CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND BUILDINGS
COMMITTEE ON FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

----X

June 7, 2011 Start: 1:03 pm Recess: 4:29 pm

HELD AT:

Committee Room

250 Broadway, 16th Fl.

B E F O R E:

ERIK MARTIN DILAN ELIZABETH CROWLEY Chairpersons

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Erik Martin Dilan
Elizabeth Crowley
Christine C. Quinn
Gale A. Brewer
Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.
Lewis A. Fidler
Vincent J. Gentile
Sara M. Gonzalez
Daniel J. Halloran
Robert Jackson
Letitia James
G. Oliver Koppell
Brad Lander
Melissa Mark-Viverito
Rosie Mendez

# APPEARANCES

# COUNCIL MEMBERS:

James S. Oddo
Diana Reyna
Joel Rivera
Ydanis Rodriguez
Eric Ulrich
Peter F. Vallone, Jr.
Jumaane D. Williams
Ruben Wills

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

Robert LiMandri Commissioner NYC Department of Buildings

Thomas Jensen Chief of Fie Prevention NYC Fire Department

Vito Mustaciuolo Deputy Commissioner of Enforcement and Neighborhood Preservation NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development

Edward Boles Treasurer/Legislative Chair Uniformed Fire Officers Association

Tanya Kessler Staff Attorney MFY Legal Services

Samuel Biele-Fisher Industrial Business Assistance Coordinator Pratt Center for Community Development

Shafaq Islam Attorney Community Development Project Urban Justice Center

Patrick Siconolfi Executive Director Community Housing Improvement Program

Roberta Bernstein President Small Property Owners of New York

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

David Whitmore Small Property Owners of New York

Seema Agnani Executive Director Chhaya Community Development Corporation

Larry Wood Community Organizer Goddard Riverside Community Center

Jill Hamberg Faculty Member Empire State College

Marika Dias Supervising Attorney Make the Road New York

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: At this time,

I'd like to ask everyone to turn their cell phones
onto silent mode, or shut them off. Once the

committee gavels in, we'd like all private
conversations to take place outside of the

committee room.

Anyone that has not filled out an appearance card that wants to testify on today's items, please see the sergeant-at-arms. The sergeant-at-arms can provide you with an appearance card so that you can weigh in on today's item. We will begin in about two minutes.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Sergeant, are

you ready?

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Good afternoon.

I'd like to convene this committee to order. My

name is Erik Martin Dilan, and I am the chair of

the City Council's Housing and Buildings

Committee. Today, the committee will convene

jointly with the Committee on Fire and Criminal

Justice, chaired by my colleague, Council Member

Elizabeth Crowley of Queens, in conducting an

oversight hearing on how the city responds to illegal use and illegal conversion complaints.

Additionally, we are also hearing two legislative items in relation to the illegal conversion problem. The first, Intro 240, which will be a local law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to illegal residential conversions. Intro 368-A, another local law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to inspections conducted by the New York City Department of Buildings.

Both committees are interested in exploring what obstacles exist for city agencies when seeking to address illegal use and conversion complaints, how effective the city is in overcoming the obstacles and how the city can improve its response to illegal use and illegal conversion complaints.

Two recent fires have brought this issue to light. In April, a two-alarm fire broke out in the early morning hours in the Bronx, killing a family of three. This particular building did not have accessible fire escapes due

б

2 to an illegal conversion.

Just last month, a three-alarm fire tore through an illegally subdivided house in my district, resulting in the deaths of two individuals. In addition, four firefighters were injured at this fire in my Council district.

The city received three illegal conversion complaints related to the building in October, November and December of last calendar year. DOB inspectors attempted to gain access to the building six times but were unsuccessful.

That begin said, there are two legislative items before us. Intro 240 would allow the Department of Buildings or other city agencies who can enforce Building Code, to issue a violation for circumstantial evidence such as a number of mailboxes or mail receptacles, operational utility meters or doorbells servicing an apartment greater than the number of legally authorized apartments in the building.

The bill also provides that a violation for an illegal residential conversion based on circumstantial evidence may not be considered corrected until an inspection is

2 undertaken by the Department of Buildings.

Additionally, when a criminal proceeding is brought for an illegal conversion, the bill would establish a minimum criminal fine of \$1,000. This fine may be issued in lieu or in conjunction with imprisonment or civil penalty.

Intro 368 would require the

Department of Buildings to respond and inspect

every unit for which a complaint of an illegal

residential conversion has been received. If the

department is unable to gain access after two

attempts, they must notify the property owner that
an illegal conversion complaint has been filed and
an inspection will be scheduled.

Where the owner of the property does not respond to the notice within ten business days of the request, the Department of Buildings must prepare an affidavit. After reviewing the affidavit, the commissioner must determine whether allegations in the complaint if observed would be immediately hazardous or a major violation. If that is the case, then DOB must seek an access order from a court and promptly execute the order if it is granted by the court.

The bill also provides that persons seeking to gain access using a court order tell this to any occupant of the building upon request and show the occupant a copy of the access warrant or the original warrant.

The committee expects to hear testimony today from the commissioner of the Department of Buildings as well as representatives from HPD, the Fire Department, Law Department and representatives from the Allied Building Inspectors, the UFA/UFOA, housing advocates and representatives of the real estate industry as well as other persons interested in this topic.

At this time, I'd like to state again if you want to testify on this item, please see the sergeant-at-arms. I will turn it over to my co-chair, Council Member Elizabeth Crowley.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Good

afternoon. My name is Elizabeth Crowley and I am

the chair of the Fire and Criminal Justice

Services Committee. I'd like to thank Housing and
Buildings Chair Erik Dilan for hearing today's

proposed bills and for addressing problems on

illegal conversions.

б

that has plagued our city for decades. It has become increasingly dangerous as the city population grows. Illegal conversions are dangerous not only for the city's residents but also for the city's firefighters. Tragically, we know what could happen when illegally altered apartments don't adhere to the code and block necessary exits.

In the infamous "Black Sunday"

fire, in the Bronx, several years ago, six

firefighters were forced to jump out of a burning

building, 50 feet above the ground. That day,

when our firefighters could not access a fire

escape because of illegal alterations, two of our

bravest died and four other firefighters were

seriously injured, because they could not find the

fire escape.

Fires across the city over the past few months, in which residents were killed and firefighters were injured in illegal conversion apartments are painful reminders of what could happen when fires break out within these death traps.

2.

We're here today to examine the
city's response to complaints of illegal
conversions, which by all accounts, is in dire
need of improvement. I look forward to working
with my colleagues, the Speaker and the
administration to identify and implement ways to
make those improvements. The DOB, the HPD and the
FDNY can all do more to address this problem.

As we learn more about the new task force that the Mayor and the Speaker announced today, it is critically important that the Fire Department, in being asked to expand its role in enforcing provisions of the Building Code, adequately train our firefighters and our fire officers for this job, and ensure that these duties don't negatively impact the department's emergency response operations. All of this highlights the need for more funding for the Fire Department budget, despite our fiscal climate.

We are expecting to hear from many witnesses today, so I will conclude my remarks and turn back over to my co-chair, Erik Dilan.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Thank you,
Council Member Crowley. I'd like to turn to the

2 first bill sponsor, the sponsor of Intro 240,

Council Member Vallone, for the purpose of a brief opening statement. Council Member Vallone?

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,
Chairs. Thank you for holding this important
hearing so quickly. As usual, one of hearings
gets some response, as we were at a press
conference about a task force, which I think is a
great idea.

I have a letter here from a couple in their late 70s who bought a house in 1979, with a finished basement, and then received a summons for an illegal bathroom, which was there when they bought the house. They asked for hearing. They went in. The judge asked for documents. They brought the documents on another day. The second judge found them guilty. Now they're going to be fined \$6,000. This matter is affecting their health and their marriage, this letter says. They wrote personally to Commissioner LiMandri. I'll give you a copy of this without all of my writing on it, and they CC'd me.

Up until now, up until this task force, the Buildings Department's priorities have

been all wrong. They have been wasting time going after cases like this, looking for somebody's grandmother in a basement or a house with a toilet that shouldn't be there, while ignoring death traps. Knocking twice and going away isn't a policy; that's a complete abdication of the responsibility that the city has to keep its residents safe and its firefighters safe.

Lives are at stake here. We can no longer have these priorities as skewed as they have been. We can't waste time going after taxpayers for money while we have illegal dwellings with 20 people living in a two-family dwelling and firefighters are at risk. It needs to be stopped.

I want to commend the Commissioner and the Mayor for this new task force, which apparently is finally going to get the priorities in order. My bill, which will make it easier to give violations without actually gaining access, it is part of, I think, a lot of things that need to be done that this hearing is going to look into. Again, I'm glad that the chairs convened this so quickly, and I commend you both.

б

2	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you,
3	Council Member Vallone. Now, we'll hear from the
4	sponsor of Intro 368, Council Member Oliver

5 Koppell.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. This legislation arose out of an
experience that I had, which I believe is close to
incredible, but apparently exists in the city.

I represent, in part of my district, the Woodlawn area. Woodlawn is an area that has a large number of single and two-family homes and there are many illegal conversions we believe have taken place in Woodlawn over the years.

I had complaints from neighbors of one particular building that the owner of that building was doing considerable construction work and it was believe on significant evidence by these neighbors that this was an illegal conversion without permit. However, after numerous requests for the Building Department to inspect, nothing happened. So they came to me and I went to see the Bronx Building Commissioner. This goes back a couple of years. So I can't say

б

for sure exactly what the procedures have been recently.

I went to see the Bronx Building
Commissioner and I said you know there have been
these complaints about this building and nothing
seems to be being done. He said, well, we don't
have the manpower to do much of anything if we
can't get access. If we can't get access, we
can't show that there's an illegal conversion, so
there's no way we can place a violation.

I said, well what do you do to try and gain access? He said, we go there twice and if we get no answer at the door, we file a complaint. I said, that's impossible, how can government act this way? I mean regardless of the circumstance, you go there twice and if you can't get in, you do nothing? You don't seek a warrant, you don't do anything further? No, we don't do anything further.

So then I introduced this legislation. As a result of the recent disastrous fires in buildings that were illegally converted, the Daily News has written a serious of articles which basically confirms my experience. It's

totally unacceptable, totally unacceptable and hasled to loss of life.

Now, I'm glad that the Mayor has convened this task force and that they're beginning to do more than just visit twice and then leave. In my opinion, there is an obligation to pursue these complaints. Certainly there can be priorities and you go after the more serious complaints first and then go after less serious.

There are obviously due process issues. Under my bill, it would require that, obviously, notice be given to the property owner, that a hearing be convened. I believe, incidentally, that if a property owner gets a legal notice of a hearing, in 95 percent of the cases they won't have to go further. They'll get access, because nobody wants to hire a lawyer and go to court and respond. So the fact is that if we change the procedures and don't just give up after two attempts, I think we'll gain access without a lot of extra effort in most cases.

So, something like the bill that

I'm introducing, I think, is absolutely essential.

It's a sad thing, I might say, that it has taken

fatalities to bring us to the point of having this
hearing. It's essential that the city not only do
what the Mayor is doing with the task force and
the Fire Department but proceed where they can't
get in to go to court and get a warrant. I refuse
to accept the fact that the Fourth Amendment will
not, in appropriate cases, permit an inspection to
take place.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to testimony.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you,

Council Member Koppell. At this time, we will be
joined by our Speaker, Christine Quinn, who is

very concerned about this issue as well. She will
take a moment to get seated and then weigh in with
her statement. We welcome you, Madame Speaker.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you, Erik.

Thank you very much. Sorry for being a little bit late.

First, let me start by thanking the chairs of our committees, Chair Dilan and Chair Crowley, for holding this oversight hearing. I want to thank Council Members Koppell and Vallone for their work on this issue before the hearing.

I also really want to thank our staff as well as the Mayor's staff for their work on this matter.

Once again, tragic events in our city cost New Yorkers their lives in fires. The question is why? In this case, because the buildings they were living in had been illegally altered to create more apartments than the law allowed. These alterations had been done in a way that almost assured a tragedy would, at some point, occur.

The two recent fires in the Bronx and Brooklyn that took the lives of five people demonstrate clearly just how dangerous and lifethreatening illegal residential conversions are to emergency responders and the New Yorkers who, sometimes with no knowledge of these conversions, reside in these apartments.

When we look at these two buildings, there is a common thread to both. One: a history of complaints and an inability of the city to effectively and thoroughly respond to those complaints. The problem of illegal conversions must be dealt with, therefore, at all levels of government. From how we receive illegal

б

conversion complaints to investigating the

complaints and seeking access, from enforcing

access warrants to preventing illegal conversions

in the first place.

This morning, the Council and the Mayor's Office announced the results of a new inspection task force and the creation of a new inspection task force that will prioritize inspections based on metrics to identify high risk illegal conversions. The initial results of this new pilot and task force are encouraging and the first step in addressing this problem in our city.

There is more that needs to be done. We know that today's oversight hearing will move us towards that more that needs to be done.

I actually want to say I think the scheduling of this oversight hearing helped compel the announcements that were made today.

I just want to thank a moment to thank everyone in the Mayor's Office and the agencies, DOB, Fire, HPD, who worked on developing the announcements today, but in particular Sherry Hyman from the Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office. Did I get your office right, Sherry? Who

is one of those New Yorkers--I said this earlier-who most people will never meet and a lot of the
solutions that come out of city government come
from Sherry and she doesn't really ever get the
credit for it. So thank you very much for your
work.

As I said, Sherry, there's more to be done. Let me be clear about that. The city should, among other things, develop a plan that tiers all illegal conversions after those that are the highest priority. All illegal conversions complaints, as well as institutes a protocol for responding to these based on priority level. This plan should begin at the point of intake—and this is what the task force will be looking at—with 311 operators, who are ready with questions specifically for a caller that would allow a complaint to be appropriately evaluated, as it relates to illegal conversions.

Importantly, this plan should include a formal process by which agencies, particular HPD and the FDNY, coordinate with and refer illegal conversion complaints to DOB, ensuring that complaints are counted and receive

appropriate follow-up. The lack of coordination among agencies historically, and that's where the idea of the task force comes from is a recognition of that, represents a serious weakness in the city's ability to historically respond effectively to combat these problems. That's why this task force is a very good step forward in addressing that.

This plan must also include formal protocols to guide agencies regarding when to seek access warrants. The city must develop a better list of proxies that can be used—this is something the Council Members have been looking at legislatively—develop a better list of proxies that can be used to support the contention that a building has been illegally converted when seeking a warrant.

What do the water bills look like?

How many mailboxes are there? How many doorbells

are there? Are there separate entrances or

separate gas and electric meters? How many gas

and electric meters are there?

Some fixes are just common sense. It isn't necessarily enough to knock on the door

at 10:00 in the morning when a lot of people are at work. You may have to come back at 6:00 at night. Now the Council recognizes that we are dealing with this issue in difficult economic times, and coming back at 6:00 or 7:00 at night may have an impact on the budget. We're trying as much as we can to come up with ways that focus limited resources and that don't need more resources and can use the resources we already have.

Department of Buildings in particular, which said in their budget hearing that they were cutting back on overtime, to find other places in the agency where cuts can come from to not erase overtime that may in fact be needed to have inspectors have the ability to go back after hours. We would work in the weeks ahead, before budget adoption, with the commissioner and others to find those other places we could cut back on that are less life sustaining than the overtime as it relates to these inspectors.

I want to thank, again, the chairs of this committee for holding this oversight

hearing very, very quickly. I know that was a particular big ask because the Housing Committee has a lot on its agenda. So I want to thank both of you. In addition to thanking the members of the Mayor's staff I want to thank the members of our staff who worked on this, in particular Laura Popa, who really led a team of Council staff people on this effort.

Look, this is simple in its end, in the cut of the bottom line. People have broken the law, and they have had a situation where, really, experience showed them it was unlikely they were going to get caught. That breaking of the law and that small likelihood of getting caught put them in a situation where they could make money they were not by law allowed to make. That put people's lives at risk and people died.

We're here today in this oversight hearing to hear every idea that's been created, to thank everyone who's created it, but to say we're going to do more to send a message that we're not going to let people die because other people have decided to break the law to make money and because our city government has not yet found the way to

Thank you.

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hit the nail on the head to break down and stop 2 this lawless activity. 3

> So I thank everybody who takes an important step on this road today in our ongoing efforts to focus our resources in a prioritized way on this problem. Thank you, again, Mister and Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I'll briefly introduce the members of the committee who are present. Starting to my right is Council Member James, who is a member of the Housing and Building Committee; Council Member Ulrich, a member of the Housing and Buildings Committee; Council Member Comrie, a member of the Housing and Buildings Committee. In the

In the front row, to my left, is the Republican Leader Jimmy Oddo, who is also a member of the committee; Council Member Gale Brewer of Manhattan is a member of the Housing and Buildings Committee; Council Member Rivera, who is also a member of the Housing and Buildings Committee. I believe Council Member Crowley would like to take the opportunity to do the same for her committee.

2	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Members of
3	the Fire and Criminal Justice Committee: to my
4	left is Peter Vallone, Jr. To my right is Dan
5	Halloran, in the front row, and Vincent Gentile.
6	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: We've also been
7	joined by Council Members Reyna and Gonzalez. I
8	believe that covers everybody.
9	At this point, we'd like to turn it
10	over to the administration. From what I
11	understand, the Buildings Department will take the
12	lead in the presentation for the administration,
13	with Fire and HPD playing supportive roles. So,
14	with that Commissioner LiMandri, welcome.
15	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Thank you. Thank
16	you, Madame Speaker. Thank you, Chairs Dilan and
17	Crowley. I am Robert LiMandri. I am the
18	Commissioner of the Department of Buildings. I
19	have with me, to my right, Chief of Fire
20	Prevention, Chief Jensen of the Fire Department,
21	and to my left, Deputy Commissioner of Enforcement
22	and Neighborhood Preservation, Vito Mustaciuolo
23	from HPD.
24	SPEAKER QUINN: Yay, we love Vito.
25	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Everybody has a

2 fan club.

[Pause]

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Then certainly we have other agencies here for the topic at hand, sort of behind me and to my left. Thank you for allowing me to be here today. We certainly agree, this administration, myself included, the Fire Department and Housing and Preservation, we realize that we need to do more, perhaps with the same or less.

Whether it is to provide a new living space to accommodate a family member who may require assistance or it is a homeowner who feels he or she may lose their property without additional income to cover a mortgage, personal circumstances may require people to make difficult decisions. These difficult decisions can have a direct impact on the affordable housing market and result in the creation of substandard and unsafe living conditions in the form of an illegal conversion.

Illegally converted dwellings

typically consist of a homeowner who converts a

garage, basement, or attic to an apartment without

about.

getting the proper permits. It can be an owner or
a tenant who sublets a room or rooms within his
apartment or house to another family. Sometimes
it's a basement apartment in a one-family home for
a member of the family, as some of you talked

The worrisome situation is apartments and rooms that are illegally subdivided into smaller rooms or cubicles, as we call them. Any of these scenarios represent serious violations of the New York City Building Code and the Fire Code, and any one of them can result in a dangerous situation and have tragic consequences, as we've talked about today already.

Illegal construction often creates substandard and potentially dangerous housing without regard to basic safety measures such as a smoke detector, proper egress, or sprinkler systems. In addition, illegally converted dwellings put a strain on electrical wiring, and are often accompanied by illegal extension cords and space heaters. Creating an illegal apartment can include construction work or almost no work.

Just by adding bunk beds, or locking a couple of

б

doors, a property owner can significantly change the use of his building and make it unsafe.

In Fiscal Year 2011 the Department of Buildings, received approximately 86,000 total complaints, and of that 18,000 of them were related to illegal conversions alleged, and 13,000 unique properties in the City. Illegal conversion complaints are down, about 27 percent from the combined average of the last three fiscal years.

In Fiscal Year to date 2011, the Department issued more than 3,800 violations for illegal conversions and 783 vacate orders. All of our construction inspectors can issue violations or request a vacate order for an illegal conversion. As you know, these violations are adjudicated at ECB.

Over the last four fiscal years,

ECB violations issued for illegal conversions are

upheld at a slightly lower rate, 75 percent, than

other violations that we go to court with, at 82

percent.

When the Department receives a complaint relating to an illegal conversion it is our policy to have our inspectors make multiple

inspection attempts at the location. If access is not granted or if it's denied, the inspector leaves a form we call an LS-4 form, and it advises the property owner to call the department to schedule an inspection. The Department also mails this form to the registered property owner. It increases our chances of gaining access to properties, but more importantly, it puts an owner on notice that an inspector can and will return. Certainly, we know that some of the people who perhaps play in this space don't want to return our phone calls.

One issue we have to keep in mind when trying to gain access to someone's private home and property is the protection provided under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution and how this impacts our inspection protocols.

The Fourth Amendment provides: the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the

persons or things to be seized. This protection prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures and safeguards the privacy and security of individuals against arbitrary invasions by governmental officials.

When inspectors are unable to enter a property, Section 398 of the New York City
Charter provides that an agency can request the
Corporation Counsel to make an application for a
court order directing the entry and inspection of
a premise in order to abate any nuisance therein.
The legal threshold that must be met to justify
such an access warrant must constitute a
significant standard.

In the City's case, before DOB asks the Law Department to seek such an access warrant from the courts, DOB makes at least two efforts to gain access to the property in question, one of which occurs either after business hours or on the weekend.

So let me explain how the process works on the day-to-day. If the inspector cannot gain access to the property, yet suspects that there is sufficient evidence of an illegal

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conversion from the exterior inspection, the inspector will gather evidence of those conditions. He will report those findings to his supervisor and the department may seek the courtordered access warrant. This process is highly resource intensive. Once the Inspector and Supervisor review the evidence, they will sit with a Borough Enforcement Attorney, who reviews the facts. The attorney will apply the Court's standards to the evidence and prepare an affidavit, complete with evidence in the form of sworn affidavits from inspectors or concerned citizens, to be reviewed by their supervisors and then sent to the Law Department. The Law Department does a review, and perhaps sends it back to the Department for more evidence, and then go to Court in the hopes of obtaining a warrant.

Obtaining access warrants has
become a priority for this enforcement agency over
the last few years. In Fiscal Year 2011, we have
obtained 11 access warrants with 10 pending. In
Fiscal Year 2010, we obtained 68. These 168
access warrants have more than doubled the total
amount obtained in the prior seven fiscal years

combined. Over the last two years, we've done 168 access warrants, which is more than double than the total obtained by this department over the prior seven fiscal years.

The standards I have outlined present both an operational and constitutional challenge to proposed Intro 368, sponsored by Council Member Koppell. This bill would mandate an attempt to obtain an access warrant based upon inspections where an inspector did not gain, or was denied, access. It is important to note that of the residential illegal conversion complaints where the Department does gain access, 55 percent of the time no violation is written.

In those cases where the inspector does not gain access, he/she may not find enough evidence of an illegal conversion or any evidence at all, to meet the constitutional standard that the Court would expect. Remember, these guys get smart. They know what they go for and they change their behavior.

Further complicating the matter is that 311 allows any member of the public to enter hearsay complaints, perhaps based in little or no

fact. Seeking access warrants in potentially thousands of instances where insufficient evidence of wrongdoing exists is not an efficient use of City and Court resources. However, we're open to listen and perhaps change our methods.

In order to determine whether there is probable cause to issue a warrant, our inspectors will document evidence of the suspected illegal conversion. This prima facia evidence would allow us to seek an access warrant, because it shows probable cause to conduct an inspection, not probable cause to believe that there is either a crime or regulatory violation has occurred, as suggested in Intro 240, sponsored by Council Member Vallone.

This circumstantial evidence is just a presumption of an illegal conversion, when the actual illegal condition has not been witnessed. In fact, the worry is that this bill would drive this evidence even further underground and hamper other investigations of enforcement. In other words, if you kind of tell them what you're looking for and make it law, they'll stop doing it and they change their tactics.

In Fiscal Year 2011, DOB inspectors gained access to the premises on illegal conversion complaints approximately 42 percent of the time. In Fiscal Year 2009, we began to track the statistic of access denied by an occupant of the premises. So far in Fiscal Year 2011, DOB was denied access 26.7 percent of the time. It is important to remember that DOB inspectors, HPD inspectors and firefighters do not have the authority to force entry into any premise where they are denied access.

A more effective way of uncovering dangerous illegally converted units is leveraging inspections done by our sister agencies, and coordinating referrals of complaints based on those inspections, as you suggest. As all of you know, housing complaints received by 311 are routed to HPD Office of Enforcement and Neighborhood Preservation.

Since complaints for illegal conversions are routed directly to the Department of Buildings, HPD inspectors will be dispatched for standard housing complaints such as lack of heat and hot water, mold or vermin infestation.

2.

When an inspector is dispatched to a residence, he
or she is legally required to issue violations for
any breaches of the Housing Maintenance Code that
are in the line of site of the inspector.
Accordingly, should an HPD inspector view
violations such as illegal occupancy like
existence of an unlawful cooking space, or
unlawful overcrowding, he or she will issue
violations and potentially a vacate order when the
inspector observes inadequate egress.

the interagency MOU between us, to issue DOB ECB violations for occupancy contrary to the certificate of occupancy should there be evidence. Similarly, should an HPD inspector witness structural damages he or she makes a direct referral to the DOB through 311. Once the unit or building is vacated, HPD if necessary will seal the apartment or building to prevent re-occupancy.

In Fiscal Year 10, HPD issued 183
vacate orders for illegal occupancy. HPD also
issued 242 related violations. In the Fiscal Year
11, we received 485 official referrals from HPD.
Of those, 144 resulted in violations written by

2 the Department with 12 vacates.

Dur partnership with FDNY has also been strengthened in recent years, and our agencies work closer together than ever before.

In March 2007 we initiated a pilot program, named the A8 Referral Program. A8 being a form that the Fire Department uses. This new protocol enables FDNY to transfer field observations directly to the Department of Buildings. Battalion commanders or Fire Prevention Officers can call direct to Buildings, or enter a complaint directly into our information system.

In· 2008 we provided formal training sessions and training materials to the FDNY, including full standard operating procedure of these programs and they were institutionalized. The A8 program enables FDNY to transfer field observations directly to DOB. Currently, FDNY and DOB have increased the program to include three types of referrals: High Priority, a regular referral and a joint inspection. The total number of referrals from FDNY in Fiscal Year 11 is 3,454.

Over these last three fiscal years, these referrals have resulted in 4,237 violations

and 796 full or partial vacate orders. While

vacates are issued in order to protect the tenants

of illegal apartments from the hidden dangers they

may face, it still takes a human toll on the

families who are forced to leave their homes. Our

inspectors call the American Red Cross, who will

offer relocation services to these tenants, to

make sure that the tenants have a place to go.

FDNY inspectors enforce the Fire

Code and certain provisions of the Building Code.

If a violation is found by FDNY, they can take the following enforcement actions. They can issue a Violation Order, a Commissioner's Order identifying a violation and ordering it to be remedied, an issuance of a violation, a Notice of Violation, an order similarly identifying a violation and ordering it remedied, but in addition requiring an appearance at a hearing before the ECB. And then three is to issue a criminal court summons, and four, issue a vacate order. And five, issue a vacate order, with a seal order.

Depending on the circumstances, a member or inspector can take a combination of

б

these actions. The BISP Manual, which is an acronym that the Fire Department uses, provides direction to members and the inspectors in this regard.

We're certainly always looking for more aggressive and creative solutions, as well as, more partnerships to help tackle the issue of illegal conversions. All of these programs, we hope, will have an exponential affect on building. Targeted enforcement raises awareness about the consequences that these illegal dwellings can present for tenants, neighbors and first responders.

In the spring of 2010, we launched a new enforcement approach to combating illegal conversions. Our investigators researched rental apartments on Craigslist and posed as tenants in order to gain access. From May to September we accessed 62 buildings throughout the City.

Illegal conditions were found in 54 of the apartments for rent. Vacate orders were issued for 33, where conditions posed an immediate threat to public safety.

As a result, the Department issued

there illegal conditions, including fire safety
hazards such as inadequate egress, illegal gas,
electrical and plumbing work. We have continued
to conduct the same undercover program and since
March our investigators inspected 40 new
apartments advertised for rent on Craigslist. In
those inspections, 32 sites had violating
conditions, resulting in 64 violations written and
22 vacates.

This undercover investigation has exposed how landlords and realtors are becoming more and more savvy on how to advertise these apartments and advise the would be tenants how to list their address, how to get the mail delivery, how to explain unique living arrangements like attics and dormers, and which questions to avoid from neighbors and inspectors, and how to avoid illegal conversions being identified in the first place. In other words, they're getting smarter. So we definitely need to do more and change our tactics.

In response to the most recent fires, the City once again sought new ways to

evaluate, diagnose and combat the problem of illegal conversions. Working with the Criminal Justice Coordinator, FDNY, HPD and DOB, we used a different set of data points. I'd like to just quickly go through it with you. We used lis pendens, tax liens, and not just limiting ourselves to illegal conversion complaints or violations, to create these new risk-metrics to help proactively identify buildings at risk or higher risk.

For example, the site of the fire in the Bronx on April 25th had been in foreclosure proceedings just months before the fire occurred. Joint inspections by FDNY, DOB and HPD were conducted and overall, the results were very encouraging. There was a high rate of access gained, and we are pleased to report that many of the sites with active vacate orders are still in compliance. We are studying these results to determine useful ways to move forward with this multi-agency data-driven approach.

Through 311 we receive referrals from many other agencies as well: NYPD, community boards, OEM. We offer community boards the

opportunity to submit locations to the Department and inspect once a month. We have an active Community Affairs Unit, taking complaints from you and your colleagues and since November 2009, and DOB volunteers and sometimes elected officials to distribute more than 150,000 informational flyers to explain the dangers of living in illegal dwellings. We printed these in 11 languages and are downloadable from our website. Our website also contains a page with the Top 10 Tips for renters to learn to avoid illegally converted apartments. So it is also about education.

We have taken lessons from past experiences as well. The 2008 New York City Construction Code mandates sprinklers in more buildings than ever before in our City's history, including all new housing with three or more families, all attached 2 family homes, and all one and two-family homes over three stories.

The Code also requires
interconnected, hard-wired smoke alarms in both
new and renovated residential units. Installing
more sprinklers in more areas, will make buildings
safer, and hard-wired smoke detectors are a

significant improvement over the more common

battery-operated detector that most of us are

accustomed to.

In addition to the ongoing activities, a long term approach is necessary to address the real problem, which is a variety of solutions that we've talked about today.

Certainly, we need to not only talk about enforcement and education, but changes to the various codes and zoning to allow for more places for people to live and more affordable. Even with increased vigilance, there is no practical way to completely end the practice of illegal conversions.

As a city we must continue to work together. I am here to work with you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I would like to thank you, Commissioner, for your testimony. I'd like to take the privilege in starting off. Just as a note in your testimony, I happened to do a leafleting campaign, along with members of your staff, Donald Ranshte, in particular, about alerting tenants about the dangers of illegal conversions and notifying people if they live in

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	require from an inspector to see, wrote that down
3	and made sure that they had training so that they
4	could actually get those warrants. We provided
5	that information to the Law Department.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Nothing external of your department that your inspectors saw or the reports that your agency was receiving that triggered your staff to seek extra warrants over the past couple of years?

> ROBERT LIMANDRI: I'm sorry.

SPEAKER QUINN: So, like, did the downturn in the economy, did that lead more people to illegally convert? Was there some change in something outside that led to you seeing a change in external conditions that brought more work to the department or caused you to have to respond more aggressively? Or was there just kind of an aha moment within the department that you hadn't been taking this seriously enough from a managerial perspective and you began to take it more seriously which then increased things?

I mean either is possible. I think I kind of agree with the chair. I might have assumed that it had something to do with the

2	economy	or	something	external,	but	perhaps	not.

3 Perhaps you just had a managerial insight that

4 your department hadn't been doing what it should

5 have been.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: You know,

frankly, I mean the Council Members and their staffs, the Community Boards, have really been pushing us to focus more on this. In particular districts as people started to renovate what they were doing is—and I'm sorry that I didn't follow the line of questioning—is that the construction boom also led people to buy buildings, renovate them, flip the, but use them as illegal

occupancies to--ability to pay the mortgage.

So the most recent several years,
many people probably got into a home they couldn't
afford to begin with. Then they realized that
they needed to do something. Perhaps someone
showed them the way. They either did illegal work
or they ended up just sharing their space with
others. That's what we think has been primarily
the driver.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: My next question and I think I have some further follow-up

questions that will lead to the answer that I seek
to achieve. Once an access warrant is obtained by
your agency, how frequently does an inspector

obtain access after it's obtained?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: After we get an access warrant, we generally get a 90 percent ability to get in. As you know, we still can be stopped at the door, even though we have an access warrant. But 90 percent of the time we can get in.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: So what happens to the other 10 percent? Are they considered in contempt of the court order and the court deals with it at that point? What happens to those? I mean 90 percent is a great rate, don't get me wrong, but I just want to know what happens with the outstanding balance.

If you don't know the answer, you can get back to me at some point. I just would like to know if they're in contempt of a court order.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Okay.

SPEAKER QUINN: Can I ask a

question?

2 CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Sure.

SPEAKER QUINN: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to leave in a minute. In the answer to the first question, you mentioned some issues related to mortgage issues and people being in risk of foreclosure. Have you guys included in your conversations the Center for NYC

Neighborhoods, which the Mayor and the Council created, who do a lot of the fraud work out there--I mean, not the fraud work, the foreclosure work out there and the network of nonprofits that they're working with to assist homeowners to get the info out there that this is illegal activity, notwithstanding how desperate they may be, cannot engage in?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: We haven't but we certainly could.

SPEAKER QUINN: I mean, one, it would be useful from the outreach perspective.

Two, I think it would be useful to better confirm your belief that that is what is, in part, spurring this increase in illegal conversions.

They may have data. So I would ask that you do that and then report back to the committee.

2 R	BERT LIMANDRI: Okay
-----	---------------------

3 SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Commissioner,

have you at all heard of the term three quarter housing or three quarter of the houses, or any member of the panel? Do you believe that has been an external force leading to the increase in your numbers in terms of achieving access warrants?

myself and then I'll turn it over to my colleagues. I don't have any data that supports or suggests either way. I don't think we've ever had any insight into details of that type of the amount of times when we haven't been able to track it in that sort of way.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I know at least on two occasions, through my normal constituent service work, we have tried to push your agency to get access warrants because the common conditions that we see around this three quarter housing, first there's men coming home from parole or other services, where at least 20 beds are being joined together in a residential building. We know when they come because automatically we start receiving

2 complaints of harassment from women on the block.

3 And they come, and as soon as they come in and how

4 they complain, we already know in my office that

5 there's a three quarter house.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: We certainly know that it is occurring in different districts.

Primarily, most likely, you're hearing about it immediately because of the complaints in the neighborhood, but I don't have any statistics on that.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Because there's no statistics, I would respectfully request that under the list of criteria that your task force will be looking at is to take a look at the impact on three quarter housing with the criteria.

Include the number of beds that are being shipped into buildings late at night which are common conditions in my district, into your criteria. I believe that has been a major factor in the jump of the numbers. Obviously, these people have to go somewhere and they have to live somewhere, so I don't disagree with that. But it's being done in a way where homeowners are blatantly violating Building Code for profit. The money is attached

there is culpability of landlords in a way today
that perhaps they didn't see in the past. I do
see recognition from the district attorneys with
regard to flouting Building Code and Law but I
don't have any statistics.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I guess, again, if you could provide us, post-hearing, on the frequency, I would seem to think it would be not that many occasions because it hasn't reached your level of attention. I'm pretty sure if it was often, you would know about it.

You spoke in your testimony about the Fourth Amendment and Council Member Koppell spoke about the Fourth Amendment as it relates to this subject in his brief opening. I respect the Fourth Amendment and everything that it tries to protect. I ask this loosely, acknowledging that you're not an attorney, is there room for us to take further legislative steps that would help us solve our problem but also be in compliance with the Fourth Amendment.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Certainly, as I stated before, we want to be more aggressive and we want to be able to petition for more access

my co-chair.

warrants. We have to do it judiciously so that the average New Yorker doesn't feel like they're being harassed. But certainly that's something that we'd like to do and we'd be open to suggestions that are similar to that.

The types of things that we think of at the Building Department, remember as an administrative agency the kinds of things I look to, to solve a problem, are how can I either retroactively or change the housing use, instead of talking about enforcement data to present as a legislative solution.

So for example, is there a technology that we could import on those buildings as opposed to suggesting specifics in a criteria?

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I have just a few more questions and then I'll turn it over to

Just generally speaking, within the Building Code in general, and I'm not aware at this time the particular section of the code, but in the code there are parts that deal with family composition or the number of--say it again.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: The number of

б

2 unrelated people.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: The number of unrelated people in a dwelling. How often do you find that those conditions persist?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: The way we live is different. I mean what's unfortunate is that the codes don't recognize that today. So, for example, three students wanting to share an apartment or three unrelated people seems to make sense and actually the multiple dwelling law, which identifies that, puts that out.

But we know that there are opportunities where families are merged. A lot more people want to reside in those buildings. We do think that there are opportunities to look at different codes to make changes there.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Can I tell you,
I'm very sensitive to that. There are a lot of
people that live in my district that can't afford
to live on their own and they need to have
roommates and they need to maybe take in a family
member because a family member has lost an
apartment or lost a job. So I'm sensitive to
that.

But when you have conditions of 20
different unrelated individuals living in one
residential unit or one residential building,
depending on the size of the buildingand I'm
talking normally here three-family homesI
consider that to be a clear violation of the code.
I'm hopeful we can use that also as another
criterion to gain an access warrant.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, certainly when we come upon these buildings that are clearly being, I'll call them, overused, you know the Fire Department and this department, we aggressively go after these in a difficult way.

So when we look at the risks, certainly those that are being used that were not originally designed that way, we are working on those differently.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I want to shift to HPD for a second. I have two questions for HPD and then I'm done. First, I just wanted to get your answer on three quarter houses. I believe the Commissioner was about to defer to you but I kind of interrupted. How often do you get complaints on those conditions?

25

2	VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Actually, again,
3	we don't receive complaints directly for illegal
4	occupancies.
5	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: If you can
6	introduce yourself for the record.
7	VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Sorry. My name
8	is Vito Mustaciuolo, Deputy Commissioner for
9	Enforcement and Neighborhood Services at HPD. So
LO	HPD, as Commissioner LiMandri had mentioned in his
11	testimony, we do not receive complaints directly
12	for illegal occupancies. So we may receive a
13	complaint for lack of heat or hot water, which
L4	would bring us into a building. It is rare that
15	we have seen conditions that you're referring to.
L6	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Most often, at
L7	least in my office, we direct them to Buildings.
18	VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Correct.
19	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I wanted to see
20	if people did it differently outside of my office.
21	So normally, do HPD inspectors check a building's
22	unit occupancy standard prior to responding to an
23	illegal conversion complaint?

VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Again, we do not

respond to illegal conversion complaints.

2	CHAIRPERSON DILAN:	You	do	not
2	respond to them			

Commissioner indicated, have an MOU with the Department of Buildings, so we can issue Department of Buildings' violations, they're ECB violations. This fiscal year we have issued 663 of those ECB violations. That would be for occupancy contrary to C of O. It's made on a line of sight observation. We also make a referral to the Buildings Department in those situations as well. It is possible that the owner may have filed for plans or permits to legalize the conditions. When our inspectors are out there, they're not seeing that.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: What I would do, and if you don't have the answer now, you can certainly get back to us, but if you can just give to the committee how many referrals of illegal conversation complaints you have referred to the Department of Buildings, I would like to know the answer to that as well. The Buildings

Commissioner may well have it

VITO MUSTACIUOLO: I actually have

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 57
2	that.
3	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay.
4	VITO MUSTACIUOLO: In total, for
5	this fiscal yearI'm sorry, I apologize, it's 668
6	Environmental Control Board violations that we've
7	issued. So, each of those resulted in a referral.
8	In addition, there were an additional 485
9	referrals. They're not all for illegal
10	conditions. Some of those referrals may have been
11	for a structural defect. So if our inspectors
12	observed a sagging floorwe don't differentiate
13	between the types of conditions when we make
14	referrals to DOB.
15	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: What was the
16	number again?
17	VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Again, 668
18	violations were issued on behalf of DOB for
19	illegal occupancy. An additional 485 referrals
20	were made to DOB, not exclusively for illegal
21	occupancy. So if we saw a condition wherewe saw
22	a sagging floor, we would make a referral to DOB
23	for that as well.
24	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. At this
25	time, I'll turn it over to the Co-chair of this

cuts--

2 hearing, Council Member Elizabeth Crowley.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Thank you,

Co-chair Dilan. Good afternoon. Commissioner, I

have a question that relates to the number of

access, or your rate in terms of percentage wise.

In Fiscal Year '06, I see that the DOB had a 60

percent success rate in gaining access to

buildings with complaints. That number has fallen

significantly. In Fiscal Year 2010, you only were

able to get 45 percent. Is that true?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I don't have that particular stat from '06 in front of me, but access rates depend on many conditions. One of them, I think we talked about it earlier, was the time of day. The time of day, weekends, you know certainly those play a huge role of is someone home. That's certainly an opportunity where we've cut back on overtime over the last several years. So we haven't been out maybe perhaps always at the time when someone's home, which may be one of the reasons why the numbers that you're looking at, the access rate has gone done.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: So budget

2	ROBERT LIMANDRI: [interposing]
3	Certainly that's one. I'm sorry to jump on you
4	for a second. The other is we know that we have
5	done some increased enforcement; people know that
6	we are out there. They don't answer the door as
7	often. The indicia that we talk about, what do
8	you see on the outside of the building, it's gone.
9	Even when we did the Craigslist undercover
LO	investigation, we were being asked to show up on a
L1	corner to go meet someone to go look at a house.
L2	They wouldn't give us the address.
L3	So I think that the recent economy
L4	and certainly the focus has been a problem
L5	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: [interposing]
16	I can see that. Word catches on and neighbors
L7	talk, and people stop letting DOB people in. But
L8	just in terms of having people not on staff in the
L9	evening time, maybe it's a better idea to have
20	fulltime employees that only work on those hours.
21	This way it's not a budgetary issue and you're
22	able to gain access and have people out there in
23	the times when people are home.
24	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Certainly, the

300 inspectors, approximately, that I have, you

23 ROBERT LIMANDRI: Versus 45 24 percent.

25 CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Right.

	ROBERT LIMANDRI:	Clearly, I can
tell you that	that's certainly	very encouraging.
But we both kr	now that people lea	arn over time what
works and what	t their rights are	

We all hear about the fires that are caused by illegal conversions and there are deaths. I'm curious to know what percentage of fires because, you know, of conditions like extension cords or other issues that will come about from having an illegally converted apartment are causing the fires in the City of New York. Do you have statistics like that?

THOMAS JENSEN: I don't have those statistics.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: If you could introduce yourself for the record.

THOMAS JENSEN: Sorry. Chief Tom

Jensen, Chief of Fire Prevention. I don't have
those statistics. We could probably get some of
them through the fire marshals who investigate the
fires. I'm sure it's a fair percentage of fires
that are caused by these illegal conversions or
the conditions that the illegal conversions

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 62
2	provide, such as the extension cords and the
3	illegal heaters and so forth.
4	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: So you have
5	those statistics somewhere probably.
6	THOMAS JENSEN: I'm sure some of
7	those
8	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Because you
9	do investigations of the fire.
10	THOMAS JENSEN: Yes. Yes, all
11	fires are investigated one way or the other, yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Good to know.
13	Could you walk us through what happens when
14	emergencyyou have a fire and the Fire Department
15	responds and you're responding to a situation
16	where there are illegal conversions.
17	THOMAS JENSEN: That's how the Fire
18	Department actually comes upon many of these
19	illegal conversions. A few are through complaints
20	but many through operations, whether it's a gas
21	leak, water leak, a medical emergency or a fire.
22	We're in the building and we discover the illegal
23	conversion and the dangerous conditions. That's
24	usually how we either institute a vacate or a
25	violation orders or maybe call HPD or DOB in to

[interposing] How would that impact responding to emergency and life-threatening situations?

21

22

23

24

25

THOMAS JENSEN: If the companies are out doing surveillance and doing inspections, it would clearly slow down response times.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: How about for

the other city agencies, what type of stress would this new response team that the Mayor was talking about put on your department?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: One of the benefits of using—there are two things. One of the benefits of using this protocol is to look at the most egregious cases. So we're not talking about thousands or hundreds, we're talking about the most egregious cases. So we're thinking that on a regular basis, that the impact may be not as great because we can distribute that across the city.

But certainly, any program that we institute means for any one of us that you're doing that versus something else. Certainly, the Mayor made it clear today that we need to know and learn how to do more with less or with the same amount. In this case, the idea is to focus our resources. When you think about 18,000 complaints, and I think someone made the comment about knocking on a door and looking at a bathroom in a basement. You know, those are the types of things that people get annoyed about, but we don't know that when we show up at the door.

2.

	So, one of the	e good parts	of this
program is to	use this layer	ing effect t	o sort of
focus the effo	ort on the most	eareaious c	ases.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Right. It's clear that people will be more receptive to the Fire Department coming in. Now, I imagine with the gaining of access, you'll be able to issue more fines for violations and then therefore increase some type of funds coming into the city budget. Now, would they be earmarked since it's the Fire Department that's increasing?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, all the ECB fines that I issue and actually collect for the city are not part of my budget. So this--

In terms of the current fiscal climate, with the Mayor threatening to close 20 fire companies, it's important that if we're spreading the resources even thinner than they're already spread, that if we're gaining some type of monetary value to the city budget that it could be earmarked and then baselined at least.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I think it's a matter of proportions. When you look at agencies

and the size and what their responsibilities are, certainly you have to engage the amount of time that you'll allow for one thing versus another.

I'm sure that the Commissioner of Fire will sort of evaluate that and let us know how much that they can do.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Chief Jensen did say that response times would increase with more firefighters out there doing inspections. So we have to think about the safety of the people of New York. We always should make sure that we have enough firefighters to fight the life-threatening emergencies and also inspect these potential deadly hazards as well. Thanks. I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I just want to acknowledge some of the members of the committee who have joined us. Council Member Lander of the Housing and Buildings Committee has joined us. Council Member Mendez of Manhattan, who is also a member of the committee, had joined us, as well as, briefly, Council Member Melissa Mark-Viverito, as well as Council Member Jumaane Williams.

So I have Council Member Vallone.

2	He'll	be	followed	by	Council	Member	Lander
---	-------	----	----------	----	---------	--------	--------

Council Member Vallone?

It was me who mentioned grandma in the basement. Yes, you don't know that when you show up at the door, but you do know what doors you show up at. You're showing up at the wrong ones. A 12-year-old on a bike could tell you which house has the 20 illegal people living in it. But you're not showing up at that door, you're showing up at the one with the grandmother in the basement. So there is a problem here with your priorities. That needs to be ended right away.

I think this task force is going to do that. I'm not saying ignore that. I'm the Public Safety chair; I never say ignore things. I'm just saying get your arms around the problem which is endangering the lives of our residents first. Then we can worry about grandma in the basement. That's not what's happening.

In fact, I'm amazed that in seven years you did 79 warrants, based on your own testimony. It was before your time. Seven years, 79 warrants, that's 11 per year. We've got 8

million people in New York City and you guys did

11 warrants a year. Completely proof of what I

said in my opening statement which is that you

completely abdicated your responsibility to keep

New Yorkers safe from illegal conversions. Eleven

warrants per year, ridiculous.

You're getting better in the last two years since you've been there, and you deserve credit for that. I'm blown away by that statistics.

It seems that the biggest improvement you've made with this task force so far is having a uniform firefighter show up. I think that's great. But as you admitted, that will not last. Landlords will learn, soon, as they do all the time, that this is the new tactic and won't open the doors to firefighters either.

As our chair has pointed out, we may have fewer firefighters soon, who are already overworked. So that's not a strategy which is going to be a long-term one. We've got to come up with better ones, which is why Oliver and I and the City Council as a whole are trying to look at laws that will help you.

I've seen. I'd love to see some laws that you guys have proposed that might help you. You've knocked ours, so let's start with mine. On page five you say that my law would give you prima facia evidence to seek a warrant but not probable cause to believe either a crime or regulatory violation has occurred. That may be true. I understand that you're up against some very difficult constitutional standards here. Again, we're trying to work together to get something legal that will help you.

I think it might rise to probable cause under certain circumstances. You don't.

What if the law that we're writing created a rebuttal presumption which would say something like if five of these ten things are present, a rebuttable presumption would arise that there was a violation which can be rebutted by access to the home?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Listen, we certainly would love to have the ability to push back. If you think that that can help us, certainly we would support that.

2.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Again, I'd
like to work with you and your attorneys. I don't
have attorneys on my staff and I'm sure you do. I
know we have some great attorneys working on the
Council committees but the individual Council
Members don't have attorneys. We would love to
work together with you to amend my bill, take a
look at Oliver's bill and see what we can do to
help you because the status quo isn't working.

Again, we applaud the task force.

It's long overdue. Good minds thinking about a problem, like is happening now, is always going to be helpful. You've made some great strides already but we need to find some long-term answers.

When it comes to the firefighter situation, Chief, I visited firefighters and we all did; we've visited our firehouses, so many times. For years they've been telling me that they've been doing these inspections and they are stretched to their limit at the inspections right now. Approximately how many inspections does your basic firehouse do? How many more would be expected under this new task force?

2	THOMAS JENSEN: Well, each fire					
3	company is scheduled nine hours of inspection each					
4	week on a normal basis. Many of the inspections					
5	that we're talking about here are inspections that					
6	are done on other times: in the evenings, on the					
7	weekends. So that will be in addition to their					
8	required nine hours. Depending on certain areas					
9	of the city where these illegal conversions are					
10	prevalent, the companies could be quite taxed in					
11	those areas.					
12	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Obviously,					
13	if 20 fire companies were closed, that would					
14	seriously hinder those efforts.					
15	THOMAS JENSEN: There's no doubt					
16	about that.					
17	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I'm a					

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I'm a little confused--this is not my area of expertise--how you work in conjunction with the Buildings Department. They do inspections; you do inspections. Can you just flesh that out for us a little bit?

THOMAS JENSEN: Well, we have been on some limited task forces before with building inspectors and HPD inspectors, speaking about the

three quarter houses. But many times if we come upon an illegal conversion, we will either call the Building Department to the scene if we think it's a serious matter, or we have a good method of referral where we refer the problem to the Building Department and then they will follow up. Depending on the severity, it could be--well, if it's very severe, we would not leave. We would wait for them and we'd take care of it. If it's moderate severity, they come within 35 hours to inspect it.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: So when you're out doing these nine hours of inspections, a fire company, are you knocking on doors and getting access to these buildings? Or are you just observing the outside and calling the Buildings Department?

THOMAS JENSEN: These inspections are normally commercial or multiple dwellings. We do not inspect the private dwellings or the two-family dwellings that are the focus of this hearing, in most cases, these illegal conversions. We inspect the larger multiple dwellings and commercial. So we don't normally inspect the PDs,

here. Thank you.

Council, we partnered with Chhaya CDC who are

25

here. We estimated—it may not be a perfect
estimate—there were 114,000 of these units. This
was a couple of years ago. What we did to get
there, it was a real interesting methodology
developed by Frank Braconi, looking at the census
change from 1990 to 2000, and how many more units
were appearing in the Census than you could find
Building Department permits for. We then mapped
that and it overlaid pretty well with the
neighborhoods that you would have reason to think.

I want to start there because I guess what I'd say is if there are something like 114,000 of these units in the city, that really has to shape our thinking about how to address the problem. There is no way that simply kind of ramping up enforcement and hoping we get to all of them is a smart way of saving the lives of the people that live in those buildings or the firefighters that might get there.

Even leaving aside the 100,000 families we might make homeless and the collateral problem that would cause us on our housing side, leaving that totally aside for a minute, and just thinking about safety of both the residents and

2.

firefighters, it'd be a very foolish way to thin
about things like this entire unit of 114,000
units. So I'm encouraged to hear that you're
thinking about more targeted approaches. I guess
I want to explore that a little bit more.

My first question, it sounds like your answer to this is no, from your testimony.

Do you believe that complaints are a good proxy for dangerous conditions amongst the illegal units?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: We certainly have always used that in the past to direct our enforcement efforts at the Buildings Department.

What's different today is we're using other metrics, as you've heard the Mayor speak about this morning: foreclosure proceedings and those types of things as well.

encouraged to hear that. Part of the reason I'm encouraged to hear it is I believe there's actually a pretty significant mismatch between where complaints come from and where the problem lies. Now that's not to say people aren't complaining about real conditions.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the same study that I'm

referring that we did together, Pratt Center and

Chhaya CDC, we found the top ten neighborhoods

with these unaccounted for units, and the top two

7 Bronx and East Chester/Woodlawn in the Bronx which

neighborhoods were Castle Hill/Soundview in the

8 actually I think have more of the subdivided type

9 of units that we saw the tragic situation earlier

10 this spring. Those two neighborhoods don't appear

anywhere in the top ten neighborhoods where

complaints come from, nine of the ten of which are

in Queens and the tenth out of ten is in Brooklyn.

If we're organizing ourselves around a complaint-driven system, it seems to me we're actually unlikely to find a lot of the illegal units. And I would guess especially unlikely to find the ones where the most dangerous conditions are. Does that make sense?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: It certainly sounds like you're on to something. We certainly know that, for example, HPD go into units that have nothing to do with illegal conversion complaints and they're there for heat and hot water as a source of those types of issues. But

2 certainly, you're on to something, yeah.

a little more about the new data-driven system and how it's designed out of those 114,000 units on the one hand, out of the nearly 30,000 complaint calls you get in a year, out of the information you're getting from those FDNY companies in the field and from HPD. What's it looking like in this targeted or proactive system to try to prioritize data to figure out where the most risk is and really focus our enforcement there?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, I'm glad you brought it up because one of the thoughts is what we're using today is not necessarily what we're going to be using four or six months from now or a year from now.

So, for example, I think the

Speaker suggested the amount of water that

someone's using in a building. But today, we're

using when it was constructed, meaning prior to

1938, those are buildings that were built before

what we'll consider a modern building code. Was

there a high risk of fire in that? So we use the

Fire Department data to push us. So it's not

about complaints from the Buildings Department first. Is there a foreclosure proceeding? You know, lots of those in that neighborhood. Then, of course, have we gotten calls in that neighborhood or for that building.

But I do think that the thought is once we exhaust this metric and algorithm, the next step is to go and say well what else can we use as a predictor? So, maybe it's the housing study you talk about, maybe it's water bills.

There are lots of things that the department doesn't have at their disposal, but because we've built this sort of warehouse of data and throwing it in there and sort of coming up with a list is to be an early predictor. This is what we're going with right now.

Again, we are fishing. We are looking in a different way than we've ever done before. Everyone wants us to say well the guy got 12 complaints so therefore he's the worst offender. We know that that's not the case. It could just be that the guy next door hates him. I mean, and it happens every day. Or they don't like the people next door.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I didn't get to hear the Mayor this morning, and maybe he said this, I don't know, but have you thought at all about combining the two solutions that are sort of being explored here: a more targeted strategic way of figuring out where to go with a new legal framework to enable you to compel admission to the buildings if you're not able to get it.

It sounds like the numbers are up with the FDNY, but still, obviously those buildings we've targeted as problems, we want to be able to get into.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I certainly support any ability to have more power to push people to do something differently. The Council was very supportive of this department when we needed to make sure that contractors understand who was in charge. We've made a tremendous amount of progress. I think we can do the same thing here. This Council has been very good at showing us the way to do that. Certainly, we'd love to hear it. The two bills, the way they're constructed today, we think are problematic, but

was not generated that way at all. I think it was generated on previous vacates and so forth. had nothing to do with that as far as I know.

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: appreciate your being honest. You know, I don't see how we could possibly, as we could go into deliberation and thinking about closed fire companies and then sitting here today, thinking

about what the risks are in our communities and knowing that the Mayor in suggesting those companies hadn't even thought about whether we're increasing the risk that future people will die as a result of illegal conversions because we impinged the companies' ability to do exactly the kind of targeted outreach we're talking about and we didn't even look at whether the capacity we were reducing was in the neighborhoods at most risk. I thank you for your candor on that.

My last question goes to the more proactive side of things. It seems to me, and Commissioner I think you suggested this slightly at the end of your testimony in talking about looking at the Zoning Code and the Building Code, if we're right that there's 100,000 plus of these units, then on the one hand, we've got to try to find those amongst them that are really the most dangerous and focus our enforcement there to save lives.

I think we also need to be realistic that quite a lot of those units are not dangerous to people's lives and that we need some different approach than enforcement. I wonder if

any of you have looked at the model that folks use in other cities that has accessory dwelling unit frameworks. Or something where if what we're talking about is the bottom floor unit and there is light and air and there are means of egress but it doesn't exactly meet a building code that was written long ago and without reference to where we are now, that at the same time that we're increasing targeted enforcement of the most dangerous situations, we provide a path to regularize many of those units which really don't pose a safety risk or even a health risk.

We could let HPD then inspect those units and ensure they met code and bring them up to code, helping landlords and tenants without risk of vacate, without over deploying Fire Department resources to the less risky situations. I wonder whether you've looked at this at all and see any opportunities for us.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I mentioned it just at the tail at the end because I realize we were talking about enforcement. The three main themes, as you suggest are enforcement, making sure people understand, so training people to

understand how to sort of protect yourself. And
the third is to create new housing units by
changing zoning and multiple dwelling housing
maintenance code and our building code. I think
you're spot on, because this is about a housing
problem and this is a symptom of a larger problem.
Although we've made tremendous strides, we realize
that we need to do more.

So there are probably some limited opportunities that you suggest. There are probably some more global things that should be done that are bigger and far reaching, because we're talking about not adding 10,000 or 20,000 units, we're talking hundreds of thousands of units, and they have to be affordable, which is the key.

So if you look at certain neighborhoods that now actually don't allow, based on zoning, don't allow them to be denser on that lot and you layer that with codes and sort of the way people believe people should live together, all of the sudden you a constriction on what you can do with that property. But I do think that that's something that we're hoping that HPD and

2 certainly the Mayor's Office are going to look at.

like you think that this can be done not only I a way that separates dangerous conditions from those things which are not currently allowed under regulations but which might not be dangerous and which in fact could help make the entire system safer by enabling us to focus enforcement in the risky places and expand regularized housing in those places where is may already exist and is not putting people's lives at risk. That's obviously complicated, but it sounds like the administration believes there is some opportunity to move in that direction. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you very much, Council Member Lander. Council Member Koppell, followed by Williams. We've also been joined by Council Members Robert Jackson, who was here, and Council Member Lew Fidler and Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez. Council Member Koppell?

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I notice

you sort of hide behind the Fourth Amendment, but how do you reconcile--

ROBERT LIMANDRI: [interposing] I'm

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 8/
2	not hiding. I'm right here, okay.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: You're
4	hiding. You're hiding
5	ROBERT LIMANDRI: [interposing] I'm
6	not hiding; I'm right here.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I know
8	you're here, but you're claiming that you can't
9	get access because of the Fourth Amendment. So
10	your statement is trying to use the Fourth
11	Amendment to defend your lack of gaining access to
12	these apartments. I want to know how you
13	reconcile your concern over the Fourth Amendment
14	with your Craigslist initiative.
15	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Can you answer
16	the question? I mean can you
17	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
18	[interposing] No, I want to ask you the question.
19	ROBERT LIMANDRI: So, can you
20	rephrase the question?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: The
22	question is how is it that you can use inspectors
23	secretly with Craigslist to get into people's
24	apartments without violating the Fourth Amendment.
25	ROBERT LIMANDRI: You're

2.

advertising on Craigslist. You're inviting me
into those apartments. You are trying to rent
those apartments. I have the ability to go in
those apartments and look to see what's there.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So you think that the Fourth Amendment permits you to secretly, the government to secretly enter into people's apartments under the guise of fraudulent contention that they are going to rent the apartment.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: What we are trying to do is look to innovative ways to get to the heart of the problem, which is what you would like us to do. And this is--

## COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:

[interposing] Yes, that's correct. And I think that you--I'm not objecting to the Craigslist.

I'm objecting to the fact that you claim that you can't get access warrants based on complaints that people make about illegal conversions.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Listen, if you come into my world, if I tell you that 50 percent of the time when I show up and I actually do get in, so clearly someone is allowing me to come in,

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 50 percent of the time there is no violation.

3 There is harassment going on, on the ground, and

4 you have to be careful about how to use your

5 enforcement. Just as you had stated, you want to

6 make sure that you are doing the right things for

7 the citizens of New York. I understand that we

8 have a housing crisis and we want to protect

9 citizens. But they are taking some responsibility

10 too. So if we knock on the door and they deny us

11 access 27 percent of the time, they know that they

don't want us in their home.

So I do think that there's a fine link about suggesting we should ask for an access warrant every time there's a complaint. Or every time we see, for example, I'll give you an example. Three meters on a two-family house is not necessarily an illegal conversion. I just want to just give you this one example. The third meter is allowed to be installed by Con Ed for common area. So, sometimes people think that if I see an extra, and dare I say it, satellite dish, that there's an illegal conversion. It's not that simple.

So what we have to do, the

threshold to get an access warrant, we have to be clear with the Law Department that we will be successful because it takes a lot of time to do it, and we're not going to be using it frivolously. So I'm not standing behind it; I'm trying to uphold it. What we're trying to do is to do it constructively.

So if there's some way that you can help us creatively, give us a little more power to push, I'm all for it. But I just want you to understand that we have to be careful about making these sweeping generalizations about how we're using our power.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: First of all, I think that actually Council Member Vallone, even though there may be instances where three meters is not a sign of improper occupancy, I think the Vallone bill actually offers us some opportunity to discriminate between what may well be violations and what may not be.

The Speaker has suggested the creation of a special panel, including the judiciary, to discuss this issue of access that I'm hoping will go forward. But just to

understand, right now if you're denied access and
you go twice, do you send a letter to the landlord
asking for access?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: We do two things.

I brought a copy. Many of you probably actually don't live in an illegal conversion. We actually post this, and this goes up on the wall. It's called a notice for inspection. Most of the time, if they don't want to cooperate they won't actually use it, but this is one way that we talk to them. The second way is we do send them a letter that describes to them that we have a complaint and we want to come in and we want to seek access.

So, at the end of the day, you're right, there is notice. But, you know, essentially going forward we need to figure out how to do it. Certainly, the judges in the different boroughs have recognized that they need to be supportive of what we're trying to do. We have seen a tremendous amount of support from this. We are pushing more, like I said--now, I know it seems paltry in your estimation, but we have been pushing for more. We have gotten some

_	HOUSING WITH PIKE AND CRIMINAL OUSTICE
2	saying that you post the notice and you always
3	send the letter?
4	ROBERT LIMANDRI: It comes actually
5	automated out of that beautiful thing called the
6	Building Information System. It's sent out
7	automatically, yes.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay, I
9	still
LO	ROBERT LIMANDRI: [interposing] I
11	mean, you know, you could say it doesn't get to
L2	them, we don't know
L3	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
L4	[interposing] No, nobody has told me you send a
L5	letter. It's good to know. We do have the bill.
L6	I'm perfectly willing to adjust the bill. I
L7	understand there's some request to adjust the bill
L8	to have some sort of priority scheduling so that
L9	it wouldn't be every case you'd have to go to get
20	a warrant. I'm certainly willing to consider
21	that.
22	I think that the response I got is
23	not an acceptable response and we've got to get
24	further than that.
2.5	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Unfortunately. we

haven't spoken, but we have been going through a process of separating the agency into two pieces.

One of them is in the enforcement piece. We have a new head of enforcement, Gene Corcoran, who has 30 years of law enforcement experience. It is a different place than it was several years ago. I think that we would be really, really glad if you could show us some opportunities in this area for enforcement. That would be great.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I look

forward to doing that. As I say, I don't think it

should delay consideration of the legislation, but

looking forward to this legal task force that the

Speaker has asked to convene with the judiciary.

The courts, by the way, as you know, have become

much more permissive, if you want to call it that,

some of the civil libertarians may not like this,

but the fact is they've become much more

permissive in permitting inspections. It should

not be an obstacle in my view.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, it should not be. But when you get down on the brass tacks of doing business we both know that we're talking about volume and we're talking about priorities.

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	11.	So I	just	wanted	to	clarify	that,	on pa	age
3	four.	It	is 10	00 acces	ss v	warrants,	corre	ect?	

4 ROBERT LIMANDRI: It's 100.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Then I wanted to underscore some of the you. things my colleagues and Brad Lander said, just about prioritizing where we do this. I represent a district and an area of Brooklyn that this happens a lot, illegal conversions. Illegal is illegal, but usually not of the highest priority, usually basement ones. I worked a lot in Flatbush Development Corporation, even Victorian homes and people who did this. A lot of time, I find it was neighbors calling neighbors. When I informed them that what they actually had was an illegal conversion, they were taken much aback. So I just want to make sure that we are somehow prioritizing where we're putting our efforts in and I'm not sure we're doing that.

make the point, and I think someone suggested it earlier. If you're in a--and I technically call it a cellar, which is in our sort of building speak, it means that you can't walk in to the

first floor. You know, in Brooklyn they have the first floor and then you walk up the steps and the second and third. But in many homes in Queens, for example, what we call a cellar is very dangerous. So even though there's only one person living there or two people living there, it can be just as serious. I'm not suggesting that that is the end all to be all on that.

Even simply locking the doors, sometimes people lock a door to a room which is actually the only other way out of a second floor or a third floor story in a building. And it doesn't require any construction. So sometimes even something as simple as that.

In one of the fires, we found that the tenants actually used a piece of furniture that blocked access. So those are the kids of things that a mere rearrangement of furniture to their liking actually created a real hazard for them.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I agree with that. My focus is making sure we are prioritizing the most egregious of what's happening. I know for sometime, I don't know if

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I'm sorry; the areas?

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: The areas in the city.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: We can get that for you. We have it by CB. I think to the point

of your colleague, which is just because th	iere are
a lot of complaints doesn't necessary mean	there's
a lot of conversions. But we certainly can	ılayer
it to show you where the most complaints ar	e,
online, we certainly have that, but we can	give
that to you.	

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Are there priority codes with respect to how quickly you respond to the illegal conversion?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Today, we respond to illegal conversions within 40 days. That is our standard. The idea is that by using this task force and creating these new layers, we would respond within 48 hours.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Is there any difference in the types of illegal conversions that are called in that would make you say I have to go here because it's one apartment with 30 rooms or not go here?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, I think as the Speaker suggested earlier, the more information we have from the caller, the better. So certainly, if we have some indication that there are 20 or 30 people living in what I'll call

a rack room on bunk beds, we consider that a high priority, a higher priority than another complaint. But many times we don't have the detail, so we have to go and we have to try to ascertain what it is. We do understand that it is difficult, but we try.

Now certainly, when we get in, sometimes we don't vacate. We write violations, but it's not enough to push somebody out onto the street. So there are times where it's illegally converted gut it's okay, but they still need to do some things. So there are times where it doesn't happen that we have to immediately vacate and we have to push people out on the street. What we're trying to do is just to alert the landlord of here, fix these three or four things. Even if you're violating the zoning resolution, you can stay but you've got to fix these things.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I wasn't clear if this question was answered. Did you find that affordability was a reason that some of this has spiked up?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Well, one of the layers that we used in this task force was to look

б

at income levels by neighborhood. We did see some correlation to that.

right. Just to wrap, just to underscore what my colleague was saying. On behalf of many of my constituents, many homeowners in my constituency and in Brooklyn, if we can find a way of help legitimize the ones that can be legitimized in a way that it's not cost prohibitive so people would actually do it, I think would be very good to add to this task force list of agenda items.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I think one of the things that you just mentioned is affordability. So what we're finding now, and I think the Speaker had mentioned it earlier, is that we're in a point in time where people are holding it together by a shoestring and they need this income. Suggesting that they want to go ahead and legalize it or to do something to make it safe may actually not even be an option for those people. They may actually even be underwater from their financial perspective. So we certainly would love to hear some options.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 102
2	you.
3	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you,
4	Council Member Williams. If I understand
5	correctly, Council Member Brewer has agreed to
6	defer to Council Member Fidler.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Council Member
9	Fidler, followed by Brewer.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Thank you,
11	Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Council Member Brewer.
12	Commissioner, this is a very frustrating
13	conversation for me. In the early 1980s, I
14	chaired a community board in East Flatbush, now
15	Council Member Williams' district. I woke up one
16	morning to find that there had been a fire; I
17	think it was one East 49th Street and Beverley
18	Road, between Beverley and Clarendon. Five people
19	died in that fire.
20	They found that the house had been
21	divided up into cubicles with plywood. People
22	were running electrical wires through plug
23	monsters. The rooms were being rented out in
24	eight hour shifts.

As chairman of the community board,

25

I convened an investment of our own. We found that both the Buildings and Fire Department had been in the premises, had both issued violations and no one had considered it an immediately hazardous condition and cleared the building.

As a matter of fact, it was the lead story on Channel 4 news. So I think it was the first time I had ever made a TV appearance, so I remember it very, very well. It was, I think, the night a mafia chieftain had been killed, so obviously somebody considered it to be a pretty important story. I think it was the Koch administration swore it would never happen again. Here we are almost 30 years later discussing the same thing.

I guess what I wanted to say to you is understand the problem that you're facing. I have personal experience with your department, with constituents who have called my office and made complaints about illegal conversions that were total fabrications, simply to harass their neighbor. That's a waste of your time and it's a waste of taxpayer money.

This is not an issue for me of

3

4

5

6 7

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

someone who has converted an apartment in their basement illegally and turned two into three or one into two. I want to focus on the priority of these cubicle living arrangements. I want to suggest to you that I'm glad to see you getting warrants and I think you need to do more of that.

When you get a complaint of this nature at all, reach out to the community boards. Make it systematic. Community boards know the people in the neighborhoods, where they can be your eyes and ears and tell you, maybe buttress your warrant. Everybody knows if one of these is on their block. You have to be deaf, dumb and blind not to notice the traffic into a private home for people who are coming in and out at that volume. If they don't know, then they know somebody who does.

I think you ought to incorporate that into your procedures and use the community boards and the civic associations and the block associations as your resource so that you can get those warrants. I think in terms of Council Member Koppell's bill that if you considered this the top priority amongst illegal conversions, I

think the courts would understand that, in fact,

every one of these is an immediately hazardous

condition. We have seen people die way too many

times for a problem that we are aware of and have

done nothing to solve.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: I would like to respond because you bring up a very good point.

Many people don't perhaps realize this but we have always considered the community boards our eyes and ears. You know that we have a tremendous amount of complaints and sifting through and trying to figure out what's most important many times comes down to the district manager focusing and pushing us in the right direction.

We did start an affidavit program where actually two Council Members on the City Council have actually used this where they actually certified an affidavit to us where we used it in court to get an access warrant.

This is something that we have certainly pushed for, for community boards and district managers, and I don't think she's here right now, but people have used it. If there's a neighborhood community board, you know if we want

to talk about this more generally so that people understand how to do it. We have used it and it has been successful and I'd love to--you know, if there's something we want to normalize it so that people feel like they can use it.

I know that residents in the neighborhood do not want to do this. They're afraid of retaliation and they're concerned for themselves and their safety and I agree. But public officials certainly should be able to stand up and do it.

I'm suggesting that you do it proactively. I understand that people are frequently afraid to put their name on it. In order for you to drill down on exactly where you need to be directing those resources and what the priority should be, that's how you can find out. You'll figure out a way to get the warrant after that, I mean, you know, whether it's the elected official, the community board or some brave soul on the block. I don't want you wasting your time chasing nothing.

If it's the first thing you do when

2.

you get a complaint of an allegation of this type
should be to contact the community board and ask
them if they know if it's substantiated, if they
believe that it's actually one of these cubicle
living arrangements. I think that's where you
should prioritize your resources.

I apologize for having to run to the Democratic Caucus and coming late and then leaving early, but this is a very important issue to me and I look forward to working with the chair and the sponsors and the Buildings Department and the Fire Department.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Cubicle living arrangements, similar to the three quarter houses, in a nutshell.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: The name's changed.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yeah. Okay,
Council Member Brewer?

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you.

I actually was going to say exactly the same
thing, having served on my community board, as
many of us have for many years. I guess my
question would be in addition to talking to them,

2	I would suggest that you go immediately to the
3	borough boards where there are community boards.
4	I know you go there regularly but I would say that

5 this is a priority and that you would like them to

6 help.

The community boards work with

Local Law 47, which is DoITT, meet regularly with

DoITT to talk about technology issues. If there

was some way of working with CUNY grad center and

Steve Romaneski [phonetic] and the community

boards and DoITT to do the GIS mapping that I know

you can do, but you could get some community

input. This could happen much more quickly.

I mean I know in my neighborhood the district manager has been there 25 years, like a lot of district managers, and she can tell you exactly, in our case, where the single room occupancy and every single person who lives in them. That's the kind of information that we have.

Second, what happens to the people when there is a vacate order? I know you mentioned the Red Cross, but actually what does happen? They could all move into my illegal

2.

hotels. I would welcome them. You just need to
give an abatement to the owner so he can afford
the rent that the renters will not pay much of.
That's the only little problem.

VITO MUSTACIUOLO: As you know, the Red Cross is actually on contract to HPD, so they do provide for a short term stay.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: But what happens after the short term stay, which is not very long, from my experience?

VITO MUSTACIUOLO: The families that were vacated can register with HPD and seek relocation assistance from HPD. As a matter of fact, in the Commissioner's executive budget testimony, we did talk about the rules changes that we need to make with respect to relocation and some of the legislative ideas that we'd like to work with the Council on to actually increase the civil penalties on vacates that we enforce. And also, put more responsibility on owners for relocation, converting their liens actually into tax liens.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Most of these owners are absentee or not absentee or do

2	you know? Of the cubicle type or where you're
3	getting your orders? In other words, does it seem
4	like the owners are living in the building or

5 they're all absentee or it's hard to know?

VITO MUSTACIUOLO: Certainly, for the smaller buildings, the PDs, the one and two-family homes, it's more difficult to find the owners. For the larger buildings, the multiple dwellings, we do refer to the multiple dwelling registration system. We also have other data that we can look at. So it is a little bit more difficult to find the owners of the smaller buildings.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Then just finally, obviously, I have a lot of friends who are airline pilots. Are they considered safe, because they're all breaking the law, left, right and sideways? They all stay in illegal places, all my friends. Are they considered part of this challenge too or you just sort of let them go? What do you do with all of my pilots?

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Why don't you give me their names?

25 COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: No, I'm not

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 111
2	going to give you their names.
3	ROBERT LIMANDRI: All right, tell
4	me where they stay.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I think
6	they all stay right near LaGuardia, like everybody
7	else. But I even have friends who own the damn
8	buildings, it's horrible. Go ahead.
9	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Could you
10	rephrase the question?
11	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I hardly
12	talk to them.
13	ROBERT LIMANDRI: We don't
14	discriminate of who it is.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I was going
16	to say, those pilots are unbelievably illegal
17	where they stay. Are you looking at them?
18	Really, it's incredible what goes on around
19	LaGuardia.
20	ROBERT LIMANDRI: We certainly have
21	been using this new paradigm and we certainly can
22	look at that. I don't know if that's part of
23	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:
24	[interposing] They need affordable housing just
25	like everybody else, or a place to stay. I'm just

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 112
2	saying if you're looking at economics that should
3	be more Seth Pinsky. But it's dangerous I feel.
4	ROBERT LIMANDRI: How much do
5	pilots make a year?
6	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Very little
7	on the small airlines.
8	ROBERT LIMANDRI: Oh, is that
9	right?
10	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Yes.
11	Believe me, I listen to it. So they make a
12	little; they stay for a short period of time. Of
13	course, we worry that they're awake. I just think
14	in general that would be a Seth Pinsky kind of
15	issue. They're all staying in illegal cubicles
16	just FYI. Thank you. I don't want them in my
17	illegal hotels, those pilots.
18	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you. We
19	certainly appreciate the time and effort and
20	attention to detail. I would suggest that as soon
21	as possible on any outstanding responses that are
22	due to the committee, if the agencies could
23	respectfully get back to the committee as soon as
24	possible.

I certainly look forward to working

2.

with all agencies involved, including the Fire
Department on this issue. I believe the fire in
my district was from a three quarter house. I
don't think any other person in this city should
have to die because their housing doesn't comply
with laws that are already on the books. So we
need to work hard to get our arms around this
issue and see how we can work with the court
system to make the city a safer place to live.

So with that, I thank you all.

ROBERT LIMANDRI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Next, we'll start to hear from the public. First, we'll call up the Uniformed Fire Officers Association and Lieutenant Eddie Boles. They'll be followed by Tanya Kessler, Samuel Biele-Fisher and it looks like Shafaq Islam.

I'd like at this time thank you for--and you'll identify yourself for the record obviously--but thank you for the information you provided me the night of the fire in my district. I'd certainly like to say we're certainly sorry for the injuries that firefighters faced at that incident. So with that, you could identify

2 yourself and get into your testimony.

EDWARD BOLES: I appreciate that.

Good afternoon. My name is Lieutenant Eddie

Boles, Treasurer and Legislation Chair of the

Uniformed Fire Officers Association, testifying on

behalf of President Alexander Hagan and the 2,500

members that we represent.

I want to extend an apology to Chairperson Dilan for not including your name and committee. Certainly, this is what we feel a very, very important issue and want to just provide some comments on.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this very serious issue and I send my compliments to the Mayor, Speaker Quinn, Committee Chair Dilan, Committee Chair Crowley, all committee members and agencies for addressing a problem that has been festering for years.

Throughout my years in the

Department, I can recall both civilian and

firefighter fatalities that was the result of an

illegal residential conversion. Black Sunday, in

the Bronx, which was in earlier testimony, which

occurred on January 23, 2005, when I was still

fighting fires as a lieutenant in the South Bronx, is still etched deep within my soul. That horrific fire, which resulted in six firefighters jumping from the fourth floor, killing two of our members, Lieutenant Curt Meyren and Firefighter John Bellew, who was promoted posthumously to lieutenant, were the result of an apartment that was illegally converted to a rooming house.

I can also recall a fire in
Woodside in 2009, where two young immigrant men
were trapped in an illegally converted basement in
a two family home. As our units arrived on the
scene, a Lieutenant who responded said he could
hear the screams of one of the men trapped in the
basement. Despite the efforts of our members,
both men died in that building fire.

I worked with Speaker Quinn. She was here earlier and I wanted to mention this. I worked with Speaker Quinn and with many of the Council Members. Anytime there's a fire, I usually let them know, especially if it's horrific. Sometimes we even go visit. We had a fire up in the Bronx where Lieutenant Harvey Karpluck [phonetic] and probationary firefighter

б

Mike Reilly [phonetic] got killed in an illegally
renovated store.

The City Council, under the

leadership of Speaker Quinn, was able to put

legislation where we addressed that issue. So I'm

hoping that what you're doing today doesn't fall

on deaf ears. But again, there are concerns that

I want to express to try to minimize the

tragedies.

I can tell you firsthand, being an officer, I've been out of the field since 2005, but I can tell you during all my times as a lieutenant and a firefighter, most problems that we encountered at fires, most fatalities that we found were generally in illegally converted buildings. So it is a huge problem. It's a problem that's very, very difficult to tackle that you've heard all afternoon.

But having said that, let me just talk about some concerns we have from our perspective. First of all, they expand the power of the FDNY to issue Building Code violations for illegal conversions. We have a question, how is this going to be accomplished? What is the make-

up of the proposed task force? Those answers weren't there and we would like to know what the answers are. We have a proposal.

We propose the task force--one of the things they talked about was having separate units, which was mentioned earlier. Our units that are in service to respond to calls are actually doing the inspections. So it's the way the system is set up right now is not effective. It's just not effective. What happens is you go in, our units go in and the do an inspection and then they've got to run. Last year was the busiest in the history of the Fire Department.

So if you've got to run, you might get a second run and you might not get back to that dwelling. In fact, you might not get back to that dwelling until the following week. When you get back the following week, you might not have access.

So there's a whole scope of problems that are attached with our units that are in service in order to effectively do building inspections. If you close 20 fire companies, well you could throw that right out the window. Chief

Jensen, who I have a great deal of respect for was very, very honest, and candid in his insight. He told you straight out that inspections aren't going to be done, access is not going to be done and if you increase the amount of inspections we do already with the units we have, then response times are going to go up, which is going to endanger people. It's a very complex issue that we would like to be a part of.

However, a solution, we would like to see a task force. One deputy chief for overall supervision of the entire program; five battalion chiefs, one assigned to each borough; nine captains, one for each divisions; and 45 lieutenants, five for each division as a task force to help alleviate the complexity that will occur with increased access and increased inspections to these sites. It doesn't have to be just for illegal conversions. You can expand it to many things.

We also talk about training. What training is going to be provided? It needs to be comprehensive like we suggested in our Training
Bill that was passed last year by the City Council

that would provide 80 hours of training to our members because our members are not properly trained. Yes, I'll say that again, our members are not properly trained in order to do building inspections. In fact, I have 18 years on this job. I still don't know how to write a summons. That's being honest and frank.

So we need to do a better job of training. If you're going to provide more things for our members to do, you have to provide the training.

What resources are going to be provided? Where is the financial support for this initiative? Of course, keeping all fire companies is the priority of the UFOA and money used for this program should not be in lieu of money used to keep firehouses open. So I'm hoping that keeping fire companies is a priority. But if you want to address both, it's going to cost money, of course. There may be productivity issues and expansion of responsibilities to our officers that need to be addressed.

The other thing is access issues. We are fully aware that access to these

occupancies is difficult and limited. How is access improvement going to be accomplished? What protections can be assured for our members from a safety, liability and legal perspective? Our officers, just to let everyone know, are trained Peace Officers. We do not possess the ability to get warrants and we don't have a gun like police officers. How can we be assured that the credibility and excellent relationship of our officers with the public can be maintained? Our primary role is to assist those in trouble not enforcement.

So if you use the Fire Department just for access purposes what's going to happen is when there's a real emergency, we may not be able to get the access we did in the past. What we're afraid is a sort of distrust to firefighters and fire officers. Right now we have a very good rapport with just about every citizen in the city, who will provide us with access. I'd hate to see that diminished.

However, saying all that, there are countless issues and ideas that we would like to discuss with the Administration and the Speaker

2.

and the Council but I don't think that this is the
most productive forum to accomplish that task. We
welcome the opportunity to meet with all the
parties to ensure the success of this initiative
and we are open to the dialogue. We feel our
members can play an integral part in this program
and we look forward to future discussions.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and I'm here for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Thank you,
Lieutenant Eddie Boles for being here today and
testifying and giving us the opinion of the
Uniformed Fire Officers on this proposal, these
proposed laws, the new proposed task force.

Your recommendations are interesting. I'm curious to know what the price tag would be for the city if they were to hire many more battalion chiefs and lieutenants and all the officers that you mentioned in your testimony.

EDWARD BOLES: To be honest, I

don't know. I haven't done that analysis. I'm

sure if you call Steve Rush, in the Fire

Department, he will give you an estimate. It

depends on how serious they want to be.

2.

Just to let everyone know, I didn't
know about the press conference today. I would
have appreciated some inclusion in the process.
But we'll try to get those numbers for you.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Right. The press conference came together rather quickly. It was news to many Council Members that this new task force was coming together. However, welcome news because we needed the access issue addressed. It's pretty impressive that Chief Jensen said the Fire Department has an access rate of 90 percent.

Regardless of whether a fire official gains access or not in a regular routine type of visit on call due to a complaint, if there is an emergency, they're getting into the facility, regardless of whether the person at the door welcomes the fire officers or not.

So in terms of the public opinion audience when it comes to public safety, I think that if it works with the Fire Department then the city has to strengthen the ability of the department to do what it currently does for life saving emergencies but also supplement and give the department the ability to do these types of

2 routine visits to prevent serious accidents from3 happening.

I had a question for you and now it's slipping my mind. It'll come back to me. Yeah, you jump in Erik.

in. I just want to get data. I would imagine, and I'm not sure if this was asked of the last panel, and it was probably appropriate of the last panel to give the answer to this question. I believe you may be able to get the data.

I would imagine that buildings that are illegally converted that we've seen in the past years, I would imagine that, you know, any fire is dangerous, but I would imagine that's the most hazardous condition for a firefighter to walk into. Do you agree?

EDWARD BOLES: Absolutely. Just to give you some insight, when we do inspections, we don't inspect single family homes. We don't inspect two-family homes. We go into apartment buildings but we don't go into the individual apartments. So really, where we see these illegal conversions is when we go to an emergency, to a

3

4

5 6

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

gas leak, to an electrical emergency, a water emergency, to a medical emergency. That's when we get access to these apartments or into a twofamily home or single family home. Then we look around and we say, whoa, what do we have here? CHAIRPERSON DILAN: You want into it.

EDWARD BOLES: Then we walk into Unfortunately, too many times in the past, we see it after the fact. Meaning, we never got access to it because there was no emergency or any need to be in there. Then unfortunately, like the fire in the Bronx and many other fires, when they start putting up these illegal partitions in the apartments, we know pretty much through experience you know the layout.

Pretty much, layouts of apartments you know. The people that got killed that day were very experienced officers. They know that you go through a certain building, go through a certain room that they've got access to a fire escape. Well, if you put up illegal partitions, it will a lot of times deny access to that fire escape, which endangers both civilians and

2 | firefighters going in to help put the fire out.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: That leads into the question that I want to get to. You have data on firefighter injuries and deaths as the result of illegally converted buildings over the past several years?

EDWARD BOLES: No, I don't.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: So what we'll do is I'll direct my staff and maybe Council

Member Crowley's staff could reach out to the Fire Department and ask that specific question in writing. I'd like to know the answer to that.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Co-chair

Dilan, also when we spoke and asked Chief Jensen
about the number of fires, you know we hear about
the fires when there's a death related to the
fire, whether it be a firefighter or a civilian.
However, I imagine that many fires, regular fires
happen because of illegal conversions, because of
the extension cords or dangerous hazards that are
set forth, with ovens in the wrong place, the
various different hazards that could have been
avoided. So that's another statistic that we're
going to look to get, in addition to how many

2 people get--

probably want to tap into the Bureau of Fire
Investigation or Fire Marshals and Supervising
Fire Marshals. If you have a joint agency task
force to put together however you're going to
implement these resolutions, you should probably
include them because they do the investigation of
fires and they can let you know why certain fires
were caused, by electrical or whatever, things
that they did.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: You brought up the fact that fire officers are not trained well enough in accordance with the Fire Code in the city. That's alarming. It's disturbing. I'm curious to know when you go into a building to inspect, you're a fire officer. What are the firefighters doing with you? Are they with you, the regular firefighters?

EDWARD BOLES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Are they

looking and are they trained as well?

24 EDWARD BOLES: No. Both have

25 limited training. Most of the training that

firefighters get is in probationary school and
self learning. Most of the training that the fire
officers get is through self learning, meaning
studying to get promoted and then some limited
training. When they get promoted they go through

school. They go through a five-week program.

But fire prevention is only a small component of the training we get. Whereas, our counterparts get much more training, like our civilian inspectors get much more training. Even state firefighters get a minimum of 120 hours of training, where we get about, I think, 16-20 hours. That's why we had the bill last year.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: I agree. If we're going to expect fire officers to be going into dangerous situations, we need to make sure that they find all the violations. In order to do that, they need to know the code. It's a waste of time if they don't. I agree that more training hours need to be set aside and ultimately more funding into the department.

I'm glad that you brought up the Woodside fire. That particular building was a basement conversion where three residents passed

problem. The Black Sunday fire was five years

25

2	ago. Council Member Fidler brought up a fire 30
3	years ago. I think there needs to be some sort of
4	joint agency committee where you have members of
5	the City Council, you have members of each of the
6	agencies, you have members of the various unions,
7	the Fire Officers Union and the Firefighters
8	Union, and whatever other groups to get together
9	and come to some sort of helpful resolutions.
10	You're on the right track. It's a very complex
11	issue. Especially any time there's a financial
12	crisis in the city, housing becomes very limited
13	and people are going to do things to try to get
14	by.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,
16	Lieutenant.
17	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you,
18	Lieutenant.
19	EDWARD BOLES: I just want to thank
20	all the Council Members for your consistent
21	support on keeping the fire companies open.
22	Thanks so much, each one of you.
23	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yet again, we
24	are here. Next, we'll have Tanya Kessler, Samuel

Biele-Fisher and Shafaq Islam. They'll be

followed by Patrick Siconolfi, Roberta Bernstein and David Whitmore.

So the three individuals, the three ladies that I just mentioned, the three individuals that I mentioned can come forward and provide testimony. If you have written testimony, you can submit it to the sergeant-at-arms and she'll get it to the committee members. So why don't we go MFY, Pratt and then the Urban Justice Center, if we could do it in that order. Just state your name for the record and you can get into your testimony. The mic is off. If you could, push the button and turn the mic on.

TANYA KESSLER: Good afternoon. My name is Tanya Kessler. I'm from MFY Legal
Services. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'll give a somewhat shortened version of the testimony that I submitted.

MFY Legal Services provides legal assistance to 7,500 New Yorkers each year. Our practice focuses special attention on our city's most vulnerable residents, including people with mental disabilities, SRO tenants, adult home residents and the elderly.

I work on MFY's Three-quarter House

Project. We provide assistance and representation
to tenants of three-quarter houses, which are also
known as illegal boarding houses, sober houses, or
transitional houses. Our representation focuses
on Brooklyn, where we see the largest
concentration of houses.

This is an underground industry, whose growth has been fed by the severe shortage of decent affordable housing for very low-income individuals in the city. Many three-quarter houses, in fact probably almost all of them, have been illegally converted and it is common for three-quarter house operators to deny access to Department of Buildings' inspectors. Many of the tenants in three-quarter houses have been referred to them by city agencies. I want to talk more about that a little bit later.

I first want to briefly describe what three-quarter houses are. They are buildings that falsely hold themselves out as some kind of supportive housing program, having no contract and no license from any government agency to operate a residential service program of any kind. They

recruit people a variety of settings, including

hospitals, substance abuse programs, prisons,

jails, soup kitchens, and other service systems

that interact with people who are homeless, on the

verge of homelessness, or otherwise desperate for

7 housing.

We don't know the origin of the term; we're often asked what "three-quarter house" means. But it seems to capitalize on the familiarity with the halfway house concept. The term is used to imply that people who are struggling to overcome setbacks in their lives, who are often coming from institutional settings will get all manner of services and assistance they need to reintegrate into the community. Unfortunately, in three-quarter houses, usually the opposite is true and there are, in fact, no services available onsite.

After arriving and signing on the dotted line, being asked to waive the most basic rights of tenancy in New York City, here is what three-quarter house residents discover: They are packed in rooms in illegally converted buildings, sometimes with as many as eight people in a room

2 in bunk beds. There are rarely sprinklers or 3 sufficient means of egress.

In addition to extreme overcrowding, typical conditions include jury-rigged electrical wiring, a lack of heat and hot water in the winter, and vermin, especially bedbugs. Severe harassment, unlawful evictions, and retaliation for complaints are commonplace.

Over three years ago, the Coalition for the Homeless issued a report documenting this problem and particular the unsafe conditions, the stream of referrals from city shelters, and a good number of vacate orders.

We've seen some changes in the industry since that report. The three main changes that we've seen is that the operators have diversified their outreach and recruitment targets, far beyond the New York City shelter system to the soup kitchens and substance abuse programs and other settings I described earlier. Many three-quarter houses have developed questionable ties with outpatient substance abuse programs, which appear to provide a new lucrative source of income and a new incentive to create

more three-quarter houses. Finally, they are increasingly operating out of larger, rent-stabilized buildings, in addition to the two and

three-family houses where they started out.

They're denying tenants their rights under rent stabilization and effectively removing regulated housing from the market. We have filed lawsuits against two such operators, but the practice continues in other buildings.

I want to talk a little bit about Building Code enforcement in three-quarter houses. You heard a little bit about the abject conditions that three-quarter house tenants endure.

Tenants frequently report that they are told by the operators of their houses and the staff not to contact city agencies about building conditions on pain of immediate "discharge." This is the three-quarter house euphemism for illegal eviction. The house managers working in the houses who are usually tenants who are paid a pittance, tell us that the operators instruct them not to give access to inspectors: Department of Buildings inspectors, HPD inspectors. This is usually on pain of immediate discharge. Tenants

2 who allow inspectors in face great retaliation.

So it's not surprising that the

Department of Buildings records that can be

accessed publicly online frequently show

complaints for illegal conversions, and that

inspectors are frequently denied access. We know

of over 200 addresses that are three-quarter

houses in Brooklyn alone. We know of over 350

citywide. We know that the list we have is very

small compared to what actually exits, because

it's only what we happen to hear about when

tenants contact us.

In those 350 buildings citywide, there have been 151 occupancy complaints documented on the DOB website. So almost half of them have complaints related to illegal occupancy. Ninety-two of those 151, access was denied to inspectors, according to the records on the Department of Buildings website. So inspectors are very frequently not getting into three-quarter houses.

I want to talk about three-quarter house tenants' perspective on Building Code enforcement. MFY works with a group of three-

quarter house tenants who have formed the Threequarter House Organizing Project which is also called TOP. TOP members were very much saddened by the death of two individuals on Covert Street recently in a fire.

They are concerned about their own safety and that of all tenants and the surrounding communities. To that end, they want to see better enforcement of the Housing Maintenance Code and Building Code in three-quarter houses. However, at the same time, they are deeply concerned about the effect such stepped-up enforcement would have on their lives, given the lack of alternative housing.

Intro 240 we think is unlikely to have much effect on enforcement in three-quarter houses because the kind of readily observable circumstantial evidence that inspectors might look for doesn't tend to exist with three-quarter houses. Tenants there don't have their own doorbells, their own mailboxes, their own utility meters.

We see pluses and minuses to Intro 368. On the plus side, there would probably be

some increased protection to residents and
communities from dangerous conditions in threequarter houses. With improved access, more

5 violations would probably be placed. There would

also probably be an increased number of vacate

7 orders.

We're not taking a position on the bill because our clients, and the members of TOP, are in constant fear of winding up on the street following a DOB or Fire Department vacate order. Three-quarter house residents feel they have two, only two dangerous options: living in an overcrowded illegally converted three-quarter house, or becoming homeless again, which is also hazardous to their health and safety. Neither is acceptable to them and neither should be acceptable to any of us.

The overriding question we hear from three-quarter house tenants is and then where do we go? The official answer is: if there's a vacate order, occupants are entitled to relocation services. The real life answer is possibly the street. It's proven difficult for three-quarter house tenants to access HPD's relocation services.

б

HPD requires three-quarter house tenants, it requires all tenants to show a great deal of documentation to prove their occupancy, and three-quarter house tenants usually don't have utility bills, leases, and the other documents that would satisfy HPD.

So we have some suggestions for what should be done. First, HPD should reconsider its documentation requirements for relocation services and promulgate new requirements that are consistent with the type of documentation three-quarter house residents can reasonably be expected to have, such as records of their address on file with HRA and other government agencies.

Two is unsafe housing referrals by city agencies is a real problem that needs to be addressed. Those are not the agencies that were present at today's hearing. Single adults desperate for a place to live continue to be referred to three-quarter houses by city and state agencies. These referrals are the very reason three-quarter houses are proliferating.

So long as the practice of city agencies referring individuals to unsafe housing

continues on the front end, yet other city

agencies will struggle to enforce the buildings

code and maintain public safety with regard to

three-quarter houses on the back end. So a

coordinated response is very much needed. Every

city agency that's involved with referrals to

housing should prohibit unsafe placements.

The Department of Homeless has adopted a regulation last July and also did a pilot project at the same time. Those appear to have significantly decreased the number of referrals from city shelters to three-quarter houses. Other agencies should do the same or should adopt something very similar. These include the Human Resources Administration, the Health and Hospitals Corporation, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Every agency and every organization that receives city funding should at a minimum be required to screen housing placements.

There's publicly available information that they can review. The following referrals should be prohibited: to all buildings that have a DOB, HPD or Fire Department vacate

order in effect, that show uncorrected violations related to unlawful occupancy or conversion on the Department of Buildings website, that show complaints related to unlawful occupancy or conversion, even where no violation has been placed and no summons served, where inspectors have been denied access.

So if the inspectors can't get in, there's not going to be a violation or a summons. There shouldn't be a referral if the inspectors can't get in. That information is publicly available. Referrals should also be prohibited to buildings that have pending litigation with HPD or are in the HPD alternative enforcement program.

There is some additional criteria that would provide sorely-needed protection to clients of city programs. One is my written testimony--I didn't get into it just now--talks about the kind of recruitment and outreach that these three-quarter houses are doing, in a variety of social service settings.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: If I could ask you, and as you could tell, I'm very interested in your testimony because it led into the questioning

2	that I asked of the administration, but if I could
3	ask you to summarize because there are some people
4	that still wish to testify. Then I would, if you
5	would permit me, like to have a meeting with you
6	outside of the hearing setting, so I can further
7	discuss this issue. I obviously have a great
8	interest.

TANYA KESSLER: Sure, we would welcome that Council Member Dilan.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: If you could summarize, that'd be great.

TANYA KESSLER: Overall, what we are looking for is a change in the way tenants show their eligibility for relocation services following a vacate order, but especially, a prohibition on referrals to unsafe housing by all city agencies, not just the Department of Homeless Services. We believe the problem of three-quarter houses requires a coordinated response. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you. We have Samuel Biele-Fisher from Pratt.

SAMUEL BIELE-FISHER: Good afternoon and thank you for the correct

2 pronunciation.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I got lucky there. I won't get lucky the rest of the day.

I'm sure I'll mess up one. Please correct me, for anyone who I mispronounce. Even though I said it correctly, you do have to say it in your own voice, and then you can get into your testimony.

SAMUEL BIELE-FISHER: Samuel Biele-Fisher, Pratt Center and New York Industrial
Retention Network. Thank you to Chair Crowley and
Chair Dilan. Thank you for the opportunity to
testify here this afternoon.

Understand that addressing the public health and safety issues raised by illegal conversions, while respecting New Yorker's rights to due process, and to privacy in their own homes, is a complex challenge, and we commend the Council and these committees for taking it on.

We are here to discuss the specific problem of illegal conversions of commercial and industrial space for residential use. Such conversions often create health and safety hazards.

When manufacturing buildings are

illegally converted for residential usage, they

pose a dangerous problem for tenants, for adjacent

businesses and especially to the health and safety

of officers responding to emergencies.

can no longer afford to pay.

In addition, they undermine the industrial character of New York's remaining manufacturing neighborhoods, and accelerate the displacement of small businesses and the loss of manufacturing jobs. That displacement may begin with illegal residential occupancy of "work only" loft spaces, gather momentum as landlords seek special permits to legalize conversions, and culminate in re-zonings that ultimately force land prices and rents up to levels that manufacturers

In 2004 the New York Industrial
Retention Network collaborated with the East
Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development
Corporation, EWVIDCO, and manufacturers in the
East Williamsburg In-Place Industrial Park to
document conversions of industrial space to
residential usage. Together, we recorded 30
locations within the industrial park containing
illegal conversions. Ninety percent, or 27 of 30

conversions, were illegal. These residential conversions, and those in subsequent years negatively impact industrial businesses by decreasing the amount of available space for industrial uses. By removing space from the market these illegal conversions help drive up real estate costs, a major issue for a sector where two-thirds of businesses lease their space.

As the number of residents in industrial neighborhoods rise, the potential for complaints and harassment of businesses increases as well. Rising rents and complaints from residents in illegally converted buildings add to pressures on industrial businesses to consider relocating out of New York City, further hurting our industrial sector.

Enforcement of code and zoning provisions prohibiting residential uses in industrial areas should be more straightforward and less intrusive than identifying illegal subdivision of existing residential buildings.

Inspections during business hours should find business premises open and accessible, in contrast with the challenges of gaining access to

residential buildings and units. If a space is identified in agency records as a commercial or industrial occupancy and it is not accessible during business hours, the process proposed in

Intro 368 should begin.

We would like to note for the committees that, while enforcing occupancy regulations and thus penalizing illegal conversions of industrial space is good public policy, and is in the long-term and collective interest of businesses located in industrial districts and buildings, all small businesses experience complying with New York City's myriad agencies and regulations to be a real burden.

operations, a small manufacturing company may have to provide routine filings with and be visited by inspectors from the Department of Environmental Protection, the Fire Department, the Department of Health, the Department of Sanitation, and the Department of Buildings and its several divisions, not to mention New York State agencies. So we would urge you to adopt measures that will streamline the inspection process and increase the

5

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certainty of enforcement against building owners 2 who now violate the law with relative impunity but which will not impose additional time and money 4 costs on business owners.

We look forward to working with the committees as these bills move forward, to identify ways that they can strengthen protections on public health, safety, and as well, on the vitality of New York's manufacturing sector. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you. Mr. Islam, you can go next.

SHAFAQ ISLAM: Good afternoon. My name is Shafaq Islam. I'm an attorney at the Community Development Project of the Urban Justice Center.

The Urban Justice Center is a project-based umbrella legal services and advocacy organization serving New York City residents. the past 25 years, the Urban Justice Center has provided direct legal assistance, systemic advocacy and community education to low and moderate income rent regulated tenants in New York City.

The Community Development Project,

CDP, of the Urban Justice Center formed in
September 2001 to provide legal, technical,
research and policy assistance to grassroots
community groups engaged in a wide range of
community development efforts throughout New York
City. Our work is informed by the belief that
real and lasting change in low-income, urban
neighborhoods is often rooted in the empowerment

of grassroots, community institutions.

I am here today to urge the Council to oppose both legislations Intro 240 and 368. The negative effects of both pieces of legislation, if passed, far outweigh any positive impact they might have on New York City communities. We, at the Urban Justice Center, oppose any regulations that impede the growth of affordable housing.

First, the proposed revisions to

Intro 240 are open to abuse and exploitation

because of the overly broad language. Section 28
210.1b states that a violation can be issued

"based on readily observable circumstantial

evidence," including a mailbox or doorbell in

б

excess of the number of units authorized in a particular dwelling. Section 28-210.1 says that a dwelling shall be inspected when "the department has received a complaint of a condition which, if observed, would be identified by the department as an illegal residential conversion."

Such broad language may invite
neighbors to place complaints with the Department
of Buildings based on antagonism to a residence's
occupants rather than on actual evidence. Many of
the occupants of basement apartments in Queens and
eastern Brooklyn are recent immigrants and
therefore more vulnerable to prejudice and
discrimination.

With the amendments, there is potential for an increase in violations issued and inspections ordered by the court based on frivolous complaints, even in legal apartments.

Accordingly, DOB inspectors would waste unnecessary resources going on wild goose chases and unnecessarily impede the lives of innocent families. This will hardly develop the trust and respect inspectors need to work successfully in the communities.

It is undeniably important to protect tenants from dangerous conditions in apartments. However, not every illegal apartment is dangerous. With a few modifications, many of the presently illegal basement apartments could, in fact, become legal dwellings.

A process to legalize these types of apartments would incentivize such conversions for homeowners by offering, for example, J-51 tax credits. This would simultaneously increase the stock of affordable, rent-stabilized housing in New York City while reducing homeowners' vulnerability to the foreclosure crisis.

The proposed revisions, however, could dampen homeowners' willingness to modify existing illegal apartments to meet legal standards. They may fear that applying for a permit to conduct modifications would open them to inspection, violations, and penalties for an existing illegal apartment.

The penalties for an illegal conversion are excessively harsh. They include: being reported to the IRS, the New York State

Department of Finance and Taxation, the New York

City Department of Finance, as well as a criminal
misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to \$25,00
or a year's imprisonment.

These penalties do nothing to encourage homeowners or landlords to modify existing illegal apartments for increased safety. Instead, landlords may force their tenants to keep a yet lower profile and leave conditions unaddressed. They may remove the extra doorbell and the extra mailbox to avoid detection but the underlying issue, a lack of affordable housing, will still remain.

Lastly, Section 28-210.1 says that it is unlawful to convert a dwelling to be occupied by more than the legally authorized number of families as well as "to assist, take part in, maintain or permit the maintenance of such conversion." Under this section, it could be possible for supers and tenants to be subject to penalties as well as landlords. As it is, the language of this code does more to threaten tenants than to protect them from unsafe housing conditions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you all

2	for your time and testimony. I just have one
3	question and that's for Ms. Kessler. Just in your
Ŀ	general knowledge of how individual tenants make
5	it into a three-quarter home, how is their tenancy

generally funded?

TANYA KESSLER: Many of the tenants receive public assistance. So they direct their benefits to pay their rent to the landlord at the three-quarter house. There are also tenants who are on disability, unemployment and who have wages and who pay out of those sources of income.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: To your knowledge, when a referral comes, say from the homeless shelters or from probation or from any city service, are any of these tenants contracted in some way, shape or form? Do they receive any contracts with the city or the owner of the buildings? Does any of that happen to your knowledge?

TANYA KESSLER: The operators of the buildings often have residency agreements that purport to waive tenants' rights--you know, basic right to court process prior to eviction. So there is that kind of contract.

Τ	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 152
2	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: No, I mean with
3	the city. I'm sorry.
4	TANYA KESSLER: With the city?
5	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yeah.
6	TANYA KESSLER: No. Generally,
7	three-quarter houses are not under contract with a
8	city agency.
9	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Are any of the
10	individuals, do they receive any rent subsidy from
11	a city agency?
12	TANYA KESSLER: Subsidy, no. I
13	mean some are receiving public benefits like
14	public assistance. But generally we don't see
15	them having additional subsidies.
16	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thanks. Thank
17	you all for your time and testimony. Next, we
18	have Patrick Siconolfi, Roberta Bernstein, and
19	David Whitmore. They'll be followed by Seema
20	Agnani, Larry Wood and Jill Hamberg.
21	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: If each of
22	those who are here today to testify could limit
23	your testimony to less than three minutes, we'd
24	appreciate that. The sergeant-at-arms, if you
25	could, start the clock.

HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 153
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Patrick, why
don't you lead us off?
PATRICK SICONOLFI: Good afternoon,
I am Patrick Siconolfi, Executive Director of the
Community Housing Improvement Program, or CHIP. I
want to thank you, Council Members, for the
opportunity to make these remarks.
CHIP is a trade association
representing 5,000 multi-family owners in the
City, and one of CHIP's core missions is to
educate its members about the regulatory
requirements of government.
Access has three aspects which need
to be addressed separately. They are: access when
a tenant makes a complaint, access when a third
party makes a complaint, and access when the
building owner must inspect to make repairs. It
is crucial to recognize these three aspects
because each has a different remedy.
The first is the easiest to

address. In situations where a tenant makes a complaint about an apartment condition, the key to access must be the tenant. There are two reasons

23

24

25

for this. First, in the great majority of cases,
the tenant has not shared a key with the owner, so
access can only be provided by the tenant.

Second, it is the tenant who has sought some kind
of intervention. If the tenant abandons the
complaint, there is no feasible manner in which to

8 continue.
9 There is significant precedent over
10 an extended period of time for this type of

Community Renewal uses the same procedure for tenant complaints of reduction in services. It

action. The State Division of Housing and

provides something called a no-access inspection,

whereby an agency schedules an inspection at which

time a State inspector, the tenant and the owner's

17 rep are all present.

The second aspect presents greater difficultly because the person with direct access, that is the tenant, is not the person raising the complaint. Here it is useful to look at the city's social service agencies for a more successful model. The Department for the Aging, the Department of Health, and the Human Resources Administration have a record of successfully

obtaining access. Those agencies tend to use a team approach and have access to services which can be useful in gaining access such as multilingual case workers, and a case management model.

For a program of government access to achieve its aims, coordination among agencies is required. HPD, DOB, FDNY, DOH, HRA and DFTA should redeploy staff to create an agency task force. Its mission would be specific and limited to aggregate complaints of illegal housing units, to seek access for inspection and follow up, to determine which complaints need court warrants and to provide support and guidance to DOB in providing such warrants.

I think there's a time issue here, so I'm just going to move on. The third aspect of access which needs to be addressed is access by the owner for inspection and repair. An owner needs access to inspect for tenant-installed illegal partitions—and please recall that the Black Sunday, that infamous incident, was decisively caused by tenant installed situations—but the owner can't get in to inspect. This is a

2 | big problem.

The owner needs to be in there to make inspections, to make repairs, to ensure the safety of the building's residents. Not only to ensure the safety of that tenant but to ensure the safety—that's a very annoying bell—to ensure the safety of other tenants in the building. So I think it's critical that this aspect be addressed.

The failure of a tenant to grant access places other tenants in jeopardy. Illegal partitions are examples and the most obviously here. An owner can't remove an illegal structure unless he or she knows about them. They can't know about that without access. So we would ask you as a public policy, the question at hand is how to enable willing owners to gain access to do the work that the City Council correctly believes is important.

We recommend a two part access process where health, safety, or building infrastructure is at issue. In step one the owner would request written access. If that was denied, the owner could then go to an expedited court proceeding which would grant next day access.

1	HOUSING WITH FIRE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 15
2	I'm out of time. I will leave the
3	comments there. I'd be happy to take any
4	questions you might have.
5	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Thank you.
6	Patrick, we're going to wait until everybody
7	testifies on the panel.
8	PATRICK SICONOLFI: Sure.
9	CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Then we'll
10	ask questions.
11	ROBERTA BERNSTEIN: Good afternoon.
12	I'm Roberta Bernstein, President of the Small
13	Property Owners of New York. We own the smaller
14	buildings in the five boroughs. Our owners
15	frequently live in the buildings that they own.
16	We're the backbones of our neighborhoods.
17	I have been saying for years that
18	there has been a secret supply of affordable safe
19	housing. That supply really is what you're
20	focusing on today. Specifically, it was really
21	news to me and shocking to find out about the
22	three-quarter buildings, but I have something I
23	want to say about that a little bit later.
2.4	I gnogifically want to addrage

third dwelling units in a two-family property and

25

б

basement apartments. We do have some members in Queens that have converted illegally and they're living in fear. In two cases, the owner uses it as storage or for family and the Fire Department and the Buildings Department have come down very heavily on them and keep making repeated inspections. I found out why a little earlier. They've not been using it and they've taken away the cooking facility and so forth, but it hasn't stopped the visits.

It would be a very simple matter to legalize these. A lot of them are illegal simply because of zoning. The zoning for that area says two-family and they've got a three-family, when in fact these are quite viable apartments. So in this case, a simple amendment of the zoning would legalize these units.

In the case of basement apartments, a lot of them are really not fire hazards and are used, in fact, for superintendents. The tenants benefit by having a super on the premises that they can call at any time. If they fit the fire code and safety regulations and the building code regulations, should be allowed to be legalized.

б

You have a great supply of affordable housinghere. New construction is at an all-time low.

4 think if we just tweak the system a little bit,

5 they could be made viable.

Now, those three-quarter buildings

I was really troubled by the thought of 20 beds.

I mean it's horrendous. Yet, it serves a purpose,
like the SROS used to serve a purpose for those
who were borderline homeless. So perhaps those
owners, instead of—the bottom line is inspect
them, make them safe and usable. We need that
housing.

Now, Intro 240 doesn't address the problem of the tenants who create those illegal partitions and deny us access. They should be included in such a bill, there's no question, because they really affect the safety and health of others, not only in the apartment but in the building and the firefighters.

Now, circumstantial evidence such as an additional mailbox should not be considered. In my building I have one for tenant comments, landlord mail or superintendent's use. To use this as a means of determining illegal apartments

б

or to make an extra mailbox illegal is unwise, unfair, and doesn't make a lot of sense.

Access, I'll be very brief here.

The city now know how it feels when it can't get access to a building for inspection, how an owner feels when they can't get access to an apartment.

Now legally we're entitled to have keys to all units. Tenants often change the locks when they move in and don't give us a set of keys. So I have a solution, which I think was really touched on. We have to go to court and spend money that we could really spend maintaining our property on attorneys and getting access if DHR is not involved, if it's something that we need to inspect.

A possible solution might be a quick access form promulgated by the regulating agency or housing court. It would do the following: declare that a state of emergency exists after two requests for inspection have been sent by certified mail and by phone calls, for the purpose of making repairs or to make an illegal use inspection. Pursuant to the emergency, the owner would have permission to change the locks

for specifically that purpose. It would mandate that a new set of keys be given the very same day to the tenant and it would also allow for a marshal, a city marshal, policeman, or licensed locksmith to sign an affidavit that no personal belongings were taken or damaged, all of this after due notification to the owner and the tenant.

Now, at present, owners are very reluctant to enter an apartment even with cascading water coming out under the front door because they're afraid of legal ramifications.

But allowing an owner to have quick access in emergencies would mitigate that problem.

I agree that having no compliance by the owner when the Fire Department or the Buildings Department want to make an inspection is a definite problem. But perhaps if the owners knew they were being treated fairly that would change.

Perhaps it's not such a bad thing to tell the owner this is what we're looking for and by the way, this is what you've got to do to cure it. It should be a transparent process.

2.

Make friends of owners; don't treat us like
enemies. The legislation 240 is extraordinarily
punitive. It calls for reporting us to the IRS,
my God, to the City and State Finance Departments.
That is strictly punitive. Let's change this
attitude, let's change is 180 degrees from
treating owners like they're criminals to trying
to help us do what's right. Most of us want to do
what's right and we have no compassion for those
who do illegal things.

I think it's critical that this committee have the necessary information and different viewpoints essential to making the informed decision you need that's so essential for New York City housing. I truly thank you from the bottom of my heart for the opportunity to present our viewpoint and hope that what I've said will have some impact on your determinations. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.

DAVID WHITMORE: Good afternoon,

Council Members. My name is David Whitmore. I'm

a small property owner as well.

It is my belief that Intro 240 has

been written without any real consideration given to the other side of the problem here. And that

is those who reside in the apartments.

I have been a small property and a property manager for numerous other small property owners in the City of New York for over 25 years.

I have firsthand experience of new tenants moving into an apartment under my care and/or my responsibility only to find out that other family members related to the family on the lease have moved into the same apartment without my knowledge or consent, to share or save on living expenses.

I have also witnessed divided walls erected in apartment rooms for privacy for additional family members who were not listed as occupants in the lease paperwork when the apartment was rented out. Granted, there are owners who probably willingly skirt the law for an extra buck, but they are by no means alone or the majority owners in these tragic situations waiting to happen.

The way that this law is written only identifies and penalizes the property owner, and does not even consider that the residing

tenant could be the problem without the property owner's knowledge or consent. To have a law written pre-determining that a property owner created an illegal residential conversion without any penalty or consideration of a severe penalty given to the resident who could have created the overcrowding will only empower that resident to either do it again elsewhere or communicate it to others knowing that there is zero chance of being penalized. This law must be written for both sides to take serious notice of the consequences, not just one side.

It is very difficult for a small property owner who may not live at the multiple dwelling owned to be able to constantly determine the amount of new additional family members that have moved into an apartment. The vast majority of small owners that I have ever come into contact with all have regular jobs that they must go to on a daily basis that doesn't allow for them to be a constant watch dog over who is residing at their property. A tenant knowing this and also knowing that they cannot be penalized for creating an overcrowding situation will not stop what this law

2 is trying to prevent.

with the continuing housing shortage that never seems to abate, with new construction housing funds that have either dried up or are very tough to obtain in this economic climate and/or with new housing starts that cannot meet the demand for people who want to live here, this city would be better at serving its constituents if it were to develop a strategy to re-zone those neighborhoods where the illegal conversions are most prevalent to allow for said conversions to take place under strict guidelines.

Some of which should include the following: greatly assist the property owner in properly obtaining the needed paperwork to increase the building's unit size, if feasible. If it is determined or found that the property owner didn't have any knowledge of, or consented to overcrowding in one or more of his units, and it is discovered, then create a fast track system in housing court to easily and expeditiously remove the law breaking tenants from the dwelling. Set up a viable lending program—

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: [interposing]

Excuse me a second. Ma'am, if the conversation

happens, it needs to happen outside of the

chambers. I'd like to ask if you can put the

phone on silent mode for the remainder of the

proceeding. Thank you. You can continue and

we'll allow you some extra time.

DAVID WHITMORE: Thank you. If it is determined or found that the property owner didn't have any knowledge of, or consented to overcrowding in one or more of his units, and it is discovered, then create a fast track system in housing court to easily and expeditiously remove the law breaking tenants from the dwelling. Set up a viable lending program to allow for the property owner to draw from, to legally increase his building's units, and only allow for periodic withdrawals as each required step is completed and verified.

By making these simple changes it will greatly assist the property owner by allowing him or her to legally increase his rent roll, it will allow for new residents desiring to live at said location with others of their liking, and it will also allow the City of New York to benefit

2 from increased real estate taxes for the newly 3 zoned property.

We the Small Property Owners of New York only support safe housing for all our property owners and residents. We strive to get out information and have informative meetings for our members that would allow for them to operate their property in a safe manner.

But, we also recognize that only
the property owner is penalized when a condition
is found to be unsafe at our property, when many
times we had no knowledge of it nor created the
unsafe condition. When a devious or unscrupulous
tenant creates a hazardous condition, he or she is
doing so that affects their neighboring law
abiding resident. Are said law abiding neighbor's
lives not to be considered in this bill?

I believe that the purpose of this hearing is to allow for input from those affected by this bill, to give additional reasoning that might have been overlooked when the bill was drafted. Please give strong consideration to what I have communicated here today to provide for a more well rounded and better bill which will serve

all sides more equally, judiciously and will

probably save more lives, which I believe is the

intent of this bill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.

Some of the things that you guys mentioned—this is not really a question but a statement—some of the things that you guys have mentioned in your testimony regarding the basement units is something that I have been trying to work with the administration on for some period of time. It's just proven to be a lot more difficult from a legal standpoint to get that accomplished than I would have liked.

patrick, if I could meet with you guys, I'd love to explore the issue. There appears to be, and I want to say this carefully because I'm not sure, but there appears to be that it's not an urgent matter for the current administration. That may be different but last I checked it wasn't an urgent matter to try to bring these apartments up to code where they can actually be used. I hope I'm wrong and I would like to continue to work with the Bloomberg administration on this.

But there are some legal hurdles that they just cannot get around, which I understand. I'll answer them offline. I can see you chomping at the bit--what are they--which is why I would request a meeting.

PATRICK SICONOLFI: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Then we can discuss it at that time. As it relates to the bills in general, you know obviously I like to pass bills that come out of this committee that are balanced. Should these bills go forward they will be, because we recognize that there are some actions that your tenants may take without your knowledge that could lead to this illegal conversion. So, we recognize that, and whether the legislation passes or not, we will recommend to the task force that that be taken into consideration.

So I have no questions, but I just did want to state that to you guys for the record. I'm not sure if my colleague has any questions.

PATRICK SICONOLFI: Just one thing, we would be very happy to have those meetings.

There are a lot of ideas that the three of us have

and certainly that I didn't get a chance to go to because of time limitations. I think there are ways that the bill could be made more robust and probably have more of the targeted effects that you're looking for.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Myself and the committee staff are open to alternative ideas, so we're happy to take those under consideration.

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: I'm glad that you three testified today. Your perspective was not heard much throughout the hearing in terms of the landlord and not being able to control what the tenant does and the tenant being the one that actually breaks the laws and changes an apartment into a single room occupancy. I am aware of how difficult that situation is and how dangerous it is and how that also needs to be addressed.

PATRICK SICONOLFI: Thank you for that comment. There's a larger problem here, which if it could be reflected in an ultimate solution would be helpful. The Council, for meritorious purposes, ends up giving the owner responsibilities. These are publicly wise responsibilities. But then it doesn't give the

25 CHAIRPERSON DILAN: We'll start

2	with Seema.	If I	said	it	incorrectly,	please
3	correct me.					

SEEMA AGNANI: No problem. Seema

Agnani is my name. Good afternoon. I'm with

Chhaya CDC. We are based in Jackson Heights

Queens and work with both owners and tenants:

tenants on eviction prevention issues and repairs,

and owners on foreclosure prevention and home

ownership issues.

I'm going to keep my testimony brief. I'm submitting it in writing. I want to note that some of the testimony got cut off, so I'll make sure I cover what I wanted to verbally.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak on this pervasive issue that's really impacting predominately the outer boroughs of New York City in terms of the single and multifamily homes.

I think a lot of what I wanted to say has been said. We're here opposing the proposed legislation. While we agree a lot of the unsafe housing really needs to be addressed, we think that these proposals really focus on the wrong issue. Just simply focusing on enforcement

measures won't necessarily address this problem

that's been around for a really long time. We

need a more sustainable and long-term solution.

We think that that should be the priority of where

6 the city focuses its resources right now.

It needs to be acknowledged first and foremost that the reason that this issue even exists is that there's a lack of decent and affordable housing in much of the city. The people that are living in these units are those that are sort of the workforce behind our thriving economy.

Secondly, that one solution to the issue of illegal conversions simply won't work. There are those units that are unsafe and overcrowded such as the divided up apartments and there are also those that are safe and decent apartments. We've seen many of them in single and two-family homes that, like other people have noted, really should be brought up to code.

Some of those also happen to be cellars in the current definition. We've seen many apartments that are defined as cellars that could definitely be legalized and brought to code.

owner.

These are a viable source of affordable housing and we want to encourage the Council to look at the creation of an Accessory Dwelling Unit code or a similar code. These codes have been used in municipalities across the country. It's a really viable solution and I think articulates what a lot of people have been talking about. Providing a way for owners to streamline the process, legalize the units, bring them up to code, and it's a win/win situation.

This way the tenant has rights as well as the

We estimate that it will cost about \$10,000-\$15,000 to bring the majority of these units up to code. That's about the same amount that an owner pays in fines. So why not divert those resources into bringing these units into compliance.

We did a door to door survey. I have attached the summary of our findings. We spoke to more than 300 across Queens and most of them we found were owner occupied homes and also the majority of them really wanted to bring their units up to compliance, and more than willing to

2 put fire and safety measures to their homes.

So I think that right now we are in a recession. It's a time to think about bold changes, not necessarily continue what we've been doing. We think that this is a potential way to really bring this issue to light and find a long-term solution.

So I'll end there, and please do take a moment to review our recommendations in the written testimony when you have a moment. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.

What we'll certainly do is make sure that the testimony that you have submitted in writing gets entered into the record in its entirety. Mr.

Wood?

LARRY WOOD: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I've worked 25 years as a community organizer at Goddard Riverside Community Center and specifically with the SRO law projects. I've worked in many SROs for more than two decades.

I guess my issue I want to raise is can we safely and affordably legalize new SRO

housing. Initially I thought this would be beyond the scope of this hearing, but hearing Councilman Brad Lander, Jumaane Williams and a number of other folks, including SPONY all saying is there a way we can safely legalize these units, I think that really gets to the heart of this matter.

Clearly, the city needs to make inspections and they must have access and you must enforce fire and safety regulations to eliminate firetraps and other unsafe and hazardous conditions. But as long as we have an acute shortage of affordable housing, particularly for one and two member households, this problem is not going away and enforcement will only go so far.

I remember sitting at a similar hearing 20 years ago, the same issues, the same type of testimony and the same call for legalizing SRO housing and it didn't go very far. But there was a lot of work done, which we've brought these reports. We don't have to reinvent the wheel.

City Council and advocates have attempted to address this issue. You could say we've come almost full circle with SRO housing.

It was banned in 1954. You couldn't construct new

SRO housing. SRO housing was seen as substandard so there were incentives to demolish and convert the housing. Then, in the late 70s/early 80s, we realized with the spike in homelessness, we needed to preserve this low income housing. But we've only three quarters way, we haven't come full circle, and that's why you have so many illegal three-quarter housing out there because there's such a need for this type of housing and it's not being produced.

One of the documents I've submitted to you is just excerpts but it's called "Desperately Need Now: An SRO Housing Revolution." This was produced 20 years ago by a visionary urban planner. It became the catalyst for others to look into this issue, look at the impediments in zoning, housing maintenance and codes that were in the way of new construction, particularly for for-profit landlords. Nonprofits could still do SRO construction but there are still many impediments that make it much more expensive than it need be. Jill Hamberg, who you'll be hearing from next, has a much more extensive report on this issue.

2	I want to point out, the other memo
3	I gave you is a memorandum that the City Council
4	itself produced from the Infrastructure Division.
5	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: We were looking
6	at some of the names on there.
7	LARRY WOOD: Yeah, it's memory lane
8	for me too.
9	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I happen to
10	know those two individuals that did the report.
11	LARRY WOOD: We'd be very
12	interested to go over that because a lot of work
13	was done previously about what was needed to
14	balance the need for safety and good conditions
15	with affordability and how could we construct this
16	housing and remove some of the obstacles. So this
17	work was done.
18	In my mind, I'm reminded of a Tale
19	of Two Cities by Dickens. This was the best of
20	reports and it was the worst of reports. It was
21	the best of reports because it laid out what
22	needed to be done. It was the worst of reports
23	because it was dead on arrival. The City Council,

forward. The pushback by homeowners and others

there was just no stomach for moving this issue

2.

didn't want it.

who said we don't want rooming houses, we don't
want the homeless moving into our communities.
This was viewed as housing and shelters and people

I know at Goddard Riverside, just for us to build Section 202 housing for seniors and disabled, we had to overcome lawsuits. So there's a big pushback against creating new SRO housing. It's necessary, it's needed and we're going to have to get around to it some day or else homelessness is never going to go away.

If you really only dealt with enforcement, the shelter population would totally spike. Some of these reports also give you estimates on how many illegal units are out there. There are only about 40,000 legal SRO units. It sounds like there are almost twice as many illegal SRO units this current day. We've got to do something to legalize the ones that we can.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.

JILL HAMBERG: I come before you to general support greater targeted enforcement against--

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: [interposing]

2	If you could move the mic closer to you, and then
3	also identify yourself in your own voice for the
ļ.	record.

JILL HAMBERG: My name is Jill
Hamberg. I'm a facility member at Empire State
College, part of the State University of New York.

I come before you to generally support greater targeted enforcement against dangerous illegal conversions, although not necessarily the specifics of the bills before you.

However, if stepped up enforcement is the only strategy to stem the tide of illegal occupancies it is doomed to fail. This assertion is based on my involvement as an urban planner in writing about illegal conversions and code issues in the past and participating in drafting—I was part of the committee that drafted the memorandum that Larry referred to, we met for a year and a half—proposed legislation to partially address this issue.

Housing advocates have long called for building and preserving housing for low and moderate-income households to tackle the city's severe affordability and overcrowding issues. But

б

my argument goes further. It consists of five points. First, illegal occupancies represent the main source of newly created units for low and moderate-income residents in the city for the last several decades. I've got the details if you're interested.

Second, illegal occupancies consist of full apartments and those that are the code equivalents of SROs, rooming houses and lodging houses, which I refer to collectively as SROs.

Only a few can be legalized of fully legalized according to current building and zoning regulations. Indeed, since 1955 it has been virtually impossible to legally create any kind of SRO, except for nonprofits.

Third, stepped up enforcement, evictions and vacates of illegal occupancies, while removing residents from dangerous conditions in the short run, force many households further into the informal housing market to perhaps even more unsafe conditions.

Fourth, only by taking measures to make most illegal occupancies both safe and legal, or at least semi-legal or temporarily legal, will

2.

are still valid.

the effort to stem the tide of death and
destruction from fires begin to bear fruit.
Possible approaches to such legalization are
outlined in a report I co-authored in the 1990s
and you've got excerpts from it in the packet
there. Since then, there have been changes in
building codes and zoning and tragically many
fire-related deaths. But the general approaches

should never reduce housing standards, even temporarily: history is full of examples of codes and enforcement practices adapting to market conditions, in some cases partially or temporarily. In fact, regarding basements, between 1953 and 1967 there was a temporary permit system that legalized basement and cellar occupancies to address the needs of returning servicemen and the housing shortage.

Anyway, rather than relaxing standards, revised rules concerning illegal occupancies would actually improve housing conditions in practice by requiring these units to meet at least some minimal standards and provide

2 some legal protection to tenants and landlords.

Therefore, I urge both of your committee to study the broader context of illegal conversions and develop legislation to make many of them affordably safe and legal by building on the past proposals of Infrastructure Division staff, that's the memorandum, and involving other public agencies and interested organizations.

I've been contacted in the last several years by the counsels of the Department of Buildings and HPD. I know there's interest in the departments but it's just never gone anywhere.

Well, I shouldn't say it's never gone anywhere. In 1988, I met several times with a committee of lawyers from all the different departments who had been tasked to deal with this issue. That was a result of the Blackburn report which I worked on; I wrote the code section of that. It first raised the issues of illegal SROs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.

Thank you all for your time and testimony here today. Thank you all.

Next we have Marika Dias and

We've been concerned with this issue of illegal conversions for some time. Our

24

25

offices in Brooklyn and Queens hear reports of
this issue time and time again from our members,
either because they themselves are living in
illegal conversion or because they're living in

buildings where there are illegal conversions.

It's motivated by these experiences that Make the Road has been a member of the New York Immigrant Housing Collective's task force on Accessory Dwelling Units, which is basically the term used to describe additional units that are created illegally, whether it's by subdividing existing units or in the cellars or the basements of buildings.

I think we all know that illegal conversions are a problem for tenants. They create dangerous and unhealthy conditions, and the tenants themselves are very vulnerable to displacement, either by their landlords or by the Department of Buildings. For tenants in surrounding apartments it can be also a problem because it really puts a strain on the services in buildings and creates a sort of over crowding effect. Then for neighborhoods, it can be a problem because you have this unplanned growth.

So it's a drain on the resources of neighborhoods, over crowding in schools, sanitation services are insufficient, all those kinds of things.

I think it's very important that we really recognize why tenants live in these illegal conversions. It's really a combination of a lack of affordable alternatives and the increasing population that we have in New York City that makes it very difficult for low-income tenants to find viable housing. Plus, many of the tenants living in these illegal conversions are low-income immigrants who are particularly vulnerable and often they'll live in less than desirable accommodations just as a way of making ends meet.

I have seen many cases of tenants living--you know, as a housing lawyer--seen many cases of tenants living in illegal conversions or with illegal alterations. Oftentimes they have no idea that a particular wall or a particular doorway is an illegal alteration. Sometimes it's the building's superintendent that does the work at the request of the landlord.

Sometimes the tenants themselves actually pay to have this stuff done, not

realizing that it's something illegal that they're paying for. Then sadly, these same tenants will later on see themselves involved in eviction proceedings and being accused of illegal occupancy.

We also see a lot of profiteering by landlords, who make these illegal conversions and then charge unregulated and vulnerable tenants excessive rents.

I've mentioned other things in the written material, but one concern that I do have about Intro 240, which wasn't raised by other people, so I will mention it now, is that it actually permits this issuance of a notice of violation based merely on circumstantial evidence.

Now, a notice of violation actually potentially could impact quite greatly on tenants. So under current case law, if a landlord wants to evict a tenant for illegal occupancy, a city violation is generally required. So if a city violation can be issued without actually there being a violation in existence, then this could potentially facilitate the eviction of tenants unnecessarily. You know, we heard from the

Department of Buildings that in 55 percent of cases I think they said, they get access and no violation is issued. So if you combine those two things, it really can potentially be something that can be detrimental to tenants.

Now, you know, we approve of measures to discourage landlords from making illegal conversions. We approve of measures that would penalize those landlords who do take advantage of low-income tenants, who they place at risk for the sake of their own profits. But we're particularly concerned with the preservation of affordable housing and protecting vulnerable immigrant communities.

New York's crisis of affordable housing, which disproportionately affects low-income, immigrant tenants, is really a critical factor in the proliferation of these illegal conversions in New York. So it's therefore really imperative, we think, that any legislative response actually enhances the protections for tenants who are living in the illegal conversions and promotes the creation of more legal, affordable units.

you very much.

2	This might involve financial
3	incentives for owners to legalize units and we've
4	heard other people talk about that this afternoon.
5	It might involve technical assistance for owners
6	to legalize. It might involve protections for
7	existing tenants so they can stay in the units and
8	so that rents will be affordable going forward.
9	But certainly I think, just to
10	close, really what we're trying to emphasize is
11	that any response to illegal conversions, whether
12	it's facilitating inspection as provided for by
13	Intro 368 or whether it's enhanced penalties as
14	provided for by Intro 240, should also actually
15	also include protections for tenants and some sort
16	of mechanism for legalization. This is really the
17	only way you're going to protect vulnerable New
18	Yorkers and at the same time avoid depleting the
19	affordable housing stock.
20	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you for
21	your time and testimony.
22	MARIKA DIAS: No problem. Thank

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I at this time would like to, on behalf of the members of the

2.

Housing and Buildings Committee, thank the staff
for putting this together. I'm pretty sure that
Council Member Crowley feels the same about her
staff of the Fire and Criminal Justice Committee

CHAIRPERSON CROWLEY: Absolutely, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: So I'd like to thank the staff for all the hard work that they've done on this issue and for what it sounds like, the hard work that's still to come on this issue.

I do have some items that have to be entered in for the record from the Uniformed Firefighters Association, testimony from Steven Cassidy that will be submitted for the record.

Testimony also from the Allied
Building Inspectors Union, which will also be
submitted for the record, from Mr. Joseph Corzo
[phonetic] will be submitted for the record.
Testimony submitted by the Coalition for the
Homeless for Ms. Giselle Routhier. That will be
submitted also for the record.

As well as testimony from the Rent Stabilization Association who has testimony that will be submitted for the record. From SPONY,

2	testimony	for	the	record	from	Mr.	Christopher
---	-----------	-----	-----	--------	------	-----	-------------

3 Anthineos; that will be submitted for the record.

4 Is this all one package? As well as testimony for

5 the record from the Queens Civic Congress by their

6 President Patricia Dolan; that will be entered

7 into the record.

At this time, all legislative items

9 before the Housing and Buildings Committee are

10 | laid aside. That will conclude this hearing.

I, Donna Hintze certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signat	ure		Speak Lentre
_			
Date _	_July	8,	2011