I think it is a mistake to put the size of
13 housing that they're proposing on this spot of land.
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm now going to call on
16 Christopher Leon Johnson.

17 SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

18 CHRISTOHPER LEON JOHNSON: Yeah, hello, hello.
19 Can you hear me?

20 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yes we can.

21 CHRISTOPHER LEON JOHNSON: Yeah, hello, my name
22 is Christopher Leon Johnson. I'm supporting this
23 initiative about EDC. Let me make this clear right,
24 the reason that everybody is complaining but they
25 didn't to bring it up that look, both Alexa Avilés

1 and Shahana Hanif voted in favor of the City of Yes,
2 which allows EDC to do this without no real community
3 input. And I want to make this clear about one of
4 the people that spoke earlier like John Leyva, who
5 was complaining about him not being part of the
6 taskforce but he won't disclose that on the website.
7 His organization Tiffany, which is in Shahana Hanif's
8 district, is part of the barge port to put him on the
9 same, the taskforce and the advisory board will be
10 like double dipping and to try have him and say like
11 oh, we need Columbia Street Waterfront to be on both
12 items of the taskforce or the Advisory Board will be
13 like double dipping. It will be a big interest
14 because he run both of them. He run both of them and
15 he run both the social media council. Let's make
16 that public record right now.

18 Now I want to make this clear, right? Reynoso
19 was acting like he really - he's really for the
20 people but he's really not. He's just campaigning on
21 government time and trying to say this but from
22 Edwards, let's make that clear. Now, like I said,
23 this is all nothing but political grants, anybody's
24 elected officials, like I said, they all like if you
25 vote for the City of Yes, you, Avilés, and Shahana

1 Hanif, why are you acting like you are for the people
2 and try to oppose this initiative? This initiative
3 is good. If you voted for the City of Yes, that
4 means you're for luxury housing and why are you
5 against luxury? It's like you want it in other
6 people's backyard but you don't want it in your
7 backyard. It doesn't work like that. You vote for
8 the City of Yes; you reap what you sew.

10 So, I'm for this project. I'm for it 100 percent
11 and I want to make this clear that I believe that the
12 Worker Justice Project should have been on the
13 Advisory Board on the transportation. I understand
14 TA oversees them but they need their own too because
15 the WJP which is led by [04:09:23] is in your
16 district. So, you need to like tell them to put her
17 on -

18 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you for your testimony.
19 Time is expired.

20 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Seeing no one else signed up
21 to speak online, we have now heard from everyone who
22 has signed up to testify. If we have inadvertently
23 missed anyone who would like to testify in person or
24 virtually, please visit the Sergeant's table and
25 complete a witness slip now or use your hand function

2 in Zoom and a member of our staff will call on you in
3 the order of hands raised.

4 Seeing none, I would like to note again that
5 written testimony, which will be reviewed in full by
6 Committee Staff may be submitted to the record up to
7 72 hours after the close of this hearing by emailing
8 it to testimony@council.nyc.gov. And this hearing is
9 now adjourned. [GAVEL]

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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



Date July 26, 2025