

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON RECOVERY AND RESILIENCY

----- X

October 27, 2016
Start: 9:41 a.m.
Recess: 10:39 a.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E: MARK TREYGER
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Rosie Mendez
Margaret S. Chin
Donovan J. Richards
Carlos Menchaca
Eric A. Ulrich
Steven Matteo

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

Amy Peterson, Director
Mayor's Office of Housing Recovery Operations

Patrick Whaley, Assistant Commissioner
External Affairs
Department of Buildings

2 [sound check, pause] [gavel]

3 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay. They ready?

4 Okay, good morning. My name is Mark Treyger, and I
5 am the Chair of the Committee on Recovery and
6 Resiliency. We are here today to discuss a
7 preconsidered intro at the request of the Mayor that
8 I have sponsored. This bill would eliminate some of
9 the barriers in the Build-it-Back program that have
10 slowed down recovery after Super Storm Sandy. This
11 committee has held numerous hearings on Build-it-
12 Back. We have thoroughly discussed its challenges in
13 recent months. Among these challenges have been
14 various issues related to timely construction. For
15 instance, the current demolition process requires
16 extensive documentation prior to work beginning
17 including construction document approval. In some
18 cases, approving construction documents and
19 completing compliance related requirements have
20 delayed demolition starts for homes in Build-it-Back
21 as long as six months. Further, many homes in Build-
22 it-Back have open DOB permits or unresolved
23 violations that effectively prohibit contractors from
24 working on them, and prohibit DOB from providing a
25 certificate of occupancy when that work is complete.

2 In addition, homes in the program that are subject to
3 a DOB violation must pay the penalty prior to
4 continuing with the program. This involves a complex
5 process to calculate the amount of civil penalty.

6 This cost may be a prohibitive for low-income
7 residents, vulnerable residents in the program. I am
8 encouraged by the opportunity we have to resolve some
9 of these challenges with effective legislation.

10 Overall, I am supportive of the notion that we must
11 cut red tape that is needlessly hindering summer
12 building and repair efforts. At the same time, I-I
13 am exercising the same caution that my colleagues
14 likely are that these efforts do not compromise the
15 safety of our residents. Ensuring timely
16 comprehensive construction and elevation with proper
17 safeguards during the demolition and elevation
18 process should be the ultimate goal, and really to
19 help all those families that are still in need.

20 We have been joined by my colleague, the
21 Minority Leader Councilman Member Steven Matteo. I
22 appreciate the work of my committee counsel, and
23 Policy Analyst. I also want to appreciate the work
24 of Ed Atkins and the Council, and with us here to
25 testify we have Director Amy Peterson from the

2 Mayor's Office of Housing Recovery as well as Patrick
3 Whale. Is that correct?

4 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: [off mic]
5 Whaley.

6 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Whaley, Assistant
7 Commissioner of External Affairs, Department of
8 Buildings, and just before you testify, please raise
9 your right hands. Do you wear or affirm to tell the
10 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth
11 today?

12 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: I do.

13 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay, you may
14 begin.

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Good morning, Mayor—
16 good morning, Chair Treyger and Council Member Matteo
17 and members of the committee. I am Amy Peterson, the
18 Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing Recovery
19 Operations. I am joined today by Patrick Whaley,
20 Assistant Commissioner for External Affairs at
21 Department of Buildings. I am here today to speak in
22 support of the legislation sponsored by Council
23 Member Treyger at the request of Mayor de Blasio. As
24 you know, the city is working hard to complete Build-
25 it-Back construction and return homeowners to safe

2 and resilient housing. As we work to complete the
3 most challenging project, we have identified two
4 separate processes that will benefit from city
5 legislation. First, we want to expedite the
6 demolition of homes by allowing city managed
7 contractors to file required paperwork with
8 Department of Buildings after demolition, and proceed
9 immediately with demolition under the oversight of
10 contracting city agencies and the full-time
11 supervision of design professionals and on-site
12 safety professionals. Second, where a lack of
13 resolution on longstanding pre-existing violations
14 and open permits have a been a barrier to securing
15 necessary approvals, this law will provide homeowners
16 with a path forward. With your partnership, we can
17 clear the way for roughly 200 homeowners who have
18 been unable to proceed with the program to secure
19 building permits and other necessary approvals to
20 start and complete work on more resilient housing.
21 We can also achieve significant—significant time
22 savings in the demolition process, and if we seize
23 these opportunities today we will be able to
24 capitalize on the remaining weeks of fall weather
25 before construction productivity declines with the

1 arrival of winter weather. Related to demolitions,
2 the City has taken numerous steps to shorten the time
3 frame for filing for demolition permits. This
4 legislation will further shorten the time frame by
5 allowing paperwork to be deferred until
6 demolition. Although we are motivated certainly by
7 our goal of returning applicants to their homes as
8 soon as possible, safety is our paramount concern.
9 We've developed an alternative approach to the
10 demolition process that defers submission of
11 paperwork to DOB, but benefits from multiple layers
12 of professional oversight [banging door] to ensure the
13 safety of the process. To start off with, this
14 process will apply only to projects being completed
15 through contracts held by city agencies doing Build-
16 it-Back work. Second, the demolition plans will be
17 prepared and stamped by a licensed design
18 professionals such as an architect or an engineer.
19 And third the demolitions will be completed under the
20 supervision of design professionals and safety
21 professionals will be on site at all times to monitor
22 the work. Finally, the City's professional
23 consultants registered design professionals,
24 construction management and safety professionals will
25

2 ensure that all of the DOB required documentation is
3 prepared prior to demolition to ensure compliance
4 with all relevant code requirements. The contractors
5 will maintain proof of compliance on site for
6 inspection at any time. Contractors will still be
7 required to submit the paperwork to DOB after
8 completion of the demolition. By eliminating the
9 need for plans to be filed, approved and permitted
10 prior to commencement of work, we anticipate
11 shorting—shortening the timeframe for demolition
12 significantly, and with all of these safeguards in
13 place, we are confident that the work will be done
14 consistent with the higher standards of safety
15 [banging door] for everyone involved, workers and
16 neighbors alike. With the winter months approaching
17 the time for this for is proposal is now. The sooner
18 we can proceed with demolition, the sooner we can
19 begin foundation work. Foundation work relies
20 heavily on concrete work, which becomes more
21 challenging when temperatures drop before 40 degrees
22 for three consecutive days. Historical temperature
23 data for New York City shows that days over 40
24 degrees are much more common in November and even
25 December, but average highs dip below 40 degrees

when—when January arrives. Moving forward with this legislation today will allow us to take maximum advantage of these remaining productive weeks.

Related to open permit and violations, this legislation will provide a path forward for homeowners with open permits or open Department of Buildings violations. Hundreds of homes in the Build-it-Back program had open permits or open violations including work without a permit violation prior to applying for or beginning Build-it-Back construction. Throughout the program the Housing Recovery Office has worked with the Department of Buildings, elected officials, the American Institute of Architects, and non-profit organizations to resolve and close these open issues. Many of these issues are decades old and may even predate the current ownership. There remain approximately 200 homeowners in the Build-it-Back program where these issues have not been resolved. This legislation will allow these homeowners to proceed with Build-it-Back construction and defer resolution of these issues until after Build-it-Back has completed its work. Homeowners would still need to address underlying conditions including open permits in order

2 to obtain a new certificate of occupancy, but this
3 legislation would allow the work to proceed before
4 those issues are resolved, and enable the Department
5 of Buildings to issue a letter of completing
6 certifying that the elevation was completed according
7 approved plans. The law would also allow homes not
8 requiring the certificate of occupancy to receive a
9 letter of completing notwithstanding pre-existing
10 violations or pre-existing permits that have not been
11 signed off. Lastly, the legislation would also allow
12 the Department of Buildings to waive penalties
13 specifically in cases where civil penalties were
14 imposed for pre-existing violations for work without
15 a permit. We are targeting those particular
16 violations because work cannot proceed without
17 resolution of those—the outstanding work without
18 permit violations. This provision will allow city
19 contractors to obtain permits and proceed with work
20 right away. Thank you for the opportunity to
21 testify. We appreciate the Council's willingness to
22 take up this matter with urgency and attention. We
23 know that with the approaching winter season every
24 day counts, and we believe this legislation can make
25 a difference today for homeowners. My colleagues and

2 I will not take any questions you may have about the
3 legislation. [banging door]

4 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay. Thank you,
5 Director Peterson. We've also been joined by Council
6 Members Carlos Menchaca and Council Member Donovan
7 Richards. So we do have some questions, and we'll
8 begin. There's a section of the bill that permits
9 certain demolitions to be performed where only a
10 qualified individual with experience in demolition
11 has to be on site provided the individual is
12 supervised by a registered design professional. What
13 constitutes a qualified individual with this
14 experience?

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So it would be
16 someone who is qualified under OSHA for overseeing
17 demolition. So it's a qualified person and it would
18 be someone who had demolition operations experience.

19 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And this is a
20 person that will be on site--

21 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] For the
22 whole duration.

23 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: --throughout the
24 entire--

25 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: --process?

3 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And this is for
5 both. There is manual demolition and then there's, I
6 guess, machine related demolition.

7 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, so the--

8 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Can you explain the
9 difference?

10 DIRECTOR PETERSON: --the--the nuance
11 where the licensed profession will also be on site is
12 where you use mechanical for work other than the
13 foundation. So in all instances the qualified
14 professional with experience in demolition will be
15 onsite. When you're using--doing mechanical demo
16 other than just the foundation work, you'll actually
17 have the--the licensed professional, the registered
18 engineer or architect who did the plans on site.

19 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And to be clear,
20 the City is simply looking to backload the
21 bureaucratic paperwork, but that still will be
22 required, you know, in order to really complete the
23 process to move forward beyond demolition before you
24 can start construction that paperwork has to be in.
25 Is that correct?

2 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, and they'll be
3 required to do all of the things that are required,
4 but the submission of the paperwork to DOB for the
5 sign-off prior to demolition will no longer be
6 required.

7 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And does DOB have
8 designated staff that is watching this and monitoring
9 this and is familiar with these cases.

10 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY:
11 Absolutely. We have inspectors who are on site.
12 Additionally, as Amy had mentioned, while the
13 paperwork is being submitted post demolition, they-it
14 has to be submitted before the new building permit
15 would be issued. So there was a check in place to
16 ensure that that paperwork does get submitted to the
17 department.

18 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: There's a section
19 of the bill that permits homeowners to occupy an
20 elevated home without a new C of O even if the
21 homeowner has pre-existing violations. How can we be
22 assured that this will not permit occupancy when
23 violations are related serious safety issues?

24 [background comments, pause]

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: So it
3 depends on the scale of the violation. Ordinarily,
4 these violations are not the kind of which that
5 present eminent threat to the occupants of the
6 building or the public. If that, in fact, was the
7 case, the scope of work being performed on the
8 building would be correcting those types of
9 violations. So this is merely an effort to sort of
10 defer responsibility to take care of these
11 outstanding violations, and these open permits to
12 allow folks to occupy their homes, and then prior to
13 receiving the certificate of occupancy, these
14 violations, these open permits will need to be
15 correct.

16 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Now, this applies
17 to only—these provisions apply to only city issued
18 contractors with the Build-it-Back program, is that
19 correct?

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So, can you explain
22 just so—for the sake of clarity non-profit
23 organizations doing this work whether it's a Habitat
24 for Humanity or St. Bernard Parish, they would not be
25 covered by these provisions, and can you explain?

2 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, so typically
3 this issue comes up when you're doing elevations and
4 rebuild. So neither of those organizations are
5 currently doing elevations or-or rebuild for us, and,
6 you know, when people are choosing their own
7 contractor, which is how they-they do that, they
8 typically have their resources and figure out how to-
9 to deal with these issues on their own and in terms
10 of their contract. When it's the city managed
11 contractor, we're very concerned about ensuring that
12 those homes can move forward. We want them to take
13 advantage of it, and not have to deal with long
14 outstanding issues.

15 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So the non-profits
16 are not doing the elevations, but with regards to the
17 demolition part of the bill, that does not apply to
18 them? That only applies to again to only city-issued
19 contractors, is that correct?

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, and they're not
21 doing demolition.

22 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay. What is the
23 city's definition of pre-existing as it-as it relates
24 to the terms pre-existing violation and pre-existing
25 permit that has not been signed off in the bill?

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: That
3 would be any pre-existing violation or open permit
4 that was issued prior to the commencement of the
5 Build-it-Back work.

6 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So, can you give us
7 an example of one so we—we have better clarity?

8 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: So, if
9 there as permit issued ten years ago, 15 years ago to
10 do work on a kitchen or a bathroom, and that permit
11 was never closed out by the applicant of record that
12 would be an example. Violations can include anything
13 including perhaps a fence violation. [banging door]
14 It really runs the gamut of all the types of
15 violations that the department has the authority to
16 issue.

17 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Uh-huh, and is it
18 possible that for example a homeowner purchased their
19 home let's say a year before Hurricane Sandy, and
20 some of them might not have been aware of these open
21 permits of violations. Have—have you had cases like
22 that in your program, Director Peterson?

23 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, so typically
24 when people buy homes that's part of the due
25 diligence, and so you would expect that to be

2 discovered, but we have certainly had homeowners who
3 have been faced with the barrier of having to deal
4 with these and say they pre-date their ownership.
5 Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Uh-huh, and one
7 more question with our interest of time, as well as
8 some of my colleagues as well, but there's a section
9 in the bill that waives penalties that may be imposed
10 for pre-existing violations for work without a
11 permit. Why are these waivers only applicable to
12 penalties for work without a permit and not other
13 types of violations?

14 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So this is--this is
15 purely to allow us to do the work. So this isn't
16 dealing with violations or fines or issues that
17 homeowners might have for--for other situations. To
18 do--and I'll let DOB correct me if I'm saying this a
19 little bit wrong. To actually start work and pull a
20 permit, you can't have an open civil penalty for work
21 without a permit. So that has to be waived for the
22 city to be able to proceed with that work. So that's
23 why that was specified as one of the things that
24 would be waived.

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: That's
3 correct. So the—the civil penalty issued for work
4 without a permit is unique relative to other
5 violations and permits, and that the law prohibits a
6 department from issuing a permit if a civil penalty
7 for work without permit was issued. So for that
8 reason, this legislation is calling for the waiving
9 of that penalty, which will allow us to go ahead and
10 issue the permit so work can start.

11 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So just to be clear
12 again, with regards to the demolition permit, we're
13 back loading their process. That paperwork will
14 still be required to be submitted. There will be a—a
15 designated professional on site at all times,
16 designated by HRO, is that correct?

17 DIRECTOR PETERSON: By the contracting
18 agency.

19 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And who—

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] So HPD,
21 HRO or DDC depending on who was managing the project.

22 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay, and that's
23 for the demolition process?

24 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And in order for
3 them to proceed post-demolition, they need to submit
4 that paperwork before construction can begin. Is
5 that correct?

6 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And with regards to
8 the open violations, open permits, we're also in a
9 way back loading that. At some point they do have to
10 get resolved, but you want this process to move
11 forward, and then at some point if they want to get a
12 new C of O, they have to resolve the prior violations
13 and permits. Is that correct.

14 DIRECTOR PETERSON: The homeowner
15 themselves, yes. We don't want them to not be able
16 to take advantage of the Build-it-Back work, and so
17 this allows them to not have to handle the situation
18 that they have today, but they will have to handle it
19 at some future time especially if they want to get a
20 mortgage or sell their property.

21 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And only those
22 violations are pertaining to the building process
23 will they--? Who has the discretion to waive? It's
24 the DOB Commissioner or who has that power? Who—who
25 makes that call?

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: I'm
3 sorry. The—the way they have the penalties is only
4 occurring for the work without a permit civil
5 penalty.

6 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Right.

7 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: And so,
8 we would be waiving that penalty.

9 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So, but I'm saying
10 who makes that decision? It's the Commissioner of
11 DOB?

12 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: It's
13 either the Department of Buildings perhaps in
14 conjunction with—that must be right. Yes, the
15 Department of Buildings. Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: It's DOB. Alright
17 so I—I have some more, but I'll turn it over to my
18 colleagues Council Member Steve Matteo.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: Thank you, Chair
20 Treyger. Just—just to be clear because I think it's—
21 it's important that we're all clear here. So, you—
22 you're waiving the application for demo. There—
23 you're doing the demo and then who's the—the onus is
24 on the applicant to submit the paperwork or are you
25 walking them through it? And is there potential

2 delays that even after you demo and then, and say for
3 some reason because we all see different reasons and
4 unintended consequences as we go forward with—with
5 issues like this that they're not properly applying
6 for the—for the rest of the—the permits?

7 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah, so the—the
8 contractor themselves will be responsible for doing
9 the filing after the demolition is complete to ensure
10 that they can get the new building permit to move
11 forward.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: So is—are you
13 then out of it once you [banging door]— Are you
14 minding them? Is there--?

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah, I mean we're
16 going to be, you know, the point of expediting demo
17 is so you can expedite construction right. So, you
18 know, the gap between finishing the demo and
19 submitting the paperwork we want to be, you know,
20 immediate really.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: So, why—why now
22 about pushing for the—for the—getting the—the demo
23 complete? Why didn't we—why didn't we do this a
24 while ago, and, you know this process is we're
25 talking about this and—and to be honest thinking

2 about the potential vote today, is it necessary that
3 we need today to do it, or what would happen if this
4 was pushed back another two weeks for us to review
5 everything and—and ensure that there are no—because
6 we all know there's always unintended consequences.
7 So I guess can you respond to that two parts.

8 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes. So I would say
9 for—for both the demolition and the open permits we
10 have worked very hard over the last number of years
11 to try to both expedite and fix the problem. So with
12 demolition as part of ex-accelerate Build-it-Back we
13 did a number of things to waive pieces of that
14 process to shorten notification timeframes, to waive
15 or make it easier to file related to baiting, which
16 is a part of the demolition process. Additionally,
17 the Department of Buildings, best plan examines have,
18 you know, been located at sites and worked with us.
19 So we've continued to expedite that process, but it's
20 clear that (1) the City is managing this work; (2)
21 there's a lot of homes we want to demolish. The—the
22 ability to flip more homes to rebuild has identified
23 a new pool of homes. Sometimes even after you can
24 start the elevation process or get—get in there, we
25 make the decision. So we really want to be able to

2 do the demolition quickly. We feel like the—the
3 steps we've taken have gotten to a much shorter time
4 frame, but this will really allow us to move quickly
5 in more of a kind of production style for the
6 remaining work. The—the timing. You know, today is
7 October 27th. November and December are very good
8 months to do excavation and demolition and begin
9 foundation work, concrete work. Depending on the
10 winter and January and February it gets tougher. So
11 our ability to start this now is—is definitely
12 improved. On the open permit and violations side,
13 it's really the same thing. We've done a number of
14 things over the years to try to help homeowners to
15 close these out. As you know, we had the—kind of an
16 architect in Staten Island who passed away, you know,
17 I think in 2002, [banging door] and had a number of
18 open permits. We've actually had, you know, AIA and
19 volunteer architects to help us with this. But there
20 remain a number of homes, about 200, some of which
21 are, you know, ready to go today but for this issue.
22 So, and we really appreciate your opportunity to hear
23 it and, you know, as all of us know the—the
24 priorities to get the homeowners home in three weeks

2 or two weeks before, you know, at this time of year
3 is--is important.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: So, if-if this
5 was passed today, wouldn't you see result in two
6 weeks about--

7 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yes, we
8 have a number--

9 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: [interposing] Do
10 you have a number? I mean.

11 DIRECTOR PETERSON: We have a number of
12 demolitions that are ready to go, and so we-we're
13 targeting about 50 demolitions that would use this
14 new process beginning in November. We have 31 homes
15 that are on hold day, and a number that, you know,
16 continue to get plan approval that have open permits.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: So 31 homes if
18 this was passed would go through?

19 DIRECTOR PETERSON: For open permits and
20 violations yes. Immediately.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: And you said
22 there's 50--or is that part of it?

23 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Excuse me?

24 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: I thought you
25 said there was 50 homes that--

2 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] So
3 about 50 homes that we're targeting for demolition in
4 November with this new process in place that would--
5 would take more weeks to get to. So we wouldn't be
6 able to get all of them in November if we don't have
7 this legislation, and we have about 200 homes that
8 we've identified [banging door] with the open permits
9 and violations. Thirty-one are on hold ready to go.
10 The rest are in the process and right behind that.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: Okay, so
12 specifically when it comes to the legislation and--and
13 correct me if I'm wrong--it seems open-ended. Why--
14 why not put a sunset provision on this to protect--

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Well,
16 it--it means it--

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO:[interposing] -to
18 protect us and say in a year or two years--

19 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] -it's--
20 it's not open-ended in that Build-it-Back is not
21 open-ended. So in that sense--

22 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO:[interposing] I
23 know, but we don't have a date, we don't have that
24 date of completion. So is it--so when Build-it-Back
25 is--when you--when the Mayor says Build-it-Back is

2 complete, that's it, why not put that in here and
3 just say-

4 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yeah,
5 so-so I would say, and certainly we all want to
6 finish Build-it-Back, but, you know, one of the-the
7 most complicated pieces of this has been trying to
8 help homeowners who have things with their homes that
9 don't make the work simple. So just like the Zoning
10 Text Amendment kind of allowed us to, you know, do a
11 group of homes, this open permit and violation
12 language will really help homeowners and, you know,
13 there may be some homeowners that are part of the,
14 you know, Quartz projects of something else that will
15 benefit for this so--

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: My last question
17 and concern right now is the CO process. Do you
18 foresee this making that a little bit much-a little
19 bit difficult for-for those who tried to see it down
20 the line? You see-what do you-what do you foresee,
21 what problems that may arise by us doing this at the-
22 for those who are, you know, two years from now
23 trying to get that CO, and is DOB going to be
24 basically holding their hands to-to make sure that
25 they get that CO at the end of the day?

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: So with
3 this legislation, we see only a benefit not a
4 barrier. Folks will be able to enter their homes
5 sooner without having to worry about resolving these
6 violations and open permits. Subsequent to that, you
7 are correct, they are going to need to address these
8 violations and open permits to get the certificate of
9 occupancy, but they're not in any worse of a position
10 at that later date than they are right now.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: Okay. I'm sorry.
12 I do have one more. Do you--are there liability
13 issues that we're not seeing here on the professional
14 and Build-it-Back on the City by fast tracking this
15 and getting the paperwork after.

16 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah. No, I would
17 say the, you know, the--the responsibility for the
18 safety of these sites and for these--these homes the
19 rest of the city and the contractors that we've hired
20 and that remains with this work that we're doing.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Thank you for those
23 very important questions. Next we have Council
24 Member Donovan Richards.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: How are you?

3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Amy and Patrick.

4 Just a few questions. So where the majority are you

5 seeing these particular properties concentrated out?

6 Is there any particular areas where these particular

7 issues persist more than others or do you have

8 numbers like a breakdown of these--?

9 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yeah, I

10 mean, I-I can-I can get you the breakdown. We have--

11 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: [interposing]

12 Thank you.

13 DIRECTOR PETERSON: You know, we were

14 looking at specific examples this morning and

15 Edgemere and Breezy Point in Staten Island and in-in-

16 in Brooklyn. So-

17 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: [interposing]

18 Including it's broadly everywhere. It's the same as

19 have there.

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] It's-

21 it's across-it's across the-the neighborhoods. Yes.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: And then a

23 question for DOB. So work is done, the homeowner

24 moves back in. Are you going to be knocking on their

25

2 door for them to complete these violations like the
3 next day or how long will they have??

4 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: No,
5 there's no sort of time table per se. Again, once
6 they move in their homes, the outstanding violations,
7 the open permits remain. They obviously continue to
8 have an obligation to resolve those violations, and
9 open permits. But there's no time table per se. So,
10 to be quite--

11 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: [interposing]
12 So you're not going to get aggressive verse
13 homeowners who--are you positive?

14 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: Certainly
15 we are.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Do you have
17 your word on the record.

18 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: Yes.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Okay, and then
20 I guess this is for the Department of Buildings as
21 well. How much do you anticipate this will cut for--
22 the red tape?

23 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: It's--it's
24 weird. I--I can certainly say it will save a
25 significant amount of time. It will depends--

2 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Is it months or
3 weeks or--

4 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: I'd say
5 weeks would be a fair estimate, but I want to qualify
6 that by saying every project is different--

7 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: [interposing]
8 Yes, uh-huh, it is.

9 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: --and it
10 really depends on the scope of work involved, and for
11 those who are moving in sooner, you know, how many
12 open violations they have, how many open permits
13 involved they have, the amount of work necessary that
14 they would have to do to resolve those open permits
15 to ordinarily moved into their homes and get the CO.
16 So it really is very much a case-by-cases basis--

17 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Uh-huh.

18 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: --but I
19 think it may need, you know, correct me if I'm wrong,
20 it's reasonable to say certainly in many instances
21 this will be saving weeks on a process.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: And so you said
23 200 homes will be affected by this. So out of those
24 200 I mean can you give a time frame of how many

2 homes would be able to rebuild or do demolition on
3 within a certain time frame with this legislation?

4 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah, so there's--
5 there's about 100--over 100 homes that still need to
6 be demolished. So we're targeting the first 50 at
7 least for just--for--for November, and--

8 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: But for
9 November.

10 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: So the first
12 50?

13 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Okay,
15 beautiful.

16 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, and the others
17 may even move into that month, and certainly will be
18 right behind.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: So then can we
20 say by January 100 or 200 will be done?

21 DIRECTOR PETERSON: I believe so, yes.
22 In January.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Alright, let's
24 not set deadlines--

2 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yes.

3 [laughs]

4 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: --or I'm going
5 to get you in trouble. [laughs]

6 DIRECTOR PETERSON: A 100 homes will have
7 the open permits and violations. Each of them are in
8 different stages in the process.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Okay.

10 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So there's about 50
11 that--31 exactly that like are on hold for a
12 construction start right now so there--they'll be
13 ready to start as soon as this legislation passes,
14 which is amazing. In addition, there is up--up to 50
15 that would be ready to start in November and an
16 additional 50--and another 50 would have DOB plan
17 approval in November.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Thank you.

19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Thank you,
21 colleague. We've also been joined by Council Member
22 Margaret Chin. I just want to recognize her, and
23 next we have Councilman Carlos Menchaca.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you
25 Chair, Amy and Patrick, good to see you this morning.

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: Good
3 morning.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thanks so much
5 for being here today, and I-I have a couple of kind
6 of bigger questions and some specific ones. Is there
7 precedent for us in-in the city to do something like
8 this? Have we done like something like this before?

9 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: [off mic]
10 I don't know who. I'm-I'm not aware of any type of-

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: This is the
12 first time we're kind of embarking on this con-
13 versation and this legal-through legislation
14 anyway the daily press to kind of--

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yeah,
16 I-I would-one thing I would say is, you know, I think
17 the-the-it's not-it's not a complete precedent, but
18 it's a parallel. So I think what the zoning text is-
19 You know, our goal is to elevate these homes, and
20 things that happened or were done to these homes
21 prior to the storm, and certainly prior to us
22 elevating shouldn't hinder someone's ability to be
23 unsafe for zoning and housing. And so just like the
24 Zoning Text Amendment basically ignored whatever
25 anyone had done in the 40s, 50s, 60s, 70s to-to

2 change the home—their home, these are things that
3 have DOB violations or permits—open permits and
4 things like that. It's the same—it's the same thing.
5 We want to be able to give these people the benefit
6 of elevation, the benefit of Build-it-Back without
7 having to deal with pre-existing conditions [banging
8 door] that would hinder them from getting that.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And—and that's
10 becoming clear as far as just the full understanding
11 of what the intention of—of this is, and so because
12 we're kind of embarking on this, and this is urgent,
13 and we get that. This is why we're here talking
14 about it. We're going to have a hearing and a vote
15 at the same time. So we're going to look at this,
16 and we're—we're asking some—some really good
17 questions about this. Where are we sitting a sense—
18 sense of precedent moving forward in—in the future
19 for other type of—types of emergencies that are not
20 necessarily related to storm activity but other—other
21 things potentially natural disasters that we haven't
22 seen before or—or just wanting to rebuild faster.
23 And so I—I—I worry about that right now. Have you
24 thought about it?

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: It's a
3 fair concern. So I'll give you some more thought, on
4 the violation side there is precedent for doing this.
5 What we're proposing to do here with demolitions I
6 believe there is no precedent for, but I think that's
7 largely because Hurricane Sandy was unprecedented,
8 and what we're trying to do here is a result of, you
9 know, an unprecedented catastrophe, and to the extent
10 that these types—you know, perhaps down the road, you
11 know, God forbid something like this occurs again, I
12 think it's—I think it's reasonable that the city
13 might want to consider doing something like this, but
14 for now specific to this legislation it only covers,
15 you know, these Build-it-Back projects.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay, and I did
17 read the legislation and—and it clearly it kind of
18 lays out only for Build-it-Back, and so again I think
19 the legislation looks tight, but I—I just—I want to
20 air that concern that we—I wonder where—where people
21 will find the opportunity to say look we did it here.
22 We can do it again, or this legislation might be able
23 to unlock other opportunities that people with a lot
24 of resources and a lot of lawyers can look and—and
25 uncover for us in the future. So I just want to—I

2 just want to lay that out. I'm also curious about the
3 determination. It's clear, but I just want you to
4 kind of lay it out for us. I think—I think we can—
5 we—we could—it serves us better in determining the
6 detached versus—or the detached versus attached
7 homes. And talk to us a little bit about—about that
8 determination.

9 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So both semi-detached
10 homes that are attached to one—others, this would not
11 work for and fully attached. So they would have to be
12 individual single-family detached homes.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And again,
14 help—help—help me understand the logic on—on that.
15 It seems pretty clear, but I just want you to
16 articulate the logic for a focus on detached homes,
17 and—and not the range of—of other homes that—that
18 could benefit from something like this?

19 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: So, the—
20 the logic is an attached home, either fully attached
21 on both sides or semi-attached, when it comes to
22 demolition, that—that work presents a greater degree
23 of complexity and sophistication. So that's the
24 concern.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So, it's—it's
3 really just based out of complexity. This is already
4 complex, right, in so many ways right, but so you're
5 stopping at that opportunity for—for moving forward
6 with the same confidence you have with detached homes
7 with semi or fully attached homes.

8 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: That's
9 correct.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay. I also
11 want to know a little bit about the costs. So I kind
12 of looked at the impact statement. It doesn't like
13 there's any cost. In fact, you're—you're pushing
14 towards savings for folks on the ground, for the
15 administration. You also talk a lot about
16 supervision and having—having people on—on site at
17 all times. I think that was—that was these are the
18 chair's words. How does this not have an impact in—
19 in administrative fees and administration?

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So, the—the on-site
21 supervision, the design professional to do the plans
22 all of that is currently required. The—the—when we
23 process the plans and submit them to DOB and the
24 timing is what's changed here. So, we—we have those
25 resources already dedicated to this work.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So that's not-
3 that's not necessarily new. I mean it's-it's
4 highlighted in the legislation, but it's not-not new?

5 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Uh-huh.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: It's already,
7 it was already planned.

8 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And the
10 acceleration of-of the work because it sounds like
11 this was-this was-we were in molasses and now we're
12 going to go into speed mode here, and none of that
13 will change the impact on-on resources?

14 DIRECTOR PETERSON: No. I think the-the
15 intent is to get this done more quickly and get
16 people home, but no.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay, on the
18 violations piece, is there an example of a violation,
19 and Patrick I think you mentioned this. Most-a lot of
20 these violations will be addressed through the
21 reconstruction, whatever plan the homeowner decides.
22 Are there any examples of violations that are
23 actually critical and life threatening that you can
24 kind of share with us today about what-what may be a
25 concern for us.

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: So
3 critical life threatening violations I can't speak to
4 all the properties involved in the program, but
5 presumably they have all been addressed. How they-if
6 they're not addressed, certainly they'll be addressed
7 through the scope of work to improve these homes.

8 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes. So I would add
9 that, you know, we're required to leaves homes
10 decent, safe and sanitary through HUD. So we would
11 ensure that there's no danger. There's no safety
12 issues in-in the home. The issue is more related to,
13 you know, verifying all of the legal code
14 requirements to related to a bathroom on the second
15 floor or something to that regard, and wanting to-to-
16 Not wanting to take on that challenges, but if
17 there's safety issues in the-in the home we address
18 those in our work.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And then-and
20 then finally, where-where I'm having a little bit of
21 difficulty is understanding this post and-and Council
22 Member Richards kind of spoke to it, but I have like
23 another take on it, which is post-construction,
24 homeowner responsibility, and really kind of-I--I
25 kind of see this in-in pushing accountability a

2 little bit out, allowing us to do the work, and then
3 we kind of return back to normal in certain ways.
4 Build-it-Back goes away. Thank you so much for the-
5 for the new reconstruction, and then there exists
6 this pile of-of stuff of work that's already
7 difficult anyway. This is-this exists today. We're
8 pushing it out, and now the homeowner is responsible.
9 The homeowner is always responsible. I get that, but
10 I guess I'm-that world is a little bit murky to me,
11 and what responsibility do we have as a-as a city to
12 reconcile that in the future, and what resources we
13 could think about now so we anticipate that a little
14 bit, and I'm thinking about liability. Does anybody-
15 does-are-are architects liable? Like does that
16 change the liability of who is responsible if-if a
17 homeowner doesn't address these issues because
18 they're now in their own, they're living-- These
19 homeowners have gone through so much on so many
20 different issues, their health, mental health, work,
21 life and I-- Again, I'm just putting myself in the-
22 in the roles of these and-and-and homes of-of these
23 families, and then they don't-they don't deal with
24 it, and then those problems compound. Do you have a

2 sense about what that-what that looks like, and what
3 we can do as a city today and think about it today?

4 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So-so I would just
5 add as part of this you know, we're-we're here for
6 this legislation because it's clear that there are
7 some issues that aren't being resolved, but we've
8 been resolving these issues both with the Department
9 of Buildings, helping homeowners close out all
10 violations and do things on a daily basis. We've had
11 a partnership with DOB and AIA to try to get some
12 things closed with volunteer architects. NYDIS is
13 now helping people with the funds they need. So all
14 of those efforts will continue and remain to help
15 these homeowners do that through certainly all the-
16 the time that we're here, and I think it could prove
17 to be a model potentially with another non-profit in
18 helping people. Because this issue certainly doesn't
19 just exist with, you know, Sandy homeowners.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So, and what I
21 heard here was, you're-you're already kind of helping
22 them do that now. What-what-what I want to hear is
23 that we're creating--we're going to create a plan so
24 that-so that-- And this not at all part of the
25 discussion, but I want to make it part of the

2 discussion that at the end of the day when—when
3 reconstruction is over that—that there is a plan, or
4 that it is resolved at some point. You know, we—we
5 hold ourselves accountable as a team, a city, a
6 homeowner and all the resources that you're pulling
7 together to ensure that—that families are going to be
8 okay after. And what I don't want us to do is
9 essentially just kind of send them off with a whole
10 list of things that they have to take care of, and—
11 and honor the full scope of the work beyond the
12 construction. And so I don't know what that looks
13 like. I'm not an expert in this kind of post-
14 construction world that we're creating here, but I
15 think—I think we need to look at that. I think we
16 need to come up with some—something and not wait like
17 we do so much emergency and urgency situations where
18 we'll just take care of that later. We'll come back
19 to that, and then we have to do some emergency
20 legislation for them again, or—or come up with a new—
21 a new program in the middle of—of a firestorm. I—I
22 want us to think about that now, and so I don't know
23 if there's anything that you can think about now,
24 right now in this public hearing, but I—I want to
25 come back and—and really think about what that—what

2 that world will be for the homeowner even in their
3 new home that's reconstructed, Build-it-Back
4 successful. Everyone is happy and they're left with
5 something to do they might—they might not be able to
6 do without our help.

7 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Okay.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Thank you,
10 Councilman. Next, we have Council Member Margaret
11 Chin.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you, Chair.

13 [banging door] Thank you, Chair and good morning.
14 So from your testimonies, and you said this group is
15 about 200 including open violations and demolition
16 together?

17 DIRECTOR PETERSON: The—the open
18 violations is about 200, the remaining demolitions is
19 about 100—over a 100, over 100.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So altogether?

21 DIRECTOR PETERSON: It's more 300 or 350.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay, so this—okay
23 that's a larger number. So with the legislation are
24 the homeowners ready. The one that you talked about
25 you said right now about, you're going to start with

2 at least 50. So are the homeowners ready to move
3 out? [banging door]

4 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So and then that is
6 going to be organized in a way that--

7 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yes.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: --they're all like
9 this was done, and so now they all have places that
10 they could relocate to. So you have staff working
11 with them?

12 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, yes.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So, so this will
14 get expedited, and the total number is--is 350?

15 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay, thank you,
17 Chair.

18 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Thank you, Council
19 Member. Just a couple of clarifying questions. So
20 what determines whether the demolition will be manual
21 or mechanical? That's something that we're just not
22 clear about?

23 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So I--I think it
24 depends on the--the size of the house and the
25 proximity of the house to other structures. The

2 reason there's the delineation in the-the-the
3 legislation is because the idea of using manual
4 demolition above ground, above the foundations is
5 something that needs that extra level of supervision
6 on site, and to ensure especially in these closed
7 neighborhoods. So-so that's the-you know, its-its
8 kind of manpower and speed, and-and safety, time and
9 all of those considerations. So it will depend on a
10 site-by-site basis, but often the-the method you use
11 depends certainly on the type of construction, the
12 type of home you're demolishing, but also its
13 proximity to its neighbors.

14 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And you are
15 confident and-and-and with-and the bill states that a
16 qualified person will be on site for both of those
17 options. Is that correct?

18 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Very. Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And walk us through
20 very quickly if that person sees something that's not
21 supposed to happen what is the process to make sure
22 things are safe right away?

23 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So our safety
24 professionals currently have the ability to stop
25 jobs. So they will stop the job.

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So they have that
3 power?

4 DIRECTOR PETERSON: They have that power.

5 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And please walk us
6 through that process. Do they have to contact you?
7 Do they have to contact the commissioner?

8 DIRECTOR PETERSON: So they can—they have
9 the authority to stop the work onsite. Additionally,
10 they would reach out to the kind of safety super-
11 supervision, and now that we have the field
12 coordinator and the trailers in each of the boroughs,
13 we have safety people and present at all times, and
14 we would also if there was something unsafe we would
15 reach out to the Department of Buildings.

16 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: It would
17 be required make notification, and we would respond
18 right away. And should any issues arise, the full
19 liability is on the contractor and the city, not on
20 the homeowner. Is that correct?

21 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct, most
22 definitely.

23 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So there's no
24 liability from the homeowner?

25 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And the last
3 question I have is what type of data or information
4 is requested on a demo permit application that the
5 city might already have. Because in this—it's my
6 understanding that the city already knows the
7 contractor is doing this work. Is that correct? But
8 to just—what type of information do you think you
9 already have that goes on such an application anyway.

10 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yeah, so a lot of it
11 has to do with ensuring that the things that need to
12 be done prior to demo have been done. And so a lot
13 of it has to do with the utility disconnects and
14 verifying that that's been done, and we've worked
15 closely with the utility just to kind of-- The
16 utility companies both to expedite the disconnect,
17 and then to also expedite how we get that
18 notification and ensure that we have it before we
19 move forward. There is a requirement for baiting.
20 So that's part of it. Part of it's the notification
21 requirements and other things like that in addition
22 to the plan that explains how you're going to safely
23 demolish the building.

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: And has that
3 happened? Is there some sort of a demo readiness
4 assessment checklist that has taken place already?

5 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So these homes have
7 been baited and all that stuff already happens?

8 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So they're just
10 waiting on--

11 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: --just to move
13 forward?

14 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: So, just again one
16 of--one of the things that--that I raised that my main
17 concern throughout this was just making sure that
18 we're not compromising safety. So I want to ask both
19 of you: Are you confident that with this
20 legislation, with this--with this measure we are not
21 compromising safety whatsoever for the residents and--
22 and the workers there are you confident, Director
23 Peterson?

24 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, I am confident?

25

2 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: Yes, I am
3 confident? There are a number of additional layers
4 of oversight that this work provides for that's not
5 typical for normal demolitions, and all that
6 additional oversight as we've discusses, gives us the
7 comfort that this work will be performed safely.

8 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Right, and as you
9 said that there are about—there are hundreds of
10 people waiting on this in order to get this work
11 started as soon as possible, and they're probably
12 waiting with boxes looking to get this process
13 started. With that, if there—are there any other
14 questions from any of my colleagues? With—with that,
15 I guess we'll have—I'm sorry? [background comments,
16 pause] Okay, so we'll go into a temporary recess of
17 about five minutes I would say, and we'll call for a
18 vote. Thank you.

19 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHALEY: Thank
20 you.

21 [pause for recess] [background comments]

22 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay, we're ready
23 to restart the—the hearing. Director Peterson, we
24 are all very eager—

25 DIRECTOR PETERSON: [interposing] Uh-huh.

2 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: --to get this
3 recovery moving for--for the impacted families and--and
4 for their communities to make them whole again. And
5 certainly I think that every member of this committee
6 certainly is willing to entertain the notion of
7 trying to cut red tape to move things along. The
8 issue of safety is something that we take very
9 serious and, you know, you're on record saying that
10 you're confident that this does not compromise the
11 safety of our residents or our neighborhoods. The
12 other issues has been trying to restore a sense of
13 confidence with regards to the timeliness of these
14 projects. We don't want to come back in January or
15 February and only two homes were demolished. So
16 with, would you be willing to provide this committee
17 with weekly updates starting in November with regards
18 to the number of homes that are being demolished just
19 to see progress actually happening?

20 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Yes, definitely.

21 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay so weekly
22 updates with regards these homes that would benefit
23 under the--under this--under this measure. Okay,
24 having said that, will the Clerk please call the
25 roll?

2 CLERK: William Martin, Committee Clear,
3 roll call vote committee on Recovery and Resiliency
4 and preconsidered introduction. Chair Treyger.

5 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: I vote aye.

6 CLERK: Chin.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: I vote aye.

8 CLERK: Richards.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Aye.

10 CLERK: Menchaca.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: I vote aye with
12 the conversation that we continue to really help
13 homeowners post the construction, and come up with a
14 way to make that happen together. Thank you.

15 CLERK: Matteo.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MATTEO: With the caveat
17 that we provide the information and also I spoke with
18 Chair Treyger that we would like to—we would like to
19 have oversight hearings following up on the progress,
20 and that we—this committee and this council stay as
21 partners in this process as we look to pass this
22 legislation. So with that, I'm going to vote yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: Okay, I believe—
24
25

2 CLERK: [interposing] By a vote of 5 in
3 the affirmative, 0 in the negative and no
4 abstentions, the item has been adopted.

5 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: We're going to
6 leave the vote open I would say for about—I would say
7 the maximum of three minutes. [siren] A certain is
8 on his—on his way for him to vote, but I just want to
9 say that I—I think that it's clear that the City
10 Council here [banging door] and the administration do
11 want to work together to get these things done. Just
12 with the interest of safety in mind, the interest of
13 making sure that we're not losing a step with regards
14 to keeping neighborhoods safe, and getting these
15 projects moving forward in a timely manner, and
16 making sure that we don't let red tape get, you know,
17 get in the way. So thank you for your time here, and
18 again, the vote will be left open. Otherwise, the
19 hearing is—well, the hearing is not adjourned yet,
20 right? We have to—we have to wait three minutes.

21 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON TREYGER: But thank you all
23 very much.

24 DIRECTOR PETERSON: Thank you. Thank you
25 very much.

1 COMMITTEE ON RECOVERY AND RESILIENCY

53

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T 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 November 9, 2016