CT.I.A	COL	JNCTI	_	
CITY	OF	NEW	YORK	
				 X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES

----X

November 26, 2012 Start: 11:34 a.m. Recess: 12:52 p.m.

HELD AT:

250 Broadway

Hearing Room, 16th Floor

B E F O R E:

BRAD LANDER Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Rosie Mendez

Maria del Carmen Arroyo

Annabel Palma James F. Gennaro Diana Reyna

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

Le Dan Cai Linda's CAI Trading, Inc.

William Zou Attorney Linda's CAI Trading, Inc.

Jenny Fernandez Landmarks Preservation Commission

Gregory Shaw Attorney for Real Estate New York City School Construction Authority

Kenrick Ou Senior Director for Real Estate New York City School Construction Authority

CHAIRPERSON LANDER: All right,

we're ready to go. Good morning, hope everyone had a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday, lots to be thankful for this year, for sure. I am New York City Council Member Brad Lander, chair of the City Council's Land Use Subcommittee on Landmarks, Public Siting, and Maritime Uses. Very pleased to be joined this morning for our Monday morning post-Thanksgiving meeting by Council Members Rosie Mendez of Manhattan, Maria del Carmen Arroyo of the Bronx, Annabel Palma of the Bronx from the committee. And then joining us today, as our first item is in his district, Council Member Jim Gennaro from Queens, nice to have you with us.

work. We have items on the calendar today both on the Landmark side and on the Public Siting side, and we will begin on the Landmark side. We're picking back up Land Use number 720, application number 20135041, the Brinckerhoff Cemetery located at 69-65 to 69-73 182nd Street in Council Member Gennaro's district in Queens. We recessed the public hearing at our last meeting so that we could provide—make sure we were providing, go out

2	and gentlemen, honorable Councilwomen and the
3	Councilmen, I have heremy name is William Zou,
4	I'm an attorney, I represent the homeowner, Linda
5	CAI Trading, Inc. I have the principal, Ms. Le
6	Dan Cai, who is the homeowner and I'll let her
7	speak first, but she doesn't speak English so
8	she's going to speak in Chinese, and I happen to
9	be fluent in Chinese and in English, so I will
10	swear to translate to the truth and correct
11	translation.

LE DAN CAI: Good morning everybody. My name is Le Dan Cai, I'm a single mother, I've been in the United States for over ten years. I have American dream to have my own house in the United States. I'm also an American citizen.

I'm sitting here, this is the first time I'm appear in your public hearing. Regarding that property, I'm a victim, I want to tell you the whole story.

In about May 2010, I was referred by a friend--I'm sorry, I'm very upset whenever I think of that property.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER Take your time,

we're here to listen and please take the time you
need to tell your story.

LE DAN CAI: A friend of mine introduced to me a property, he told me there was a vacant offer for sale so I can build a house, I always wanted to have my own house. So after he give me the address, I went to visit the property, I went there a couple of times and I didn't see any problem.

So I talked to my family and the friends, they agreed to support me and we start negotiate a price and the price was good. So I was very happy, and I have my attorney also did a title search and nothing showed up it's a cemetery. If it's a cemetery, I won't buy it.

And I didn't know anything until
the closing. At the time of the closing, the
seller's attorney told me there were two lots and
one you can build on it, the other one is a
cemetery. He told me one lot is clean and you can
build on it, and the other lots, there might be
people buried underneath, but he wasn't sure
whether you can still build on it, so the price
was very attractive so I decided to buy it.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So after I bought it, I decided to
hire a architect to build a house on it. I hired
Kelvin Zou, who is a architect and then he started
to tell me a lot of stories about this property.
I asked Kelvin Zou to take care of everything and
however I didn't know what was going on and I
didn't know anything until I receive this letter,
then I couldn't find Kelvin Zou, so I decided to
hire attorney.

After I hired the attorney, I was told the landmark commission already designate it as a cemetery, but I didn't know about that and I really have no idea what's going on, but I really want to build a house. I hope everybody here can understand my situation and I really want to build a house and spend a lot of money already, so I hope you can support me, allow me to build a house.

I'm an American citizen, I also respect the American history. But as the property owner, I spend money on it and I hope you can give me a fair resolution.

Thank you everybody.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER Thank you.

24

25

24

25

2	First, I want to just say thank you very much for
3	coming today and presenting your testimony. You
4	know, one of the things that the City Council
5	tries to do is really listen. Sometimes we're
6	faced with challenging and hard decisions where,
7	you know, the full information isn't available.
8	And, anyway, I'm glad that the Council and I
9	appreciate the staff working hard to make sure
10	that you were able to come and testify and my
11	colleagues to be here to listen.
12	I'm going to turn it over to my
13	colleague, Council Member Gennaro, who is the
14	Council Member of the district and knows the site
15	and the story. But I do want to let you know that
16	we really appreciate your coming and
17	[Crosstalk]
18	WILLIAM ZOU: [Interposing] Yeah,
19	I'm sorry, I appreciate the committee allow her to
20	testify. Can I put in few thoughts as well?
21	CHAIRPERSON LANDER Yeah, you also
22	signed up to testify so you can

WILLIAM ZOU: Yes, yes.

separately as her lawyer. Council Member--

CHAIRPERSON LANDER --testify

2.

	WILLIAM	ZOU:	Yes
--	---------	------	-----

CHAIRPERSON LANDER --we'll let them [off mic], yeah, sir, go ahead.

WILLIAM ZOU: Yeah, I'm sorry to interrupt. Again, good morning, my name is William Zou, I'm an attorney in Flushing. I want to thank everybody here on behalf of the owner to allow the owner an opportunity to testify before this meeting and to explain herself regarding the process and the situation she got into.

As she testified earlier, she stepped into this without knowing anything about the landmark, without knowing anything about a cemetery, without knowing anything about the history of this property. And up to this juncture, she already spent about \$200,000, purchasing the lots, putting up with the plans, paying the broker's commission, so she has spend a lot of fortune to own this property. And all this were happened without knowing the history of this property.

So she's the victim and, as she testified, she hired Kelvin Zou, who is a architect, but she hasn't been able to explain

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 herself to this committee or to the LPC regarding 3 her situation.

Kelvin Zou, I was approached about less than a week ago and I tried to catch--get in contact with Kelvin Zou, but I couldn't reach him at all, so we came here without any preparation whatsoever, except that during the last week we did some research and we also approached the community, and I have handed over to you about a petition in opposition to the designation signed by 12 members of the neighborhoods. There are people living right on the same street as the property, 182nd Street, and there are people living around the block. And we got the signature within about two hours yesterday, we did not have the time to contact everybody and there was Thanksgiving weekend, so a lot of people are not at home. But still with this such short two hours, we were able to get 12 signatures in opposition to this designation.

So my point is, I don't believe the community has been hurt in opposition to this because Ms. Cai did not really--well she had the chance to present her opposition, but she was not

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

competently represented and she was not able to
present her opposition as well as the opposition
from the community.

And in addition to the people who signed the petition in opposition, we also talked to some neighbors, talked to some members and some of them, they bought their own property without knowing this is a cemetery, they regret it because the property has been abandoned over probably two centuries. It doesn't look like a cemetery, it didn't look like a cemetery, a lot of people bought the people around the cemetery without knowing it's a cemetery. So they regret it. the proponents for this designation also did a very good campaign, they send e-mails and they send out letters and some of the neighbors, they're not willing to sign the petition opposition, but they expressed definitely expressed their concerns in opposition.

I know the committee probably did a lot of research regarding this property, so I want share some stories with the committee as well. This property consisted of two lots, one is in the front, it's about 100×24 . It seems to be based

on the report prepared by the LPC, it's clean, was
never been used as a cemetery before, was never
been used as burial grounds before. That's
attached to the report prepared by LDC, I think
that's the 1919 survey prepared by the City, it
shows two lots and the cemetery is in the back,

not in the front.

So the homeowner is willing to compromise and we can--we're willing to separate these two lots and so the front, which is not a burial ground, has never been used as a burial grounds, can be build on so she can have her own house with her daughter. And the back can be, I mean, designated a landmark cemetery. I mean, we came from--the owner came from a culture, a Chinese culture, which respects their ancestor, respect the elders. She still lives with her elderly mother, taking care of her mother. We respect the people who were buried underground, so we're willing to compromise and we're willing to do what necessary to designate this, but not the whole two lots, just one.

And the other thing I want to put on the record is this two lots has always been

owned by private owners. It was first owned by
the Brinckerhoff family and then sold by
themselves without noting portion of them were
cemeteries, they didn't... So with all the respect
to the Brinckerhoff family, I mean, they sold this
property. And then the property was transferred
to private owners and at a certain juncture, the
property owner did not pay real property taxes,
and the City even foreclosed this property because
of a tax lien. And then the prior owner acquired
this property through a public auction. And right
now, there are still real property taxes attached
to this--imposed upon this property. So there's
no way knowing this is a burial grounds or
cemetery.

And also there's no visible evidence, there's no tombstones, there was no graves, there was no aboveground, any evidence whatsoever showing this used to be a burial grounds or used to be a cemetery. So, I mean, Ms. Cai's attorney did a title search and the title search shows clean, the building department did not show it's a cemetery, the Department of Finance did not show it's a cemetery, and the--all

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the city records shows not as a cemetery or a

burial grounds. And all this information led her

to make the decision to buy it.

And the other thing I want on the record is, it seems to me the commission in support of the designation, there was no thorough investigation, the only thing they did is based on prior written records, written reports, generals magazines. The evidence they strongly relied upon is the 1919 survey prepared over 100 years ago, over a century ago. And even according to the survey, you can look at the survey, this survey does--I mean, shows 76 tombstones or markers showing this as a burial grounds. However, there is no measurements, there's no size, how big is the burial grounds. I mean, their reports says it's a part of 54 acres, the reports says this burial grounds was as large as one acre and a half, I mean, that's on the LPC official report. CHAIRPERSON LANDER Go ahead and continue, just I think if you can--I really--

CHAIRPERSON LANDER --appreciate your testimony, we've--I've given you a lot more

WILLIAM ZOU: Yeah.

about 100 x 100. So part of the cemetery, I mean,
one half of the cemetery were developed upon
already.

So we are asking the committee to balance the public interest to designate the landmark with the interest of the private owner who has spent about \$200,000 in this property and her 5th Amendment rights, her 14th Amendment rights, and to balance this.

And lastly, but not least, with all respect to the preserve the American history and also the heritage, the Brinckerhoff family is very famous, they're very large. I research a little bit, there are numerous books about them, and they have hundreds of thousands of dissidents all over the country, they mainly constitute Ohio and also upstate New York, Fishkill, Duchess County, and even within New York City, we have First Union Church, first Dutch church in Brooklyn to, I mean, to respect them. So I think there are plenty of other ways to worship them, to respect them to preserve the heritage at this age, and I ask your committee to balance the interests of the public and also the interests of the individual and

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 18						
2	[Crosstalk]						
3	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:to your						
4	client.						
5	WILLIAM ZOU: Sure, sure.						
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Would that						
7	beso maybe you can just give her the gist of						
8	what I said so far and then						
9	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.						
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:we'll do						
11	it that way.						
12	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay. I'm sorry.						
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Sure. And						
14	thank you for providing that translation.						
15	WILLIAM ZOU: Sure. It's						
16	Councilman Gennaro, right?						
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Yes.						
18	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.						
19	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And so						
20	WILLIAM ZOU: [Interposing] Well						
21	she responded, she said why not.						
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Right,						
23	but						
24	FEMALE VOICE: That's not a						
25	response						

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 19
2	[Crosstalk]
3	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Right, so-
4	_
5	WILLIAM ZOU: Right.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:yeah,
7	please advise her that, you know, this is not
8	colloquy, this is not a
9	WILLIAM ZOU: Right, right, right.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:
11	discussion, I'm making a statement.
12	WILLIAM ZOU: Yes, I stop her
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Okay.
14	WILLIAM ZOU:and ask her to
15	wait
16	[Crosstalk]
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Sure.
18	[Crosstalk]
19	WILLIAM ZOU:you finish.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Sure. And
21	you have stated that your client during this whole
22	proceeding has not been competently represented.
23	And that, very tragically, is a problem for your
24	client, but not really a problem for the LPC or
25	for this Council, and there are other avenues that

you can pursue. Why don't you do that, then I'll continue? And I am not an attorney, but I would think that, you know, the current attorney that you have now can perhaps pursue some kind of proceeding against the entity that did the title search that gave your client advice. And also there is a procedure by which you can petition the LPC to seek to build a home if you can, you know, positively determine that there were no interments on this—on one of the lots. That has not been established to the, you know, LPC's satisfaction. I'm saying a lot here, so why don't you just tell her that, then I'll keep going.

WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.

where we are. The LPC absolutely believes that there have been interments on both of these lots. This is what has been represented to us, this--by the LPC, by people within the local community who have been tracking the history of this site for hundreds of years. And we are going to act based on the information that has been provided to us by the local community activists and by the LPC, who have done a lot of due diligence on the action and

24

25

2 their designation. Now if you--okay, go ahead.

So if your client wishes to pursue 3 4 an action with the LPC to represent to the LPC 5 both your belief that there are no interments in one of the lots and also if you want to do what is 6 known as a hardship proceeding, these are avenues that are open to your client. Those proceedings 9 may ultimately be, you know, good money after bad, 10 but I don't represent your client, that would be 11 for you or whomever represents your client to, you 12 know, make that determination whether that makes 13 sense to try to determine conclusively that there 14 are no interments in one part of the property. 15 But the LPC believes that there have been burials 16 on both sides of the property and this is their 17 finding and this is what I am--and this is their finding, which has, you know, led them to landmark 18 19 this property and I am in support of that 20 designation. And why don't you just say that, 21 then I'll conclude? 22 WILLIAM ZOU: All right.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And I guess, for the purposes of your client, we are forced to--or compelled to act on the evidence

that has been brought forth, you know, by the due diligence of the LPC and the people who have been students of this site for so many years. And as one who represents the area, I have no choice other than to support the facts presented. I do that with a sorrow for your client who has spent much money and has not been represented well, but—and the only thing that I think that I can offer, although I don't speak for the committee or anyone else, that your client, you know, has the ability to, you know, take some kind of legal action against the people who served her very poorly, and so that is one avenue.

And the other avenue is to, you know, try to continue to work with the LPC to do some kind of hardship proceeding and do, you know, some kind of analysis that can determine conclusively to the LPC that there are no bodies buried on one part of the property and then, you know, perhaps—and I have no idea if it's worth the money to do that kind of analysis or whether it would hold water with the LPC, but, you know, these are the avenues that, I guess, you know, out of compassion and sympathy, I'm kind of, you know,

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 compelled to offer.

But in terms of, you know, this committee ratifying what the LPC has done, it is going to be my recommendation to the chairman that that's what happens here today. And I do that with, you know, sadness for your client. It's not a happy thing to hear that someone who has, you know, spent a lot of hard-earned money and has not been represented well in the legal process. you know, like I said, there are avenues where, you know, she can proceed against the people who, you know, did not serve her well. And, again, I'm not an attorney, but people can take action against people who don't do their jobs well and don't make proper representations to them. there's that avenue, and then there is, you know, continued interaction with the LPC based on what I said, if she or anyone advising her thinks that that is a good expenditure of money.

WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And, you know, that will conclude my statement, and I thank the chairman for his indulgence and I would recommend to the chairman and to the committee

Τ	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 2
2	that this be approved.
3	CHAIRPERSON LANDER Thank you very
4	much, Council Member. Do you want to summarize
5	for
6	WILLIAM ZOU: [Interposing] Can I
7	translate?
8	CHAIRPERSON LANDERMs. Cai, yes,
9	please.
10	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay. Yeah, thanks.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANDER Thank you. So
12	I'm going to say a thing or two and then Council
13	Member Arroyo has a couple of questions. I know
14	some issues have been raised that I think it
15	probably is helpful for us to get some response
16	from the LPC on. One possibility would be for us
17	to maybe get some of those things in writing,
18	rather than a dokind of keep going back and
19	forth today, but to follow up with the LPC on
20	these questions of a little more information on
21	the evidence of where the graves are and what
22	information, which I know some of it is in the
23	designation report, but it'd be helpful to
24	include.
25	And one thing that's not in the

2 designation report that I'm just doing a little online looking at here is a little more of the 3 history of the calendaring public review and 4 5 designation process because, obviously, part of the issue that I think would be helpful is in the 6 public record is an understanding of the consideration over time. I mean, I'm just 9 looking, I just pulled up a November 2000 Queens 10 Times Ledger news article which reports on the 11 public hearing which took place and makes clear 12 that the prior owner was quite aware of the 13 calendaring of the process of a extensive debate 14 in the community that makes me believe that, you 15 know, that owner or the attorney, Ms. Cai's 16 attorneys, the title company had every ability and 17 reason to be aware, but I think if we could just be a little more clear that it's in the 18 19 designation report about some of the--just a 20 little history of the calendaring and designation, 21 that'd it give us--those two things at least would 22 give us the, I think, the information that we need 23 to put on the public record and have as part of 24 the hearing. So I want to--I think that'll mean 25 that we wind up laying this item over because, I

2 don't know that you can have them for us by
3 tomorrow, but--

[Off mic]

CHAIRPERSON LANDER --but I think that would help us a lot in the--and we have a little more time, I think, on this item before we are obligated to vote. So rather than do that back and forth today, let me go ahead and ask that the LPC provide us with that information which we can then share and so--

[background noise]

CHAIRPERSON LANDER So now you're effectively become part of the hearing, yeah, well, for the record, you know, I'll identify Jenny Fernandez from the Landmarks Preservation Commission, but the council—the chair is asking that the commission provide in writing some additional information on the public process that took place, the dates of the calendaring and a little more—some of it's in a footnote I saw in the designation report, but a little more information on the public review process that took place back prior to 2000 and in 2000, when this was first calendared so we have that on the record

that there'll be a chance to respond, this is the

25

way a public, you know, hearing works, people come and testify and then we sometimes ask follow up questions of the agency, but the hearing, we're going to close the hearing after today. We can make sure that you get a copy to be sure, and if you choose to write a follow up letter, that's, of course, something that you can write a follow up letter and that can be part of the public record as well, but we won't have any further public hearing after we close today's public hearing.

WILLIAM ZOU: I understand.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER Yeah, and I'll just--just to--one more thing, so, you know, we had closed the public hearing, we reopened it to make this opportunity for you to testify, so then I'll be reclosing the public hearing today, but when we get that in writing, we'll make sure it gets to you, and, of course, you have the right to write and to provide written communication subsequent to receiving that letter.

WILLIAM ZOU: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER So if you want to go ahead and summarize and translate, and then I'll call on Council Member Arroyo.

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 29
2	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay. Mr. Chair, I
3	have finished the translation, but she would like
4	to summarize.
5	CHAIRPERSON LANDER Let me have
6	Council Member Arroyo ask her question
7	WILLIAM ZOU: Oh, okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON LANDERand then in
9	the context
10	WILLIAM ZOU: Sure.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANDERof asking
12	thatanswering the question, there'll be
13	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON LANDERopportunity
15	to respond.
16	WILLIAM ZOU: Sure, sure.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Good
18	morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning and
19	thank you for being here and, Ms. Cai, for your
20	testimony.
21	WILLIAM ZOU: Good morning.
22	LE DAN CAI: Good morning. Thank
23	you, thank you, thank you for your comment.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: I have two
25	questions.

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 30
2	LE DAN CAI: Okay.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: What
4	happens if we do not designate, what's your
5	intention?
6	LE DAN CAI: I'll build a house
7	belong to myself and move in with my kid.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: And what
9	happens to the remains that are on the property?
10	LE DAN CAI: Yeah, I'll respect
11	them and then put them in the back. There are two
12	lots, so one in the front, there is, based on her
13	knowledge, there is no remains, and then there is
14	a lot behind it that used to be.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Have you
16	had thismade this proposal to the Landmarks
17	Commission? And if you did, what was the
18	response?
19	LE DAN CAI: Well I was represented
20	by Kelvin Zou in the earlier proceeding, I did not
21	have any information regarding what's going on. I
22	bought this property to build a house and if there
23	are remains buried underground, I will put a
24	monument or whatever necessary in the back to
25	worship them.

2.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay. So
the Landmarks Commission has not had an
opportunity to hear that proposal.

LE DAN CAI: I don't know, I've been trying to reach Kelvin Zou for weeks, but couldn't get a hold of him, so I don't know whether he conveyed that to the LPC.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: And, Mr.

Chair, I guess the question then for the Landmarks

Commission is what options are available to the

property owner under a designation that will

enable her to realize the dream that she has

articulated while preserving the historic

significance of the property.

extend the request to the LPC, first to make comments to the extent that they're able to on this question of the two lots and what information they have about whether they concur that there is this division or not. And in light of that, how that would relate to their standard process of reviewing a hardship application or, you know, any other kind of application that the owner might bring to the LPC if--

2.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	Γ	Cr	0	SS	st	a:	lk	c 1	
	L	\sim \pm	\sim	\sim		<u> </u>			

3 LE DAN CAI: I hope--

4 CHAIRPERSON LANDER [Interposing]

5 Just if I can clarify first--

WILLIAM ZOU: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER --'cause I

think, Council Member, there's really two different questions being asked and one is about actually our action to only--you know, the LPC is asking us to as designating, you know, as voted in favor of the designation of both of these two lots and is asking us to do the same. They are not proposing that we designate one and not the other, though that is something that's within our powers. There's a separate question about if we designate both of them, how the LPC would look on an application that would propose to build on a piece of the site, but which the owner would represent was not cemetery, does not contain remains. the former is not really fair to ask them to comment on the latter, you know, if we, you know, we could do what we want to, what we choose to do. No? I mean, we can ask them what we want to... So but I guess let me just--if the LPC can respond to

this issue of where they believe that the graves and the remains are located and what possibilities that would provide for development on some piece of the lot, that would be helpful in our deliberations.

WILLIAM ZOU: Thank you very much.

LE DAN CAI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER All right, thank you very much again for taking the time to testify, I think you can hear from the seriousness with which all of the Council Members are asking their questions that we, you know, that we hear the public--you know, the representations by many members of the community who testified last time and who testified in the past about their desire for the preservation of this site, but we are also moved by and trying to take into real consideration your situation and your story. And we thank you for taking your time to come and testify to us.

WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER So and with that, we're going to go ahead and close this hearing with thanks to you, and we'll close the

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 34
2	public hearing at this time.
3	LE DAN CAI: Can I speak?
4	CHAIRPERSON LANDER We've taken a
5	lot of time now
6	LE DAN CAI: Yeah.
7	CHAIRPERSON LANDERback and
8	forth and I want to say a big thank you, but we're
9	going to go ahead and
10	WILLIAM ZOU: Yeah.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANDERclose the
12	public hearing, we have other items on the
13	WILLIAM ZOU: Sure.
14	LE DAN CAI: Yeah, okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON LANDERagenda and
16	you can continue to communicate with us in writing
17	and by letter
18	WILLIAM ZOU: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON LANDERas well to
20	me, to the Speaker
21	WILLIAM ZOU: All right.
22	CHAIRPERSON LANDERto the
23	Council and we'll continue to
24	[Crosstalk]
25	WILLIAM ZOU: [Interposing] Okay.

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 36
2	[Crosstalk]
3	GREGORY SHAW: [Interposing] Thank
4	you. The first one that I
5	CHAIRPERSON LANDER [Interposing]
6	Please, even though we know you well, please
7	GREGORY SHAW: Yes, I
8	CHAIRPERSON LANDERgo ahead and-
9	_
10	[Crosstalk]
11	GREGORY SHAW:I will. No
12	problem.
13	CHAIRPERSON LANDERyourself for
14	the record.
15	GREGORY SHAW: Good afternoon,
16	Chairperson Lander, and Council Members, my name
17	is Gregory Shaw, I am principal attorney for real
18	estate from the New York City School Construction
19	Authority, and to my immediate left is, of course,
20	Kenrick Ou, Senior Director for Real Estate for
21	the New York City School Construction Authority.
22	I wasn't sure, Chairperson Lander,
23	which site you want me to talk about first,
24	testify to.
25	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Just Land Use

The project site contains a total of approximately 48,000 square feet of lot area. The site is currently leased by the Verizon Communications repair and installation maintenance facility and contains surface parking and a 10,800 square foot building.

Would acquire the property and demolish the existing structures and construct the new 800-seat primary school facility. A Phase 1 environmental site assessment and Phase 2 environmental site investigation were conducted at the site. A soil, vapor, and active sub-slab depressurization system will be installed in the new school building and two-foot layer of environmentally clean fill will be installed in the areas where soil is exposed within school site.

The notice of filing for the site plan was published in the New York Post and the City Record on May 4th, 2010. Queens Community Board number--excuse me, number 4 was also notified of the site plan on that date and was asked to hold a public hearing. Community Board number 4 held its public hearing for the site plan

on June 1st, 2010, and submitted written comments in favor of the proposed site plan. The City Planning Commission was also notified of the site plan on May 4th, 2010, and it also recommended in favor of the site.

The SCA has considered all comments received under the proposed site plan and affirms the site pursuant to Section 1731 of the Public Authority's law. In accordance with Section 1732 of the Public Authority's law, the SA submitted the proposed site plan to the Mayor and the City Council on November 15th, 2012.

We look forward to your

Subcommittee's favorable consideration of the

proposed site plan and we are prepared to answer

any questions that the committee may have

regarding this proposal.

much. I'll note for my colleagues that we do have the minutes of Community Board 4 in Queens and their approval of the project. And it's located in Council Member Dromm's district and I'm informed that he is in support of this application as well. Any questions from members of the

committee? All right, seeing none, we'll close the public hearing on that item and move on to--they're still lost in thought in the Brinckerhoff cemetery--and we'll move on to Land Use number 728, which I believe you're calling PS 320 in б Queens. I believe this is located in Council Member Reyna's district, and we're delighted to have her here with us. So please go ahead and present it to us.

thanks, Chairperson Lander and Council Members.

The New York City School Construction Authority
has undertaken the site selection process for the
proposed 472-seat primary school facility that
would be located in tax block 3425, lot 7, located
at the southwest corner of Seneca Avenue between

Dekalb Avenue and Stockholm Street in the
Ridgewood section of Queens. The proposed site-school site is also located in Community School
District number 24 and Queens Community Board
number 5.

The project site contains a vacant former parochial school two-story building. The site has a total of approximately 20,000 square

feet of lot area. Under the proposed plan, SA

would acquire the property and demolish the

existing school and construct a new 472-seat

primary school facility. The SCA is currently

under contract with the owners of the school and,

upon receiving our necessary approvals, will go to

close on this property.

A Phase 1 environmental site assessment and a Phase 2 environmental site investigation were conducted at the site. The Phase 2 determined that no hazardous materials will impact the project site. A soil vapor barrier will be installed as a preventative measure beneath the foundation of the new school building. All soil removed from the site will be properly disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and city regulations.

The notice of filing for the site plan was published in the New York Post and City Record on March 20th, 2012. Queens Community Board number 5 was also notified of the site plan on that date and was asked to hold a public hearing on the proposed site plan. Community Board number 5 held a public hearing for the site

plan on April 12th--excuse me, April 10th, 2012, and submitted written comments in favor of the proposed site plan. The City Planning Commission was also noted the site plan on March 20th, 2012,

and it also recommended in favor of the site.

The SCA has considered all comments received on the proposed site plan and affirms it, pursuant to Section 1731 of the Public Authority's law in accordance with Section 1732 of the Public Authority's law, the SCA submitted the proposed site plan to the Mayor and City Council on November 15th, 2012. We, again, look forward to your Subcommittee's favorable consideration of the proposed site plan and we are now prepared to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Thank you very much. Let me turn it over to Council Member Reyna.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to take a moment to truly thank Lorraine Grillo for her enormous effort in trying to make certain that we wouldn't lose this property in your portfolio. This has

been something that I have been calling for for

quite some time and it's finally here before the

end of my term.

I do want to just address some of the concerns that were raised by Community Board 5 in which they had certain provisions associated to their voting, despite the fact that there was 37 members in favor and no opposition, there was an effort in requesting the precaution—that precaution be taken during demolition and construction of the proposed new school for minimum adverse impact to the students of neighboring PS 305, located right across the street on the Stockholm Street side. So there will be an elementary school right beside this particular school site.

The issue of whether or not--and

I'm not too certain if this has been determined to

the fullest extent--will the school proposed be

only for elementary or will there be a

consideration for further review of a middle

school--excuse me--of a middle school facility.

Having already built within the last decade a

brand new pre-K to second grade school facility at

3

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to your second

A building is being designed to serve grades V

4 building is being designed to serve grades K

5 through 5. I understand that our colleagues at

6 | the Department of Education's Office of Portfolio

question about the use of the building, the

7 Management have been hearing different ideas as to

8 how that building might be best used, whether that

9 would be a brand new organization, whether it

10 would be a building that would then be one of two

buildings used by the existing PS 305 community, I

don't think the decision has yet been made--

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Okay.

KENRICK OU: --on that point, but that typically happens, I think, within the year or so before the new building is ready for occupancy. So based on our current schedule, we anticipate this building being open in September 2015. So in, you know, the planning cycle for the Department of Education that year before school opening, I think is when they will continue to work with the CEC and also review the available data to propose the--what they believe will be the most effective use of that building to address the overcrowding.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And as far
as the zoning boundaries, will those zoning
boundaries be affiliated to that similar of what
was currently instituted for PS 305? There has
been certain amendments that have been made upon
request from the community as well as my office
and I just wanted to ensure that those boundaries
continue to be in effect for this new site

KENRICK OU: I cannot speak to the specifics of the zoning situation because that really is managed by the Department of Education with approval from the CEC. So the process of—and as I understand it, PS 305 used to share a zone with PS 81 and then there were some concerns about how the graduating—well to—be third graders coming out of PS 305 would be accommodated—

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

[Interposing] Are going back.

KENRICK OU: --at PS 81. So I think you probably know more about the specifics of that process better than I do, but, again, the rezoning process is one that the Department of Education cannot undertake unilaterally, it is something that would have to be proposed and if

back to what would be school districts, but those particular boundaries were never changed to reflect that. And therefore, most recently, that was taken a closer look at was accommodated and the issue of overcrowding persists at PS 81, so the measure of trying to reduce the overcrowding at 81 was never achieved.

21

22

23

24

25

Therefore, we don't want to repeat those same mistakes, we want to make sure that we're flagging this and making sure that we're tracking what would be the reduction of overcrowding at PS 81 because of new schools in the pipeline. In addition to that, making sure that we're accommodating what would be the need for the middle school once PS 305 has graduated its third graders or second graders, I fail to remember right now, up to what age. The need for those students to go back to PS 81 defeats the purpose of a new school building and so we have to make sure that we're taking that into account.

Right now, at PS 81, the hope and understanding and request to the SCA is that as we move towards opening this new school building at the Seneca Street--sorry, Seneca Avenue site for 2015, we want to make sure that there is a removal of the trailers at PS 81. And so I don't know if those discussions have begun. If you happen to know further information as to the parallel timeline for deconstructing what would be the mobiles, mobile trailers, while constructing the new school, hence, on the first day of school for

б

September 2015, we will have achieved a very

triaged form of providing the quality education

that was promised to school district 24.

KENRICK OU: And I think that's absolutely aligned with what the Department of Education and the SCA are trying to do by bringing this 472-seat building online in Ridgewood, this is all part of the capital plan, which has one of its goals to reduce the reliance upon and actually remove transportables.

With respect to the question about the timing of and the coordination of--'cause really, there are going to be three buildings involved--PS 81, PS 305's building, and this new building--that really gets down to the nitty gritty of the planning cycle that the Department of Education would undertake in that year prior to the new buildings opening.

I can tell you, I will certainly bring, you know, these concerns back to the Department of Education so they--I think they've heard this before, but that they are--it is placed again at the forefront of the consideration of this area and how this new building could be used

2	the community board's feelings really areand
3	thoughts are really in-line with what we saw when
4	we looked at the existing parochial school
5	building, that that building could not meet those
6	kinds of requirements. So that's why we're
7	proposing to demolish that two-story parochial
8	school building, which basically is only a
9	classroom building with a basement cafeteria
10	space, and replace it with, you know, a four-story
11	school building which will have, in the case of
12	the youngest students, bathrooms in the
13	classrooms, as well as for the older students, you
14	know, hallway bathrooms placed on each floor, as
15	well as an assembly space, what we call a combined
16	gymnasium auditorium that can serve both
17	functions. I think, as I understand it, some of
18	these concerns came from PS 305, which was
19	designed not so much to be a full primary school
20	building, but really to be what was a model that
21	we no longer pursue, which was the early childhood
22	model where, in lieu of providing the larger
23	gymnasium auditorium type space, smaller play
24	rooms, which were considered at the time to be
25	age-appropriate were provided. So I think that

this, and I don't want to lose members and then
we'll lose a vote for today, I want to just
continue these discussions because we need to make
sure that we're going to do this right now that
we've gotten to this point, and the need for a K
through 8, those kids graduating after the fifth
grade don't just stop going to school, they have
to be accommodated, and so the need will shift
from being a primary school to then an
intermediate school and then we won't have the
space to accommodate it. And so this is a very
low density community, if we're going to build it
from scratch, it should take that into account,
and there's very little land. And school district
24, as a whole, is one of the school districts
that's highly populated in theregarded as one of
the highly in demand for seats. So I just want to
make sure that we're not losing the opportunity
and that we continue the discussions of not just a
K through 5, but a K through 8 to accommodate the
overcrowding overall in school district 24.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Could I just maybe make a suggestion in this regard 'cause

2	we've had this dialogue, before I had it in one of
3	my schools, other members have had it, and I know
4	one thing that eitherI forget whether it's the
5	department or the SCA has been wiling to provide,
6	especially where, you know, by then there'll be a
7	new administration, there'll be a new Council
8	Member, but a letter just memorializing what you
9	said here, which is that, you know, you continue
10	to look at the demographic projections and that as
11	September 2015 approaches, there will be a
12	dialogue with the community and the Council about
13	the appropriate, you know, most appropriate
14	[Crosstalk]

[Crosstalk]

KENRICK OU: [Interposing] Right,

16 and--

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LANDER: -- of the

18 space--

[Crosstalk]

KENRICK OU: --and I think we absolutely will talk to that, that is a letter that we will ask the Department of Education to prepare because they actually do manage that process of the portfolio planning and the rezoning proposal issues that we've discussed.

CHAIRPERSON LANDER: That will be
great, just and then there's an invitation to that
conversation to it continuing it over time.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Absolutely.

And this is going to include—the memorializing includes what would be is there going to be a playground in the—I didn't get to ask any of that information.

KENRICK OU: Yes, there will be a grade level playground, basically at a high level. The new building will be located approximately in the same location as the current parochial school building, only it will be taller and the footprint will be slightly larger, but that area which was formerly used as a parking lot by the parochial school will in fact be improved with a playground.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And no green roof opportunity or you will build it so that it has the capacity for future--

KENRICK OU: [Interposing] I think, in light of how compact this building footprint is and the rooftop mechanical equipment that is being provided, I think we've discussed this on some of the other very, very small sites, it's not

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 56
2	practical to meet all of the requirements in terms
3	of access safety and accessibility to actually
4	create a green roof space on this building.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Okay. And
6	all right, well I look forward to contacting you
7	offline. And I thank and send my regards to
8	Lorraine Grillo for making this finally happen.
9	KENRICK OU: We will do that
10	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you.
11	KENRICK OU:thank you.
12	GREGORY SHAW: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Thank you,
14	Council Member, and I apologize
15	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON LANDER:for rushing
17	you along, though we want to be able to vote this
18	before we
19	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:
20	[Interposing] Cemetery took all the time.
21	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Yes, I think
22	what we learned is that public schools are less
23	controversial than burial grounds, and we're
24	learning that in these committee. So
25	[Off mic]

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 58
2	everyone at the SCA, but that you do on behalf of
3	the school kids and our constituents and your
4	patience with us as we ask a lot of questions
5	about how we make sure those schools get built in
6	the best way possible. So thank you very much on
7	behalf of the
8	[Crosstalk]
9	GREGORY SHAW: [Interposing] Thank
10	you, thank you very much.
11	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: All right, and
12	now we will move forward to vote on the two items.
13	We are laying over Land Use number 720 and moving
14	to vote on Land Use numbers 727 and 728.
15	FEMALE VOICE: Do you have a
16	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: [Interposing]
17	The chair recommends a vote of aye on both of
18	these items.
19	FEMALE VOICE: Chair Lander.
20	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Aye on both.
21	FEMALE VOICE: Council Member
22	Palma.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER PALMA: Aye.
24	FEMALE VOICE: Council Member
25	Arroyo.

1	LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING, AND MARITIME USES 59
2	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Aye.
3	FEMALE VOICE: Council Member
4	Mendez.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Aye.
6	FEMALE VOICE: By a vote of four in
7	the affirmative, zero in the negative, and zero
8	abstentions, the aforementioned items are hereby
9	adopted.
10	CHAIRPERSON LANDER: Thank you very
11	much, thank you to Gail Benjamin and thanks to
12	everyone for their patience today. This meeting
13	is adjourned.

I, Tammy Wittman, 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 Tammphattman

Date _December 10, 2012_