

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE
COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

----- X

March 29, 2017
Start: 11:25 a.m.
Recess: 2:52 p.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E:

DAVID G. GREENFIELD
Chairperson
JAMES VACCA
Co-Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Vincent J. Gentile
Annabel Palma
Daniel R. Garodnick
Darlene Mealy
Rosie Mendez
Ydanis A. Rodriguez
Peter A. Koo
Brad S. Lander
Stephen T. Levin
Jumaane D. Williams
Ruben Wills
Deborah L. Rose
Donovan J. Richards

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Inez D. Barron
Andrew Cohen
Ben Kallos
Antonio Reynoso
Ritchie J. Torres
Mark Treyger
Rafael Salamanca, Jr.
Barry S. Grodenchik
Joseph C. Borelli

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

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Commissioner, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission

Sarah Carroll
Executive Director
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission

Gardea Caphart
Budget Director
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission

Marisa Lago
Chair
NYC Planning Commission
Director
NYC Department of City Planning

Purnima Kapur
Executive Director
NYC Department of City Planning

Jon Kaufman
Chief Operating Officer
NYC Department of City Planning

Anita Laremont
General Counsel
NYC Department of City Planning

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

Anne Roest
Commissioner
Department of Information Technology and
Telecommunications

Annette Heintz
Deputy Commissioner
Financial Management and Administration
Department of Information Technology and
Telecommunications

John Winker
Associate Commissioner
Financial Services
Department of Information Technology and
Telecommunications

Michael Pastor
General Counsel
Department of Information Technology and
Telecommunications

Stanley Shor
Assistant Commissioner
Franchise Administration
Department of Information Technology and
Telecommunications

Thomas Lowenhaupt
Chair
Connecting.nyc Inc.

2 [sound check]

3 [pause]

4 [gavel]

5 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: I am the Council
6 Member from the 44th Council District in Brooklyn;
7 I'm privileged to serve as the Chair of the Land Use
8 Committee. I want to welcome my esteemed colleagues
9 who are members of the Committee; I would also like
10 to recognize Chair Donovan Richards, Chair Peter Koo;
11 Chair Rafael Salamanca for their leadership and work
12 with the Zoning, Landmarks, and Planning
13 Subcommittees respectively. I want to welcome
14 Council Member Gentile, Council Member Palma, Council
15 Member Mendez, Council Member Koo, Council Member
16 Lander, Council Member Rose, Council Member Williams,
17 Council Member Wills, Council Member Richards,
18 Council Member Kallos, Council Member Reynoso, and
19 Council Member Treyger.

20 This hearing is being held jointly with
21 the Technology Committee and I welcome Chair Vacca
22 and members of the Committee who will be joining us
23 in a little bit when we do our oversight hearing of
24 Department of Information Technology and
25

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 6

2 Telecommunications, or as we so fondly call them,
3 DoITT.

4 This particular portion of the hearing
5 will cover the FY18 Preliminary Budget for the
6 Landmarks Preservation Commission; we will then cover
7 the FY18 Preliminary Budget for the Department of
8 City Planning and then the Department of Information
9 Technology and Telecommunications. Chair Vacca will
10 join us to speak to the issues regarding at DoITT at
11 1:00 p.m. After DoITT, we will hear from interested
12 members of the public.

13 I'd like to remind everyone that if you
14 would like to testify today, please fill out a
15 witness slip with the Sergeant-at-Arms.

16 Before I begin, I want to thank our
17 Finance, Land Use and Technology staff for their
18 outstanding preparation in advance of today's
19 hearing.

20 We're going to begin this portion of the
21 hearing with testimony from the Landmarks
22 Preservation Commission. The Landmarks Subcommittee
23 is chaired by Council Member Peter Koo and I want to
24 thank Chair Koo for his outstanding work on these
25 issues. The Landmarks Preservation Commission

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 7

2 designates, regulates and protects New York City's
3 architectural, historic and cultural resources. The
4 Commission has granted landmark status to more than
5 36,000 buildings and sites since its creation in 1965
6 including 1,398 individual landmarks, 118 interior
7 landmarks, 10 scenic landmarks -- sorry, every time I
8 say scenic landmarks, Council Member Treyger comes to
9 mind -- and 141 historic district extensions in all
10 five boroughs.

11 The Landmarks Preservation Commission's
12 Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget totals \$6.3 million,
13 representing less than 1% of the City's total budget.
14 I would say that's much less than 1% of the City's
15 total budget. The Department's Fiscal 2018
16 Preliminary Budget is \$35,000 or less than 1% more
17 than Fiscal 2017 adopted budget of \$6.3 million.

18 I wanted to take an opportunity to
19 commend Chair Srinivasan and her staff for working
20 together with us in the Council to clear the backlog.
21 I was very proud to have worked with the Chair to
22 pass a law together with Chair Peter Koo last year
23 that requires the LPC to go through its backlog and
24 make final recommendations on calendared properties;
25 legislation Intro 775-A also ensures that there will

2 never be a backlog again -- Yay! -- because
3 recommendations must be made within one year for
4 individual properties or two years for historic
5 districts.

6 The Chair and her staff have done an
7 outstanding job addressing the backlog of 95
8 properties, most of which have been calendared for 20
9 years or more. I'm actually excited that today, just
10 right before this hearing, we actually voted on the
11 final of the backlog items. I mean, I really, I just
12 have to say this on the record 'cause I don't think
13 people appreciate how rare it is for government to
14 actually, a.) work together -- collaboration between
15 the Council the Administration in the form of the
16 Landmarks Preservation Commission; and b.) actually
17 -- I know this is going to sound crazy to some of you
18 folks watching at home -- but to actually keep the
19 commitments that were made. I always joke that if
20 government worked well I wouldn't have anything to do
21 all day, and today I don't even have as much to do
22 because this is my fourth year that I am engaging in
23 these hearings and for the last four years I would
24 have the joy and the privilege of beating up whoever
25 sat in that chair and saying, "What's going on with

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 9

2 the backlog?" And finally, working together, we've
3 actually got it done. So thank you, Chair Srinivasan
4 for your outstanding work and for your staff and for
5 your diligence; I know that these were hard decisions
6 and not easy to do, but everybody said it was
7 impossible and you got it done and so we're very
8 grateful for that.

9 In addition, the Land Use Committee is
10 interested in hearing from the Chair about the
11 Commission's \$6.3 million budget including details
12 regarding headcount, technology upgrades and
13 enforcement efforts. We would like to thank Chair
14 Meenakshi Srinivasan for joining us this morning; we
15 will now turn it over to the Chair for her testimony.

16 I want to just note we've been joined by
17 Council Member Barron.

18 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Good morning Chair
19 Greenfield and members of the Land Use Committee.
20 I'm Meenakshi Srinivasan, Chair of the Landmarks
21 Preservation Commission. Thank you for giving me the
22 opportunity to testify before your Committee about
23 the Commission and its FY 2018 Preliminary Budget.
24 I'd like to start by telling you about the budget and
25 then update you on the progress of several

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 10

2 initiatives we outlined in our last budget hearing,
3 as well as some new initiatives. [interpose]

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Chair, if you
5 don't mind; is it okay if I ask if you will just
6 identify those people who are sitting up there with
7 you at the dais for those folks who may be watching
8 at home...? [crosstalk]

9 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Of course..

10 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you.

11 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: that is my mistake.

12 I'm here with Sarah Carroll, our Executive Director
13 and Gardea Caphart, who's our Budget Director.

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you very
15 much.

16 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Thank you.

17 So LPC's FY 2017 adopted budget was \$6.31
18 million and FY 2018 Preliminary Budget is \$6.34
19 million which comprises \$5.75 million in City funds
20 and \$595,983 in Community Development Block Grant
21 (CDBG) funds. This slight budget increase is due to
22 the last round of Collective Bargaining increases
23 that have been baselined into our budget for FY 2018
24 and the out years.

25

2 Of the overall budget, 88%, or
3 approximately \$5.57 million, is allocated to
4 personnel services and 12%, or \$670,000, is allocated
5 to other than personnel services. The Agency's total
6 headcount is 81 including 73 full-time positions and
7 8 part-time positions. There are presently a total
8 of 72 staff members -- 66 full-time staff and 6 part-
9 time staff, and we are currently in the process of
10 filling these vacancies.

11 Of the CDBG funding, about 80%, or
12 \$470,000, is allocated to personnel supporting
13 critical community development-related functions;
14 while 20% or approximately \$115,000 is allocated for
15 our Historic Preservation Grant Program.

16 In the first half of FY 2017, we
17 completed an ambitious designation agenda that
18 included the culmination of two major initiatives:
19 addressing the Agency's 50-year backlog of calendared
20 properties, and landmark designations in Greater East
21 Midtown.

22 We are pleased to report that we
23 successfully completed the backlog initiative in just
24 18 months that resulted in landmark designation of 27
25 outstanding properties. And I just want to take the

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 12

2 opportunity to thank the Council for affirming 26 of
3 our designations, and we understand that the Council
4 has to weigh many issues in its review and we thank
5 you for your support. Among these new individual
6 landmarks is Schofield House on City Island in the
7 Bronx, the Van Sicklen House in Gravesend, Brooklyn,
8 Bergdorf Goodman in Midtown, Manhattan, the Pepsi
9 Cola Sign in Long Island City, Queens and the
10 Vanderbilt Mausoleum in Todt Hill, Staten Island.

11 Further, as part of the Administration's
12 multi-agency initiative to plan for Greater East
13 Midtown's future, this past December we designated 12
14 properties, including the former Citicorp Building,
15 Graybar Building and the Yale Club, and fulfilled our
16 commitment to identify and designate buildings in the
17 district prior to the certification of City
18 Planning's rezoning proposal.

19 Thus far in FY 2017, in total we have
20 designated two historic districts (Sullivan-Thompson
21 and Morningside Heights in Manhattan), 26 individual
22 landmarks and two interior landmarks, including
23 multiple publicly-accessible rooms within the Waldorf
24 Astoria Hotel, for a total of approximately 324
25 buildings. In FY 2016, the Commission designated

2 three historic districts (Mount Morris Park Historic
3 District Expansion in Harlem, Bedford Historic
4 District and Park Slope Historic District Extension
5 in Brooklyn) and 17 individual landmarks, for a total
6 of 1,411 properties.

7 The Agency continues to evaluate historic
8 preservation opportunities in neighborhoods
9 undergoing change. Currently we are analyzing the
10 historic resources in East Harlem, as well as Gowanus
11 and we are participating in an interagency agency as
12 part of the Public Realm working group.

13 Now turning to our Preservation
14 Department: As you know, the Preservation Department
15 reviews applications and issues permits for proposed
16 work on designated properties; received 13,972 permit
17 applications in FY 2016 and took action on 13,954
18 applications during the same period. Through January
19 in FY 2017, we have received 7,715 permit
20 applications, and have taken action on 7,928
21 applications.

22 Approximately 95% of our permits are
23 issued at staff level pursuant to Agency rules and
24 the other 5% require review by the full Commission.
25 In FY 2016, the Commission reviewed more than 442

2 proposals for work on landmarked properties and took
3 431 actions. In the first half of FY 2017,
4 Commissioners reviewed 263 proposals and took action
5 on 245 proposals.

6 In order to further streamline our
7 regulatory process, we have been working on a package
8 of discrete amendments to our rules to provide
9 updated standards and codify well-established
10 Commission practices for ministerial staff level
11 approvals. We have begun engaging stakeholders
12 regarding these proposed amendments and we hope to
13 commence the CAPA process this year.

14 With our Community Development Block
15 Grant funding we also administer a modest Historic
16 Preservation Grant Program targeted for low- and
17 moderate-income homeowners and not-for-profit
18 organizations to restore or repair the facades of
19 their landmarked buildings. In FY 2017, the program
20 awarded three grants: two residential grants; one in
21 St. George/New Brighton Historic District on Staten
22 Island, and one in Crown Heights North III Historic
23 District in Brooklyn, and we also awarded one not-
24 for-profit grant for Lewis H. Latimer House Museum,
25 an individual landmark in Flushing, Queens.

2 My agency has also been actively pursuing
3 transparency, in part by using digital technology and
4 our website to provide timely information on the
5 Commission's work. Last May we launched a new permit
6 application search feature that provides the status
7 of all permit applications; this complements our
8 earlier feature that provides presentation material
9 and decisions on all full commission actions. This
10 past month we created a new internal database that
11 will assist in monitoring the review of applications
12 and improve the efficiency of our permit process.

13 Last October we introduced a new website
14 to search and browse the City's archaeological
15 artifacts, making New York City the first
16 municipality in the U.S. to host a digital archive
17 dedicated to its extensive archaeological collection.

18 More recently we created an interactive
19 three-dimensional historic district model with
20 building-level data and photographs for Morningside
21 Heights as both an informational tool for
22 stakeholders as well as an educational tool and fun
23 feature for everyone. And finally, in January the
24 Agency received an approximately \$50,000 grant from
25 New York Community Trust to support the Historic

2 Building Data Project. Over the next year, the LPC
3 will create and publicly release a robust GIS-based
4 database with searchable building-by-building
5 information on each of the 36,000 properties and
6 sites under its jurisdiction.

7 I will just end by saying it is a
8 tremendous privilege to lead this Agency and I intend
9 to ensure that we fulfill our mandate to preserve the
10 city's rich architectural and cultural heritage. I
11 would like to thank you again for all your support
12 and allowing me to testify and I am happy to take any
13 questions that you may have. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you very
15 much, Chair.

16 So I just want to run through some of the
17 details regarding your headcount of 73 full-time
18 positions. Can you walk us through how the
19 Department assesses its staffing need in each budget
20 cycle?

21 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Well we do that in
22 many ways; one is that we assess what positions we
23 already have and may need to fill, so we look at what
24 our vacancies are and we pursue advancing that in
25 terms of hiring. We assess increased workload in our

2 various divisions, so I think the three departments
3 where we see that a lot is in our application, our
4 regulatory responsibilities, as well as our
5 designation agenda, as well as our enforcement. So
6 we gauge the increased workload and see if the staff
7 that we have can manage that. We also dovetail that
8 with our strategic plan to see areas that we want to
9 do new initiatives, and we assess whether the number
10 of staff people we have within these different
11 departments can address that. So what we've seen
12 over time is actually the Agency headcount is, in
13 fact, one of its highest it's been since the 1990s.
14 In the last 10 years the headcount has been increased
15 by approximately, I think 20% for full-time and 33%
16 for part-time, and under this administration we've
17 also increased our headcount by 11% for full-time and
18 by 7% for part-time.

19 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay, great.

20 And you're confident that this is the right level of
21 staffing; you're comfortable that everything that you
22 need you currently have?

23 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We are very confident
24 about that. We've been in the process of hiring, as
25 I noted before, but even with that we've been able to

2 really advance a fairly aggressive agenda in all
3 these areas and so we are exceeding our targets. So
4 yes, I'm confident that the staff... [interpose]

5 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Speaking of
6 staffing, last year when we passed our law, Chair Koo
7 and I, there were some folks who said, "There's no
8 way that LPC will be able to get this done by those
9 deadlines," respectively, the one year on the
10 individual applications and the two years on the
11 historic districts; how has that been working; have
12 you found that to be a pragmatic and practical law;
13 have you been able to meet those deadlines?

14 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: I think that they're
15 very reasonable deadlines and as you know, we were
16 sort of simpatico on this, ensuring that the
17 designation process was more efficient, and so when I
18 came onboard we had already started that process
19 internally to make sure that designations would move
20 through the process in a timely manner. So what we
21 have found is that all the initiatives that I've sort
22 of initiated have been completed, except for one, and
23 all of them have done within seven months. So we
24 believe that these timeframes have been reasonable
25 and we can meet our mandate.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great. One of
3 the things I've noticed, from looking at some of the
4 budget documentation, is that the enforcement actions
5 have increased over the last few years. Can you
6 explain the kinds of violations that you're
7 encountering and are these violations primarily
8 complaint-driven or are they found through
9 investigative visits on the site? What is the
10 process and why do you believe that the enforcement
11 actions are going up?

12 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Alright, so it's sort
13 of complicated, but there are a couple of things.
14 One is that it's generally complaint-based and so in
15 certain neighborhood people are more active, there's
16 more activity and we receive more complaints; we also
17 received requests to investigate from Council Members
18 and community boards, and in certain cases, when our
19 staff is reviewing some of these investigations, they
20 may identify noncompliance and bring it to our
21 attention.

22 So the interesting thing again is that
23 there may be an increase in requests to look and
24 investigation; then we would go ahead and
25 investigate, and just to let you know, that -- let's

2 say in 2016 we had investigated about 900 complaints;
3 out of that, about a third of them did not lead to
4 any enforcement action; two-thirds led to some kind
5 of enforcement action, which is either warning or
6 violations. And the other thing I just wanted to
7 point out; that the number of violations is not
8 necessarily related to the number of buildings,
9 because you may have a building that has multiple
10 violations. So I think you know that our enforcement
11 agency tries to be very diligent and respond quickly;
12 our first sort of action, once we know that there are
13 noncompliances, is to work with property owners to in
14 fact remedy those noncompliances; either that they
15 remove those violations or they come to the Agency to
16 seek permits to allow them to continue to have that
17 work done. So we continue to push through that.

18 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: You just
19 mentioned that the number is not necessarily related
20 to the number of historic buildings because some of
21 those buildings are disproportionate. Can you tell
22 us, who are those bad actors; are there two, three,
23 four; five that are racking up a ton of violations
24 and don't seem to care about the fact that you're
25 trying to enforce the regulations?

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: You know I would have
3 to say that I don't think there's a pattern that's
4 developed that one particular property owner has been
5 doing in all their buildings, but I think that it's
6 also that some of these violations are minor versus
7 some that are more significant; some may be where
8 there's a scope of work that is construction
9 oriented; some are just the fact that they haven't
10 asked for permits to change their windows. So it
11 really sort of runs the gamut. But I think if you
12 want us to give you maybe more analysis in terms of
13 what patterns we see, we'd be happy to get back to
14 you and give you a little more detail... [crosstalk]

15 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: We'd appreciate
16 that, and certainly, if you could send the Committee
17 -- let's call it the top ten violators, and I'm not
18 saying necessarily that they're all bad actors, but
19 it just would be interesting to know that if there
20 are folks out there that are not following the rules
21 and maybe some of them may stand out and perhaps
22 there's some other mechanism that we might want to
23 look at.

24 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: You know there are
25 some cases where -- particularly what we call

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 22

2 demolition by neglect where owners are really not
3 looking after their property, and there are not that
4 many, but some of those we pursue to litigation as
5 well. So we will try... [crosstalk]

6 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great.

7 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: package a summary of
8 our enforcement.

9 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you. I
10 want to recognize that we've been joined by Council
11 Member Perkins, Council Member Mealy and Chair
12 Salamanca.

13 You mentioned that the Community
14 Development Block Grant funding; I believe it was
15 that you gave out three grants. How many
16 applications did you receive for the CDBG funding? I
17 just like saying that -- CDBG.

18 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We get about 16
19 applications...

20 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay.

21 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: and just to give you
22 an idea about how that sort of falls out; this is a
23 federal grant and therefore there are requirements
24 that you have to comply with; most of it's income-
25 based and for nonprofits, only certain kind of

2 nonprofits may comply. So within the group of
3 applicants for grants there will be a certain number
4 that don't qualify at all; there are some that are
5 related to the type of work which will be funded --
6 typically it's restoration work on the facades of
7 buildings, so we try and identify the ones where the
8 work dovetails with what the grant is about, and in
9 certain cases, we need additional information. So
10 while we've granted three, we've awarded three grants
11 for this fiscal year, we have a few applications
12 where we've asked for additional information and
13 we're hoping that they will provide that to us as
14 well. I think that sort of covers it. But we're
15 happy that we've got these grants and they're
16 advancing. And similarly, the grants that we gave
17 last year in 2016, two of them have come to fruition;
18 one is going to be completed in the spring.

19 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay, great. I
20 have some other questions, but I'm going to turn it
21 over first to Chair Koo; to be followed by Chair
22 Salamanca; to be followed by Council Member; to be
23 followed by Council Member Perkins. Chair Koo.

24 CHAIR KOO: Thank you. Thank you Chair
25 Srinivasan. The LPC now is a much better, more

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 24

2 efficient agency with your leadership. Before, when
3 people would talk about LPC, you know, oh, it's the
4 laughing stock of the agency, you know takes 25 years
5 to approve a landmark, but since you came, everything
6 improved so much, so I want to thank you for your
7 leadership.

8 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Thank you so much.

9 CHAIR KOO: And you made LPC famous
10 internationally too. A couple years ago I was in
11 Hong Kong and they were talking about landmarking and
12 decided New York City LPC is a role model for Hong
13 Kong to follow.

14 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: That's fabulous.

15 CHAIR KOO: So my question **[inaudible]**..
16 [crosstalk]

17 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: I hear they have
18 Chair Srinivasan's picture and it's plastered all
19 over Hong Kong.

20 CHAIR KOO: My question is; suppose the
21 owner of a landmarked home, right, they want to file
22 an application to do some remodeling; how much does
23 it cost to file the application? Because everyone
24 says, "Oh landmarking is very expensive," it takes a
25 lot of time and expensive to do, remodeling after a

2 house has been landmarked. So what does the process
3 cost -- applicant fee with you or with the Department
4 of Buildings or?

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Okay. Why don't I
6 talk about the fees first and then I'll talk about
7 the process.

8 So I think in the large scheme of things,
9 the fees are not... I believe not onerous, and we
10 haven't seen any real change in the number of
11 applications that come us as a result of the fee. So
12 the fees are paid at the Buildings Department; it's a
13 fraction of what they pay for the building permit
14 itself, so it's \$95 for the first \$25,000 of work and
15 then \$5 for the next \$1,000 of work. The fees are
16 only collected when in fact an application is
17 pursuing, actually implementing the work at the
18 Buildings Department. So when they come to us to
19 file an application, they don't have to pay the fee
20 and therefore if, for whatever reasons the project is
21 not successful, there's no money that has been given
22 to the City.

23 In terms of the process itself and the
24 added regulatory review that we have, I just want you
25 to know that about 95% of our applications are done

2 at staff level and therefore is ministerial and the
3 process is much more quick and much more certain. So
4 we have a staff of 35 people approximately in our
5 Preservation Department who work with property owners
6 and applicants in terms of advising them how to put
7 an application together and then what would be
8 allowed at staff level. And so I think this works
9 well, because in fact, most people do come for their
10 approval at staff level. Within the staff level
11 applications, there are various levels of expediency,
12 so a Certificate of No Effect and a Permit for Minor
13 Work take somewhere between 20 and 30 days -- we try
14 to actually even speed that up. We have applications
15 which are considered expedited -- Expedited Applicants
16 [sic] of No Effect; those we can issue in two days
17 with a complete application. And then we have also
18 certain projects which can go on a FasTrack and that
19 can be done in 10 days.

20 But I just want to add one more aspect,
21 because I think that, from our perspective, it's
22 absolutely imperative that people understand and
23 embrace landmarking and they don't see this as
24 something burdensome, so we try and do a lot of
25 outreach before they are designated, to explain to

2 them what the landmark process is, understand the
3 kind of scope of what they're thinking about for
4 their property; trying to explain what that process
5 is, and sometimes with certain, especially historic
6 districts, we would go back after it's designated to
7 again just give them... it's like a refresher course on
8 how they can really find ways to make that process
9 easier. We also have information on our website
10 which are guides and we also have instructions in
11 terms of our application process, and we work with
12 them to make sure that they find this easy and not so
13 burdensome.

14 CHAIR KOO: Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you very
16 much. I am going to turn it over to Chair Salamanca.

17 CHAIR SALAMANCA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 Good morning, Madam Chair.

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Good morning.

20 CHAIR SALAMANCA: I have a few churches
21 in my council district that will qualify for
22 landmark; the concerns that they have is the fact of
23 the cost to repairs that they will incur if they were
24 landmarked, and I understand their concerns. Wanted
25 to know if your agency has any plans to create some

2 type of funding where these churches who qualify to
3 be landmarked can access for these very expensive
4 repairs that they may incur because of the materials?

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Thank you so much;
6 it's good to see you again, Council Member -- we met
7 last year, of course.

8 I just want to say that the Agency, first
9 of all, understands the unique and complex issues
10 related to religious institutions in particular. We
11 understand that they have a mission to fulfill and
12 that regulatory process should not interfere with
13 their exercise of religion, so we're very mindful of
14 that. I think the other issue is that we're very
15 rigorous and we establish a fairly high bar when we
16 think about religious institutions and which ones
17 should be designated. In terms of the scope of work
18 that they have to do, I think one of the things is
19 that we do explain to religious property is that by
20 being landmarked you're not necessarily compelled to
21 do work; it's when you have a scope of work that
22 you're intending to do; then you need to come to the
23 Landmarks Commission, and I think we are very
24 sympathetic that they have to balance both their
25 program needs as well as cost in proposing work that

2 can be approved by the Commission. So what we've
3 seen just sort of in our practice is that we work
4 with religious institutions for upgrades; we think
5 about areas where they can use substitute materials,
6 which may be more cost-effective. So sometimes you
7 have areas where they want to fix the cornice or
8 parts of roofs; if they're not visible; if they are
9 not discernable, then we can work with them to find
10 materials that are in fact more cost-effective.

11 In terms of sort of our own grant
12 program; our grant program has certain limitations,
13 which is we do a lot of nonprofits and not religious
14 nonprofits, but we work with partners, including
15 other nonprofits that have money available to
16 religious institutions specifically and to other
17 nonprofits and to homeowners. So one of them is, of
18 course, the New York Landmarks Conservancy; they have
19 a fairly large fund that provides both loans as well
20 as funding to religious institutions and very often
21 when we are engaging in that outreach with religious
22 institutions, we will, first of all, let them know
23 that this kind of funding is available and often
24 encourage that they speak with a nonprofit and that
25 the Conservancy also speak with them to explain what

2 are the possible ways in which they can help them
3 financially in preserving their buildings.

4 CHAIR SALAMANCA: Alright. Now, I also
5 have two historic districts; one of them, the
6 Longwood Historic District..

7 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes.

8 CHAIR SALAMANCA: beautiful townhouses; I
9 drive by there often; it's not too far from where I
10 drop off my son in the morning for day care, and I
11 see that some of these homes need repairs; I know
12 these homeowners very well, and they're concerned
13 too; a lot of them are seniors and they're on fixed
14 incomes; again, access to funds, programs that will
15 help them repair some of their homes. Now my
16 question is, again, to have access to these funds,
17 your agency does not have these funds, so they would
18 have to go to a not-for-profit; am I correct?

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Well we have funds for
20 homeowners and it's not a large grant, but we do
21 award grants every year, and one of the things that
22 we try to do, and you know, you've mentioned Longwood
23 Historic District, is we can do outreach to people
24 within historic districts, especially if they qualify
25 within the income levels, and that's something we'd

2 be willing to do. So what we've done in the past is
3 that we have identified areas, census tracts that
4 have certain income levels; we'll proactively go out
5 there, or when we're looking at new historic
6 districts that may qualify, we will talk to them
7 about the grant programs as well. So it's helpful to
8 us when we hear from Council Members about particular
9 areas where they've either seen the need for some
10 more funding and that gives us an opportunity to
11 reach out to them. And again, even for -- we have
12 our own grants, but there are other nonprofits over
13 here and we definitely educate them on other ways to
14 seek funding.

15 CHAIR SALAMANCA: And in terms of
16 enforcement, I mean your agency, the enforcement
17 component or division, they don't go out and do
18 enforcement and say hey, you need to fix your façade
19 because it's breaking, I mean you do enforcement
20 because some work may have been done that's not
21 within your guidelines; am I correct?

22 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Without a permit, yes;
23 if they haven't... But you know, and I may have
24 mentioned it before; I think we really see property
25 owners as partners in preservation and we do have an

2 enforcement **[inaudible]**, and I'm not going to
3 diminish the need for that, but we really do prefer
4 to work with property owners as our first sort of
5 approach, which is, if there are noncompliances, to
6 try and find ways in which they can comply with the
7 law. And again, very often some of this is cleared
8 through staff level approvals.

9 CHAIR SALAMANCA: My office is going to
10 have a town hall meeting with that immediate
11 neighborhood in the upcoming month... [interpose]

12 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Okay.

13 CHAIR SALAMANCA: we'd love to have your
14 agency there to... [crosstalk]

15 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We...

16 CHAIR SALAMANCA: do a Know Your Rights
17 or dos and don't in terms of the historic district.

18 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We'd be happy to do
19 that, Council Member.

20 CHAIR SALAMANCA: Thank you. Thank you,
21 Mr. Chair.

22 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
23 Chair. Council Member Ben Kallos.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: As Justin Bieber
25 once said, "Is it too late to say I'm sorry now?" and

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 33

2 of course we know he's referring to the statement of
3 regulatory intent, S O R I, SORI. If you could just
4 share a little bit for folks watching at home and
5 those who follow Justin Bieber on Instagram what it
6 is we're talking about.

7 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: The Statement of
8 Regulatory Intent?

9 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Yes.

10 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: The Statement of
11 Regulatory Intent... [crosstalk]

12 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Can you share
13 with us your Apple iTunes music list on your website
14 or your Twitter handle so that we can learn more
15 about the musical preferences of Council Member
16 Kallos? I'm suddenly very fascinated... [crosstalk]

17 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I... I... I would be...

18 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: by your choice...
19 [crosstalk]

20 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I would be happy
21 to...

22 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: by your choice
23 of music.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: As you know, I'm
25 in favor of transparency and if you want to introduce

2 legislation requiring our elected officials to make
3 their playlist public, we'd be happy to hear it in
4 the Governmental Operations Committee.

5 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: But what about
6 doing it voluntarily; it's a better... better
7 government; we don't just do things that are
8 required, we do things that show the way forward as
9 the Chair of the Gov Ops Committee in the New York
10 City Council.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I am open to your
12 advocacy; I don't see the value in sharing playlists,
13 but I would love to hear more about the SORI.

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: I think most New
15 Yorkers, especially those on the East Side; we'd like
16 to know the music stylings of Council Member Ben
17 Kallos. I'm certainly intrigued, for one. Alright,
18 I'm sorry. Yes.

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: So the Statement of
20 Regulatory Intent, which is incorporated in our
21 designation report, is really just a policy statement
22 that is used as a guide to the Commission when it
23 thinks about regulating these properties in the
24 future. It's a tool, so to speak, or an aspect of a
25 designation report that has existed historically; it

2 may not be used for every report, but this is not
3 something new, so Greenwich Village Historic District
4 had a very long policy statement; we've seen that for
5 individual landmarks as well [inaudible] and
6 [inaudible] Seminary. And what it does is, the
7 designation report overall is sort or encapsulating
8 or sort of embodying the basis for a historic
9 district or designation, based on its research and
10 based on the process as well. So when we started
11 doing it again recently, it really is a way to just
12 have clarity in the report and it is meant to be a
13 clarification and transparency. So some reports
14 don't have it and some reports in the past may have
15 had it incorporated in a very long prose -- I don't
16 know if you've had a chance to look at those reports;
17 they've very dense. So it was a way to really
18 provide more transparency. So I'll just give an
19 example; we wrote a Statement of Regulatory Intent
20 for the Citicorp Building and all it says is really
21 that the basis of this designation is not just the
22 architecture, but also the fact that it had a very,
23 very unusual history of being one of the first
24 buildings to really incorporate very novel zoning
25 incentives for public spaces, and as a result, over

2 the last several decades, public spaces have been
3 regulated by the City Planning Commission, and it
4 just alerts the Commission that these spaces have
5 dual jurisdiction and that we would coordinate in the
6 future when these places come to us.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And so does this
8 SORI have the full force of regulation or is it just
9 a -- so yes, does the SORI have full force of
10 regulation and a later impact; does it bind future
11 LPCs in any way?

12 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: It really is... it's a
13 guide and I think that it doesn't supersede or
14 override our rules, which really determine staff
15 level and Commission level approval, and it can't
16 supersede the law as well. So Certificates of No
17 Effect are Certificates of No Effect and those will
18 all remain the same; it's just that the Commission,
19 when considering changes, can think about particular
20 aspects of these buildings.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And so I don't
22 know if you heard any of the chatter between myself
23 and the Chair of the Land Use Committee on Land Use
24 Item 582; how can we work with regard to an item in
25 Staten Island? How can we work as a Council with the

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 37

2 LPC to work with homeowners and building owners -- I
3 mean in this case the person appeared to be taking
4 really good care of the property, investing tens of
5 thousands into rehabilitating and improving it, and
6 it seemed like a landmarking would actually help
7 improve the value and would not detract, but for
8 whatever reason we weren't able to get to a meeting
9 of the minds. It's the first time I've had to vote
10 against the Landmarks Preservation Commission in my
11 three years, two months, 28 days and 12 hours in
12 office and I don't ever want to have to do so again,
13 so... [interpose]

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: And we will
15 never let you live it down. Wednesday, March 29th at
16 11:40... [crosstalk]

17 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Well welcome to
18 my... wel...

19 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD:

20 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: 11:47 a.m.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: For those of you
22 watching, welcome to my life, but that being said,
23 what can we do to work together better so it
24 shouldn't happen again?

25

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We understand your
3 concern and you know, these decisions are very hard
4 to make for the Council and we understand and respect
5 that process. I think from our side is that we
6 really believe that doing outreach at the beginning
7 of the process is really critical and so the more
8 support we get for designations, the more successful
9 it will be, both at the Commission and at the
10 Council. So our outreach includes working with lots
11 of [sic] property owners to try and get them to
12 embrace designations. We obviously work with
13 advocacy groups and constituents, but also with the
14 Council Members as well and so that's something we
15 will continue to do. I think our agency has to
16 sometimes prioritize and we really do want to advance
17 the projects that have very strong successes of
18 designations at the end. So I think we are very much
19 on the same page, Council Member, that we want our
20 designations to be successful and we'll continue to
21 work on that.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And I think just
23 going back to the legislation that the Land Use Chair
24 frequently refers to, during that hearing the most
25 frequent comment we received from both Council

2 Members and the community is that folks want more
3 historic districts, they want more landmarks and some
4 communities felt less empowered to make it happen
5 than others. How can we support communities that may
6 not have the same resources and bring more landmarks
7 and historic districts to every district in the city,
8 even where David Greenfield represents?

9 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: As you know, people
10 from the community reach out to us and we take that
11 into consideration, we do an evaluation; we look at
12 it in the context of priority. But just a point that
13 you made, which is, with communities that may not
14 have the resources, I think one of the things that is
15 part of our goals and our strategic plan is to really
16 look at neighborhoods that have not seen a lot of
17 landmarks, and for a host of reasons, but it doesn't
18 mean that they're not areas to preserve. The
19 Commission is informed in a couple of ways in how we
20 can advance designations, both in neighborhoods where
21 you may not have people who have the means to
22 organize themselves or be able to do the studies that
23 they bring for the Commission; that doesn't
24 necessarily mean that we're not looking at it, we
25 are; we're looking at areas in East Harlem and

2 Central Harlem, one, because there's a rezoning
3 taking place, but also because of areas that people
4 are asking us to actually go there and look, but
5 we're also looking at areas where communities have
6 had their original historic district done in the 70s
7 and they're looking to see if there are reasons to
8 expand that.

9 So to answer your question, we do devote
10 a lot of our resources to doing ongoing survey and
11 analysis and studies of neighborhoods to try and
12 address people's concerns or interest in having
13 designations in their neighborhood.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Would it be
15 possible to, as part of the budget process, increase
16 your budget to provide for an application-based
17 organizing or study grant or to partner with the
18 Landmarks Preservation Foundation to offer that
19 support and services so that a block association or
20 neighborhood association will say you know what; I
21 think we have something here and let's just fill out
22 a simple form that is hopefully a lot easier than the
23 member item form that we have, to have these
24 resources available?

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 41

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Council Member, what I
3 would say right now is that we have staff positions
4 available that we want to fill, so we're really
5 talking... we've got seven positions available and some
6 of those are in fact going to be allocated to our
7 Research Department, so I think that once we fill the
8 vacancies, which we're hoping to do in the next
9 couple of months, we'll have resources to continue to
10 do survey work [inaudible]... [crosstalk]

11 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Great; when those
12 get filled, I'm looking to do a small district in
13 Sutton; we've got a... [crosstalk]

14 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We're aware of that;
15 we...

16 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: So just... if you
17 can have somebody touch base with us, we'd like to...

18 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Oh absolutely, we...

19 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I'd like to get a
20 small historic district done in my first time, if
21 possible.

22 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We are looking at that
23 and we're happy to set up a meeting with you
24 afterwards to discuss that.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
3 Council Member. Council Member Perkins.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Good morning.

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Good morning, Council
6 Member.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: So I want to
8 first ask... I assume you have inventory or sort of
9 listings of applications that are pending for our
10 districts?

11 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We don't have
12 applications for our historic districts or individual
13 designations. We have done our own research or
14 survey work in neighborhoods, so we've identified
15 buildings are areas that are meritorious that may
16 require more study. We do receive requests from
17 members of the public that ask for our input on
18 whether a building or an area is deserving of
19 designation, so we get about, I don't know, maybe
20 about 150 requests in a year and we respond back to
21 them. And so the ones that we feel are meritorious,
22 we think about that in our strategic plan and see
23 which ones we can advance towards designation. So
24 it's not like a pipeline of, you know, so many
25 districts that are just waiting; I think it's really

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 43

2 about us prioritizing in our strategic plan, but we
3 are informed by both the requests that we get as well
4 as our own survey work.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. So for
6 instance, in my district, what's pending? I mean do
7 you have applications pending to be reviewed or?

8 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Right. We don't have...
9 they are not applications, but we are... [crosstalk]

10 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: 'Kay.

11 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: looking at areas in
12 Central Harlem, so... [interpose]

13 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

14 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: in fact, good that you
15 asked us about this, because we'd love to set up a
16 meeting with you and talk to you about some of the
17 areas that we've been looking at.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Alright. ASAP
19 is fine with me, but I also would like to know
20 beforehand what have you... if you can give me the
21 latest report, if it's not too overwhelming, in terms
22 of what's been done... [crosstalk]

23 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Oh absolutely.

24

25

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 44

2 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: but also, more
3 importantly, in terms of what's pending that... that's...
4 [crosstalk]

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We... We...

6 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: that's on your
7 list of applications or however you describe it, so
8 that I can see what properties or type of
9 applications are on the pipeline.

10 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Interest there. Yes.
11 We can provide you with that.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Is that
13 something you can do like easily or does it take a
14 long period of time?

15 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: I think we can do that
16 in the next couple of weeks or so.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: A couple of
18 weeks?

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

21 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Is that too long?

22 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Well I would
23 prefer tomorrow, since you're asking... [crosstalk]

24 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: [laugh] Well I think
25 we could... I would say that the designations that

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 45

2 we've done in your district we can easily provide
3 you; that we can... [crosstalk]

4 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: turn around very
6 quick, and I think there are quite a few historic
7 districts, not very large, but there are several of
8 them and we've done a lot of individual designations
9 as well, so that we can provide you very easily, and
10 probably by the end of the day we could get you that.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

12 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: So it's really about
13 some of the requests that we've got in the past and
14 some of the things that we've been thinking about;
15 that may take a little time to pull together for you.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: A little time
17 for me is like tomorrow, but I know that for you it's
18 much more realistic. So what is realistic, like a
19 month, a week; a year? Just need to know what's
20 pending... [crosstalk]

21 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Definitely not a year.
22 How 'bout...

23 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: so I can catch
24 up with... [crosstalk]

25

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: So we can touch base
3 next week.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. So when
5 you say touch base, I just want to be clear what that
6 means, I'm sorry..

7 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We can pull together
8 information on requests that we've received, some of
9 the areas that we're looking at; I know that
10 Community Board 10 once put a report together which
11 talked about many things -- zoning, as well as
12 landmarks; we can provide that to you as well, so
13 this.. in fact, we have been largely informed by
14 Community Board 10 in terms of some of their
15 priorities and some of our own survey work. So it'll
16 come to you as a package of addresses and areas.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Very good. Now
18 Board 11 is also a part of my district, and so..
19 [interpose]

20 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Okay.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: if you can do
22 the same... [crosstalk]

23 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We'll do it according
24 to your council district.

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 47

2 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay, you will
3 know easily that that is?

4 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Right, we can... Oh yes,
5 absolutely, we can do it according to your district
6 boundary.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay, very good.
8 So for those folks in my district that might be
9 interested in putting together some kind of
10 conference related to this, what is the process or
11 what... who will I have to touch base with?

12 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: You can definitely
13 touch base with Lauren George, who's our Director of
14 Community Relations, and if you want us to come to
15 the Community Board to talk about something --
16 [background comments] we just did that last night,
17 we...

18 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: we were invited and..
20 but if it's a more formal sort of conference..
21 [crosstalk]

22 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Well you...

23 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: you can talk to Lauren
24 and we can help you with that.

25

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 48

2 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. So just
3 so I'm clear -- so generally how do you... like you
4 said you were just recently at the Community Board by
5 invitation or how does that... by your invitation...
6 request to the Board or by the Board requesting you
7 to come? I just want to...

8 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Well you know, it's
9 sort of interesting; we always seem to have contact
10 with the Community Boards on a number of issues
11 including applications that come before us, but I
12 believe they requested us to come there and talk to
13 them.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. And so if
15 I request, you will come to me?

16 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We will.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. Just want
18 to be sure, 'cause I don't want...

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We'll be happy to come
20 and talk to you and your constituents.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. And you
22 will also be able to provide me with some pending
23 landmark sites that are in the district?

24 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes... [crosstalk]

25 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Are there pen...

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: requests that we
3 receive.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: I assume that
5 there are some that are pending to be designated.

6 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: There are... right now
7 there is... pending; there's nothing that has been
8 calendared, but there are... [crosstalk]

9 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay.

10 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: because we cleared up
11 a lot of the calendar, including... we were very
12 thrilled about the YMCA that was designated in your
13 district. So but we have properties that we're
14 looking at and... I just want to sort of clarify, all...
15 [crosstalk]

16 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Can I see what
17 you're looking at?

18 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay, I'd like
20 that, if that's possible. I just want to get a... what
21 has been designated; I just want to get a priority...
22 [crosstalk]

23 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We can provide you
24 with that; that's very clearly.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Okay. Thank you
3 very much. So and you mentioned that you've been in
4 touch with the Community Board related to some of
5 this work?

6 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We have been in touch
7 with the Community Board... yes, related work, but I
8 believe yesterday's meeting -- and I'm just going to
9 look at -- was about designation... it was about both.
10 It was mostly about explaining our regulatory process
11 and responsibilities of landmarking, but there was
12 discussion by other local groups about priorities
13 within the neighborhood, so we were there to listen
14 to what people within the neighborhood were thinking
15 about in terms of historic resources.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: With respect to
17 the faith-based sites, you mentioned there is some
18 faith-based funding?

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: We don't have faith-
20 based funding directly, but the Landmarks
21 Conservancy, which is a nonprofit, they have funding
22 for religious sites, sacred sites.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: And you have I
24 know some faith-based sites that have been
25 landmarked.

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Please make sure
4 that they're listed.. [crosstalk]

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Right, the religious
6 properties in your neighborhood, we can do that.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: And those that
8 are pending, I guess, as well.

9 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Okay, ones that we're
10 considering; got it.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER PERKINS: Right. That'll
12 do it for now, thank you.

13 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Councilman.

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you
15 Council Member. My final question for you is; as
16 Council Member Kallos alluded to -- Council Member
17 Mendez has a question as well, so I'm actually going
18 to go to Council Member Mendez and then I'll give you
19 my final question. Thank you.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to see you again, Madam
22 Chair. Can you tell me what was headcount at LPC
23 prior to you being named the Chair?

24 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: [background comments]
25 It'll be one second. [background comments]

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 52

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: So can I do a
3 follow-up question while that's going on?

4 [background comments]

5 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Okay. [background
6 comment] So... okay. So it was [background comment]
7 72 and right now our headcount is 81, and we're...
8 [crosstalk]

9 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: 81.

10 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: filling some of the
11 vacancies.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And how much of
13 that, of the 81 is full-time and part-time? I don't
14 see it in my notes right now.

15 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Full-time is 73 and 8
16 is part-time.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Okay. And prior
18 to you coming onboard, what was full-time and what
19 was part-time?

20 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Was 68 and 4.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Of the
22 individuals on your staff, is there one dedicated
23 person that works with DOB to put the landmark status
24 of buildings into the BIS system or wherever it is on
25 the internet?

2 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: There are two things;
3 one is that our Research Department immediately puts
4 calendared properties into the BIS system, so it
5 shows it immediately. We have ongoing, sort of
6 liaison with DOB on many issues, including buildings
7 that are calendared, but also enforcement and so John
8 Weiss, he works very closely with the Buildings
9 Department. So properties that we hear about that
10 have certain complex issues that particularly sort of
11 relate to the both agencies, we do a lot of
12 coordinating regarding that.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: So the Research
14 Department, anyone in the Research Department would
15 be the ones inputting that into BIS?

16 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Yes.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And that
18 department is how big?

19 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: It's I think now 11.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Eleven.

21 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Ten or 11, yeah; we
22 have some part-time people there too.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Thank you very
24 much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you very
3 much. In the interest of time and because we have
4 the Department of City Planning waiting, I will
5 follow up with the Landmarks Preservation Commission
6 directly with any other questions. I want to thank
7 you all for your testimony; thank you for your
8 stewardship and we look forward to continue working
9 together. Thank you... [crosstalk]

10 CHAIR SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Councilman
11 [sic].

12 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: We are going to
13 invite Department of City Planning to come up now and
14 join us at the dais and then we'll do the
15 introduction of this next part of our Land Use budget
16 hearing. [background comments]

17 [pause]

18 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Welcome back to
19 the Land Use Preliminary Budget Hearing. I am still
20 David Greenfield; I still chair the Land Use
21 Committee and I am joined by several of my
22 colleagues; most significantly, Chair Donovan
23 Richards, Chair Peter Koo, Council Member Perkins,
24 Council Member Palma, and Council Member Mendez, who
25 are still here and we -- just so the folks know who

2 are watching at home -- we follow the practice of
3 other legislative bodies; we have multiple hearings
4 going on in this body at any particular time, and so
5 we have two other hearings that are currently
6 happening, including a budget negotiating team
7 meeting, because this is the heart of the budget
8 process; this is why we're here today, so we've got
9 members coming back and forth from different hearings
10 and meetings, so please excuse the interruption. We
11 also are joined by Council Member Brad Lander as
12 well.

13 We're now going to hear from the newly
14 appointed Director of City Planning, Marisa Lago.
15 Chair Lago is a fellow Brooklyn native who started
16 her career in government at the City Planning
17 Commission. She joins us mostly recently from the
18 United States Department of Treasury, where she
19 served as Assistant Secretary for International
20 Markets and Development. The Chair has actually
21 pointed out to me that she is an expert testifying in
22 front of legislative bodies because she's got
23 difficult Congress members who would try to catch
24 her, so this will be easy, because we're just such a
25 friendly bunch here in the New York City Council; if

2 you don't believe me, just ask Purnima and she'll
3 tell you that I probably just lied.

4 Seriously speaking, we welcome you back
5 to New York, we congratulate you on your appointment;
6 you obviously have a long history of working in and
7 out of city and state government and we're excited to
8 have you onboard and to work with you on the upcoming
9 Midtown East rezoning as well as further the City's
10 affordable housing efforts.

11 The Department of City Planning plans for
12 the strategic growth and development of the City
13 through ground-up planning with communities in
14 development of land use policies and zoning
15 regulations and is responsible for promoting housing
16 production and affordability, as well as fostering
17 economic development and coordinated investment in
18 infrastructure.

19 I want to once again acknowledge the
20 Zoning Subcommittee Chair Donovan Richards for his
21 leadership on City Planning issues and his
22 partnership working together with all of us here and
23 myself on the Committee. In addition, I would like
24 to congratulate and thank Chair Rafael Salamanca for
25 his work as the new Chair of the Planning

2 Subcommittee, and we of course already, as I
3 mentioned in our last hearing, the great work that
4 Chair Peter Koo does in the Landmarks world.

5 As we celebrate the one-year anniversary
6 of the passage of MIH and ZQA -- Mandatory
7 Inclusionary Housing and Zoning for Quality and
8 Affordability, for those of you who are watching at
9 home -- and yes, for those of you who are watching at
10 home, I did not come up with the names or the
11 acronyms; in fact, maybe the Chair will explain to us
12 how they came up with those very compelling MIH and
13 ZQA acronyms.

14 We're particularly interested in hearing
15 about how City Planning is making the rezoning
16 process more inclusive and transparent for local
17 residents. Recently we've had applications to change
18 the local zoning that have come under intense
19 scrutiny; in fact, the Council denied projects in
20 Inwood, Sunnyside and Carroll Gardens, where local
21 members determined that the proposals were wrong for
22 their communities. However, as we face the housing
23 emergency and homeless crisis, our city still needs
24 to offer more housing to welcome immigrants, young
25

2 people, artists, entrepreneurs, and, of course,
3 seniors who have made New York what it is today.

4 So we're interested in hearing about
5 Chair Lago's views on this issue and how we can
6 encourage more involvement and more transparency. As
7 the Chair knows, we've actually -- for the last
8 couple of years here in this Committee, we've
9 requested that the Department of City Planning
10 provide to the Council the pre-application forms so
11 that the communities have more relevant information
12 and we've had a back and forth and so today Borough
13 President Gale Brewer and I are actually requesting
14 that as a determined condition of today's budget that
15 these pre-application forms be shared with the
16 relevant Council Member, Borough President and
17 Council Member and would love to hear your
18 perspective on that as well.

19 Additionally, the Land Use Committee is
20 looking forward to hearing more about the new needs
21 reflected in the City Planning's \$42.5 million
22 budget, including details on the paperless filing
23 system, the hiring of four employees to advance
24 implementation of the City's Mandatory Inclusionary
25 Housing program and proposed savings, and, of course,

2 we're looking forward to hearing about how wonderful
3 your new digs are; I know that everybody's excited
4 about the great office space that you work in and we
5 were very pleased to provide funding for that in past
6 years and we're happy that actually worked out.

7 So we welcome you and we welcome your
8 entire team, especially Purnima Kapur, who many of
9 here in the Council have been working with; in fact,
10 I actually had the distinction of... in my... when I was
11 first elected as a Council Member and I came to the
12 abysmal offices of the Brooklyn office of the City
13 Planning -- and I'm embarrassed to say; they're sill
14 pretty abysmal -- and I... I... [background comment]
15 What's that? [background comment] That's what I
16 said; I'm embarrassed to say that those Brooklyn
17 offices are still pretty abysmal -- the Manhattan
18 office has since improved -- and I made the trek up
19 and got lost in the maze of different cubicles and I
20 saw with Purnima Kapur and she was very kind to give
21 me the Zoning Handbook and we are actually also
22 excited about the possibility -- although we're a
23 little bit late; we were told that it was going to be
24 ready at the end of 2016 and my law students are a
25 little bit anxious, but we made them buy the old

2 books anyway -- we're excited to hear about when the
3 new Zoning Handbook is going to be coming out, along
4 with the relevant MIH and ZQA information. My
5 students actually at Brooklyn Law School are more
6 excited even than I am, 'cause they've got finals
7 coming up in a few weeks, so let us know if they
8 could use that as an inside hook, but certainly we
9 want to thank you, Purnima, for working with all of
10 us and also welcome Anita Laremont and Jon Kaufman as
11 well.

12 So without further ado, we promise,
13 seriously speaking, we're not always nice, but today,
14 in deference to your great public service and the
15 fact that this is your first hearing; all of us, with
16 the exception of Donovan Richards, will be very
17 friendly and so we're looking forward to your
18 testimony. Thank you.

19 MARISA LAGO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
20 I will note; there is one difference between being
21 here and testifying before the U.S. Congress, which
22 is; we're all New Yorkers.

23 So I'll start by formally saying good
24 morning to you, Chair Greenfield and to Subcommittee
25 Chairs... [interpose]

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 61

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: But for some
3 reason the Mayor still roots for the Boston Red Sox;
4 what's up with that? Seriously. We're going to have
5 to bring him in here and have a separate hearing.
6 What do you think, Council Member Lander? An
7 oversight hearing on rooting, plus an economic
8 development on how that impacts New York City by
9 having the Mayor root... [crosstalk]

10 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: We're going to
11 fight for that in Rules, Privileges and Elections; I
12 think... [crosstalk]

13 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: 'Kay.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: it's a privilege,
15 but anyway it's uh... [crosstalk]

16 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Fair enough.

17 MARISA LAGO: It may destroy the good
18 will if I admit that my husband is also a Boston Red
19 Sox fan and we joke... [crosstalk]

20 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Oh...

21 MARISA LAGO: that we have a mixed
22 marriage.

23 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: You were doing
24 so well there, Chair, so well. Okay.

25

2 MARISA LAGO: Well I also want to
3 welcome, or say thank you to Subcommittee Chairs
4 Richards, Koo and in abstention, Salamanca as well.
5 Not only is this my first testimony before the City
6 Council; I'm still within my first month on the job,
7 but this hearing I'm sure will go swimmingly because
8 as you noted, I'm joined by City Planning's senior-
9 most management team, who are expert on any topic.

10 Given your introduction, Chair, if I
11 might break my testimony into a few parts; one, an
12 introduction of myself, because while I am new to
13 many of you, I'm not new to the City; I would then
14 move on to the budget itself; after that, the
15 Greenfield Brewer [sic] proposal that was put
16 forward; after that, the Zoning Handbook; and then
17 finally, the paperless filing, so covering all of
18 your various questions.

19 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Sure; I'm
20 looking forward to it. Thank you.

21 MARISA LAGO: So as far as myself, I was
22 born in Brooklyn and I went to college at Cooper
23 Union, becoming my family's first college graduate.
24 Within a year of becoming a lawyer I started by first
25 stint in City government at City Planning, but at

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 63

2 City Planning, before it even moved to 22 Reed Street
3 -- this was at 2 Lafayette Street -- and I was a
4 Special Assistant to the then Chair of the City
5 Planning Commission Herb Sturz, who was a visionary
6 leader, and what he taught me was this passion for
7 social justice, which has imbued everything that he's
8 done, but he also taught me how the tremendous power
9 of the City government could be deployed to help all
10 of our citizens, particularly the most unfortunate.

11 So my second time in City government was
12 as General Counsel of New York City's Economic
13 Development Corporation during the Dinkins
14 administration, at a time when Carl Weisbrod, my
15 predecessor, was the President of the EDC.

16 During that time I worked on projects
17 that ranged from the small to the large -- the
18 Greenpoint Manufacturing Center that is still up and
19 running and thriving, to the large -- negotiating the
20 lease for the Billie Jean King National Tennis
21 Center, along with Carl Weisbrod.

22 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: If you have any
23 good Carl Weisbrod stories -- now that he's not here
24 anymore -- we love to gossip about him, so please
25 feel free to dish.

2 MARISA LAGO: During my next testimony
3 maybe.

4 I've also headed the Empire State
5 Development Corporation and I was especially pleased
6 during that period that construction began on
7 Brooklyn Bridge Park, because some of my earliest
8 childhood memories are of walking down to the piers
9 there to pick up my grandfather as he got off of
10 work; he was a cook on a tugboat that worked in New
11 York Harbor.

12 Now in-between I've run the Boston
13 Redevelopment Authority, which despite its name is
14 the city's Land Use, Planning and Economic
15 Development agency combined. But at the same time, I
16 held the role of Boston's Chief Economic Development
17 Officer, which meant that I oversaw the affordable
18 housing and the neighborhood community development
19 agency as well. My point of pride during that period
20 of time is that we successfully competed for two
21 federal grants to rehab our two most troubled public
22 housing projects, and including public schools within
23 the project.

24 Now as the Chair mentioned, during the
25 past seven years I've been serving the Obama

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 65

2 Administration at the Department of the Treasury, and
3 for the past three years I've been serving under
4 Treasury Secretary Lew, himself a native New Yorker,
5 but also someone who is so committed to addressing
6 inequality.

7 What people may not know about the
8 Treasury Department is that in addition to issuing
9 the public debt, it is also responsible for the U.S.
10 government's participation in the World Bank, the
11 African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and
12 I had the privilege of representing the U.S.
13 government at these entities as they engaged in
14 infrastructure projects and social development
15 projects to alleviate poverty in the world's poorest
16 countries. And there are just such strong
17 connections between that development work and what we
18 are committed to here in the de Blasio
19 Administration.

20 The approach that I brought to all of
21 these positions is to listen to and to learn from
22 communities, the residents of the community who may
23 have varied perspectives -- may not be speaking with
24 one voice; the elected officials in the communities
25 whose job it is, whose passion it is to represent

2 their communities, but also the civil society or
3 nonprofit sector, a sector that brings its varied
4 expertise and who advocate on communities' behalf.

5 So with that background, I'll now turn to
6 the Department of City Planning's FY18 budget.

7 I'll start with the Department's Adopted
8 FY17 budget, which had an expense appropriation of
9 \$46.3 million. 66% of the funding comes from City
10 tax levy dollars, and 34% comes from a variety of
11 federal funding sources.

12 Of this \$46.3 million, roughly 60% of it,
13 or \$28 million, was allocated for personal services,
14 and this supported the salaries of 349 full-time
15 staff, and that includes me as well as the 12 other
16 City Planning Commissioners. 195 of these full-time
17 employees are funded by federal and other grants,
18 while 154 full-time staff are tax levy funded. Our
19 remaining budget allocation, which is about \$18.2,
20 was apportioned to the Department's OTPS (Other Than
21 Personal Services). The single largest component of
22 this \$18.2 million is \$6.4 million, so about a third
23 of it, and that was budgeted for environmental
24 consultants that were necessary to complete the City
25 Environmental Quality Review. This review is legally

2 required before the zoning recommendations in our
3 neighborhood plans can be brought forward, first, to
4 the City Planning Commission and then ultimately
5 presented to the City Council for a vote. These
6 funds are used to secure services that either require
7 a surge in personnel to complete the EIS or required
8 specialized equipment that just wouldn't be cost
9 effective for the City to maintain on a permanent
10 basis.

11 Turning now to our FY17 January budget;
12 it's 2% higher than the FY17 Adopted plan, rising
13 from \$46.3 million to \$47.1 million. This very small
14 change of about \$800,000 is driven by a variety of
15 changes including the fact that the federal, city and
16 state budget cycles aren't synchronized and so funds
17 flow at different times. The January 2017 plan also
18 includes four new full-time positions.

19 Now looking forward, our budget
20 allocation for FY18 is \$42.5 million; this is down
21 8%, or \$3.7 million from our FY17 Adopted budget.
22 This is largely the result of planning reductions to
23 our OTPS allocation. A portion of this amount will
24 be offset by anticipated off-cycle state and federal
25

2 grants that will flow into the budget during the
3 first half of FY18.

4 There are four drivers of the planned
5 \$3.7 million reduction, the year-on-year reduction.

6 The first is funding for building the
7 paperless filing technology -- which we'll get to
8 later -- is predominantly located in our FY17 budget,
9 so this contributes to a reduction of \$2.8 million in
10 FY18.

11 Secondly, a \$1.4 million in reduced
12 funding for consultants needed to prepare
13 environmental impact statements for planned City-
14 sponsored projects. Now I do have to note, however,
15 that this amount may need to be adjusted should
16 additional projects be undertaken by the Department.

17 There is also \$700,000 in FY17 one-time
18 projects, such as the expenses associated with the
19 new facilities at 120 Broadway, and I do have to
20 thank the Council for those appropriations. City
21 Planning is now working in professional space that
22 fits the quality and the professional work that the
23 team does, but also the Bronx office as well. Also..

24 [interpose]

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Get those
3 Brooklyn folks some paint maybe, new paint...

4 MARISA LAGO: Even if I have to pay for
5 it out of my pocket.

6 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: carpeting
7 perhaps.

8 MARISA LAGO: Another cost savings that I
9 am sure you will appreciate, Chair, is the reduced
10 number of hard copies of the Zoning Resolution that
11 we need to produce.

12 Finally, our resiliency grant funding has
13 been added to the FY17 [sic] budget from our prior
14 year grant surpluses. This grant is going to remain
15 active until FY19, and it increases our FY18 budget
16 by \$1.2 million in CDBG Disaster Recovery funds.

17 So in terms of planned headcount for
18 FY18, the Department's overall headcount is going to
19 increase [sic] by five positions in FY18 as a result
20 of the elimination of some temporarily funded
21 positions and the addition of three grant-funded,
22 resiliency positions. So we will enter FY18, we're
23 planning for an FY18, with 348 full-time positions.

24 Now the Department continues to look for
25 grant-funded opportunities to minimize our costs. We

2 use grant funding for a wide variety of planning
3 efforts, including resiliency, transportation and
4 hazard mitigation studies. The Department is
5 currently working on getting six grants and we're
6 engaged in important resiliency efforts; especially
7 important following Superstorm Sandy, but also
8 because of the reality of climate change.

9 Now the Department believes that our
10 preliminary budget will support effective integrated,
11 and I have to emphasize, community-based planning,
12 which will allow us to meet the needs of the people
13 of New York.

14 I do want to comment briefly on the
15 Agency work program. Last year City Planning's
16 senior team outlined for the Council six strategic
17 objectives that provide structure to what we do and
18 highlight our agency's priorities. They're covered
19 in far more depth in my formal testimony that we've
20 submitted, but I just want to describe each of the
21 six; they encapsulate nearly all of the initiatives
22 that we're working on collaboratively with the City
23 Council.

24 The first is to catalyze long-term
25 neighborhood improvement through integrated planning.

2 The second is to encourage housing
3 production, affordability and quality.

4 The third; to promote economic
5 development and job growth.

6 The fourth; to enhance resiliency and
7 sustainability of neighborhoods.

8 The fifth; to ensure the integrity,
9 timeliness and responsiveness of our land use
10 reviews; and then finally, to supply objective data
11 and expertise to a broad range of planning functions
12 and stakeholders. This last function becomes
13 especially important as we head into the 2020 census.

14 So with that, if I might then turn,
15 Chair, to the proposal that you described, with
16 respect to the timing of providing information about
17 applications to the Council, to the Community Board;
18 to the Borough President. Given the timing, I
19 obviously have not had a chance to look at the
20 proposal in-depth, but I do have... I would want to
21 correct a few misconceptions.

22 Applications are sent to the Council
23 Member, Borough President and the Council prior to
24 certification. When an application is formally filed
25 at City Planning, it's then referred out to Council

2 Member, Council; Borough President, and this is in
3 advance of certification. This morning I was only
4 able to pull together the information for the 182
5 complex projects that have been filed since 2013, but
6 for these projects, they have been formally filed and
7 referred out to the public on average 90 days before
8 certification.

9 The second misconception that I wanted to
10 address has to do with respect to what happens post-
11 certification in the formal ULURP process. Projects
12 routinely change during the ULURP process as a result
13 of the input from the community, from the Council;
14 from the Borough President. In technical speak,
15 since this is the Land Use Committee, I can note that
16 the formal process is an A-filing, a filing for an
17 amendment of the application, in addition to the
18 minor modification process.

19 A third observation would be that some of
20 the most consequential filings that are made with the
21 Department of City Planning are those that are
22 sponsored by the Department itself, our neighborhood
23 rezonings. These applications go through a
24 consultation period, an engagement with the community
25 that is measured not in days or weeks but rather in

2 months or even years. We actually at times hear that
3 it perhaps is proceeding a little bit slowly and
4 we're taking too much time in the pre-certification
5 or in the pre-filing phase.

6 I want to emphasize that despite these
7 misconceptions that I believe are embedded, the
8 Department; myself, are committed to strong community
9 input, strong community consultation. The
10 Department, as an absolute matter of course,
11 encourages applicants to reach out very early on to
12 communities and their elected officials in the
13 earliest phase of their project planning.

14 I would also urge communities that are
15 reviewing projects put forward by applicants that
16 have not engaged them early, to take that into
17 account as they review the application.

18 Turning to the purpose of the pre-
19 certification process, it's to ensure that the
20 application, as it enters public review, is complete,
21 accurate, clear, and provides the public the
22 information that the public will need to judge the
23 merits of the proposal.

24 Further, the initial filings are a rather
25 imprecise tool to gather clear and accurate project

2 information, because projects change quite frequently
3 during City Planning's consultation and review of the
4 applicant's proposal.

5 Finally, I would note that ULURP is a
6 time-tested process that provides a formal,
7 predictable seven-month-long period in which to
8 evaluate the merits of the proposal. When I say
9 time-tested, I know that when I was first at City
10 Planning in 1982, already there was a ULURP process.
11 Having worked in other settings in other
12 municipalities, I have not seen a process that is as
13 predictable that has as many different touch points
14 with elected officials with the community. So I
15 would look forward, Chair, to further speaking with
16 you about what occurs during the pre-formal filing of
17 the application and to, again, reinforcing mine and
18 the Department's commitment to this engagement with
19 the community, with the Council Member and with the
20 Borough President.

21 If you'd like, I could move on to the
22 Zoning Handbook.

23 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Do you have a
24 copy for me?

2 MARISA LAGO: I have... [interpose,
3 background comment] I actually have something even
4 better. As I was unpacking my office, which is still
5 partly in boxes, I found what I took with me from
6 City Planning when I left in 1985; this is the 1981
7 version of the Zoning Handbook [background comment]
8 and it is so simple. This was before **[inaudible]**...
9 [crosstalk]

10 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Available on
11 eBay later today.

12 MARISA LAGO: To the highest bidder;
13 right? Actually, were it not my only copy and a
14 cherished one, I would give it to you, Chair. It's
15 interesting; it's before contextual zoning; it is
16 before the number of special districts that were
17 created, and certainly before MIH and ZQA. With
18 respect to the timing of the most recent, the
19 upcoming handbook, in preparing it we realized that
20 it was a far more complex undertaking because of the
21 breadth of the MIH and ZQA, but we anticipate that it
22 will be coming out later this year; I don't have the
23 exact date that you might be looking for.

24 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Later this year?
25 [background comment] We're still in March. Chair

2 Richards would like to propose, in homage to the
3 Chair, that it be a green cover, for Council Member
4 Greenfield. [laughter] But alright, we anxiously
5 await that. Does that conclude your remarks?

6 MARISA LAGO: Well the final... [crosstalk]

7 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay.

8 MARISA LAGO: the final matter that you
9 had mentioned in your opening comments, Chair, was
10 the paperless filing...

11 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Yeah.

12 MARISA LAGO: and on that I'm going to
13 turn it over to the architect of this, Jon Kaufman.

14 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great.

15 JON KAUFMAN: Thank you. In terms of
16 paperless filing, it is a... [crosstalk]

17 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: You're an actual
18 architect or just the architect of paper... [crosstalk]

19 JON KAUFMAN: **[inaudible]**...

20 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: I mean it's the
21 Department of City Planning; I just want to make sure
22 we get the record straight. Yes, okay.

23 JON KAUFMAN: Yes, absolutely not an
24 architect.

25 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Fair enough.

2 JON KAUFMAN: But I do want to just
3 comment a little bit on paperless filing, for those
4 of you who may have heard of it or been anticipating
5 it for some time. This is a system that we think
6 will bring City Planning up to speed with sort of
7 current technology and allow a lot of benefits to
8 both our other agencies and the public at large.
9 Without going into the details of the entire system,
10 or its architecture, there's really three benefits
11 we're trying to derive from this.

12 The first one is just to make the
13 spending of public dollars more efficient. Right now
14 there are actually three different tracking systems
15 within City Planning for every application that comes
16 through, and those are tied together in a very loose
17 way, but very different technologies. We're going to
18 make that one single system so we can see it from
19 beginning to end; that's going to allow us to manage
20 applications more adeptly through our different
21 divisions that comment on them; it also connects to
22 other divisions, like the Department of Buildings.
23 Currently they get hard copies of every application
24 that comes through sent over them; this new system
25 will allow them to access it instantly

2 electronically, which has a lot of benefit for them,
3 in addition to the paper savings and the name of
4 paperless filing is really what grounds this entire
5 enterprise.

6 The second set of benefits is for the
7 applicants. Again, they can submit paperlessly,
8 whereas now, again, they have to bring in multiple
9 copies that are distributed in different places that
10 were often 100-page documents overall. It will also
11 allow them to pay online as opposed to having to come
12 to our office for every single application.

13 The third set of benefits is around
14 accessibility for the public, and again, namely, the
15 Council Members, Community Boards; Borough Presidents
16 can access the documents from their desk rather than
17 having to ask for things at certain periods of time
18 or getting physical copies, which again we think will
19 deliver a lot of benefit for some of these things
20 that you're asking about in terms of how could we see
21 the documents that are filed for all the public to
22 see.

23 So we're quite excited about this
24 overall; we're waiting for the contract to be cleared
25

2 by the Comptroller, which we hope is imminent, and
3 we'd be able to build in earnest in upcoming weeks.

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great, thank
5 you. Are there any other portions of your testimony?

6 MARISA LAGO: No, but I welcome your
7 questions.

8 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Wonderful.
9 Excellent. I'm just going to follow up on one issue
10 and then I'm going to turn it over to Chair Richards
11 for some questions and then we'll have some other
12 members and then I'll save the questions that haven't
13 been asked for myself for the last.

14 The only issue I want to follow up with
15 is on the issue of what we discussed in terms of the
16 pre-application. So certainly on this side of the
17 table we're familiar with the system and the timing
18 and how it works and we have a lot of respect and
19 admiration for the Department of City Planning and
20 especially -- and I always say this and this bears
21 repeating -- is that in my experience it is one of
22 the most professional agencies in the City of New
23 York; the employees who work there, many of whom
24 worked there for many years, are very dedicated and
25 knowledgeable and certainly are experts in the field,

2 and you won't get any argument from us about any of
3 that, even if Winston Von Engel and I do disagree on
4 occasion. Of course, I'm right and he's wrong, but
5 he's still a good guy. That being said, I think the
6 concern that we have and really what we're trying to
7 improve is that, as you well know, there is a period
8 of time -- it could be rather lengthy between when
9 there's a pre-application filing and when there is an
10 informal application, and during that period of time,
11 in our experience, there is a lot of feedback and
12 perhaps most of the feedback that a project engages
13 in actually does happen during that process, and
14 correctly so, because the outstanding women and men
15 of the Department of City Planning are working with
16 the applicants to try to improve that application and
17 give them feedback and suggestions and guidance. As
18 you point out, on some occasions, on some occasions
19 -- this certainly should happen more frequently --
20 the developers are smart enough to know that they
21 should be engaging with the local stakeholders;
22 however, what we've seen happen most recently is that
23 developers do not engage with their stakeholders and
24 in fact they -- even in the ULURP process they only
25 come to Council Members, and even Community Boards,

2 at the very end of that process, and as a result,
3 most frequently we've actually seen several
4 applications that have actually been voted down, and
5 the reason -- and some of them haven't technically
6 been voted down because generally they get pulled,
7 but just as a matter of technicality for those folks
8 who in fact are the policy wonks watching at home,
9 right -- and the reason for that is that there is a
10 lack of communication and we believe that there could
11 be improved transparency, and it's not a criticism of
12 the Department; it's, to be frank, criticism of the
13 developers who aren't engaging in an earlier process.
14 And so we think, to be frank, that it's somewhat
15 unfair that folks come and say oh wow, the Council,
16 how could they oppose a project, and they're missing
17 the context, which is, in many cases, the Council
18 Member wasn't even aware of the project until a few
19 months ago, even though the project at that point had
20 been; let's call it 99% baked, and it's very
21 difficult at the end of the process to engage in the
22 kinds of changes that sometime would actually make a
23 project accessible and then in fact what you have is
24 an applicant who has to come back and has to start
25 all over again or perhaps the property will just sit

2 there or they may sell the property or transfer the
3 property, all sorts of options. And so our interest
4 over here, and certainly we recognize what you're
5 saying, but our interest over here is actually in
6 improving the process and trying to allow the
7 stakeholders, and this is why we didn't, as part of
8 our term and condition, we're not saying that this
9 has to go to the general public but those people who
10 do have a part of the process, which is, the Borough
11 President, the Council and the Community Board, by
12 giving them advanced information, we think that would
13 significantly improve the process, and more
14 importantly, improve the likelihood of success so
15 that these issues are addressed early on in the
16 process and then some of those changes could in fact
17 be made whereas later in the process we come to a
18 project and there's not much that we can do. As
19 Council Member Brad Lander pointed out recently at
20 one of our hearings, it's not our responsibility how
21 much you paid for a piece of property because you
22 decided that you were going to bake in the cost of
23 what you thought that you were going to get in terms
24 of a rezoning. And if developers were in some way
25 forced, because they would be sharing their pre-

2 application with us, to show us their plan; we would
3 then be able to go to the developers early on and say
4 hey, guess what; you're going' down a road over here
5 where you are not very likely to be successful; that
6 would save them a lot of time, effort, frustration,
7 and it would save all of us a lot of frustration as
8 well and it would be clear I think to the public in
9 many cases, which -- and I appreciate your
10 clarification as well -- misunderstand and they just
11 say, oh the Council wants to vote that down. The
12 Council doesn't want to vote that down; the challenge
13 that we have as a Council is that it is our job in
14 fact to balance the various competing interests that
15 come to the table and we do that, we balance your
16 interest and we balance the interest of community
17 groups and we balance the interest of affordable
18 housing and good jobs and policy interest and
19 Community Boards, and there's a whole hose of issues
20 that we are trying to engage in and many times, when
21 it comes to us at the end of the process, it's just
22 simply too late and then we're left with a project
23 that even if we wanted to support it, we simply can't
24 support it.

2 And the final that I would make is that
3 -- and this is actually why I'm working with Borough
4 President Gale Brewer on this is; as a matter of law,
5 she can and she has been FOILing your pre-
6 applications, which you have to give to her anyway,
7 and so what we're suggesting is, rather than engaging
8 in a dance where -- I mean certainly we could do it;
9 I'm happy to ask Council every week to send you a
10 FOIL request and we could do it that way -- but it
11 seems like it would be better if we could come up
12 with a system where in fact we do get the information
13 once there is a pre-application -- and by we, I'm
14 referring, of course, to the Council as a whole, the
15 Borough President and the Community Board -- and that
16 way we can actually work on these issues, and, of
17 course, I think that we're all professional enough
18 and mindful enough to understand that those
19 applications are new in the process, but we do think
20 that it would help the process, and certainly we're
21 not suggesting changing or tweaking -- which as you
22 pointed out -- the ULURP process, which is a very
23 good process that we respect and appreciate; we just
24 think that this would improve the overall process,
25 because as you know, in the last two years there's a

2 lot more intense interest, scrutiny, media coverage,
3 and I would also add, participants in the land use
4 process that have made it, in my view as the Chair,
5 more difficult for projects to get approved and this
6 is really our interest in trying to compensate for
7 that to make it a more thorough and transparent
8 process so that we can actually get to a point where
9 we get to yes.

10 MARISA LAGO: If I might, Chair, it's
11 very helpful to hear your explication beyond reading
12 the article this morning, and I would very much
13 welcome the opportunity to sit down with you, other
14 interested Council Members and the Borough President
15 to see how it is that we might -- since it appears
16 you're talking about private applications principally
17 -- how, one, we might explore opportunities to have
18 developers act in the way that respects the community
19 and engages them early, and then second, we'd also be
20 glad to discuss the particular applications that you
21 had mentioned to see where things may have gone
22 askew. So I would welcome that opportunity.

23 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great, I'm happy
24 to follow up with you on that. And just to be fair,
25 we've discussed this -- just so that you know -- the

2 last two years at these hearings as well and we've
3 actually had some back and forth in writing between
4 us and the Department of City Planning -- I just
5 want, for those following at home, to know that this
6 isn't a new proposal; this is just a new twist on a
7 new proposal, which is that we realize that we
8 actually have a way of doing this which would be by
9 creating a term and condition. So we're happy to
10 engage, and like I said, we're big fans of the work
11 of your agency and especially the hard work of all of
12 your outstanding professionals, and with that I will
13 turn it over to Chair Donovan Richards for a
14 statement and some questions.

15 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you so much and
16 welcome Chair and a privilege to speak to you last
17 week and look forward to our continued partnership
18 with City Planning, and it's a very, obviously,
19 important time in our city's history where MIH and
20 ZQA are at play and obviously there's a lot of
21 tension in some of the rezoning plans, concerns about
22 affordability and other things, and you know I just
23 want to put out there very early that it's critical
24 that we maintain a very open dialogue and clear
25 communication as we move through these processes in

2 communities. And I'll start, I guess, one of the
3 first things I'll ask you about is; what are your
4 plans to ensure that we foster a strong working
5 relationship, and when I say we; the Council and your
6 agency? And one of things we pride ourselves in
7 doing here at the Council, the Land Use staff, led by
8 Raju, is really working with City Planning to make
9 sure that we come up with, you know, a clear, concise
10 way to get through some of these projects, and one
11 thing I'll point out is that we send documents over,
12 you know about possible changes to applications, to
13 City Planning, which we do not have to necessarily
14 do, but we do that to ensure that we can ensure that
15 we achieve the best outcomes in projects. So I'm
16 just interested in hearing a little bit more on how
17 do you view or how do you foresee the relationship
18 growing and strengthening between City Planning and
19 us not getting these last-minute responses to things
20 and as the clock plays out, as David spoke of
21 earlier, Chair Greenfield spoke of?

22 MARISA LAGO: Thank you. I do want to
23 pick up for just a moment on a comment that I should
24 not have overlooked that Chair Greenfield had
25 mentioned about the professionalism of City Planning.

2 One of the delights of returning, and I left in 1985,
3 is that there are still expert professional staff
4 working there and it is these career public servants
5 that are the backbone of the Agency.

6 And to thank you, Chair Richards, on
7 mentioning MIH and ZQA; it is appropriate that this
8 hearing is being held almost on the one-year
9 anniversary of the Council's passage of these
10 groundbreaking pieces of legislation. What is
11 interesting in doing the retrospective, the one-year
12 look-back is that the Council has approved MIH
13 projects in every borough except Staten Island, and
14 Staten Island is not far behind; we have an
15 application, with strong public support, which will
16 soon be coming to City Planning and then to the
17 Council for a vote.

18 On how to foster communication, it has to
19 occur at multiple levels; it's not just one person.
20 You mentioned the fact that the Council has Land Use
21 staff; in the same way within City Planning, it has
22 to start in the borough offices, right, because those
23 are the eyes and ears in the community, and then
24 extend throughout folks, including to the senior-most
25 of management. Speaking for myself, I think we'll

2 continue the culture that Carl and this senior
3 management team that Purnima has instilled, of long
4 engagement with the community. I think that the
5 processes that we have gone through in East New York,
6 are going through in East Harlem and Jerome Avenue,
7 on Southern Boulevard, on Bay Street; these are
8 communities that are engaged with us where we are
9 listening to -- and again, I always have to emphasize;
10 it's not just listening to; it's learning from the
11 wisdom of the community. Speaking very personally
12 for myself, I would welcome an invitation from any
13 member of the Council to go out, break bread in their
14 district, to take a tour, to see the district through
15 their eyes what the planning priorities are, because
16 one of the challenges that we face within any broad
17 rezoning but also just within our workload overall is
18 making priorities and the Council can be very helpful
19 in -- you know that you are confronted with more
20 needs than you can meet and you yourself are
21 developing these priorities.

22 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you so much, and
23 we don't do bread, because Chair Greenfield and I are
24 trying to stay away from the carbs, [laughter] but we
25 will definitely do vegetables.

2 But thank you, and I appreciate that;
3 definitely your conversation, especially around
4 getting out to districts and seeing that, so that'll
5 be definitely a welcoming change.

6 I wanted to inquire about the
7 Neighborhood Development Fund, so obviously we have
8 several rezonings either in the queue or happening at
9 this time, and it's a conversation I have brought up
10 with the Mayor on the billion dollar fund; we would
11 like to see a little bit more transparency around the
12 fund -- to this day, I don't know how much is left in
13 the fund -- and are you confident that there will be
14 enough dollars to get through the majority of these
15 rezonings, being that you're saying that we've been
16 moving slowly, I think I heard you say, and we're
17 going to start to ramp up a little bit more?

18 MARISA LAGO: Excuse me; I do believe
19 that the creation of the Neighborhood Development
20 Fund is another groundbreaking feature; the fact that
21 there was a recognition that, as part of the
22 rezoning, the ability to take on priority projects
23 that might not appear, or that the frontline City
24 capital agencies might not get to for a while. I
25 have not yet enmeshed myself in the mechanics of the

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 91

2 NDF and so I'm going to turn it over to Purnima, who
3 was one of the architects, and she truly is an
4 architect of the fund.

5 PURNIMA KAPUR: So thank you, Chairs. As
6 you know, the Neighborhood Development Fund, as the
7 Chair said, was one of the real major breakthroughs
8 that allowed the Department to really engage in
9 planning and neighborhood revitalization in a way
10 that we had not been able to do before in engaging
11 the community, engaging the Council Members, engaging
12 various stakeholders in coming up with a plan that
13 addressed the needs of the community that is there
14 today, even as we plan for growth and development,
15 and we were very pleased to be able to really provide
16 that kind of integrated planning and support in East
17 New York, which was the first adopted plan where, you
18 know there is a new 1,000-seat school, there are
19 improvements happening as we speak to the streets in
20 the area, there is engagement by Parks Department on
21 the various open space components, there is an RFP
22 out for the first 200 units of 100% deeply affordable
23 housing in the area; a new community center is
24 underway, so it's a whole sort of package. The NDF
25 is one part of that overall package; it is not just

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 92

2 the NDF purely that's paying for all of this. We
3 feel pretty confident that we can engage in a similar
4 process in all of the neighborhood planning work that
5 we are doing currently where we are working very
6 closely in understanding the needs of the
7 communities, understanding what is lacking as we move
8 forward, and that there will be funds available
9 either through the Neighborhood Funding process or,
10 in many instances, the capital agencies have planned
11 for improvement; that in combination can provide the
12 sort of package that is essential.

13 CHAIR RICHARDS: Sounds great. How much
14 money is left in the fund?

15 PURNIMA KAPUR: The money in the fund
16 allocated for East New York, about \$70 million is
17 coming out of the Neighborhood Fund; out of \$700
18 million, that is for non-DEP-related funds and you
19 know, we continue to.. that's allocated.. [interpose]

20 CHAIR RICHARDS: So \$70 million has
21 directly come out of the fund.. [crosstalk]

22 PURNIMA KAPUR: \$77 million.. [interpose]

23 CHAIR RICHARDS: at the moment.. 77, so I
24 would deduct that from the billion?

25

2 PURNIMA KAPUR: Yeah. I mean you could..
3 [interpose]

4 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay.

5 PURNIMA KAPUR: Right; these are
6 allocations as projects occur, the money is avail..
7 we... [interpose]

8 CHAIR RICHARDS: So there's not a
9 billion... So are you saying there's a billion dollar
10 sitting in the fund right now or is not sitting in
11 the fund or are you saying as we go... [crosstalk]

12 PURNIMA KAPUR: There is a billion
13 dollars that is... [crosstalk]

14 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay, **[inaudible]**.

15 PURNIMA KAPUR: allocated to Neighborhood
16 Development Fund...

17 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay.

18 PURNIMA KAPUR: which will become
19 available as these projects are identified.

20 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. And how do you
21 decide to take money out of the fund or not take
22 money out of the fund? How do you decide; is there a
23 process; is there some sort of quality review done
24 that says we should use money out of the fund or not

25

2 use it; is there criteria is what I'm trying to get
3 at...? [crosstalk]

4 PURNIMA KAPUR: It is... It is... It is
5 variable in each case. I think in East New York we
6 looked at... we worked very closely with all of our
7 sister agencies to look at what projects they might
8 have been contemplating, what is underway, what may
9 have -- you know, a lot of the work often is coming
10 out of what would be state of good repair, in many
11 instances; SBA [sic] has its own process that it goes
12 through. So in each case we are looking at what the
13 needs are and what the best sources are... [interpose]

14 CHAIR RICHARDS: Of the fund. Okay.

15 PURNIMA KAPUR: to get that... that done.

16 CHAIR RICHARDS: Get it. Okay. And I
17 hope... I'll just say this and we'll move from this
18 quick, 'cause I want to get to questions from my
19 colleagues who have questions. So I just want to put
20 out there I'm hoping that there will be a little bit
21 more transparency around when you're dipping into the
22 fund and some level of accountability to the City
23 taxpayers obviously first, but also to Council
24 Members and local community, so as we move forward we
25 would love to see some sort of reporting mechanism on

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 95

2 the NDF. Would you be open to that is the question,
3 Chair?

4 MARISA LAGO: I mean on this I can state
5 the obvious, with respect to fiscal accountability;
6 it's something that all of us as public servants and
7 certainly the Administration is committed to.

8 PURNIMA KAPUR: Yes. And as you are
9 aware, we have been working on a mechanism to make
10 that more transparent, both to each other and to the
11 public... [crosstalk]

12 CHAIR RICHARDS: Yeah and that was part
13 of the MIH discussion [**inaudible**].

14 PURNIMA KAPUR: and we continue to be
15 committed to that.

16 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Staying on MIH
17 discussion, so the Voluntary Inclusionary Housing
18 Program is still in place and through MIH and ZQA,
19 when the Council negotiated the bill with the
20 Administration, one of the things we said we would do
21 is come back a year later and look at the voluntary
22 program. Can you give me an update on that; where
23 are we at; are we looking to keep this commitment and
24 move forward soon on the voluntary program, to
25 strengthen it?

2 MARISA LAGO: Yes, we remain committed to
3 this relook at the VIH and how it might be adapted,
4 particularly in light of the lessons that we learned
5 through he NIH. I'll note that the timing was not
6 limited to a year and that the work is some...

7 [crosstalk]

8 CHAIR RICHARDS: Uhm, I don't think
9 that's true; it was limited to a year.

10 MARISA LAGO: Nonetheless, regardless of
11 the commitment, we... [interpose]

12 CHAIR RICHARDS: We have it in writing,
13 Danielle.

14 MARISA LAGO: I sense that you and
15 Danielle will be having some follow-up. [laughter]
16 But turning to the substance, Chair, the challenge
17 with the VIH is how integrally it is intertwined with
18 421-a. The program was designed around and intended
19 to work with 421-a. When a new -- being an optimist,
20 I'll say not if, but when a new 421-a program is
21 adopted, that will give us an opportunity to see what
22 a new program, what an amendment to the program might
23 be that could work. I will note, however, a note of
24 caution, which is that as we look at the entire
25 landscape of creating affordable housing, the changes

2 on the federal horizon actually complicate the
3 picture, whether it is reported cuts to the CDBG
4 budget or even tax changes, tax changes that could
5 affect the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit as well. So
6 it's not that we shy away from complicated subjects,
7 but this one is both a complicated subject and one
8 that has variables outside of our control, at the
9 state level and at the federal level. But again, I...
10 [interpose]

11 CHAIR RICHARDS: But we do expect to hear
12 something on 421-a, let's say, in a few months,
13 right? So I'm really hoping that we are going to
14 ramp up serious conversations around voluntary,
15 although federal conditions obviously have changed,
16 but still, we should not shy away, as you said, from
17 revisiting the program at all.

18 MARISA LAGO: That's our shared
19 expectation, Chair.

20 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Last two
21 questions. So we've been doing some work around
22 FRESH -- are you familiar with FRESH? So we're
23 losing a lot of supermarkets, a lot of food access in
24 low-income communities -- food deserts -- so we've
25 been doing some work with the Administration; just

2 interested in hearing if you're committed to
3 continuing the work that Carl certainly started with
4 us on this issue.

5 MARISA LAGO: Absolutely. The issue of
6 addressing the inequality in our city doesn't have
7 just one solution; affordable housing, clearly a
8 portion of it; jobs, another; quality education, but
9 also nutrition. Given my work in the developing
10 world, one sees the importance of nutrition to
11 employability to educational gains. Speaking very
12 personally, when I was at EDC I was so proud to be
13 involved with the selection of a developer and the
14 opening of the 125th Street Pathmark; this goes back
15 multiple Mayoral administrations, the recognition of
16 the importance of combating these food deserts.
17 Purnima, if I might turn it over to you for more
18 details about the FRESH program specifically.

19 PURNIMA KAPUR: Yes. So we have been
20 working actually with the Council staff on that and
21 there are ongoing meetings to understand the areas
22 that are of interest to the Council and to find a way
23 -- as I understand, the last meeting was as recently
24 as last Friday..

25 CHAIR RICHARDS: Uhm-hm.

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 99

2 PURNIMA KAPUR: so we remain committee to
3 working with you on **[inaudible]**... [crosstalk]

4 CHAIR RICHARDS: And I'm hoping we're
5 going to speed this conversation, 'cause we're losing
6 a lot of... [crosstalk]

7 PURNIMA KAPUR: Absolutely.

8 CHAIR RICHARDS: supermarkets in areas
9 across the city. So I definitely appreciate the work
10 we've done together on FRESH, but...

11 PURNIMA KAPUR: Yes.

12 CHAIR RICHARDS: we need to move a little
13 faster. Last question -- one major issue we expect
14 to be looked at is making a developer/ community
15 trade-off more equitable. One example of that is,
16 parts of Manhattan are R10 districts and they provide
17 a 20% FAR bonus with only a 5% affordable housing
18 addition. Does that sound like a fair trade to you,
19 so a 20% FAR bonus and only a 5% affordable housing
20 addition? And I'm just saying this... I know you just
21 got here, seat is still a little cold, but eventually
22 we're going to want to have serious conversations
23 around trade-offs and what equitable trade-off looks
24 like as developers receive incentives and more FAR
25 bonus as well.

2 MARISA LAGO: So Chair, I appreciate the
3 fact that even while not steeped in every detail of
4 the activities, getting to hear directly from the
5 Council of what the priorities are is tremendously
6 helpful, so the chair is neither hot nor cold, as it
7 should be [sic].

8 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Well I want to
9 thank you and I think I've taken up a lot of time
10 here, but look forward to certainly continuing to
11 work with you to make this city a better city for
12 everyone. I really appreciate you coming back from
13 DC and Boston to really take on this big job in this
14 metropolis, as we know it is, so I look forward to
15 continuing to work with you to make all neighborhoods
16 across the city better and equitable. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you, Chair
18 Richards. As is our practice, aside for the relevant
19 Subcommittee chair, we put a clock on members, just
20 because we have another hearing on this afterwards,
21 so I'm going to ask the Sergeant to put a five-minute
22 clock on the board, right behind Council Member
23 Kallos. Thank you very much. I also want to
24 recognize that we've been joined by Council Member
25 Ydanis Rodriguez and Council Member Andrew Cohen, the

2 newest member of the bearded caucus. I'm going to
3 turn it over now to Council Member Brad Lander.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chair. Welcome, Madam Chair, **[inaudible]** in the
6 long-term, but. Welcome, it's wonderful to have you
7 here, and first, as I think you know from our earlier
8 conversation, you know, simply by evoking Herb Sturz
9 in your opening testimony, you know, I'm going to
10 have a hard time today, at least, giving you any hard
11 questions -- a true champion for so many remarkable
12 things in this city and his spirit is a good thing to
13 have in this building as much as we possibly can.

14 Your team, you'll be glad to know, from
15 the Brooklyn office was out at a Gowanus Community
16 Planning workshop on Saturday and a couple hundred
17 people, very good dialogue about urban design and
18 land use issues, five active working groups underway
19 there, so we won't talk about that process now, but
20 it's going well. There will be, you know, some of
21 the challenges that arise in every neighborhood and I
22 look forward to working with you and your team on
23 them.

24 On an even smaller project, I do just
25 want to flag a challenge that I had with the prior

2 Chair were these small rezoning projects at or near
3 or just under the MIH threshold; it created a
4 challenge and a conflict on the last one; I have
5 another one coming; this developer insists they will
6 do it voluntarily, but we don't have a good mechanism
7 together for how to implement an MIH commitment;
8 we're going to make up our own way if we can't do it
9 together with you, so I just want to flag that; it's
10 early in the process, but I hope we can find a good
11 way to land that, I'd love to support that project
12 and get some commitment, the commitment they're
13 willing to make to affordability.

14 I am also looking forward at a future
15 hearing to working with you and your staff on the
16 Council's envisioned proposed overhaul of the Fair
17 Share system, which I'm not going to drill down on
18 today, we'll have a full hearing on that later, and I
19 thank the Chair, but I did note that you guys have
20 put up this new capital planning platform website in
21 beta testing or Facilities Explorer -- and let me
22 start by saying it's great; it's much better than
23 Zolo was, it's easier to use, it looks good, you can
24 find a lot of information, so thank you for that
25 work; I guess I have a few questions about it. I

2 note that it has some facilities but not all
3 facilities, and not only land use facilities; some of
4 the Article IX contracts like child care centers and
5 waste transfer stations are up, but homeless shelters
6 are not, so I wonder what guided that. There isn't
7 currently information on the capacity or size of a
8 facility, which can obviously be relevant. And
9 third, I wonder if you're aware and made any
10 connections between it and the Capital Projects
11 Dashboard, which the Mayor's Office of Operations
12 keeps; even more than we care about Fair Share, the
13 Council Members feel passionately and frustrated with
14 New York City Capital Projects' management, which is
15 not your job, mercifully, but that is a good new
16 database and map that they've put up, but it seemed
17 like those things might want to talk to each other.

18 MARISA LAGO: Before turning to over to
19 Jon Kaufman, I do want to say how pleased I am,
20 Council Member, that by putting this out in a beta
21 form, it's attracting exactly the type of input, of
22 criticisms, of suggestions for the next phase; rather
23 than waiting for the perfect, we thought it made
24 sense, with the information... [crosstalk]

25 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Absolutely.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: that we had, to
3 get it out there and we would welcome this type of
4 input from any Council Member, because it can only
5 help but make it better.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you.

7 JON KAUFMAN: Yeah, so let me echo that.
8 Again, it is a little different to put out a beta
9 product, for City Planning in particular, but we do
10 think it's the kind of thing.. we want to make this a
11 useful tool. As you probably also know, Council
12 Member, the data has been available for quite some
13 because we are Charter mandated to have a selective
14 facilities database. What we've gone and done here
15 is tried to innovate to make it more accessible to
16 the public at large to understand where these sites
17 are located overall. The platform you're referring
18 to is, you know a platform that actually aggregates
19 other sources that come from other agencies and City
20 Planning can't vet nor produce those datasets and so
21 we're still very reliant and will always be reliant
22 on the agencies to provide information of any sort,
23 be it the location or the capacity, as you indicate.

24 As this is beta, we have not... you know
25 there's not a... we work with datasets we have and make

2 that agencies are comfortable with what they're
3 providing, now that they're in a [sic] newly
4 accessible format, and we posted those the best we
5 can. And as you've noted, nearly every facility you
6 can imagine is on there. There are a couple agencies
7 where they're still verifying the data to make sure
8 that they're perfectly comfortable with what's being
9 public. You'd appreciate; some facilities also
10 should not be publicly accessible; that we also want
11 to be very sensitive to making sure there's no
12 information inadvertently shared because people
13 didn't realize it would be on a map, so we're taking
14 extra steps to do that in beta version, but we do
15 hope to have every kind of facility we can publicly
16 share on there as soon as possible.

17 In terms of the capacity information,
18 [bell] again, that's difficult to ascertain; where
19 we've been able to do it, for example, with the DOE
20 Blue Book, we've posted it on there because we think
21 it will save people steps for having to find that
22 information; that is a much harder thing to do
23 because every agency has a different way of measuring
24 capacity, and again, City Planning is an aggregator
25 of these datasets, not in-depth and responsible for

2 actually what is produced overall, so there will
3 always be some limitations there, but we are
4 soliciting suggestions on how we can enhance the
5 platform overall.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay, we'll pick
7 this conversation back up at the Fair Share hearing,
8 but I'll just encourage you as you're looking at
9 those bills in advance of that hearing, some of them
10 would be satisfied with some adjustments on this
11 platform and some of them would change sort of your
12 power through the criteria to actually require
13 agencies to provide information. So thank you for
14 putting it out in beta form so we could start the
15 conversation, and I'll look forward to picking it up.
16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
18 Council Member Lander. As I mentioned before, we
19 have multiple hearings going on back and forth, we've
20 been rejoined by the new Chair of our Planning
21 Subcommittee, Rafael Salamanca, who has some
22 questions as well.

23 CHAIR SALAMANCA: Thank you, thank you,
24 Mr. Chair. Good afternoon. Just first want to give
25 a shout-out to the Bronx Director for City Planning,

2 Carol Samol; we worked very close together in my
3 prior life as a District Manager; we're going through
4 a Southern Boulevard study now and I'm really excited
5 about it; really hearing the concerns of the
6 community to see how we can best change some
7 neighborhoods that are underserved.

8 My question is very direct. In my prior
9 capacity as District Manager, there were situations
10 with the prior administration where a Community Board
11 would make a recommendation; the Borough President
12 will make a recommendation, let's say very similar to
13 the recommendation the Community Board made, and the
14 City Planning Commission will make a totally
15 different recommendation than what the community's
16 actually requesting. I understand that the
17 composition of the Commission, where the Mayor has
18 his appointees, and the Borough Presidents, and I
19 believe the Public Advocate, each have one appointee,
20 but the Administration has more appointees than
21 everyone else, and so I just want to ensure that
22 decisions that are made at the Commission are in the
23 best interests of the community and you know, as a
24 former District Manager, I take a community's
25 concerns very seriously, and just want to hear from

2 you in terms of when you're making decisions how
3 seriously do you take Community Boards' and Borough
4 Presidents' recommendations, because they are
5 advisory, as I've been reminded by the Commission in
6 my prior life as a District Manager?

7 MARISA LAGO: Thank you for raising the
8 community perspective, which, Council Member, has
9 been throughout the hearing a very constant theme;
10 the importance of listening to and learning from
11 communities. There are probably few people who have
12 sat through more Commission meetings that Purnima, so
13 I will turn it over to her.

14 PURNIMA KAPUR: So you know, we have been
15 engaged on our own initiatives, when it's a
16 departmental initiative from the get go with the
17 community, with the Council Members; with the
18 stakeholders -- you know, the Southern Boulevard is a
19 good example of that. In terms of the formal ULURP
20 project and the recommendations that come from the
21 Community Board or the Borough President, Department
22 staff presents that very clearly to the Commission at
23 an open session; there is a public session just two
24 days before the public hearing where those
25 recommendations are presented to the Commission and

2 are debated and heard, and I can tell you, based on
3 my experience, the Commission takes that very
4 seriously. We have a 13-member body; we have an
5 independent commission; it's the five Borough
6 Presidents, the Public Advocate, plus the Mayoral
7 appointees; each one of them has their own skill set
8 and perspective; it's a varied commission, and if,
9 you know, you come and listen to any of those
10 sessions, there is a very broad and intense debate
11 about issues, particularly when a Community Board or
12 a Borough President has raised serious concerns about
13 an application.

14 That said, the decision-making body at
15 City Planning is the Commission; it's not the
16 Department; the Chair chairs that Commission, and I
17 think there are not that many instances that I'm
18 aware of where there is a big divergence in what we
19 hear from the community and the Commission sort of
20 reacting to that. I'm sure there are projects where,
21 you know... [interpose]

22 CHAIR SALAMANCA: Okay. I just want to -
23 - because my time is running out -- I just want to
24 make sure that I got a commitment from you, Madam
25 Chair, that this Commission is an independent body,

2 you know, and really want to reiterate, please, take
3 Community Board recommendations and Borough
4 Presidents' recommendations exactly when they're on
5 the same page seriously. At least in the South
6 Bronx, any recommendation that comes from Community
7 Boards, Borough Board and the Borough President and
8 is different from the Commission, I'm going to side
9 with my community.

10 MARISA LAGO: Thank you, Chair. A couple
11 of observations, building on what Purnima said; one
12 is a helpful hint, which is; these review sessions,
13 which are simulcast live and the presentations are
14 made by City Planning staff of their view of the
15 application, but also the public process, what has
16 come forward from the Community Board; from the
17 Borough Board. Frequently [bell] applicants will
18 come to those meetings -- the public is welcome to be
19 in the room in listening mode -- and to the extent
20 that your staff is available, it is a very helpful
21 preview and can then help prepare what the testimony
22 will be two days later at the public hearing.

23 The second is; the fact that we do need
24 to keep a keen eye that in reviewing land use
25 applications, the tools that City Planning can use,

2 the things that we're allowed to consider, may not
3 cover the entire gamut of what the Community Board
4 has asked for, and so that again could be another
5 opportunity to engage to get a clear understanding of
6 what is within the land use application and which
7 requests of the Community Board are legitimate, but
8 may fall outside of the land use application.

9 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
10 Chair. Council Member Kallos.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Thank you, Chair
12 Lago; nice to finally get a chance to meet you at
13 least in person; sorry there's a desk in-between; I
14 look forward to getting a chance to have a longer
15 conversation; also, have a chance to work with you on
16 some of the pending matters that I have as an
17 applicant before you and what we can do together, and
18 this is something I've spoken for a while about, in
19 terms of bringing affordable housing to the East
20 Side, which I represent; we want affordable housing,
21 and if we could get it, I would love Mandatory
22 Inclusionary Housing, and also, a similar [sic]
23 refrain from anyone in the body or has [sic] been
24 paying attention to me is just asking for school
25 seats, and so we hope that you'll have a chance to

2 see an application that we've put forward that would
3 provide affordable housing as well as community
4 facility that we hope might actually become school
5 seats, which we desperately need.

6 I did want to touch base on a different
7 question, because I feel like that application has
8 been filed and we've moved forward. This one comes
9 from a constituent named Betty Cooper Wallerstein
10 [sp?] and she leads the East 79th Street Neighborhood
11 Association and the question being -- and I have
12 legislation on point -- is; we have Community Boards;
13 they used to be called Community Planning Boards, and
14 often they will pass resolutions, so Community Board
15 6 had passes a resolution asking to cap the midblock
16 in my district, to add 75 feet; the Community Board
17 8, which I also represent, has passed a resolution to
18 cap the neighborhood at 210 feet; I have legislation
19 that would give Community Boards urban planners,
20 however, the pushback we've gotten at hearings and
21 other places is that the Department of City Planning
22 are the planners for the Community Boards, so I guess
23 moving forward, can there be a partnership so that as
24 Community Boards are passing those resolutions
25 there's an affirmative response from Department of

2 City Planning that planners are coming in to meet
3 with them and that the Community Boards are empowered
4 to pursue large-scale zoning changes with the support
5 of DCP without having to do a community-led effort
6 such as what we've done in the Sutton area?

7 MARISA LAGO: I apologize for not being
8 familiar with Miss Cooper Wallerstein's particular
9 proposal. I will note that we have our strong
10 network of borough offices to be able to engage with
11 the community; now engaging with the community does
12 not always mean agreeing with the proposal that the
13 community has brought forward, but certainly I can
14 commit the borough staff to listening, to engaging
15 and then obviously we will need, as a Planning
16 Department, to make our determination of whether the
17 requests are appropriate in light of balancing the
18 multiple factors that go into any zoning decision.
19 Do you want to elaborate, Purnima?

20 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I think that's
21 fair; I think what we're seeing, just from my
22 district, is just a concern with a lot of development
23 and so I think that under the prior Chair that there
24 were specific policies and would just love to work
25 with you and being open to hearing some of the

2 concerns that are coming. I know that on the West
3 Side Gale Brewer had fought for two terms to get her
4 district height capped and get contextual zoning
5 there and I hope to not have to fight as long for
6 similar outcomes in my district.

7 MARISA LAGO: Council Member, I'll extend
8 to you the invitation that I had extended to the
9 other members, but I would very much welcome meeting
10 you and I was told I shouldn't say "break bread";
11 maybe "chomp on cheese" in your district and then
12 take a tour to see, one-on-one with our teams, with
13 our eyes, the challenges that you're facing.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: That is
15 incredible, absolutely, and if you're free during the
16 Passover holiday, we won't break bread; we'll bake
17 matza, and my colleague can tell you they are not the
18 same thing. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Chair Richards
20 and I actually recommend a walk through of
21 neighborhoods; it's a more physically appropriate way
22 to actually get the scene and then you don't have to
23 deal with all of those superfluous calories from
24 sitting and having lunches or dinners with 51 Council
25

2 Members; that can add up after a while, so that's
3 just our pro tip for you as the new Chair.

4 MARISA LAGO: I appreciate it, and being
5 a bicyclist, I might even one-up and say hey, let's
6 get out on our bikes..

7 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay.

8 MARISA LAGO: and cover more distance;
9 burn more calories... [crosstalk]

10 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Excellent. I'm
11 looking forward. Council Member Rodriguez, to be
12 followed by Council Member Cohen.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank you,
14 Chair. I have like -- first of all, I would like to
15 invite you for a tour of Washington Heights; that's
16 the area that we're going to be looking for a major
17 rezoning in the Inwood area and I think it would be
18 important for someone with a lot of experience in the
19 city and the nation but also with a new role,
20 especially on how to work with the developers and the
21 community to develop the best project, to have the
22 opportunity to walk around the neighborhood.

23 I think that -- I love, you know, all the
24 experience that someone like you brings to the table;
25 I also believe that we have to learn from previous

2 projects and economic development that we have done
3 in the city and be more creative on how to create...
4 use the land use process to get developers to not
5 only bring retail, especially to the underserved
6 community -- we don't need more clothing stores --
7 you know the community, the city needs to close the
8 gap when it comes to produce the best training or
9 jobs that we can produce the \$70-80,000, and I think
10 that sometimes it's all about be creative and we from
11 the city, especially from your leadership, to get
12 developers to think outside the box. I wasn't
13 thinking about being elected to office when the
14 Target project at 225th, between the Bronx and
15 Manhattan, was built; I assumed that the developers
16 would pool the money and saw the opportunity was
17 unique, because if anyone will come to that part at
18 the tip of Manhattan and think that that project,
19 that Target there will be the one to have the second
20 **[inaudible]** per square foot in the nation; it doesn't
21 happen usually, and I think that we as a city already
22 have made all the billions and billions of dollars
23 investing in the Midtown area and now in Brooklyn, in
24 the Long Island City, now we are thinking about the
25 outer borough area. People are traveling an hour-

2 and-a-half to go and look for the jobs from many
3 places, and I think that in a city where we are
4 thinking of putting like \$300 million incentive for
5 developers, the private sector that creates jobs in
6 our city; even if we have to increase those
7 incentives, but we need to create jobs in the outer
8 borough area. And my challenges to many individuals
9 when they come to my community is that what they had
10 in mind that they're going to be meeting an elected
11 official, that the trading that they get from the
12 elected official is going to support those
13 **[inaudible]** few, smallest space to rent to small
14 businesses and to bring the Marshall's and the
15 Targets and I think that if we want to compete
16 worldwide, we have to get as many of those developers
17 also to think about how can we create new jobs around
18 health and technology. And reading your testimony,
19 especially **[inaudible]** to promote economic
20 development and growth, I would like to invite you,
21 to work with your team and especially -- I've gotta
22 say, I've been clear to anyone, especially this day
23 coming to my Inwood, conversation on the Inwood
24 rezoning -- I will support the large area of the
25 rezoning if the jobs that we will create will be

2 around technology and health. I don't need more
3 Marshall's, I don't need more Targets; I would not
4 need more like those type of investments, but we need
5 the City to also think, you know like, when I saw
6 that with the whole new computer hub initiative
7 putting in Times Square, I get it, a lot of school
8 students go there, it's in a central location, but
9 when are we going to be thinking outside the box and
10 looking at opportunity, not only in my district, but
11 in other places -- in the South Bronx, in Brooklyn --
12 that they are not in the Midtown area; that we know
13 that we don't have the same foot traffic, but we can
14 bring some developer to say, we will work with you in
15 this rezoning. But the type of economic development
16 that we need cannot be the traditional one. So what
17 is your vision when it comes to how to work -- take
18 advantage of this process where you control from the
19 rezoning process and incentivize developers to create
20 good jobs, training jobs, especially in the
21 underserved communities?

22 MARISA LAGO: You raise such an important
23 point, Council Member, which is that in addition to
24 the great strides that we've taken in addressing
25 inequality and addressing the challenges in some of

2 our poorer communities through affordable housing, it
3 needs [bell] to be complimented with a focus on jobs
4 and certainly the Mayor's commitment, his 100,000
5 jobs initiative is focused on good-paying jobs, is
6 entirely in line with what you are speaking about.

7 There's also another piece of the puzzle that you've
8 touched upon, which is the need to diversity our
9 economy, to not put all of our eggs in one sector of
10 the economy, and to move beyond our traditional areas
11 of strength into health, into technology jobs. There
12 is no magic solution, but I'm proud that you think...

13 I'm pleased that you think that City Planning is part
14 of the answer. We work extremely closely with the
15 Economic Development Corporation, with Small Business
16 Services, and you will see that in the Inwood

17 rezoning the community engagement process that we've
18 spoke about, it takes all of the agencies working
19 together, together with a community that is very

20 clear about what its priorities are and an elected
21 leader who is representing their priorities. I do

22 think that the Inwood process, the process that we
23 follow in our neighborhood rezoning, is a reflection

24 of this Administration's commitment to engaging with
25 a community, not just filing a land use rezoning

2 application, but rather, having a deeply understood
3 sense of what the community's needs and priorities
4 are and how the multiple arms of the city; I'd extend
5 it to the Department of Education, because to get the
6 jobs in these cutting edge sectors that you've
7 mentioned, one needs a well-educated and well-trained
8 workforce. So I do look forward to working with you
9 both on the Inwood zoning, specifically, but also
10 more broadly.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, and my
12 30-second recommendation on transportation -- can we
13 stop putting priority on getting developers to
14 provide parking space and instead using those
15 resources to get developers to invest in mass
16 transportation, especially, those buildings are close
17 to mass transportation? I get it that that's
18 different from the Queens, from places that they
19 don't have access to mass transportation, but in many
20 areas in Manhattan -- and I have a car and I know
21 that I use it too, but as for me, it's not a priority
22 to focus on the requirement of parking, but for me,
23 the priority should be getting developers to invest
24 in our mass transportation.

2 MARISA LAGO: When people talk about MIH,
3 people focus on the fact of the requirement of
4 producing affordable housing becoming mandatory and
5 that is groundbreaking in the nation. There's
6 another facet of MIH that doesn't get as much
7 attention, but also I think reflects the wisdom of
8 the Administration putting it forward; the Planning
9 Commission and the Council in approving it, which is
10 a recognition that we do have many transit-rich areas
11 and the fact that the parking requirement is
12 eliminated. There are few cities that would have the
13 rich, the robust mass transit to be able to eliminate
14 a parking requirement. I understand that you're
15 asking for something even further, but I do think the
16 Council should be proud of the fact that it is in the
17 MIH focusing on the production of affordable housing
18 rather than parking spaces.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank you,
20 Chair. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
22 Council Member Rodriguez. Council Member Cohen.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: Thank you, Chair.
24 I do just want to echo the comments of my colleague,
25 Council Member Salamanca, that I think the Bronx

2 office really does yeoman's work, that Carol Samol is
3 incredibly accessible; we spend a lot of time
4 talking, and I'm not just saying that 'cause she's a
5 constituent; she is really a partner in a lot of ways
6 and I'm appreciative of that.

7 But you know, I'm a little concerned
8 about the resources for the Bronx office, to be
9 perfectly honest; you know we have two neighborhood
10 rezonings, neither of which is taking place in my
11 district, which is maybe why I'm concerned; is that I
12 want to make sure that when I have concerns, that we
13 have concerns, that there are resources available;
14 that these neighborhood rezonings are not eating up
15 the entire budget.

16 I wonder if you have any idea, in terms
17 of the budget, the resources that are devoted to the
18 Bronx office per se, and just sort of as an agency or
19 its commission [sic], in terms of the neighborhood
20 rezonings, is that the... you know, I'm sure it's the
21 lion's share, but is it all of the... what do you think
22 is available for non-neighborhood rezoning projects?

23 MARISA LAGO: Couple of observations; one
24 is, thank you to the Administration, to the OMB
25 Director, to the Council for the significant

2 increases in the City Planning budget over the prior
3 years; I think there was a recognition, given the
4 ambitious neighborhood rezonings, that City Planning
5 needed more staff and it's much appreciated.

6 The second is to recognize that the
7 resources available for these rezonings extend far
8 beyond just the people who are in the borough office.
9 The people in the borough offices are invaluable,
10 because many of them live in the community, they work
11 full-time in the community and they are, for those of
12 us headquartered at City Planning's headquarters, our
13 eyes and ears; they're the field troops. But they
14 are backed up by a tremendously expert staff with
15 expertise in everything from housing to
16 transportation to resiliency and that team is also --
17 oh, to environmental review I should note -- that
18 team that you see in the borough is buttressed by
19 those folks.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER COHEN: So again, I just
21 want to emphasize that there are large parts of the
22 borough that are not part of neighborhood rezonings
23 and you know, particularly I want to give a plug for
24 Community Board 7, working very hard on trying to
25 have zoning that sort of reflects their current

2 values of how they'd like to see development there.

3 So just, again, there are neighborhoods beyond the
4 neighborhood rezonings, and at some point, whenever
5 we get a chance, I'd like an update on SNAG [sic]
6 too, which also affects my district. Thank you,
7 Chair.

8 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you,
9 Council Member. I'm going to wrap up with some
10 questions of my own. One of the areas there's been a
11 lot of discussion over has been on preservation of
12 industrial businesses in New York City, specifically,
13 around industrial business zones and also in other
14 manufacturing areas. Can you update us on your
15 perspective, as the Chair and Director now, on what
16 your view is on industrial businesses and
17 specifically, the timeline for the hotel special
18 permit in manufacturing zones.

19 MARISA LAGO: Thank you, Chair. The
20 solution to keeping manufacturing in New York has to
21 be multipronged, and I believe first and foremost it
22 has to start with a recognition of how manufacturing
23 is changing and making sure that we have available
24 space that meets the needs of today's manufacturers,
25 and so that is why I am so pleased that my former

2 agency, EDC, has been investing so much not only at
3 the Brooklyn Army Terminal, but now at the Bush
4 Terminal. With respect to the special permits that
5 you referenced, I assume you're also referring to the
6 self-storage permits and then as well as the hotel
7 special permit. They're proceeding on different
8 timelines... [background comment] Excuse me?

9 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Self-storage
10 seems to be moving along, so I wasn't... that timing
11 seems to be actually in real time, so that's why I
12 was referring to the hotel special permit.

13 MARISA LAGO: With respect to the hotel
14 special permit, that work is also underway, but
15 proceeding, as you note, on a different timeline.
16 The self-storage special permit is focused on IBZs;
17 the hotel special permit is focused in all
18 manufacturing districts, so a far broader sweep, but
19 it does make the analysis that much more complex and
20 so requiring more time, but both are proceeding.

21 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay. So do you
22 have an approximate time on when you think the hotel
23 special permit in manufacturing zones will... the
24 application will be complete?

2 PURNIMA KAPUR: So at this time we are
3 engaged in actually looking at every -- as you know,
4 we have to put together an application that addresses
5 the range of the M1 districts in the five borough;
6 our borough offices, along with our team at the
7 center, is focused on looking at each and every one
8 of those areas and pulling together the data that we
9 need to complete this. We are also doing other
10 studies to also understand hotels and hotel
11 development and hotel industry to support the
12 recommendations that we hope to come out with. Our
13 hope is that we can start engaging with the public
14 maybe towards the end of the summer or early fall and
15 with some basic understanding and a set of
16 recommendations that we can start a discussion
17 around. The application itself will require an EIS;
18 we will be scoping, but we would start the engagement
19 process before that. Once we have completed the work
20 that is needed to really be able to speak
21 intelligently about the proposal, we will be out
22 there.

23 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great. Thank
24 you. You know several years ago the Administration,
25 led by the Mayor and your predecessor, announced that

2 they would be engaging in 15 neighborhood rezonings
3 across New York City; I think, by my count, right now
4 we've done one, and it's not a criticism because
5 obviously there are a multitude of factors, including
6 sometimes the communities push back and the irony, of
7 course, of some of the conversation we've had today
8 is that in fact that the Department is responsive,
9 because when communities come back and they say this
10 is a rezoning that is being pushed by the
11 Administration; we don't want this or we want to
12 change it; to your credit, you've pulled back. So
13 once again, it's not a criticism; it's just trying to
14 clarify how things have actually changed. So I'm
15 just curious; are you perhaps interested in revising
16 that and saying okay, we're not going for 15 anymore,
17 we're going to go for 5 or 7 or 10, and -- that would
18 be question number one; and then question number two
19 is; what are the next rezonings that you see coming
20 down the pike and a priority for you as Director and
21 Chair?

22 MARISA LAGO: Thank you, Chair. With
23 respect to revising; don't see a need for that. With
24 respect to the next coming down the line... [interpose]

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: So we're still
3 doing 15 rezonings?

4 MARISA LAGO: With respect to the next
5 coming down the line, I would say we are going to see
6 East Harlem, a very significant and one that was
7 preceded by very extensive community engagement,
8 including with the Speaker. Also moving their way
9 through the community engagement process is Bay
10 Street on Staten Island; as was mentioned by the
11 Council Member, Southern Boulevard; also in the
12 Bronx, Jerome Avenue and then in the Far Rockaways,
13 the business core. So these are all very significant
14 undertakings that are underway.

15 PURNIMA KAPUR: **[inaudible]** note that
16 **[inaudible]** Far Rockaway is in the process, as you're
17 aware, so yeah.

18 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Chair Richards
19 would just like the record to reflect that he doesn't
20 think there's enough resources coming to Far
21 Rockaway, [background comment] and he needs some more
22 resources. I'm teasing; we have actually -- it's
23 just an internal joke and how he seems to have taken
24 all the City's money and focused it on this one
25 neighborhood; [laughter] I guess we'll call it

2 Chair's privilege. I'm not trying to nudge and I'm
3 certainly not trying to change a policy, but I'm
4 curious; do you really think it's practical to still
5 get to 15 rezonings over the next four-and-a-half
6 years, if the voters are so included to return this
7 administration to power come September and November?

8 PURNIMA KAPUR: I think that we are
9 focused on addressing as many of the community
10 requests and as many of the neighborhoods that have
11 come forth and requested a rezoning as possible.
12 Beyond the ones that the Chair has mentioned, as you
13 are all aware, we are working in Bushwick, we are
14 working in Gowanus; we are working in Long Island
15 City. I think that -- you know we will do as many
16 rezonings as we possibly can in areas that are in
17 need of more housing; in need of more economic
18 development, as long as our staff can handle it. We
19 move -- as you said, we are really working closely
20 with the communities; we are focused on doing them
21 right as much as we are focused on doing the right
22 number... [crosstalk]

23 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Sure.

24 PURNIMA KAPUR: So we have close to 10 in
25 process at this point... [interpose]

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great.

3 PURNIMA KAPUR: and if I recall, it was
4 up to 15 in the document that you are referring to,
5 so.

6 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: I don't have it
7 in front of me, but I'll take you at your word, and
8 once again, I do note that it is a reflection of the
9 feedback that you've gotten. I will add an 11th; I
10 hear that the leadership of communities of Southern
11 Brooklyn are interested in a small rezoning as well
12 that you and the Chair and Winston and Danielle are
13 all very familiar with, so we can add that to your
14 list so you can get credit for it; then you can get
15 closer to your 15 number, so that would be a win-win
16 for everyone.

17 I want to just follow up on -- Jon, I
18 believe you were talking before about the paperless
19 filing system; when do you think the system will be
20 fully implemented; what's the remaining timeline on
21 that system, because it has had some setbacks?

22 JON KAUFMAN: Yes, we're currently -- in
23 2018 we hope to have completed the system. As you
24 know, the contracting and procurement process takes
25 some time and so again, we're hopeful to have

2 something public in 2018 and completed by the end of
3 the year next year.

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: So beginning of
5 '18 or the end of '18 or?

6 JON KAUFMAN: So obviously what we're
7 doing is what we can to deliver some of the
8 functionality sooner, so there'll be the first
9 release of it in early 2018 but completed by the end
10 of 2018.

11 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great. And then
12 what portion of that system will be accessible to the
13 public? So what will the public be able -- 'cause
14 obviously that's an internal system, of course, but
15 what will the public be able to see if they logged
16 on; what, if any, information will you be sharing
17 with folks from that system?

18 JON KAUFMAN: We haven't specified every
19 piece of it in terms of what exactly where it's
20 appropriate to have the privacy, so to speak, but any
21 public document would be publicly available is the
22 aim of the system. Again, when we get into the
23 specifics of how it's built, that may change, but the
24 goal would be that any that is publicly available can
25 be accessed through the system.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay. And in
3 similar vein, as you know, the Mayor signed a law in
4 December, 1132-A, which is based on a commitment that
5 was made to the Council during the MIH and ZQA
6 process to create a tracking system to track
7 commitments and the law is supposed to go into effect
8 at the end of June. Are you folks working on that;
9 are you working on that system or do you expect that
10 it'll be up and running by the end of June so that
11 there's that public database for folks to track the
12 commitments that are made in rezonings?

13 JON KAUFMAN: Yes, we're familiar with
14 that and we've been a participant in looking at the
15 legislation and giving our input as to how to do it,
16 and we want to make sure that, again, these
17 **[inaudible]** of these neighborhoods are getting what
18 they need; we know that part of the rezoning process
19 involves that. We've been working with the Council
20 Members who brought the legislation through and we
21 think a solution is imminent, you know it's not a
22 City Planning responsibility to ensure every agency
23 is compliant, but we know that the Administration is
24 taking that quite seriously and is trying to set the

2 right mechanism so those issues can be seen by the
3 public.

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay, great.

5 You know that -- just to follow up on some of my
6 colleagues' questions on Community Boards. Community
7 Boards engage in an exercise where they send to the
8 Department of City Planning different recommendations
9 in terms of needs; what happens to those
10 recommendations? It seems to some of the Community
11 Boards that we hear from that it sort of goes into a
12 black hole and there isn't necessarily any follow-up.
13 Do you share it with other relevant agencies or do
14 you just file it away or do you folks use it for the
15 next tickertape parade? So what exactly happens with
16 those recommendations, because to be fair, the
17 Community Boards tend to spend a fair amount of time
18 on those documents where they send you their need
19 assessments for their particular Community Boards?

20 JON KAUFMAN: On this particular subject
21 of the community district need statements, I believe
22 you're referring to overall. We have actually been
23 working quite a bit with our partners at OMB to work
24 on reforming that process; we have heard those
25 concerns from the Community Boards that it felt like

2 they're doing a lot of work and they weren't sure
3 what... [interpose]

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Who is... You
5 would shred it and then use it for the tickertape
6 parades that would come down Broadway?

7 JON KAUFMAN: No.

8 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay.

9 JON KAUFMAN: As you know, it is, in all
10 seriousness, a Charter mandate for City Planning to
11 collect all those and distribute those to the
12 agencies, but again, with this Administration and we
13 sort of reflected on what was happening and on the
14 resources involved, then we did retool that process
15 so that -- I can tell you we do, actually now have
16 converted that process to be an online process, so
17 community districts with lesser resources can
18 actually submit higher quality requests that we at
19 City Planning do distribute out to the agencies in a
20 much more efficient format, and we've been spending a
21 lot of time with the agencies to make sure that we
22 can improve the quality of that and we've seen a lot
23 more **[inaudible]** involvement in that. I believe if
24 you check with the Community Boards they would
25 comment on a much more robust process that while

2 involving a lot of change, actually in some ways
3 makes it easier for them to discuss what are the
4 needs in the budget requests they want to put in in
5 one process rather than having a separate process for
6 City Planning than from OMB overall. If you look on
7 our website in the community portal, you can see some
8 of the newly formatted reports that again make it
9 very clear what their needs are and what their
10 requests are in a way that's just very easy to digest
11 across Community Boards and for agencies themselves
12 to understand.

13 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: And you are
14 getting that information both to the OMB and the
15 respective agencies?

16 JON KAUFMAN: Yes, it's in an integrated
17 format now which again, makes it much easier for
18 anyone to understand what the Community Board is
19 saying and for themselves to discuss it in a way that
20 ensures the needs are actually consistent with what
21 they're asking for so they don't have one set of
22 needs and then they're not [sic] asking for anything
23 else that would logically follow.

24 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Okay, great.
25 And I guess my final question for you, Chair, is; you

2 know every chair has a different imprint that they've
3 put on the agency; what's your priority, and as long
4 as you shall be chair, what do you hope to accomplish
5 that may be different than your predecessors and what
6 are you going to state and say, here's what I'd like
7 to see get done after I leave this agency in X amount
8 of years, however long that may be?

9 MARISA LAGO: Thank you for the vision
10 thing [sic] question, Chair. I think that my message
11 would be one of continuity. I have the good fortune
12 of following in the footsteps of someone who I think
13 was an extraordinarily effective Chair of the City
14 Planning Commission, and someone who I had the
15 pleasure of working for and learning from. And so I
16 know that Carl, in leading the Department, valued and
17 built up and empowered the staff of the Department of
18 City Planning and I hope to continue that, because as
19 you had mentioned before, it is an extraordinarily
20 expert, professional agency that brings not just
21 expertise, but also a long-term vision that is built
22 on the community's needs.

23 Now times change and I know that we see
24 this in the Mayor's focus on housing and now adding
25 the element of jobs, and so I do think that my

2 commitment is to continue to address the issues of
3 inequality using the tools that we have at City
4 Planning. MIH was as creative as it gets, but it may
5 not alone be the entire solution, and so looking for
6 other ways that we can deploy these tools in ways
7 that get at the fact that we are such a rich, we're
8 such a prosperous, such a dynamic city and yet we do
9 have such inequality and that it is certainly what
10 keeps me coming back to public service and being
11 proud to call myself a public servant that I think
12 that the public sector, [background comments] working
13 with the private sector is the single-most powerful
14 platform to assure that we address this issue,
15 whether it is for residents of the city who have been
16 here for generations or whether it's for our newest
17 immigrants. Coming from an immigrant family, I am
18 extraordinarily proud of the fact that we are a city
19 that welcomes and that benefits from our immigrant
20 population, but at the same time we have to recognize
21 that much of the poverty in our city is also a
22 resident in long-term populations, and so it is this
23 commitment to address inequality that keeps me coming
24 very happily to the office each morning.

2 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you. When
3 you refer to the jobs, what specifically are you
4 referring to; what sort of more actions do you think
5 the Department could take to help create jobs in the
6 process of zoning applications?

7 MARISA LAGO: I think in that area we can
8 work extraordinarily closely with EDC. Like my
9 predecessor, I have not just an understanding of but
10 a fondness for the ability of that agency to work in
11 manners that City agencies alone can't, but I would
12 also stress the Department of Business Services,
13 which is newly muscular. I think that our role as a
14 planning agency is making sure that as they identify
15 initiatives that we make sure that our land use
16 patterns are receptive to the changing way in which
17 work is done, whether it is in the garment district;
18 of being supportive of this broader initiative to
19 make sure that we retain a garment industry, a
20 garment industry of today in this city, or whether it
21 is looking at new technologies, attracting life
22 sciences through the activities that the City took.

23 I will end by noting the importance our
24 academic institutions. The fact that we have so many
25 academic institutions that train our residents for a

2 variety of careers is essential; we're not at risk
3 of, but we should never fall into the trap of
4 becoming a company town with only or two industries;
5 it is the diversity that continues to bring people
6 and keep them here in New York.

7 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Great. I want
8 to thank you very much for your testimony today.
9 Anita, I feel bad; I don't think we asked you any
10 questions; [background comments, laughter] we're
11 certainly happy to hear from you, if you'd like, if
12 you have a statement that you'd like to make or...
13 [background comment] Okay. See, so this hearing
14 went swimmingly, as we promised; as promised, Chair
15 Richards busted your chops a little bit, so everybody
16 kept up... [interpose, background comment] everybody
17 kept up their end of the bargain. I thank you Chair;
18 I thank you Anita; I thank you Purnima; I thank you
19 Jon. I also want to thank your borough directors --
20 in Brooklyn, of course, Winston Von Engel; in Queens,
21 John Young; in the Bronx, Carol Samol; in Staten
22 Island, Len Garcia-Duran; and of course, in
23 Manhattan, Edith Hsu-Chen, all of whom really do
24 outstanding work, and to their credit, they work very
25 closely with our offices and even if we don't always

2 agree, we certainly appreciate that they work with us
3 and they're responsive, and as well, I want to
4 recognize the work that Danielle does; she has the
5 unenviable task of trying to keep us and you happy
6 and I know that it virtually impossible, so we
7 appreciate her at least making that effort. And so I
8 thank you all for coming here today; we wish you of
9 course considerable success, Chair, and continued
10 success to your team. We thank you for your
11 professionalism and your diligence and for all the
12 accomplishments that the Department certainly should
13 be proud of in the last three years. So with that
14 we're going to conclude this portion of the Land Use
15 hearing and we are going to take a five-minute
16 coffee/restroom break and we will start at 2:10 p.m.
17 with DoITT. And of course, we'll be joined with
18 Chair Vacca for that portion of the hearing. Thank
19 you very much.

20 [pause]

21 [background comments]

22 [pause]

23 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Good afternoon everyone,
24 we welcome you to the Committee on Technology,
25 committee hearing on the upcoming budget of the City

2 of New York and it's being held jointly with the
3 Committee on Land Use, chaired by my colleague to my
4 right, Council Member David Greenfield.

5 My name is James Vacca and I'm Chair of
6 the Committee on Technology and today we will be
7 holding the preliminary budget hearing for the
8 Department of Information Technology and
9 Telecommunications, known as DoITT.

10 The Department's proposed Fiscal 2018
11 expense budget totals \$603.1 million, including \$135
12 million in intracity payments from other agencies for
13 telecommunication services and support for which
14 DoITT coordinates payment. The Department's
15 personnel services funding for Fiscal 2018 total
16 \$147.6 million to support 1,741 full-time positions.
17 DoITT's Fiscal 2018 preliminary budget is \$23.6
18 million less than the 2017 adopted budget of \$626.7
19 million. This decrease results primarily from the
20 Department's citywide savings program and other re-
21 estimates that eliminate budget surpluses.

22 Today we examine all components of
23 DoITT's budget including the Department's cost-
24 savings program, which is expected to generate
25 savings of \$11 million in Fiscal 2018, it's contract

2 budget, which is projected at \$265 million for Fiscal
3 2018, and its anticipated revenue, the majority of
4 which comes from cable television franchise fees. We
5 would like to get updates on recent investments in IT
6 security, the progress of LinkNYC rollout and the
7 status of PSAC2. Additionally, we will talk about
8 the cost to maintain the City's IT systems and
9 capital investments and any plans to modernize the
10 City's IT infrastructure.

11 In the past, we have seen how easily
12 costs for technology projects can spiral out of
13 control, which is why we must diligent and ensure the
14 City makes prudent decisions in terms of building and
15 maintaining its IT infrastructure. For these
16 decisions, we must keep in mind the ongoing
17 advancement of technology and ensure that when the
18 City looks to make government more efficient it
19 invests in agile systems.

20 At this time I would like to welcome
21 DoITT's Commissioner Anne Roest and we look forward
22 to her testimony.

23 I want to welcome Annabel Palma, a member
24 of the Technology Committee, and as I mentioned,
25 Council Member Greenfield, who's jointly chairing the

2 Committee with me. Council Member, do you have some
3 remarks?

4 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Yes, thank you,
5 Chair Vacca. My name is David Greenfield; I'm the
6 Chair of the Council's Committee on Land Use. As the
7 Chair indicated, we're going to be covering the
8 Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget; this is a
9 continuation of the Land Use Budget Hearing; we're
10 now joined by the Technology Committee because there
11 are significant land use considerations related to
12 building and maintaining IT infrastructure throughout
13 the city as well as the franchise responsibility that
14 the Land Use Committee has; that's why we're holding
15 this joint Committee.

16 I want to thank Chair Vacca; he is in
17 fact the technology guru in the New York City Council
18 and is someone who's really worked hard to make sure
19 that we incorporate technology and efficiency as much
20 as possible in the city, and we appreciate that.

21 DoITT of course provides citywide
22 coordination and technical expertise in the
23 development and use of data, voice and video
24 technologies in City services and operations, they
25 also provide infrastructure support for data

2 processing and communication services to numerous
3 City agencies, researches and manages IT projects,
4 and administers the City's cable television, public
5 pay telephone, mobile high-capacity telecoms
6 franchise agreements, and of course, the lack of Fios
7 throughout New York City. That was a joke.

8 With an operating budget of over \$600
9 million and hundreds of millions more in capital
10 investments, we have to thoroughly examine DoITT's
11 financial plan, planned projects and operating
12 challenges to assure that we're optimizing our return
13 on the substantial investment; because of the ever-
14 evolving nature of technology, it's necessary to
15 constantly review the City's IT operations and plans
16 moving forward to make adjustments accordingly and in
17 fact, Chair Vacca holds regular hearings on this
18 issue in his committee, where I am actually doing
19 double duty today, 'cause I'm also a member of his
20 illustrious committee as well.

21 We hope today's hearing will contribute
22 to our efforts in finding ways to use technology to
23 make government more efficient and we look forward to
24 working with DoITT towards that goal and we thank the
25 DoITT Commissioner Anne Roest and her staff for

1 COMMITTEE ON LAND USE, JOINTLY WITH THE COMMITTEE ON
TECHNOLOGY 145

2 joining us here today, it's great to see you back and
3 we're certainly looking forward to your testimony and
4 a line by line explanation of all \$600 million in
5 your budget -- that was another joke, Commissioner;
6 not to worry; whenever you're ready. Thank you very
7 much.

8 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Thank you and good
9 afternoon Chairs Greenfield and Vacca, and members of
10 the City Council Committee on... [crosstalk]

11 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Excuse me.

12 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Land Use and
13 Technology... [crosstalk]

14 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Excuse me, Commissioner;
15 I have to ask you...

16 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Oh...

17 CO-CHAIR VACCA: to be sworn in before
18 you begin [sic]. Would you please raise your right
19 hand and do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole
20 truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony
21 before this committee and to respond honestly to
22 councilmember questions? Thank you, Commissioner;
23 I'm sorry. Please proceed.

24 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Alright, now good
25 afternoon. My name is Anne Roest and I'm the

2 Commission of the Department of Information
3 Technology and Telecommunications (DoITT), and New
4 York City's Chief Information Officer. Thank you for
5 the opportunity to testify today about DoITT's Fiscal
6 2018 Preliminary Budget. With me are Annette Heintz,
7 Deputy Commissioner for Financial Management and
8 Administration; John Winker, our Associate
9 Commissioner for Financial Services; and Michael
10 Pastor, our General Counsel.

11 DoITT's Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget
12 provides for operating expenses of approximately \$603
13 million; allocating \$147.6 million in personal
14 services to support 1,741 full-time positions; and
15 \$455.5 million for Other Than Personal Services.
16 Intracity funds transferred from other agencies
17 account for \$135 million, or 22% of our total budget
18 allocation. Telecommunications costs represent the
19 largest portion of the intracity expense, which is
20 projected at \$109 million for Fiscal 2017.

21 For Fiscal 2017, the budget appropriation
22 has increased by \$28 million from the Fiscal 2018
23 November Budget. The increases to the Fiscal 2017
24 Preliminary Budget are attributed to a few items,
25 including funding received from the NYPD for their

2 ITB Mobility project, which will provide
3 technological enhancements for police officers'
4 everyday use, like smartphones and tablets for every
5 patrol unit. Additional increases include OTPS
6 funding associated with the ongoing maintenance costs
7 required to support recently approved capitally-
8 funded initiatives, and one-time funding received for
9 HIPAA and other Security Risk Assessments to ensure
10 the protection of the agencies' data.

11 For Fiscal 2018, the budget appropriation
12 has dropped by \$3 million. The net decrease to the
13 Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Budget is the result of
14 savings and efficiencies programs that DoITT will be
15 implementing.

16 We're consistently looking for ways to
17 cut costs while making the City run more efficiently.
18 That led us to develop a 30-head "insource pool,"
19 which is a roving team of City employees based at
20 DoITT, serving in roles traditionally filled by
21 outside consultants. This pilot team directly
22 assists City agencies when technical expertise is
23 required, a much less expensive alternative to
24 consultants that also has the benefit of keeping
25 institutional knowledge in the City and in the

2 agencies. To date, 21 team members have been hired
3 and have already worked on multiple projects, saving
4 \$2 million that otherwise would have been spent on
5 outside consultants. Three more people are in the
6 process of joining the insource team.

7 I would now like to describe in further
8 detail for the Committees some highlights of our
9 preliminary budget.

10 So as a minder, DoITT is charged with
11 implementing the technology needed to fulfill the
12 goals of the Administration and its agencies. We
13 work hand in hand with Miguel Gamino, who was
14 recently appointed as the Chief Technology Officer,
15 on a number of these goals, including bringing
16 affordable, reliable, high-speed broadband to New
17 York City's residents and businesses by 2025.

18 A signature element of this work is the
19 LinkNYC initiative, the franchise to replace New York
20 City's outdated payphone infrastructure with free
21 gigabit speed Wi-Fi kiosks, our most high-profile
22 effort toward this end. This public-private
23 partnership with our franchisee, CityBridge, enables
24 the build-out of up to 10,000 kiosks in all five
25 boroughs over the next several years at no cost to

2 the taxpayers. The project is completely funded by
3 advertising revenue, guaranteeing that the City
4 receives a minimum of 50% of gross advertising
5 revenue each year, and with a guaranteed \$500 million
6 in ad revenue over the first 12 years that LinkNYC is
7 in operation. At the beginning of March, revenue for
8 FY17 is approximately \$15.8 million and cumulative
9 revenue to date is approximately \$37.3 million. We
10 further project \$25 million in revenue in FY18.

11 We have continually worked to improve
12 LinkNYC to make it as user-friendly as possible for
13 all 8.5 million New Yorkers and the tens of millions
14 of people who visit us every year. That has included
15 an update to the privacy policy, implemented earlier
16 this month, to provide New Yorkers with even more
17 confidence that using a Link for super-fast free
18 internet doesn't mean sacrificing their privacy.

19 With over 600 active LinkNYC kiosks
20 across the five boroughs, we expect the continued
21 success of this unprecedented project.

22 DoITT also provides the technical
23 infrastructure for key City programs and services.
24 One of the most important projects of this nature is
25 the Emergency Communications Transformation Program

2 (ECTP), the City's project to modernize and
3 consolidate the City's 911 emergency communication
4 system -- the most complex system of its kind. We're
5 proud to say that since DoITT took the reins of ECTP
6 in 2014, the project remains on time and on budget.
7 The Public Safety Answering Center (PSAC2), a crucial
8 component of ECTP, opened last year in the Bronx. On
9 June 13, 2016, NYPD took its first call at PSAC2, and
10 today, approximately 30% of all 911 calls are
11 processed there. NYPD continues to staff up,
12 expecting to operate radio dispatch operations at
13 PSAC2 by this December. The Fire Department is
14 expected to start its call taking and dispatch in
15 August, continuing to ramp up its operation through
16 the end of the year.

17 Concurrent with our ongoing ECTP efforts,
18 DoITT has been working on a long-term strategy
19 towards migrating New York City's 911 system to a
20 new, IP-based, NextGen 9-1-1 system based on national
21 standards. We thank the Council for your diligence
22 in highlighting the importance of NextGen 9-1-1 over
23 the past year. Pursuant to Local Law 78 of 2016,
24 DoITT, in collaboration with NYPD and FDNY, released
25 the 2016 Annual Report on Implementation of NextGen

2 9-1-1. This month we will begin the competitive
3 search for vendors to help bring NG9-1-1 to life.

4 NG9-1-1 will not be fully implemented for
5 a few more years, and in the interim we share the
6 Council's passion and commitment to offer a Text go
7 911 (TT9-1-1) solution. We will be closely
8 collaborating with NYPD so that less than one year
9 from today, those who are unable to make a voice call
10 to 911 -- the deaf community, the hearing and speech
11 impaired, and crime victims unable to make a voice
12 call -- will be able to communicate with New York
13 City's 911 call takers for the first time ever via
14 text.

15 In an ongoing effort to ensure the
16 delivery of efficient technology services to
17 agencies, DoITT has finalized a contract to overhaul
18 the 311 system. As you know, 311 has been running on
19 the same technology since its inception in 2003, and
20 while this system continues to operate, an overall
21 improvement to 311 is long overdue.

22 Through a competitive and deliberative
23 procurement, we awarded a contract to IBM to lay the
24 essential groundwork for the system migration and to
25 improve 311's answers to New York City's questions.

2 DoITT's main focus during this project will be to
3 ensure the smooth transition between systems to
4 maintain the level of service that millions of New
5 Yorkers have come to depend on. The new system will
6 be able to seamlessly integrate improvements across
7 all platforms -- call, web, mobile, app, text and
8 social media. In partnership with 311's leadership,
9 we look forward to discussing future improvements
10 with the Council and other external stakeholders.

11 March 7th marked five years since New
12 York City's pioneering Open Data Law (Local Law 11 of
13 2012) was signed into law, and we have certainly come
14 a long way in those few years. In close
15 collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Data
16 Analytics, we've made tremendous progress to improve
17 the quantity, quality and accessibility of New York
18 City's datasets. There are now over 1600 datasets on
19 the Open Data Portal, ranging from FDNY fire and
20 dispatch records to more comprehensive NYPD crime
21 data.

22 Over the last few months we've made a
23 great deal of improvements to engage all users, from
24 novices to exploring data for the first time to
25 experts who live and breathe Open Data. Our new Open

2 Data website was built using human-centered design
3 and with significant stakeholder feedback, including
4 from representatives of the City Council. We welcome
5 continued feedback from the Council to help make Open
6 Data accessible to all.

7 Finally, I want to update the Committees
8 on the status of the Verizon Fios agreement. As a
9 reminder, Verizon had promised that every household
10 in New York City would have access to Fios by 2014.
11 Today, they are off by three years and by millions of
12 households, and counting. After years of trying to
13 hold Verizon to its obligations, this Administration
14 is done waiting. On March 13, the City filed suit in
15 State Supreme Court against Verizon for failing to
16 deliver on its promise. We look forward to our day
17 in court.

18 I appreciate the opportunity to highlight
19 some of DoITT's top budget priorities for the year to
20 come, and this concludes my prepared testimony. I
21 look forward to answer any questions. Thank you.

22 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Thank you Commissioner,
23 and I want to welcome Council Member Barry
24 Grodenchik, who has joined us.

2 Let me just touch on that Verizon
3 situation for one second. So by bringing Verizon to
4 court, we are aiming for a court-ordered timetable,
5 because in the past they have given us timetables
6 that have not been adhered to; is that basically what
7 the court case is about?

8 COMMISSIONER ROEST: That's what we're
9 looking for, yes.

10 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. I wanted to
11 question you on LinkNYC as well, but first, you know
12 I want to thank you for your hard work throughout the
13 year, your agency and everybody that I've worked
14 with, I've always had a collaborative relationship
15 with the Committee and yourself and the agency, so I
16 look forward to continuing that work.

17 Regarding LinkNYC, in Fiscal 2016 the
18 City received \$18.4 million in revenue and revenues
19 are going to be increasing to \$23.3 million by the
20 end of this fiscal year and then \$26 million in
21 Fiscal 2018. Now when will the rollout of LinkNYC be
22 completed?

23 COMMISSIONER ROEST: So the rollout
24 continues through 2012; we'll have at least 7,500 and
25 up to 10,000 Links.

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: By when?

3 COMMISSIONER ROEST: 2012, and let me
4 verify that... [interpose]

5 CO-CHAIR VACCA: No, not 2012.

6 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Oh, I'm sorry; I'm
7 in the wrong decade. [laughter]

8 CO-CHAIR VACCA: No, I...

9 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Thank you.

10 CO-CHAIR VACCA: I had to check too;
11 don't worry.

12 COMMISSIONER ROEST: I have a hard ti...
13 [background comment] 2022.

14 CO-CHAIR VACCA: By 2022 you expect total
15 rollout... [crosstalk]

16 COMMISSIONER ROEST: 7,500 Links and up
17 to 10,000, at our request.

18 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And that is the
19 contract; that is the completion of the contract?

20 COMMISSIONER ROEST: How many?
21 [background comment] I'm sorry; I'm going to ask
22 Stanley Shor to come up... [crosstalk]

23 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Of course; that's okay.

24 COMMISSIONER ROEST: to speak to the Link
25 franchise.

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Commissioner, just
3 identify yourself, please. Don't swear in again; I
4 know you tell the truth.

5 STANLEY SHOR: Stanley Shor; I'm
6 Assistant Commissioner for Franchise Administration.

7 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Yes.

8 STANLEY SHOR: So we have -- it's an
9 eight-year build-out, so the first two years expires
10 this July, so then there's six more years afterwards,
11 so what does that bring us to -- [background
12 comments] 2023, yeah. So... So... [interpose]

13 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And that... And that will
14 be finished?

15 STANLEY SHOR: And then... then... So at that
16 point we have the opportunity to negotiate with the
17 franchisee for an additional 2,500, mutually agreed
18 upon. So the contract provides for a required 7,500
19 and then 2,500 is a possibility after that, but...
20 [interpose]

21 CO-CHAIR VACCA: But the additional 2,500
22 would be an option that you have to negotiate with
23 the existing franchisee... [interpose]

24 STANLEY SHOR: Yes.
25

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: or would you have to go
3 back out to bid or that's an option that... [interpose]

4 STANLEY SHOR: That's an option within
5 the contract with the existing franchisee.

6 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Alright. The revenue
7 projections are on track at this point, the revenue
8 projections?

9 STANLEY SHOR: Yes. So the revenue was a
10 little bit reduced initially because a number of the
11 public pay telephones that they were supposed to
12 receive from an existing franchisee were held back
13 due to a lawsuit which has been totally settled at
14 this point and so now they have all of the existing
15 advertising payphones, which guarantees us a minimum
16 annual guarantee each year of the full amount. So
17 for this year, \$22.5 million is the guarantee versus
18 50% of their gross revenue.

19 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. Now can you give
20 us some details about how much the advertisements
21 cost on LinkNYC? Does the cost vary based on
22 location or... tell me about the advertisements.

23 STANLEY SHOR: They have different
24 programs; I mean they have... for the digital you have
25 the ability... [interpose]

2 COMMISSIONER ROEST: We're getting you a
3 seat, Stanley.

4 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Thank you, very good
5 idea. Come join us officially here.

6 [laughter]

7 STANLEY SHOR: So I don't have their rate
8 card, but they can vary from \$250 for a small buy for
9 a local business to get in the cycle on the digital
10 ads, or they still have thousands of regular paper
11 locations on the payphones, or they could go up; it
12 depends on what they negotiate with a buyer. So the
13 revenue projections that were submitted with the
14 proposal that was ultimately successful showed quite
15 a large increase in the revenue due to the digital
16 advertising, and so far so good; they've been able
17 to, as of the last six-month true-up -- in the
18 contract they have to pay us the 50% twice a year;
19 they do a true-up against the minimum annual
20 guarantee that they pay monthly, and they came in a
21 little bit above, so they seem to be making their
22 revenue pretty well at this point.

23 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Does the City have any
24 oversight over how much the franchisee charges? Do
25

2 you have guidelines you give or is the franchisee

3 **[inaudible]**... [crosstalk]

4 STANLEY SHOR: We do... we... we... they can
5 charge what the market will bear; the only thing that
6 the City has is that 5% of the advertising is
7 reserved for the City's use and that's administered
8 by NYC and Company for their advertising program for
9 public service announcements, so whatever arrangement
10 the City has for publicity.

11 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Are we taking advantage
12 of that opportunity; do we have City agencies posting
13 information; using... [crosstalk]

14 STANLEY SHOR: Yes.

15 CO-CHAIR VACCA: using that 5%?

16 STANLEY SHOR: Yes.

17 CO-CHAIR VACCA: I thought originally we
18 spoke about the Community Boards having some type of
19 usage there; are we working with... [interpose]

20 STANLEY SHOR: The Community Board
21 provision, that was going back to the 1980s, Verizon
22 contract; the Community Boards can, you know, go to
23 NYC and Company and tell them what they are
24 interested in as far as a public service
25

2 announcement, but in the contract that responsibility
3 is with NYC and Company pursuant to the contract.

4 CO-CHAIR VACCA: But the Community
5 Boards, they're not subject to the pricing that a
6 private sector person... [interpose]

7 STANLEY SHOR: No, no, no; they wouldn't
8 have **[inaudible]**... [crosstalk]

9 CO-CHAIR VACCA: they're under the 5%?

10 STANLEY SHOR: They would be part of the
11 5%, because they are part of the City government...
12 [crosstalk]

13 CO-CHAIR VACCA: City agencies.

14 STANLEY SHOR: Yeah.

15 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Now besides the ad
16 revenue, are there other potential opportunities for
17 revenue from LinkNYC besides ads?

18 STANLEY SHOR: So in addition to
19 advertising, LinkNYC has the ability to do
20 sponsorships, with our approval, and if, for example,
21 a big company wants to say they're sponsoring all the
22 Wi-Fi in Staten Island, they can strike that deal
23 with our approval and then that goes into their gross
24 revenue, and as I said before, we get 50% of the
25

2 gross revenue, if it's higher than the minimum annual
3 guarantee.

4 CO-CHAIR VACCA: But the only revenue I'm
5 hearing is basically the advertisement; there's not
6 much other revenue potential do you think?

7 [background comments]

8 STANLEY SHOR: Any revenue that they make
9 from the program, so it's not totally defined; it's
10 defined in the contract very broadly, so if somebody
11 pays the company \$100,000 to take a Link out for two
12 months while they're doing work on their building;
13 that goes into their gross revenue and if there's
14 anything that has to do... if they have some kind of
15 publicity event that requires, you know were they
16 rent out the use of the Link, with our approval, for
17 some purpose or other; that would go into their
18 revenue. So it's primarily advertising, but there
19 are possibilities for other things. We haven't
20 approved anything else at this point, so we're
21 certainly involved in anything to make sure that they
22 don't get involved with, you know, a sponsor or a
23 program that would be contrary to the City's
24 interest.

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. I wanted to ask
3 about sensor data.

4 STANLEY SHOR: So currently they have
5 approval to have sensors in the Links, but only for
6 the purpose of running the Links, so you know, a
7 sensor to determine if the screen is overheating or a
8 sensor to determine vibrations; that sort of thing.

9 We don't have any other... we haven't given any
10 approval for any sensor that's not related to
11 actually operating the Link per se [sic]... [crosstalk]

12 CO-CHAIR VACCA: But that's not a revenue
13 producer at all?

14 STANLEY SHOR: That's not a revenue
15 producer. You know if we were to amend the contract
16 in the future to allow for some sensors that produce
17 revenue; that would be something that would have to
18 be done through the Franchise and Concession Review
19 Committee.

20 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. I did want to
21 touch on MOME; I know that the Commissioner is not
22 here, but MOME comes under your agency, Commissioner,
23 and what is DoITT's role in managing MOME's budget?

24 COMMISSIONER ROEST: It is exactly...
25 [interpose]

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: For the record --
3 Mayor's Office of Film I'm talking about, the Mayor's
4 Office of [background comment] Media and
5 Entertainment; I know it as the Office of Film, but
6 can you just say what your role is, Commissioner?

7 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Yes, certainly. We
8 provide administrative support to MOME, which means
9 budgeting and HR; some legal support for the agency;
10 we don't manage the programs within MOME.

11 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Is their budget part of
12 your budget?

13 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Their budget is in
14 our budget, yes.

15 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And what is,
16 approximately -- they're indicating \$16.3 million; is
17 that their total budget?

18 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Do we know the
19 total...? [crosstalk]

20 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Is that... or is that the
21 budget of this... What's the budget for the Film
22 Incentive Program? I think that's a separate budget.
23 Is that a separate budget, separate from MOME, Film
24 Incentive Program?

25

2 JOHN WINKER: My name is John Winker. As
3 far as the Incentive Program, that's \$16.4 million
4 within MOME's existing budget; it's part of their
5 overall appropriation.

6 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And what is that total
7 budget?

8 JOHN WINKER: \$26 million for FY18.

9 CO-CHAIR VACCA: So \$26 million plus
10 \$16.3?

11 JOHN WINKER: No, **[inaudible]**...
12 [crosstalk]

13 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Inclusive of \$16.3?

14 JOHN WINKER: That's correct.

15 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Now is there an accrual
16 in that money? Is that money all spent every year?
17 Do we have enough companies to incentivize by using
18 the Film Incentive Program?

19 JOHN WINKER: There have been some
20 accruals in the past, and those monies have been
21 rolled over from year to year. But as far as what
22 the projection is from this year, I don't have that
23 information with me today.

24 CO-CHAIR VACCA: But am I right in saying
25 that film production in New York City is up; it's

2 just that we don't have enough companies who qualify
3 for the incentive or do people know about the
4 incentive? Why do we have money unspent at the end
5 of the fiscal year, if I'm correct in thinking that
6 film production is up? Why do we have money
7 leftover?

8 COMMISSIONER ROEST: That's a question I
9 would suggest we take back to MOME; it gets more into
10 the program and how they're operating with their
11 constituents.

12 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. Does your office
13 receive regular spending reports from them?

14 JOHN WINKER: Well the reporting that we
15 get is from FMS, which is what every agency sort of
16 uses as its system of record in terms of reporting.
17 From time to time we do get some updates,
18 particularly on the revenue that they're collecting
19 from the international programming that they run.

20 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. PSAC2 you
21 mentioned; 311; I want to ask one or two questions,
22 and I know I have colleagues, but with all that we're
23 doing for 311 with the technology advances you spoke
24 about, Commissioner, I know that the capacity of 311
25 has to be something we are concerned about; people

2 are using it more and more, which is great, but we
3 have to be prepared to take those calls and get
4 people action. Do you think that with the technology
5 advances you're proposing that we have good days
6 ahead for 311; that we can cope with the increased
7 utilization with that number?

8 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Absolutely. So I do
9 want to mention too that we've done some work in the
10 meantime, while we work on this project to make the
11 current 311 platform more resilient and be able to
12 handle loads that we run into, in the meantime, but
13 yes, 311, absolutely; some of the criteria we were
14 looking for when we went out to bid was scalability
15 and resilience, so yes, we'll be able to scale; we'll
16 be able to add new features that we weren't able to
17 add before; we'll be able to make changes faster. So
18 when there's a new service someone wants to put
19 online, we'll be able to implement that more quickly.

20 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And you mentioned PSAC;
21 can you give us an overview on PSAC1 and PSAC2? I
22 was impressed when you said that PSAC2 -- which is my
23 district in the Bronx -- is handling 30% of the 911
24 calls; that seemed very significant. At this early
25 date, I don't think that that build-out is finished.

2 Can you give us a little understanding as to where we
3 stand?

4 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Okay, sure. The
5 building itself is finished; the technology, the
6 primary technologies are implemented, and in fact,
7 they are taking calls. So we would consider the PSAC
8 up and running; what we're working on now is getting
9 ready for Fire to move, and as you can imagine, we
10 can't lose a single call, so there's a lot of testing
11 that goes on before each phase of the build-out, but
12 PD's in; Fire's going to be in this summer, and then
13 again, in the fall, with their fire and then
14 emergency management, and then PD dispatch will also
15 be moving in at the end of the year, so by the end of
16 2017, they will be fully occupied.

17 CO-CHAIR VACCA: How many employees will
18 Fire be bringing there; Fire Department's going to
19 have several floors or -- tell me about their
20 operation.

21 COMMISSIONER ROEST: So we have...
22 **[inaudible]**... So the primary call taking is all on a
23 single floor with Fire and PD, and then they have
24 offices on other floors. So EMD will have 250
25 dispatchers and Fire will have 160 dispatchers.

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Where are they moving
3 from, the Fire Department, where are they located now
4 that they're coming to PSAC2 in the Bronx?

5 COMMISSIONER ROEST: So they're in
6 several locations... [interpose, background comment]
7 Pardon? [background comment] Initially, yeah. So
8 they've had different COs or operation centers, so
9 Manhattan and the Bronx would be the primary.

10 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Now PSAC1; do you have
11 plans for PSAC1 beyond anything from a technology
12 point of view?

13 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Yeah. So the idea
14 was always to have redundant PSACs, so PSAC1 we will
15 continue to maintain and they'll both always be up
16 and running so that we'll know that any point in time
17 we could shift from one PSAC to the other if we
18 needed to, if there were a disaster in one PSAC or we
19 had a surge. So they will be fully redundant PSACs
20 with both agencies operating out of both at all
21 times.

22 CO-CHAIR VACCA: I know you spoke about
23 Open Data, and I want to thank you for your hard
24 work, and please keep going. We have targets that we
25

2 have to meet and I'm hoping DoITT will meet the
3 targets for their data dictionary mandates.

4 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Yes, thank you.

5 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And I know you're doing
6 a good job there. Do you still have open positions
7 though that you're looking to fill for Open Data?
8 Are we committed to doing that, if there are open
9 positions?

10 COMMISSIONER ROEST: We have two more
11 positions that we want to fill for Open Data, but we
12 have ramped up; we've got seven positions now; just a
13 few years ago we only two in DoITT supporting Open
14 Data, and a lot of that was to meet the expectations
15 of the new Open Data Law, which, and you know that we
16 were supportive of all of those initiatives. So yes,
17 we are still ramping up, but we have a really great
18 team; they're really committed to Open Data.

19 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Do you have an Open Data
20 coordinator or how do you feel about -- well you have
21 one?

22 COMMISSIONER ROEST: So we do, every
23 agency has an Open Data coordinator... [crosstalk]

24 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Your agency does?

25 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Yes.

2 CO-CHAIR VACCA: And then every agency
3 has one or if that person is not a specific Open Data
4 coordinator, they designate someone in their agency
5 to do that?

6 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Yes, every agency
7 has an Open Data coordinator that we meet with
8 regularly. In fact, Amen Mashariki from MODA, the
9 Chief Analytics Officer for the City, coordinates
10 regular meetings with all of those folks from the
11 agencies.

12 CO-CHAIR VACCA: I think there was an
13 issue that I questioned before about the non-Mayoral
14 agencies having one also, and if you could follow up
15 -- I'm thinking of Health + Hospitals, NYCHA, quasi-
16 City agencies -- I wanted to make sure that they were
17 online with that.

18 COMMISSIONER ROEST: We will follow up on
19 that.

20 O-CHAIR VACCA: Okay. Questions; any
21 questions, council member? No questions.

22 [background comment] Okay. I want to thank you all
23 for your testimony today.. [crosstalk]

24 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Thank you.

25 CO-CHAIR VACCA: enjoyed having you.

2 COMMISSIONER ROEST: Thank you. And can
3 I say thank you for the complement earlier for me and
4 my team, it has been a real pleasure working with you
5 and look forward to working with you as we go
6 forward.

7 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Thank you, Commissioner;
8 same here. Thank you again. Thank you everyone.

9 Now we have one speaker from the public,
10 Thomas Lowenhaupt, Jackson Heights, Queens.

11 [pause]

12 CO-CHAIR VACCA: Please have a seat and
13 identify yourself for the record.

14 THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: I'm Tom Lowenhaupt;
15 I'm a founding Chair of Connecting.nyc, and shall
16 begin. Alright.

17 Connecting.nyc is a New York State
18 nonprofit that was formed in 2006 to advocate for the
19 development of the .nyc Top Level Domain as a public
20 interest resource. For those not familiar with .nyc,
21 it's like .com, .org, .edu, and .gov, but just for
22 New Yorkers.

23 If New York is to succeed in developing
24 .nyc, it must make it intuitive and trusted.

2 By intuitive I mean user-friendly. So
3 when someone wants to learn about our city's schools,
4 they should be able to type "schools.nyc" into their
5 browser and see a curated page that informs and
6 guides them. The same with Hotels.nyc,
7 Libraries.nyc, Restaurants.nyc, Sports.nyc,
8 RealEstate.nyc, and 300 other category names.

9 Again, if New York is to succeed in
10 developing .nyc, it must make it intuitive and
11 trusted.

12 By trusted I mean that those using our
13 .nyc domains must believe that under the content
14 provided, and the transactions in which they engage,
15 are under a protective umbrella. Those using our
16 .nyc domains must trust that if something goes wrong,
17 there is recourse, because the people and the City
18 government stand behind it.

19 Success will have our city shine on the
20 internet, drawing attention to our city's products
21 and services from a global audience.

22 But today we're failing at this. There
23 is no meaningful use of intuitive names, and trust in
24 .nyc is nonexistent.

2 Our organization, the New York Internet
3 Society, and others have called for public hearings
4 on this failing initiative. I urge the City Council
5 to engage with this matter.

6 Finally, DoITT's preliminary budget for
7 2018 shows \$900,000 in projected revenue from the
8 operation of .nyc. We recommend that those funds be
9 used to hire professional planning staff; to develop
10 the neighborhood names licensing program; and to
11 repurchase vital intuitive names that have been
12 prematurely released without any public interest
13 commitments; for example, RealEstate.nyc and
14 Fashion.nyc.

15 So I'm very glad to see that the Chair of
16 the Land Use Committee is here as well because this
17 matter or .nyc is more land use than it is
18 technology. There is a technology base, but the
19 planning of it certainly should have been undertaken
20 by the City Planning Commission and never was. Our
21 organization was after them for 10 years to take an
22 interest in this matter and they refused; apparently
23 architects can't see anything that's concrete unless
24 it's concrete. So unless it's a building, something
25 digital, they're unimaginative with and I think that

2 the City Council needs to work with the City Planning
3 Commission to see that they take an interest in this,
4 because they have the expertise to apply it, whereas
5 DoITT has some expertise on a very low-level digital
6 format, but the more planning and more high-level
7 stuff is really in the realm of the City Planning
8 Commission.

9 CO-CHAIR VACCA: I thank you and I
10 welcome back Chair Greenfield and I will now hand the
11 meeting over to him.

12 CHAIRPERSON GREENFIELD: Thank you very
13 much. Is there anybody else that wishes to testify
14 on any of the items that we have discussed here
15 today, including the Landmarks Preservation
16 Commission, the Department of City Planning or DoITT?
17 Okay, hearing none, we will conclude this oversight
18 budget hearing, which is a hearing of the Land Use
19 Committee and the Technology Committee for the
20 Preliminary FY18 Budget. This concludes the hearing
21 for March 29th, 2017. This hearing is hereby
22 adjourned.

23 [gavel]

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 April 27, 2017