CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

-----X

July 27, 2011 Start: 10:50 am Recess: 11:07 am

HELD AT: Committee Room

250 Broadway, 16th Fl.

B E F O R E:

GALE A. BREWER Acting Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Gale A. Brewer
Brad S. Lander
Stephen T. Levin
Ydanis A. Rodriguez

Ruben Wills

A P P E A R A N C E S

Patrick Markee Senior Policy Analyst Coalition for the Homeless

CHAIRPERSON BREWER: Good morning,
I'm Gale Brewer, City Council. I apologize for
being late. That's no excuse, except I'm helping
constituents all morning with all their frigging
problems. I'm delighted to be here and simply in
the absence of the very great Annabel Palma, who
is the real chair of this committee. While we're
waiting for more people to join us, I'm just going
to go through the Power Point and talk about this
hearing today.

Obviously, we're talking about a Resolution authorizing the Council to intervene or file an amicus brief in Chelsea Business and Property Owners' Association v. City of New York. The purpose is to defend provisions of the Administrative Code that limits the size of homeless shelters for adults to 200 persons.

On May 6, 2011, the Chelsea

Flatiron Coalition, known as CFC, filed a lawsuit challenging the construction of a 328-bed inpatient and outpatient drug, alcohol and mental health care facility and homeless shelter for the mentally ill at 127 West 25th Street. Among other things, CFC claims that the size of the proposed

2 shelter violates Local Law. Under th	2	shelter	violates	Local	Law.	Under	the
--	---	---------	----------	-------	------	-------	-----

Administrative Code, adult homeless shelters may
not exceed 200 beds. This Local Law was enacted
by the Council in 1998. I believe Speaker Vallone

6 was in charge then.

On July 8, 2011, the Corporation

Counsel filed a memorandum of law in opposition to
the petition. This memorandum argues that the
section of the Administrative Code is invalid
because it is preempted by New York State Law, and
in any event, the proposed 328-bed facility does
not violate the Administrative Code. This case is
currently pending the State Supreme Court.

As I said earlier, today the Preconsidered Resolution we are hearing would authorize the Council to intervene or file an amicus brief in Chelsea Business to defend the 1998 Local Law that limits the size of homeless shelters for adults to 200 people. We will hear testimony from the Coalition for the Homeless and the Legal Aid Society and any other interested individuals or parties who are present and who want to testify. Then the committee will vote on the Preconsidered Resolution.

So, at this point we'd like to ca.	11
to the podium Albert. Is that Albert? I can't	
read it. Mr. Foley and Patrick Markee from the	
Coalition. Please join us up at the podium. I	
just want to thank the staff of General Welfare.	
I'm sorry; just Patrick is coming up. What do I	
know? I'm just following instructions here. Bu	.t
then we'll have Mr. Foley.	

I just want to thank the staff of this amazing committee, because on a regular basis they brief us and they are so informed and they really add a lot to the people of the City of New York.

Thank you very much. Why don't you begin your testimony? I don't know what happened to the lights, but in any case go ahead. Thank you very much, sir.

PATRICK MARKEE: Hi, thank you. My name is Patrick Markee. I'm the senior policy analyst at Coalition for the Homeless. I submit this testimony on behalf of Coalition for the Homeless and of the Legal Aid Society. Josh Goldfein, Staff Attorney at Legal Aid sends his apologies; he wasn't able to join us today.

I've submitted written testimony,
and I won't read through the entire testimony.
I'll just summarize it here. We strongly support
the Preconsidered Resolution that would authorize
the City Council to intervene or file an amicus
brief in litigation involving the City's plans to
create homeless shelters in excess of 200 beds.

It's worth sort of considering the history here and the importance of the Local Law and the capacity limits that are enshrined in that law. When modern homelessness began in the early 1980s, the City of New York responded in a haphazard fashion by sheltering thousands of homeless men and women in very large warehousestyle, barrack-style shelter facilities. These included armories, former hospital buildings, and other large buildings.

The conditions in these shelters were positively deplorable. Many folks in the city will remember the horror stories that came out of the Fort Washington Armory, which had 1,000 beds across the armory drill floor. There were other armory shelters, which had hundreds and hundreds of beds, with men crowded next to each

other in cots that were only a few feet apart from each other. Communicable diseases spread throughout these shelter facilities. Incidence of violence and other threats of violence occurred on a frequent basis in these shelters.

It's worth also remembering who these shelters were meant to serve. Homeless single adults, the population of homeless single adults is characterized by having significant high rates of serious mental illness, other serious health problems. We're talking about individuals who are suffering some very serious conditions and disabilities, folks who need places where they can feel safe, places where they can get the care that they need.

At the time, in the 1980s, there were, in fact, capacity limits included in state regulations. State regulations limited the size of shelters for adults to no more than 200 beds. Unfortunately, the state government did not enforce those capacity limits on a systematic basis.

Advocates sued in the early 1990s to enforce those capacity limits, and as a result,

many of the largest and most notorious shelters, mostly in armories, were forced to downsize their capacity. The Fort Washington shelter downsized from 1,000 beds to 200 beds. The Sumner Avenue Armory in Bedford-Stuyvesant in Brooklyn downsized from 550 beds to 200 beds. That was, in fact, one of the many positive reforms that we saw happening in the early 1990s, responding to the terrible conditions and the health and safety hazards at those shelters.

At the same time, the Dinkins administration, following some moves by the Koch administration, had also begun to move in the direction of using smaller, more services-enriched shelters.

I think it's worth considering the recommendations that were made by the New York City Commission on the Homeless in the early 1990s. This was a commission that was chaired by our current governor, Andrew Cuomo. The Cuomo Commission, as it was called, recommended that the City, "end the use of large barrack-style shelters for homeless single adults." The commission agreed with "the Mayor's philosophy that smaller,

2 service-based facilities are preferable."

This was a time of real reforms and moving away from these dangerous warehouse-style facilities. The enforcement of the capacity limits, the litigation by advocates and the move by the city government towards smaller, services-enriched shelter was part of that very positive reform movement.

Notwithstanding that fact, the Giuliani administration, in the winter of '93 and '94, attempted to add some beds to the Sumner Avenue Armory in Bedford-Stuyvesant Brooklyn.

Again, the state courts ruled against the City when they tried to exceed the capacity limits of 200 beds. Then, in what was the most misguided move, the Giuliani administration asked the Pataki administration, former governor Pataki, to eliminate the state regulations on capacity limits, which Governor Pataki did in 1995.

As a result of that, and as a result of the fears that the city was moving backwards towards these larger warehouse-style shelters, once again the City Council acted, and acted in the right way. The Council passed a

Local Law that restored the capacity limits of
shelters to 200 beds. Folks who were in the city
at the time and were in the Council or working for
Council staff will recall that there were
significant disputes with the Giuliani
administration at the time over this legislation.
But at the end of the day, the Council and the
mayor, the former mayor, reached a negotiated
agreement That's the Local Law that we have now

Unfortunately, over the past year, the current administration has been again taking a step backwards, moving towards large warehousestyle facilities that would exceed 200 beds. We became aware last year of the plans to open a shelter with more than 200 beds in the Chelsea neighborhood of Manhattan. That shelter is the subject of the current litigation which this Resolution discusses.

Last fall, we also became aware that the city had begun to add 200 beds to the already 200-bed Pamoja House Shelter, which is located in the Sumner Avenue Armory in Bedford-Stuyvesant Brooklyn, which I've previously spoken about. In fact, the City continued with its

costly plans and did in fact install an additional
200 beds on the drill floor of that armory.
Fortunately, the city so far has not begun to use
those additional 200 beds. That is, we
understand, still part of the city's intentions.

That is why it is, one of the many reasons why it is absolutely essential that the City Council fight to protect the capacity limits that are enshrined in this law. It would be a huge step backwards to move away from the positive reforms that we saw 20 years ago to protect the health and safety of vulnerable homeless New Yorkers who reside in shelters for homeless adults. It would be a huge step backwards for surrounding communities which are impacted by these facilities. That is the reason that we strongly support the Resolution.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify, and I'm happy to take questions.

CHAIRPERSON BREWER: Patrick, thank you very much for your encyclopedic knowledge of this topic, and for testifying. I want to make sure that people know that Council Member Rodriguez, Council Member Wills, and Council

Member Lander have all joined us. I appreciate their participation. Are there any questions?

Brad, do you have any questions? No.

I do have one quick question. I obviously share your strong feelings. I think perhaps even 200 is too many. That would be my opinion. I think we want small shelters.

I know that on 108th Street where there's a Catholic church, there was to be a large one. They worked, as many people, Lisa and others from DHS know and it is now some 48. The church wants to buy the building. The church wants to make it permanent housing. It was the right size, it was the right mixture and it was the right community and that's what you need.

You don't need, despite Muzzy's efforts you don't need a large group of people who are not going to involve themselves productively in that kind of number. They're not going to bounce off each other with good signs and good, positive life changes, in my opinion, when you have that number of people. Of course that impacts the local neighborhood. So I couldn't agree with you more.

My quick question is do you think
that there is a possibility, working with DHS, to
make smaller shelters that would achieve the kind
of goals that we all want, which is self-
sufficiency and people employed and being
productive citizens of New York? How would you go
about that? Not too long an answer.

my answer in context, the Coalition for the

Homeless has been for 30 years the court-appointed

monitor under the terms of the consent decree in

Callahan v. Carey of shelters for homeless adults.

So I think we have a fairly thorough knowledge of

the shelter system as a whole.

The shelters for homeless adults that the City administers are now more than 50 facilities with around 9,000 beds. It's been our experience that the smaller shelters tend to have better services, better conditions, and better outcomes for the residents of those facilities.

I would agree with you that 200 is too many. Nevertheless, it is essential to protect these capacity limits. We, again, support the Resolution.

2 CHAIRPERSON BREWER: Council Member

3 Lander?

very much, Chair Brewer, and Mr. Markee thanks for being here. I just want to explore this just a little bit further. I appreciate you being here. I totally support your testimony and I'm glad that the Council is moving forward to try hard to prevent the administration from violating the law or obviating the law here. I think we both think that there are ways that we could be focused much more on permanent and supportive housing that would get the shelter count down.

But given where we are and the fact that we do need to build more shelter beds with what's going on, to provide shelter for people in New York, and that we have real concerns and frustrations on the hotel side, on the kind of shotgun leases that are getting signed in a lot of cases for quality and that we don't want really big shelters, do we need to do something to kind of have a more coherent plan for shelter siting so that we can building appropriate shelters, appropriately sized ones, appropriately located

ones? I wish we could use that energy to just focus on permanent supportive housing but we obviously are at a moment when we may need to be ratcheting capacity up. Is that something you guys have been giving further thought to?

patrick market: Let me just answer by saying that first of all, obviously, the city would not be expanding the size of the shelter system if it was, in fact, investing and utilizing the proven solutions that are available. That, of course, includes the use of permanently affordable housing, federal housing programs which are available and which should be used to move homeless families and individuals from shelter back into the community, investments in permanent supportive housing and all of that. I happen to agree with you strongly there.

I think it's worth remembering, just to put the answer in some sort of a recent historical context, since the economic crisis began a few years ago, the number of homeless single adults in the shelter system has risen quite dramatically, to levels that we haven't seen since the late 1980s.

Notwithstanding the crisis
conditions that the city faced, and its failure to
utilize affordable housing resources in a smart
way, the city has managed to build and site
shelters for homeless single adults without
exceeding the capacity limits, without violating
this Local Law. They've added more than 1,200
beds in the past couple of years.

These were under very difficult conditions. I understand there was concern and upset in some communities about that, but they did it without violating the law. There is no reason that they need to do it in a violation of the Local Law in this instance or in any other instance, including in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

I think there's certainly lots of things the city could do much better in terms of siting shelters. We would much rather see the city investing in the solutions that work and permanent supportive housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you very much. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BREWER: We've been joined by Council Member Steve Levin. Are there

2	any other questions?	Yes, go ahead, Council
3	Member Wills.	

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: Good
morning. Could you just give me a feeling on the
Mayor's ability to do an emergency declaration and
then from the emergency declaration get around
doing the public meetings, as far as sitings of
shelters and different things like that?

PATRICK MARKEE: I guess all I would say about that is there are certainly circumstances where the city does face what I think all of us would agree is a genuine emergency. The circumstances that existed in 2009-2010 in the wake of the economic crisis, I think in many instances qualified.

Also, it's important to remember too that the need for homeless single men and women tends to be much higher in the colder weather months of the year. So there's traditionally a seasonal increase in that population at that time of year. I think the city was forced to open some shelters on a very short-term basis in that period of time. We certainly were very concerned that the city had not planned,

2	particularly in 2008 and 2009 for what all of us
3	could have predicted would have been an increase.
4	I think there was some failure of planning, but
5	there was also historical economic circumstances
6	that contributed to that increase as well.
7	CHAIRPERSON BREWER: I also want to
8	thank Jennifer Gomez who is the general counsel;
9	Liz Hoffman, who is the policy analyst to the
LO	committee; Crystal Coston, the financial analyst;
11	and William Hongach, who is another policy analyst
12	for the Juvenile Justice Committee. As I said,
13	this entire staff is phenomenal regarding General
L4	Welfare.
15	So without further ado, we'd like
L6	to take a roll call on this intro, and I recommend
L7	a positive vote. Can you call the roll?
L8	Mr. Foley waived his right to
L9	testify, is that correct? Okay. Go right ahead
20	and call the roll. I thought you were going to
21	testify. Go ahead.
22	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: Jeffrey

Velazquez, Committee Clerk, General Welfare roll call vote. Excuse me. Committee Clerk roll call of Committee on General Welfare. Council Member

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 19
2	Brewer?
3	CHAIRPERSON BREWER: I vote aye.
4	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: Rodriguez?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: [off
6	mic] Aye.
7	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: Lander?
8	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Aye.
9	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: Levin?
10	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I vote aye
11	and I'd like to be added as a co-sponsor of the
12	bill.
13	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: Wills?
14	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: [off mic] I
15	vote aye.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I'd like to
17	be added as a co-sponsor as well, as long as we're
18	all chiming in.
19	CHAIRPERSON BREWER: Me too. And
20	Muzzy Rosenblatt should know better. Thank you
21	very much.
22	JEFFREY VELAZQUEZ: The affirmative
23	is five; zero in the negative and no abstentions.
24	All items have been adopted. Members, please sign
25	the committee reports. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BREWER: Thank you all

3 very much. This hearing is adjourned.

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.

Signature		Day	a dentro	
_			00.07	
Date	_August	5,	2011	