CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

----- X

October 16, 2023

Start: 1:24 p.m. Recess: 6:08 p.m.

HELD AT: COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

B E F O R E: James F. Gennaro, Chairperson

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Jennifer Gutiérrez Kamillah Hanks Robert F. Holden

Julie Menin
Sandy Nurse
Lincoln Restler
Keith Powers

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

John Castelli Deputy Commissioner Legislative Affairs Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings

Amy Slifka
Deputy Commissioner
Hearings and Adjudications Division
Office of Administrative Trials
and Hearings

Angela Licata
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Environmental Protection

Mark Page
Executive Director
Bureau Environmental Compliance
Department of Environmental Protection

Alyssa Preston
Director
Air and Noise Policy and Enforcement
Department of Environmental Protection

Andrew Rigie
Executive Director
NYC Hospitality Alliance

Max Bookman Counsel NYC Hospitality Alliance Robert Bookman Counsel NYC Hospitality Alliance

David Sheldon South Street Seaport Coalition

Kathleen Reilly Irwin
New York State Restaurant Association

Katelyn Mooney
General Manager
The Independent

Michael Jacobs Corner Table Restaurants

Vanessa Oré General Manager Romantic Depot Queens

Brittney Mayorga Supervisor Romantic Depot

Joel Kupferman
Environmental Justice Initiative

John Conroy Mustang Harrys

Theresa Sigler Manager Pig N Whistle Liam Malanachy
Junior's Cheesecake

Clint Smeltzer
Manhattan Community Board 3

Mark Fox
Fox Lifestyle Hospitality

Lesa Rozmarek Nederlander Organization

Robert Camacho Bushwick Allience

Yoav Erez Citizen of New York

Sandra Telendrana Flowers by Giorgie

Nikolay Gergov Pando 39

Frank McCawley Tito Murphys

A.M. Riccielli, Co-op
East 17th Street Loft Corporation Co Op

Gregory Guarino
Acoustilog Incorporated

Norma Cote Citizen of New York Peter Gibson Citizen of New York

Murphy Fitzpatrick Manager BarDough Restaurant

Robin Warren Citizen of New York

Sharon Trennor Representative Eight restaurants

Cormac Flynn
Community Board 2

Jonathan Rinaldi Citizen of New York

Raul Rivera Citizen of New York

Eric Eisenberg Citizen of New York

Jeanine Bata Citizen of East Flatbush

Dietmar Detering Citizen of New York

Leslie Clark Citizen of New York Alfred Fuente Attorney

Deborah Farley Citizen of Sunnyside

Ernest Welde Citizen of New York

Hayden Brockett Citizen of Manhattan

Michael Streeter Citizen of New York

Michele Campo
Representative
Little Italy and Bowery Block Association

Laura Sewell
Director
East Village Community Coalition

Lisa Ann Chapman Citizen of New York

Micki McGee Citizen of New York

Mitchell Grubler Bowery Alliance of Neighbors

Susan Ginsburg Citizen of the West Village Victoria Hillstom Citizen of New York

Zach Winestine
St. Gansevoort

Alex Stein Citizen of New York

,

SERGEANT AT ARMS: At this time, please silence your electronics, and if you wish to submit a testimony you may do so at testimony@counsel.nyc.gov. Just a friendly reminder: Please do not approach the dais at any moment. If you need assistance, you may ask one of the Sergeant at Arms. And at this time we are ready to begin, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Sergeant, we're ready to go right? Did he say yes? Oh, yes.

[GAVEL]

Good afternoon, I am Jim Gennaro, Chair of the
Committee on Environmental Protection, Resiliency,
and Waterfronts. Today we're here to examine the
Department of Environmental Protection's response and
management to noise complaints. The Committee will
also hear a few pieces of legislation including Intro
No. 160, sponsored by Councilmember Holden, in
relation to the noise standard for commercial
businesses, Intro No. 1194 sponsored by me in
relation to citizen noise complaints, and a package
of bills sponsored by Councilmember Powers (that
should be Majority Leader Powers) in relation to
construction noise, noise inspection results, and
creating a photo noise violation monitoring device

_

a

program for motor vehicles. New York City must balance the vibrancy of being a world class city with the needs of everyday New Yorkers. However, DEP cannot always respond quickly to every noise code violation in the city.

To that end-- Sip of tea. To that end, the city's noise code allows New Yorkers to file their own noise complaints against violators of some quote "some" noise code-- noise code provisions. These civilian enforcers must first serve a complaint upon DEP. Then if DEP fails to act within 30 days, the enforcer may file a complaint directly on the alleged violator and the Environmental Control Board in the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings, known as OATH. Civilian enforcers are awarded a percentage of any penalty assessed from a complaint they pursue, that is if it's upheld, typically between \$110 and then \$660 per complaint staff informs me.

Engaged New Yorkers play an important role in enforcement of our city's noise code. However, recent news reports have highlighted a small number of civilian enforcers who filed large numbers of complaints under one particular noise code provision, often repeatedly against the same businesses to

2.2

2.3

collect the reward money. The result is local
businesses being unfairly burdened by overzealous
enforcers who are more motivated by profit than
quality of life. There I said it. This hearing will
examine DEP's and OATH's roles and enforcing the
noise code to balance the needs of all New Yorkers.

In addition, we'll hear several bills that will—that make will make civilian enforcement of the noise code less financially lucrative and more objective, make it easier for New Yorkers to request and obtain the results of certain noise inspections, and reduce the overall level of unnecessary noise in the city. These bills include Intro 1194, which I sponsored, or am sponsoring that would cap the compensation civilian enforcers can receive when their complaint prompts proceedings under Subdivision B of Section 24-244 of the noise code at \$5 for proceedings brought by DEP, and \$10 for proceedings and enforcement and enforcer brings themselves.

This would reduce the financial incentive for-well let me just kind of edit this sentence as I read
it. This would reduce the financial incentive for
individuals who file multiple harassing complaints
against businesses for the purposes of collecting the

reward money and will allow DEP inspectors to focus on legitimate noise complaints and on improving the quality of life for all New Yorkers.

We're also here-- we will also hear Intro 160 sponsored by Councilmember Holden, who would amend the definition for quote "unreasonable noise" close quote, as applies to commercial establishment, to be sound that exceeds specified prohibited noise levels. Unreasonable noise would include impulsive sound above 15 decibels measured at any point within the property in question, or 15-- or 15 feet or more from the source of the sound on the public right away.

I just have a sidebar on that: Twenty years ago when the Mayor did his revamp on the noise code, and it came before this committee, and I was Chair at the time, and it was my understanding that we had put that all to rest, and that there was a big-- this is a little history. There was a big fight at the time about the Bloomberg administration's desire to have an unreasonable noise standard for-- for business establishments, for people having backyard parties, for people doing loud noise in their apartments or whatever. And I and the Council, the-- the Council at the time-- the Committee at the time, thought it

was unfair for businesses to not have an objective standard that they had to meet. Just like one drives a car, and the speed limit is 30, you know, the speed limit is 30.

And so, we felt it was important to have an objective standard that that business establishments could be apprised of, and they would have to stay within that standard. That would be measured by a decibel meter. Because if the Bloomberg administration had had its way, and it was an unreasonable noise standard that that applied to business establishments, any business would be--would be subject to a violation for noise for anything, you know, depending upon the individual writing the summons. And so how can a business reasonably prepare? And how can they operate if they have no idea when they're going to be violated? And so it'd be-- you know, served with a violation.

So that was when we came up with the—with the noise meter for establishments. That was going to be their standard. They'd be apprised of what the decimal standard is, and then they would have to meet that, they would know it. They can get an engineer. They can look at it. They can measure it, and then

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

they'd be in compliance. And if someone caught them being out of compliance, as measured by a noise meter, they would get a violation.

And the unreasonable noise standard (this is back 20 years ago when we thought we put all this to rest) -- the-- the unreasonable noise standard was still going to apply for things that were not establishments: For someone having a loud back backyard party, someone playing a loud noise in their apartment at, you know, three in the morning. So there was certainly as a road for an unreasonable-for an unreasonable noise standard.

And so-- but it seems-- not a lawyer-- but it seems that there is still ambiguity as to what that what we actually did 20 years ago, and I think the Holden bill speaks to that. And so we will hear more about that. But I just thought that history lesson was in order. We fought like anything to get the noise standard, measured by decibel meter, to be fair. There was blood shed over that provision. But we prevailed, and now it seems that, you know, unreasonable noise standard for businesses that -- I understand the difference between noise emanating from the operation of a business, and people pointing 2 speakers out to say

2.2

2.3

speakers out to say, you know, "Come and shop here, by a necktie here." I think that's a little bit of a different story. But certainly, you know, so the plot thickens, over the last 20 years, to where we are now. And so-- Where was I? Where were we?

Okay, well hear a package of bills sponsored by Councilmember Powers that includes—— look at this package. Jeez. Look at this whole thing he's got here. Intro 774, which would require DEP to measure the volume of certain types of construction noise from within dwelling units upon request of the owner, lessor, or occupant; Intro 775 which would mandate that DEP publish the results of their noise inspection online within 24 hours after they had been completed; Intro 776, which would require a DEP and NYPD to give a copy of a noise report pursuant to a 311 noise complaint to anyone who requests the report and provides the 311 tracking number within 14 days of the request.

And you know-- and I know the Majority Leader is going to speak on these bills in a minute. I just kind of want to set them up. Intro 777, which would require any person engaging in a construction project

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 15 1 to obtain an after-hours variance before removing 2 3 construction debris, before or after certain hours 4 and on the weekend; and Intro 778-- he's the majority leader so I noticed that all of his bills are in consecutive order; 774, 775-- you've got to be the 6 majority leader to pull that off-- Intro 778, which 7 8 would establish a noise camera program to detect motor vehicles in violation of the noise code. Vehicles found to be in violation are subject to the 10 11 civil penalty as prescribed by existing law. 12 bill would require a DEP to report on noise camera--13 on the noise camera program annually. 14 Finally, I would like to thank the really 15

terrific committee staff who have done such great work over the years, particularly on this hearing. Committee Council Samara Swanson, and Clara McLaughlin, Policy Analyst Ricky Chawla, and Andrew Boren, and Financial Analyst Andrew Lane Lawless. And finally my great legislative director Navi Corr for all of their hard work. Before I turn it over to members who have bills for statements, I want to recognize that we're joined by Councilmember Holden, whom I made reference to, Councilmember Nurse, Councilmember Menin, Committee -- Uh, Majority Leader

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Powers. We have Councilmember Hanks on Zoom.

that correct? And is Lincoln here? Okay. A

2.2

2.3

5 questions will no doubt go over time, but I always

Lincoln. And Lincoln Restler, who, when he asks

6 | indulge him. And I think I got it.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Okay.

And with that. Bob, you're a member of the Committee and—but if you wouldn't mind, we do have the Majority Leader with us, if you would defer and have me call upon the Majority Leader to speak about his package of bills first. Is that okay, Bob?

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. Councilmember Holden is being most gracious. And now I recognize the Majority Leader to speak on his good bills.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. Thank you,
Chair. Thank you to Councilmember Holden, who I know
has a bill that we're hearing here today. I also
want to congratulate Lincoln on achieving the Donna
and Cher status as one name for people in this world.
But I really want to thank the Chair and the staff
here for giving me the opportunity to hear these
bills today and being great partners on a number of
issues that we're working on together around
environment and quality of life.

We introduced a package a few months back we call the Stop Spreading The Noise Act. Yes, it's a bad pun, but you're going to have to deal with it, my friends. It's to help to reduce excessive noise across the five boroughs. This is directly from constituent calls that we get every single day, and whether you are in Manhattan or anywhere else in the city, I can tell you without question your neighbors and your constituents are— are dealing with noisy issues every single day.

We all know New York is a city that never sleeps. But between noisy helicopters, constant construction, and loud cars, I think we all can agree it's time for some quiet. I've introduced these five bills to help tackle some of the most common and frequent issues that we hear in my office. First, Introduction 778 establishes a noise camera program to help us detect noisy vehicles and issue violations to any drivers found to be violating city noise limits. This bill would require annual reporting on the locations of the cameras, the number of violations detected, and—and any revenue raised by the program. And I want to note that the DEP, as I understand it, is rolling out

2.

2.2

2.3

a program right now, to evaluate this and to understand how it could work here in the city.

We also know that construction is another major source of noise. Intro 774 will allow New Yorkers who live near construction sites to request an inspection of sound levels within their home through DEP, and to cut down on construction-related noise overnight on weekends.

Intro 777 would require an after-hours variants for the removal of construction debris, two things that we've gotten calls about in my office.

Introductions 775 and 776 will help our 311 noise complaint system to be more transparent and effective by ensuring the results of those noise inspections are published online with 24-- within 24 hours, and made available to anyone with a 311 tracking number.

Like a lot of issues of 311, it's a fantastic system, but we often hear New Yorkers complain about what happened to that actual call I made? And we think that on this particular issue, they deserve a right to have the outcome of that call in their hands to admit— to understand better how that city and that system is working for them.

1 | R
2 |
3 | i
4 | h
5 | e
6 | 2
7 | t
8 | s
9 | h
10 | w
11 | m
12 | w
13 | c

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

it's a public health issue. The Department of Health has reported that one in six New Yorkers already experience ringing in their ears or hearing loss, and 20% are frequently disturbed by noise at home. Longterm exposure can not only lead to hearing loss, or stress, and sleep disruption, disruption but also high blood pressure and heart disease. It's also-we're obviously coming off a period of time where many New Yorkers are staying at home and working, or working increasingly at home, and we have seen citywide the amount of complaints go up, enforcement go down, or the ability to respond to those perhaps stay even while we try to tackle many more complaints coming in. And certainly for the New Yorkers who are experiencing a new way of life, they deserve an opportunity to have a greater, a greater opportunity for peace and quiet.

And to be clear noise is not only a nuisance,

I am confident this package of legislation will help greatly improve New Yorkers' quality of life. I want again, to thank Chair Gennaro for holding this hearing and the Committee staff for their work. I want to thank my staff for helping to put this package together. I look forward to hearing the

2.2

2.3

testimony today moving forward this package
legislation to make New York just a little bit of
quieter. Thanks so much.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much Mr.

Majority Leader. It's my privilege to recognize my

colleague and great member of this committee,

Councilman Bob Holden to speak on his bill.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you Chair Gennaro.

And—And just follow up on Majority Leader Keith

Powers's comments: The noise problem in New York

City has been forever. We all know this. And

particularly if you live in a mixed—use area,

commercial along with residential. And so there's

got to be a balance there. And so the introduction

of my bill, Intro 160, is a big step in addressing a

significant problem we face in New York City, of

course, the noise. I'm not a big fan of noise and

some of my legislation in the past has shown that.

And I know many others feel the same way. Noise

pollution can really impact our daily lives and our

quality of life.

With my bill, we're looking to take action to deal with this issue seriously. We're setting clear noise standards that don't leave room for any

2.2

2.3

24

25

compromise. Many times, it's very subjective. 2 3 get a police officer. And if you call it into 311, it takes -- it tells you on 311, it'll take eight 4 hours, many times to address it within eight hours. The problem we have, and my district is certainly one 6 7 of them, we have a problem where the officer goes 8 there and says, "Oh, it's not that noisy." And then the homeowner calls and says, "Listen to this councilman. Look at how noisy this is. I have this 10 11 for eight hours a day." So we need some kind of 12 standards. So I'm hopeful that these measures will 13 make our city a quieter and more comfortable place to live. Again, particularly in mixed-use areas. 14 15 I'm looking forward to hearing from both the 16 administration and the public on this matter. 17 open to suggestions on the bill. If people feel that 18 it's-- it's too strict, we could-- we could change it. We can modify it. 19 So your feedback and support are crucial. 20 21 work together to create a more peaceful and enjoy--

But I also want to bring up a little history, if you if you don't mind, Chair Gennaro that--

to thank the Chair again.

enjoyable urban environment in New York City. I want

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please, please do so.

this. Mayor Bloomberg had Operation Silent Night.

Does anybody remember operation Silent Night? One person in the room. And where did it go? It went nowhere. Nothing really came of it. It's a noisier city. So, I thank the Chair for this, these series of bills, and the Majority Leader because these are important bills to make-- to improve our quality of life. Again, thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. And notwithstanding the fact that Silent Night didn't turn out the way a lot of people thought, when the mayor put forward his comprehensive overhaul of the noise code which took— he put it forward, I think, in 2003. But by the time we got through with all the yelling and screaming, it was like 2005 when we actually got it done. So it was— you know, it affected the carting industry. It affected building managers that had air circulation devices. It affected construction, carting. It was— We— It was a comprehensive package that I thought did a good job. But you know, not everything is— is a big hit. So Silent Night wasn't a big hit. But to the Mayor's

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

credit, he really tried to take noise, you know, seriously. We got a lot done, but we're back.

And-- and with that, I think we're ready to call

the first panel, the Office of Administrative Hearing and Tribunals. I'd ask the Committee Counsel to swear in the witnesses, and I'll just-- as a matter of, you know, just a statement I-- I want to thank DEP for, you know, kind of working with us to structure the hearing this way. Ordinarily this is--When we call The Administration this hearing ordinarily would be-- DEP would be the first entity to testify. But as always, we work well with DEP. We work well with The Administration. And I worked well with OATH before. I was the one that gave you folks the ECB. I don't know if you enjoy that or not, but it used to be in DEP. We took it out of DEP and gave it to you. And I hope that worked out for you. And so, with that said, let me make sure I have my copy of your testimony in front of me. And the witnesses are sworn, right? Or have they been sworn, or just called forward? Have they been sworn yet? COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Would you please raise your

right hand? Do you swear or affirm to tell the

truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth
today?

PANEL: I do.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much. I have your statement. You may proceed with your testimony.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Thank you,

Councilmember-- Chair Gennaro. Thank you. Good

afternoon Councilmembers. My name is John Castelli,

and I am the Deputy Commissioner for Legislative

Affairs at the New York City Office of Administrative

Trials and Hearings.

I would like to start by thanking Chair Gennaro, and the members of the Committee here today, taking the time that— you're— I know you have extensive responsibilities and it's appreciated. I'm joined by my colleague, Amy Slifka, who is the Deputy Commissioner of our Hearings Division.

By way of background OATH is New York City's central independent administrative law tribunal, and our mission is to ensure that everyone who appears before us receives a fair opportunity to be heard and a timely resolution of their case. We are a high-volume court, and in fiscal 2023 alone in our

city agencies that appear before us.

2 hearings division, we processed almost 765,000

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

summonses, and held over 238,000 hearings, and issued close to 2000 appeals decisions. We also closed after trial or by settlement conference approximately 4200 cases at our trials division. In each of these cases, we take great care to ensure that every party who appears before us is treated impartially and is accorded due process. In order to fulfill our mission, ensure impartiality, and protect due process, OATH must remain independent from the many

New Yorkers, including individuals, homeowners, and small businesses, need to know that when they come before OATH, they are coming to a place that is unaffiliated with the agency that issued them a summons or notice of violation. And that they will be given a fair hearing. I have had the opportunity to do outreach events in a number of council districts, including some of your own (and if I haven't done it with you yet, believe me, I'm going to be there at some point, and looking forward to it), and through that work, I've come to learn that your constituents rely on OATH being independent. And for these reasons, we take our independence very

24

seriously. One way that OATH maintains its independence is by not getting involved in enforcement matters. OATH does not opine on potential enforcement legislation, enforcement policy, or enforcement penalties. Those decisions are for the policymakers. We are the tribunal. Once a law is passed, we apply that law to the facts of each case brought before us. Consistent with this OATH takes no position on the package of proposed legislation that is under consideration at today's hearing. We are here today because we understand that the Committee has questions about OATH, processes and data, and we are happy to assist the Committee and understanding how OATH works. And we will do our best to respond to your questions. you Chair Gennaro.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much for appearing here today. We appreciate all that OATH does. And, oh, we're also joined by Councilmember Gutiérrez. She has joined us, and we are grateful to have her.

And -- And you came out to my district recently, and we have to -- we have to coordinate that.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yes, Chair. We had a tremendously successful event out in your Kew Gardens branch--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: --library and we're looking forward to coming out again.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yeah, there was a little disconnect with my office. But, yeah-- but we certainly appreciate you know, getting out to-- getting out to Queens, particularly my district.

Okay, I have some prepared questions, but I-just help me out here a little bit. So, on August
17, there was a resolution put forward by OATH
regarding the exercise of authority to remit a civil
penalty in code Section 24-244 B matters. This has
become a big deal. And-- And so if you could just-For those that are not familiar-- Because this is
seems like kind of an extraordinary thing for-Because-- For OATH to put forward because it wasn't
in relation to one specific appeal or whatever. It
was just OATH putting this out. And-- And if you
could just walk us through the reason why OATH felt
compelled to-- to put out this resolution. This is a
real resolution with whereas clauses and a resolved

1	RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 28
2	clause and all the trimmings, you know. You know,
3	what compelled OATH to do that, and for the laypeople
4	here what are you trying to get across to folks?
5	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Mr. Chair, the
6	decisions made by the Environmental Control Board are
7	something I can't comment too as a representative of
8	the administrative law tribunal. It those decisions
9	are they speak for themselves, just like the
10	decisions that are made by a quasi-judicial
11	decisions that are made by our hearing officers and
12	our ALJs. So I can't speak to
13	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay.
14	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI:that decision.
15	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: All right. I am officially
16	oh-for-one now. Let's see if I can get my batting
17	average up. Lincoln's one of his jobs is to
18	chuckle at things that I say, nothing else.
19	You're supposed to do it all the time.
20	Okay, thank you.
21	Now, in light of what you said, let me ask
22	questions that would be appropriate for OATH,

according to how you just couched that.

2.2

2.3

This could be-- I just want to get this on the record. You probably have to get back to me with this: What is the total monetary value of the civil penalties that OATH has sustained for citizen-initiated summonses alleging a violation of Section 24-244 B?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: That I'd have to get back to you on now.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So I-- Again, this is-this is the things that we want, and we appreciate
that.

And what percentage of— This— You may have some sense of this, you may not, or you may— may want to get back with a reassessment. What percentage of citizen—initiated summonses alleging a violation of Section 24-244 B have been defaulted on? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: The percentage is 59%.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So 59% default? Okay. All right. Now the citizens— citizen enforcers have been using Section 24-244 B to— which I believe is really meant for those that have speakers facing out from an establishment trying to generate business.

And— And are you in a position to tell us whether or

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 30 1 not that -- that section of the code is being applied 2 3 correctly when it comes to businesses that are-- not 4 have outward facing speakers, but they have ambient noise within the establishment that spills out into the street? That is my undrestanding. 6 7 supposed to be like a decibel noise measure standard, 8 and not subject to the unreasonable noise standard. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Mr. Chair, we wouldn't be able to comment on whether or not the 10 11 enforcement -- This is more of an enforcement type 12

question. We can comment on the processes where we have a citizen-prosecuted summons filed with OATH, and we can tell you what happens once that summons is filed. And I do want to stress that I have tremendous respect for this Committee and the

council, and I don't like to tell you, "Hey, I can't

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

answer."

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No, no. It's fine.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: So I just want you to be aware of that.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: John, don't worry about it. We're-- We feel you. We got it, you know? And-- But I will for the sake of the public, you know, indicate, just -- just to put on the record, that

1

3

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

this, you know, August 17-- this August 17 resolution talks a lot about 24-244 B, and what it really gets at is that -- I'll just read it.

Resolved that the board exercises -- meaning the Environmental Control Board -- exercises the authority granted under 24-25 Section B-- which is-- that's the whole-- it's the enforcing thing. To remit in whole the civil penalty in all matters, wherein summonses, charges, a violation of 24-244 B, upon finding at the hearing that the respondent is no longer in violation accordingly upon a hearing officer, so finding a zero penalty shall be imposed.

And I just want to let that sink in a little bit. So this is from the Board, saying that if someone brings something forward, under 24-244 B, if the respondent is no longer in violation, and that can be substantiated, a zero penalty shall be imposed. It seems to me-- this is my own editorializing-- I'll own it-- that OATH has kind of had it with these violations, and they are-- this is their own way-- my interpretation, you know -- that this is their way of, like, putting forward that the -- what's been going on since this fairly recent phenomenon of the, you know, citizen enforcers going out and-- and using 24-244 B,

_

J

you know, in a way that differs from what it was intended. You know, to me, this is OATH doing, kind of, all it can to indicate that, as long as the, you know, condition is now corrected, no penalty will be imposed.

And so I know that OATH is kind of in a little box here, and— and has limited ability to opine on this and that. But, you know, to me, this was a striking resolution. I think, kind of an act of courage on the on the part of OATH, and I salute you for that. That's not a question. It's a statement.

And—— But getting back to that 59% number. So, someone gets a violation under 24-244 B, and maybe the section—— maybe that maybe that section of the code is being applied in the right way, maybe it is being applied in the in the wrong way, but if they default, they lose, judgment against them, they have to pay the—— the citizen enforcers, you know, get their bounty or whatever you want to call it. And then the businesses have to pay. So this a 59% default rate. And, so that I think is—— are there—— Just to turn this into a question. I mean, is it—— is it ordinary for a lot of different violations for there to be like this level of default? Or is 24-244

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1

2 B, you know, unique in its, you know, percentage of 3 defaults?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I couldn't answer that question. Regarding--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: It was a good question, though, I think.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: That says, I mean, as the administrative law tribunal our -- our role is to ensure that the hearings happen, I can't speak to, or can't--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: --can't opine on why someone defaults, fails to answer a summons. And I can't...

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well, I tell you what. don't we have someone from OATH, if you wouldn't mind, you know, put some numbers together on default rates if that's-- obviously it's-- it's public information. I'm just I just want to kind of zero in on that 59% default number.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: So I can-- I can look into that and we'll get back to you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1 And-- And regarding the OATH appeals unit, if 2 3 you-- if you're able, can you describe the role of 4 the OATH appeals unit? And are the decisions of the appeals unit binding on all hearing officers? 5 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: The decisions by 6 7 the-- depending on-- obviously, there could be 8 factual distinctions between cases, but where the where the facts are basically the same, a decision is made when it's-- those-- those facts are applied to 10 11 the law in question. If the appeals decision is made 12 based on those facts, and there are similar cases 13 those--14 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. 15 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: --those similar 16 cases could follow that -- that decision. Again -- But 17 it each case is taken on its own. 18 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. 19 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: so it-- there are 20 so many nuances involved, as you know. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah. 21 2.2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: So regarding this:

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. But-- So the-- When something is appealed, and, you know, you -- and -- and

Yes, and my answer is: It depends, basically.

2.3

24

25

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 35 1 the appeals unit comes forward with the decision that 2 3 is-- that is-- that's what lawyers might call 4 precedent or something. Is that -- Is that a proper use of that term, Counsel? And, but it is -- so it --5 so these appeals would be disseminated to the hearing 6 officers, and they'd be aware of various appeals, 7 8 that when they're in the midst of adjudicating, you know, whatever, they're adjudicating, they would-- it would be, it would be fair to say that that would be 10 11 quidance for them, right? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Pursuant--12 13 Pursuant to the charter requirement, yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. Okay. 15

And has OATH-- has OATH seen an increase in citizen-initiated summonses under 24-261 alleging a violation of Section 24-244 B in the last year? you have any sense of that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I can't. couldn't tell you. I'd have to get back to you on that.

2.2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: All right.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

24

25

There's so many questions here. I want to be--And ordinarily when-- I normally bring in my other members fairly early to ask questions, because I like

- COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 36 1 to get them involved and engage them. I'm being a 2 3 little bit of a ball hog here, and it's not my way to 4 do this. But this is kind of a special case. Pardon me while I shuffle through papers. While I kind of get my head together for my next 6 7 question, we have Councilmember Nurse who has asked 8 for the opportunity to ask questions. I recognize Councilmember Nurse. COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Chair, I think my question 10 11 is going to be for DEP.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, no. These would just
 13 be for OATH. Okay. And so...
 - COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Actually, mine will be for later.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: What's that?
- 17 COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: I have a question for
- 18 | later.

15

- 19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, fine. Sure.
- 20 CONSERVATIVE MEASURES NURSE: Thank you. Thank
- 21 you.
- CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah. So yeah, when-- when
- 23 DEP is on what, we'll do that.
- Okay. I recognize Councilmember Holden for
- 25 questions.

_	
2	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you, Chair. Just a
3	few questions on the types of complaints and some of
4	the defense that we hear from, let's say some
5	establishments. I'm more interested in hearing from
6	commercial establishments, like do some of these
7	commercial establishments say or do most of their
8	defense would say, "I didn't know about the law," or
9	"I didn't know the standards of the law."
10	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I mean, in that
11	scenario, the answer would be yes.
12	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: That would be the majority
13	of the time
14	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I couldn't tell
15	you
16	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN:they didn't know they
17	were violating violating the law?
18	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I can't
19	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: It was essentially noise
20	complaints. I would I would think that would be
21	probably the defense.
22	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: That could be a

defense, yeah.

THE THIRD WITH

2.2

2.3

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: And—— And so when you say that there was a default, that means they didn't answer the complaint?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: They failed to answer the summons.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: They failed--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Which means-- Yes, I'm sorry, Councilmember.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: And then-- So tell us what happens.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: So if they fail to answer a summons, what happens is OATH will notify the respondent, business establishment, and let them- immediately notify them and let them know that you're-- you've missed your hearing, please contact us ASAP regarding this. And they get 75 days from the date of the hearing that they missed where they can file a motion to vacate that default. So that's 75 days without any questions asked they will be given. Once they file their motion to vacate (you can do it online, you can do it in writing), they will be granted a new hearing date.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: So you give them--automatically give them a second chance?

1	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 39
2	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: A second chance.
3	Yes. Yes.
4	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Then what happens after
5	that if they don't?
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Well, if they
7	don't, then from between if it's more than 75 days
8	and less than one year, they need a reasonable excuse
9	to for to get a motion to vacate that default.
LO	They have to provide a reasonable excuse. And if
L1	it's more than a year, they are going to need a an
L2	extra extraordinary circumstance to succeed in
L3	getting that motion to vacate.
L4	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: All right. At what point-
L5	- what point do you generate a summons?
L6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Well, we don't
L7	generate the summons
L8	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: You don't generate, but
L9	the agency will.
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: The summons The
21	summons is filed with us by the enforcement agency.
22	That's when it comes into our universe. That's when

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Right.

it exists in our world.

23

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

1

8

9

10

11

13

14

21

2.2

2.3

24

- 2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: So it depends when the agencies file it with us. 3
- 4 COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: So it's up to them if they file it. 5
- DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yes. And they set 6 7 the hearing dates.
 - COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: All right. Thank you, Chair.
 - CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Holden.
- Now, most times, the entities that bring 12 summonses forward to OATH would be agencies, yeah? You know?
- 15 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yes.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And are there any special 17 accommodations or changes to OATH-- to OATH's 18 practices that must be made for citizen-initiated 19 summonses, as opposed to when the petitioner is an 20 agency? How does that -- how does that work?
 - DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Well, when--Obviously when-- when the agency files a summons with OATH, then the -- it comes into -- again, as I said, we-- then the adjudicatory process begins. And then there is a hearing. And until we get to that

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 41 1 2 hearing, there are no ex parte communications between 3 OATH and any of the parties. The only time we have 4 any communications is on the record at the hearing. Now, when a -- when a citizen-prosecuted summons is filed with OATH, then it's treated-- the hearing 6 7 date is set similarly to the-- similarly to the what 8 the -- the enforcement agency sets the hearing date, and also the -- the citizen complainant, the citizen prosecutor who -- who becomes -- who prosecutes the 10 11 They have to appear at the hearing. Now, 12 sometimes the enforcement agency is not -- does not 13 appear -- they don't always appear at the hearing. 14 They usually do. But in the case of the citizen--15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. If you could just-just hold on that point again. So -- So you've got a 16 17 citizen-initiated adjudication that's going on. 18 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Rirhgt. 19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So the entities that would 20 be there would be the adjudicatory entity, which is 21 you folks. 2.2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yes. 2.3 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And then you have the

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI:

person making the complaint?

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And the person that the complaint is being made against?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And then you would have the agency that's involved?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: No. No. What I'm talking about is where the -- where it's a citizenprosecuted summons, where-- that's filed with OATH, it's the citizen complainant who has to appear at the hearing to prosecute the case against the responding-- the respondent -- before the OATH hearing officer.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. And let's just say this citizen enforcer was-- makes an allegation of a violation, and OATH makes a determination that the section of the code cited by the complainant is not the right section of the code, or that section of the code doesn't apply to the complaint that they're bringing forward. What happens then?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I'm going to defer to Deputy Commissioner Amy Slifka, who is the head of our Hearings Division.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: All right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: She can give a better answer than me.

6

7

8

9

2

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So basically, from

3 one--

4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please state your name for

the record. 5

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I'm sorry.

Slifka, Deputy Commissioner of Adjudications at OATH.

So basically, from what I'm hearing, you're saying is: If a summons is issued, and for example,

they don't-- the facts don't make out the charge for 10

11 the section of law, if both parties are present, then

12 the hearing officer would hear the case, the

13 petitioner would present their case, in this case the

citizen complainant, the respondent would present 14

15 their case, and the hearing officer would decide the-

16 - make the decision on the case. If the facts don't

17 make out a case for the section of law charged, then

18 obviously, it's not making a prima facie case, and it

19 would more than likely be dismissed. But this is not

20 done ex parte. This is not done by the hearing

21 officer without both sides being given an opportunity

to present their side of the case. 2.2

2.3 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. But the -- But the --

Any individual who will be-- who would be doing the--24

who would actually be doing the -- doing the 25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 adjudication would be a hearing officer and-- and ALJ
3 or...?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Right. It's a judicial hearing officer. Right.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And so that person is-- is obliged to make sure that the code is--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Applied correctly.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: --that section is being is being applied correctly?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, and that-- and that's 13 that, right?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: And that's that.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. All right.

Okay. I recognize Councilmember Nurse who has a question for OATH.

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Just one question. I'm just trying to understand what— what data you can share. I had a question about how many of the complaints that have been initiated by the two people, who I'm reading, make about 90% of the noise complaints, how many of those are successful?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Thank you,

Councilmember for the question. First thing I just

1	RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 45
2	want to clarify for so I answer the best I can to
3	your question is: When we at OATH We look at
4	Citizen-prosecuted summonses and not they're not
5	citizen complaints. So they're filed with us, the
6	citizen-prosecuted summonses. That's when uh, so
7	in terms of
8	COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: So of those that are of
9	those that are filed with you?
LO	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I I couldn't
L1	tell you what the what the what the numbers are. I
L2	cannot tell you. I can check to see if we can find
L3	out.
L4	COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: What kind of data are you
L5	able to provide today, I mean, related to this
16	hearing? I'm just kind of struggling to understand
L7	what we're what we're getting here.
L8	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Sorry?
L9	COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: I'm asking what kind of
20	data are you able to provide today around this
21	hearing topic?
22	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Well, the data

that I provided-- that was provided from the

That's the only data point I heard, but I might-- I might have mis-- misheard.

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: The 59%? That's really--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: No, I can't-- I mean, the questions that were previously provided to us, we had given information regarding the summonses that were issued by the enforcement agency, DEP, and by the citizen-prosecuted, citizen complainants who prosecute summonses with us.

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Okay. So even if you've said it or not, just to restate it, because I'm trying to keep on top of what's being said across here.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: And Councilmember, please, it's-- We want to make sure we--

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Yeah. I know. I'm trying to understand the scale of it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: we explain. As the administrative law tribunal, it's-- it's our job to make sure that you know-- the more you know, the better it is for your constituents, the better is for all of us, and we can make sure that people get fair and impartial hearings.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

2.2

2.3

2 COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: I believe you. I believe 3 you 100%.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I sound like a broken record when I say it, because that's all I say, and people get annoyed because all they hear about from-- from us is "fair and impartial hearings" and "due process", because that's what we focus on.

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: It's just been hard for me to follow exactly the numbers in this conversation.

So, I'm trying to get a sense of— how many cases that are complaints, that move into your jurisdiction where you are taking action around noise complaints, have been successful?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Well, the-- If

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: How many of those cases are you getting a year? Because you testified a lot of numbers, just in terms of all of the cases, but I don't know if that was...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: If-- If I'm if I'm correctly interpreting the question, and forgive me

If I'm not, please, we have-- the numbers that were provided have the cases that are dismissed and the percentage. If you look at citizen-issued summonses

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 48 1 2 by percentage for noise, you will see the percentage 3 of summonses that are dismissed. That would be on 4 page three, if we have the same type of--COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: I think maybe mine has a 6 missing page. I have a paragraph where you have, you know, 765,000 summonses, 2000 appeals. I just don't 7 8 if that's -- just that's like your whole casework. 9 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Right. provided numbers and have numbers. 10 11 COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Okay. 12 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: We provided the 13 answers to questions that counsel-- that the 14 committee has submitted to us. 15 COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: I will follow up and get those then, because this was not-- I was like, I'm 16 17 not 100%. 18 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Yeah. Please feel free. We're always available. You can-- Feel free. 19 I'm able to give you our-- I'll give you my card 20 21 after that -- when we're done here so you have access, 2.2 and please contact us any time.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER NURSE: Okay, that sounds great.

2.3

24

25

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you, Councilmember

2.2

2.3

Nurse. Here's just one, a sort of final question.

Getting back to the resolution. I'm kind of still stuck on that. And Counsel of the Committee thinks it's good idea to get this question in full on the record. Again, going back to the resolution. On August 17th, the ECB adopted a resolution to exercise the authority— to exercise the authority— the noise code grants them, ECB, to remit a civil penalty upon a finding and a hearing that the respondent is no longer in violation of Section 24-244 B, which concerns the use of a noise reproduction device by a commercial enterprise for advertising purposes. What factors will the ECB rely on to make a determination and each matter that there is no longer a violation?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Again, Chair, I can't speak to-- I cannot opine on the decision, a quasi-judicial decision that the Board made.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. But I think the resolution, you know, does kind of speak for itself somewhat on that. And does anybody have any more questions for-- for OATH? No? Okay.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

With that, I would like to thank you both for coming before us. Do you have another statement you want to make?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I just want to thank you, Chair Gennaro. OATH wouldn't be where it is today without the work that you did 20 years ago. You've helped us. You've expanded and provided accessibility, greater access to justice for people throughout our city for the work that you've done.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well, I was getting a lot of complaints back in the day, from vendors, from this, from that. And also, you know, we've got-we've got, you know, DEP, who is-- you have an entity within DEP that is hearing like fire violations and noise violations, and all kinds of different -- and sanitation violations. And, you know, the ECB of that era didn't have, like, such a great reputation. I thought it's a good idea to, you know, to put it into OATH where, you know, OATH has got some game. So I thought that would be a better place, there would be more, there would just be better justice meted out. And people would go to ECB, and then they'd have to come back another day. And, you know, I used to get a lot of complaints. And I was, again,

1 Chair of the Committee at that time. And then I--2 You know, overseeing DEP, and I'm like, we should--3 4 we should move this to OATH. So, um, I'm glad for 5 all the work that you've done. And vendors and other people that used to get jammed up at you know, ECB--6 7 Let's just say I don't get complaints anymore. And 8 so that is a testament to your good, you know, 9 stewardship of the -- of the ECB and, you know, adjudicating all stuff is not really what DEP is all 10 11 about. That's what you're about. So that's where 12 that came from. And so, thank you for coming before 13 us. 14 And now we have the face of OATH at our

committee, and this is your first time before this committee, so pick up your door prize before-- as you're-- as, you know-- We don't really have door prizes here.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: Thank you, Chair. Thank you members of the Committee. Thank you members of the Committee.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Lincoln is just going like this, just going like this.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I'm going to give you my card, Councilmember.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, thank you very much. We want to call, you know, DEP forward. I'd ask DEP to get themselves situated and sworn. I'll be back in two minutes to hear their statement.

[TO MINUTES SILENCE]

Okay it is always a pleasure to have DEP with us, and you know, they are folks I go back with a long way, Deputy Commissioner Licata, Mr. Page-- Well, you have your-- I just want to call everybody by the right title. But hello. Hello. Great to have you here. I look forward to hearing your good testimony. Everyone's all duly sworn and everything? Okay. All right with that, we'd be-- Oh, they haven't been sworn in? Okay. Now if Counsel could swear in the witnesses.

COUNSEL: Please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth before this committee and to respond honestly to Councilmember questions?

PANEL: I do.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much. Again, a pleasure. Please -- Please commence with your good testimony.

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Good afternoon, 3 Chairman Gennaro, and members of the Environmental 4 Protection Committee on-- We would like to begin just by introducing my colleagues. As you noted, this is Mark Page. He's the Executive Director of the Bureau 6 7 Environmental Compliance. And sitting to his left is Alyssa Preston. And yes, I knew you would recognize 8 that name. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, Alyssa. Have you been 10 11 in DEP all these years? Oh, well, it's been a long 12 time. So good to see you. So good to see you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: She's the Director of Air and Noise Policy and Enforcement.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So, I am Angela Licata, and I'm the Deputy Commissioner for the Department of Environmental Protection. And I'm-- Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I'd like to begin with a brief overview of DEP's noise enforcement work, including the citizen complaint program, and then we'll speak to each of the bills being considered today.

To begin, DEP and my colleagues were very proud of the work that we had done to improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers by enforcing the city's

2.2

2.3

noise code. The code does ensure that the city that never sleeps remains vibrant and active while meeting the needs of those who live in, work in, and visit the city by reducing noise pollution and protecting public health.

DEP and the New York City Police Department share responsibility for enforcing the noise code. DEP's responsibilities focus on commercial music, construction noise, noise from buildings' heating and ventilation equipment, and DEP's noise inspectors proactively approve and inspect noise mitigation plans and respond to approximately 50,000 noise complaints each year.

The noise code has been updated twice in recent years. First, as Chairman Gennaro explained, was in 2005. And then we had some updates and improvements that were made with Local Law 53 of 2018. And we're very grateful for the leadership and the support of the New York City Council, and especially of the now Chair and then Chair Gennaros for making these improvements. We are forever looking to—continue to make these improvements. So we don't want to rest on our laurels. But we do want to appreciate how far that we've come since the 1970s.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Although I will indicate-just indicate that Local Law 53 of 2018 was when I wasn't here.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So anyone who has got a problem with that law, it's not-- that ain't me, you know? And so-- but it's always-- it's great to be partners with DEP. We've done a lot of great things together over the years, the Council and DEP. Please continue. Forgive my interruption.

updates standardized commercial music regulations, require that these noise mitigation measures for construction activities, created a section that prohibits excessive noise for motor vehicles. Since the 2018 changes, DEP has been required to respond to after-hours noise complaints in specific timeframes, and requires that all noise mitigation plans be filed electronically and be available for public inspection. These changes have significant—significantly strengthened DEP's enforcement.

In addition to the proactive enforcement DEP inspectors focus on the areas of known complaints, and they also have very specific training, and can

1 use their discretion to determine if there is a 2 3 violation or not. If a inspector determines a 4 complaint is justified under the noise code, the 5 inspector informs the business of the alleged violation and what can be done to correct it, and 6 7 that is generally before a violation is issued. 8 Depending on the severity of the alleged violation 9 and whether or not it is purposely and egregiously

our inspectors are trained to provide.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And our goal again, we need to be really clear, is to bring businesses into compliance with the noise code and to reduce noise pollution for the benefit of the public and its public health. The goal is not to be punitive. The goal is not to make profits, although as we stated, we do not hesitate to issuing summonses to bad actors.

performed, these are the levels of discretion that

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Angela, I'm going to confess that I've lost my place.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: We're going to start with a paragraph.

Of course DEP's inspectors will never be able to address all of the city's noise issues as they are happening.

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 57 1 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Page 2? Is this page 2? 2 3 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Mm-hmm. 4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Where is -- say that again? 5 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Of course, DEP's inspectors will never be able to address all of the 6 7 city's noise issues as they are happening. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Keith, you got this? Not 8 the one with--Oh, my testimony is missing a page. I'm 10 vindicated. 11 12 We should have music in the background as we kind 13 of figure this out. 14 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Okay, beginning with 15 the paragraph--16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I don't have anything in 17 front of me now. I will soon. 18 MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: The testimony that was 19 given to us, I think, was missing some pages. So--20 at least on some of the legislation, it was missing several bills. 21 2.2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yes. There was a missing 2.3 page. Now I have the page. It is a partial

paragraph, and the first whole paragraph begins, "Of

course, DEP's inspectors..." right? 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, sorry about that. Sorry for the hubbub.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Okay. So it says...

Of course, DEP's inspectors will never be able to address all of the city's noise issues as they are happening. We simply cannot be everywhere all the time. This is why citizen enforcement can be a useful complement to DEP's work. Local laws allow us-- allows anyone to provide evidence of potential violations of certain sections of the noise code to DEP. DEP or the reporter can then bring this evidence to the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings for a hearing to determine whether a violation has taken place. We believe citizen enforcement is valuable, but it needs to be fair. Citizen enforcement of the noise code should pursue the same goal as DEP lead enforcement, encouraging compliance and reducing noise pollution.

Unfortunately, that has not been the norm.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: If I could just jump in-Again, sometimes, if I don't do it now. And-- I'll-Please pardon the back and forth. And so with regard
to the citizen enforcement, you talks about-- here's

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 2 how it works. Local law allows anyone to provide 3 evidence of a potential violation. And so-- the DEP's or the reporter can then bring this evidence 4 to-- to OATH for a hearing, but don't they have to bring it to DEP first? 6 7 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: They come to DEP first. DEP has 30 days to either seek enforcement on 8 its own, in conjunction with the citizen or--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So -- So somebody comes to DEP and they-- they have a complaint. And so DEP can send their own enforcement people out there to monitor it, do what needs to be done, assess it, issue violations, or whatever. So DEP gets that. And-- And, failing that, like, what happens? So DEP decides for whatever reason -- So if somebody brings a complaint, and DEP wouldn't go out there, if it's just like something that -- that that that already happened, and somebody comes forward and they have evidence or whatever, right? Then DEP like takes a look at that. And then DEP can use that evidence to issue its own violation?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes. DEP can issue its own violation if it witnesses. It can go out there as you stated, and look--

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No, but I'm asking-- but 2 3 can they do it based on --DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: The citizen's--4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: --based on the citizen's 5 information that's been brought forward? 6 7 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: It can be a videotape. 9 can be an audio tape. It could be a decibel level 10 reading. 11 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes. 12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: It could be what-- whatever 13 the heck it is, right? 14 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And so based on that, DEP 16 can issue a violation. And then DEP is the 17 complainant, and then it has to go and deal with OATH? 18 19 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yes. DEP would co-20

sponsor that complaint. The citizen would get a portion of that penalty if the penalty is upheld at OATH. So they would receive some of that penalty money.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. Okay. And-- All This is-- I don't want to get too much into

in.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

2.2 2.3 24

the questions, but just-- just know that coming out of this, Alyssa, there's going to be a question about this section, whatever it -- wherever it is, you know, whether or not Section 24-244 B-- people are using that section for sound reproduction devices, which I believe, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, is really meant for people that are using that for advertising purposes. But yet, these violations are being brought to DEP for ambient noise that is spilling out into the street, and therefore not.

So I just think that's, you know, the wrong section of the code. So just get ready for a question on that, and why the DEP is even entertaining these, and not just -- not just indicating, like, "You've got the wrong section of the code. Go home." And so-- So that that question is coming. Okay? Make sure I do that. Okay? Please continue. I'll try to limit my jumping

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Unfortunately, that has not been the case recently. Citizen noise enforcement has been a significant problem for many businesses this year, with businesses receiving multiple violations by citizen enforcers all at once

__

without a warning, and racking up thousands of dollars in fines for minor infractions. We do not think this has been fair and we thank the Chair for his attention to this real issue and to protecting the livelihood of businesses unfairly targeted by a select few citizen enforcers.

Citizen enforcement is supposed to be a tool to reduce genuine noise pollution in circumstances where DEP inspectors cannot respond in real time. The program is also used for our vehicle idling program, a program that has been largely successful and that is playing an important role in improving air quality in the city and helping communities protect themselves from pollution. The idling program allows citizens to film a vehicle idling and submit the video with a description of the incident through the DEP website. DEP inspectors then review the evidence and issue a summons if warranted.

If the vehicle owner is found in violation at the subsequent OATH hearing the citizen who submitted this evidence is entitled to receive 25% of the collected fine. If DEP does not issue a summons, and the citizen decides to self-pursue the case with

2.3

OATH, then the citizen is entitled to receive 50% of the collected fine.

Some citizens have realized that the money-making potential of the idling enforcement program and begun to patrol neighborhoods looking for idling vehicles.

Overall, the diligence of idling enforcement has been a positive thing for communities and our air quality. However, there are some over-zealous, opportunistic, citizen idling enforcers who have abused the program. Some participants have been egregiously aggressive towards our staff and some have tried to defraud the system by doing things like filing fake videos or resubmitting the same video repeatedly.

Our staff has thwarted their attempts to submit falsified evidence, and they are also successful in fact that a few participants started looking for new ways to profit from the citizen enforcement programs. About a year ago, these few participants realized they could file noise complaints against businesses who are playing music outdoors. Because noise videos do not have time minimums, they could make money more easily.

A small number of people abused this enforcement option and have been targeting and harassing several

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 64 1 businesses. In fact, about 90% of the approximately 2 3 6000 noise complaints filed in 2023 by citizens were 4 filed by only two people. As you can see on the map that we provided in testimony, these citizens have 5 been targeting specific areas of Queens and 6 7 Manhattan. They are mostly commercial areas where they can walk down the street and record sound from 8 9 multiple businesses in just a few minutes. Locations have citizen enforcement of Section 24-244 B which 10 11 relates to businesses playing music outside for 12 commercial purposes. 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, I just lost my place. So you have, "As you can see from this map, they can 14 15 do sound from multiple business in a few minutes." 16 Then you have the map. And then what happened after 17 that? Did you skip something? 18 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: "Locations of 19

citizen enforcement of Section 24-244 B", you should see, which relates to businesses playing music outside for commercial purposes.

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I don't have that on mine. Do you have that? Oh. Okay, that's the fine print on top of the -- the graphic I'm sorry. Okay. Please continue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

current--

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS The enforcement DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: being done through citizen enforcement is hurting businesses and is not helping communities. Citizen enforcement is happening in areas where we do not receive 311 noise complaints. No one is complaining about noise from Times Square in the middle of the day, but more than 1000 Citizen complaint reports have been focused there. The participants are not using enforcement to achieve compliance and reduce noise pollution they are using it for personal profit. And now we're turning into the legislation. Overall the legislation being considered today complements DEP's work and we generally support these bills. We do want to recommend a few specific changes to the introduced legislation, and would like to postpone consideration of Intro 1194. Intro 1194

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Postpone consideration? This is the hearing

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Not postpone the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No, I'm just saying that-but this is the--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Well, I'm going to testify about our concerns on that right now. So-CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh fine, fine, fine. Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: It's completely-Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I thought you meant like you didn't want to address it at all. Okay, and I'm saying, "This is the hearing. You have to."

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yup.

So currently if a business pays a fine from a noise summons by a citizen enforcer, the citizen enforcer can receive as much as \$660. Subsequent violations have heavier fines than the first one. So enforcers are incentivized to stack a series of complaints against one business and deliver many at once. Before a business has received one summons, they already have racked up several more. Intro 1194 would reduce the payout collected by citizen noise enforcers from a percentage of that penalty to a flat rate of \$5 or \$10. This reduction would make it harder for bad actors to use these violations as a source of significant income. This reduced incentive could reduce the volume of summons— summonses that

businesses, we want to reform the program to protect city staff from repeated harassment and abuse that

In addition to these changes to protect

businesses receive, addressing one of the challenges small businesses are facing.

We share the goal of reducing this undue burden on small business. But we would like to work with council to enact broader reforms to the citizen complaint program. DEP has been working with other agencies, including small business services on comprehensive reforms to improve the citizen enforcement program. These reforms will make the program a more effective tool to combat noise pollution and protect businesses from program abuse.

Using penalty reduction to achieve the volume of complaints that a business receives only resolves one of the challenges that businesses are facing. Even if this bill were enacted as it is currently drafted, businesses could still receive many summonses, and many summonses long after the alleged violation date.

So, we would like to take the time to defend—
Oh, I'm sorry—— Summonses at once, having to take
the time to defend themselves at an adjudication
hearing and having to pay a significant fine.

2.2

2.3

small number of citizen enforcers have harassed staff at multiple agencies and the companies they provide evidence against. Some specific issues we have dealt with included several instances of aggressive citizen complaints attempting to access secure government office spaces, looking for specific individuals, including an instance of a complainant attempting to assault a staff member, aggressive verbal harassment targeted at specific employees, and instances of the same piece of evidence being submitted with different allegations with the intent to generate multiple summons based on intentionally fraudulent evidence.

they have experienced. As I alluded to earlier, a

I understand that some of your colleagues' staffs have received similar aggressive communications. If any Councilmember has further questions regarding abusive behavior, please feel free to reach out to the Administration for more details. We welcome continuing this conversation.

The Administration therefore wants to enact holistic reform legislation that would establish a fixed monetary payment for citizen enforcers as this bill does, but would also ensure the businesses receive a summons in a timely manner and do not

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 receive too many at once; limit citizen noise 3 enforcement to overnight hours when these noise 4 violations have a greater negative impact; create a 5 cure mechanism so that businesses can work with DEP to resolve an issue, avoiding the need to appear at a 6 hearing and eliminating any potential fine; 7 authorizing DEP to establish clear rules for evidence 8 required with reports; authorize The City to disqualify citizens from participating in the program 10 11 if they are found to submit fraudulent evidence or exhibit abusive behavior. Further, we would like to 12 13 update the type of violations that can be-- be 14 reported by citizens. Noise complaints through 311 15 about ice cream trucks playing music is one of the top five 311 noise complaint categories. 16 Ice cream 17 trucks are not supposed to play music continuously 18 while they are parked. DEP inspectors cannot 19 regularly respond to these calls, so we want to 20 expand citizen enforcement to include this noise. 21

Intro 160 would amend the noise code relating to interior noise at commercial establishments so that noise that is generated inside but cannot be heard from the sidewalk is no longer treated the same as noise that is generated outside. This would include

removing interior noise from citizen enforcement eligibility. We think this is a clear delineation to the citizen enforcement program, and it makes sense, and makes the code more understandable for businesses

Intro--

so we support this bill.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. So I just want to jump in for a second. And so-- You know what? Let me-- Let me let me just kind of save that. Mark that and save that for-- for a question. And that's an alarm going off saying I have to take some medication. So as soon as you finish your statement, I'm going to do that. It's going to go off again in a minute to remind me. But, yeah, it's a thing.

Okay, again, forgive the interruption. Please continue. Intro 774.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Intro 774 would require DEP to measure construction related sound levels inside homes whenever asked to. DEP falls this practice currently, so we support this requirement, and is already codified in 24-223 D for after hours work. DEP recommends amending sections 228 and 229 to allow for readings to be taken from a dwelling during the day with limits warranting a

2.3

summon set to an increment of 10 decibels above the ambient during the day, instead of a limit of 85 decibels at the weighted scale, and retain the 7 DbA standard or decibels at the weighted scale for afterhours work.

Intro 775 would require DEP to post the results of all noise inspections online within 24 hours of the inspection being completed. We request that this bill be amended to extend the time window. Each inspection report must be reviewed and approved by a supervisor, and there are extra considerations when we expect a summons to be issued. We prefer to delay posting information to ensure that the information is accurate. So, we would like to work with the sponsor to determine a more workable timeline.

Intro 776 would require DEP to provide any noise inspection report that was generated in response to a 311 call to be provided to anyone who requests the report, and has the 311 tracking number. Currently, FOIL requests are required to obtain these reports. We support the goal of this bill but we'd like to discuss it in more detail with the sponsor and our colleagues at the police department.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

2.2

2.3

Intro 777 would add debris removal to the definition of construction work that requires a variance for after-hours noise generation. DEP currently considers debris removal in noise permit requirements as removal of material as part of the construction process. DEP does include— supports the inclusion of debris removal in the definition of construction work.

Intro 778 would require DEP to establish the noise camera program for motor vehicles, and lays out the specifications for how a program should work and how OATH should process violations. DEP began piloting a vehicle noise camera program in 2021.

After a successful pilot period, we launched the program officially in March of 2022. The program has led to more than 300 violations being issued. The use of the cameras as an effective and efficient complement to boots on the ground or field patrol enforcement efforts. We continue to learn and evolve the program, including adopting new technologies and increasing the number of camera locations.

If a noise program is required by local law, we support many of the proposed requirements including the reporting and certification requirements.

However, we would like it to complement the program that we have developed over the last few years and be flexible enough to allow the program to evolve as new technologies emerge. We're happy to work with the sponsor on this legislation as well.

Thank you for consideration of these matters. We look forward to engaging in thoughtful discussion with the Chair and bill sponsors to work towards our shared goal of reducing noise pollution to protect the health of all New Yorkers, and we are happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much, Deputy Commissioner Licata. Yeah. So we've got, like, a bunch of bills by the Majority Leader. And then Bob Holden and I are fighting the war on civilian enforcement. And so, I'm going to yield to the Majority Leader. He has questions on his bills.

Sergeant, I'm not putting the Majority Leader on a clock. And so I recognize Councilmember Powers for questions on his bills.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Thank you. I'll try to be quick anyway out of respect for everyone here. I just want to ask you-- first of all, thank you for your testimony. Without question, I'm happy to work

Ŭ

with DEP to make sure that legislation we're working on is efficient and effective. I think your recommendations make some sense and appreciate the constructive feedback on the various different programs we're talking about here. And I'll have ask some questions. I want to start just taking a--taking a step back.

We were looking at some of the data around new lays enforcement in the city, which— which helped inform us on the legislation and going into the hearing. It feels like it's a shared responsibility between DEP and NYPD right now, when you call 311, and— and file a— or reach out to— call the city and— and file a complaint. I don't— I'm trying to understand what is the actual separation of duties there? How does the NYPD respond to calls? How does the DEP respond to calls? What is the current resource allocation for the DEP to noise complaints?

And it seems like a tremendously high amount of them are going to the PD, and they're going out and responding. Various levels of enforcement are happening. But I guess just to understand this conversation, you have to kind of understand how we're doing enforcement in the first place. So can

_

2.2

you share with us how DEP's role is shaped in this conversation, and where handoff happens between DEP NYPD? Or how the NYPD or DEP might share responsibilities here?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah, thank you very much for the question. So, um, first and foremost, we have air and noise inspectors that cross-trained individuals. We have about 65 of them on board at DEP. And we are generally enforcing the sections of the code that I mentioned in my testimony: The commercial music, the HVAC systems. And we are looking at joint operations with NYPD as well.

So that is something that has really been sparked by the Adams Administration. We're very grateful for the support that we're getting from NYPD. And I think they're grateful for the support that they get from us. And we do conduct a lot of shared, what we call, operations whereby we're balancing the best of both features of the departments. So we have training on the noise meters. We can actually take those measurements. A lot of our violations are actually at a higher cost. So it's also a benefit to NYPD to be supported by DEP. And we have had many of these shared operations, especially during the

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 2 weekends, and especially in areas where we're having very high complaints. 3 4 MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: So let me just follow up 5 to that. If I have a noisy construction site, let's say, an after hours variance, or even just a noisy 6 7 construction site that feels like it's exceeding the

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: It would be DEP.

decibel limit. I call 311. Is it DEP or NYPD who is

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: DEP?

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

showing up?

12 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: For construction 13 noise, yes.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, because that's in the bucket that you select from. So, if I call 311, they are farming it out to the agency where they believe the jurisdiction lies?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: So anything outside of the ones that you named would be going to the NYPD for them to respond to: If it was a noisy neighbor, a noisy party, or something like that, which I do see they respond to a lot.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS:

which violation. I don't have those scripts here
with me, but we could provide them.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay. What is the
average response time for your 65 inspectors?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Generally, the 311

scripts are very precise about who is getting routed

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: We are generally going within a one-week timeframe. So if we have a call, let's say there's a dislodged construction plate, right? Let's say it's roadwork. And we could respond to that within a day or two. But let's say we're responding under our Section 24-231, where a resident would like us to take a reading within their premise. That we would schedule an appointment for. So they may have called us about an activity that's happening on a Friday night, and they know that they need to schedule that appointment with us for the next Friday night. And that's why we have those timeframes that's reserved for those types of events.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: I mean, unfortunately, for the person who's staying up all night, pulling their hair out, because they have a noisy thing going on outside their premises, it's-- the next Friday won't be-- will be far too long to respond to that,

∠

which I think we're trying to get into that, including providing people more information, you know, whether it's 24 hours, 48 hours, whatever it is of that extra report. I think we are sometimes lacking the ability to enforce in real time, which is really when the noise issues tend to happen, and they need enforcement right now.

I don't disagree with the NYPD being part of it, because they-- we have precincts in all of our neighborhoods, and they responded to it quickly. But of course, we're pulling them off one assignment to do another when we do that.

How many decibel meter machines do you have that are dedicated to construction?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Let me just go back to your earlier comment. I think that was an excellent point. We do have rapid response units in place, and the way that we can work around making the appointment, let's say, for a citizen to issue under that section of the code, that is the benefit of having various sections of the code.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Right. About the civilian-- you're talking about the benefit of having

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 the civilian complaint program, if you reform it in 2 3 the way you desire to? 4 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah. It's the benefit of having that unreasonable noise. So, if we 5 wanted to respond to that complaint in real time, we 6 7 could get out there and we could respond to that 8 complaint, we could respond to various sections used to get at the same purpose. MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: 10 Okav. 11 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So just wanted to make that-- [TO DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI:] 12 13 many noise meters do we have? 14

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: All of the 65 inspectors have noise meters.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: And those can read any level of noise, whether it's construction noise, or--DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA:

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: So basically it just records the sound-- the decibel, like, level? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: They are very sophisticated machines. They are calibrated regularly, and the inspectors are trained on them. They're able to evaluate decibel levels on the A

scale, which is what the human ear can detect. And

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

C scales.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay. And for-- You

mentioned-- We'll just go into the civilian

which is very important to get to some of the bass or

they also kind of valuate on other octave bands,

there being no time minimums related when they record video. Can you just explain what you mean by that

complaint program. You mentioned something around

when-- I can read you back your part of that. But there was a point when you were making, I think,

recommendations about it, that with some of the

videos, I believe, there were not timed minimums

required-- involved in them. So, it becomes a costly

endeavor. I can find my underline of that, but if

you-- if you recall, I can-- I'm happy to read. Uh,

here it is. It's uh-- I will find actually-- I'll

find that section and I'll come back to it.

But it did want to ask another thing. You said 90% of the approximately 6,000 noise complaints filed in 2023, so this year, by citizens were filed by only two people. How many total people participate in that program?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I think we have six.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

1

7

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Like what is the other 2 3 10%?
- DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I think we have six. 4
- 5 MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Six civilians in New York City are filing that, two are responsible for 6 90%.
- 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: The majority are 9 filed by six.
- MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: And 1000 in the area 10 11 around Times Square? It's my district.
- 12 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Mm-hmm.
 - MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay. And the-- Just to understand the violations once more: A citizen of course can receive as much as \$660. So it's capped at \$660? Or that's just how the percentage would play out if you add them up.
- DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: That's the first 18 19 violation.
 - MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: The first violation? Okay.
 - DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah. And then there would be a higher penalty for the second violation. And then an even higher penalty for the third violation.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

2.2

2.3

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: So what are those violations? First, second, third, amount wise? Not the citizen complaint part of it. But to the-- We have-- We presumably have some business owners here, who are here to talk about this.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: What-- What is the fine on them?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So the first violation is, generally speaking, on the citizen issued is \$440. And then the second violation is \$880. And the third violation is \$1320.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: That's what the business pays. And then the civilian is taking-- I think right now, 25% of that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: 25% of the department department participates, and 50% of the department does not participate. And then there's also even higher penalties for the first, second, and third for default penalties. So they're very steep.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay. Got it. So we have-- I am familiar with Time Square businesses and non-Time-Square businesses who have been-- have been raising concerns about the program.

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

There was a-- I can't find my other. 2 I will find 3 it. But the question I had after that, I wanted to 4 also talk about the noise cameras, which we have a 5 legislation to codify that program, to expand it, maybe perhaps to distribute it in an effective way. 6 7 Can you just talk to us about how that program is 8 going right now? I understand you're through going through a pilot program. I've seen, I think, some feedback on how it's working so far. I think you're 10 11 rolling it out more. Are you able to share with us 12 how many noise cameras are on the city right now? 13 have your violation number, I think your testimony. But just-- Any feedback on what-- what the department 14 15 is learning about that program as you're rolling it 16 out? 17

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah, so we're very, very pleased with the program now. We had one camera where we were piloting. We moved it several times.

So, we practiced at different locations. We have learned that we need to have a certain configuration or roadway geometry for the camera that is part of the microphone system to be very deliberate in terms of discerning which vehicle generated the noise. But we are doing so now quite successfully. We currently

have nine cameras that we've purchased, and we have seven that are and have been installed.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Say those numbers one more? You have nine purchased and seven installed? Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: And seven installed.

We've been generally issuing or violations off the one camera. So this should expand quite rapidly, very quickly as these other nine cameras come online.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: And location wise, I think I read something— Long Island Expressway, difficult to differentiate between vehicles because of the fine, but what are you learning in terms of geographic location?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: We're looking throughout the five boroughs. And in fact, we've had a lot of recommendations from Councilmembers for where they're experiencing a lot of complaints. And really, you know, your constituents are the eyes and ears on the ground. So we do take their recommendations very seriously. In fact, I believe that based on the camera experiences that we've had so far, that they have been proven very right, because we're issuing a lot of violations, not just

Thank you.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.3

24

25

2 for the loud muffler noise, but also for unnecessary

3 horn honking that is not related to emergency

4 situations.

MAJORITY LEADER POWERS: Okay, just to be respectful of the other sponsors here and the Chair, when to stop there. We'd be happy to continue to talk with the department about my legislation, the five bills we have. We think there's more to do here, and expanding this enforcement around this issue is an easy way to deliver some wins for New Yorkers who are pulling their hair out. And we get—These are all I think informed by real life experiences. So, I look forward to working with you guys on that. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you, Mr. Majority

Leader. One more great package of bills that you're

bringing forward. I really appreciate you doing

this. And very happy to give you the allotment to

21 them to ask questions as long as you want. And so

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Okay.

22 thank you for that.

I just saw Councilmember Holden now. I was going to ask a question before I go to him, but I just had a-- the thing that I was going to read from, I want

1	RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 86
2	some copies made of it, because I'm going to give
3	them to DEP. And so while that's going on, I'm going
4	to recognize Councilmember Holden for questions.
5	COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you Chair. And I
6	just want to just follow through on Majority Leader's
7	questions on noise cameras, because they can't happen
8	fast enough. We You know, you have the the
9	mufflers that backfire, sound like gunshots. I have
10	them every single night within earshot of my home.
11	And the guy comes by every you know, almost the
12	same time. So, these noise cameras. Are they very
13	expensive, first of all? There's probably different
14	stock different makes and models and so forth. And
15	how how expensive are they? Because that'll
16	dictate how many we put up, I guess.
17	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah, they're
18	running about \$50,000.
19	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: 35.
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: 35? Yeah, \$35,000.
21	They will improve.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: \$35,000 each?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Each.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Okay. And you have nine cameras. Seven were installed. But how come the other two weren't installed yet?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: They're just going up now, as we speak. We have staff that are employing them.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Now, so these-- And I'm worried because when I hear, "We don't have that many," I'm just worried that they're going to be in Manhattan, and not in Queens. Only because-- you know, there's-- there's a bunch of bills that we have, but I think we also have to sleep in Queens too. And we chose to live in residential areas mostly. Yet we have things that we've never seen before. We have-- First of all, why would somebody modify their muffler to make it sound like gunshots? We've never had that before. We had some people that just soup up their cars. And obviously that happens. It's always happened. But now there's a strange phenomenon. People just like to make noise.

And if the cameras are that successful, and can generate—— Again, I just wanted to ask about the fines. Let's say you do get a guy with a muffler and you caught them. What's the fine?

2.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: \$800

J

_

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: \$800. This is why I like DEP, when they're involved. Because when NYPD is involved, and I just want to ask a couple of questions. I guess-- I'm on the clock, right? Yeah, I see.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: We're-- We're partners on this whole civilian thing.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Okay. So-- So--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Sometimes they get off the- plus I'm looking at my stuff, so knock yourself out.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: No, I think I-- Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: It's good.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Just -- Just the

coordination between NYPD and DEP, because I've had chronic locations where NYPD cannot handle. They just— The local precinct, and I listen to the scanner— They're busy with 911 calls. The— the noise complaints are when they get around to it. And it's rarely now with the new police department, is it within eight hours like they promise on 311. It's sometimes the next day, 24 hours, and of course the noise has probably gone.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

_ 1

25

And so when does-- when does NYPD-- are they mandated to contact the DEP at one point because they can't address is this? It's a chronic location?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So that's an excellent question. And thank you for it. When we do have those chronic locations (and again, I just want to recognize Mayor Adams and Commissioner Agarwal at DEP, because this has really improved under their tenure), the agencies, or the police department, or the DEP are working together with these joint operations, and again blending the skill sets of both departments really well, where we can go out and do the technical work, we can do the measurements, we can issue to the offending parties at the higher rate of penalty. Whereas the police department is helping us safely access some of these locations. We do not have armed personnel, so it is very important that they stay safe.

So it has really been a wonderful blend. If you have locations, you should please provide them to us. Because we are constantly on the move with these joint ops.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Yeah, normally it's-- it's neighbor and neighbor who say, "Well, they're playing

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the radio too loud," that kind of thing. 2 And-- But 3 the police increasingly now cannot handle this. 4 That's why-- But I'm also wondering, with all these 5 packages of bills that we have, are 65 inspectors

I-- I don't know how you promote the awareness of the citizen noise complaint program. Because a lot of 8 people don't know about it. And maybe we would get more people participating, rather than the bad actors 10

that you say they're doing it for profit.

enough to handle this -- this load here now? Because

But it's not-- it's not under the-- you know, if we did promote this more, we might get, really, to the point where enforcement is, and we do have-enforcement is good -- and we do have a livable city.

But right now, again, I can't get the police to handle parking summonses anymore in my district. It's so bad because they're handling increased 911 calls.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah. That's a very sensible recommendation. And we agree that we could do a better job of marketing this. I think we've been a little reluctant, holding off, because we'd like to make these reforms first so that we can ensure that we have a successful program to promote.

2 So we would greatly

2.2

2.3

So we would greatly appreciate working with you for it.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: So-- and I like the strategy: "Let's get the program to where we it'll function properly. And we can get, you know, get some of these issues solved, whether through legislation or regulations." But I do like the idea.

But I would like to see the program operate.

And-- Because I'm dealing with the same locations over and over again. And I did speak to the Commissioner about this. But I do-- On chronic locations, I recommend DEP because that will put an end to it. You get a you know, a few \$1,000 fine, you're not going to be playing, you know, music very loud, constantly, every night, or just on weekends. So I like that idea.

So-- But do you need more inspectors? That's what I'm, you know-- Because 65 for the entire city of New York, and noise seems to be one of the biggest complaints on 311.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yeah. Um, it's a tough question to answer during these budget constraints. We do feel like we have enough to respond to the complaints that we're getting within

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 2 the mandated timeframes through the mayor's 3 management report. We're always meeting our targets. 4 However, additional staff would always be welcome. Clearly, you know, we would put them to good use. 5 will say that in recent history, we've been working 6 7 much more efficiently. We're working smarter. have utilized technology to our advantage. We have 8 9 heat maps. We call them the heat maps. They're--Generally when we can see complaints coming in, our 10 11 supervisors can see that in real time, and they can 12 deploy people to those areas. So, yes, we feel 13 somewhat constrained, as all agencies are now. But we do feel like we are working as efficiently as we 14 15 possibly can. And, through the use of technology, 16 there's probably room for additional improvement. 17 COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Right. Let me just go

back. And last question, I promise you.

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The biggest -- One of the biggest complaints we get, and probably the most frustrating because the police can't catch these guys, the guys that play their music very loud in the car, and they ride around, and they wake the whole neighborhood up. they set -- they even set up -- there's -- it's so loud, not only with their mufflers, but they're setting off

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

car alarms as they drive down the street. A camera program that would catch these guys, you know, again, as long as it we don't identify where these cameras are, you know? Like if people know that -- where the speed cameras are, so they don't, they'll drive down every other street, but they'll avoid those streets, or at least slow up. Are these cameras hidden? Are they noticeable?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: They're hidden in plain sight.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: We have had a circumstance where one was detected, and absolutely it was avoided. There's a lot of clubs, these automobile clubs. They got the word out really quickly. And we were able to get there. We moved the camera as quickly as they were able to identify it. So, we do try to disquise them. And we do keep the location secret.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Okay, but I'm just offering my-- my budget-- a portion of my budget that I get in my council office for these cameras, because I think they'd be a godsend for peace and quiet, and

2.2

2.3

we need to sleep at night in New York City. Thanks so much.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you, Councilmember Holden. Pardon me. I'm going to take some water.

Okay, folks, I'm having a sidebar with Alyssa

Preston about— about an appeal from a citizen

enforcer, or— versus Jackson Hole Restaurant. And

the appeal was dated July 27, 2023. And by my

reading of it (and it is pretty plain language), it

seems to indicate quite clearly that, you know, with

regard to— with regard to sound that is emanating

from the interior of an establishment, and that—

that 24-244 B is the wrong section of the code for

that. It's really meant more for outward facing

speakers, if you're trying to draw people in for you

know, as I said, before "come on in and buy neckties

here" or whatever.

And so, with this having been put forward by OATH, in July 27, 2023, the question would be-- It seems to me that OATH has established that 24-244 B is the wrong section of code for the for-- for the citizen enforcers that are coming forward with these with-- with these violations. Now with-- with this

2.2

2.3

in place-- And this also seems to clash a little bit with the-- with the August, whatever it was, resolution of the board that says, "Okay, if we can establish that-- that the that the infraction, or the problem, or the violation has been fixed, then you

know, we're not going to levy a penalty."

And so, in July, it says it's the wrong section of the code for this kind of violation. In August OATH is saying, "Well, as long as you can show that it's fixed, then we're not--" They-- they don't seem to agree with one another. But I'm going with the July one, because it just plain old says that it's, you know, the wrong section of the code.

Now, if I'm DEP, and I get the ability to dismiss violations as frivolous, or whatever the term is, if you're using the wrong section of the code, then why not just quash it there rather than just not act and have the civilian enforce who go to OATH, have the person default (59% default), and then the city gets its money, and then the bounty hunters get their money. It just seems that this provides some clarity as to that section of the code being in the wrong section of the code, that— that is being used by the civilian enforcers.

1

5

8

7

1011

12 13

14

16

15

17

1819

20

21

22

2324

25

And so that's kind of my statement. And so the question would be that, since this has happened, and there's been some clarity made, that this is the wrong section of the code, has DEP changed the number of violations that it is dismissing from the civilian enforcers, when they're presented to DEP, based on this, you know, appeal by OATH, saying it's the wrong section of the code? And what is DEP's sense of this-- of this whole thing, being like the wrong section of the code? And why-- I don't want make a characterization, but why is DEP sitting back and let he's letting these things go through to-- and tying up OATH, and getting the business owners to come They're most likely not; 59% don't. And so it's-- You know, forgive the cynic in me-- that you know, it's money for city. Okay. And then, you know, money for the-- for the for the bounty hunters. I don't get it.

And so I would just like, you know, someone to opine on what's going on here, when we have a document in hand, by my interpretation, showing that that section is the wrong section of the code for all of these violations that are being put forward by the civilian, or by the what I call the-- hang on, yeah,

2 by the civilian enforcers. Some of you call them

citizen enforcers. I prefer civilian enforcers. So that's my statement-question-statement-question. So

5 there you have it. I don't want to be you right now.

6 But sorry.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So thank you for that. We are aware of the appeals decision that you're referencing. I think it's important to draw the distinction that--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I need you to speak right into the mic like this, you know?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Sorry. Is that better?

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yes.

aware of that appeals decision. I think it's important to point out in that particular appeals decision, the court focused on the fact that they were using it for the entertainment of the dining population, and they also pointed out that that particular location referenced in the appeal was near the Grand Central Parkway. So it was very hard for the citizen to prove it was for commercial or business advertising purpose.

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 98 1 2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No, just stop right there. 3 I'm not-- I'm not following that line of--DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I'm going to explain 4 5 it to your point. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah. 6 7 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So I think it's helpful that appeals decision, because there's no 8 9 longer presumption that just because it's audible, that they're innately in violation of 244. 10 So what 11 DEP is doing is we're reviewing as we have been--12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But-- But I'm going to take 13 issue with that. Because just -- "plainly audible" or whatever, you know, gets into the whole, you know--14 15 That's something that we put the bid 20 years ago 16 with-- with the noise meters and all that. And so 17 like, that's what we're supposed to be doing. And so 18 the whole plainly audible standard, which is like the unreasonable noise standard, is, you know, harkens 19 back to a day before we did the noise meters and all 20 21 that, and we put that to bed 20 years ago, and so I 2.2 can't get -- I can't get past that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So I understand your consternation. So 244 B is in the code, and that

2.3

24

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 99 1 2 does have a statement that it basically must be for 3 commercial or business advertising purpose. DEP--4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Advertising purposes. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Right. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So 244 B--6 7 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: For commercial. 8 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: --is for advertising 9 purposes. But yet all the bounty hunters are going there and putting their cell phone, or whatever the 10 hell it is, you know, like, you know, right up 11 12 against the glass. And, you know, DEP could have 13 been dismissing these things from -- from the get go. 14 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So we can't--15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So why aren't they-- So why 16 weren't they before? And certainly, why are they not 17 doing that now? 18 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: So we are just 19 dismissing a great portion of the citizen complaints 20 that come to us, based on lack of appropriate 21 evidence. But we have not been--2.2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well--2.3 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: --opining and

adjudicating whether or not, you know, what the case

24

25

specifically is.

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah, but certainly DEP is 2 3 in a position to know whether or not the wrong 4 section of code is being -- is even being applied. Doesn't that give -- If someone comes forward to DEP, you know, a complainant, and then they have this, oh, 6 7 but-- So do they come to you with a ticket, or do 8 they just come to you? Or they-- they come to you with their-- with their homemade ticket--DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: They come to us 10 11 first. We have 30 days in which to review the 12 citizen complaint. Um, for a portion of them, we 13 determine that we don't believe that the evidence is sufficient for anybody to pursue that complaint. So 14 15 just based on--16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Do you have any kind of--17 any kind of statistic on-- for the civilian enforcers--18 19 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: What is the number? 20 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: How many come to you that 21 have been dismissed by -- or whatever the word is, you 2.2 know...

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yes. We have that number. So... If you want to report that. But ultimately, I agree that since we have these

2.3

24

25

1 decisions now, I think that we do (and you're making 2 3 that point) that we probably have the basis of more 4 dismissals. And we-- we can do that. That takes staff away from DEP's other business. 5 certainly -- based on what we're trying to do to 6 7 support our local economy and our small businesses, 8 now that we have these rulings and decisions -- we 9 can probably dismiss a great deal more. But also the reforms that we are proposing, I believe, will 10 11 eliminate this problem in the future. So these--12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. And certainly 13 that's a good conversation. But, you know, right now, we have a situation where, you know, 59% of the 14 15 businesses get these things. They don't show up. 16 They get whacked. And then, you know, the bounty 17 hunters get all their money, \$660, whatever. And--18 And this is, you know, by your own testimony, and the strong language in your testimony it's a real--19 it's a real blight and a real problem, and a real, 20 you know, imposition on businesses in the city. And, 21 2.2 you know, we in government just -- just don't really 2.3 have the, you know-- don't have the luxury of just putting, you know, harsh language, in testimony, when 24

DEP comes before the Council. The whole idea is to,

25

_

once these decisions come forward, and they're, you know, moving the needle on what is and what is not, you know, a valid violation, you know?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Then, you know, then DEP not only has the right, but— but the obligation to make sure that it steps up and says, "Okay, we can do— We can come down harder on these." And then—And then that has done that has a chilling effect on the people who are writing the violations in the first place.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yes. We can dismiss--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Because they are—they are like starting to get shut down and shut out, because they're using the wrong damn section of the code,

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: We can dismiss based on meritless and frivolous— I believe that's the language of the section. And if we determine— It's just very, very difficult, sometimes by viewing those videos to determine what the intended purpose is, of those speakers. It is just difficult for us. And we— There's that blurry line that we don't like to cross, which is that we are not the adjudicating

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

body. That would be OATH. So that's the fine line
that we're walking.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'll put that under the category of what I call "nice try", you know what I mean? And-- And I would have said the same thing, if I were you. But you know, the fact remains that, you know, with-- with--

And again, OATH too. They got this thing in July, and then they got this thing in August that don't appear to me to, sort of, agree. But both are kind of, in different ways, sending the message that we're sick of this nonsense. We don't want to do this anymore. We got businesses getting jammed up. We got people walking away with like, pockets full of-- hundreds of thousands dollars a year from this, and we're helping them essentially, you know, perpetuate a scam. And this-- this can't be. And--And, you know, I wouldn't want to be part of DEP top management that has got to shift resources in order to, you know, make this thing go away. But, you know, it sort of is what it is, and the people who are paying the price is not-- it's not DEP. It's these businesses that are getting these violations. They don't know what they are. They don't want to

2 | hire a lawyer, or they don't know, or whatever.

3 They're trying to run their business. They've got to

4 take a whole day off and go down there. They don't

5 know what they're going to face. "And if I hire

6 lawyer and do this, I'm just going to break even

7 | anyway. So why don't I just pay the vig, so to

8 | speak?" Vig is a slang term. Most people-- Most

9 people might know what that is. But, you know,

10 \parallel those, my age and older would probably know that.

But-- So this is my-- You know, this is- this is
what I get from-- people know I'm Chair of the

13 Committee. I get-- I get businesses from all over

14 | the city like yelling and screaming at me. And then

15 | I get the bounty hunters yelling and screaming at me

16 with their, you know, very aggressive tactics and--

17 and, you know, being aimed at my staff, and I'm like,

18 | "What the heck are we doing here?" And so: Happy to

19 work, you know, going forward with, you know, things

20 | that we could and should do. But I think there needs

21 \parallel to be a change, and there really needs to be a change

22 now.

2.3

24

25

And so, you know, whatever you need to do in order-- well, you tell me what-- what you think is going to happen now, after, you know-- you're going

2.2

2.3

2 to go back to Lefrak and say, "Gennaro did his whole
3 thing." And so...? So...?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: We're riled up too about this. I mean, there have been, again, a lot of conversations with Small Business Services. Our colleagues over there are very frustrated with this program. And again, I think the best thing that we can all do is move quickly on this package of reforms, additional—

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I know, but right now-- but right now there-- there are people-- you know, they're people interacting with DEP today, on behalf of bus-- The number of summonses is like off the charts. And so, I'm all for the reforms, but I'm-- What we have in hand right now, you know-- appeals of OATH, the resolution of OATH. And it would appear that, since these resolutions have-- and this appeal and this resolution came forward, I don't think DEP has really changed the number of-- of violations that they themselves are taking the opportunity to dismiss as frivolous, or whatever the word is, or not consistent with the code, or whatever. Or has there been a difference? If there has been a-- if there has been a difference, now's the time to say it, and

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I'll be the first one to applaud, you know? 3 that been the case?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Well, as I said, I think now we have a greater opportunity to dismiss some of these cases.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But the time is now. Like this is July.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: And the time is now. There's nothing I can do about pending cases with OATH. So that's a clear distinction.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well, I think, you know, once we do something those that have not been adjudicated, you know, we could -- we could tie all those up in a bow and just get rid of them. But, again-- I don't play lawyer here, but you know, to the extent there is this kind of, you know, mis-this kind of, you know, injustice in the name of justice playing out in the city, where-- where, you know, business owners are getting fleeced, and you know, DEP has, you know, decisions in hand, and can-and can just, you know, be kind of, you know, nip these at the bud, and not drag in OATH, which is clearly sick of this. I think that's-- I think that's the obligation. I think.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And in the meantime, we work through, like, what we're going to do in terms of, you know, reforms, both, you know, to the civilian enforcement for noise, as well as idling, which we're not really talking about today (you did in your statement, and I thought it was important for you to do that, and so I gave you a little latitude on that), but I'm kind of like decoupling, you know, officially decoupling, at least for now. Because, you know, this is the fire that is raging, the one right now with the bounty hunters and -- and with the business, with the businesses that are being impacted by it, and, you know, government kind of throwing up his hands a little bit saying, "Yeah, we could do more but we're busy." You know, that just-- You know, in the case of this kind of wildfire, that doesn't -- that doesn't sort of carry the day. It's just not good enough.

I still like you all. It's not about that, you know? But, just, I think we need to do better.

Let me see what other-- Hang on. Oh. My very patient partner in government here and partner in the Council Lincoln Restler.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: I thought you were going to call me loquacious.

_

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: What's that?

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: I thought you were going to call me loquacious.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, yeah. You're-- You're that and more, my friend.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: I'll be brief today.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So you thought I was-- You thought I was that I was a tough customer. Okay.

You're going to get it now. Okay. So I recognize my friend and colleague, Lincoln Restler, for questions.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: Thank you very much. I'm not giving anybody an overly hard time today. But I- I do really appreciate Chair Gennaro's leadership on this topic, and comments of my colleagues.

You know, there is a noise complaint to 311 every minute of every hour of every day for the year, across the year, for the city of New York. We get-I think there were 523,000 complaints last year.

And, you know, we get it. We live in a loud city, and we're accustomed and acclimated to a certain extent of it— to a— to a certain extent.

But in many areas, it is just inexcusable. And it's very challenging to get any kind of meaningful enforcement from DEP or from the NYPD. I recognize

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

that I think of those 520,000 complaints, only 60-something-thousand of them get sent to DEP. The vast majority of them go to the police department. So we should bring them in next time, Chair Gennaro, and give them a hard time about their failure to enforce on any of the noise complaints that we have across our district.

The stuff that drives me the craziest are the extremely loud mufflers, the extremely loud motorcycles that ride through our communities and have no regard whatsoever for our neighborhoods. I'm interested in just understanding where we are on the camera pilot study and the status of your plans to expand it. My recollection is that you've had it at five different locations over the past year and change, year and a half. We had at some point been approached about identifying locations in our district that we thought would be viable. suggested a number of locations. None had been selected, as far as I know, much to my chagrin, and we want you to have a presence in our community and to be utilizing this technology to impose fines for people who are incredibly disrespectful of our neighborhoods.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And so how are we doing on this pilot? Are we finally ready to-- to acknowledge its success? Its efficacy or lack thereof? And what are the plans for expansion?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Thank you very much for the question. We really are pleased with the noise camera pilot program. This all began during the pandemic, or at least we saw our roads being overtaken by a lot of drag racing, loud-- loud mufflers, and it was very difficult to be able to deploy personnel in all of these locations simultaneously. It was frustrating to us. It was frustrating to NYPD.

And we read about a program that was successful in London. So what we did is we sent over for one of their pieces of equipment so that we could pilot it here in New York City. We are extremely pleased with the level of precision of the microphones that are associated with the cameras. They're directionally oriented so that you can really pinpoint and discern which is the vehicle that's creating the noise. That's not in all cases. In some cases, it is not easily discernible. We don't feel like that would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

24

25

honking, the noise of the cars. It's extraordinary.

And there should be more attention there. And I

don't think-- I would love to see more PD enforcement

on this, but I don't think that that's the right

solution. I think that the cameras are a better

approach. I appreciate that you have nine cameras.

hold up in court. But we are pursuing quite a large volume of these associated just with the one camera.

So, we had about 250 summons that were issued so far. We have about another 100 that are pending.

And I was reporting earlier that we have nine cameras in total that were purchased. And we just finished installing seven of them. So the other two will happen in the next couple of weeks.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: But none in District 33?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I have to check. We have not excluded you purposefully. I honestly would have to check, but we are taking--

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: I'm glad that you haven't

prioritize our district because downtown Brooklyn has

a phenomenal amount of noise. And we could use some

purposefully excluded me. But I hope that you

attention, especially by the entrances to the

Brooklyn and Manhattan bridges, the levels of

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 112 1 Could we-- Are we in a position where we could 2 3 allocate capital dollars in this year's budget for additional cameras in our district? 4 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: It's hard for us--6 COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: How do we get you to say 7 yes? 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: --to mix capital 9 money with our expense budgets, so that--COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: We purchase cameras with 10 11 the NYPD, Argus cameras, to-- in high crime areas in 12 our districts to try and make sure that our police 13 departments have the tools they need to be 14 successful. Why couldn't we do the same here? 15 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I'm very welcoming 16 of the idea. And if we could figure out a way to do 17 that, I would definitely support it. COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: I don't know that DEP 18 19 takes capital money from the Council. But if we 20 could identify an alternative agency that could be a 21 partner--

2.2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Mm-hmm.

2.3

24

25

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: --so that we could purchase cameras and place them in locations that we jointly determine are most helpful, then we could

2.2

2.3

2 help expedite that. Do you have any sense of what
3 the cost would be per camera?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: Yes. We were just talking about that earlier, too. It's about \$35,000 per camera. And I will say that it— they are paying for themselves. So, they are a wonderful use of technology. Again, we are not a profit driven enterprise. We don't run on quotas or anything like that. But given the quality of life disturbances that this creates, I believe it is a very effective enforcement tool.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: Okay. I would really like to follow up you, Deputy Commissioner, about how we can be ready in this upcoming budget to allocate additional capital money to bring additional cameras to our district. So, we'd like to start those conversations quickly. And then just lastly, as Chair Gennaro gives me the hook: In light of the passage of the SLEEP Act, the New York SLEEP Act up in Albany this year, that went into effect— or last year, that went into effect in April, enforcing decibel limits and raising funds for illegal muffler modifications, has there been any additional DEP enforcement or any ways that we can demonstrate that

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 we've been able to execute on the efficacy of this 3 law?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SLIFKA: I'll let Alyssa handle that because we want to differentiate between the vehicle traffic law and the enforcement of the DEP's noise code.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CASTELLI: I'll just add that the penalty is \$800 now, which we were able to do as a result of the SLEEP Act in March of 2022. Before that, it was around \$250. So that did give us the authority to be able to increase that penalty. referred to the VTL to set the sound limit that we use for the camera. But the authority for us to implement the program is purely within the New York City noise code.

COUNCILMEMBER RESTLER: Great.

And so I look forward to working with you on capital allocations this year. We will figure out however we can make that happen. We would very much like to see an increased presence of these cameras around our district. And I imagine many of my colleagues would want to do the same. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you, Councilmember Restler. And we have no more questions for the

| |

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 panel. We really appreciate your, you know, being

3 | here. And it seems like the message kind of sunk in.

4 And we are appreciative of that. We look forward to

5 | the work, you know, coming ahead, that we can, you

6 know, work on this with the noise, and also the

7 civilian with the idling, which we're not talking

8 about today, but we do very much look forward to

9 that. Always a pleasure to see you and thanks very

10 much for your good testimony, and-- yeah. Thank you.

11 And with that we have our first panel. If the

12 | Counsel could call them the first panel?

13 Just one second.

work with

Okay, we have a first panel of Andrew Rigie, Max
Bookman, and Robert Bookman, all testifying on behalf
of the New York Hospitality Alliance. where you can

Okay, am I going to call upon Counsel to swear in this-- swear in the panel.

Thank you.

Okay, Sergeant, normally we set it a two-- this is, like, a juicy topic. We're going to go to three minutes to give people a chance to say what they have to say. Even though it's-- that means I don't have dinner tonight. No loss there.

MR. RIGIE: I can't say my name in two minutes.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Now that said, people don't have to take up three minutes if they... you know.

Okay. Yeah, we just swear in the administration, those folks. So please proceed with your good testimony. And we appreciate you being here.

MR. RIGIE: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Chair,
Councilmembers, committee staff. My name is Andrew
Rigie. I am the Executive Director of the New York
City Hospitality Alliance. We are a not-for-profit
association that represents thousands of bars and
restaurants across the five boroughs. So first, I
want to thank you, both Chair, Councilmember, for
introducing legislation that will put an end to the
unacceptable abuse that far too many bars and
restaurants have been subjected to by a tiny group of
self-interested, private bounty hunters.

These bounty hunters are not your average citizens. They have turned profiting into the-- off the backs of small business owners into an opportunity. They wake up. They go across the city to different neighborhoods, and they target small businesses. Worse, they're relying on an incorrect reading of the law to do it, as was recently

recognized by OATH's appeal unit, which was referenced earlier. They repeat this process over and over again enriching themselves in significant sums.

This is not how New York City should do sound enforcement. In a moment you're going to hear from the alliance's counsel, both Robert and Max Bookman. They'll speak a bit about the history of sound enforcement, and the correct law that governs here, as well as some comments on these specific bills.

But first, I'd like to say Councilmember Holden's bill will clarify that the correct statute for policing commercial sound violations is the one that has been on the book for nearly two decades, and which you're very familiar with, the one that provides objective criteria based on a decibel reading. It would send a stark message to the bounty hunters victimizing bars and restaurants that the section of the law they are currently using to go after small businesses is off limits.

Second, for those who may not get the message,

Councilmember Gennaro's bill would cap the amount of

money bounty hunters could collect from initiating

these summonses. But after listening to DEP's very

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

20

2.2

2.3

24

25

thoughtful commentary on this matter, it seems that the best idea may just get rid of the section entirely of the noise code that permits civilian complaints, and these bounty hunters to go around and exploit small businesses, because of the degree to which they're doing it, and some of the really incredibly horrible techniques they are using.

There were some comments we had about limiting the ability of a citizen to live within 200 feet of a business, to be permitted to issue these violations. But perhaps the idea is just get rid of that section in its entirety.

But also, we want to make sure that the thousands and thousands of these summonses that are currently pending are tossed out as well. So, we'd love to see a provision that not only applies moving forward in the future once a law is enacted, but also to ensure that all the summonses that are pending are tossed out.

So, for these reasons, the Hospitality Alliance strongly supports these efforts. And you'll hear from my colleagues at the Hospitality Alliance in more specificity. But I want to thank you for your time and your effort to address these issues.

т -

anything, you both know that we need to support our small businesses. And what's happening here just send absolutely the wrong message to not only our

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you Anthony.

small business owners, workers--

got to move forward. The way I want to do this is—
I do—— I just want to pose a question. You made
reference in your statement to Mr. Bookman, that was—
— who was going to give us some legal commentary.

Let me put that in the form of a question: Mr.

Bookman, if you would opine with your—— with your
very substantial, you know, legal background going
back—— you were part of this 20 years ago.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: Yes, I was.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And so if you just take us from 20 years to now, give us some legal commentary on what you saw play out before us today.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: Sure. My name is Robert

Bookman. I'm counsel to the New York City

Hospitality Alliance, but I'm also a partner in the small Manhattan law firm, Pesetsky & Bookman, and we specialize in representing small businesses and have been doing so for 35 years now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So you're correct. About 20-some-odd years ago, you and I were both involved with the once-in-ageneration change of the noise code. And you did an excellent job as Chair of the Committee at that point, bringing in all the stakeholders that were going to be impacted by this new noise code. As you said before, there was construction, there was garbage collection, cars. One of the last sections--Actually one of the last things that remained was the hospitality industry commercial noise. There had been on the books for a long time what was called an unreasonable noise standard. It meant, as Councilman Holden said, anything anybody wanted it to mean. it meant everything and it meant nothing. businesses were complaining that the default violation from the NYPD when they went to a place was to issue an unreasonable noise summons. invariably required you to hire a lawyer, they all got dismissed, but that would be used against you when your liquor license was up for renewal that you had these violations. And we brought that to your attention. And we had one specific request, and that is that there be an objective standard for the measurement of sound emanating from a commercial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

establishment. It didn't seem complicated noise is one of the things that in fact can be measured.

And thanks to you, you told the Administration,

Mayor Bloomberg, and the Chairman Emily Lloyd-
CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Lloyd. Yeah.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: --at the time that unless that issue was resolved, you're not passing a noise code. And if you recall, it was the end of a session, and if they didn't pass it in December, they would have to start all over again. She went to-- Emily Lloyd, the Commissioner, went to the Mayor, and explained the problem. And as it is now well known in folklore, Mayor Bloomberg, who was a techie kind of person in his in his day said, "So what's the problem?" And she said, "Well, if there's an objective standard, every police department and DEP will have to have a handheld noise meter." And he's said, "So go buy them." And that resolved it. the-- We passed a specific criteria that, as you recall, which requires a certain amount of decibels above ambient during the day, a different one, you know, a lesser standard at night when people are entitled to more quiet.

2.2

2.3

And we've lived happily ever after, for the last 20 years, where we have not had these unreasonable noise violations. But businesses know with a couple hundred dollars, they can—they can buy these handheld meters, and they measure themselves pursuant to the law when their sound is leaking from inside, which it often does when you're playing background music for patrons, you have windows and doors open, but they can measure it for themselves. That's the standard—[bell rings]

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I was going to say that because I'm the Chairman, I'm not-- I'm not subject to the clock in terms of the answers.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: And that's been the standard objective criteria (not subjectivity) for 20 years now until these bounty hunters found a 1972 section of the noise code that I am embarrassed to admit I did not know existed. I'm not sure you did, either, which--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Nor did the Bloomberg administration in 2003 either.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: No. Nor did the Bloomberg

Administration, nor did the Commissioner, Emily

Lloyd, which apparently was put in before there was a

311, before Community Boards were even really being established, where people didn't have a way to complain about noise. So this sec-- this was put in there that if you had an-- if you were a true citizen and wanted to complain about, you know, somebody's downstairs from, you know, or around the corner on, you know, on a commercial strip, you know, in Queens, or in a building underneath, there was a mechanism to do it.

No one knew it existed because it was virtually never used, until these bounty hunters decided to abuse the system.

And to answer the second part of your legal question, they were abusing it in an improper way, because they are citing the section of the law, which we clarified— or at least we thought we clarified.

But I think we need Councilman Holden's bill to make it crystal clear and black and white, that what we meant, and what has been happening for the last 20 years, be the law for the next 20 years. And that is a specific objective— a specific objective criteria.

So that solves that problem. But it doesn't solve the bounty hunter problem, which is new to me.

As matter of fact, the first time we started hearing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

about this last November, we quite frankly, thought

it was a scam that somebody was trying to collect

money from a restaurant, because it had no name on it

It had some POBox. So we told had DEP crossed out.

people to ignore it. Then when we started to get a

lot of them, we went to DEP, and they said, "Yeah.

No. It's a subsection of law that nobody knew about.

And there are these guys issuing tons of them."

So that's the-- you know, that's the-- the noise code issue. And the citizen complaint history, legal history, how we got to where we are today.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. Let me get to my next question.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And, you know, thank you for your indulgence in keeping you up here, but we've worked on this stuff a long time.

And now, with regard to the OATH appeal of July 27th, the-- you know, I, as a non-lawyer, and the Counsel to the Committee, you know, seems convinced that this kind of rules out, you know, 24-244 B as-as an applicable section of the code to be used as a bounty hunters are using it.

Do you believe that this-- that this appeal is, you know, very dispositive of that of that legal fact?

MR. R. BOOKMAN: I do. And I do want to say that I was very impressed with DEP's testimony here today, how they are in complete support of Councilman Holden's bill. They provide—provided plenty of support, you know, for your bill. I'm frankly shocked that the situation is even as bad—it's worse than I thought it was, where only six people have filed these citizens' complaints and two of them have 90% of them, and only six have filed more than one. It's really, really a bad situation.

So if they felt that they were constrained by this 1972 law, which allowed for bounty hunter complaints before this appellate decision, and I disagree with them about to what extent they are an adjudicator under this law. It's true when DEP issues that summons, or consumer affairs, or any other agency, they are—they are the plaintiff, but this law provides for—is something different. And so this law did not allow for, quote, "citizens," and I put it in quotes, because I don't even know if

2 these two people are citizens of the city of New 3 York.

4

5

6

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's why I call them "civilian." That's why I preferred-- That is why I prefer the term "civilian."

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

MR. R. BOOKMAN: I don't even know where they live. They could live in Long Island as far as I know, and just, you know, making a living here in New York. But it gives the agency three options. can't just go right to OATH, you know, and submit a violation. It created a different process. And that process is: DEP has three options. They could say, "Hey, this is a really good violation based on the amount of evidence we see. We're going to take it over as-- as the as the petitioner in the normal course of a violation." Or, "You know, we think it's a little bit weak, but you -- you citizen bounty hunter could proceed with it on your own, if-- you know, if you want." But the third option, which they kind of ignored until you asked them, the question They could dismiss it right out by finding that it's frivolous or duplicitous.

24

25

So the law does require them to have a judicial role here, basically. You know, because it's

O

Z 4

different. It's-- it's somebody sending in a violation. And they should use that judicial role judiciously. And they certainly, before July, were not, because we now hear that 6000 of these went to-- went to OATH, which is an outrageous number. Now comes this decision of-- of July 30, whatever.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: I'm kind of disappointed that DEP-- that OATH felt constrained not to be able to answer any of your questions today. But if you read that appellate decision, they are basically reaching out to DEP and to the Council to do something about these thousands of violations. It's their Supreme Court, and it is binding upon their other ALJ's and-- and Max will speak to whether the ALJ's are-- are informed about this--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: If I asked him. If I ask him to, he will.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: --decision, because he has appeared on these violations since then. But this appellate decision is very clear cut, it gives DEP all the ammunition that it possibly needs. And let me read the-- what we call the holding in the law,

2.2

2.3

you know, where the court says, "Okay, here's the facts, and here's our legal decision."

It says, quote, "Where music contributes to the atmosphere of a dining establishment or store, and is directed to the patrons or shoppers therein, even though it may also be incidentally heard by passersby, an advertising purpose is not established.

And that section of the law that these bounty hunters are writing in under is a section that talks about commercial advertising--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: --the old Canal Street, you know, hawkers where they're standing out there with a microphone or a megaphone. That's commercial advertising. OATH is saying here that restaurants, stores, bars that are playing music for the enjoyment of their patrons, even outdoor patrons (because that-this appeals case, by the way, the speakers were out to outside, but they were facing their out-licensed outdoor dining area. Even in that case, OATH is saying, "Wrong section of the law."

So DEP can tomorrow, and should tomorrow, review all the violations that have not been fully adjudicated yet (and there may be thousands of them),

_

/

all the ones where there were defaults, because they could all be reopened as we heard today, and apply this new standard, where the court has made clear that that's not a commercial advertising purpose, and therefore get rid of a whole bunch of these before you guys even pass a law to limit, you know, the bounty hunters.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Now, in order to do that, if there are indeed thousands, you know, DEP--although I did bring up the resource question. It's just like, okay, we have to suddenly pour through thousands of them. And, you know, how are we supposed to do that, like, on...? And I, you know, you heard what I said. But I--

MR. R. BOOKMAN: You said, "Nice try."

MR. R. BOOKMAN: Yeah, but there-- you know, there are resources that-- that you know, in all candor, there-- there are resources that would have to be applied to do that. But as I also said that they have not only the right, but they have the obligation. That's because the workload is-- is a lot is not an excuse for not doing it.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: Correct. And once they start dismissing all these as—— as Councilman Holden, I

7

8

9

2 think said, the volume is going to go way down,

3 because these guys are only in it for the money. And

4 | if they're not going to get the money, then-- then,

5 you know, yes, initially there may be thousands. But

6 in two months from now, there may be hundreds and two

months after that they may only be dozens.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right.

MR. R. BOOKMAN: But they'll do something else to

10 make a living.

11 Also, you know, DEP is not completely an innocent

12 | bystander here. They got to put in the work, but

13 | they're also getting a cut of the action here by not

14 doing the work. And you know, they don't have clean

15 hands.

24

16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Or the City-- the City is

17 getting money.

18 MR. R. BOOKMAN: Well, it goes into their monthly

19 | report or annual report about fines that have been

20 collected. And this is a-- this is an easy, cheap

21 \parallel way for them to collect fines, because they don't

22 | have to do any work. They just say, "Okay, you

23 | bounty hunter, you prosecute the case." They don't

have to put in any-- any of their inspector time, any

25 of their attorney time. You know, maybe OATH will,

2.2

2.3

will lend them a couple of ALJ's to go through some of these.

Also understand that DEP has a citizen complaint noise form that goes with the citizen complaints, and it is wholly lacking in requiring the citizens to put in sufficient information for the DEP's to make a determination. It doesn't ask what is—a simple question: "What is the commercial advertising purpose that you are—that this noise was complaining about?"

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh. You're saying that the form should properly reflect the section of the code that people are...?

MR. R. BOOKMAN: And this appellate decision.

And there were other court cases going back 20 someodd years ago, which talked about this. If this is
all they're-- they're looking at, of course, they're
passing all these along, because they're not asking
enough questions from the-- from the bounty hunter.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: [TO COUNSEL:] Do we have that? Do we have that form? Okay. [TO PANEL:] I mean-- the Sergeant will-- you don't mind giving us that. So, Sergeant, when they when they leave the

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

dais, I want that for the record of the-- of the

Committee.

And if I could, just to move things along--

And if I could, just to move things along-- just you just move things along, I'd like to ask Mr. Max Bookman, if you have anything to add what Robert had to say.

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You want to speak right into the microphone--

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Of course.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: --with the red line on.

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Councilmember Holden and committee staff. My name is Max Bookman. I'm a partner at the law firm, Pesetsky & Bookman. And for the past eight years, I've been representing small businesses before OATH.

No small business should have to go through the time and expense of hiring me to defend them at OATH for this type of violation. The abuse of these summonses: It's not delivering justice, it's creating injustice, along with wasted time and money.

Chair, you said to DEP you wanted to decouple the idling violations and the citizen complaints for those from the noise violations. You said we have a

2

3

4

5

6

Ŭ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

fire, we have an emergency going on with the noise violations. So what I'd like to do is I'd like to give you a report from the trenches in OATH, where I practice, and give you three of the aggressive tactics that these incredibly small number of individuals are using to misuse our city's summons apparatus.

One is that they're ignoring OATH precedent. appeals unit case that we've been talking about today was issued on July 27. These citizens are still prosecuting these cases. And when you go into the hearing, the virtual hearing room with them, they're not bringing up this appeals decision with the OATH ALJs. You asked, Chair, whether the appeals unit decisions are disseminated -- disseminated to the OATH hearing officers to the ALJ as well. They're supposed to be, but we've had many hearings where the OATH hearing officers are unaware of this decision. So, our clients are fortunate to have us. We're aware of it. We bring it to their attention. But not everybody has us, and not everybody is-- is hiring a lawyer, or a lawyer who knows all this background. And so if the hearing officer doesn't know about the appeals decision, and if the citizen

2.2

2.3

complainant is not bringing up the decision, it's
just going unmentioned.

So that's a major problem.

You know, in state court, there's a duty of candor with the court. You have to be forthright with the court about the legal arguments that you make. There's the same expectation in OATH and it's not happening there. So that's problem number one.

Number two: Not only are they ignoring the OATH precedent, but they're issuing multiples of these frivolous violations one day after the next. And I'm glad to hear DEP talking about it, because it's really a problem. So just to give a little more color on that: These folks are coming unannounced. They're not— they have no badge to show, but they're not— once they do come unannounced, they're not making themselves known. So they come day after day in secret, recording businesses day after day, issuing summonses day after day. We have one client in OATH who got sent—

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But they don't serve them.

They don't serve-- the businesses don't serve them.

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Right. No. They take their video, they go home, and then they submit the

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

complaint form to DEP. So we had one client who got
seven of these in a 20-day period, and didn't get
summons number one in the mail, until, you know,
until after turns out summons number seven was
issued. So it's like there's a delay here. So they

7 come issue 1-2-3-4-5-6-7. And then, you know, 20

days later, 30 days later, you know, 60 days later

now in the mail, they get summons number one, then

10 the next day number two, 3-4-5-6-7.

So what legitimate purpose is this serving? You know, DEP talked about education. There's no legitimate purpose to this.

And lastly, the third, you know, aggressive tactic that they're using is they're alleging recidivism. And this is so dishonest. You know, like many of your laws 24-244 B has higher penalties for repeat offenders, which we call recidivists. But you're not a first-time offender until you've been found guilty of something. But it's not so with these folks. When they go on their summons spree, where they're issuing the summonses day after day, when they come to the on the second day, and every day thereafter, they're alleging recidivist repeat offender fines in their complaints to DEP, which DEP

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the citizen gets to issue the summons. So take my client who got the seven summonses in

then turns into a summons or DEP takes no action, and

20 days--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Mr. Bookman, if I could just jump in here for a second. I just wanted to see who was remaining behind from the administration? Who's-- Who's here from the administration to hear their good testimony that we're-- Anybody here from the administration? Going once? Going twice?

MR. RIGIE: That's a law we should pass. They've got to stay until to the end of the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: If I could-- Andrew, can you call Robert Patello, and indicate that, you know, it is my expectation that the administration has to have somebody in this room to hear this good testimony. Just -- Just step outside and give him a call. You got his number? Okay. Like, somebody's got to be here like really quick, or I'm going to get upset.

Okay. Please continue.

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Thank you, sir. So just to finish the point. So you take my client who got the seven summonses in a 20-day period. By the time that

2.3

24

25

second summons came in the mail, they're already 2 3 being told that they are a repeat offender, when the 4 first summons they just got yesterday, and it hasn't 5 even been adjudicated yet. And this is particularly insidious with these-- these citizen bounty hunters, 6 7 because the repeat offender fine, even just to settle, even just to mail in a violation saying, "I 8 don't want to hire a lawyer. I don't want to take a 9 day out to do OATH. I'm just going to mail in the 10 11 fine." Even the mail in fine is significantly higher 12 for these repeat offenders summonses. So at minimum, 13 you know, I don't know why DEP is not policing that. It's not in their form, you know? "Are you saying 14 15 this is a repeat offender? If so, state the date 16 that the summons was previously adjudicated, and, you 17 know, provide proof of that." But, you know, we need 18 to, you know, it's just another example of these aggressive and dishonest tactics that --19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But- But- But OATH is part 20 of this, because they are, you know, they're not 21 2.2

disseminating these appeals, and resolutions, and they're, you know, levying fines for repeat offenders when there has been no conviction or whatever you call it, you know, no, no, substantiation. So you

1	RESTLIENCY	ΔND	WATERFRONTS

- 2 haven't had-- So, you know, to the extent that, you
- know, you could give us -- or not like right now, but, 3
- 4 you know, prepare something for us that our legal
- counsels can look at, and we would like to make an
- overture to OATH about your good testimony and about, 6
- 7 like, what they're doing, and we want answers from
- 8 them.
- 9 MR. M. BOOKMAN: Thank you for that. Yeah. Ι
- mean, there does need to be, I think, better 10
- 11 education of the judges at OATH. I mean, ultimately-
- 12
- 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: We're going to handshake,
- 14 and then you're going to give me-- what you're--
- 15 you're going to summarize what you're saying, right?
- 16 Item one, item two, item three?
- 17 MR. M. BOOKMAN: Oh, yes. And that's what I'm
- 18 saying. They ought to be-- they ought to be--
- 19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's the right move to go
- to OATH, right? I mean... 20
- 21 MR. M. BOOKMAN: Well, I mean, yes and no.
- 2.2 mean, yes, the right move is to go to OATH.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well, I mean, you know
- what? I'll ask my own lawyers that question. 24

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 139 1 MR. RIGIE: It's a combination of both. But also 2 3 understand--4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But I-- Just for my own 5 edificatio--MR. RIGIE: Yeah. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: -it would be--MR. RIGIE: A lot of these small businesses, 8 9 they, you know, they are overwhelmed with just running their business and trying to make a profit, 10 11 you know? They're their own HR department. They're-- Many of them are immigrants. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Just to follow this by the rules, because there's going to be other witnesses, 14 15 and they're going to say that I gave you a lot time--MR. RIGIE: All right. I'm just going to finish-16 17 18 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So what I'm going to say 19 is-- So in answer to my question, you were in the 20 middle of a thought that was of interest to me. 21 MR. RIGIE: Let me just finish that thought. 2.2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: What's that?

MR. RIGIE: Let me just finish this thought,

right?

24

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'm just saying that I am--I am asking you to finish your statement.

MR. RIGIE: Yeah, so--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: So this is being--Everyone, this is being done in response to a question by me. Go ahead.

MR. RIGIE: They get something from the government. It has a fine that you could just mail in. A lot of them just think, "That's what I'm supposed to do. And I just mail in the fine." Even if it's a recidivist fine. You know, they don't even know this, sometimes that they can go down and defend themselves.

And so OATH, you know, when these-- when these people get these things in the mail, it has a mail in fine amount, you know, right there on it. And so for a lot of people, it's a cost of doing business in New York City, is paying a certain amount of money to city government, when you -- when you get violations. It's always wrong. But it's especially wrong when it's a citizen bounty hunter, and they're getting a recidivist amount.

So, you know, it's not so easy just saying that OATH should not institute the recidivist fine.

S

__

true if you went to a full hearing. Then the OATH judge looks and says, "Well, you've never been convicted of anything before--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, I see.

MR. RIGIE: --so it's a first-time violation."

But a good portion of these-- 59% are defaults,

another percentage are settlements where the person

just sends in the fine. Only a small percentage are

actually going to a hearing.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I see. I see. Okay.

That-- yeah, we-- I-- we had great collaboration 20

years ago. And let's, you know-- I appreciate your

advocacy on behalf of thousands of small businesses

that are-- that are being set upon in a most unjust

way. And it is, you know. I as Chair on this

committee, and then the Council at large, you know,

stands for trying to do what we can as soon as

possible to right this wrong. And I appreciate your
um...

MR. RIGIE: Thank you. Thank you again. Thank you for 20 years ago. Thank you for now. Thanks for joining the battle, and Councilman Holden. I think together, the two of you each have half of the coin here, with which we could solve this problem.

2.2

2.3

MR. R. BOOKMAN: And there's some business owners here, I know, that had been victims of this that would be good to hear from--

MR. RIGIE: Who would love to come and testify. Some have to get back to work.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You know what? My col-- My colleague, Bob Holden, has a question for the panel.

I recognize Councilmember Holden for questions.

and just-- I guess this is for Max, because you mentioned that some businesses were targeted multiple times, and they are repeat offenders. What are we talking about in the way of fines that they're--? Like, what kind of nightmare stories do you have one business absorbing thousands of dollars worth?

MR. M. BOOKMAN: Yeah. I've got one client right now, who was here earlier, but had to go back to their business who is facing right now, because of the total number of these citizens issue summonses they've gotten, over \$12,000 in fines. You know, 50% of that goes to a citizen. So that's just-- that's the citizen.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Yeah. And so this is coming on top of the pandemic, where all these

_

especially-- I mean, I had a barber shop that was-He didn't have like these little six feet markers on
the floor, and he got hit with thousands of dollars'
worth of fines. He said, "I only had one customer at
a time. I'd make an appointment. And so I never had
more than one person in my store. And I had to pay
\$1000." And we couldn't, you know, again, OATH, they
find him, and we couldn't do anything about it.

And this is-- so, this is egregious. It's particularly egregious, when, on top of the pandemic and all the restrictions, we had to close, to shut down, to only operate, you know, outside, whatever it was that the business had to put up with, and then they have this now.

And that's why I think we have to fix things that are unfair. God knows government's unfair, bureaucracy is unfair many times, and this is why things fall through the cracks. So I thank you for your—for your testimony. I'd like to see even fine tuning this further, where we get the businesses an even shake here. And I'm not what—you know, again, I have businesses that cause problems in the neighborhood. So, we understand that, but they need some kind of measurement. And they need to know when

2 they're breaking the law. And not some subjective 3 and arbitrary person.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

MR. RIGIE: Correct. And the last thing I want to say in response to you, I think most important part of the DEP testimony, which was surprising to me is they are saying that there is no court, there isthat these places that are getting these-- bounty hunters are not places that are getting 311 complaints for noise. So this, you know, it's one thing if these are, you know, are trouble locations and problem locations in the neighborhood, you know, where there's a hundred 311 complaints. This is just

13 14

people, according to their map, they're walking around just wherever they can hear a sound system

16

15

they're giving a violation, even though nobody's

complaining about it. It's outrageous.

17

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you, Chair.

19

18

MR. RIGIE: Thank you.

20

this panel for your advocacy on the part of the

21 2.2

business community, and your commitment to making a--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. I want to thank

2.3

you know, to bring justice to the business community.

24

I appreciate it.

2.2

COUNSEL: Next we have David Sheldon with the South Street Seaport coalition, Katelyn Mooney with The Independent, and Kathleen Reilly Irwin with the New York State Restaurant Association.

You may begin when ready.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. I'd just like to ask the witness and make sure they state their name for the record. And I have the statement of the New York State Restaurant Association, but in whatever order you wish, just-- or you know, the-- the witness on my left started, so why don't you start?

MS. MOONEY: Sure. My name is Katelyn Mooney.

Why don't you bring the mic right in front of
you, like I have it?

MS. MOONEY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Just move the whole thing.
Yeah, because it'll help other witnesses too.

MS. MOONEY: My name is Katelyn Mooney. I am the General Manager at The Independent in Time Square on 40th Street between Seventh and Broadway. We received two noise violations dated back from last September. There's not any residential in our area. It's all commercial. Also, we do not— The tickets stated that we had speakers facing the sidewalks. We

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

- do not. We have French doors that have speakers

 inside where we play music, but not-- not outside,

 not facing the sidewalk. So it's kind of just a

 completely false statement.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And I'll come back for questions.
- 8 MS. MOONEY: Sure.

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- 9 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Is that the extent to your 10 statement.
- 11 MS. MOONEY: Yeah.
 - CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay. Brevity is a-- is a blessing. So I appreciate that. Please. Please commence.
 - MS. REILLY IRWIN: Good afternoon. My name is
 Kathleen Reilly Irwin, and I'm the New York City
 Government Affairs Manager for the New York State
 Restaurant Association. We are also here to testify
 in strong support of the interest under consideration
 today to reform the noise ordinance and put an end to
 the abuse of the civilian complaint system.
 - Under the current law, civilians are empowered and incentivized to issue complaints regarding the noise ordinance. And with no limits in place, you have these career complainants who have abused the

system by reporting the same establishments over and over in quick succession and resulting in sometimes thousands of dollars in fines for restaurant operators.

We've received frantic and frustrated calls throughout the summer into the fall. I got one literally today right before this hearing. He said, "I need to talk to you. We just got a violation. Is this one of these two people who's issuing all the fines?" I said, "Yes. You should fight it. It's obviously bogus." Same exact thing. It said he had speakers facing the sidewalk, except we don't have those speakers.

So the abuse of the system has been incentivized up until now by offering civilian complainants up to 50% of the fines collected if they're the ones who actually bring the claim all the way through OATH, with no limits in place on total dollar amount, number of complaints that can be compensated or any other type of limits. And that creates a situation where these notorious noise enforcers are bragging in the press about making a living off of frivolous complaints.

We've already discussed at length the decision in the appeals board, and it was also already read for the record. But I also would like to point out a little note that was put in the decision, saying that "the board further finds that whether there are patrons or shoppers currently in a dining establishment or store is not a material fact, as such dining establishment or store is not expected to turn on and off music being provided for ambiance as customers enter and leave." So that's one more of the sort of factors that the OATH appeal appeals board has already put in writing and should be used as precedent.

So, while those findings are encouraging, and we're glad to hear that the appeals board even reversed several past decisions based on the precedent, restaurants should not be dragged before OATH and forced to adjudicate their ambiance setting, however often these serial complainants would like. The incentive system must be re-engineered so that the noise ordinance is not able to be abused.

So, Intro 160 would add concrete decibel levels into the definition of unreasonable noise, and importantly it specifies that Section 24-244 of the

Administrative Code which is the section being abused, shall not apply to music originating from an interior space in connection with the operation of any commercial establishment or enterprise (quoted from the language).

So, if this legislation is enacted, it would strongly curtail the complaint activity that has been so burdensome for restaurants.

1194 would work to revamp the incentives and cap the dollar amount that a civilian can receive for reporting the noise ordinance to either \$5 or \$10, which is also a much needed reform to put an end to this current system of abuse and frivolously harassing businesses.

Thank you so much for considering our feedback and for bringing these two very important pieces of legislation.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you for coming forward with your good testimony. I certainly wish you well in fighting your thing about the speakers. I urge you to do that. And, Kathleen, I salute you and your support of restauranteurs in your capacity with the New York State Restaurant Association.

Thank you for your good testimony.

2

3

4

5

6

7

/

8

9

10 11

1213

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I just want to-- Sergeant? Sergeant, can I see for a second? Okay, just call the next panel.

COUNSEL: Our next panel will be Michael Jacobs with Corner Table Restaurants, Vanessa Oré with Romantic Depot Queens, and Brittney Mayorga with Romantic Depot.

You may begin when ready.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You've got to put the microphone on.

MS. ORÉ: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Vanessa Oré, and I serve as the General Manager of Romantic Depot, a distinctive novelty and lingerie store located in the vibrant neighborhood of Sunnyside, Queens. Our store stands alone at 4702 Queens Boulevard. It's important to understand that our location is unique. We have no neighboring buildings, no upstairs or next door neighbors. Our storefront faces an eight-lane stretch of Queens Boulevard, bustling with traffic, divided by the elevated M train. The nature of our surroundings naturally make it a noisy environment. In 2022 and ordinary white envelopes arrived at our store mysteriously delivered by the US Postal Service. To our surprise it contain what appeared to be four or five counterfeit summonses.

^

authorized city inspector. Rather, they bore the signature of the individual residing a few blocks

away. The summons incited alleged violations related

documents were not issued by a police officer or any

to music for business or commercial purposes. It's important to clarify that we've never utilized our

music for commercial advertising. Our music has

always been intended for the enjoyment of our

customers and employees.

Devoid of promotional content or sales announcements, we have consistently been conscientious about keeping the volume at an appropriate level and avoiding late-night disturbances.

Initially we regarded these tickets as a prank or novelty summons available for purchase online to place on someone's car windshield. We even conducted online research to verify whether civilians could indeed issue summonses for noise violations.

Surprisingly, there was a complete absence of information confirming the legitimacy of these tickets, especially before media coverage and the

2.2

2.3

2 involvement of local politicians shed light to the 3 issue.

To make matters more baffling, these summons referred to violations from months earlier. Since we believe the summonses were not genuine, we did not respond to them. However, several months later, we see an official notice from the DEP, stating that we owed \$1,000 due to the failure to address the initial summonses. Regrettably, by that point, we had received at least 10 or 15 additional summonses, all bearing the same charges and originating from the same individual. We haven't received physical tickets. It appeared that this individual Mr. Detering, has been documenting instances of audible music outside our store and stockpiling them before delivering another wave of violations.

Consequently, quietly, we find ourselves facing overwhelming sum of \$30,000 in fines. I humbly request that you intervene and rectify this glaring injustice.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. Thank you.

I'll come back with comments after I get the next witness.

MS. MAYORGA: Hello, good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, you got to turn the light on, the red light, and speak right into the microphone.

MS. MAYORGA: Gotcha. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Brittany Mayorga, and I serve as a supervisor at Romantic Depot, an establishment conveniently located at the intersection of 47th Street and Queens Boulevard.

As stated by my colleague, this section of Queens Boulevard is exceptionally busy with vehicles and trains passing by around the clock seven days a week.

Our business specializes in novelty items and exquisite lingerie, and we are dedicated to creating an enjoyable atmosphere are both our customers and our dedicated staff. Part of that ambiance involves background music. We have always been diligent in ensuring that our music remains at an appropriate volume. It's also worth noting that the sound from our stores is genuinely confined to the immediate vicinity, since we are the only people taking up that block.

Upon discovering that the tickets that were initially believed to be fraudulent were indeed legitimate, and that a program existed to monetize

_

them through reporting, I was truly astonished. I was even more taken aback when I learned that these citations were not for excessively loud music, but simply for being audible outside our store.

It seems improbable that the music we play intended for business and aesthetic purposes could be categorized as a violation of commercial noise regulations.

What's most distressing is while this program may have been established with good intentions, it is evidently having the opposite effect. When a business exceeds noise levels, common sense dictates that an appropriate authority should issue a warning and offer an opportunity for correction. However, instead of this reasonable approach, it appears that individuals who benefit from issuing these tickets choose to accumulate them and serve multiple citations simultaneously, primarily driven by financial gain. I genuinely appreciate my role and the excellent relationships I share with my coworkers who, like me, are all striving to make better lives for ourselves and our families. We all work hard and is deeply unfortunate that a handful of individuals

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can manipulate a well-intentioned but poorly executed law for their personal gain.

I wish to express my gratitude to our local politicians and the Sunnyside Business Improvement District for recognizing this issue. I implore the entire City Council to rectify this abusive practice and restore fairness and justice to our community.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Well, thank you both for coming forward and bearing witness to the problem that we've been talking about all day. You know, the more people that come and testify, you know, the more it is -- You know, it's one thing to hear me say it. It's another thing to hear people that are really affected by it. And so I appreciate you coming forward today with regard to-- The witness to-- to my right about me, you know, intervening: Because your fines are, you know, under adjudication I have no-- I have no authority to do that. But I would urge you to fight them. And -- And it would be-throat lozenge. I've been talking all day, scratchy voice. My view is to try-- and once we get the bills passed into law, all those summonses that have not been adjudicated -- you know, the ones that have been adjudicated there is nothing anybody can do. But,

- but we do intend to move quickly. And to the extent 2
- 3 that we can have the violations that have been
- written but not yet adjudicated, you know, go away, 4
- that's a legal question. That would be my intention
- to do that. 6
- 7 I want to thank you for coming forward. And I
- appreciate you -- your patience for being here this 8
- time, this -- this whole hearing. Thank you.
- MS. ORÉ: Thank you for your time. 10
- 11 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Andrew, can I see you for a
- second? 12
- 13 COUNSEL: Should I call the next panel?
- 14 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yes, please.
- 15 COUNSEL: Next panel will be Jouel Kuperman from
- 16 the Environmental Justice Initiative, John Conroy
- 17 from Mustang Harry's, and Theresa Sigler from Pig N
- Whistle. 18
- 19 MS. SIGLER: Hi there. My name is Theresa Sigler
- 20 and I represent the Pig N Whistle Group. I am the
- 21 manager over there. This past February we received a
- 2.2 ticket in the mail, like all the others have said,
- 2.3 you know from a very dodgy-looking envelope, not a
- city agency. We immediately turned off our outdoor 24
- 25 speakers, which we did have on for the ambience of

_

our outdoor diners, because they were the only ones that we had during COVID. So the speakers were turned on at that point for that. Quite frankly, we just forgot to turn them off. Rockefeller Center is a very noisy neighborhood. You could barely hear our speakers, but as soon as we did, we adhered to the law.

A couple of weeks later, we got another seven tickets all predated from the previous August, Christmas, what have you.

We have had two OATH hearings. The problem with the OATH hearing for us is we had requested to appear in person. Like I wanted to look that person in the eye who was writing these tickets. But they're not allowed. It's by telephone only. So that's one issue we have. It allows the bounty hunters to, you know, call in from home, call in from their office, call in from— even if they're out of the country.

OATH have sent us tickets that we have never even received. The person from OATH, today said that it's 75 days. It's not it's 30. And there are businesses who have not received either the ticket or the hearing. And this states right here, that the city will get a legal judgment if a new hearing is not

dealing with.

2 requested, or the \$1750 paid within 30 days. So

3 that's also another issue that the businesses are

This gentleman here asked, well, you know, "What would the defense be?" Yes, the defense absolutely

7 is I was unaware, I did not know, I immediately

8 ceased operation. The first DEP inspector that we

9 had on site was after we had received five tickets.

10 And I have been at that location for 10 years. And

11 | in 10 years, we have never received a single noise

12 violation. So yes, that is-- would have been my

13 defense.

14

16

Okay, and those-- those are my comments.

15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

MS. SIGLER: Everything else, everybody has

17 already said. So I would not like to waste the time.

18 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. And I also

19 understand we have about 40 witnesses on Zoom. And

20 so, you know, brevity, as I said, is a blessing. I

21 thank you for that. And thank you for bearing

22 witness to the problem.

MS. SIGLER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Joel?

24

MR. KUPFERMAN: Good afternoon, thank you.

I'm a

1 2 3 little upset that there's all this talk about 4 protection of the small business people and abuse of 5 environmental law. I'm here partly to-- to defend the citizen suit provision in general, and then here 6 7 in particular. DEP has a bad record of enforcement. 8 They have a bad record of enforcement. There's also-- There's no coordination with Department of Buildings and other city agencies. As an 10 11 environmental lawyer that has been dealing with noise 12 complaints, air pollution complaints, environmental 13 complaints, City enforcement is basically nonexistent. Okay, that's the tenant that's out 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to Brownfield sites. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: We're not talking about Brownfields or anything. Just please limit it to noise. We're talking about noise.

MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay. I'm limiting it to noise. With many, many construction sites, we've called up

I'm here probably not to protect the

restaurant owners. But all the other thousands and

hundreds of thousands of people that are suffering

from lack of air enforcement by DEP. I'm here to

protect the DEP enforcement people who were sent out

the DEP, we've asked them to send down inspectors, they tell us they don't have the time to do it, and the people in DEP have told us that it doesn't make that much of a difference, because they're only going to introduce a small fine, that doesn't get collected. So I think it's without the outside goading, without these private or public citizens, we wouldn't have been having this hearing in a way, and non-enforcement would be continuing. The City's owed \$2 billion in uncollected fines.

So without this outside pressure in different ways, this-- we're not being protected. The other thing about noise protection. What you're asking is unequal enforcement. When-- When NYCHA residents call 311 to complain about noise, they're told they have to go back to NYCHA. So we have a definitely--Mr. Gennaro, you should look at the unequal enforcement to the city, especially in terms of noise enforcement. Okay? But also you can't have a bill of attainder-- you can't do a bill undoing past complaints. That's unconstitutional. That's called a bill of attainder, all right? So I just want to-- I think it's-- it's a little stacked here that there might be without going into the details.

- COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 161 1 2 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude. 3 MR. KUPFERMAN: Excuse me? 4 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude. MR. KUPFERMAN: Conclude? CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah. 6 7 MR. KUPFERMAN: Well, I think one of the things 8 I'm going to ask, if you're so concerned about 9 restaurant owners and small businesses, which you're expressing here, I think the City Council should look 10 11 at-- at commercial rent control is one way to--12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's another topic. 13 That's -- that's out of order for this hearing. 14 MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay. But in terms of noise, 15 that you have to look at-- that DEP does not have 16 injunctive relief when there's a serious noise 17 violation that's going on at a construction site. 18 They can't stop that construction going on. We've 19 dealt with cases where there should be--20 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Joel, your testimony is not
 - MR. KUPFERMAN: But just let me finish. Okay.

 You gave the other people more than two minutes, Mr.

 Gennaro.

relevant to the hearing.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'm just saying that--

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 MR. KUPFERMAN: A lot more than two minutes. 2 3 right. And I think it's really unfair that you allow 4 three people to speak for like 10-12 minutes, and you don't let--5 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That is the -- That is the 6 7 discretion of the Chair, and your off topic. MR. KUPFERMAN: Well, I'm asking--8 9 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You're not asking anything. I get -- I'm just saying that you are -- you're off 10 11 topic. We have 40 more witnesses. 12 MR. KUPFERMAN: Well, I'm getting back on-- I'm--13 I'm back on topic. 14 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Next panel. Next panel. 15 Your time -- Your time has expired. Next panel. 16 MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay, but the enforcement--17 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Next. Panel. MR. KUPFERMAN: But let me just--18 19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'm calling the next panel. 20 MR. KUPFERMAN: Okay. I'm going to say--21 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Sergeant. Turn off the

The next panel will be Liam Malanachy COUNSEL: (I apologize if I mispronounce your name) with Juniors, Mark Fox with Fox Lifestyle Hospitality

microphone. Next panel.

2.2

2.3

24

25

2.2

2.3

2 Group, and Clint Smeltzer with Manhattan Community 3 Board 3.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: And while that panel gets sell together, I have to take a two-minute break.

I'll be right back.

Okay, I'm back. Thank you. Yeah, please turn on your microphone and speak right into it.

MR. MALANACHY: Thank you. Good afternoon,
Councilperson Gennaro and the rest of the Committee.
My name is Liam Malanachy. You did a great job. I
represent Junior's Cheesecake. And they have been
subject to—— I would love to tell you how many
summonses they have. What I can tell you is that
right now I'm representing them on a total of 13
summonses, which I beat out Mr. Bookman by a couple
of \$1,000. We now have somewhere around \$16,000
worth of outstanding summonses that we hope to have
adjudicated in one fell swoop sometime next year.

I say I can't tell you because we have just gotten to new ones that allege violations back in October of last year. So we have every reason to believe that we're a very juicy target and that we may be subject to more coming down the pipe. I won't reiterate-- I won't go over-- The work you've done

2 here is amazing. I'm very impressed by today's

3 hearing and by the testimony that's taken place so

4 far.

1

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

6 MR. MALANACHY: It is clear that this type of

7 enforcement is not germane to quality-- to the

8 | quality of life in New York City. Junior's

9 | Cheesecake has been here for 73 years, has been in

10 | the Time Square area for 20 years, and they've

11 received a grand total of zero noise complaints aside

12 | from these most recent summonses. I can tell you

13 | that I have represented a smaller business. A friend

14 of mine has a bodega. He would have never been able

15 | to hire a lawyer. And we had a hearing back in May.

16 So as a report from the trenches, it was a-- it

17 resembled a kangaroo court to the extent that the

18 | administrative law judge in question felt as though

20 | fine based on remediation. We've heard that.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right.

22 MR. MALANACHY: He also felt as though once it

23 was audible from the street-- [bell rings]

24 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah, that's you. But-- so

25 please conclude.

21

2.2

2.3

MR. MALANACHY: Okay. So once it was audible from the street, it was completely irrelevant. I'm a former administrative law judge myself. Discretion was the stock and trade of our business. I would urge you to do one thing. If you're going to pass—if' you're successful, which I hope that you are, is considering making it retroactive. Contrary to what Mr. Kupferman said, that would not be an ex post facto law. That would merely be applying the same justice—

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I know.

MR. MALANCHY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

15 MR. MALANCHY: Okay.

MR. SMELTZER: Hi. My name is Clint Smeltzer, and I'm here representing Committee Board 3,

Manhattan. I'm Chair of their State Liquor Authority

Licensing Committee. Our board hasn't voted on this legislation. It's just been a discussion.

We're mainly concerned about Intro 160 and that the changes would have a negative impact on our board specifically. We've had the highest number of commercial noise complaints in Manhattan, and the second in the city total. Our complaints— our noise

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 complaints have increased significantly since 2019.

3 I think it's a 74% increase in 2023 from 2019. Our

4 area is densely residential, but there's also a lot

5 of non-conforming businesses on the side streets,

6 both nightlife businesses and other businesses. Our

job is to make sure the businesses and residents can

8 peacefully coexist. The protections that keep the

9 noise from businesses inside the business and not

10 spilling into the streets or nearby apartments and

11 allow people to sleep also allow different types of

12 | businesses to coexist right next to each other.

Without these protections, we're putting the residence-- reticent-- sorry, residences and businesses unnecessarily in conflict with each other. Many of our businesses are located in tenement buildings which are almost impossible to soundproof.

So therefore, the sound emanating from there becomes

19 a huge problem for the residences above.

Basically, that's it. We were just asking that the protections that have been put in place years ago must be maintained and enforced in order to have this balance between residents and businesses, and that you keep the existing legislation and the existing language of legislation in regards to the decibel

2.2

2.3

2 levels and readings of sound emanating from inside of 3 business.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. And certainly we are going to you know work with a host of stakeholders both on Intro 160, mine, and Keith Powers' bills and make sure you touch base with—well, if you were notified of this hearing, then, you know, you're in our orbit, and we'll make sure that we stay in touch as these bills, all of them, roll down the tracks. Thank you very much for participating today.

And as the next panel is called, I have to do-- I have to take a special eye drop, and I just-- I'll just take a second.

COUNSEL: Call the next panel?

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah, call the panel.

COUNSEL: The next panel will be will be Lisa

Lesa Rozmarek with Nederlander Organization, Robert

Camacho with Bushwick Alliance I think, and Yoav

Erez.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, forgive me. I just have to-- It's one of these things I've got to do it every two hours. It's just an eyedrop, but it's like fancy. I have to fill the little dropper. It's got

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

know?

to be refrigerated. It's like a whole thing you

COUNSEL: You may begin when ready.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's it done. Thank you for your indulgence.

MS. ROZMAREK: Good afternoon. My name is Lesa Rozmarek. I'm the Director of Facilities for the Nederlander Organization, a well-established and respected business in Broadway theater and the entertainment industry.

I'm here to share our experiences and concerns regarding the enforcement of the ordinances under review, and the impact they've had on our-- our organization.

Since 1965, the family owned and operated Nederlander Organization has been a proud contributor to the vibrant cultural landscape of New York City. We offer premier Broadway entertainment experiences to our audiences and are strong supporters of our local economy. Recently, our business has been negatively impacted by a series of sound-related violations that we believe require a more balanced and equitable approach to enforcement.

To date our organization has received (as of yesterday or last week) a total of 28 violations related to speakers mounted underneath our marquees directly attached to our theatres, the majority of which were issued during the summer and fall of 2022.

What is particularly troubling is that these violations were issued without any prior warnings or notifications. It is our belief that a fair and just system should provide businesses with the opportunity to rectify violations through education and corrective actions, rather than resorting to immediate punitive measures.

In our 58 years of business in Times Square theater district, we have never received a citizens complaint regarding noise from our theaters until a bounty was placed upon businesses with no restrictions. There's zero evidence to back up that low level sound coming from theater marquees is disruptive to Times Square. Moreover, in commercial areas, such as Times Square, there was no expectation of quietness, and these citizens have chosen to target the theaters as a source of revenue by traveling to this area to issue violations.

2.2

2.3

Additionally, to the clarifications proposed accompanying the violations, citizens should be required to also submit noise level readings. This has been common practice by the DEP to confirm if there really is a violation. The fact that these citizens have found a loophole where they must only show that there was an audible noise is against public policy in the spirit of the law. The videos submitted are often in areas in Midtown where the ambient noise levels are much higher than other areas of the city and this is not considered when reviewing the hearing. Furthermore, there should be measures taken to establish—

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude. I'm sorry, you know.

MS. ROZMAREK: We'd like to point out in our experience that citizen complainers held on to a stack of summonses for a significant amount of time before mailing them via first class mail, and several tickets were lost in the mail and never received. We were made aware of the violations after they went into default. So we do support the bills with the additional— additional clarifications and thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

your views and your patience. Yes, my friend.

MR. EREZ: Hi. My name is Yoav Erez, and I'm

here because I'm a concerned citizen, sick of being

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much for

businesses. It has never before been easier to buy a powerful speaker which is causing a noise pandemic in

the city. I literally cannot walk one block without

someone trying to force their DJ skills on my

the victim of illegal unregulated noise from

unwilling ears. Restaurants should not be allowed to

pollute the public space with their music. It cannot

be more clear to any reasonable person that the

intention of the law when referring to advertising is

any sound heard outside of a business. Even if it's

just music, it doesn't matter how loud it is.

Literally 100 feet from here, there are food carts and street merchants who blast music out to public most days and nights. And even if there are hundreds of 311 calls, they continue to make city hall into an open air disco without any interruptions.

The reality is there is currently zero noise regulation enforcement in the city. Calls to 311 get

a visit from the police sometimes, and only up to eight hours later when the problem is often gone.

Even in cases where the crime is obvious, and the police are there on time, they will never issue a fine or confiscate a speaker. All they do is give a meaningless warning and leave, and the issue continues once they are gone.

Yes, there is a small number of people taking advantage of the citizens complaint program right now, because it is not advertised anywhere. New Yorkers aren't even aware it exists, and it takes hours of work, months of waiting around and hoping and praying that the DEP will sometimes reply to your emails. We are on a mission to protect New Yorkers and their ears, and we should be compensated for it.

Because noise pollution is considered a smaller crime that is easier for most people to ignore, who you'll end up hearing from today are businesses who instead of simply turning their music off, will continue to advertise illegally with complete disregard for peaceful, quiet, respectful New Yorkers who live in their areas, because most New Yorkers are nonconfrontational and don't even know that this hearing is taking place or that they have this

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

option. Even if they didn't know you wouldn't hear

3 from them because all you're here for is squeaky

4 wheels that are losing money.

Thank you. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

MR. CAMACHO: Hi. Hi, how are you? My name is Robert Camacho. I live in the hood of Bushwick. When nobody wanted to be there. All of a sudden, everybody wants to come there and be like Christopher Columbus syndrome and throw the natives out. talking about that Intro 160, the noise code. organizing from interior space -- space like restaurants, bars, and now we got the weed shops. Don't forget about that. Intro 1194 would cap the fines of noise violations from \$5, which was reported-- if you report it to DEP environment to protection to \$10 if you report it by a citizen who was sick and tired of being assaulted by the noise for profit coming from neighborhoods like mine, and businesses like theirs. The Sound Bar. It sounds--It gets worse. The LU 00112-22 adopted by the resolution 53, passed by City Council in 2020 allows restaurants to keep their facility open at all times.

They are operating. Local law 121 passed by City

2.2

2.3

Council in August mandates restaurants and bars must

be allowed to operate from 10am to 12pm, indoor and

Outdoor, even if it's a residential neighborhood.

Put it all together. Under these combined four laws, restaurants can keep their doors open 14 hours a day, blast music in the streets, and in homes by nearby residents with no fear of a fine that is the cost of a sandwich, which is absolutely not true.

I'm going to change the sandwich routine, because we had a community space that was given to community because they don't have no more CBOs. A private entity got rid of the CBO and did a-- a supermarket. Very well. We need supermarkets. So I went in there. And I went to buy a sandwich. And do you know I pay \$14.50 for a sandwich only with cheese lettuce and tomatoes. More than that-- these people would pay for fine. Please.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude.

MR. CAMACHO: You've got to stop this. You gotta listen to the community. I know I have both of my Councilpeople here. Jennifer Gutiérrez and Sandy Nurse, and we will be blasting it, because we're dying. Our seniors and our kids can't live on top of

2.2

2.3

these stores. And the covert-- our kids got to study seven days a week.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Your time has expired. I have a comment--

MR. CAMACHO: Thank you, God bless you, and I appreciate you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No, so-- but I--

MR. CAMACHO: Take care of yourself, because you don't sound too good.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I've got— No. I've got something to— to add, is that— You know, the individual civilian, you know, sometimes feels a little helpless. They call 311 or whatever. And this is why, you know, you not only have your local Councilmember, because you go to the Councilmember, and you know, you go to he or she, and indicate, you know, that you've got a problem. There's also the local Community Board. You know, we do have these, you know— Councilmembers have the ability to get local problems addressed. And that's like a large part of what we do.

And there's 311 and there's like members of the Council. And so, you know, most Councilmembers are better than 311 at getting, you know, situations

- 2 remedied. And that's what I do. And I think I speak
- 3 on behalf of, you know, the other 50 Councilmembers
- 4 here that when we hear specific situations, we do our
- 5 best, you know, to try to, you know, give-- give
- 6 people the, you know, peace and repose that they
- 7 need, and to address whatever problem they have.
- 8 And so we try to fill in where you know, 311
- 9 | leaves off.
- 10 MR. EREZ: This is the opportunity. So, I've
- 11 | never felt more helpless then until I came and saw
- 12 | how one-sided--
- 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay.
- 14 MR. EREX: [inaudible]
- 15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: But I just had-- I just
- 16 | wanted to have that as a -- as a parting comment. And
- 17 | I appreciate this panel being here with us today.
- 18 | Thank you very much.
- 19 MR. CAMACHO: And I thank you. And that citizen
- 20 thing needs to be fixed too. So, thank you.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you sir.
- 22 COUNSEL: The next panel will be Sandra
- 23 | Telendrana (again, I apologize if I pronounce her
- 24 name wrong) with Flowers by Giorgie, Nikolay Gergov
- 25 | with Pando 39, and Frank McCawley with Tito Murphys.

_

Okay. Why don't we go from-- from my right to my left? How about that? We'll start with you.

MS. TELENDRANA: Good afternoon. My name is

Sandra Telendrana. I stand before you today as the

voice of Flowers By Giorgie, a small family-owned

flower shop nestled in the heart of Sunnyside,

Queens.

Our shop has been marred by an unpleasant encounter with Mr. Dietmar Detering, who in conjunction with a DEP, unjustly slapped us with three unwanted tickets. Two of these tickets found themselves in the favor of Mr. Detering, each carrying the weight of an \$880 fine, adding up to a staggering \$1760.

Our luck ran out when the so-called bounty
hunters were instructed to document violations
themselves. The second ticket handed out by the DEP
cited unreasonable noise on the sound reproduction
device for commercial business advertising purposes,
on November 28, 2022, at 8:12am. This was despite
the fact that our doors remained open and the music
emanating from our shop was meant to create a
pleasant atmosphere inside, not to disturb our
neighbors. However, the DEP argues that even if you

2 stand at our front door with the doors open, and can

3 hear music from there, it qualifies as a violation.

4 This interpretation left us perplexed. The third

5 ticket further deepened our confusion claiming that

6 speakers outside our store were playing music to

7 attract attention. We probably removed those

8 speakers, which were remnants from the previous

9 tenant that were not even connected to our music

10 \parallel system. During the hearing, when we explained this,

11 | we were asked if we had evidence from a sound

12 | technician proving those speakers' inactivity. For a

13 | small business like ours, it is financially

14 | impractical to allocate funds for a sound technician,

15 | especially when money is already in short supply.

Our flower shop is not just a business, it's our livelihood and the legacy of our family. It has sustained us, put food on our table, provided shelter, put my siblings and I through school, and

19 shelter, put my siblings and I through school, and

20 now my youngest sibling.

Witnessing individuals misuse their power to levy hefty fines on hardworking families like ours is disheartening. My parents tirelessly dedicate 60 to

 $24 \parallel 80$ hours each week to make ends meet, pay monthly

16

17

18

21

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

2.2

2.3

2 rent, cover utility bills, and restock our store with 3 merchandise.

The pandemic left countless small businesses reeling, and now we find ourselves under the relentless scrutiny of city agencies.

So as you deliberate the purpose of bills to curtail the exploitation of small businesses by bounty hunters through unjust violations, we implore you to contemplate the impact of these actions on families like ours. Your support could be the lifeline that ensures businesses like Flowers By Giorgie continue to flourish. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. I'm just going to jump in for a second, even though ordinarily I'd wait until a panel is done. But now, the person—the entity that you're talking about, or the individual who heard sound outside your—your business, what—was this someone from DEP?

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: It was the bounty hunter guy.

MS. TELENDRANA: No. The individual --

MS. TELENDRANA: It's the bounty hunter guy.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, fine. Fine. I just
wanted to make sure that-- because DEP would know in

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 that situation that they have to use a decibel meter. 3 And so--

MS. TELENDRANA: They didn't. On the second ticket that was issued, and I had the hearing with DEP, that's what-- I raised the-- all the flags during their--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Right. Okay. No. is-- This is part of the whole bounty hunter phenomenon, and why we're doing everything we can to try to-- and we're moving on this. But thank you. Let me go to the next witness.

MS. TELENDRANA: Thank you.

MR. GERGOV: Good evening. My name is Nikolay Gergov, and I represent Pando 39. We've received 16 summons from the same individual. One of them was from someone else, but 15 from the same individual. We took the business as is, and there was a small speaker right above the front door, which we took down the moment we received the first one, by-- But this time the summons kept coming. And as you're already aware, there's a huge disconnect somewhere, because most of the summons were issued in the two weeks of this February, and we received them sometime in the beginning of May. And then we received

2

3

.

4

5

6

7

8

9

,

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

summons that were from last November as well and December. If we are to pay the total final of those 16 sermons that's over \$20,000.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You should fight those.

MR. GERGOV: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You should fight those.

Thank you.

MR. GERGOV: Thank you.

MR. MCCAWLEY: Hi, my name is Frank McCawley.

I'm a partner in Tito Murphys on 46th Street, right

on restaurant row. Our business is rest-- primarily

a restaurant with a bar. We have an area of about

300 square feet outside with two speakers that are

kept as background music. They are not facing the

street, even though we have outside dining. We were

summonsed 8 times by the same individual, by the same

bounty honor. He just keeps coming back, and coming

back, and coming back. Until we got our first

summons, we had no idea this was going on. We got no

warning. We just had no clue. So I think it's very

unfair. I think we're low hang-- low hanging fruit,

and we've been exploited.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Correct. That's what's

going on. And that's what we're here to fix. And

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 you know, Councilmember Holden, who, you know, is 2 3 hanging in with us this late in the hearing, and you know, Bob and I-- well, Councilmember Holden and I 4 are very committed to making sure that -- that people 5 aren't abused by people who self-empower on a 50-6 7 year-old unknown law, and that's what we're here to

8 fix. And so bear with us as we get through this. 9 the meantime, anything that comes your way you should 10 fight.

MR. MCCAWLEY: Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I thank this panel. direct Counsel to call the next panel.

The next panel will be A.M. Riccielli, COUNSEL: with the East 17th Street Loft Corporation Co Op, Gregory Guarino with Acoustics Inc., and Norma Cote.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: While we're here, I'm just wondering if anyone from the administration has made their way into the room? Okay. Thank you for being here. Please tell the City-- the City Legislative Affairs that we need someone from the Administration to hear every single word of testimony that these good people have waited around hours to deliver. And they're not getting paid to be here. So it's the least that we can expect for-- someone from the

2.2

mayoralty, someone from the Administration to listen to the citizens, and as further impetus to work with the Council to get this fixed. But I thank you for being here.

Okay, please, commence when you're ready. How about you. You have to turn on the microphone, red light on?

MS. COTE: Okay. My name is Norma Cote. I live directly over a restaurant. It's a residential building. It's a residential block. It's a residential street. There are no other commercial establishments on that block or at that intersection. That restaurant plays its music in its dining room. I don't hear it through the floor, because they have sound protection equipment. But there's no way you can introduce sound protection out of doors. And if this restaurant should choose to play its music loud enough that it penetrates into the outdoor space, it will not only harm me, but it will harm everyone else who lives around that neighborhood.

I think it is not fair to ask the residents to endure the-- the destruction of their peace and quiet in order to support a private profit-making enterprise.

2.2

2.3

Music is a kind of air pollution. It's no answer to say, "Well, we'll just we'll just regulate it at night." I am at home a lot. I work at my computer a lot. It's just as destructive of my life in the daytime as it is at night.

In order to have any enforcement at all, since
the city agencies will never be able to do it, you
have to preserve effective citizen complaints. I say
whatever problems you have with people who are
abusing it, don't throw the baby out with the
bathwater. Keep effective civilian complaints, which
has to be underlaid by effective penalties placed onon violators.

Violators can't say, "Well, my music is just background music." If it was just background, it wouldn't be out in the street. And those people need to be reined in. Thank you for hearing me.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. Thank you, and I do agree with you.

MR. GUARINO: My name is Greg Guarino. I'm from Acoustilog Incorporated. We measure noise. We agree that 24-244 clearly should not be used to penalize accidental sound leakage. But Intro 160 will have

2 unintended consequences due to its use of the wrong

4 The current noise code includes the phrase "shall

measurement technique, dBA.

a

include but shall not be limited to before specifying three very limited examples, B1, 2, and 3." By

removing that phrase, Intro 160 will allow businesses

to disturb both businesses and residential neighbors

by only requiring them to conform to those three

limited examples.

I understand my Councilman's wish for an objective standard. But all three examples only use dBA. dBA ignores the bass. And as everyone knows, bass is the problem. Bass is what comes through floors, walls, windows, etc. Right now, a business can at least use 24-218 to complain about bass from another business. If the code has changed, that bass leakage will no longer be a violation. Right now the commercial music section, 24-231 protects residents from some bass frequencies, but not the subbass from subwoofers. The proposed change would allow businesses that produce unlimited sub-bass, disturbing everyone around them indoors and outdoors.

If you live near loud business, a gym club restaurant or even a clothing store, you will not be

RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 2 able to complain about sub-bass coming through the 3 wall or floor. And if you work next to one, you 4 won't be able to complain at all, because dBA does 5 not properly measure the bass that you hear. If you remember nothing else about what I'm 6 7 saying, remember that there are many ways to measure 8 it many different kinds of decibel measurements. dBA ignores the bass, and bass is the problem. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. I'd be very 10 11 grateful if you could provide a copy of your written 12 statement to the Committee Council. 13 MR. GUARINO: Our consultant, Alan Firestein, who wouldn't be here if he wasn't 10,000 miles away, is 14 15 going to submit something more comprehensive. 16 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please do, because we want 17 to get all of the technical subtle nuances correct. 18 MR. GUARINO: Exactly right. That's what we're 19 asking. 20 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yup.

MR. GUARINO: Thank you very much.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yours is very compelling testimony. We really appreciate you coming forward. Make sure we get that.

Uh, Chair could I...? COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, uh, I recognize Councilmember Holden.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Again, I thank you for that. Because I don't know some of these things. And we need the experts. That's why we have hearings. So, I don't like the base either. And I think that's the most annoying. So, I agree with you. So, this is very, very good information. If we could adjust it, we will.

MR. GUARINO: Thank you very much. We would be more than to provide you with the information. And this is what we suspected: that we've been hearing a lot of words like decibel go around. And there's different kinds of decibels. And there's-- You talk about objective measurements. But there are different kinds of objective measurements. This just isn't the right one for this problem.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: So we could tweak the bill, right?

MR. GUARINO: Right.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: With language that would cover the bass. I'd appreciate that. Because I don't want to create another problem by solving one problem, we created another one.

2 MR GUARINO: Okay.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

3 COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you so much for 4 this.

5 MR. GUARINO: Thank you very much. And if it 6 matters, I live in Glendale.

COUNCILMEMBER HOLDEN: Thank you. Thanks for that.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next panel will be Peter Gibson,
Robin Warren, and Murphy Fitzpatrick.

You may begin when ready.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: If you could— if you could just hold on one second until I'm ready to listen.

Sorry about that. I just want it to be focused on your testimony. Please commence.

MR. GIBSON: Okay. My name is Peter Gibson. I am a concerned citizen. And I wanted to say that I have concerns about the Bill 0160 that would completely exempt any penalty for noise operating from an interior space in a business. It seems to me that passing this law would mean any business can now play music as loud as they want without any deterrence.

2.

Going forward, these laws would allow for a business operator—a business operator that was previously—previously considered a bad actor by their Community Board to play music without installing soundproofing or blast music directly into the street, as long as the speakers were in an open window inside.

These amendments would increase harmful noise in the residential neighborhoods that were already experiencing. These laws might make it easier for a business to operate, but would vastly and— at a vastly and proportionately higher cost to the residents and the quality of life and health of those residents.

As you know, 311 database indicates that noise is the most common complaint in New York. New York City Department of Health Reports that 40% of New Yorkers report disruptive noise at home in the past three months. About 30% of New Yorkers with serious psychological distress report frequent noise disruption. The New York Department of Health also reports that common effects of noise is hypertension, diabetes, anxiety, increased risk of heart attacks.

O 1

It seems that amending these laws would negatively impact the quality of life of many of your constituents. To produce the overall—— To produce an overall greater good and balance for New York City, businesses and residents—— and for businesses and residents, that we urge you to change these amendments.

So, the citizens--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Please conclude.

MR. GIBSON: Okay. The citizen initiated noise summons program should be improved. I agree that meter evidence should be submitted, the business operator should be sent a copy of the proposed summons immediately. If the citizen submitting a proposed summons does not live in the neighborhood--

MR. GIBSON: --he should have several residents that reside in the immediate neighborhood co-sponsor the summons, but keep the effective citizen complaint program in place. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Hi, my name is Murphy

Fitzpatrick. I'm a manager at a restaurant called

BarDough on Restaurant Row on West 46th Street. And

2.2

2.3

I think I can one up everyone where I have 18 violations from the same person. And I actually have residential neighbors above and directly adjacent to my establishment. And I've never received a 311 call from any of them. And I'm friendly with many of them, because when these violations started coming in, I asked all of them, that they can always text me let me know if they had issues.

And because I'm a smaller establishment as well, and where I'm located close to Times Square, where my rent is high, and my square footage is low, that my violations total almost between three and four months of my rent, which, if all of these hit my bank, would probably put me out of business.

So this is something for me. And I totally understand everyone else's-- who are on the side as well as people who are abusing the noise, that for myself who is not one of them, that I would like for there to be some sort of justification that we can get through, and again, that people that do abuse it, yes, there should be some penalty. But for 18 violations from one person, for one location, that really has no problems with any of their adjacent neighbors doesn't really seem fair.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. And I will say that before the-- before this section was uncovered, that the bounty hunters were using, you know, life went on and with the new noise code for 20 years, and we were using the decimal standard. So, any declaration that any witness would make that they're under no obligation whatsoever to limit their noise.

You know, there was a paradigm in place that was just blown up and the bounty hunters got into business. And so I just— I just felt it was important to make that point that, you know, people were getting decibel meter violations, this was happening. It's not like, you know, the bounty hunters showed up and then, you know— now and only—and only since their arrival is there any kind of noise enforcement. That's just— that's not the case. We need to do better.

We need to do better, you know civilian enforcement, we needed to do better on all frontiers. But what we don't need is, you know, profiteers running around who do not have your best interests at heart. They just want to make a lot of money. But—And any problem that you're having—And any problem that you're having, I would urge you to engage with

- 1
- 2 your Councilmember, your local Community Board and
- 3 make yourself-- That's where you turn up the volume,
- 4 to them.
- 5 MR. FITZPATRICK: Yeah, we're doing that. And,
- 6 you know, that's your speculation that this person's
- 7 doing it on-- for profit. And that's, uh--
- 8 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I don't think that's
- 9 | speculation, but we will agree to disagree and we're
- 10 calling the next panel. Thank you.
- 11 | COUNSEL: The next panel will be Sharon Trennor
- 12 and Cormac Flynn
- 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Cormac. Cormac and I go
- 14 | back a long time.
- 15 Is that the League of Conservation Voters days or
- 16 | something? Or something like that?
- 17 MR. FLYNN: Yeah, I was there a long time.
- 18 Before that--
- 19 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah, right. You've got to
- 20 put on your microphone, you know.
- 21 MR. FLYNN: Well, I was there a long time, but
- 22 | before that Former Speaker Vallone.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Oh, right. Right. Right.
- 24 Yeah. Please.

J

J

MS. TRENNOR: Hi, my name is Sharon Trennor, and I am representing eight bars and restaurants in Manhattan, Jack Dempsey's, the Playwright Irish Pub, the Playwright Tavern, McHale's, BarDough, Legends, Tito Murphy's, and St. Pats.

I am testifying as how it is unfair that civilians can write up their own noise violations and get paid for it, creating bounty hunters, and I feel like bars and restaurants are being targeted.

I am also testifying that the rules are unclear as it states unreasonable noise from sound reproduction device for commercial and business advertising purposes. Meanwhile, businesses are not advertising, but simply creating a nice ambience for their customers.

As I mentioned before, our eight locations have received over 87 violations. We started receiving them in the mail of March 2023 for dates occurring as far back as August 2022. This was the first time we had received any sort of noise violations. And as soon as we received the first one, we actually took down our speakers. The problem did not stop there. We began to receive them week after week in the mail, some days two days apart, some days a week apart, all

.

ranging from August 22 to March 23. So these violations were being held for over six months before being sent out. As a matter of fact, I'm still receiving them from dates in October 22, 5th and 7th, but they're only been mailed out September 27 of this year, nearly a whole year later.

I believe this is an attempt to rack up as many offenses as possible in order for maximum penalty payouts.

Nobody has come to actually give us a violation in person. Some of these violations have gone into default, 59% as we established, because we never actually received them, and only find out about them when we got a default letter. Some of our managers have even witnessed the bounty hunters going right up to the speakers to video them. May I add there's two individuals in particular are responsible for 95% of these--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yeah, we know. We know that.

MS. TRENNOR: Yeah. Okay. [Bell rings] Can I continue just--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Very briefly, because-very briefly. Because there are scores of witnesses
still to testify.

MS. TRENOOR: What is the point in paying for outdoor seating permits and music royalties, if we can even give our customers the same ambience as inside? They'd rather listen to music than honking horns and sirens.

I feel the need to testify today, because I'm genuinely worried about how we are supposed to pay all these fines if they are sustained. We also have to pay legal representation. Some businesses will not survive this. We're still recovering from the repercussions of COVID, and we never got back to where we were before then. This is just creating more stress for us.

May I suggest that civilians do not get paid for reporting noise complaints. And if they do file complaints that they'd be filed within 30 days of it actually occurring? I'm also suggesting that all the rest of the noise violations be dismissed. We weren't given the chance to cure them in the first place. Had we done that, we wouldn't have racked them up.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: This is—Yeah. I—The ones that are already in the pipeline, we'll do what we can. Anything that has been adjudicated, it's out of our hands. But you know, we're trying to work as quickly as possible to get the best result as soon as possible, and to have those that have not yet been adjudicated thrown out. Thank you. I'm going to move on to Cormac now.

MS. TRENNOR: Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You bet. Sure. Cormac?

MR. FLYNN: Hello. My name is Cormac Flynn and
like Clint before from Community Board 3, I'm on

Community Board 2. We also haven't taken a position
yet because our Community is really just learning
about these bills in the last few days.

However, for background, I'm a member of

Committee Board 2 for 12 or 15 years. I'm the SLA-former SLA Chair. I'm also the former head of my

Block Association on the residential side. And I've
been for over 10 years on the board of the Village

Alliance Business Improvement District, working to

fill empty storefronts and that sort of thing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

1213

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

2.3

Z 4

25

to.

So, I actually know the noise issues from every which side on this thing. Let me just say that I do not, and no one I know has any objection to the main legislative purpose that you seem to be pursuing here, which is to stop the monetization abuse of— of a complaint mechanism for the noise code.

However, we have very large concerns about Intro 160. And most of those concerns, it turns out, were just addressed a few minutes ago by that gentleman from -- what was it? Acoustilog? -- who came up. They are specifically about the bass. So if you strip out the language that says, you know, "including but not limited to," and you just leave these three 20-year-old examples, those examples are all A weighted, right?, and not C weighted. And so you end up leaving out bass and sub bass from any kind of mechanism. And this is important, because as you said, Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago, the noise revisions were made. And I remember because I testified a few times on that. In those 20 years, technology around bass, around woofers and subwoofers, have just changed dramatically. you can get that kind of sound when you weren't able

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. Thank you, Cormac. And certainly, you know, the points were made about the bass, and we will duly consider it. We don't want to go backwards, and we're trying to go forwards.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much.

Andrew, if I could just see it for a second? And you can call the next panel.

COUNSEL: The next panel will be Jonathan Rinaldi and Raul Rivera.

MR. RINALDI: That's on Great. Good morning Chair. I have some materials showing how you, Gennaro, are taking significant bribes from Kathy--Kathy or Kathleen, wife of registered lobbyist Robert Bookman in exchange for you introducing 1194. Kathleen is married to Robert. I have email--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Your testimony is out of order.

MR. RINALDI: I've had emails between the both of you, but Intro 1194 is something that has no sponsors. It's just your bill. And which not-forprofits do you actually support? Do you--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: We don't answer questions. You get to testify and don't get to ask questions.

MR. RINALDI: Right. Well, I'm just letting you know that I've have evidence that you are taking bribes for your bills that you're introducing. Plus you-- you really don't care about the community because you filled--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Okay, you're out of-Sergeant, shut off the microphone--

MR. RINALDI: --our district with illegal aliens.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You're out of order.

You're off topic. Thank you.

MR. RIVERA: Can you hear me? Good afternoon.

My name is Raul Rivera. I'm a TLC driver and a TLC

driver advocate. It's been brought to our attention
- I mean, you want to censor people. You don't want

to let people speak, not even for two minutes. I

don't know how that works. But we are here at your

committee, because we are New Yorkers and we are

concerned--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: If you're going topics, speak on topic. If you're going to speak on-- if you're going to go off-topic then you're not going to be allowed to testify.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 201 1 MR. RIVERA: We're not -- We're not going off 2 3 topic. We're speaking about you and your committee--CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'm-- It's not--4 MR. RIVERA: Hold on a second. CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I am not the topic. 6 7 MR. RIVERA: I'm asking you to hold on a second. 8 We're speaking about these bills and you're--9 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No you're not. You're not. MR. RIVERA: You're cutting -- You're cutting us 10 off. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: You're not talking--13 MR. RIVERA: We have two minutes to speak, sir. 14 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: No. You get -- You get two 15 minutes to speak on topic. MR. RIVERA: That is censorship. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: On topic. 18 MR. RIVERA: It's censorship. You're cutting us 19 off. We ask respectively--20 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: GENNARO: You're off topic. 21 Sergeant, turn off--2.2 MR. RIVERA: --that you stand down and let us 2.3 testify.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Sergeant's-- Call the next panel. Call the next panel

24

25

2 [BACKGROUND VOICES]

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Call the next panel. I ask the sergeant to clear these individuals out of the room.

[BACKGROUND VOICES]

COUNSEL: We will now turn to zoom testimony. For panelists who are testifying--

[BACKGROUND VOICES]

We will now turn to zoom testimony. When your name is called a member of our staff will unmute you and the Sergeant at Arms will give you the go ahead to begin. Please wait for the Sergeant to announce that you may begin before delivering your testimony.

We will return to ought to in-person testimony after we finished the Zoom testimony. Yes. We will be doing the in-person testimony and then the Zoom testimony. I would now like to welcome Eric Eisenberg to testify.

MR. EISENBERG: Hi. First thank you to Keith

Powers for your strong bills. Now on to the bad ones

which are Intros 1194 and 160. In the early 1970s,

New Yorkers realized that city agencies namely the

NYPD and DEP were failing to enforce their noise

laws. They knew that chronic noise is not a mere

2.3

Z 4

nuisance, but also harms our sleep, our health, our learning, and even our lifespans. So, City Council in the 1970s noise code enabled and monetarily encouraged members of the public to also enforce our noise laws against businesses that purposely direct their advertising noise to the public sidewalk.

Unfortunately, in 50 years the DEP never explained to the public how they could participate. In 2022, the public sick and tired of the city's non-enforcement read the noise code and again insisted that yes, they did have a right to fight for a healthy soundscape in New York City.

OATH has treated businesses more than fairly at noise hearings. 80% of citizen-based noise summons result in a violation finding, much higher than the 49% of the NYPD OATH summonses. Nonetheless, OATH has very generously issued \$0 fines when the businesses stopped their noise pollution by the time of the hearing. That's unprecedented. And where the businesses have an alternate explanation to the music, like outdoor dining, OATH has been dismissing the tickets.

Only persistent and entirely unnecessary noise polluters have anything to fear from citizen

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

20

21

22

23

24

to the noise laws.

The results of the past year of citizen

enforcement have been outstanding. Numerous

businesses in Midtown, the Village and Corona have

stopped unnecessarily blasting their music and

enforcement at presents. For responsible businesses,

the only consequence of a ticket is free education as

advertising come-ons directly to the sidewalk.

Citywide, 311 complaints have dropped from 766,000 in

2021 by about 100,000 or 13%. That's overall noise

insane. That's an amazing improvement. All that is

complaints by 311 in New York City. That's-- That's

really needed. And on top of our current citizen

enforcement lawsuits is better education, like the

DEP immediately telling businesses when they get a

complaint that they got a complaint. It's not hard.

The DEP has just failed businesses in that regard.

[BELL RINGS]

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired.

MR. EISENBERG: Can I have a little more time?

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Time expired.

MR. EISENBERG: Maps of quality of life

improvement--

_

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Time expired. Next witness.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Jeanine BATA.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

MS. BATA: I'm here to testify about noise camera location selection. My name is Jeanine Bata. I live in East Flatbush, and I began advocating for use of noise cameras combined with an educational component in 2016, attempting to engage with my elected leaders which was unsuccessful. I testified at the City Council hearing on the Smart City on January 21, 2021, citing cities throughout the world that were already piloting noise cameras.

I'm affiliated with organizations concerned with acoustics and noise, but I'm not representing them at this hearing. I'm only speaking for myself and other New Yorkers affected by vehicle noise who live in areas of low 311 usage. I'm here to request that the city council and DEP look beyond NYC 311 data and direct complaints to elected leaders when selecting locations for noise camera placement. A high volume of 311 noise complaints might represent a prevalence of high volume of noise, or it might represent complaint behavior. Low numbers of 311 noise

Ŭ

complaints might represent a quiet area or might represent a noisy area where residents are reluctant or afraid to submit noise complaints. There are areas like mine where elected leaders don't have much interest in or knowledge of noise pollution as a health issue. Most residents here don't use 311 or complain directly to elected leaders, but they will complain about noise in NYPD, Community Council, or Build A Block sector meetings.

I suggest the following three ideas about using broader methods of site selection and I ask the City Council and DEP to consider the following: Outreach efforts that combine marketing and education as a means of giving advanced warning to drivers, educating about health risks of noise and marketing use of reporting noise, and I'm going to send in my updated testimony and October 24, 2011, TLC press release that did this in such a super fantastic way.

[BELL RINGS]

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired. Please wrap up.

MS. BATA: Okay, comprehensive noise--

COUNSEL: The next witness is Deitmar Detering.

MR. DETERING: Thank you, Committee. Thank you, Chair Gennaro. You have a packed agenda today, and I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regret that I can only speak to citizen noise complaint matters. The city kept this noise complaint program a secret for over 50 years. When I inquired with the DEP in April of last year about how to submit citizen noise complaints under Section 24-261, the department had neither information, nor forms, nor processes for this.

To this day, the DEP publishes no information about citizen noise complaints. It does not, and to my knowledge, never did publish any information about the city's rules against advertising noise pollution either. Why is that? To fill the void and to effectively answer all the requests that I received about how to participate in the program, I've created a how-to that I've shared as a Google Doc. But soon you can find it online at NYCquiet.org. But it really should be the DEP providing that information. Please understand, Section 244 B is not about noise coming from legitimate -- legitimate purposes. bar or restaurant is allowed in the course of the business, then that is not advertising and the DEP deems such complaints frivolous already. complaints will not become a summons, will not reach the respondent and will not get to OATH. However, if

it can be shown that a business is purposefully placing or using a speaker to be heard by the general public, then such businesses must be held accountable for such nuisance. Then not with the noise, the city's full of it, and the noise code. But not just protecting our hearing but also our attention must be enforced. Unlike noise from much of construction and traffic, advertising noise only benefits the polluter at the expense of its law-abiding competition in the neighborhood, and all of us New York's denizens.

Making polluters stop has no effect on the industry as a whole. And all of us win some peace and quiet. Intro 160 is pro-noise because it would give carte blanche—

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

MR. DETERING: --seeking free advertising with

noise. All they need to do is place the speaker-
COUNSEL: The next witness is Leslie Clark.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. CLARK: Hello, thank you. I want to in-investigate some of the words that are being used
here today. They're talking about advertising and
just ambiance sound. One of the representatives of a
restaurant even said that they-- why couldn't they

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 have their ambient sound outside when they were

3 | having it inside? There are two reasons for that.

4 One is that I live over those restaurants. And I

5 don't want their ambient sound in my home. The

6 second reason is that it's illegal.

The other thing is the use of the term advertising in terms of noise. All noise that comes out of restaurants and bars is in fact advertising. It is saying to the people walking by, "There's a party in here come on in." And the reason why these things matter today, and the fact that they these terms are not being used carefully at all in this discussion today is that with the zoning text amendment that passed a year and a half ago, the-all restaurants will be allowed to keep their windows and doors open at all times that they are in operation. And also with Local Law 121 that passed in August, no restaurant can be restricted in its hours to less than 14 hours. So that -- put it all together. You've got you have people-- you have restaurants who are going to be in business for 14 hours during which they will be allowed to keep their windows and doors open at all times, basically blasting their ambient music at me.

2.2

2.3

This is not something that we that we want as a city. The fact that people— that there are citizen enforcers out there is in fact a very good thing, and the fact that in this committee hearing, they were—it was said of citizen enforcers they are more motivated by profit than by quality of life. In fact, that is an excellent description of many, many restaurant and bar owners who are much more profit motivated by profit than by the quality of life of their neighbors, thank you.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Alfred Fuente.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

Thank you, Chair for hearing me today. And thank you to the Committee for considering these bills.

I'm an attorney that represents restaurants and bars before the State Liquor Authority, before Community Boards, as well as before OATH. And I'm-- I oppose all the bills before the Committee. We live in a city right now that is not responding to the disorderliness, the noise. The police will not respond to our calls. We had somebody try to climb up the scaffolding of our building the other day, and we called the police, and they do not answer.

I'm also flabbergasted that two individuals have caused 90% of these problems, and that no one is considering taking action against them, whether it's the restaurant and bars that are affected, that can bring causative action against those two individuals, DEP, who's also profiting from the receipt of all of these of all the revenue generated—generated by these tickets, that Mayor's Office of Special Enforcement can bring a proceeding against these individuals. There needs to be enforcement— Excuse me, there needs to be action taken by the restaurants themselves against the people that are causing all of these problems and all of these violations to be lodged against them.

I understand and appreciate how unfair it is to them. But nevertheless, it's also unfair to New Yorkers who are already living in a city littered with homeless people, marijuana use rampant everywhere, as well as open containers. And we do not have any kind of authorities that are responding to our needs. Because when you call the police, they don't-- they don't show up. And when you call the precinct, you're told to call the police. So we're living-- we're living in a place where the city

government is not answering the-- the neglect that is continuing to grow throughout the city, and instead we're going to be rewarded with-- with more noise and more chaos throughout the streets. Thank you for your time and thank you for considering my testimony.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Deborah Farley.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. FARLEY: Thank you. My name is Debbie Farley and I have resided in Sunnyside for 72 years. My perspective on noise violations, and who was most negatively impacted by it is diametrically opposed to those of businesses that gave testimony today. My apartment building is adjacent to two restaurants. Both have dining sheds, both have curbside dining, and one restaurant has backyard seating. All of my windows face either the street or avenue sides of these dining establishments.

Because of the proximity of the two restaurants to my building, I cannot escape the raucous noise outdoors. In an attempt to deafen the noise my apartment windows have been remained permanently shut for the last three years. To watch television, hold a simple conversation, or get a restful night's sleep, my windows must remain closed. My stress and

2

3

4

5

6

7

_

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

24

25

anxiety levels have risen sharply due to the interrupted sleep patterns. The excessive noise level makes falling and staying asleep impossible.

Living with windows that are permanently sealed,

never feeling fresh air gives me a feeling of entrapment inside of my apartment. Both restaurants, dining sheds, and curbside dining areas are packed with large noisy crowds every night of the week. Live entertainment is often on weekends and performances are amplified with outdoor speakers and microphones. When there is no live entertainment, the music being played inside the restaurant is played to outdoor speakers mounted onto the sheds. Even during the days and nights when there are no customers seated outside, music is blasting through speakers mounted onto the shed. Sunnyside is a residential, family-oriented community. Living 20 feet away from these restaurants demands that measures need to be adopted to address the chronic noise violations and lack of enforcement. Exposure to hours of continuous loud noise contributes to sleep disturbances, sleep deprivation, high blood pressure, heart disease, anxiety, and stress.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Ernest Welde.

3

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

4

speaking in opposition to Intro 1194. Removing the

MR. WELDE: My name is Ernest Welde, and I'm

6

5

only productive thing about the noise code

7

incentivizing citizen enforcement is an awful idea.

8

I live in New York City. Although I have not filed

9

any noise complaints myself, I fully support the

10

citizen reporting component and I participate in the

11

citizen component of the idling law. At my day job,

12

I'm an attorney and a legislative director at an $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) =\left$

13

environmental health-based nonprofit. I studied

14

legislation and work with legislators to enact

15

5 protect-- protective laws.

16

for clarity but you all should be extremely skeptical

1718

of what Intro 1194 will actually do. It will destroy

I believe that the noise law should be omitted

19

the citizen component of the noise complaint system,

20

the only thing that it's actually working to protect

21

residents from excessive and unlawful noise. New

22

York City citizen program is the best legislation in

23

America that I know of to deal with daily micro-

24

violations such as excessive unlawful noise.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Giving citizens the power to record these violations and receive a percentage of the proceeds is pure genius and the model to emulate. Councilmember Powers is absolutely correct: creates a lot of health issues. Excessive noise can be a major environmental problem impacting the health and well-being of residents of New York, and this creates a broad range of issues including general annoyance, sleep disturbance, negative effects on the cardiovascular and metabolic system, as well as cognitive impairment in children. Excessive noise can take years off one's life. Intro 1194-- if Intro 1194 passes, it will regulate the noise reduction program to the Silent Night Program of Bloomberg's, the same dark and lonely, and place zero enforcement. A minuscule number of tickets were issued before this, and after-- if 1194 passes, a miniscule number will pass. There seems to be a focus on what citizens are making on this program and accusing them of abusing the system, but the real focus should be on how much benefit the citizens have brought to these communities by making them more peaceful and quiet places to live. Excessive unlawfully loud

noise is a huge environmental problem, and there was

2 no enforcement. This year there is enforcement, and

3 we are seeing huge changes. Chair Gennaro, I saw

4 that you identified the citizens enforcers as the fly

5 in the ointment. Unfortunately, I believe you got it

6 wrong. Excessive noise from commercial

7 establishments is the actual fly in the ointment.

The ointment is the peaceful enjoyment of our

9 environment.

1

8

14

17

18

19

10 We New Yorkers have a lot to deal with.

11 Excessive noise is one of those, and this is a

12 program that is stopping that excessive noise.

13 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Diana Mauer.

15 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

16 COUNSEL: Diana Mauer.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Hunter Severini.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

20 MR. SEVERINI: Hello, my name is Hunter Severini.

21 | I'm a resident of downtown Manhattan. And I would

22 | like to testify against any and all bills weakening

23 \parallel citizen noise enforcement, particularly the two bills

24 | that were mentioned earlier, those being 1194 and

25 | 160. I live in the Central Business District. And

J

like Debbie, who just testified, I literally cannot open my window. It's a nightmare. I live on a high floor. And yet I don't ever get to have fresh air because anytime I do, it's just a constant barrage of noise. So my suggestion to the Council is that they should look into using technology to enforce noise, such as unnecessary honking, which is like a virus in the city, or like a cancer pretty much because it's like we don't know how to get rid of it.

You know, there are other things. Even dog barking. I mean, DEP is in charge with enforcing stuff, but they basically—they're under resourced as well. But they also don't really go out of their way to help. I've made numerous complaints about things that have, you know, and at most gotten a letter in response, not any kind of like in-person visit, which is, you know, them kind of saying, "We don't really believe you."

And then looking at all these businesses that testified most of them seem to have been notified but not done anything. Like they all seem to have 10 or 20 violations, and like I really don't think-- maybe if they got a few at once, I really don't think they all came on the same day. So I don't really buy

2.2

2.3

2 this. I think that these people are some-- are, you
3 know, acting surprised.

But we live in a country of laws. Ignorance does not excuse guilt. I think there are plenty of people who would have common sense after receiving one of the summons say, "What it is for?" Go to the hearing. Was found in violation, and corrected the problem.

And besides that, I really disagree with the tone of this hearing. I think it's been conducted in a one-sided manner. You know, Councilmember Gennaro, I would appreciate much more impartiality from your end. I don't think the way that you've presented this is respectful to the citizens who have taken opposing positions. Whatever, you know, the outcome of all these hearings and bills is, there are points to be heard on all sides. And if I, openly saying that one side is right does not encourage people to come forward and testify against bills.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Hayden Brocket.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MR. BROCKETT: Good afternoon. My name is Hayden Brockett. I'm a lawyer. My family and I live in

8

25

2 Manhattan. I've never filed a commercial noise

3 complaint, so unlike the businesses and lobbyists who

4 | testified today, I don't have a financial

5 disincentive here, or a conflict of interest, but I

6 urge the Committee to oppose Intros 160 and 1194

7 because they will both harm-- they will both New

Yorkers' health and undermine citizen enforcement

9 laws that are already on the books and working.

10 Noise hurts our health, just plain and simple.

11 And as Chair Gennaro and Mr. Holden said at the

12 | outset of the Committee hearing, in the last 20

13 | years, New York has gotten noisier. And that's

14 | because right now, for the most part of our noise

15 code, the so-called objective standard actually means

16 no enforcement. That's how businesses like it.

17 Almost no noise enforcement takes place because

18 ∥ only the DEP or the NYPD can issue a ticket. And

19 | they don't show up for 7 to 10 days and they don't

20 write summonses. You need boots on the ground.

21 | Citizen enforcement works. Complaints are down 13%.

22 \parallel And if you want to tweak around the edges, fine, but

23 you don't need to change the law. Councilman Holden,

24 | you asked for feedback. And as written Intro 160

will make it impossible for ordinary New Yorkers to

1

2 make commercial noise complaints. If it passes, in

3 effect, you'll have that same system that you were

4 talking about that you don't like where it's only the

5 DEP or the NYPD, that'll be everywhere. And there'll

6 be no effective enforcement. Only if the DEP shows

7 up at the right time with the right equipment, and it

8 can get the offending business when they're still

9 doing it will there ever be a violation issued. That

10 is not an objective standard that is an unenforceable

11 standard.

12 This system doesn't work for other parts of our

13 | noise code. It does work for commercial noise

14 pollution. Commercial noise pollution is about

15 money. The businesses who pump speakers onto our

16 streets for every passerby to be assaulted are in it

17 | for the money. We-- Jobs make money when people walk

18 \parallel in the door. And so do bars and restaurants. They

19 \parallel actually-- the bars and restaurants that break the

20 law are hurting the bars--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired. Thank you.

MR. BROCKETT: Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Michael Streeter.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

21

2.3

24

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. STREETER: Hi, I wanted to-- to express my support for most of the Introductions being discussed

4 today. I think they're mostly solid and necessary.

And I want to thank Mr. Powers for introducing them.

6 But I wanted to use my time to speak out against

7 Intro 160 and Intro 1194, even though I've never

filed such a complaint myself.

311 has been completely useless in addressing noise complaints for years, nothing happens and if someone does get sent over to inspect, it's a Michigan J. Frog situation where you'd have to luck out that they show up at a time where the -- where the noise issue isn't temporarily off or long gone. you get an officer who tells you, "Hey, this is New York. Go move to Ohio." It's a joke. We all know this. We need video and audio evidence from citizens. I disagree with Chair Gennaro's statement that there was that -- there was enforcement before the bounty hunters came along. There-- There has been a huge difference since citizens have been submitting complaints. Even just six of them. Gutting this citizens' program would take away the most valuable tool that we have in addressing illegal noise pollution from food shops, restaurants, weed

2 shops, the cell ph

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

25

shops, the cell phone stores, and the like. We shouldn't have to put up with this.

You know, these lawyers got to go on earlier for like 20 minutes. And it really seems like they're—they're running the show here. The fact remains that commercial noise is a huge problem.

One thing I wanted to bring up that hasn't been really been discussed is that this this music when you pass a food place, or a weed shop, or whatever, it's overstimulation. And that's something that a lot of people struggle with, or they're struggling with this with their children or loved ones. There's enough noise from traffic, but music of varying levels of volume and annoyance to divert our attention, which is advertising, that's illegal and we-- we didn't opt into that. I think people are--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Michelle Compo.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. CAMPO: Hello. Do you hear me?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: We can hear you.

MS. CAMPO: Good. Okay. I represent most of

Little Italy in Manhattan as well as the Bowery Block

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Association. The idea of weakening these Intro bills
that has been long accepted—the bills have been

4 long accepted, hard won with restrictions that-- and

5 wanted restrictions because what-- what is

6 recommended is an assault on myself, my family, and

7 the residents of New York City. Restaurant noise is

8 | already at ear damaging levels with little to no

9 compliance to existing restrict, no adherence.

10 Calling 311 is kind of a joke. A rough joke.

Community residents are, or should be as important as the restaurants. Unbelievable to even propose 14 hours a day. Noise pollution is well documented as having adverse health outcomes. Are individuals to be considered more important than our-- Excuse me. Are restaurants to be considered more important than residential well-being? I think that's what you're trying to say.

Residents also work from home and we need our sleep.

Also, legally speaking, as was mentioned before, ignorance of the law is not an excuse. And I agree that this has been a very unbalanced hearing. Very. We're all very frustrated and very annoyed. And we

2.2

2.3

2 live here, and we've lived here all our lives, and

3 you should have some respect for that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Laura Sewell.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

COUNSEL: Laura Sewell?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. SEWELL: I apologize. I'm having trouble with my laptop. I'm Laura Sewell. I'm the Director of the East Village Community Coalition, which has long worked to support the local individual businesses that make our neighborhood unique, and to support local residents in seeking a balanced quality of life in an area well known to be oversaturated with nightlife establishments. And I want to thank everyone contributing to productive conversation on this today, because we definitely need additional help.

One thing: Outdoor speakers have always been and should continue to be prohibited in outdoor dining in New York City. The burden is on residents as always to support—report them and work with the Community Board, Council Office, and precinct to educate businesses and work to get them removed. But we have

2.2

2.3

2 had some success with that in our area. I know it's 3 not citywide, and it should be.

But we do want to clarify that we are only talking about sound emanating from within a business here. To my understanding, I guess that's a question you can tell me if I'm wrong when I'm done. Our main comment on Intro 160 is that if the Council is considering a change, rather than completely exempting what's commonly known as background level music from within an establishment, why not define a reasonable cap on the volume of music in decibels (not dBA; thank you to the gentleman from Acoustilog). We don't have the expertise to state what that level would be, but in layman's terms, if I have to shout to be heard by my companion passing by, or if the person on the other end of the phone wants to know what the heck is that, it's too loud.

For Intro 1194, you know, the city has increasingly turned to citizen enforcers for help with handling standing violations such as idling, and we find no reason why citizen enforcers could not be continued to be helpful in enforcing DEP violations, given appropriate parameters. I've heard some horrible things here today.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

COUNSEL: The next witness is Lisa Ann Chapman.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. CHAPMAN: Hello?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: We can hear you.

MS. CHAPMAN: Hi. Yeah, my name is Lisa Chapman. I'm a resident living in a mixed-use neighborhood, with a hotel, with a nightclub and restaurants that operate sometimes until two or four o'clock in the morning, and I've tried all means, 311. They also have a smog hog. And you know, I've been to DEP and 311. I just-- The noise codes or-- or the-- what's available to me as a resident who can't sleep is-- is limited and I just -- I just want to say that I can't-- I just would urge-- I understand the issues, but I would urge that we not be further restricted from our ability to live peacefully and -- and get sleep especially at two o'clock in the morning. Anything after midnight, and I agree with-- with what's said about -- there should be a way to measure it. should be a decibel level that's livable for the residents, that also-- you know, in this situation, the-- the venues that the-- that the hotel has have

1 RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS

glass walls and rooms that open up. So when the nightclub is in full swing, in the middle of the night, the noise that's emanating from them is not one that a person can live with or sleep with. And

6 you know, I have young children and I have elders

7 here at home.

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And so I just think that there needs to be a recognition of the that there has to be a level that's-- that's livable. And it just-- that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you.

13 COUNSEL: Next is Micki McGee.

14 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. MCGEE: Thank you very much for having this hearing. I want to express my gratitude to Councilmember Holden for still being here. It is my understanding, although I can't see it on my own screen, that the Chair has left the meeting. And I hope--

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: I'm here. I'm here. I'm Jim Gennaro. I'm the Chair. I'm here.

MS. MCGEE: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you.

Earlier in today's testimony, Robert Bookman, the

chief lobbyist for the Hospitality Alliance, and the

prime architect of the open restaurants program, testified that ever since Bloomberg moved to move us to an objective noise standard, we have lived happily ever after, until recently with the emergence of the citizen noise complaints, the rediscovery of this law.

I am here to testify that Mr. Bookman's HappilyEver-After is my neighborhood's living hell. I live
in the South Village. I live in the community
district where we have 1000 outdoor dining sites. We
have so many per square mile, it is unbearable.

So what Mr. Bookman has wrought, Mr. Bookman is seeing the return of.

I want to share with you the sound from MacDougal street, which is around the corner. And I have elderly neighbors living there in rent stabilized units who have reached out to our neighborhood group to ask what they can do. This is what it sounds like. I'm only going to play you 30 seconds of it.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: The purpose of this hearing is to get testimony not to put on a display. And so I'm not inclined to grant this. I know what noise sounds like. I'm sure it's going to be noisy. Next witness please. This is not testimony.

2 COUNSEL: Next is Mitchell Grubler.

3 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

COUNSEL: Mitchell Grubler?

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

MR. GRUBLER: Yes, I'm here. I'm with the Bowery Alliance of Neighbors. I'm a senior living in Mitchell Lama housing. And it's not enough to restrict noise when it's just in the interior. interior noise permeates to the outside. Doors open and close by the waitstaff and by patrons. I live across the street from a hotel with a bar on the I can't-- I cannot keep my windows open because of the noise that comes from that bar. And it's not just a matter of what sound can reach the sidewalk. The sound comes up from that bar into my windows. We would like to have fresh air in our apartment when the weather is nice. And I am deprived of that right of that fresh air as a result of the noise that permeates from that bar on the roof. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you, sir.

22 COUNSEL: The next witness is Susan Ginsburg.

23 | SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts.

MS. GINSBURG: Yes, hello. I live in the West

25 Village and I agree with all of the people that are

1 2 very articulate about why we stand against these two 3 new laws. We have been suffering, especially living 4 near NYU's dorms, with noise. And we complain. I didn't even know that there was this thing of these But we call 311. We can call the 6 bounties. 7 precinct. And the restaurants -- I have a bar on the 8 corner, that they are not supposed to open their windows on my block, for the noise to come in that they are playing their music inside. And, of course 10 11 they do. I live about three doors from them. And 12 it's excruciating. I have to go one o'clock in the 13 morning, two o'clock in the morning, go into the bar 14 and say, turn your music down, please. Do I report 15 it? Sometimes. Sometimes not. I call the owner. 16 We just -- it's just not going to change. 17 not going to stop until somebody says that you're 18 going to be punished for this. Or when you get your 19 liquor license, that you have to abide by a certain 20 kind of decibel level, and if you don't, we're going 21 to fine you. I mean, I just think that -- I just 2.2 think that that's the reasonable way to operate in 2.3 New York City. We live here. And somehow to the

restaurant industry, that doesn't seem to matter.

And we think that this is just an excuse for them to

24

25

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 1 want with the new law that they can have outdoor 2 3 dining with music, which we will-- We're just going to have to leave. We're-- I'm a senior. And it's--4 it just makes you want to cry, half of our lives. That's it. I don't have any of the things. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. COUNSEL: Next is Victoria Hillstom. 8 9 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts. Hello, can you hear me? 10 11 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Yes, we can do it. 12 MS. HILLSTOM: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

much for having me. I would first like to say that Intro at 160, and I believe it's 1194, your other bills are absolutely beyond the pale. I am a resident of Tribeca, 385 Greenwich, aka 71 North Moore, since 1982. Many of our neighbors left during the pandemic over the absolute chaos on our streets from-- from the outdoor dining. The noise is absolutely untenable.

And I would just like to say, a quite famous restauranteur is above me, Carlos Omada. designed nightclubs around the world. Our work has been published. We've worked with Ian Schrager, Andre Blahs. Really all the best and brightest.

2.2

2.3

We've designed the most relevant nightclubs in the world. And I would just like to say that these bills are really just beyond the pale. New York City has become a laughingstock. We don't open our doors and windows and advertise. There isn't a credible nightclub operator in the world— they don't do this in Paris or London. And so I would also like to share in the sentiment that Mr. Bookman can certainly bring suit against these two bounty hunters, which really nobody has ever heard of. And I am the last person in the world to be speaking out against restauranteurs. I would not do it.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired. Thank you.

COUNSEL: Next is Zack Weinstein.

16 | SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts

MR. WINESTINE: Sorry, I'm having trouble with my computer. Yeah, Hi. My name is Zach Winestine with St. Gansevoort. St. Gansevoort is an organization that deals with quality of life, landmarking, and land use issues in the Meat Market and far West Village area.

As you folks know, noise is a huge problem citywide. This has been mentioned in almost city--

2.2

2.3

every citywide survey. It's mentioned in the number of 311 calls.

What I'm puzzled by at this hearing is it appears that the bad-faith actions have to citizen enforcers who are intentionally incorrectly interpreting the law is being used as an excuse to significantly weaken the citywide noise code. The solution isn't to change the code the solution is to correctly enforce it the existing code. The specific concern that I have is the same that that was brought up by the representative of Acoustilog. They shortchanged themselves. Acoustilog is one of the most highly respected noise consulting businesses in the city.

As they said, removing the unreasonable noise language from Subdivision B of Section 24-218 leaves only the specified decibel levels as a constraint upon noise. And the problem is that those decibel levels are specified as A-weighted decibel levels, dBa. DBA does not, contrary to what was said earlier in this hearing, mimic human hearing. At normal listening music listening volume levels dBA filters out the deep bass frequencies. And as we all know, it's the deep bass that creates the noise problems when establishments are playing loud music. It's the

deep bass that travels distances, that travels through the walls, that travels through ceilings, and creates the profound disturbances that community residents feel.

It is essential that if the council wishes to rely upon specific decibel levels, they've got to be defined as C weighted. It's the alternate way of measuring sound, of measuring decibels. It incorporates the deep bass and the bass levels and more authentically replicates the disturbing sounds that you hear.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time expired here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you very much. That
was very compelling testimony. I appreciate that,
the bass stuff.

COUNSEL: If we have inadvertently missed anyone that has registered to testify and has yet to have been called, please use the Zoom hand function if you are testifying remotely and you will be called in the order that your hand has been raised.

Seeing none, we will return to the in-person testimony. The next panel is Alex Stein.

MR. STEIN: Are the mics hot? All right.

Finally, it took forever for me to be able to speak.

- RESILIENCY AND WATERFRONTS 235 1 Alright guys, I am primetime Alex Stein. 2 I have a 3 little mom-and-pop adult bookstore and we get fined 4 like crazy on gloryhole night. We play the music loud. We're getting fines. They're coming there. 5 People are complaining. The bounty hunters they're 6 7 on us, partially because my wife's boyfriend is--8 well, her ex-boyfriend is a bounty hunter. But that's neither here nor there. Now what is my biggest complaint, is on 45th Street at the Roosevelt 10 11 Hotel. You have every illegal Venezuelan out there 12 hooting and hollering. 13 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's off topic. 14 MR. STEIN: No, no, no. I'm saying--15 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's off topic. 16 MR. STEIN: But I tried to report them, right? 17 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: That's off topic. 18 MR. STEIN: Gennaro, no, no, no. I tried to 19 report them for their sound. 20 CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Thank you. 21 MR. STEIN: They're out there. No, no, I'm 2.2 saying they're hooting and hollering. They're just
 - CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Sergeant, turn off the microphone.

going, ay-yi-yi-yi. And then the Haitians--

2.3

24

25

	THE THIRD WITH THE WATER TO THE TENT OF TH
2	MR. STEIN: And I try to report the Haitians, and
3	then the Haitians and they're having a turf war
4	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Turn off the microphone.
5	MR. STEIN:and I'm just trying to get their
6	attention, and I'm trying to call the bounty hunter.
7	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Can I have the microphone
8	turned off please?
9	MR. STEIN: But you guys aren't doing anything.
10	I mean, it sounds like a little like a fiesta.
11	They're just out there dancing. This is what it
12	sounds like. This is what it sounds like. Their
13	Bluetooth speakers. Gennaro, and I'm just I'm just
14	sick of it. I'm trying to complain, and I'm trying
15	to live in this city.
16	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: This is off topic.
17	MR. STEIN: I'm a pimp on a blimp and I'm trying
18	to complain, and you don't do anything.
19	CHAIRPERSON GENNARO: Turn off the microphone
20	please. This hearing is adjourned.
21	[GAVEL]

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



Date 11/13/2023