CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

OCTOBER 20, 2015 Start: 10:10 A.M. Recess: 11:23 A.M.

HELD AT: 250 BROADWAY - COMMITTEE RM, 16TH FL

B E F O R E: DONOVAN RICHARDS

CHAIRPERSON

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

DANIEL GARODNICK
VINCENT GENTILE
ANTONIO REYNOSO
JUMAANE WILLIAMS

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

DEBORAH ROSE COUNCIL MEMBER

DAVID GREENFIELD COUNCIL MEMBER

TOM MCKNIGHT
NEW YORK CITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION

RICHARD MARIN
THE NEW YORK WHEEL

JORDAN MOST HAMILTON PLAZA ASSOCIATES

MICHAEL HARWOD ST. GEORGE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

All righty, good morning, so good morning
all righty and I want to start by saying Council
Member Antonio Reynoso gets the green star today, is
it green star or gold star? Gold star, sorry
environmental friendly star for getting here first
today and I will ask my colleagues to have a sit we
are ready to begin. Good morning I am Council Member
Donovan Richards, Chair of the Subcommittee on Zoning
and Franchises and today we are joined by the
following Council Members: Council Member Dan
Garodnick, Council Member Vince Gentile, Council
Member Antonio Reynoso, our Chair of Land Use as
well, Council Member Greenfield and also Council
Member Rose who has an item on the agenda today.
Today we'll be, we will be holding a public hearing
and voting on 2 items. L.U. No. 288, a modification
of a previously approved special permit and L.U. No.
289 a modification to a previously approved
restrictive declaration. I will now open the public
hearing for L.U. No. 288 a special permit,
application to allow for the development of
observation wheel accessory terminal building and
parking garage located in Community district 1 of

Staten Island which is in Council Member Debbie Rosie

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

AND FRANCHISES

district. And since she is here, I will call on

3 Council Member Rose to make a statement on this

4 issue.

1

2

5

25

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you Chair

6 Richards and good morning. Good morning to the Chair

7 and members of the Subcommittee on Zoning and

8 Franchises, I want to thank Rich Marin of the New

9 York Wheel and Tom McKnight from the City's Economic

10 Development Corporation for being here to inform

11 members of the Subcommittee about the changes in the

12 | plan for the New York Wheel. I understand that many

13 of these changes have been driven by Geo Technical

14 analysis that found that the soil beneath the

15 | northwest corner of site where piles would have been

16 placed for the proposed parking garage is unsuitable

17 | for foundation placement. This reduced the overall

18 | blueprint for the site leading a, leading to several

19 scale modifications that are before this Subcommittee

20 today. While these changes have given some initial

21 | challenges, they have also presented us with the

22 | opportunity to revisit the impact that this project

23 | will have on my district, on all of Staten Island and

24 on the City as a whole. Throughout this process we

have all maintained a positive working relationship

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 5
2	of mutual respect the benefit of all Staten Islander
3	and for for that I am very appreciative. I am
4	especially appreciative to St. George Civic
5	Association who's input has proven to be invaluable.
6	The approval process for these modification has
7	through and necessarily so, though I've also been a
8	strong proponent of economic development and the
9	possibilities that the New York Wheel could bring to
10	Staten Island. My focus has been on coming to an
11	agreement that includes amenities that will benefits
12	the surrounding communities and upland neighborhood
13	as well. That balance has been foremost in my mind
14	through every step of the review and oversight
15	process. As these modification work their way
16	through the community board where they were approved
17	29 to 4 through the oversight of the Borough
18	President and through City Planning Commission, whic
19	approved them unanimously. I've been in conversation
20	with the developers and with the administration to
21	ensure that these changes do not adversely impact
22	Staten Islanders. And because of this process and
23	these conversations I can now say that we have
24	reached a point where I can give the modification my

support. All of the points of agreement that I

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

AND FRANCHISES

fought for in 2013 (inaudible 5:26) are positively reflected in these changes. With ongoing oversight and diligence this project will benefit all Staten Islanders and I encourage my colleagues to vote I.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you Council Member Rose and now with that being said we will call on the applicant Richard Marin from The New York Wheel and also Tom McKnight who is joining us from EDC. Now I request you just to reintroduce yourself and your organization as well your representing. Thank you, you may begin.

City Economic Development Corporation. I have some short remarks. On behalf of EDC and the City of New York I'm pleased to express my strong support for the Wheel project and it's current applications before the City Council. Since the Wheel received prior approval back in 2013 the project has been moving diligently forward. This is included further designed development extensive agency coordination and comprehensive analysis of condition of the site all of which have led to design changes that are before you today. We view these changes as part of

2.2

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 the evolution of the project and are confident that the core benefits of the project remain intact.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

On behalf of the City, I would like to reaffirm that the City remain fully committed to working closely with you, the Council and the community on these projects and will continue to address any concerns as the projects advance. Wheel will transform the (inaudible 7:24) water fund into a major destination for Boroughs, Staten Island, the City and the Region by constructing a 630 foot observation wheel with retail exhibition space theatre, open space and a parking garage. It will bring over 350 construction jobs, 450 permanent jobs. The project will also participate in EDCs higher NYC program to provide permanent jobs to low income individuals. It will provide new and enhanced in connection from St. George to the waterfront with new walkways, bike paths and a new vehicular garage entrance from Richmond Terrace. It will create 7 acres of open space and it will maintain all of the 820 existing parking spaces throughout construction while adding an additional 150 spaces at the time of project completion.

Overall the project totals about half of billion in private investment and will result in the transformation of a formerly underutilized St. George Waterfront into a major mixed use destination.

This project in addition to the empire outlets and lighthouse point just to the south, represents over a billion dollars in private new development on Staten Island's north shore. These major catalytic projects along with the Stapleton Waterfront a little bit further down the north shore take advantage of the supreme public transit access and central location of downtown St. George.

Thank you to Councilwoman Rose and to the New York City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises for your time. On behalf EDC and the City, I hope that this Subcommittee, the Land Use Committee and ultimately the full Council will provide their support for this application. I'll now turn it over to Rich Marin.

RICH MARIN: Thank you Tom. Thank you Chairman Richards, thank you Subcommittee Council Members and especially thank you Council Member Rose who without who's support and guidance through this process would have, this project would not have

2.2

gotten this far and would not be as good as it is right now, so thank you very much Council Member Rose.

Council Member Rose and Mr. McKnight have done a good job of actually giving you a summary of what I'm going to say but I'll try and be very brief and explaining these modifications. I know you all have copies of this drawing in front of you, so I'll try and talk to these, this from this drawing.

The soil conditions that Council Member
Rose referenced were indeed a surprise to us because
yes we had done a lot of Geo Tech work but we had to
do even more Geo Tech work after the application but
most importantly when we learned that the department
of building shifted from the 08 code to the 2014 code
there were specific provisions that provided for
standards for buildings in area subject to what's
called liquefaction, which is a sizement condition
where the soil basically kind of gets soft and
unreliable. Because of that we had to take that
portion of the western portion of the design garage
reminding of course that the garage is predominately
an amenity which the City required us to build. It's
not something that we from a commercial standpoint

25

AND FRANCHISES 2 necessarily wanted or needed to build because we believe most of our... our visitors will be coming over 3 4 the harbor by waterbourne transportation. But in 5 order to accommodate the garage with full 950 spaces that we had committed to, we needed to take the 6 7 garage and if you will sort of squeeze it in a little bit because it couldn't go onto that portion of the 8 soil that was a subject to this liquefaction. In 9 doing so the size of the garage went up on level from 10 3 levels to 4 levels and became slightly more angular 11 12 as you would imagine it would happen if you compressed this space and kept the same 950 car 13 parking capability. I will add that 950 cars in the 14 15 prior design had far greater value and managed 16 parking then the current design, so for the commuters 17 of Staten Island, this is a better facility now 18 because it has far more self-park, which is clearly their preference. We also in order to accommodate 19 20 that had to make our commercial space in the terminal smaller because there's just so much that will fit on 21 2.2 this sight and the garage was a priority to the City. 23 The overall height of the garage only went up by

about 13 feet in one section of about 20 feet in

width and in the rest of the section of that 1,000

AND FRANCHISES 2 foot run of the full length of our facility the height of the massing was actually at or below the 3 prior level. So there was only one of one small 4 portion to accommodate that extra level and I might 5 add that's a section which is not really directly 6 7 impacting to many people because of the hillside and in fact from Richmond Terrace it was taking an 8 elevation from about 30 feet to 43 feet so when you 9 walked along Richmond Terrace it was actually not 10 impeding your view anymore then it had already been 11 12 impeded by the structure. So the massing was a very 13 minor change in our opinion. The changes to the 14 burming were also necessary because in pulling this 15 structure in and adding the extra level, burming was 16 structural not as possible as it was. So we ended up 17 with a more angular design which was a concern to 18 some when they originally saw it, the characterization I personally liked the best was that 19 20 we changed this from an English garden to a French garden. The point is that it's still a garden, it's 21 2.2 still a beautiful 7 plus acre green roof and we 23 believe still a very beautiful facility just a little different then it was before. But that change also 24

allowed us to create a naturally ventilated garage,

2 which is both eco-friendlier and indeed uses less energy than the prior design, there is a little more 3 structure that's being shown but only a little more. The structure is basically similar to what had been 5 approved in 2013. The other thing that did change 6 7 was that the 1,000 length of our facility along Richmond Terrace has a 50 food rail right of way that 8 the MTA needs to keep available for future use. 9 actually just the siding right now but it will in 10 theory be used in the future for other rail or bus 11 12 rapid transit. As such, decking over that rail right 13 of way was very much a part of the plan to create the 14 conductivity that the Councilwoman spoke of from 15 upland to down land that was so important to the 16 community. In providing that decking, 1,000 feet is 17 a standard that the MTA has that designate it's as a 18 tunnel that has mandatory mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation was an inferior and less safe 19 20 ventilation mechanism based on the report of experts. Then natural ventilation because of the way diesel 21 2.2 smoke accumulates. As such, we needed to reduce the 23 length of the decking at either end by 100 to 150 feet and that changed a little bit of the decking 24 exposure as well. The bulk 800 some odd feet of the 25

1,000 feed it still decked over and beautifully landscaped. Those are the fundamental changes that gave rise to all of the conversations around this modification. We did by reducing the size of the terminal have to eliminate a white tablecloth restaurant but we replaced it with an open air alfresco beer garden that quite frankly would be more interesting and useful to the community members and more accessible to them.

In addition, because of all the stairs and access points that we added for this new design, we actually have more ways to get up and down from upland to down land and we were less able to control those points in entry so that we decided to make this fully accessible 24x7 which was not the case before. So now what you have is site that is available 24x7 to community, has more open accessible space, has an amenity like a restaurant that is actually more accessible from a cost standpoint to the community. The playground which is very much the result of hard work with Council Member Rose, which was intended always to serve the community was maintained at the same level as Richmond Terrace as the prior one was, because of the ADA compliant ramp that the City

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 total?

planning asked us to put in to make even more accessibility from down land to upland to the very top of the roof. We had to restrict the size so what we did was even thought it's a little bit smaller than the old playground we actually increased with the help of I'm Impaul Freburg (sic) who designs many of the playgrounds in the City increased the play value by changing the equipment to higher quality equipment that was more age appropriate for the community members that would be using it. So we believe we have maintained as the Councilwoman said all of the elements that we committed to in 2013 actually improved on some of the elements and I think most importantly we've resulted in what many of believe to be a more beautiful project then we had before, one on which 100 union men and woman are working today and have been for five months and are anxiously awaiting your approval to be able to welcome an additional 250 on to the site to finish the construction. Thank you very much.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, so I just have, so can you go through, so I have to say you just mentioned union jobs. So how many jobs in

RICH MARIN: During construction we peak out about 350 union jobs.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Ok.

RICH MARIN: And then after construction on full time equivalent employees since we're open 7 days a week, 365 days a year. We and with maintenance in the evening we run a complete 24 hour shift, 3 shifts a day. We will have about 450 full time employees.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Can you through so, do so MWBE can you speak to particular goals of the (inaudible 18:39).

2.2

particular goals here besides being all union during our construction phase and by the way we were all union right from day one as everybody might recall. But when it comes to MWBE I've personally held two sessions with Council Member Rose at our sort of facility in the Ferry Terminal. One is recently is about a week in a half ago. So we've done two of these already, we have had a number of the local contractors that's we've already hired which are MWB I point to someone like Walsh Electric which is a

woman owned business based in Staten Island. We've

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

AND FRANCHISES 16

also sort of emphasized Staten Island businesses very very heavily and have people like Racon (sic)building

4 our temporary jetty, that's a 3 million dollar

5 contract, so we've... we've tried to favor both Staten

6 Island businesses and MWBE businesses and we fill

7 | we're doing a good job of meeting that obligation.

CHAIR RICHARDS: So... so I did request a specific number percentage of what so do you have goal in mind?

RICH MARIN: Yes we have a goal of 25%.

CHAIR RICHARDS: And how do plan to get there? Where are you at now? So you spoke with 2 organizations.

RICH MARIN: Well it's... it's our numbers are a little bit overwhelmed by our foundation contract which is a 56 million dollar contract provided by Skanska (sic) which unfortunately is not a MWBE company, I think if you excluded that one where in excess of our 25% and I think over time we will be in excess of our 25%, we just have to kind of get past the or if you will water down that huge foundation contract that we had to award already so.

24

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING 1 17 AND FRANCHISES 2 CHAIR RICHARDS: So... so overall the 3 project from EDC said is EDC said is a half a billion 4 dollar project. RICH MARIN: Yes. It started as. 5 6 CHAIR RICHARDS: You said you spoke of a 7 2 million dollar contract that's going to one business. 8 RICH MARIN: Three million. 9 Three million, I'm sorry 10 CHAIR RICHARES: three million and then you mentioned one other 11 12 business, how much is going there? RICH MARIN: Well first of all it's a 510 13 14 million dollar project but when you look at the 15 actual contracted amounts, the trade amounts, we have 16 about 157 million dollars for Guilbaine (sic) and 17 probably about 135 million for the wheel builders 18 themselves, so the number of what I will call trade contracts because that 510 includes financing and a 19 20 lot of other things. The trade contracts are probably a litter under 300 million in total that we 21 2.2 have to award. In so our objective would be to have 23 75 million dollars of those contracts going to MWBE. We don't have a specific goal for Staten Island 24

business but we look for whatever Staten Island

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING 1 18 AND FRANCHISES 2 business that we can right now for instance our security is provided by Staten Island firm, our 3 electric is. 4 5 CHAIR RICHARDS: And that's not an MWBE, the firm? 6 7 RICH MARIN: Currently no, it's a Staten Island firm but not an MWBE but we are in discussions 8 with an MWBE firm introduced at our very first MWBE 9 session with the Councilwoman. That is in very good 10 standing to pick up the security contract for the 11 12 next phase. 13 CHAIR RICHARDS: All right, let's go into local hiring for a second because we're not there and 14 15 I want to hear the more tailored and real plan on how 16 you plan to really address making sure since you said 17 75 million dollars is there for MWBE, we want to hear 18 more of a real plan on how you plan to get there. Can we just go into local hiring for a second so? 19 20 RICH MARIN: Sure. CHAIR RICHARDS: We're very happy about 21 2.2 to have union jobs, good paying jobs. How are you

intertwining union and balancing it also with local

opportunities?

23

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Tribularity Wolf one file of the state of th	2	RICH	MARIN:	Well	the	first	thing	У
--	---	------	--------	------	-----	-------	-------	---

have to realize, this is a very specialized bill. For example in our foundation bill, this is one of the largest foundations put in because of the what's needed underneath the wheel and we needed to be able to find a firm that was capable of handling it and quite frankly Skanska was one of the few that could do it. So there are some specialized things that quite frankly there isn't the local skill based to be able to handle. On the other hand, every opportunity we have to find a local and or a MWBE company to fulfill that contract we are trying to do that. have the Gilband (sic) representative who is on site, who is the project manager a fellow by the name of Dan Test, is indeed a Staten Islander in terms of his upbringing, went to high school right in our district and so he has a Fitbit of local knowledge of the various contractors and welcomes them and attends these sessions with us so that we make sure that we keep all of the doors open for both local and MWBE.

organizations, so I hear him but are you working with any local organizations to ensure that especially parts of Staten Island that have been undeveloped,

So what local

CHAIR RICHARDS:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

AND FRANCHISES

2.2

I'm sure just like the Rockaways, there has to be some local organizations on the ground doing work every day to try to plug in local job opportunities for locals, so I'm interested to hearing how you're working with them and I haven't, still have not heard a clear indication on what the local hiring percentage goal is from you as well so?

RICH MARIN: The local hiring goal was never sort of set as a percentage the way the MWBE goals was set. But if I had to say what is our goal for MWBE for local hires, I would say the same thing I would say 25%.

CHAIR RICHARDS: I thing you could do better than that.

RICH MARIN: Well were prepared to do
better than that if we have qualified local companies
and I'm going to give you an example. We actually
had one foundation company on Staten Island that
would have qualified to bit on the foundation, very
big job 56 million dollar job. However, they were
too busy with other jobs so they chose not to bid, so
sometimes that just happens and I will tell you in
the case of Walsh Electric, who done a lot of the
early work for us on site and they are both local and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the record.

RICH MARIN: You can get that commitment on the record from me, we welcome Council Member Rose's help on that, in fact I was going to say that the only people that we are really working on that are Council Member Rose, their they only people that have approached us in so, were glad to do that.

opportunity hiring so, can I get that commitment on

in insuring that local individuals have an

CHAIR RICHARDS: An will EDC, can EDC play a role here to?

TOM MCKNIGHT: And we have been, just to build off on Rich's comments. Two things of note, the project participating in the higher NYC program which is focused on the permanent jobs aspect of the

been and they'll continually be outreach through

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

1516

17

1819

20

2122

23

24

25

organizations, business originations, the chambers, SIADC, local organizations that we make contact with through the Councilwoman, so there will be a robust outreach.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Ok. I will go to

Council Member Reynoso, but I am very interested in

this part of the conversation. And we've been joined

by Council Member Richie Torres from the Bronx.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Good morning guys, how are you doing? I'm really excited about this project. I think that, I'm from Brooklyn so I don't go to Staten Island that often. The only time I go is to visit Debbie. It is actually true, it is very true. So and to play baseball against the Mayor. So and lose. So I'm excited about this project, I'm really excited about seeing this happen. I'm afraid of height so I probably won't be on the wheel itself, but I think it's an amazing thing that's happening here on the Northshore, you know 650 feet it's really going to be something that folks are going to come specifically to Staten Island to do, so the economic development and the economic opportunities are going to be great. What I do, so I'm generally supportive of this project. I do want

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

--22

23

24

25

to ask, this because it's such a large contract that is half a billion dollars which is the statement that you guys made and lofty goal is that we're trying to meet with MWBE and local hiring specifically MWBE, which I think is the one that going to be legally mandated, just wanted EDC to talk in regards to there's I quess, there's statistics that show that a lot of these companies a lot of these large organizations don't get to this goal ever or very rarely get to the 25% MWBE goal. And I kind of you know what's the enforcement that happens if you know 50% through the project we see that only 10% of the MWBE have been hired or have done the job, what penalties are there in place for that? You know just want to know what your, what you do when they don't meet those goals and if you can give me an example of something you've done somewhere else when people weren't reaching their goals and to holding them accountable to that?

TOME MCKNIGHT: Sure well a key point is that there are goals. They're not requirements.

There's a flexibility that's necessary acknowledging that projects are unique and require different types of trades and discipline which necessitate the

can to make sure you get to you know that you get as

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

there?

close as possible and then they make an effort and the local hiring is exact same thing, except one is a goal and one is not written but there both just you know made up things that were hoping we achieve, so I just want you know what our best efforts, you know what systems are in place by EDC that help us get

Right, so at EDC we have a TOM MCKNIGHT: pretty robust MWBE program and administration blueprint and the project will participate in that. It has been ongoing, there have been multiple outreach sessions with MWBE firms to help build capacity to help them understand that there's a project underway. There's been a lot of outreach to help drum up interest and engagement around that We've worked closely with the Councilwoman process. on that. We've, worked closer with local organizations on that to get the word out. program is in place, we have to get the firms into the program so that they're aware what's available to them and to help build capacity.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: And just so a heads up, the name of the organization that's doing the foundation is called Skanska (sic), what is it?

Skanska, one of the largest

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

3 constructions companies in the world.

RICH MARIN:

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: And there and just so there gonna stay the largest if there the only one receiving the contracts which is trying why we're trying to make it so that we do everything possible to allow for other folks to receive these large contracts and start developing their base and just be able to compete against these large organization and... and I get what you're saying about the quality and the capacity of the work that needs to get done and whether or not you can get those qualifications but the only way we get there on the MWBE's get there is they get a shot at it as well, so maybe they won't get the entire contract or the entire foundation but they're small, they can possible do smaller one. Just want you guys to go This what I would love to say that when all out. this is done that you guys met all your goals and this is like the premiere project. One of the premiere projects in the City of New York when it comes to development.

RICH MARIN: Well the one thing I will say and I think the Council Member Rose would agree

than living wage. I... I have committed to the City

the low level security jobs that, most likely being

provided in particular at this job or in I'll just

24

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 put it out there may not be politically correct but

3 I'm sure these are people of color who live in

4 certain parts of Staten Island, who don't have the

opportunity to... to... to break out poverty cycles.

6 So it is a little uncomfortable to say but if I'm a

7 betting person I know that's what's happening on this

8 job so, we would really appreciate you going back and

9 looking at that in particular. So I will now go, I'm

10 going to go back to Council Member Rose and will go

11 to Council Member Greenfield followed by Council

12 Member Gentile also Council Torres.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: I'm going to brief but I really would like to thank the Council Members for their drilling down about the MWBE and local hiring, as... as we know we've used words like historic and transformational and this project is really is and that's why I'm supporting this project. It is you know an economic boom for Staten Island but I also and... and this has been my goal throughout this whole process to make sure that the Staten Island community also are beneficiaries of... of the largest that comes to this project. So I really do appreciate my colleagues drilling down on the MWBE and the local hiring and as we've had meetings you

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING 1 31 AND FRANCHISES 2 know, you know that's this is something that I'm going to be following up on. And... and just you know 3 I was speaking with the community, one of the 4 community members that came to testify today and one 5 of the changes to the project were, was from sort of 6 7 a mechanical ventilation to open air, so could just for the record talk about the environmental sort of 8 impact in terms of the changes to the design and 9 scope of the project by using the open air 10 ventilation especially in the close proximity of the ... 11 12 of the playground and with the ramping close to the playground. Could you. 13 14 RICH MARIN: Sure. 15 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Just re-visit that 16 impact. Thank you. 17 RICH MARIN: I would, I would be glad to 18 but unfortunately I have with me Peter Leibowitz from AKRF our Environmental Consultants who in fact 19 20 studied that exact issue for us. PETER LEBOWITZ: Yes Peter Leibowitz from 21 2.2 AKRF, so when the garage changed and it's format we

examined that from an air quality basis and

essentially of open wall garage with natural

ventilation disburses the admissions much more, much

25

23

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

מע

2.2

more in a kind a wide spread pattern, so it's not as concentrated. What we did specific to the playground is we actually did the modeling that said what if all of that was happening right near the playground and now of the potential modeling results showed any level on adverse impact at all, so basically it's a not a change that has any affect including any of the changes to the... the ramping that was proposed. So basically from an air quality admission prospective, the project does not have potential to generate impacts to that use.

CHAIR ROSE: Is that because the is that because it the exhaust pretty much sort of dissipates.

PETER LEBOWITZ: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: We as what would have been the difference than with the mechanical tower.

PETER LEBOWITZ: So with the mechanical tower and I don't remember exactly where it's located now but basically would have been mechanically ventilated to a single point emission you know essentially it smokes type of thing that would of taken all of the ventilated in the garage and put

into at one point. So for the first EIS when that was the case we modeled that point and it's closest location to any sensitive use like the playground, like the sidewalk. And it's similarly was a sufficient distant and height that it did not have an impact.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Ok, thank you and I do want to say Rich we have worked together on the MWBE and you know I am, I'm grateful that you know that you've been you know so forthcoming and receptive to the MWBE on Staten Island and you have hosted both. I don't want to give the impression that, that has not happened. It has, but... but we also need to see now the trickle down of effect of you know of those meetings of the meet and greets and whatever, I want, I really truly want to make that a reality. We put forth the effort and I want to see the community actually benefit from the efforts that you've made.

RICH MARIN: Yes, we take it seriously, we will track it seriously and we will report back seriously on it.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, I will go to Council Member Greenfield.

exceeded our expectations. The load issues and the

2.2

quality of rock underneath the Wheel itself, was, were considerably different then we had originally hoped. The rock for instance, the serpentine rock that has layers of natural epitasis in it, so there were all sorts of issues which we encountered about that. That certainly added to the overall cost.

Part of that cost increase quite frankly is an average 20% partum cost increase in just building in New York City because of the high level of activity.

But It's really been a combination of those elements and those two elements and a little bit of some of the added amenities that we've you know had to put in to meet all over our obligations.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: The added amenity since the project was approved?

RICH MARIN: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Such as?

RICH MARIN: Well for instance the added cost of putting in the... the landscaping and ramping that had to go in for the ADA compliant ramp. When we changed this configuration we added many more ramps and many more great staircases if you look at the prior plan, they're many more access points,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

AND FRANCHISES

36

2 which had to do with making this new plan work. And those were quite costly. 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Got it.

What, so the main focus of the changes have to do with the GEO technical analysis, is that correct?

RICH MARIN: That's correct. That's what drove most of the changes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Got it. is I'm just curious, what is the GEO technical analysis have to do with the elimination of the water feature?

RICH MARIN: It didn't really have anything to do with the elimination of the water feature. The water feature was part of the cost containment to make the added cost of all of the changes we had to make more... more let's just say reasonable. The... the water feature, please understand was never really a fountain, it was a scrim (sic), it was a small amount of water on top of a surface because of the... the levels that we were dealing with, it was a very small amount of water. If you'd like to hear about the water feature I happen to have our senior partner from Ampaul

build on it, so yes, there are certain things that we

_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

eliminated because of cost for instance. Having to squeeze down the size of... of our program space in our terminal. Something I certainly didn't want to do but we did in order to accommodate mostly the maintaining the parking obligation that we had. So yes there were certain compromises we've made because of cost because the cost had risen so darn high.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: And lower the size of the playground as well.

RICH MARIN: No, that was not a cost The play, we were glad to make the playground issue. the exact same size if we hadn't had to if I may just point to it. Right here if we, if we hadn't had to make an ADA compliant ramp up to the top, that used the what remaining space we would have expanded the playground to the original size, so instead knowing that we only had a limited amount of size on that We actually first suggested putting it at a level. higher lever but City Planning reminded us that would not be as community friendly. So to maintain the community friendly level of the playground and still have the ADA compliant roof, we only had so much space, so instead we commissioned the MPFP to make

I think, I...

2

1

3

4

_

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sure that the play value was actually maintained or enhanced which is what they did.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD:

I... I think the moral of the story from our prospective honestly is were not particular thrilled in general when applicants come in and try to change projects and were supportive of the project and I think that the Council Member here Debbie Rose has done fantastic work under the circumstances but part of the questioning and part of our concern is just the general philosophy right, which is that when we like to believe and think EDC I image likes to believe this as well that when we sign off on a project the project is done, right and not that folks come back later and say well we didn't realize, we didn't know it was too expensive, we didn't figure this out, you know in our few you know that... that is part of the, that is part of the nature of the business. So folks who develop in this town is to sort of have a good understanding of what projects are and what they will cost and how prices do rise in all of that from our perspective should be taken into consideration, so it's not that we're, it's not that we're opposed to changes just it's not something that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

AND FRANCHISES quite frankly we're thrilled about. I see our friend from EDC would really like to weigh in on this, so will give him the opportunity. Will give him the opportunity to do so.

I need, I need, I need to RICH MARIN: say two things to that, quite frankly. The first one is I think you were very rarely presented with a project that is as unique and... and structurally as This is, this is the challenging as this one. largest in the world ever built of one of these things.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD:

RICH MARIN: And it, and it really, there isn't a lot of history to draw on to... to be exact at every state, so yes there have been more changes perhaps then normal. Secondly, the biggest cause of the change was an uncertainty by DOB as to whether the 08 code or the 14 code would apply to us. the 14 code was applied to us obviously we complied and did everything, but part of that was the standards for liquefaction. So in all fairness a lot of those changes were not because of things that we overlooked or didn't spend the time to consider properly but rather they were simply changes that we

To be fair

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25 comment on that.

The same with the MTA changes, had to deal with. those weren't known to us. A lot of these things only developed over ... over time and in 2014 after the initial approval.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: some of those changes were your fault and some of the changes were not your fault and I would concede that point that the message that I'm trying to relay is not just this particular applicant, it's just in general is that we in the Council are not thrilled when applications that have been approved come back to us for changes because at the time that we approve an application we like to believe that whatever agreements were made will in fact be kept and will be able to move one. So I'm not, it's not matter of pointing finger, I'm just explaining why you're getting a lot questioning today is because there is just overall concern about this concept of coming back and making changes to a project that have been previously approved. Our friend from EDC is really excited about this so I'm happy to give him the opportunity to respond as well.

TOM MCKNIGHT: Yea, I just... just to

2 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Please.

2.2

Marin and I would agree that it wouldn't be the first choice to come back and make necessary changes, but... but it was required and the... the origin of the project is, it's a unique project for New York and because of that the zoning framework that the City wanted to put in place here is detailed, it is specific and it allowed for limited flexibility and that's, that is a factor in why we're back here at the Council because it, because it was, it is not standard development project that we're more accustomed to. It is a unique project. As a result of that, there was a decision to be a little bit more specific in the zoning requirements which in this case is a special permit.

CHAIR RICHARDS: All righty. Thank you. Will go to.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I certainly,

I certainly appreciate that I just Tom I just would

end with one note which is don't make it habit to

come back here too often to change these projects. I

respect this and I think that we understand it and

certainly we support Council Member Rose who's done

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

43 AND FRANCHISES outstanding work over here, but just in general it's not, it's not a good president that we like to establish and that's quite frankly why we're asking a lot of questions. Thank you.

CHAIR RICHARDS: All righty will go Council Member Gentile.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just out of curiosity had the code the 2014 code not been imposed you're, you would have been able to put in the supporting structure for the garage in a safe manner, despite the fact that it had that... that... that consistency liquefaction it's called?

RICH MARIN: Well that's an interesting sort of philological question more than a practical question. Let's put it this way, the standard that the new code implied required us to do additional testing and when we did the additional testing this particular area of the sight didn't meet those standards. So I think it's fair to say that the code did a good job of keeping us from building in an area where we probably shouldn't have built.

	AND FRANCHISES 44
2	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I see so, again
3	philosophically you would have found that out at som
4	point if you had stayed with the 2008 code.
5	RICH MARIN: We might have, yes.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I see. I
7	looking at your you diagram here and you talked
8	about the MTA easement now you're saying that that
9	at this point is a non-use for the MTA?
10	RICH MARIN: Well the MTA actually has no
11	track there at this moment. They will replace about
12	800 feet of track and it will be a siding where they
13	will park on occasionally train and/or unload a trai
14	I meanly like with materials and/or wash trains but
15	it will not be active throughway if you will.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: So that to your
17	knowledge has no plans to extend the railway?
18	RICH MARIN: Well it's a much as the
19	Council Member from Staten Island know it's a much
20	debated issue and there is a desire for many
21	constitutes to have some North Shore transportation
22	capability whether a light rail or a bus rapid
23	transit and what we've done is insured that the site
24	is capable of handling either in the future when the

community and the City decided to do something there.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 45
2	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I see. But I do
3	see that you you have on the, on the map here a
4	shuttle stop for ferry service so is that a shuttle
5	that you'll run?
6	RICH MARIN: Yes.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: You'll be
8	running that shuttle from there?
9	RICH MARIN: Yes, we have an obligation
10	and plan to run shuttles both to the parking garage
11	but also every 3 rd or so shuttle based on demand, I
12	will also or committed to taking those shuttle out t
13	Snuge Harbor (sic) cultural center.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Great.
15	RICH MARIN: To be able to make sure that
16	they cultural on Staten Island benefits from these
17	three to four million people we expect to draw.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Well that, then
19	you took my last question away from me because I was
20	going to ask you.
21	RICH MARIN: That's that's committed to
22	our restrictive declaration.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Excellent,
24	that's good to know, that's good to know. Certainly

this area was part of my district when I was in the

permanent jobs, yes that's correct.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 47
2	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And so does NYC
3	Hirer define local hiring?
4	RICH MARIN: Local hiring would be
5	defined on a I believe at a community district level
6	based on a, based on a percentage or an average.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Ok so the
8	commitment is to have 25% of the workers and the
9	project come from the local community district is
10	that?
11	RICH MARIN: Well on a permanent basis I
12	would hope that we'd have far in excess of 25% from
13	the local community because you want workers that
14	don't have long commutes.
15	TOM MCKNIGHT: Are target for just so
16	were clear on local hiring versus MWBE on the MWBE
17	side as we said the goal is 25% what we seek to
18	achieve through Hire NYC is 15%.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: What about the
20	construction jobs.
21	TOM MCKNIGHT: Oh excuse me, 50% 5-0.
22	RICH MARIN: Well I think the
23	construction jobs we're greatly benefited by the fact
24	that 37% of Staten Islanders are union members and

that makes it what the largest, the most unionized

this.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING 1 49 AND FRANCHISES 2 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Well like Council 3 Member Reynoso I won't ever have the opportunity to visit the Wheel because I'm deathly afraid of heights 4 5 and I have no skill as a baseball player, so I would 6 never go to Staten Island. But I love Debbie. 7 RICH MARIN: We have lots of other things 8 for you. COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So that's why I 9 became an elected official. But thank you Mr. 10 11 Chairman. 12 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you. All righty, 13 all righty, well I want to thank you and... and 14 certainly Council Member Rose and I don't want to 15 take away from the work that you've done, we really 16 appreciate the sessions you've done and the work that 17 you've done to obviously get here. I will just 18 request that we have in particular, so you said there's a 50% we want to see these things in writing 19 20 if they can be submitted to the Committee and also to Council Member Rose and then also if we can also have 2.1

25 organizations to ensure that there's a long term plan

and perhaps with... with perhaps some local

in writing your commitment to also forming a task

force which we, which Council Member Rose would lead

2.2

23

CHAIR RICHARDS: That's great, all right.

just hit the button so we can hear you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MICHAEL HARWOD: Good morning my name is
Michael Harwod I'm a resident of St. George, I live
in St. Marks Place, I'm also a member of the St.
George Civic Association and I've been consulting
with the Civic Association Executive Board so I have
their permission to speak on behalf of the
association as well. We were only notified of this
hearing at a quarter to six last night, so I didn't
have time to print out testimony and no other member
of our community were able to attend and
unfortunately this is not terrible surprising
situation under these circumstances. I echo Council

2 Member Greenfield's comments, he had to leave but there were extensive hearings Ulerb (sic) process for 3 a year where the community was very much involved 4 5 before this project was approved in December 2013, we had what we thought was extensive input, changes were 6 7 made in response to our concerns. The community was concerned about having a three story parking garage 8 that was going to block access to the Waterfront but 9 we were promised that it would be completely 10 enclosed, it would be an invisible garage with a 11 12 green burm (sic) surrounding it, full access to the Waterfront, a lovely playground and it would actually 13 14 although it would block views from the street level 15 people could walk out and see the Waterfront and it 16 would actually be an improvement. And just to mention the Empire Outlets, we were also had concerns 17 18 about that but we were promised certain things with that project and particularly as Council Member 19 20 Richards and Reynoso and others have commented there were promises of local community hiring, there would 21 2.2 be job fairs, there would be apprenticeship programs 23 and there would be well paid jobs for locals. with some reluctance our community board, I mean our 24

St. George Civic Association voted in a close vote to

approve both of the projects and to support them and
go ahead. I was a bit more enthusiastic then some of
our other members but people were concerned. Since
then in the year and a half that happened since then
numerous promises have been broken. The Empire
Outlets promised us during the hearings that they
could not break ground until they were 50% rented and
they would be high end outlet stores and high end
food court. They broke ground last April, we found
out only last week that they reached their 50%
renting which they were promised they couldn't break
ground that the City apparently didn't enforce that
and we were told we are getting an Applebee's and a
Gap. Hardly high end food court, hardly high end
shopping that's going to attach tourist to our
neighborhood. We're going to get low cost, low wage
jobs for retail employees and waiter and waitresses.
They were also promised that there would be job fairs
and an apprenticeship program to hire local people.
Initially they weren't going to go union they were
pressed and switched to union St. George Civic
Association has not heard one about job fairs for our
neighbors and residence, we have not heard anything
with the community board about any kind of

2	apprenticeship programs that are being set up, there
3	have been no invitations for local residents to be
4	hired. And were thrilled and… and happy that they've
5	promised union jobs, but I can tell you that when the
6	St. George Court House was built fully union all we
7	saw was New Jersey license plate parked in our
8	neighborhood. We've never heard of anyone local
9	getting the jobs. So you know were thrilled that
10	there's promises going forward and there's going to
11	be wonderful jobs for our local residences to sell t-
12	shirts at the Gap but we have not seen any follow
13	through from that project on the high end
14	construction jobs that as Council Member Richards
15	said will raise our local residents to higher
16	heights. Then we find out a couple of months ago
17	after a year of discussion that these changes are
18	being made to the Wheel project and we were told
19	several days before the community board one was
20	having hearing on these projects and we were told and
21	I'm not, and I'm quoting that the Chairman of the
22	community board told the President of our Civic
23	Association don't bother coming to the hearing
24	because we're going to rubber stamp the project.

Those were his words. And sure enough we had a

hearing where they allowed two member, two people
from the public to speak for, two people to speak
against for only two minutes each, which is against
the Ulerb rules and not a single community board
member asked a single question and they voted to
approve this project without finding out anything
about how these changes would affect the neighborhood
or responding to our concerns. After that frankly we
were invited finally into the room to meet with City
Planning and Mr. Marin to talk about what the changes
were but we were told at that meeting that it was too
late because if we asked for any more changes or any
further delay he would lose his funding the project
would be killed so we had to take it or leave it. As
a result of that St. George Civic Association
Executive Committee has voted to now oppose this
project because we have no choice. Our promises have
been repeatedly broken and we have no confidence that
those promises will be kept in the future. EDC did
not enforce the promise that Empire Outlet made and
Mr. Marin I sure comes here in good faith but when
that process for these changes began he told City
Planning that he didn't think it even, that these
were tweaks and they didn't need go through a new

sum up.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MICHAEL HARWOD: I will sum up. The changes to this project are a substantial change to the tenor of our neighborhood and the promises that have been made in the past have not been kept and we have no reason to think they will be kept in the future. We in the neighborhood strongly urge this committee to send back to City Planning so that they can find ways to... to react some of the initial amenities we were promised and just one last thing,

2.2

Council Member Greenfield asked about the increase in cost and when you were told it went up from 350 million to 510 and Mr. Marin said that was because of civil engineering and because of landscaping. I'm a lawyer now, I'm an undergraduate degree I was aboton (sic) the botany major a BS in Botany. Looks like I should have been a landscape architect if it cost them a 150 million dollars for civil engineering and landscaping. The reason that we are not being given full information about this project and we ask that

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you for testimony.

Ok and will just now ask you to... to work with Council

Member Rose in particular and stay in touch with her

as we move, as we move through this process.

it go back and be presented for further community and

Thank you.

put in further review.

MICHAEL HARWOD: We have been and with Borough President Outo(sic) but unfortunately as I say the process was presented to us these changes which are clearly not tweaks as the (inaudible 1:06:19) take it or leave it and you guys don't want to be the people cause you're going to be hated on Staten Island and in the City. You guys don't want to be the people who are going to stop this project

that we get this opportunity here to make that happen

but finances being in jeopardy for any further delays

24

2.2

you know we're really caught between a rock and hard place here. But ultimately the... the general, the project in general is going to be somewhat similar to what we originally agreed to and hopefully will do our part in trying to hold them accountable and have EDC actually show up and enforce in a real way. But it's just were stuck between a rock and a hard place is you could only imagine.

MICHAEL HARWOD: I... I that may be the case but our view is that we who live in the neighborhood are going to be crushed between that rock and that hard place. And our neighborhood, the benefits that we were promised we don't think are going to come to pass as they were originally intended and... and unfortunately we can no longer support this project.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you for your testimony. All righty are there any other members of the public who wishes to testify? Seeing none I will now close, officially close the public hearing on L.U. No. 288. And we actually are going to couple this for a vote now to approve this item L.U. No. 288 and I would ask the clerk to call the roll.

COMMITTEE CLERK: Chair Richards.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 60
2	CHAIR RICHARDS: I vote I.
3	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Gentile.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I vote I.
5	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member
6	Williams.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I
8	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Reynoso.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I vote I.
10	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Torres.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I vote I.
12	COMMITTEE CLERK: Land Use Item 288 is
13	approved with 5 votes in the affirmative, 0 in the
14	negative and 0 abstentions. And to refer to the full
15	Land Use Committee.
16	CHAIR RICHARDS: All righty, thank you.
17	All righty I will now open the public hearing for
18	L.U. No. 289 and application to modify a previously
19	approved restrictive declaration to allow for the
20	conversion of an existing building to a gym. This
21	property is located at 1-37 12 th Street, Brooklyn in
22	Council Member Lander district and I just want to put
23	on the record we have a statement in support of this
24	project from Council Member Lander which he also

negotiated with the applicant and... and is working and

AND FRANCHISES

Member Lander worked on.

2.2

is basically will work with modification to preserve some of the restrictions particularly on this property. So I will now call the applicant up to Jordan Most (sic) who I've got to know over the years from Sheldon Lovell (sic) you were here on good terms today. So as I mentioned before Council Member Lander negotiated with applicant on some particular modifications to preserve some restriction on the property and I will now ask Mr. Jordan Most to... to one present where you're from again and state your name for the record and then to just go through in particular some of the restrictions that Council

Mobel's office (sic) office. I'm half of Hamilton
Plaza Associates which owes that shopping center
which as some of you may know contain a across the
street from a Lowe's is between the Lowe's and
Guawans Canal (sic), it's a got a fairly large
parking lot, a supermarket, a path mart and a four
story building that has some commercial and warehouse
uses at the property. The supermarket is allowed
there pursuant to a special permit that dates back to
board of estimates days, was approved in 1977 and

2	1979 it was renewed and there is, there as a
3	condition to allowing the supermarket in excess of
4	10,000 square feet where some conditions that were
5	imposed on the tall adjacent building namely the $3^{\rm rd}$
6	and 4 th floors were limited to specifically office
7	use and warehouse use. It was largely a reaction to
8	commercial use sensitivity on nearby $3^{\rm rd}$ and $4^{\rm th}$
9	avenues in that neighborhood. Today were seeking to
10	we were originally seeking to completely remove the
11	restrictions on the $3^{\rm rd}$ and $4^{\rm th}$ floor but after
12	discussing the matter with Council Member Lander's
13	Office it was agreed that we would modify the
14	restrictions, particularly to allow a gym a physical
15	cultural establishment that already had secured a a
16	special permit from the board of standards and
17	appeals in January. Hoping and anxious to get into
18	the 3 rd floor space and the so the a the basically
19	the agreement I believe that memorialized in Council
20	Landers statement is that the $3^{ m rd}$ and $4^{ m th}$ floors would
21	be still limited to office warehouse would now also
22	allow a gym use and a generally use group six retail
23	uses with some limitation as to eating and drink
24	establishments. So it's broaden a little bit but

they're still some... some limitations in place. And

on to vote to approve L.U. No. 289 with modifications

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 64
2	that were discussed by Mr. Most. Ok, seeing none,
3	ok. We will now ask the clerk to call the vote.
4	COMMITTEE CLERK: Chair Richards.
5	CHAIR RICHARDS: I vote I.
6	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Gentile.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I vote I.
8	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Williams.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I.
10	COMMITTEE CLERK: Council Member Reynoso.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I vote I.
12	COMMITTEE CLERK: Land Use Item 289 is
13	approved with modifications with 4 votes in the
14	affirmative, 0 in the negative and 0 abstentions and
15	it's referred to the full Land Use Committee.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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



Date October 27, 2015