CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

----- X

March 11, 2019 Start: 10:06 a.m. Recess: 2:08 a.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E: ALICKA AMPRY-SAMUEL

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Diana Ayala

Laurie A. Cumbo
Ruben Diaz, Sr.
Mark Gjonaj
Carlos Menchaca
Donovan J. Richards
Rafael Salamanca, Jr.
Ritchie J. Torres

Mark Treyger

James G. Van Bramer

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

Katherine Garcia, Interim Chair and CEO New York City Housing Authority, NYCHA

David Preston, Executive Vice President for External Affairs, New York City Housing Authority, NYCHA

John Derek Norvell, Resident of Abraham Lincoln Houses, and Member of African-American Teamsters Committee of New York

Mrs. Brown, Member of NYCHA's CCOP RAD, Member of Community Board 8 Upper East Side

Lakisha Taylor, Resident of Holmes Towers

Lucy Newman, Legal Aid Society

Victor Bach, Community Service Society

Anna Luft, Neighborhood Defender Service of Harlem

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[sound check] [pause] [gavel]

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: The hearing is coming to order. Good morning and thank you all for being here today. I am Council Member Alicka Ampry-Samuel and I chair the Committee on Public Housing. I am joined this morning by Council Member Ruben Diaz. Sr., Council Member Ritchie Torres, and I just saw Council Member Van Bramer. He just walked out. We are here today to discuss the new Federal Agreement to overhaul public housing in New York City. On January 31st the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development or HUD, entered into an agreement with NYCHA and the city. The Housing Secretary Ben Carson categorized the Agreement as offering both new solutions for decades old problems. Now, as someone who grew up in public housing and that has the honor of serving as the Chair of this committee, I am deeply familiar with the problems that have plagued NYCHA. Decades of mismanagement and under-funding has left too many buildings in woeful states of disrepair, and too many residents overcome with distrust. We need to examine and probe what the new Federal Agreement actually does to address those concerns, and whether it truly serves

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

residents' best interests. According to a New York Times article the former interim Chair of NYCHA believes that it does not, and for this reason he refused to sign the agreement. He stated, The city and NYCHA have all the responsibility, limited authority and all of the financial burden. That in a nutshell is why I'm against it. Given that he was brought for his expertise, and he did not approve of the deal, I would like to hear why NYCHA and the city agreed to it, and how it will function to meet residents' needs. Again, the chief concern in the city-the chief concern is that the city will be taken on all of the financial burden, and responsibility even though it and NYCHA would have little authority. Indeed, despite NYCHA being home to one in four New York City's residents, it historically has not received the commitment and funding it needs from the local, state and federal government. As of today, we don't know how the city determined the appropriate amount of funding to agree to. We don't know what the city's plan is to make up the difference between the \$2.9 billion in capital funds through FY 2027 they agreed to and the \$31.8 billion capital NYCHA We don't know how the deadlines in the

agreement were established, and whether they took
into consideration costs and residencies or whether
they were simply picked out of the hat. And since we
don't know these things, we don't know whether NYCHA
can meet the goals laid out in the actual agreement,
and we don't know if this will help the residents, as
these are things we should know, and definitely need
to know. We need to know that there is a real plan
in place, a plan with specific and achievable goals
that reflect the realities of NYCHA, a plan that
brings new leadership with actual experience in
housing, and a plan that incorporates and prioritizes
its residents since they know what's best and what's
really needed. I look forward to the testimony from
the Administration and NYCHA today, and about making
that plan a reality, and we have just been joined by
Councilwoman Diana Ayala. So, with that being said,
and we do not have any residents panel before the
Administration this morning. So, we'll have
testimony from the Administration and NYCHA.

LEGAL COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell, the truth the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay. So, if you could state name and begin.

I do.

KATHERINE GARCIA:

KATHERINE GARCIA: and members of the committee on Public Housing and other member of the City Council, good morning. I am Katherine Garcia, NYCHA's Interim Chair and CEO. I am pleased to be joined by David Preston, Executive Vice President for External Affairs. Thank you for this opportunity to discuss how we're moving forward with our partners to transform the Authority, become a better landlord and improve the quality of life for hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers we serve. My first official day as NYCHA's Interim Chair and CEO was February 19<sup>th</sup> of 2019. This was a few weeks after the January 31st signing of the Administrative Agreement between NYCHA, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and the city of New York. Mayor de Blasio asked-asked me to join General Manager Vito Mustaciuolo, and lead the agency through this critical transition period. While in this position, my primary responsibilities are to prepare the Authority for the arrival of the Monitor, and ensure

2	the authority meets the early requirements of the
3	agreement. The agreement's overarching goal is to
4	remedy the deficient physical conditions in NYCHA
5	properties to benefit our residents across the city.
6	NYCHA is under the supervision of a Monitor selected
7	by HUD and the U.S. Attorney's office in consultation
8	with the city and NYCHA. As you know, Bart Schwartz
9	started his position as Monitor on March 1 <sup>st</sup> . We
10	have met with Mr. Schwartz a number of times already
11	and look forward to working with him and his team.
12	Based on our initial discussions his focus is on
13	engagement with residents, and holding the Authority
14	accountable for meeting our commitments to improve
15	the lives of residents. As part of the agreement the
16	city will provide \$1 billion for capital expenses
17	over the next four years and \$200 million per year in
18	capital funding for at the six years following for a
19	total at least \$2.2 Billion in capital funding. This
20	is in addition to Mayor de Blasio's unprecedented
21	financial support to NYCHA, which includes \$4.3
22	billion in capital and operating funds to replace
23	roofs and boilers, fix facades and upgrade heating
24	systems and more. The agreement requires NYCHA to
25	remediate living conditions at NYCHA properties by

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

specific deadlines and to meet strict objective compliance standards regarding lead paint hazards, mold growth, pest infestation and inadequate heating and elevator service. We are in the process of setting up systems and have established a dedicated unit to track the authority's progress on all the deadlines outlined in the agreement. I would like to update this body on some of the immediate work that has been done over the last few weeks in advance of pending deadlines. With respect to lead paint hazards, the agreement required NYCHA to address any lead paint hazards in apartments that are occupied by a child under six within 30 days of the Agreement's effective date. NYCHA reported to the Southern District and a Monitor that as of March 2<sup>nd</sup>, NYCHA had inspected 2,854 child under-six apartments, and corrected identified deficiencies in 2,122. As of March 2<sup>nd</sup>, there were 171 apartments in which NYCHA attempted access for inspections in 344 apartments to which NYCHA attempted access to eliminate the lead hazards. NYCHA is working with these residents to obtain access and remediate these units as quickly as possible. Accomplishing this goal would not have been possible if NYCHA had not bee working on achieving

2	compliance ahead of signing the agreement, and these
3	numbers my shift slightly and we continue to validate
4	the data. To improve out performance in heat and hot
5	water delivery and in accordance with the Agreement's
6	requirements, starting immediately residents will
7	receive notification of heat outages via robocalls
8	and the Monitor will be notified of any heat outages.
9	These notifications to residents are currently in
10	effect and we are working with a Monitor to provide
11	the notifications in his preferred format. Beginning
12	October 1, 2019, we will be required to resolve
13	heating outages within an average of 12 hours with
14	85% of heating outages having to be resolved within
15	24 hours. Currently, heating outages on average are
16	being resolved within 10 hours. The Agreement also
17	requires NYCHA to create a 24x7 Heat Desk to Monitor
18	heating metrics and dispatch staff to resolve issues
19	during heating—the heating season by March 31, 2019.
20	The Heat Desk is already in place, and operational.
21	By the end of the year NYCHA will introduce Indoor
22	Temperature Centers at 44 developments that have the
23	ability to track temperatures through a computerized
24	building management system. By 2026, NYCHA is
25	required to replace or address approximately 400

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

boilers, 297 through the Capital Program and 200 through work done in connection with our past Section 8 conversions. As we announced last week, this work is already underway with the selection of contractors to replace nine boiler plants serving 11 developments and 24,000 residents. Construction on these projects will begin this spring and will be completed by 2022. Earlier this year, NYCHA launched the Mold Busters Program to combat mold at developments citywide. Mold Busters involves and updated mold inspection protocol, a new and comprehensive standard remediation procedure, new hands-on training for including on root causes of mold and new tools for staff to effectively and efficiently identify and remediate mold. The program requires staff to document their response to mold work orders, promoting accountability. It incorporates a faster time line for repairs and remediation as well as follow-up inspections after work is completed to ensure there has been no reoccurrence. By 2024, there may not be a single mold complaint in a 12month period, no more than 15% of mold complaints shall cover more than 10 square feet and mold may not reappear more than three times in a single year.

Critical to the success in elimination mold will bet
NYCHA's roof replacements, and repairs of plumbing
leaks. NYCHA is in the process of hiring additional
elevator mechanics to meet the repair needs. By 2024
we will replace or address 425 elevators, 275 through
the Capital Program, and 150 through the PACT
Program, and lastly, NYCHA will hire an expert in
pest control and 20 additional exterminators and will
install concrete basement floors and 8,000 door
sweeps to reduce the rat, roach and mouse
populations. In support of our work, and as part of
the Agreement, NYCHA will establish new departments
and units including an Environmental Health and
Safety Department and a Quality Assurance Unit within
45 days of the Monitor's appointment. For me the
Agreement NYCHA and the City reach with HUD is vital
because it allows us to do the real work of turning
public housing around. We can proceed with the XRF
testing of all 135,000 apartments where lead paint
has not been rolled out, and get to work eliminating
any hazards. We can proceed with improving
operations that have reduced heating outages and
reduced response time. We can proceed with
implementing landmark labor contract that provides

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

residents with 7-day service and better building maintenance. We can proceed with NYCHA 2.0 our plan to fully renovate more than 60,000 apartments across NYCHA and make \$24 billion worth of badly needed repairs. We have a lot of work to do, and at the end of the day while we all need to fight for more state and federal support, and we will-while we look closewe look forward to working closely with our monitor. We believe it's going to be the city of New York and New Yorkers like this Council, the workers and the residents of NYCHA who are going to turn NYCHA around. The agreement gives us the tools and the ability to continue that work. Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I am now happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you so much. So, the purpose of the hearing and the purpose of all of our hearings as it relates to public housing and NYCHA is just to really make sure that we are having an open conversation, an open dialogue, and being able to educate and inform the Council as to what's happening as well as the residents, and so, the purpose of this hearing is to really dive deep into the HUD Agreement itself—

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: This is something that has been discussed for the past eight months or so, and it's been playing out in the media, and that it has been signed, agreed to this an opportunity to inform the residents as to what does it really say, and why it was signed. What was the conversation to pull all of the goals and what it entails together, and how does it have a direct impact on the residents? What does it me and at the end of the day for the families that live in NYCHA? What does it mean during the heating season, the cold winter months? Like will they continue to-to-to need heat and hot water? I mean will they-will they freeze during the winter months, and there's ongoing complaint with mold and, you know, you mentioned it in the testimony and it's highlighted in the agreement, but you know, what does it mean to the residents? Will they continue to have to put in the tickets and complaints, and they come out and plaster and paint, and then they have to call back again. So, this is an opportunity to have that conversation and be transparent so could all know what's happening, what does it mean and how are you moving forward?

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- 2 that's the-I guess it's kind of give an overall. So, to put into context so we can move forward. 3 first question is: Who negotiated the terms of the 4
- NYCHA and HUD Agreement? KATHERINE GARCIA: So, obviously the 6
  - folks who were doing the negotiation was the Southern District HUD, and then there were members of the NYCHA team as well as the city.
    - CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: How long did the city, SDNY and HUD negotiate this actual agreement?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I mean I think conversations had been ongoing from the prior summer. Obviously, they got more intense in January, though there were some moments when it as a little challenging due to the fact that federal government was shut down for a period of time. So, they were very much condensed towards the end of the month, but there had been back and forth for a long time about the bones of what the agreement was, and I think the city had been pretty clear about what they wanted to see as part of the agreement that they anticipated that there would be sections related to presumed lead paint hazards. There would be sections around mold.

2.2

There would sections around the boilers and heating and elevators that that was sort of anticipated going into those negotiations.

Speak to the difference between the actual consent decrees that was signed, and was before the judge himself, and the agreement that we see today, and in particular, how will the removal of judicial oversights have or what kind of impact will that have residents' engagement or input?

it, I think that this really gives us the opportunity to stay closer to the residents with local control through the agreement so that NYCHA is really the one driving the ship on the operations, and can be held accountable for that, but there's nothing to point to if the, you know, the court or something else if something hold up—held up, and it's really very specific. I mean I think that the—and—and we'll get even more specific as it gets into place because where there are the large goals of exactly how many boilers have to get done, we have develop action plans with the monitor to make sure that they are viewed as being achievable plans that can get done in

2.2

the timeframes that were agreed to. So, in some ways
I view this as even more accountability than what was
in the Judicial Consent Order particularly for NYCHA
and for the city and so, there will be ongoing
conversations, which I know that the monitor has
already reached out to residents to make sure that he
is setting up a committee to provide him with
feedback from the residents, and ensure that their
voices are heard as part of moving forward with this.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Well, let me—
let me stop you there, and that's a—that's one of the
questions. Was there any at all feedback or input
from the residents with the language of the agreement
itself?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I don't know. I am not aware that there was best in that seat.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [interposing]
Because I'm talking about like the negotiate, like
who negotiated the agreement?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, that—that specific language I think there had been a lot of listening going on to residents. I know that the former Interim Chair and General Manager went to the hearings where residents spoke. I do believe that

2.2

think--

- there were other conversations ongoing about what was important to residents going forward. I don't think any of them were incorporated in language, but I
  - CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [interposing]
    What about like meetings at all? Like were the
    residents at the table when SDNY and the City and
    NYCHA and HUD were together negotiating and
    discussing.
  - KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I mean no and I wouldn't even have thought. I think that their goals were incorporated, but they were not sitting at the table at the time that the signatures were about to get done.
  - CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay, and you-just discussed or mentioning like the Action Plan.

    How did the City, SDNY and HUD come up with the deadlines that were stated in the Agreement?
  - KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I mean certainly from—with everything that I've heard, NYCHA was pushed very, very hard on the deadlines to tighten them and—and to be extremely aggressive, but that being said, they were all predicated on the concept that they were going to be difficult, but achievable,

2.2

and that a lot of them are where are we now in terms of designs on boilers. How many do we think we can get done? How many units are going into the PACT Programs and the conversion to Section 8, which is a big piece of this, and so it was about where we were in looking at the priorities on particularly on the capital side, and how long it would take us to achieve those different pieces, but there had been a lot of planning work already done in trying to figure out how quickly we could go through things, and we are still going to continue to work and tighten up all of those title lines to make sure that we are moving as quickly as possible.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Does NYCHA have the funds and resources to meet the proposed deadlines.

KATHERINE GARCIA: We have a lot of funds available to us right at the moment, but we do—we are continuing to advocate for additional funds. So, we are definitely going to be heavily dependent on moving into the PACT Program and those conversions, but we—we do still need to make sure that we are advocating for additional federal resources and additional state resources. I was in Albany two

2.2

weeks ago maybe three weeks ago, and I had extremely good conversations with the Legislatures in Albany to advocate for additional funding for NYCHA from the State, and I think we also saw that Senator Schumer and the Congressional Delegation from New York have bee huge advocates to NYCHA and are trying to put more money and funding into NYCHA going forward.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, going back to the deadlines, most of the deadlines that are outline within the Agreement occur with the next administration when the current Mayor is no longer in office. Why is the responsibility to get NYCHA into good repair being pushed off into just future Mayors? Is it—can you talk to us a little bit about what can be accomplished within this Administration. So, I mean like realists, like can we have a conversation about that?

ATHERINE GARCIA: Absolutely and I—and I appreciate your question because this Mayor, you know, has been very dedicated to providing resources to NYCHA, and certainly we are moving on things so while there are out years where we have to finish 500 boilers or, you know, those are all starting now so that residents can start to see the impact of that

2.2

now, and we will be providing additional action plans
that will show when these things are happening for
some of the PACT conversions. There's construction
that is ongoing now. So, I think the final deadlines
were really driven by what was the capital capacity
to move those projects, and actually meet the final
deadlines of completing all of that work, but that
work is starting now. Contracts are out on the
street, and we are moving aggressively to make sure
that really that the residents are seeing change
happen not in five years, but they are seeing change
happen now.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, can you just explain to me what that means when you mention the PACT and the RED and making that those deal are happening now, is—is it an issue where in order to really be able to do the repairs that are needed, you have to finalize a lot of the private—public/private partnerships and get those Section 9 units offline like get those into Section 8 so that you can concentrate on that?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, the—the presumption within the Agreement is that there are a lot of different modes of delivery of Capital

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Projects. So, some will be done directly by NYCHA's staff, but some would be done by private developers through the PACT Programs, and in the agreement it specifically separates about some of the work being done on either of those pathways. So, it—it does presume that those deals move forward and, you know, getting to the 500. We don't get to the 500 without doing the portion of the PACT deal.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, can you-Okay, so, I know there'll be a lot of questions from our colleagues, and I know that they are just like the different categories between the mold and the elevators and the pest and the-the heat and hot water system, the boilers and the lead. So, since were are kind of focusing right now on that boilers and it mentioned the 500. Have you prioritized the developments because when I think about a development that is in need of a boiler, but they're on a list for a RAD or PACT conversion, that RAD or PACT conversion is not going to happen right away. will take a few years, but there's a need for the boilers to be repaired. So, can you speak to what will happen in that time like in the interval with that need for a boiler just to provide heat and hot

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

water to the residents that may be in the process of going through one of the PACT or RAD conversions?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Certainly and I-I want to be very clear. Like we have made huge progress in terms of changing the staffing for this heating season, and really giving ourselves a lot more coverage, but we are dealing with a lot of very, very old systems. And so, while there have been fewer outages, and the outages have been shorter, we still are having outages, and that is going to be true until we get new boiler plants in place, and until we get some of RAD Impact Programs done. And so, we are looking at every boiler all the time in terms of where do they fall on the list of most critical? often are we out there? And for some of them, they are putting, being put into the PACT/RAD program in an earlier point if that is-if that is the direction we think we think they're going, or they're getting put into the NYCHA's Capital Program to make sure that we are dealing with the ones that are having the most problems. And that is a constantly evolving list, gut as you know were-there were some that we waiting that we had prioritized for State money with the \$450 million from the state. That just got to a

1

- 2 point where we're like no we're moving those ahead.
- 3 We're not going to wait for that funding any longer.
- 4 We're going to move that because it's really at a
- 5 point where it needs to—it needs to be in the process
- 6 of a permanent solution.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, with the
- 8 | new monitor that's coming in-well, that's here now,
- 9 and having to pull together an action plan--
- 10 KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: --almost
- 12 | immediately, you would have to know all of this
- 13 | already. Like you have-like you have to know which
- 14 | unit-which developments are in need of these repairs
- 15 | now, and which ones should go into these conversions,
- 16 and what's available? Like what do you have readily
- 17 | available financially? So, you-I would think that
- 18 | that like all of that information—it could be like a
- 19 moving target, but at the same time, it should be
- 20 kind of packaged into a plan because this is
- 21 | something that's been going on for some time now. I
- 22 think that the need is there, and you know the
- 23 developments, and you know here they stand.
- 24 KATHERINE GARCIA: So, no-no, I-I
- 25 understand your questions. So, no, we're not

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

starting from scratch with the actions plans. are going to be based on enormous amount of work that has already been underway to sort of grade where were are in each of the developments, and look at, you know, where is-where are our top priority needs in terms of both how many residents has an impact? is its reliability rating? So, all of those are factors that we are looking for the next chunk of the RAD/PACT. We are finalizing that this month so that we have a real cohesive dataset of how the choices or recommendations are made, and so we are putting together what we think would like an action plan toin a draft form to talk through with monitor to see if he has specifics that he thinks were mission, but, you know, there-there has been a lot of capital planning being done at that development level, and obviously we're looking at the P&A and how that factors in to how we move forward.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, out of the 325 developments that currently exist that are part of this Section 9, is there—can we look at every single development and say: Development A is going to be going through this conversion. Development B is going—is on the list for a new boiler by October

2.2

2019. Development C is kind of okay. We can fold them into our city's Capital Plan, and Development D, we are looking to—to be able to fix whatever needs are in this development by funding this by the \$450 million from the state that's coming in. Is there like a realistic list of—

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] We arewe are--

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: -- every single development and where they fit within this matrix?

finalizing how that list works, and I—we will be happy to share that with you when we're complete. But yes, we—that is exactly our intention. We have a lot of those building blocks we are just finalizing what goes in what goes in what bucket, what are we trying? Which strategy are we using to move forward and deal with each of these so that we are maximizing and leveraging everything to make it so that the residents are having a better experience so that we're a better landlord on the day-to-day.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay. We have also been joined by Council Member Salamanca and Council Member Carlos Menchaca. I am going to stop

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Torres.

there. I have a ton of other questions, but I've try
to ask questions for 30 minutes, and then open it and
then come back. [background comments] The first
question will come from Council Member Ritchie

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I'm going to start with-well I'll ask questions for as long as the Chair allows. I can go on for two hours, but before I do, actually, I dothe-the-the NYCHA, the Public Housing Chair just asked you earlier whether you have the resources to do your job and-and I thought you gave them a more complicated answer than you should have. You know, the answer is no you don't. You have enough resources to manage the decline of public housing, but you don't have the resources of the level of federal funding that you would need to genuinely preserve public housing. I think we should be clear about federal government is the enemy of public housing. The government has neglected and continues to neglect public housing this agreement notwithstanding. Now the agreement requires NYCHA to visually inspect and remediate lead in all non-exempt

- 2 pre-1978 units with children under the age of six.
- 3 How many units fall within that category?
- 4 KATHERINE GARCIA: So, there were 277
  5 developments that were pre-1978 and not exempt. Of
- 6 those, we identified 46,372 units in total.
- 7 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I'm sorry,
- 8 43,000?

1

- 9 KATHERINE GARCIA: 46, 372. Of those,
- 10 3,028 were identified as having a child under six as
- 11 of the January 1<sup>st</sup> Family Composition data. Of those
- 12 | 200-2,854 were inspected. We identified 2,487
- 13 deficiencies. So this is pretty--
- 14 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] How
- 15 many deficiencies?
- 16 KATHERINE GARCIA: 2,487 and let me be
- 17 | clear that the deficiencies does not mean that there
- 18 | was lead paint in the unit. It means that we will
- 19 presume that it is lead because we do not have data
- 20 | saying it's not lead.
- 21 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So—so my—my
- 22 understanding is you-your-the Agreement requires you
- 23 to visually inspect, and if necessary remediate lead
- 24 | in those 3,028 apartments within 30 days?

2.2

that were found to have—after the visual inspection were found to have a paint deficiency.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But visually inspect them. If necessary remediate?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And—and you have not done that within 30 days? Is that--?

KATHERINE GARCIA: We have—we have—so, of the inspections we also had 171 where we had no access, where we had attempted multiple times to get in, but sometimes it's challenging to get into apartments because tenants aren't home, tenants are working, and then we had three that were move outs, which means that the go into another bucket—

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing]

And-and I understand they're extended, but I just

want to be clear that NYCHA is out of compliance with

the early requirements of the agreement, and an

effort was made to inspect and remediate lead in

those apartments, but you're not in compliance with

the 30-day deadline. Is that—is that fair

characterization?

2.2

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I'm not going to characterize it. I'm going to wait for the monitor to characterize it. We provided the information as required.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: You're not going to characterize whether you're in compliance with the governing document over everything?

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Well, I—I believe that we are in compliance with what our requirements were in terms to reporting to the Southern District and to the monitor for our 30-day requirements because of the attempted inspections, and attempted repairs of paint.

mean I could read the Agreement requires NYCHA to take action within 30 days to visually all non-exempt units built before 1978 where NYCHA believes a child under the age of six resides or routine visits and remediate deteriorated lead-based paint in the apartment. It makes no exceptions for—but there's no A for effort. It makes no exceptions for attempts. There are 3,028 units that fall within that category and you haven't done that in full and NYCHA has the ability to gain access to these apartments. Where

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

you are the landlord, you could enter these
apartments even without the permission of the
tenants.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Absolutely. We were trying not to have a confrontational relation with our tenants. We are taking all legal action to make sure they are in compliance with the-with the lease, but that is a series of notices in terms of making sure that they are aware that we have to get into the apartment. We want to make sure we're taking care of the kids. We are trying to provide them with that information. We are also trying to work with community-based organizations and religious organizations to help folks understand why it's important that we get in. So you are right we can-we could take a more somewhat aggressive stance and just go in while people aren't home, but we are trying to make it so that we're having a more cooperative relationship with the residents, and we are actually seeing pretty good response on people providing us with timeframes for when we can do the paint jobs.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Now, tomorrow,

I'm going to be 31, and by the-according to this

Agreement, by the time NYCHA is done abating lead I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

will be 51, and I'm curious to know how HUD, SDNY, and NYCHA as well as the city came to settle on a 20-year time table for abating lead. If—if 30 days for inspections is too ambitions, the opposite seems to be true for a 20-year time table for lead abatement.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I want to separate out the-the difference between abatement and leadfree and lead-safe. So what the first two requirements call for, and-and what Local Law 1 and for all private landlords calls for is that you have to maintain lead paint in a safe condition, which means it cannot be peeling. It cannot be on binding surfaces. It cannot be creating lead dust. That is how children get elevated blood lead levels. And so we are going a step further than what is required in the private sector to identify where there is lead paint and eliminated it. And some of those will require extremely extensive gut renovations, but, you know, we are committed to making it so that at the end of the day, NYCHA is lead-free, which is a different standard than what the private sector is held to.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But-but-but my
3	question is how did you come to settle on a 20-year
4	time table for lead abatement?
5	KATHERINE GARCIA: So, a lot of it was
6	about the extensive—the extensive work that it's
7	going to need on the capital construction side, but
8	if we go in and find out that there is a huge amount
9	of lead paint in an apartment, we basically have to
LO	get down to the bones of it, that's going to take us
L1	a long time. And so there are varied parameters
L2	about how soon we do which pieces of work, but we are
L3	not
L 4	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] Do
L5	you know what it
L 6	KATHERINE GARCIA:we are not letting
L7	people wait 20 years in apartments where there is a
L 8	lead hazard. We are still kept in
L 9	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] I
20	understand but the-for-for me and for many the
21	ultimate form or lead safety is lead abatement

24 than lead remediation or-or--

22

23

25

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: --which is better

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES:or-or short-
3	term addressing of lead hazards. What-how much would
4	it cost to abate all the lead in public housing?
5	KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I think that this
6	is where is it is very challenging to give you a
7	number and I'll explain why because I know it's
8	confusing. We don't' know where their lead is. I
9	mean we know in certain developments. We have a
10	history that would suggest that there was a lot of
11	lead paint used specifically at the Harlem River
12	Houses and at the Williamsburg House. At many of the
13	other houses we don't know if there was lead paint
14	used extensively or whether or not particularly
15	between 1960 and 1978 when lead paint was banned in
16	New York City but still available nationwide whether
17	or not we ended up with things that were pre-primed
18	with lead paint. For example baseboards, and so if
19	we go into that apartment and all we need to do is
20	get rid of the baseboards, that's not a big job, and
21	that we can do very quickly, but we don't-we just
22	don't know, which is really why we are going to start

the XRF testing next month, which will literally look

at surfaces throughout every apartment.

23

24

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] But I just want to interject. If—if you don't know what it's going to cost, then you don't even know whether you're going to have the resources to abate lead in all the public housing over the next 20 years.

MATHERINE GARCIA: We've put in a lot of money to make sure that we can get it done, but you're right. We will not know. We will not know for absolute sure what that dollar figure is until we've a better handle on where the lead is, and this has been something that I think we have really struggled with as an authority.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But that's one of the criticisms of the agreement is that it seems to me we're setting arbitrary benchmarks and goals that have no basis in the actual reality of the living conditions in public housing, but these goals were set based on incomplete information about the true nature and extent of the problem. I'll have more to say about the agreement, but I do want to—there was a New York Post article about Bronx River Houses.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: They reported that 98% of the tests for lead in units of Bronx

2	River	Houses	came	back	positive.	The	2018	SDNY
---	-------	--------	------	------	-----------	-----	------	------

- 3 lawsuit identified three developments with notably
- 4 | high levels of lead: Harlem River Houses,
- 5 Williamsburg, and Bronx River Houses. The agreement
- 6 sets a five-year timetable for abatement for Harlem
- 7 River and Williamsburg, but a 20-year time table for
- 8 Bronx River. Why the discrepancy?

9 KATHERINE GARCIA: So, my understanding

- 10  $\parallel$  is that we have specific historical data about
- 11 | Williamsburg and Harlem River that we don't have for
- 12 | Bronx River, and I will go back and double check
- 13 | that, but that is my understanding of why those two
- 14 | are specifically called out in the agreement, and
- 15 given a specific timeline for abatement. But the
- 16 | thing about Bronx River Houses is again, we do not
- 18 | facility, and we are going to go in and make sure
- 19 | that we are identifying where the lead paint is in
- 20 | that facility, and I think that it is up to--
- 21 | COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing]
- 22 But-but if--but if you have more data about
- 23 | Williamsburg and Harlem River Houses, why was Bronx
- 24 | River specified in the SDNY lawsuit? There must have

2.2

been something—something about Bronx River that made

it an outlier when it came to lead hazards.

KATHERINE GARCIA: I don't know the answer to why it was in the Southern District's particular complaint about that because my understanding is that it's really the two that had the historical information.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Like 80% of the units that were tested, tested positive. That strikes me as an extraordinarily high number. So, is NYCHA willing to commit to expediting the time table for abatement in Bronx River Houses?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I think that we want to look at the whole portfolio after the XRF testing because there may be other houses that have more or less lead in them, and we want to make sure that we are focused on where the hazards are the worst and ensuring that we are getting that work done. So, I'm not going to specifically talk to a housing development until I really understand the whole universe of what could be required. But I—I just wanted reiterate again we do not intend to leave children in a place where we haven't corrected even presumed lead paint to ensure that there isn't a

to lead-free.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

hazard while they're living there. You know, this is really about keeping the children safe moving forward, and we are—we are committed to making sure that happens even as we go long term for—to getting

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: But, you know, as you know, and I don't want to dwell on this, remediation has limitations, right? Obviously, you could remove peeling paint in the short term, but if the roof leaks whenever it rains, and causes the paint to peel, the children in that apartment, everyone in the apartment is at risk of exposure to lead. So, ultimately, there's no substitute for abatement, and—and NYCHA is committed to abating lead over a 20-year period. I have questions about the powers of the monitor. There have been conflicting interpretations of the agreement from officials connected to HUD and the Administration. example, Lynn Patton the Regional Director HUD has if the monitor had the power to remove leadership, transfer anyone, abrogate labor contracts, a spokesperson for the Mayor says, the following in response: "Contrary to what some are saying, the new Chair, the new monitor can hire, restructure, break

powers of the monitor?

1

2 contracts that will-that would impinge on local control, which the city insisted on. If you read 3 page 6 of the agreement, which delineates the general 4 powers of the monitor, it notes that the monitor has 5 the power to access all information in NYCHA's 6 7 possession. It notes that the monitor can communicate with officials in and outside NYCHA, but 8 it also notes that the Monitor has no responsibility 9 for the day-to-day operation of the agency. There's 10 no mention of restructuring leadership or abrogating 11 12 contracts. What's your understanding of the actual

think that there's been a lot of confusion in the media around this point, and one of the biggest things that I think that the Mayor felt very strongly about is that—that there be local control, and that he is—he is the one that picks the chair of the Authority.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Well, in partnership with SDNY and HUD.

KATHERINE GARCIA: They provide—they provide the list of candidates.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And they have 3 veto power.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yeah.

KATHERINE GARCIA: --they don't have veto power.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Fair enough. Yes.

KATHERINE GARCIA: And so, they—and—and

my understanding is that it's been a very collegial

conversation—

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yes.

think that everyone, right, sort of will pass the point where we're all antagonistic to one another, and people really want to succeed, and they really want somebody in the Chair's position who will be the who will be a strong chair moving forward, but the day-to-day is run by the Chair and the General Manager, and that the Monitor can provide a lot of information, and he has access to everything, which is unlike most monitors, and it's only in the extent that we really fail. We don't need any of the accountability in this Agreement that we're supposed

working through that with--

2.2

KATHERINE GARCIA: Well, fund—like funding—grant funding for remediating lead for example, and so we are working with them to make sure that we can still move forward with those applications and continue to even bring those resources into the Authority, but it is primarily a legal term in terms of how that you get to a point where you're going into agreement.

I'm going to wrap it up here. We know the Monitor cannot remove you or abrogate contracts. I have two questions. One is does substantial default empower the HUD Secretary to remove leadership and abrogate contracts in the absence of receivership, and (2) there's mention of the Organization Plan, and it makes a vague reference work rules. Could the—you know, there's the Monitor, there's the HUD Secretary and then there's the Organization Plan. Can the Organization Plan result in the restructuring of leadership or the abrogation of contracts? So those are my two questions, and I'll end it here.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Let see ii I can
answer you. So, on the Organizational Plan, I think
that that is what-it's our focus on that and
our conversations with the Monitor has not been
around we need to change leadership, but it's been is
the organization in a streamline fashion so there's
chain of command and accountability, and you feel
like you can really execute. So, bringing in an
expert to take a look at do we have the right
processes in place I think is—is always actually in
some ways, you know, continuous change and continuous
improvement are important, but it's no specifically
designed for oh, we need to get rid of a specific
person or not. So, I mean that-that is not my
understanding of what the Organizational Plan is for
or intended. It is like do you have the strongest
organization to execute on all of these different
pieces.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: And what about the contractors? What--

KATHERINE GARCIA: And so that the
Organizational Plan is not I believe designed to
change the contracts. Our conversations so far
particularly with the Teamsters has been very

positive, and I think that the Monitor they'd have
check with indirectly, views it as like okay that was
a really important deal to make it so that we have
more coverage across all the different timeframes,
and so I don't think his first thought is we need to
throw everything out? He's getting to know the
organization. He has been meeting I believe with
Labor and he has been meeting with residents to make
sure that he has a feel for what is required and—and
that we're delivering. I mean I think the
Organizational Plan is really about is the
organization really set up to deliver on all of this?
COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I'll ask future

KATHERINE GARCIA: Absolutely.

questions in the second round. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Just for point of clarification can you—you mentioned that the Monitor cannot fire, right? So, can you just clarify what the language within the Agreement that speaks to the Monitor if there's non-compliance can allocate or reallocate personnel? Can you just clarify that?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So—so certainly. So if there is non-compliance yes absolutely the Monitor will be able to take action. That is what I meant in

the Agreement that's failing. We're not meeting our
obligations. He is calling us to account, but
there's also process before that, which is if we are
failing and he thinks we need to have a corrective
action plan, there's the back and forth about how to
do a corrective action plan, and what the
recommendations. I mean if we disagree with the
Monitor there is a dispute resolution piece as well
in this. So, I mean it's—it's very complicated, but
our perspective is that he is there to hold us to
account and to make sure that we are really driving
toward the meeting needs of the residents, which is
about their day-to-day life, which is about, you
know, have we remediated the lead paint? Have we
done the elevators? Have we done the mold? Have we
dealt with the pests, and have and have we dealt with
the boilers? I mean those are really what have been
the focus of this agreement is—is about the lives of
the residents and those real pieces of it.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: But if you cannot pull together an actual plan—if you're not in compliance, if you're not within a certain amount of days of what the agreement says then the Monitor can

in the job? Since February 19<sup>th</sup>.

DAVID PRESTON: Yes.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Okay. I—I
3	represent the 18 <sup>th</sup> Councilmanic District. That
4	covers Castle Hills Houses and Bronx River Houses.
5	KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Today, we have
7	failed, you know, me since I came here I have been
8	imploring the problem in Castle Hill with the senior
9	citizens, and called hearings and letters and phone
10	calls, but the seniors in Castle Hill they're
11	suffering. Did you know about that?
12	KATHERINE GARCIA: Am I aware that-that
13	there's are real challenges in Castle Hill?
14	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] Are
15	you aware—are you aware of—of the
16	problem in Castle Hill?
17	KATHERINE GARCIA: I'm not specifically
18	aware of a problem in Castle Hill
19	KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Well
20	you-
21	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ:today right this
22	second.
23	KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Well,
24	you are-you are the Deputy Executive Vice President

DAVID PRESTON: I mean look, we—our office communicates with you office regularly. We are aware of a number of issues at Castle Hill and—

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] It's taking—it's taking—it's taking about two years with every—every week that the—the—the seniors are suffering. Who's in charge?

General Manager has visited. We are, you know, we—we—we tracked the problems across all of our buildings very closely and unfortunately Castle Hill is one of the buildings—one of the developments that has a number of, you know, long-term capital issues that we—that are part of the work that we're doing, you know, as part of—as part of Next Generation NYCHA, and as part of our, you know, as part of—as part of our overall Capital Plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Today, we are reading about Bronx River. Your post is going to boom with Bronx River story and the 98% of apartments being tested—

2.2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: --have been found with lead-with positive, and we have another story about 20 years being given to the city to solve the problem. If we-if we allow-so Mayor-Mayor-Mayor de Blasio has two years. The next mayor assume that it takes eight years, it will be ten years. The mayor after that mayor assuming he serves eight years will be 18 years. There's still two more years for the mayor after the mayor after the mayor to serve and to take care of the problem. So, that means that that children, the Black and Hispanic children on-on Bronx River Houses would have one to-to take care of it. You came here. You are new. I believe they put you there so you-so they can shoot at you until the mayor runs for president of all the states so we could be shooting at you with that stuff. But I don't want to shoot at you. I want you-I want to ask you for a favor. Can I?

KATHERINE GARCIA: You may.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Could you promise me today in front of the camera, in front of my colleagues that you would take a look in Castle Hill and that you will institute an emergency with repair services on Bronx River?

2 KATHERINE GARCIA: So, so I want to 3 address two of-of your issues. So, in all honesty, I 4 can't promise anything in terms of more emergencies 5 for any housing development than any other right now. We are doing NYCHA Cares, which just brings a lot, 6 7 deals with a lot of our open maintenance issues. We are-we are doing. We can blitz this to close our 8 maintenance, but there is an enormous amount to do, 9 but I will go back and I will look at what is the 10 most efficient way to deal with Castle Hill and the 11 12 challenges that you're-that the residents and the 13 seniors are—are confronting there. But we—this is the beginning of a lot of work that needs to happen, 14 15 and it-it won't all happen overnight, and then on 16 Bronx River, I really just want to be clear that we are not going to wait 20 years to make sure are 17 18 keeping the children safe. That is the work that is ongoing now for remediation, and Council Member 19 20 Torres is completely correct. When you do remediation you have to go back and check 21 2.2 consistently that it's holding, and that it is still 23 being protective, but that is our intention until we can get everything to a designation of lead free and 24 25 full abatement, but that is why that will take a long

2.2

time, but let me go back, and really look at Castle
Hill, and all of the different challenges that they
have been having. It is—it is true in my limited time
here that many of the developments have a lot of
deterioration that really needs to be taken care of
but it's-it is not work that will all happen
overnight. I mean it's just-I'm trying to be
straight forward. From what I've seen there is just
an enormous amount that it will not happen overnight.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Well, I-I am not-I appreciate you as to your honesty with this and commitment to-to take a look at it.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: I am not a lawyer.

I am not an engineer. I am not a commissioner, but really in your post, I would go today—we have three developments that have been found with problems, but of all of them are Bronx River is the-the most serious one. So, if I were in charge of the-the New York City Housing, I would say that that's not maintenance. I would say that that is critical, critical and maintenance, and I would say we have to give it top priority to this, and should be. They could die. People's lives, children's lives are in

2.2

2	danger. So, even though it might not be on your-your
3	agenda, but this report our agendas, our agenda is I
4	don't know. This is a critical—this for the mayor.
5	This is something that—that—that says 98% of the—of
6	the-of the apartments if possibly for that person.
7	So, we do not want the children to do. Are we going
8	to allow it because they could. I don't want to go
9	into the how and the race thing, but you are getting
10	Hispanic children. So, can we say stop everything-
11	everything, we're going to have to concentrate on-on
12	serving and—and be sure that that these children are
13	safe.

Clear. I think that our objective here is not different than your objective. Our objective is to make sure that children are safe, and the Mayor has been very clear about that in terms of moving towards a lead-free New York City where we--

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] But the--

KATHERINE GARCIA: -no longer-where we no longer see children with elevated blood lead levels. That does not necessarily translate in full abatement right off the bat, but that does not mean we won't be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

protecting children in the interim time period to make sure they do not get elevate blood lead levels because nobody-nobody wants to see that, but we arewhen we are doing all of the testimony, we will be putting together plans to make sure that we know which one should move first, which ones should move second to get them into categories to ensure that we are getting towards the abatement as quickly as possible. But we're also trying to be realistic and not say we can do every single thing out of the gate because that-that we can't-we can't do, but we are certainly going to be trying to make a very clear plan coming out of the XRF data, and what is happening starting in April to ensure we are appropriately prioritizing where we are going after long-term abatement, where we are going after, you know, shorter term easier abatement, as I said where we might have bought, you know, pre-primed baseboards or pre-primed shelving between 1960 and 1978, and installed them into apartments and those will be easy. You know, those will be easy for us to take care of. So, we-everyone in the Administration is completely committed to making sure that we are protecting children. I mean that is across the

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

- 2 board. Really, we're absolutely—absolutely across
- 3 the board.

1

4

5

- COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] But my last question and I'm done.
- 6 KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.
- COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Because I'm going to ask you. I don't-I don't want to shoot at you.

  I'm telling you.
- 10 KATHERINE GARCIA: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
- 11 COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: You're telling me--
- 12 KATHERINE GARCIA: I'm happy to take your
- 13 question.

21

2.2

23

24

25

- COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: No, no, you are telling me--
- 16 KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

you what happened?

- 17 COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: --that when we come
  18 back here for our next meeting in the future in our
  19 next meeting that we sit in this committee, you are
  20 telling me that I don't have to come back and tell
  - KATHERINE GARCIA: That—that is my objective is that we are going through a process that should be protective of children, and we are working very closely with the Department of Health and Mental

2.2

Hygiene to make sure that we have all the data that we need on where we are seeing children with elevated blood lead levels because nobody wants to see that, and I—I want—I don't—I don't want to come back here and say, Council Member, you were right, and we allowed this happen. We are really trying to make sure that that doesn't happen.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: No, I just don't want to come back and ask David Preston did you know about it? Oh, I don't know it. So, you know about it now.

 $\label{eq:Katherine Garcia: Yes. No, I'm-you-it} % \begin{subarray}{ll} \begin{subarray}{ll$ 

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you,

Council Member Diaz. So, is there a way we can get a

list of where residents in the—in the developments in

the units stand in this process? Because I feel like

we ask the same questions over and over and over, and

I feel like we're always told that, you know, we're

working on this, and we're going to put this together

and we're going to send the Council Members a list

of, you know, what's happening in their district, and

then a month later we have another hearing and then

we say the same thing over and over and over, and so
I think that it—it would just be so helpful, and like
I mentioned earlier like looking at the 325
developments that we do have, and being able to
categorize where each development falls within this
matrix of a plan would be helpful to the Council,
would be helpful to the residents so that we can just
have something in writing and something we can
towards or chart out because I mean I know I'm a
visual learner, and I need white boards in all of my
offices and my house I have white boards, and it's-
it's helpful and I don't and I don't know if that's
something that you just don't feel the Council needs
to see or residents need to see. Maybe you feel like
it's-it's getting too much in the weeds, but at
this point because NYCHA is so much in the spotlight
in the forefront, and the residents have so much
distress and so many questions, it would just be
helpful.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, no I-I-I absolutely want to make sure that you have the information that you need, and that residents have the information that they need. I am happy to put-I

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

can't put a list together of individual units usually
just because or privacy issues.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: We're not doing something in development?

KATHERINE GARCIA: But-but developments like what are the developments that we provided to the U.S. Attorney's Office about their pre-1978 and they are non-exempt. You know, we can definitely provide that level of information. We can provide the number of units in those particular developments where we had knowledge of a child under six living. You know, that is certainly information available. We intend on the XRF to provide that information publicly through the website because we want people to be able to track our progress, but even beyond that also just to understand where not only the capital funding that's going to occur under the Agreement, but capital funding more broadly because there are things in-that aren't covered in the agreement: Who's getting the CCTVs? Who's getting lighting, you know, to make sure that you understand in what year, when those are starting. So, we're trying to figure out the best possible way to put that together not only for you, but also for resident

2.2

leaders so that they can see and hold us accountable because we shouldn't be—this is our data, you know, this is what—what we are and, you know what we want we see is that that's trending in the right direction that things are happening and—and moving forward. We haven't finished designing what that will look like, but on at least the first piece in terms of here are the number of developments. Here are the—here are then numbers in the matrix of—by development of under six, not under six. We can get that for you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: And even on the level of the mold and the roof repairs because I think it was Council Member Torres who—who spoke to that as well. Like I know when I did a tour with Vito of Howard Houses in my district the had a new roof, and it cost, you know, whatever amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and when we got there, there was ponding on the roof, and this was a new roof, and there were problems with it because the contractor came out and did a shabby job, and cost the city a lot of money, and had to go back and make repairs. And so where we a new roof in a—in a building that was supposed to be address the leaks and the molds, the residents were complaining about

2.2

the leaks, but—and so, you have to—it's like throwing
good money, you know, against the bad, and it just-it
doesn't make sense. But you would just think that
if-in order to work on the Action Plan, in order to
really get at the issues that are currently
happening, you would already have that matrix
together even if it's a development listed with

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Right,
and we--

nothing next to it like there's--

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: To say that we don't know how we're going to fix developments' heat.

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] We do have a list of—of priorities. What I meant to say is we don't necessarily know which—which ones are going into which bucket right this second, but you—when you talk to—this is something that we have to have tighter controls on in terms of ensuring that those contractors that we are providing funding for are effectively implementing their projects, and that we are holding them to account, and that we are holding them accountable for their warranty, and so that is just like first step, and then we're also doing the maintenance we have to do. You know, we have to get

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

up there. We have to clear the drains. You know, that is-otherwise we violate our warranty, and so holding-those are all things that we know needs to happen, and part of the agreement talks to quality assurance to ensure that those are pieces occurring not only on the maintenance side but on the capital side as well because we certainly don't want to-we-we need to stretch these dollars as far as possible. will say two things: Once-well one thing. Once we get the roofs in place, which were a huge issue, I mean if it's raining inside, it-we're never going to get a handle on the mold. We also need to be looking at how we're dealing with the plumbing situation because some of these issues are—and the—and the ventilation, and mold grows in places where you can't ventilate well, and so those are—are things—we're going down a list of-we've got to get to root causes, and the first piece was sort of making the building tight, putting a roof and putting-making sure the façade was tight, but we now need to go and go to the next level. Otherwise, we won't get through and really, you know, checking the box is fine on a new roof. If the new roof doesn't actually accomplish everything we needed to accomplish in terms of mold

remediation. We need to go back and adapt to what we need—what more we need to do to make sure that

4 happens because we certainly don't want to throw good

5 money after bad.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Council Member

Menchaca

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you, Chair, and I'll-I'll start just by underscoring the importance of the Chair's request, and really a demand that I think we're all demanding, which is a sense of, not a sense, a real commitment to transparency, and that's really what the-the kind of basic tenet of the both democracy, but really of our relationship with you, and with that, I want to say thank you for taking this on. This is public service at its finest and-and so I hope that we can continue from the work in your previous position. This is not going to be easy in-in any way, but transparency is going to help us build upon the work that we're doing already in our neighborhoods. I want to use some of the relationship and work that we're doing in Red Hook--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

2	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA:to offer som
3	opportunities to talk about the Agreement
4	KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: --and the first thing I want to talk a little bit about is conversations that we were having earlier with the Chair and Torres about abatement versus remediation.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Can you just define it in its simplest forms what remediation is and what abatement is?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Certainly. So, lead paint is hazardous when it's not intact. So that means when it's peeling and chipping and a child could eat it.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Actually, I'm going to ask you to walk back a little bit.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Amend it. (sic) Okay

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Only—not just
talking about lead, but like in concept what
abatement versus remediation is about mold. We're
talking about lead. So, don't talk about
specifically what it is. I just need you to
articulate for the record what abatement and

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 remediation is to anything that you're going to do at NYCHA.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Well, for lead it's very specific, and it's actually codified in law.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay, that's fair.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, so both in Local Law as well as in Federal Law, and requires a lot of other activities around any time you are doing anything related to presumed lead paint. So, the premise is that lead paint is if it's just on the wall as the blue paint is here, that's not a hazard. Like that blue paint could be lead, but that is not a It is not peeling. It is not on a binding surface, which would be a door frame or a window, and it's not on chewable surface, which is usually a windowsill. Because those are all ways for a child to either ingest it or for dust to be created and get on the child's toys or crawl in, and so you, the way that you more or less remediate is that you make it so that the paint is back in a preserved state. lead paint could be still in the room, but there's no more chipping. It's not on a binding surface and you—so you have made it so that the lead paint is

2 stable and, therefore, not a hazard to a child.

3 Abatement is you go in and you remove that or you

4 encapsulate it, or you put up like new sheetrock over

5 | it--

2.2

free NYCHA.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay.

can be no opportunity for it to fail. So, the difference is with remediation you're going to have to go back every two years even if you did remediation and check on it, and make sure that it is in good shape still because if—if you have another leak it could fail again, and create a new hazard, and so that's why while in the shorter term we will make sure that we come into compliance with all of all of—and we're not there yet but we will come into compliance with all of what we need to do in the short term, and also why we want to get to a lead—

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yes, I hear that.

KATHERINE GARCIA: But that is just a question of—of timeframes in terms of being able to do sort of those bigger jobs moving forward.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And money.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 23

24

25

up being that there is lead paint everywhere, it will be more expensive. I think that there is a certain amount of assumptions that--COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]

KATHERINE GARCIA: And—and—and if-if ends

But there is a real cost defense between a remediation plan and an abatement plan and that's the-the core of the question, and I want to go to some more-more questions, but just kind of answer and respond to that, this concept of [coughs] essentially abatement to remove mold or lead codified by the law or other things. Abatement is going to be costly, more costly than a remediation plan that-that kind of does a--

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] So, I would actually just say that I actually think that in the long run, the constant chasing of remediation is more expensive that actually abating, but I don't know that for sure, but I think that, you know, we're-we're sort of chasing after a problem constantly to make sure that we keeping children safe, but it's sort of like are you going to make the investment to go big, and I think the Mayor has been very committed to saying we want to get NYCHA to

2.2

lead-free so that we don't have to sort of be
constantly doing a paint job for, you know, and—and
treating also units equally, right, when you don't
know which one might have lead, you're treating both
equally rather than being able to prioritize where
the lead paint is.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: I don't think anybody will argue with that, and so I'm really thank-thankful that it came from you rather than my conclusion. So thank you so much for—for jumping right into that. I think that's exactly right. In the world of lead, though, in Red Hook specifically we are trying to buy ballfields. That doesn't just end at the park space. The grounds what we're calling the campus grass areas in Red Hook also are experiencing potential detection of lead. We're talking about paint right now on walls—

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And so, I'm wondering about the campus grounds, which are going to be going through a lot of remediation. Well, sorry—mitigation of Sandy money coming in—

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: --at the tune of almost half a billion dollars in Red Hook.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: We are blessed with that, and so we're in process. So, can you talk a little bit about how the Monitor is thinking about those areas in terms of—of abatement?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I actually will put into context. I don't know what the Monitor is thinking in terms of soil, but let me talk a little bit about what the Administration has been thinking about this. The Mayor committed to having all playground areas looked at and mitigated. So, the approach—

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]

And you said playground areas?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Playground areas.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, looking at it, there bare soil in playgrounds, which could therefore or so really as you look and see if there's bare soil, you don't usually test. It's not what the HUD regulations require, and then you can mitigate and remediate it through the addition of mats or wood

2 chips or other things because for a lot of places where this soil, putting additional barriers over it, 3 is considered safe. It is is considered making it 4 safe and in some ways removal could be more 5 disturbing to the lead than actually making it safe, 6 7 so there's a lot of-there are farms on the NYCHA like talking about what are best practices? How are you 8 protective if you want to do gardening or farming on 9 property and make sure that we are following all 10 those, you know, raised beds, knowing where your soil 11 12 came from. And so we-we are working with some of our

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Would you commit to coming to NYCHA residents and talking about the plan?

city partners to make sure that is occurring.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Certainly and—and I think that I'm committed to go to Red Hook sometime soon.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yes. Well that was going to be later down—okay thank you so much for saying yes to the Congresswoman who is actually leading that, and I'll really be—I want to be happy when you deal with Velazquez and her team.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

# COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

2	KATHERINE GARCIA: Yeah. No, I-I-I think
3	I had personal emergency and had to cancel, which
4	sorry today.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: We're looking 6 forward to the meeting. The--

 $\label{eq:Katherine Garcia: I was out there during Sandy.}$  Sandy.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Say that again.

KATHERINE GARCIA: I was out there during
Sandy.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yes, you were I mean in your previous role, and-

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: --and so thank you. Again, the service important to—to thank and appreciate. The incentive—so back to Red Hook. So Red Hook is having some really good things that I want to offer in this new light. The incinerators have not essentially incinerated since the 1970s, and so this has been an area of mold creation as they're generating a lot of mold, and so we're hoping that you can kind of take that on in terms of a larger project across the entire portfolio. That's something that Red Hook I think is offering as a—as a

2	thought to think about where—where is mold getting
3	crated and distributed throughout the buildings.
4	Next is the heat and hot water notification that I
5	saw that is connecting to the monitor and you're
6	still kind of figuring how you're going to do that.
7	We had a-a recent 10 days-10 days heat issue. It
8	just got clarified, but there was communication.
9	Well, actually, my question to you is can we-how-how
10	do we verify that you have sent a robocall from the
11	elected official's position, and can we be
12	incorporated in those robocalls as an elected
13	official rather than waiting for the tenant to tell
14	us there's not heat, and maybe they got a robocall
15	and maybe they didn't, and I just feel like that's a
16	really just inefficient system back to transparency
17	the we can actually support you in getting good
18	information out? And cam you commit to-to sending
19	robocalls to the elected officials as you're
20	communicating to the Monitor as well?
21	KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes. So, I think that
22	we can. I don't know from a-like if there's an IT
23	challenge or

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]

I'll take that.

24

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

KATHERINE GARCIA: I think that we can, but we also-we don't do robocalls in the middle of the night. Just we wait until the morning. So if we did a robocall, but if it's after a certain hour, we really want to-we don't want to wake someone up at 1:00 in the morning to tell them oh, is the heat back on now? Because they may be working in the morning, but we're trying to make sure that during the robocall also that they respond back to us meaning we think it's better. We think it's fixed. Are you warm, and if you're not warm, we send you back and open a new work order so that we want to make sure that there's that feedback group so, well maybe we got the boiler plant running, but now you have an issues that's related to your specific radiator, and we don't want to lose that information, and so we take it back to the Customer Care Center.

that's what's been happening in some of the Red Hook
Houses this last issue where heat was on, but they
were experiencing a lot colder temperatures in the—in
the apartments, and that's critical information.
That's—but again, we're—we're still working on
temporary boilers 2.0 by the way in Red Hook, but

that's on its way. We're-we're getting there. Next,
I want to talk a little about my heat issue. No heat,
no water, no hot water list. Who updates that? None
of that was reflected in the list. Again, that's on
transparency. So, we-we go to that list. Our
apartments that we're dealing with are not on those
lists. That's transparency breakdown, and we're
spending 13 times more time just communicating with
each other.

NATHERINE GARCIA: So, the—the

not/heat/no hot water are outages that are related to

the plant, are related to the boiler of the hot

water system, and those are—those are updated 15—

every 15 minutes out of the Heat Desk, and I think

have been pretty helpful for many people to see where

we are. If the problem is related not t the system,

it is not considered an outage per se because it

could be any—

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]

An individual radiator won't trigger--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Pull trigger an outage.

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yeah. Okay.
3 So that's-that's a finesse that I'd love to work-we'd
4 love to work with you on.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Certainly.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Do the heating plant texts go specifically—to specific apartments after 10:00 p.m. at all, the heat text? [background comments/pause]

KATHERINE GARCIA: I—I don't know the answer, but we'll see if we can—we can get that.

Two more questions. Some of the Council Members areare wanting to ask some questions as well. The Solar Panels, a program across the portfolio, can you give us an update about Red Hook specifically and the solar panels. They just are—they're about to redo all the roofs, and this is more of a—of a kind of—I don't know if the Monitor is going to be connected to anything related to this, but tell me a little about solar panels in Red Hook and the warranty. Who is going to hold the warranty on those? Is it NYCHA? Is that something you can share with us today?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I don't know. So, I—I can not share with it, but I can certainly follow up

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 75						
2	and get you an update on where we are on solar panels						
3	and on NYCHA and, of course, we need to make sure						
4	that the roof is—and the warranty on the roof isn't						
5	invalidated by solar. You know, that's been try on						
6	other projects I've worked on						
7	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]						
8	Yeah.						
9	KATHERINE GARCIA:and you really have						
10	to be careful going forward and making sure that you						
11	don't jeopardize sort of the whole point of a roof						
12	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing]						
13	Yeah.						
14	KATHERINE GARCIA:which is to keep						
15	things dry.						
16	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: You know,						
17	that's the conundrum, and we'll talk about that						
18	later. The elevator inspector was he-that was						
19	suspended in February, is he back? That's my last						
20	question.						

21 KATHERINE GARCIA: Not to my knowledge.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Okay, thank

23 you.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING /6
2	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.
3	Council Member Salamanca, and we've been joined by
4	Council Member Treyger.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Thank you.
6	Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Commissioner. I
7	just have two brief questions. So, you're serving a
8	the Interim Chair
9	KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Uh-hm.
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA:for NYCHA
L1	KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.
L2	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA:but you're
L3	still the Commissioner for Sanitation? Are you stil
L 4	overseeing the operation of Sanitation?
L5	KATHERINE GARCIA: No, I'm not overseeing
L6	the operation of Sanitation.
L7	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Okay. So,
L8	you're just focused on NYCHA?
L9	KATHERINE GARCIA: Right. I am-I am
20	full-time on NYCHA.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Alright, and
22	so is the City currently interviewing? But you're

24 KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

serving as the Interim Chair--

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING //
2	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA:correct? Is
3	the city currently interviewing for a new Chair a
4	replacement Chair, a permanent Chair?
5	KATHERINE GARCIA: My-my understanding is
6	they are working closely with the Southern District
7	and HUD to develop a list of candidates for the Mayor
8	to choose from.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Alright. Any
10	idea of timeframe?
11	KATHERINE GARCIA: I'm not included in
12	what those timeframes are looking like.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Alright.
14	Should-should they choose when they do make that
15	decision and they hire a permanent Chair, would you
16	resume your responsibilities as Commissioner of
17	Sanitation?
18	KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Good. Alright.
20	Then my final quest here is in the terms of the
21	funding here I see that with this Agreement the city
22	has to pay a certain amount of money over, and but it
23	says here that—this is my concern. The city of New
24	York has \$31 8 hillion in repair backlogs

the third largest NYCHA portfolio after my colleagues

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

Council Member Diana Ayala and Chair Alicka-Samuel.

I have over \$800 million in capital needs to address my NYCHA developments. We're talking about roofs, boilers, elevators, you know, the replacement of windows so that the heat can remain in, piping. How-what is NYCHA's plan to actually address these capital needs if you're have—if you have to pay back

KATHERINE GARCIA: Well, we're not-we're not paying them--

a certain amount of dollars to HUD?

COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: [interposing]
Well, I'm sorry. Not pay back a certain amount of
dollars, but there is a sense here that the city
agrees to pay \$1.9 Billion in capital funds through
2027 as well as \$1 billion in capital funds over the
four fiscal years following the effective date of
NYCHA and HUD Agreement. Maybe my question is: Does
this Agreement—does—as part of this agreement, is
there a commitment that HUD would allocate extra
capital dollars to address out capital needs?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, in this Agreement no there is not—there is not a federal commitment for capital dollars, and I honestly think that we still have a lot of advocating to do both at the state and

federal level, and I have to say that I think our
federal delegation has been very aggressive on this
front, and we would be in worse shape if they had not
been working so hard to make sure we were getting for
federal capital money, but that job is not over, and
we are going to still have to be out there advocating
and pushing to make sure that we are getting our fair
share of federal dollars, but—and we intend to
continue to do that. I mean that is about making
sure that we-we get enough to make things better for
NYCHA residents. But I do want to just say that, you
know, part of this will be-will be done through-the-
the PACT Section 8 transitions. I mean that is some
of the federal—that is some of the—the capital money
that's been identified beyond what the city has put
in as well as—as what sort of the usual component of
the Section 9 capital money is, but there is still
more that is needed

COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Yeah. Alright. Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Council Member Ayala.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: I let Council

Member Salamanca go before me, and he asked my HUD

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Right.

million--

24

2.2

2	COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA:because \$100 of
3	those was allocated to a couple of fiscal years back
1	and—and

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, it's and—and that was dedicated. I think that it was allowed to be used by—the Legislative—

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: [interposing] Yes.

KATHERINE GARCIA: --folks identified

whether or not they wanted refrigerators or whatever

and that was what that money got used for.

regards to—the contractors, because I have a similar concern as Chair Samuel. I've had developments in my district where we've had roof work done, and a year later we're seeing leaking in—in the development, and I wonder what is the consequence for those contractors? And I mean are we removing them from the general list of—of potential contractors that we use in the city because it happens so—so often that I—I just—I don't understand why we're not a little bit—being a little bit more aggressive in terms of who we're hiring.

KATHERINE GARCIA: And so we—I think I agree with you. I think that we need to be very

2.1

2.2

aggressive about who we're hiring, but, of course, we have contractual mechanisms to ensure that they come back and fix if it has been unsuccessful. We have warranties on all of our—our roof systems, but we also evaluate contractors, and I will go back and check whether or not—what our evaluation was of the con—the contractor in your particular—at your particular developments because as I said, to the Chair's question, I said we certainly don't want to be throwing good money after bad. We need good contractors. We need to make sure that we are holding them accountable going forward. We have a lot of work to do. I need good people for doing this work. Otherwise, it will be pointless.

right. We don't have enough money to go around to just squander it. So, thank you for that. Now, in regards to the Heating Desk. If it is always. There always seems to be a disconnect in what—we know our 250 and what we're hearing from the -the resident leaders. That happens with the robocalls that happen with the notifications. You know, in the building sometimes I will call, you know, David. I will, you know, I will call Brian even Vito, and I'm getting,

2.2

you know, information that is not consistent with what the residents are sharing with me, and so I like Carlos' idea of including residents as part of the robocalls because that—that way we, you know, can vouch for the fact that the call actually was made because often times what I'm hearing is robocalls are made, and then I ask the residents and they're like I never got a call.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: Okay. Right, and if there was one or two residents then I, you know, we would—could argue that maybe they missed the call. There was a wrong number, but when there are enough of them and you have that there is a disconnect somewhere and that that residents are, in fact, not receiving the calls. So, I'm concerned about, you know, about that, but I wonder in regards to the Heating Desk how is that—how is that going to be different? Who monitor this Heating Desk? How many staffers? Is it 24-hour heating desk?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, it absolutely is 24 hours, and they are literally checking to see what is happening across all of the developments and also managing sort of the clustered teams on the—on the overnight. So, we have staffing at all of the

2.2

developments through 10:00 at night, and then we have teams from 10:00 to 5:00 a.m. and those teams are managed centrally by the desk, but they're also managing all of that staff during the day. I mean we have put and changed that schedule to make sure there is far more coverage than there was last year when they primarily worked about 8:00 to 4:30 Monday through Friday. Obviously, heating plants don't know what day of the week it is, and will usually go off when the fewest number of people are around. So, we have tried to make sure we have full staffing across the 7 days of the week and 24x7, and so those are the clusters, and they're managing that staff during the day.

that I haven't received quite as many calls this year as I did last year. So, whatever you're doing seems to be on track with what you should be doing, but I—I wanted to just, you know, acknowledge that because I think that the same way that we bash, we have to also give some credit, and I have noticed a significant decrease in the number of calls that we've received. We are still having outages, as we assumed there will be, but there haven't been nearly as many, and for

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

2 those developments where we have had they, they have

3 them, they have been corrected quite effectively.

4 Now you stated the by 2024 there may be a-there-

5 there—there may not be a second mold complaint in a

6 12-month period, right as part of the Agreement.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: Part of this is really contingent on the roof work being done. Does NYCHA currently have the funding to complete all of the necessary roof work to date?

funding that we will need to put in place, but a lot of that—a lot of that has been identified and those projects actually were the first to move because it's—it's so critical to get a hold of the skin of a building because the other thing is—everything you do inside is a waste if you don't get a hold of the skin of the building.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: Agreed.

KATHERINE GARCIA: But there is still definitely more money that we're going to need.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: But while we—while we are trying to get the funding, the necessary funding to fix to the roof, we're still remediating

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the inside because I—I thought we were saying if you're fixing the inside but you're not fixing the roof, you're going to be, you know, coming back time and time again, but if we're waiting three years for funding five years for funding to repair a roof, and this apartment is now the recipient of this water damage, then they are pretty likely to have mold. So, is there some reason it's happening at the same time?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So-so certainly in the-in the-we are not waiting until every roof is completed before we are going to fight mold complaints, and deal with the mold in people's apartments, and while that may in some ways be a little bit more costly, we're not-we-we are committed to not having people live in mold apartments while we wait for a longer term capital fix, and so we are putting in place this program called Mold Busters that is—the gives employees more tools, but also it's more accountability like the property manager, the superintendent has to go and confirm that the mold is there and then-then it was fixed, and also that they have more tools about where is the mold coming from? Is it a ventilation problem? Is it a plumbing

2.2

problem? Is it the roof problem so that we are going into address those things? Like did someone flood you from above? You know, did they leave their sink on and suddenly there's water all over or did they have a like stoppage in their drain and so nothing is draining and now you have water in the apartment below. So, part of this having folks being able to identify, and so we can alleviate what the source is, and then we need to go in and—and make sure that the mold is dealt with, and that is now much more accountability at the property manager level about ensuring that those don't get closed unless they are resolved.

that's coming to verify also then is opening a ticket for repair work or is that—that responsibility focus, I know prior to you coming on board. If I'm a resident and I call in, you know, that I need paint and plaster, somebody usually comes in. They don't come into repair. They come in to assess whether or not I really need paint and plaster, right and then they look at and pretty much determine that maybe I do need paint and plaster, but never tell me that I now need to, you know, it is my responsibility now to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

call in separate ticket for someone to come in and paint and plaster. So, we've been kind of going back and forth about for a year now, and my understanding was that there would be some internal changes that would then put the responsibility on whoever it was that was verifying to open the second ticket for follow up. Is that happening to your knowledge?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, we are working towards making that happen because it's a-it should not ever be the resident who is responsible for identifying and sequencing what the work should be. In part because then it can be-if the resident doesn't do it exactly right, we end up with a painter getting there before the plasterer, and the plumber probably was needed in the beginning anyway. Making sure that we are sequencing the work and also that if you call in-this is something that I've seen happen, and it's viewed as a maintenance task. So, it's like it's--somehow the-the way that the tenant put it in as a complaint that that maintenance worker is suppose then close that and open all of the skilled trade tickets. Am I absolutely positive that it's happening across the board? No, but we are trying to make sure that we are putting in flags in the system

2.2

so that it can't happen so that you-that the-the
tenant isn't the one driving the process. That the
person who's doing the investigation or the person
who comes in who should be skilled enough to know
what needs to be happen is putting all of those
tickets in so that that can continue to be resolved.

and my final question is in regards to the elevators that are scheduled to be replaced, is there any priority being given to elevators where we have vulnerable populations such as maybe some of our senior developments?

RATHERINE GARCIA: So, we are certainly looking at where there are mobility issues whether or not that is seniors or other people with disabilities to make sure that we're prioritizing elevators in those developments or whether there's only a single elevator. Like, you know, if there are two elevators, we're looking at what their outage rates look like, but we are really trying to be focused on where we have mobility populations for people who have mobility issues.

COUNCIL MEMBER AYALA: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thanks. Just
as a quick follow-up. NYCHA testified at our
Management hearing last April that it planned to roll
out its-this is a Next Gen operations model, which
gives more decision making control to the local
property managers to all developments by mid-2019.
Does NYCHA still want to use a localized system as it
prepares an organizational plan with the Monitor?
KATHERINE GARCIA: I think we're looking
at what's the most effective place to have the core
accountability on the skilled trade side since
obviously those are primarily scheduled centrally. I
do believe we need to believe we need to be closer to
the developments. I don't know if it's-if I agree
that it would be all the way at the developments, but
we are still having conversations about what is the
exact right model, and we'll engage with the Monitor
around how-what is the most appropriate, and we will
come back and brief you on where we thing that needs
to be.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: And what about the—the—the concept of the borough like the—what is it?

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.2

2 KATHERINE GARCIA: The Regional Asset 3 Mangers.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Yeah, but it was a conversation around having more like borough wide or borough based general manage type concept as well.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I mean I—I don't think having a general manager and replicating everything as a general manager—like what the general manager does at each borough level is necessarily helpful. You know, I have managed very large organizations that did not and, you know, I have borough chiefs, but they report up through Central as does DOTS, as Parks as does most city organizations. So, I'm not sure if adding another layer is what we really need. I actually think that the faster the information can pass from the front line to the Chair is the most effective way to manage, but we will be in discussion on that.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: But how would-how would that happen?

KATHERINE GARCIA: How would—how does—

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [interposing]

How would they go from frontline to a Chair?

2.2

2 KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] Right,
3 so, just so I'm just saying that like adding another
4 box in that chain like adding a borough general
5 manager, I—I don't feel like it makes it so the
6 information gets up faster or things get resolved
7 more quickly. That's my personal opinion.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: But addressing how—how can it get up to the level quickly because that's the disconnect currently. Like it's not getting there.

think that there needs to be more accountability both at the property development level, but also at the Regional Asset Managers, and they—they need more support I would say because I think that they are held accountable for a lot of things they don't have actual control over, and so how to make them accountable and have control I think would be more effective.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay and just another follow-up to Council Member Ayala. Because it takes so long to like really negotiate and execute a contract because of the like procurement process itself, how are you planning for the issues you are

already aware of? So, we were just talking about the
contracts with the mold, I mean with the-with the
roof repair, and we talked about the other contracts.
I know there was an issue in the beginning with the
new third-party vendor at-I think it was Queensbridge
Houses and just with receiving so many complaints
from the residents and the elected officials, and you
know where there are issues with certain contracts,
are you addressing those issues currently where you
know you have a-yeah I go back to white board or
chart or something that says, you know, this is a
list of the-like the bad actors of the, you know,
folks that we have problems with, and so we are going
to troubleshoot and plan ahead because we're-like
that's the whole point of being able to plan.

ATHERINE GARCIA: Okay. So, there—there are two things. One thing is the—the on—sight vendor at Queensbridge did struggle at the beginning of the heating season. That actually has been improved in the last like in—for a while like Queensbridge actually has been doing very well, but we first— So, that's a little bit of a different situation in the capital, but we are willing to work with our contractors first and say like, look you're not

when they are poor performers.

2.2

meeting our expectations. You will get this taken away from you, and then in another development and I actually don't remember which one where they were not performing, we took and gave it another contractor, and it went over to National Grid. So, I think that, you know, we are definitely going to try and make sure we have the best folks working at the developments, and we're willing to take action when—

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay. Alright, thank you. Council Member Gjonaj and the Council Member Treyger.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Thank you, Chair. Interim Chair, CEO Commissioner, a tremendous undertaking on your part, and taking on the issues that NYCHA is facing. I applaud you and also feel bad for you, but I'm looking forward to some real results. This is not new. This is six years in the making of this Administration is aware of the substandard and dangerous condition that NYCHA residents were living in. There—last month there was an article that was written it's going to take roughly two years to test 80—135,000 units at the cost of \$88 million. Now if we're going to take two

2.2

years to test, why should we believe that 20 years is enough time to do abatement?

RATHERINE GARCIA: Thank you for that question, Council Member. So, I think that we have an enormous portfolio, and I think that folks sometimes forget the scale of what NYCHA represents and how important it is in the city New York, but we are basically running the city of Miami. That is what we are doing every single day at NYCHA, and so we knew that it would take us two years to get through making sure that that testing was done and done correctly, and the reason that ewe think that having that baseline information makes it so that we are set up to manage to the 20-year mark, and so we think that we have set up a achievable but aggressive deadlines.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Well, thank you for that, but this is not new. This Administration asked for the position. You asked for the responsibility. You knew what you were getting into so to say that we're managing like the population of Miami, what does that mean? You knew that New York City's population was 8.6 million. It came with tremendous responsibility in that, but this

Administration has failed. You have failed your
fiduciary responsibility of protecting our citizens
by allowing them to be poisoned, by allowing them to
be poisoned by lead, which is irreparable, and I
don't want to be angry, but I have no other way to
express the sadness and the outrage that the single
most important responsibility of this Administration
is security and health and you have failed. This is
six years in the making of lies and deceit. Our
residents deserve better, New Yorkers deserve better
and it's ironic that the same Administration will
hold the private sector to a different standard than
themselves. It's the definition of insanity. It's
smoke and mirrors. It's taking the attention in the
voting from the real truth and creating a Boogeyman
in another industry so you're not being judged. In
the private sector how would lead abatement be
prioritized?

your question, actually we're NYCHA to a much higher standard. So, in the private sector there is no longer-term requirement for complete abatement of all units. There's only abatement at vacancy for bindable surfaces and chewable surfaces. So,

actually going in and trying to create a lead-free

NYCHA is a much higher standard both for New York

City but as well as nationally in all public housing

5 authorities.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Chair, when there is a lead poisoned child, what is the protocol for the private industry?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, that is the same for both NYCHA as well as for the private sector. If there is a child that is identified by Health Department with an elevated blood lead level, the Health Department does an assessment, a risk assessment with that family, which is a very long conversation about everywhere the child spends any time. They also test an XRF all of the walls within that apartment to determine whether or not there is lead-based paint, then they issue a Commissioner's Order to Abate. So that is exactly the same.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: And if private ownership does not abate or address or the issues, what is the next step?

KATHERINE GARCIA: The next step would be for HPD to go in and do emergency repairs.

2.2

2			COUNCI	L ME	MBER	GJONAJ:	Do	we-do	we	hold
3	the	same	criteria	for	NYCH	IA				

KATHERINE GARCIA: In terms-

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing]
Where NYCHA is not immediately abating or noting the lead source, do we send in HPD Emergency Repairs to do that work?

KATHERINE GARCIA: We do not, although, to my knowledge, we have had an incident where we were not meeting those goals, but I can go back and check it. It's never been raised to me in either my role as Lead Czar overseeing the Mayor's Lead-Free Plan or by the Health Department or by NYCHA that—that they were not in-following the rules that the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene required of them, but I can certainly double check, but that has never been something that has been raised as a concern.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Chair, we have because you've contested and I don't mean you in particular, but the Administration has protested the findings of DOH to avoid abatement or a mediation.

That was the standard protocol. DOH comes in, findings, results next step NYCHA goes on defense

2.2

challenges the results of accuracy of those, and it just goes into this black hole of no one addressing, make like it's not there. Let's turn a blind eye to it while subjecting New Yorkers to lead poisoning.

know—know, Council Member that we are doing abatements of any Commissioners order to abate, but we are still taking paint samples, which is exactly the same that us allowed in both the private and public sector. So, this was not something that we had a different, that the Health Department had given us a different standard, but we want to be taking proactive approaches so we going in and making sure that we are abating those apartments.

my frustrations are directed toward you as an individual. I think you're a remarkable person. I really do, and the challenges that you have ahead of you I don't—I would hate to be. With that in mind, we are putting I believe it is \$1.2 billion and \$200 million a year for the next six years, correct, \$2.3 billion.

KATHERINE GARCIA: The-the total is \$2.2 billion that are required under the agreement.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ:	Where are we
3	finding that money?	

KATHERINE GARCIA: That money is coming out of the City's Budget.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Why didn't we have that money coming out of the City's Budge previous years to address these issues?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Actually, there-there, well, there's been quite a bit of both expense and capital money that has been committed to beyond the \$2.2 by the Mayor and the Council, and I think dating back if you start at the beginning of the Administration, I think it's in addition to the \$2.2 I think it's another \$2.3 in capital money and then this is where you end up adding also all of the expense money in as well. So, you're-you're talking about there were significant commitments that had started after the mayor took office, and that continue as well as I think this was the first Administration to not require NYCHA to pay for services such as PD or payments in lieu of taxes. And-and that I think is adding up to about a billion dollars in expenses that NYCHA would have had to pay. I can double check that number, but I think we've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I mean unfortunately while we've been sitting here, the President his budget, and zeroed out public housing capital, and so, I mean I—I think that what you see is that there has been ongoing commitment by the Administration to put capital money it, and by the Council to be quite frank with you.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Chair, thank you for that answer, but the truth of the matter is six years ago when this Administration came into power had they took a proactive approach and a committed approach, we wouldn't be waiting for two more years of testing to be done. We knew this problem existed. We were not proactive although we have committed more resources that previous administrations. Let-let's not pull the wool over the people's eyes to say that this Administration was really in tune. Administration was kept dumb, tone deaf and not really to do what's right by NYCHA residents. They won. We should have been more proactive and we weren't, and I love the slogan that NYCHA Cares, which it sounds really nice and cute, but this is state of emergency, and all of our focus and every resource should be put to safe housing, which lead,

2.2

no--contaminant-free before any other priority, any other wish list of this Administration. This is a zero sum game, and this Administration is not living up to its responsibilities. It's ironic that this Administration has proposed a program to take back private property that is not managed to the standard of the city, and hold themselves to a different standard. The proposal is to take these properties from these actors and give them to not-for-profits in hopes that they'll turn the buildings around and provide some of the basic services and protections that are needed. Why not apply the same to NYCHA? What's good-for good for the goose is good for the gander. Why the double standard? Why the smoke and mirrors?

Member, but I mean I'm struggling to understand the differential that you're making. We are making a huge commitment to NYCHA. The Administration has made huge commitment NYCHA, and I think that we really are trying to make it a better place for residents, and really address some of those core issues going forward to make it so that people are proud of the homes that they live in.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Commissioner--

to tell you that one of his successes at Ocean Bay if you talk to the residents out there is they'll you now I want to host. I want to be the host of the holidays. We want everyone's experience to be that and so we are moving as aggressively as we can in that direction.

apologize once again. It's not personal, but when you tell me that we've done so much when we have children being poisoned, pregnant ingesting lead dust as we speak. We are not doing enough. This isn't even a question about is the elevator working and do we have to take the stairs. This is to the detriment and the health and safety, irreparable damage that will take two years to test, and up to three generation to remediate. That is not doing enough. That is letting down New Yorkers. That is jeopardizing our future, and that is, and I hate to take the position but I truly believe that if they were white only, this would not be happening, but because they're black and brown, and minorities that

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

are not doing right by them because there's no other explanation. Thank you.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I just want to address your point. I-I-there is no one in this Administration who isn't working extraordinarily hard to ensure that there are no children whether in public or private housing who face elevated blood lead levels. I mean that has been a focus for the Mayor and he has come out strongly in support of making sure that we achieve that goal, and just to be clear, the testing protocol is way outside the box. No one else has ever done it like this before, and I don't think that it is not something that—that would have been required under any particular legislative action. So, it is a big deal, and it is actually creative. It is not necessarily someone would have thought about on a first day, but that does not mean that we are waiting until we are done, and that we are not addressing the lead hazards that have to presume that are occurring—that are there now until we know--

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing] Chair.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

absolutely moving forward in ensuring that these
children are protected. It is not our long-term
goal. Our long-goal is to ensure that it is leadfree but in the interim we're not waiting for that—
that final goal post. We want to make sure we're
doing the—the protective things we need now, and that
is what we intend to do going forward.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: That you for that wonderful explanation, Chair, but again, I want to just go back to one thing. You, and I truly believe you're an incredibly intelligent woman. You really are. Testing of these units to determine two years out from now especially where there are children who may be living in these apartments today. Not taking into account new busts. (sic) The amount of money and time that is being wasted by not addressing them immediate, and I go back to your earlier statement that this can be addressed quickly by prioritizing with encapsulation. It's a simple formula. If the apartment tests, bring in the contracts, put sheet rock up, and move on. You created safe housing, your fiduciary responsibility. Let's not waste more money, more time. This should be done, and if you

really wanted to give it the attention that it
deserves, you can complete this project within a
short period of time, and each day that goes by is
subjecting someone to further lead poisoning and
contamination, something that this City Council
cannot allow to happen, something that I would hope
you understand the importance of, and the timelines
that we're giving, which I still don't believe that
we can live up to based on our history, and the
behavior of NYCHA. In a few years this mayor will be
out office. You will not be there. You'll be replaced
and we'll begin the definition of insanity all over
again doing the same thing all over and expecting a
different result. You have a little close to three
years to at least make NYCHA free from lead and mold,
and if you really wanted to given all the resources,
you could do that and that would be the biggest
justice for all NYCHA residents and New Yorkers.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.

Council Member Treyger, and this will close the first

line of questions, and then we'll do a short second

round and end there.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Thank you, Chair Ampry-Samuel and welcome, Chair. That was nice

# COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

touring Marlborough Houses with you recently with
Chair Cymbrowitz from the State Assembly. I said
this in the last-with the last previous chairperson
and I'll share my views again. I fully understand
that NYCHA has over \$32 billion now or even greater
in capital need, but it—it doesn't cost a penny or a
dime to be straightforward and honest about the
challenges NYCHA faces, and respectfully I think
NYCHA dug itself deeper in trouble when it confessed
and historically has shown that it was not
straightforward about the challenges we face in our
apartments, and in addition to money, we lost
precious time in advocacy because this is a crisis.
This is an emergency, and so, you know, I know a lot
of folks like to kind of just, you know, throw sticks
at NYCHA and critique it, but we-we-we have to be in
the business of solving problems. We have to be
constructive here, and so I want to be that person,
but we need to have honest brokers on both sides, and
I do appreciate the gravity of the role that you're
taking on. This is not an easy job, but you are a
more than capable person, Chair. In-you mentioned
before that in the discussions with the federal
government there was no check or no funding, no

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

2.1

2.2

commitment from the federal government to increase
support to our housing stock. Is that correct?

KATHERINE GARCIA: That's correct.

all of that criticism and all of that critique and scrutiny from—from HUD and—and from the feds no one in the room took ownership on their part about how systemic and historic chronic disinvestment from the federal government help lead NYCHA to the problems and the crisis that it's in today? No one acknowledged that in that room?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I—I don't—I don't know for sure, but my understanding is no.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: And I'm sure that this has been shared before, but I think it's just worth repeating. [coughs] What is NYCHA's total budget?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Oh, I should know this off the top of my head, but I don't. Let me just ask someone to find it for me.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Sure, and as you're just getting that—that number, the percentage of which the federal government contributes to NYCHA's budget.

2 KATHERINE GARCIA: No, I mean I-I know 3 About a third comes from rent and the percentage. about two-thirds comes from the federal government 4 5 under Section 9, and it's very technical and I'm 6 still learning it a bit about it. You know, there 7 also are the unfunded, but my understanding is more or less every year you put forward what you would 8 like-what you think you need, sort of the income of 9 the residents, what they're able to pay and then what 10 the rest of that bucket should be, and usually at the 11 12 federal level except I think maybe one year in the last many, many, many. I mean I'm talking decades 13 14 was Section 9 Nationally ever fully funded, and so we 15 get an allocation and so if they only fund 95% of the 16 national need, we only get 95% of our need, and-but 17 that is—that really honestly probably dates back to 18 the '80s. So, our total budget is \$3.34. I will be better when I'm at the Budget hearing about having 19 20 all my numbers straight on all of that, but, you know, there is-so there are, you know, the commitment 21 2.2 by the federal government when they constructed 23 Housing Authorities across the country, which were all designed particularly in New York State to be 24 controlled locally. That ongoing commitment that you 25

need even if it's only a tiny-like they're only-
you're only short a dollar every time. We've been
short a dollar for a long, long time every year, and
that makes it very hard to keep up with the amount of
maintenance that needs to happen, and the amount of
capital investment. As these buildings age, they
need more rather than less, and I feel like the way
that I think about it is we have a relatively old
care and if we were taking it to the shop
periodically and making sure the preventative
maintenance was occurring, it would—it could hang in
there, but we allowed the oil, like, you know, we
basically let the oil dry out of the engine and we
blew it up, and so now we've got a lot of work to do.
And so, we are really committed to making sure that
we do that work, but we have to be continually
advocating at both the federal and state level for
additional resources. I mean the city is at the
table with a lot of money, but we need to make sure
that we are continuing to advocate for those other
resources, and ensure that we see that public housing
across the country gets fully funded.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, you mentioned that the federal government has-puts in

2.2

over two-thirds of resources into NYCHA's budget. Is that correct?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, on the operating side, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Right. So it's fair to say that they are technically like the landlord or the majority shareholder into NYCHA. Is that correct?

Would characterize it. I wouldn't characterize it as a landlord, though but perhaps as the shareholder.

Certainly it has to be as a partner. Like we do need to see them participating in ensuring that NYCHA improves, and I would hope advocating at the federal level and at Congress to make sure that it gets fully funded.

it's from my vantage point, if they're the majority shareholder, and contribute so much, you know, as far as the current budget, which has not increased in quite some time, you know, if you follow their social media and you follow their public statements from HUD, they keep poking NYCHA and keep critiquing NYCHA. The irony is not lost on me. You know, you

2.2

can't starve the system and the complain of signs of
malnutrition because that's exactly what's happening
here. So, to me with all due respect to HUD and all
their staff, it is not a joke, it's not a game. This
is very serious. Now, were your privy to any of
those discussions between the City and—and HUD
recently because there's been talks of these meetings
and pictures of these meetings. Were you in the roor
or you came in after the meeting was concluded?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I started in this role after the Agreement had been signed. So, I was not part of those conversations. I have been in conversations with obviously with the Monitor as well as with HUD as we move forward.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, are you aware of any discussions at the table between the city and HUD or any of and any—any person in between that—that talked about privatizing NYCHA's housing stock?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Not-not that I'm aware of.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Did that ever come up in any of the conversations between HUD and the city?

2.2

KATHERINE GARCIA: I am not aware of a
privatization conversation, but I was not in
conversations prior to the $19^{\rm th}$ of February. I mean
I think that there is a lot of support for the PACT
Program, which is a public-private partnership, but
there has not been to my knowledge a conversation
about we would just privatize NYCHA. I mean I think
that—I meant obviously I can't—I would—I would—I
would struggle to find, you know, a mayor who hasn't
been more focused on wanting to ensure that we had
local control over NYCHA going forward, and that's
part of his values.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Well, I am deeply concerned that under this federal administration especially with whose in the White House. He's more interested at times in real estate than he is really in governing this country, and so I am concerned that that might be something that they're interested in--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: --but Chair, I would like for you if possible to make a commitment to NYCHA residents and to this Council and to the public that we will not privatize any of NYCHA's

2.2

2	housing stock because this is a critical, critical
3	social safety net for our families and for our city.
4	Recently, the-the Starbucks or former Starbucks CEO
5	who came from NYCHA here in New York City declared
6	himself a self-made billionaire.

is not a self-made billionaire because we the public, we the city of New York we-we help provide a social safety net to make sure that when he was a young child he had a roof over his head, and was able to go to our schools within our community. That's a safety net that I want to preserve for the next generation and for the next generation and for generations to come. And so, we need to make an iron-clad commitment that we do not privatize this critical social safety net in the city of New York. So, can you promise and make a commitment that we will not privatize any of NYCHA's housing stock?

I'm going to do everything in my power to create more public-private partnerships through the PACT Program because that is where we have—we have a lot of

2.2

funding, but this is not privatization. All of the NYCHA tenants who are in the developments maintain all of their rights, and the city maintains ownership of all of the property. So, I am committed that—that if we are talking about selling off NYCHA to some developer, that is not—that is not. My intention is certainly not the Mayor's intention.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Alright. I—I

just—I caution folks that we need to stay alert on

this or as—as the saying goes: Things as they look

(sic) because this is something that I take very,

very serious. We heard before about the lead testing

and you were—also the—the lead testings are I guess

in the city. Are you—do you still hold that role?

KATHERINE GARCIA: No, I hold—I hold only

the NYCHA role—

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: [interposing]
Only the NYCHA role.

KATHERINE GARCIA: --while I am in the NYCHA role. I get the other roles back when I return.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, during earlier hearings we learned that NYCHA had a different lead testing approach than the Health

2.2

NYCHA?

Department. That the Health Department historically used--I think it's called XRF machines. NYCHA used a different machine. NYCHA was as—as we heard before would contest and appeal some of the determinations from Health Department. Are we now under a single measurements approach in terms of testing for lead at

katherine Garcia: So, so let me be clear because I think there's some—some—everyone was always using the same type of equipment XRF machines.

[coughing] NYCHA just like a private landlord could contest based on a paint sample, which is exactly the same. It's Local Law 1 requirements. It's exactly the same. It, however, NYCHA did contest far more often than the private landlords did, but we have taken the approach that we will abate every apartment. We will still take the paint chip, but we will do the full abatement on that—that work. So, that actually is slightly more aggressive than the current—what would be allows by a private landlord because a private landlord now if they are going to contest usually will not abate prior to that.

it?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, always.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: I don't know if
3	this came up, Chair, but forgive me because I think
4	this is also worth kind of digging deeper into the
5	PLA. Where do we stand with the-the PLA particularly
6	when it comes to Hurricane Sandy rated projects,
7	which I think you know I'm very interested in because
8	we want to get that work done, but is it in the
9	process of being renegotiated? Is that correct?
10	KATHERINE GARCIA: My understanding is
11	the city is taking the lead on this.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Who?

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Who?

KATHERINE GARCIA: The city is taking the lead on-on the PLA, and we will follow once they are done. So we I think are extending the PLA to date, and I believe most of the Sandy projects were bid under the PLA--

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Uh-hm.

KATHERINE GARCIA: --and hopefully aremany of them will be coming to conclusion in the not too distant future. I mean I know that it has been a very, very long road for developments both in your district and in Menchaca's district in terms of, you know, putting forward what-what needed to get done, but I think some of those are beginning-we're

2.2

2	beginning to-we're-we're closing in on the finish
3	line, and so my understanding is if they were bid out
4	they would have been bid out under the PLA because it
5	would been enforced at the time.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, you're saying the city is taking the lead. I'm-- taking that you're saying the Mayor's Office is taking the lead. Is that correct?

 $\hbox{\tt KATHERINE GARCIA:} \quad \hbox{\tt The Law Department I}$  mean on their PLA, and then usually we follow and negotiate afterwards.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: But you're not at the table I think with these discussions?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I am not actually sure where we are in terms of the ongoing negotiations on the PLA.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: So, that

concerns me, Chair. I mean the fact that you're not

there, and certainly the residents are not there

because that was the problem with the original PLAs

that—that we're dealing with. I am—I still am

furious that residents who fought for I'm sure my

colleague Carlos Menchaca would agree residents in

his district and my district and others who fought

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

for the Sandy money were not privy to-to the PLA Agreement signed between the Mayor's Office and-and Labor, and they've been virtually shut out from many of their work projects in their own neighborhoods, which is really outrageous. I come from labor so I support labor, but labor has to have pathways that residents work as well. Residents should not just witness work. They should be allowed to participate in the work as well, but this is a problem because if you're not even at the table, the residents are surely not at the table, I-I think-I think the Mayor needs to be called out on this. This—this is unacceptable, and-and so I-I-and I just want to point out to you we had a shooting my district, there was shooting in my district a few-few weeks back. As a matter of fact, I think a grandmother from Brownsville was-was-was hit-shot and killed near Grayson (sic) in Coney Island because there were people that were trying to intimidate or get onto the job site and cause friction and problems for the contractors there. Are you familiar with this incident, with this shooting?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I am not familiar with this particular incident.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Chair, I just 3 want you to know that my local police precinct is 4 asking for help and support to protect work sites in 5 Coney Island because there are people who are routinely intimidating the contractors and 6 7 subcontractors and residents there for access to work, and this was a part of the reason why this 8 grandmother from Brownsville a woman of color was 9 shot and killed simply for working. My colleagues 10 know we need to have more women of color and more 11 12 people of color and generally working in trade unions and construction jobs, and here we lost-we lost a 13 14 precious life, and some other-another person was shot 15 was shot, and so I-I really believe that, you know, 16 NYCHA should make sure that there is safety going on 17 in development sites that you're aware of this 18 dynamic. I'd encourage NYCHA to have a conversation with NYPD about this as well. This is something we 19 20 take serious, but I think the-the larger issue here as well is the fact that there is a feeling among 21 2.2 residents that they have been shut out of working 23 opportunities in their own back yard, and that's just not acceptable, and so I-I would appreciate for us to 24 25 follow up on this, Chair, and I plan to speak with

you again about this topic because I think this is of
the most importance, and the last thing I'll say in
the interest of time talk about trust or broken
promises. We were promised—I was promised over a
year ago, well over a year ago that we would have the
reopening of the Surfside Gardens Community Center in
Coney Island, a center that certainly had its issues
before Sandy but Sandy really wiped it out. We-you
received—NYCHA received federal money to fix it up.
I was promised that-the community was promised that
it will be open I think back in November of 2017. It
is now March, 2019, and the Center is still not open.
Can you give us any update about where it stands and
when we could get the center open? Because I just
want to point out to you, Chair, especially in my
district it's a very high needs district, because we
lost this space, children are forced to-there was a
Cornerstone Program there, and children are forced to
go to nearby schools that don't have space to
accommodate the volume of children that need
services. So this is a really, really serious issue.
It's not just a matter of fixing lights and just the
floor. Children in my community are being denied a

2.2

2 seat—denied access to critical programs. So, if you
3 could just enlighten us where we stand.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, certainly and—and I also want to just clarify on the PLA issue. We have been providing our feedbacks. I think we are in a very similar place. We want to see the PLA work better for NYCHA residents whether or not that's through a apprenticeships programs or trainings or whatever that's going to look like, but we think that that needs to be a bigger funnel into the building trades. In terms of—of Surfside Gardens Community Center, you know, as well as I that we want to make sure that that opens. I don't have an opening date with me today, but we can get one to you by the end of the day.

you were not in this role previously, but I'm just pointing out that we were told back in—that in fall 2017 it would open. It has not opened, and as we speak, there are children in Coney Island that don't have access to critical programs because they don't have the space to accommodate them. We need that center opened immediately, and I would appreciate a follow-up on that.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING   125
2	KATHERINE GARCIA: I-I will absolutely
3	follow up to make sure we're doing everything to
4	ensure that we that-that center open.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Thank you.
6	Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Thank you,
8	Councilman Treyger. A quick question and then I will
9	hand it off to Council Member Barron. Does the PLA
10	have any bearing on the capital need, the \$32 billion
11	capital need?
12	KATHERINE GARCIA: No, it's really about
13	how the contracts get-it's usually attached to the
14	Capital Contract. It doesn't-well, it could, in
15	fact, if people think it's going to cost them more or
16	less for labor, but it's designed to actually cost
17	less. I mean that would be the whole point of a
18	project labor agreement, but it is not specifically
19	about the number of capital dollars.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Council Member
21	Barron.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON:

23 KATHERINE GARCIA:

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON:

25 KATHERINE GARCIA:

2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank to the panel for coming. I just have a 3 few questions. I represent a district that has 13 4 5 housing developments in it, and the population 6 amounts to about 21,000 people in these housing 7 developments. My understanding is that for my district the five-year plan has a projected needs 8 assessment of \$2 billion for those developments that 9 are there including Brookline or Brooklyn, Linden, 10 Cypress Boulevard and Pink. Where is NYCHA on 11 12 meeting these obligations, for fulfilling this and what's the timeline that NYCHA has for those 13 particular developments in the 42<sup>nd</sup> District. 14

Member. I will get back to you on the specifics of each one of yours, but obviously even with the NYCHA 2.0 plan, that is looking to aggressively move units from Section 9 into Section 8, we know that there is still a gap. There is still a funding gap capitally. Even with the city funding there is still a funding gap, and so we are going to continue to advocate, but I can certainly get back to you on what the specific strategies are for your developments.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And I saw a
3	document, which described the PACT, the Permanent
4	Affordability Commitment Together plan, and it
5	indicates that it is designed for 21,000 units to be
6	included in that design and that plan, and I've been
7	told that Linden and Boulevard are online to be
8	included in a PACT arrangement. So, my question
9	becomes how will those developments—I initially had
10	heard years-two years ago I think it was that PACT
11	would start out with small NYCHA developments so that
12	they would be able to work through any problems, any
13	stumbling blocks. So, wanted to know what had been
14	the success with PACT that may have been implemented,
15	but you're now jumping to the two largest NYCHA
16	developments, and putting them in PACT, which I
17	understand goes-is a Section 9.
18	KATHERINE GARCIA: It is Section 8.
19	Section 9 is current public housing. So, it's moving
20	them into Section 8.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: It's moving
22	Linden and Boulevard into Section 8? [background
	1

KATHERINE GARCIA: I have to check on which of your developments are on the list. Right

comments]

23

24

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2	now we have a large number in construction
3	particularly in the Bronx and then we will have a
4	large number that move in—in Brooklyn and Manhattan
5	next as the mega-it's the bundles of apartments. I
6	don't know

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: [interposing] Okay, so you don't-you don't have information that indicates that Linden and Boulevard are scheduled to be in the PACT?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Oh, okay. Yes, they are moving into PACT.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: They are? KATHERINE GARCIA: They are.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, my question then is: What have been the results from previous PACTs that you now feel confident that moving to the two largest developments will be successful?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I mean I have to say that like I think that Ocean Bay was an eyeopener for many people. That was obviously relatively small, but it's complete. The residents there are extremely happy with the work that was done not only to the developments themselves, but inside their apartments, and feel very good about what-what

2.2

their life is like moving forward, and I'm—I'm not

sure if you were in the room, but I said before that-

5 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: [interposing] I
6 wasn't.

It want to host the holidays now. I want to have people in my apartment now. I'm feeling really proud of my apartment, and so we have quite a few—the next chunk that are already in construction, and we are moving forward with additional units this spring to move and start the—the whole process and close and moving to the Section 8 Program.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And so, once again, I just want to be clear, Linden and Boulevard will not have any requirements for Section 9, any connection to Section 9?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yeah, they will move into—as part of the process they move into Section 8. Though to be quite honest with you, given that those two developments are the—I'm not sure how—if they actually were even eligible for Section 9 because I believe they are the unfunded developments which—which is complicated, but this is make sure that they

too, but they don't have sort of their own claim on

2.2

federal money. If we only had unfundeds, we wouldn't
get any federal money. So, this is a way to make
sure that those developments have long-term funding
attached to all of those units.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you and in terms of the boilers that are going to be repaired, I understand that two developments in my district,

Cypress Houses and Long Island Baptist have been on the list or are on the list to be—to receive new boilers, and I wanted to know what is the timeline for those new boilers to be installed?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, Cypress Houses we announced that they are starting construction this spring and should be two years and what was the second one?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Long Island Baptist.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Long Island Baptist is the same thing. We announced that they are starting this spring and should be two years for construction.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: It'll take two

23 | years?

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes. These are big boiler plants.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: It-well is there 3 a reason that it takes two years or is there shorter timeline that can be--

KATHERINE GARCIA: This is as aggressive as we absolutely can move on the construction of these sites. There's not-this is not us holding anything up. The contracts are on the street. Hey are approved to go. They will go as fast as we possibly can get them to go, but this what we anticipate.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So for the next two years people in those-the residents in those developments might be subjected once again to no heat, no hot water?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I mean I think we have to be really honest until we really have gotten all the investment in place of boilers across the city. We are going to do everything we can to manage the staff and ensure that we are dealing with outages, and that we do like during the summertime do overhauls to the best that we can, but we are dealing with heating plants where sometimes the parts are not even available. We're making the parts. scavenging the parts because those people who built

2	these boilers they went out of business 10, 15, 20
3	years ago. I mean this is what we are dealing with
4	to try and keep running, and so we are making the
5	commitment to not only ensure that we are staffing
6	from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and then around the
7	clock with teams to address the issues, but you're
8	absolutely right. Until we are fully building out
9	this and the—and the reason those two are going right
10	now is because they have some of the most—the biggest
11	challenges, and we want to make sure we're addressing
12	the boilers that have really had the most challenges,
13	the most outages, and so I wish that we could move
14	more quickly, but we want to make sure that we're not
15	telling you we can get it done in a year when we
16	really can't.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Is there a
18	possibility it could be sooner than in two years?
19	KATHERINE GARCIA: It's unlikely that it
20	will be sooner than two years.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Alright, okay.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Council Member Rosenthal.

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thanks so 3 much. Thanks, Chair Alicka Ampry-Samuel for your leadership on this, and thank you [laughs] for taking 4 on this interim position. I think it's incredibly 5 6 challenging and incredibly important also. So thank 7 you so much for your leadership on this. I think one thing that—a couple things. I've learned that is 8 that—is to try to manage the disconnect between 9 what's happening at each development, and what you're 10 seeing sort of what's central is seen as a whole. 11 12 And I'm wondering as you move forward with a Monitor in place, with when there's a new permanent Chair, if 13 you could envision a time when there would be more 14 15 local tenant involvement in thinking about 16 priorities, and how that can be done in a way where 17 residents will know that their suggestions are being 18 taken seriously? What drives that question for me is Amsterdam Houses, which has over 24 buildings and has 19 20 wanted to do a number of very creative things with their space and has been held back from doing that 21 2.2 for what appears to be-for what reason I don't 23 understand. And, the same is true with Harborview where there's unused community facility space when 24 offers have been made by Central to renovate unused

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

space and use for shops or used for community space.

You know, I-I feel in just my six short years being here that people who have these great ideas when I first came in I know they were pitching those ideas for the ten years prior to my being there. And I'm wondering how do we turn over a leaf so that those

residents will feel heard and empowered?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I know it intimately-I appreciate that question. It's actually as I've been mulling in my head sort of how do we ensure that residents really feel connected and-and incorporated into the decision making, and I think (1) is we justwe just need to be more transparent both with you and with-and with resident leaders and with the residents. But, you know, what I've been sort of playing with in my head is how do we do almost like a participatory budget framework? You know, how do we sort of push this down, and also engage residents. I get the sense that-that there's opportunities particularly with young people to get them involved in thinking through what do they really want. you know, also with residents like what is it that you want at your development? What do you want to see? What are your priorities? And, you know, there-

there is, you know, obviously specific funding that
comes that we're required to provide through—through
HUD regulation, but we also can be really clear about
what the Capital Program looks like, and what's
happening. Because I know that—that all the tenant
leaders are busy advocating with you for a whole wide
slew of things that, you know, may or may not be for
what the whole development wants. But there are some
folks who clearly, you know, they want-want to make
investments, they wasn't to see things change. So, I
am thinking that it—is there a way for us to craft
almost like a participatory budget? Because I think
you get more people involved if it's sort of a voting
thing. I want a playground, I want this, I want do
almost a, you know, here is—here is what I think.
You know, I don't care about this. I want an
elevator. Just get me the damn elevator. I'm tired
of getting stuck all the time. Like what is, you
know, I think they're—on their day-to-day lives I
think they have real insight into what makes or
breaks or their day.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: I appreciate what you're saying, and I certainly have felt the same way and, in fact, we've done participatory

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

budgeting and done our best to engage people, and the truth of the matter is we haven't been successful in all our efforts. I'm not saying we're the best of anyone, but we've done things where we've gone door I think it's deeper than just the one time, you know, Hey, how do you want to spend your money? It's so much more. The roots are so much more tangled than that. People know what they want. They've been telling what they want year after year, and property manager after property manager, Council Member after Council Member after Council Member. The disconnect I think is in a-look I don't know. not there seeing it everyday, but what I'm sharing with you is I like what you're saying. It's what I've been saying for the last five years, but there is a disconnect--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: --because that information should already be bubbling up to you.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: You know, I
can-I don't know about my colleagues, but in my
district there are at least three buildings that have
gone with-three developments that have gone without a
resident leader for a long, long time with no real-
ever I mean, again, people say the right things.
Say, Oh, yeah, we're going to get there. We're going
to hold an election. We're going to do this, we're
going to do that, and then it just doesn't get done.
So, and-and lastly, you know, in sort of constructive
advice would be when you-I-I also really appreciate
what you just said. What? Do I call you Commissioner
Chairwoman? [laughs]

KATHERINE GARCIA: Call me Chair.

Advocate, Speaker? Right? It's a good one so we've got many, many roles. That's how it goes. So, the disconnect between what tenant leader might be saying and what the tenants might be thinking, and that's anot a reflection on the tenant leader. It's a reflection on a lack of resources to engage the building, you know, resources that have been dwindling for so long. So, I would urge you to think harder on that, and not think about things as from

2.2

the top down, but instead, think about ways. I think participatory budgeting personally, my experience on the very active Upper Westside and God bless all the people who threw themselves into it. It's not the be all, end all. You know, it's a word, it's a phrase, it's a concept that sounds good, but it's so much more. The roots are so much more tangled, the ball of roots are so much more tangled than that I don't know. I'm done. Thank you. You got what I'm saying. I—I just think it's—

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] And so-

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: --way more complicated.

I'm not sure necessarily that it's more complicated except that I think people raised their hands a long time ago, and they got tired of raising their hand and saying these are what my needs are, and so it's not complicated. It's just a lack of trust. Why should I bother spending any of my free time trying to do X or Y when nothing ever changes, and I never gain any traction.

2.2

2	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Well, that's
3	right. So, how do we empower people even from the
4	beginning to feel oh, I'm getting a little bit of
5	traction?

Will take back what you're saying and—and figure out if I can think of other creative things to do it, but I-I think the issue is more that there are—I've been here before. How is this different?

so much. I mean I guess on privatization—Sorry. Last thing. There's a real disconnect there, too between what residents want, what leaders want. No one wants to privatize, of course, but, you know, pulling our residents and giving accurate information is incredibly important. Thank you.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, earlier I asked about resident engagement, and I asked if there were any resident input or feedback into this agreement and, you know, we know that there was—there was—there are cuts. How do you—I guess the concept was how—how do you define input right? And what we—but my—my—how I define that is like I said earlier

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

were there any residents at that table? Right? there any residents that were part of the discussions with SDNY with HUD with NYCHA with the city when the agreement was being finalized, and they were not. And then I have here: Will resident input be solicited and incorporated as NYCHA makes its institutional changes? They should, right, because the 964 Regulations speak directly to resident involvement. They are supposed to be involved at every stage and they are not, and we know that there is a-there's We know that there's RAD . We know that there are resident leaders who are involved and, you know, they may have a board a full board and maybe they don't because there was no-no assistance of help with the resident elections, and they don't constitute a full board, but they're very active. We know that there have been stakeholder agreements formed with the different infill projects, and we know that there were stakeholder agreements with the RAD in the past and everything else, but at the end of it all we go back to there's no real level of formal commitment to the residents. And when I asked a question about no judicial oversight and what does that mean and what's the difference with this agreement, we know good and

2	damn well that Judge Pauley actually kept saying over								
3	and over and over that there needs to be some level								
4	of formal resident input, and we've heard this about-								
5	talk over and over and over again about what								
6	that looks like what it could look like, what it								
7	should look like, and I testified at the hearing, and								
8	the public advocate-previous Public Advocate Tish								
9	James testified at the hearing and we all said the								
10	same thing. Residents should have what—there should								
11	be a formal process or agreement or arrangement.								
12	There should be a formal position of residents being								
13	at the table, and when we talk about I wrote here:								
14	Not just what they want, but, you know, asking them								
15	the question about, you know, what would you like to								
16	see, and we know that they've already said that what								
17	they would like to see. But we have residents that								
18	are skilled and have a level of expertise. We have								
19	residents who are property managers and work for the								
20	City of New York. We have residents that are								
21	actually working in other developments with HPD and-								
22	and-and-so, they-they have the skillset. They have								
23	the wherewithal to be able to provide tangible input								
24	and feedback, but they don't because there's no								
25	formal place for them. And so, you can go back and								

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

say, you know, we'll take it into consideration, but we have-I've only been here a year, but I know that I've heard this same theme for decades. And so at what point as you are actually looking at the action plans and that we have an agreement, and you're trying to come up with what is going to be the case moving forward. This should already be a plan as to how the residents will have a formal input and not some resident advisory committee that, you know, that has three pages-I mean three-three sentences in the agreement. I think that's just disrespectful this, and so, we know what the right thing is, and the right thing is to have a formal agreement and a formal arrangement with the residents to be at the table during all of this, and it's just about giving a damn and caring enough to make that happen, and prioritizing that. And I-I just wanted to add that piece of it. I guess accountability. [laughs] Right? Let me call the lease a transparency, accountability Say that. Okay. Council Member Torres and then Council Member Gjonaj and then, but we're going to have now put it on a timer because we have to hear from the residents [background comments] who are now here.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2		CO	UNCIL	MEI	MBI	ER TOP	RRES:	Let	me.	How
3	much-how	much	time	do	I	have?				

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: It's the second round. The second round.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: How Much time do I have? Five please, five please.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Two-minute clock.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Oh, okay. Let me go quick then. So, there was an article in the city by Greg Smith that reported that Buck Schwartz who is the newly appointed Monitor had to resign as Receiver after the SEC-SEC and Security and Exchange Commission accused him of a conflict of interest in running up fees. According to the article, Mr. Schwartz was a court appointed receiver in civil case filed by SEC and its Platinum Management, a Hedge Fund for operating a Ponzi Scheme. Mr. Schwartz was in charge of dispersing funds to investors who fell victim to the Ponzi Scheme. According to the article, the SEC estimated at that Mr. Schwartz's Receivership ran up professional fees that made up 40% of the cash on hand. What's the existing budget for the Federal Monitor?

2.2

2	KATHERINE GARCIA: So, I don't have a
3	budget for the Federal Monitors because they are not
4	contractually engaged with NYCHA. They are
5	contractually engaged with the City of New York.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Well, do you know

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Well, do you know which department?

 $\label{eq:KATHERINE GARCIA: With the Law} % \begin{center} \begi$ 

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Law Department.

KATHERINE GARCIA: And so they will be— and that will go to the Comptroller's Office to prepare a contract.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] So, are you aware—are you aware of any cap on the expenses or the fees that the Federal Monitor could charge?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I saw one that was specific to BARTS (sic) fees for this year. I don't recall exactly what the number is but, I did not see a cap on should he decide to bring in other consultants that he wanted for special expertise.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: So, there's no cap on consulting fees, right? Now, obviously the—the Monitor is going to partner with NYCHA to create

2.2

an organization plan, but there is a scenario in which SDNY and HUD could impose an organization plan over the objections of the City and NYCHA. We have to bear the cost of the Organization Plan.

KATHERINE GARCIA: But at the end of the day, the day they can't remove the Chair without the city's cooperation.

talking about the removal of the Chair, but they could impose even more unfunded mandates on the city, and I just want since I have 25 seconds, you know, one of my criticisms of the agreement is that it imposes new requirements without new federal resources, but it's even worse than that. The press release from the Trump Administration indicates, and as you noted earlier that the Trump Administration is proposing the elimination of the Capital Budget.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

Administration is cutting your budget or proposing cuts to your budget at a time when you are expected to meet more requirements [bell] not less, and if I can fit in one more question. So that's—that's in

2.2

2 the future that if—if the Trump Administration Budget
3 goes forward—

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

cuts at the moment from HUD? I know that one of the sources of possible cuts in real time can be proration. Right, you don't receive 100% of the funding to which you are legally entitled. You receive a percentage of the funding to which you're legally entitled. So, has there been any adjustment in the proration that could result in the loss of federal funding?

the final on what HUD will put out. They, you know, didn't work for a little at the beginning of the year, but the numbers nationally looked good, and so we are anticipating actually being in pretty good shape on the capital front for this Fiscal Year. You know, it is always concerning when it gets zeroed out at the federal level, but that actually also had, you know, we are going to have to fight, and our Congressional Delegation is going to have to fight to make sure that we continue to keep the capital

2.2

money in place, but this is the anxiety that we have
every year in terms on, you know, being zeroed out of
and having to come back and make sure that we get the
money put in. So at this point in time we haven't
seen the final proration from HUD yet, but we don't
anticipate that they will--

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: [interposing] Any guidance form HUD on the proration?

KATHERINE GARCIA: They—they have not guided us in any way that would suggest negative.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay.

KATHERINE GARCIA: He's happy to have more time.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [laughs]
Council Member Gjonaj.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Thank you, Chair. How many lawsuits are you aware of that are against NYCHA including the one I'm familiar with is the Legal Aid Rent Reductions. What other lawsuits are NYCHA facing for lack of services and for lead paint and other, you know, things.

KATHERINE GARCIA: I don't have that
number today. I can certainly get it to you.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Do you know what we've paid out, the amount of lawsuits to settle cases?

Wasn't prepared to answer lawsuit questions, but we can certainly pull that—those—that information together. I think that one thing that's a little bit different than the city is that NYCHA has insurance in comparison to the city, which is self-insured. But we will get you the information so you can understand what those numbers look like.

really important as a next step, and why I'm leading into my question. Not only the dollar amounts that we've already paid out that could have gone into repairing NYCHA, but also the liabilities that we now have due to lead paint, which is going to be, which I've heard estimates in the hundreds of millions of dollars to settle these cases in the future, and the unknowns from neglect and from the elevator tragedies, and other—and other conditions that were allowed to continue or because of neglect have lead to bodily harm, injury and in some cases death.

Wouldn't it be smarter for this Administration to say

2.2

let's prevent lawsuits to begin with? Instead of settling these cases in the future, let's spend that money that we know will have to be paid out. Let's put it into these buildings now. Let's address the issues now. Let's make sure that these children are not going to be harmed so [bell] so we don't have to worry about lawsuits in the future.

think that there is no one in the Administration who wants us to be spending money on lawsuits and settling lawsuits instead of other funding, but I will have to get the specifics on what the lawsuits and settlements have been to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: But isn't that what we're doing in essence? Every incident, every tragedy, every bodily harm and incident that leads to death is followed by a lawsuit?

KATHERINE GARCIA: I think that if the city or NYCHA is found negligible—negligent, then yes usually there is a—is a settlement. I'm not sure specifically what deaths you're talking about. I would have to go back to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: [interposing]
Well, there was an incident in Boston Road Plaza. An

2.2

elevator in particular where the person feel through the shaft. The elevator gave way. These are in the tens and tens of millions of dollars that have already been settled, and there's hundreds of millions of dollars more, but I'm really focused on the lead liability where in each instance families have been awarded in the tens of millions of dollars and it's through neglect because we didn't remediate. We allowed the conditions to continue and children were harmed before where there is repairable damage.

MATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] No, I—I don't—I mean I will get you the information on the lawsuits and what the settlements have been. We are happy to provide that to you. Certainly with lawsuits it's not a direction we want to go in, but in all honesty we have really taken a different approach and that is why we were making sure that we were correcting any presumed lead paint hazards, and going through that process very aggressively.

This is all. It shouldn't be strange or--

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Chair and I apologize, if it's going to take us two years just to do testing, the liability that we're going to faced

2.2

with in the event of a child being lead poisoned is going to come with a big dollar amount.

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] And--and and as I--

KATHERINE GARCIA: And-and-and as--and I remind you, we are not intending to wait to do the remediation until after the testing is done. We are doing that now. We will continue to do that as we either have changes in the family composition in the units or as we identify any new presume lead-based hazards. They really are not-we are-we are making sure that we are protecting children earlier than the completion of the testing, and that the completion of the testing really is to drive what our long-term solution is. So they're short-term ensuring that we are correcting any presumed lead-based paint hazards, and protecting children in the short term as we work towards a longer term lead-free NYCHA.

COUNCIL MEMBER GJONAJ: Just putting it on the record. We're going to be faced with some major dollar amounts in settlements, you know, that could have been avoided from today for the period

2.2

that in the foreseeable future in incidents and lead poisoning cases that we're not aware of, and that's because are not remediating lead in these housing units now.

RATHERINE GARCIA: So we are remediating lead in these housing units now. We are not abating them, but we are remediating them—remediating them now. I want to be very clear, and on the record that for a child under six we have gone in and done a visual. We have correct that lead paint—paint—that lead paint— hazard now. That is what we are doing right now. That is the—the many corrections that we have made in the last few weeks and so you are correct to say that we will not have fully abated those, but we have corrected those immediate hazards now.

don't—I think the point was made. We went on record. You have someone that's pregnant today that will have a child born with lead poisoning, and it's because of our neglect and it's time—time is not our friend. That child's time and endangerment because of our inability or unwillingness to prioritize that child's safety, and that means all hands on deck. You can

bring in the experts from around the country to test
these units in a much shorter period of time and we
can get into these units. We mediate, we can get rid
of, we can abate for the safety of that child and
future liabilities, and every dollar that we spend
today is a dollar saved. That's my point. Two years
in 20 years in the hundreds of millions of dollars in
settlement is a poor way to spend our tax dollars.
That does not make us good stewards of tax dollars as
well the-the real priority: Protecting our children.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.

Council Member Menchaca followed by Council Member

Rosenthal with just a quick follow-up.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you,

Chair. The Agreement requires NYCHA to focus on

physical and the quality of life issues. A blog

posed on March 9<sup>th</sup> by Jennifer Lewis wrote about

structural issues in 14 different developments that

engineers found some structural issues that are going

to require a possible shutting down of these homes

and houses. Is this on your—is this on your radar at

all?

KATHERINE GARCIA: No.

2.2

2	COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: No. Okay. So
3	it's like it's going through the Facebook world right
4	now, and so I wanted to offer that opportunity.

5 KATHERINE GARCIA: But not particularly.
6 You—I'm old. I don't do really—

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: [interposing] I hear you, which is why our transparency model and commitment is going to offer an opportunity for us to share information and that--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, yes, I'm happy to have you--

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Which is really exciting.

Would like to get it from you. (sic)

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: I'm going to share with you and you on a continuum. It would be great to kind to get some--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.

council Member Menchaca: --good information out because people feel like this is the opportunity for people to get removed. Second, a senior center, and this came up earlier with facilities. There's a facility in Red Hook that got

1

- renovated recently. It was-it was like
  astronomically larger in budget and time and it's
  still not ready.
- 5 KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes.
- 6 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: So, let's come 7 back and—and I just want to mention it.
- 8 KATHERINE GARCIA: It says that its 9 formal name is the Red Hook Community Center.
- 10 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: the Red Hook
  11 Senior Center.
- 12 KATHERINE GARCIA: Senior Center. Okay.
- 13 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: The Senior
- 14 Center. I mean there's also the—the Community Center
- 15 | next door, but-but there's a real focus on-on that
- 16 project, and I think that's going to be part of our
- 17 | tour with Velazquez, and then really the last
- 18 | question this is like the concept of participatory
- 19 democracy and the values of transparency and
- 20 relations you're building. I also agree
- 21 participatory budgeting is really our first step.
- 22 It's not the end all. It's the beginning of a
- 23 conversation in relationship building that really
- 24 empowers people to not just bring their ideas, but we
- 25 | bring money with PD. There's money and that gets

2.2

2 things started, which is exciting. The Community
3 Advisory Board--

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

thinking about that? When can we get that going?

Let's get that up and running and what's the timeline for that, and included in your answer can you talk a little bit about moving and transitioning out of Interim Chair and what the process is for the people so they can understand that there is a process that you're taking to either exit soon, X whatever time and what the process is. Is there a review? Who are you looking at? How is the job search going?

Iike Community Advisory Board is driven by the

Monitor in some respects in order to make it so that
he has independent access to a lot of the
stakeholders, and I know that he has been out there.
That's—and some of his first meetings have been with
residents. We obviously will do whatever is required
to be supportive of that particular role, and then in
terms of the process for finding a permanent chair
there is a—there are lists created jointly between
HUD, the city and the U.S. Attorney's Office, and

2.2

then the Mayor selects off the list. And so, I think
that they have been trying to go through and recruit
and vet people to be on the list so that the Mayor
can make a decision. I'm not sure what the timing
will be, and so, I assume that for the next two weeks
or months I'm here.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: One quick.

Just a question for my colleagues. Has anyone met with the Monitor? Council Member Torres or Council Member Gjonaj, have you met with the Monitor yet?

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I would love that. Can we do that?

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: That would be great to just have—be able to meet with the Monitor as he's going out and meeting with the residents as well because we represent the residents and we spend a lot of time on these issues and figuring out how we can be helpful and—and a partner. So, that would be great.

KATHERINE GARCIA: I will-I will let him know.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: A quick question. You were talking about accountability and

2.2

transparency. On the boilers have you been able-do you know from your staff if they've been able to change over to a system where whatever is happening with each boiler isn't just marked on a piece of piece of paper with pencil right at the location of a boiler, but instead put on some sort of updated central database?

is the paper process at each development, but they're—it's getting captured by the Heating Desk, all of the information there, and then if there's an issue then it's created—it's creating work orders for that, but I can get you exactly what the process looks like and how that—the information moves. I mean there's a lot of work we still—we still have to do on our IT systems to make it so that we can be faster, and we can—and give you more information in an even more timely manner.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: It starts—Okay, I didn't quite understand what you said.

KATHERINE GARCIA: There—there still is gap, but we are actually—we also have like—there—there still is paper at every single site. There still is paper there. That was what your initial

2.2

question was, but we are tracking with happens with the boilers in terms of their maintenance with the Maintenance system. So, you know, is it the coupling? Is it the—the cooler—the cooling ring, coils? You know, you know, what did we do? Is capture it in part because we want to make sure that we are getting to the things that break. I mean I know that there already work orders for when spring comes or warmer weather because we can't take it down right now. We know that pipe is leaking. It's just going to have to leak until the winter season is over, and then we can repair it. I know it sounds horrible, but it's like, you know, that is just the facts of the matter.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Well, I did see that as an indicator of transparency, and accountability. I—I would love it if at one point you were able—NYCHA was able to come to one of these meetings and say, you know, we have 5,000 boilers. Here's the status of each one, and the last time of when each was repaired, and here's how we're quickly we respond [bell] to a work order. It's more getting out that large responsibility

2	KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] So, you
3	know what, but that is I think—I am sorry. I wasn't
4	really understanding what you were looking for, but I
5	think that actually we can do that. Like we can tell
6	you—I mean there are actually some boilers that are
7	relatively reliable, and then you have—I mean they're
8	actually up 99% of the time, but we have sort of that
9	information at the development level. I'm not sure
10	boiler by boiler because obviously the plants
11	sometimes serve multiple developments, but I think
12	that we-let me think about how to do something to be
13	more transparent to you, and what—what the timeframe
14	could be because I think that would be important.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And not show
16	it to me. No, no, no, just the residents
17	KATHERINE GARCIA: I mean to all the
18	electeds. To anybody who might
19	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]
20	Or to the residents.
21	KATHERINE GARCIA: My feeling is always

22 that I want-I want the resident leaders to have the information so that they are go-to people, but then elected at the same time. It's sort of I-I view that

23

24

24

25

that you want to-

1

- 2 MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: No. Thank you. 3 I've been also watching downstairs. You've all have pretty much covered it. Thank you. 4
- 5 KATHERINE GARCIA: We've been very 6 thorough.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [off mic] Yes.
- 8 [laughter] [background comments]
- 9 KATHERINE GARCIA: Great.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, you feel
- like your work is--11

together.

- 12 KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] I feel 13 like we're going to be spending a lot of quality time 14
- 15 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: It's-well, 16 we've been pretty thorough but we've-I have in front 17 of me 14 pages of questions, and I think we only 18 actually got through 50% of them, and so we do have--
- KATHERINE GARCIA: You know, if you have 19
- 21 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: [interposing] 2.2 work that we'll be able to submit.
- KATHERINE GARCIA: Yes, submit them to 23 24 us. I'm happy to have—to answer them in the written

20

the--

2.2

form since we're I guess losing the room, to make

sure you're getting all of the answers that you need.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Uh-hm. So, with that being said, I just want to close out with we've heard of the goals that were developed within the Agreement itself, and we don't know how-we still don't know how the timelines were generated in a sense and then we have costs that are still unknown related to the Agreement and the goals, and we are really—I'm not sure how much further we are along with this discussion over the past three hours and 15 minutes and the end goal was to ensure the residents that things are being done, and that there's a plan moving forward and not just constant, you know, we're working on it, we're working it—

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: --but there's something that's concrete, and like right now at this very moment I'm still uncertain as to what's happening, and so if I'm uncertain, then I know our residents must be, and we'll hear from them in a few minutes. And so with that, you know, what's realistic? What's a realistic timeline, and so I-I just really hope that this discussion will continue,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

and we'll have—there wouldn't be—there's no need for constant oversight hearings, but we can have some real roundtable discussions with the residents—

KATHERINE GARCIA: Uh-hm.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: --being able t provide the level of input and feedback that's necessary, and so I look forward to the next steps, and I know we're going to see you again on Thursday.

KATHERINE GARCIA: You know, I think-I think that that he gets to do that. Vito is going to do the next one, and I'll do the Budget. I feel like one hearing per week is fair to support the workload a little bit, but thank you. I feel like we still have work to do to make things clearer for the Council, and we will work diligently to be able to provide you with that, and I actually-I sort of am understanding the visual format that I think would be I, too, enjoyed the matrix visual use of useful. information, but let me think about how to make it so that we can do that quickly, and get it to you so that you can then hold us accountable. I feel like I have problem being transparent or being held accountable because at the end of the day, the residents know whether or not we're getting it done

2.2

or we're not getting it done, and they're not quiet people. The residents are not quiet and they're—they really know what's happening on the ground. So, there's no point in me trying to tell you things are good when things are not good because you're going to know. So, our job is here to hopefully we'll be as transparent and say look we've got challenges, but that you see trends that make life better for the people that you represent and for the residents of NYCHA.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay. So, before you go and before we hear from the residents, the Majority Leader has a-

KATHERINE GARCIA: I thought you had no questions.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I couldn't help myself. This is such an important hearing and I've been in hearings certainly all day today, but I-I wanted to ask because this issue comes a lot with my NYCHA tenants in terms of reducing the rat population and mice and roach. So, it's-it's stated in the Signatory that NYCHA shall reduce its rat population by 50% and its mice and roach population by 40%. So, how does NYCHA handle this issue currently? Is there

2.2

an in-house system that handles this or is there a contract with a company that has an expertise in this?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So, we're going to have to hire someone with an expertise in how the counting goes because as you know, for rats in particular usually the—one of the biggest signs of there are more rat boroughs, and so NYCHA has a lot of facilities where we've been part of the Mayor's Rat Program, and that has been doing investments in everything from, you know, actually putting concrete on cellar floors to—under the door sweeps, but they've also been exterminating the hell out of rats, and using the dry ice and killing off those boroughs. I think that we are—

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: [interposing] And who's doing it? NYCHA?

EXATHERINE GARCIA: Those are NYCHA--NYCHA exterminators, and we are hiring additional exterminators to deal with the pest challenges in the NYCHA and there also is-is work being done in terms of just managing garbage more effectively to eliminate the food source. So, we will have to hire special pest person--

2.2

2 MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: To deal with the 3 rat?

KATHERINE GARCIA: To deal with like—to deal with all of the—the pest questions, but, you know, we've seen— For example since we started the effort on rats, we've seen a 28% reduction in the boroughs and those developments that were identified since the start of the Mayor's Rat Program. But we are going to have to hire someone in terms of the roaches and how do you figure out what is 50% what? [bell] But—so that is something we are—we are focused on.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, how does extermination happen throughout the entire NYCHA system? So, let's say for roaches an exterminator, is there an in-house company or is there a contracted company and what does look like? Do they come in and there's a specific day? Let's say every second Tuesday and Thursday of the month they come and they exterminate? Do you have to sign your name onto a list, or how does it—how does it actually—what is the policy throughout the entire development?

KATHERINE GARCIA: So my understanding is usually that a—a resident makes a complaint of a pest

2.2

issue, and that the exterminator comes and we try and make the schedule works for the resident? You know, obviously, it doesn't help if they're working and we come by, and so that is usually the process for how we deal with that. In terms of some significant infestations, we will actually also try and do all of the apartments around the—the one that has been identified as having an infestation. So, that is the main process. There isn't usually a regularly scheduled as I understand it.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: There's not usually a regular scheduled

KATHERINE GARCIA: I will make sure of that. I have not heard of the date. So, if I am wrong, I will correct it.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Let me just say this: I wouldn't say oddly enough, but oddly enough, I have a lot of experience with this issue, right, and from what I know because I—I've hired a private company because the landlord in my building wouldn't handle the issue. So, I had to take matters into my own hands, right. So, what I actually have to do is on an every two-week basis I have to pay for myself and everyone that lives above me because many of them

are seniors on a fixed income, and everyone around
me. So, it's one of those where if you're not coming
on an every let's say two-week basis and you're not
doing baiting, trap and gels and all of those
different sorts of things, if you're just treating
like a problem, it's never going to really be solved
unless there is an entire building systematic process
to deal with rats, roaches, mice and that sort of
thing. It can't just be targeted at one apartment
and it can't just be a one-time thing. It has to be
for the life of the building really to do that or
else they will come back and the entire building has
to understand that we have a challenge and we have to
address that challenge.

KATHERINE GARCIA: So to that question, we do bait quarterly, but the other thing is I want to—I agree with you. You have to take a very particularly on some of the larger pests is you've got to make sure the holes are filled up. You know, you've got to—you've got to make sure that there isn't a habitat for them to live in. You need to remove the food sources.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Uh-hm.

2.2

KATHERINE GARCIA: You need to take a systemic look at what is bringing them, and so, you know, that is really what we're trying to get to, and to make it so that we really begin to see improvements because nobody—nobody likes pests.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: No, I mean it's--

--it's

KATHERINE GARCIA: No.

unsanitary, it's unhealthy, it's problematic to people with children--

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO:

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] A trigger for asthma.

others. Just I—I—I'm happy to see your leadership in this position, and doing the incredible work that you've done with Sanitation. I would just say that with all due respect I'm hearing your answers, but at the same time I also feel like—I feel like I'm not still coming away with a systemic understanding of how NYCHA is going to achieve these goals, and how their process is for actually dealing with this issue. It doesn't seem like it's a comprehensive systematic way in which we deal with issues from

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 rats, roaches, dead bugs and all of these different 3 sorts of things, and these are real issues that--

KATHERINE GARCIA: [interposing] So-so--

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: --I understand.

KATHERINE GARCIA: No, no, and I would say you are correct. I think we are further along in our processes about how to attack certain things such as mold and it did take us a little while to sort of get our feet under us. Moving forward, we sort of know where we want to go on boilers, sort of how the process in paint for presumed lead paint. Do I think we're as far along on exactly how we're going to deal with roaches and mice? No. We're probably a little bit further along about how to deal with roaches because we have some other tools in place, but I think the thinking through on the pest piece still need work for us to actually tell you that we have this thought-we know exactly what we're going to do. I don't think we're there yet. I think that's some place we need to get to, and while all issues are important and critical issues around mice, roaches and bed bugs dramatically impact your quality of life and your peace of mind because it happens as soon as you walk through the door, and as soon as you go to

2.2

bed. It's like you just can't function. So, I would like if the—if the next time we're at this place that this council is able to understand and hear what is the real comprehensive solution to this, and how we putting real resources forward to this and—and who are the companies hopefully that they're MWBEs that can address many of these issues moving forward.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Okay. Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Uh-hm.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.

KATHERINE GARCIA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: And so next we will hear from and you're going—you're going to remain, right for the resident panel? John Derek

Norvell, Letitia Taylor and Mrs. Brown, and are there any other residents that are here that I did not call? [background comments/pause] And then after we hear from the residents, we will have one last panel with Legal Aid, CSS and Neighborhood Defender Service of Harlem. [background comments/pause] So, I need for you to just—

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Oh, I see.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: --press the

25 | button, yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2				JOHN	DEREK	NORVELL:	Yes.	Firstly,	Ι'd
3	like	to	say	some	thing	about			

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: And can you state your name?

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Good. Yes. I'm John Derek Norvell. I live in Abraham Lincoln Houses, and my organization is the African-American Teamster Committee of New York. The Teamsters is the oldest holiday of New York and, in fact, we start-we start preparing for that every year. This year it will be June 15<sup>th</sup> at the African Burial Ground National Monument. We always have it there. Anyway, I am [coughs]-firstly, I would like to say something that I don't if the panel is aware of. I went to a hearing-well, I went to a resident meeting three weeks ago at-at Frederick Douglas Houses and this is the place where Ms. Lynn Stafford was at. She's being going, and last time she was at-it was the other day she was Queensborough houses. She came with the resident president from the White House, and they came with a gigantic banner. The banner was larger than that television thing over there, and it stated-it said in color that Donald Trump was the savior of public housing. Also, it was a diagram

2 that showed how Donald Trump would control the Monitor. Gale Brewer was also in attendance there as 3 well as Mr. Siegel who's, you know, was in charge—in 4 5 charge of the ACLU, and so we all sat there shocked 6 at this, and we, you know, Donald Trump has been 7 trying to get the waterfront properties for years of public housing, and we don't know if he's going to do 8 that through the main then-the Resident President was 9 saying, you know, that's why we must support 10 President Trump and he'll do all the fixing and all 11 12 of this and all of that. And I said to a couple of 13 people, I said beware of Greeks bearing strange 14 gifts, you know, and so-so this is an issue that is 15 of very seriousness. We are afraid of him using RAD 16 as an-as an instrument to really just take over 17 public housing. So, I'd like to read briefly what I 18 wrote about these issues and RAD. Greetings. name is John Derek Norvell of the African-American 19 20 Teamsters Committee of New York. My members are residents of public housing. We are activists as 21 2.2 well as historians, and my statement will be brief. 23 We are asking for an Intro to protect us against the claws in RAD that states that if there is a default 24 in any public housing agency in the country, the 25

2	properties will go to private developers who have tax
3	credits because of investments. They will take the
4	buildings and other edifices, raise them as they
5	wish, and build new housing. Mayoral privilege does
6	not disclose who these individuals are and we fear
7	massive constructive evictions will be the result.
8	The municipalities will retain the land, but there
9	will be total privatization of housing all to the
10	detriment to public housing residents. Therefore, we
11	ask that City Council members help us to draft an
12	Intro of protection for public housing residents, a
13	bill of public housing rights to be signed by the
14	Mayor or an overrider of his veto if that becomes
15	necessary. I don't know if the City Council has the
16	power to override as the, you know, the, you know,
17	the senate and the Congress of the Federal Government
18	but I hope do if that's the case and my contact
19	information is the following: Dr. John Derek Norvell
20	and my number 5-646 not 545. I'm sorry for the typo.
21	646-559-2218 and email is Yared Y-R-E-E-D 1954 at
22	Hotmail.com, and my address is 2175 Fifth Avenue, Apt
23	2B, Abraham Lincoln Houses, New York, New York 137.
24	[bell] Thank you, John Derek Yared Andy Miguel
25	Norvell.

2 LAKISHA TAYLOR: Hi. My name is Lakisha 3 Taylor. I'm from Holmes Towers. I came to speak about everything that's going on basically with 4 5 Fetner, and I wanted to know if the pay-I'm sorry. She spoke about this PACT deal and if that's the same 6 7 as the Next Gen-Next Gen development because what we have Next Gen is basically Fetner putting a building 8 on our development at Holmes Towers which they talk 9 about a partnership with the residents and everyone 10 at Holmes Towers-not everyone because I'm not going 11 12 to speak for everyone, but the majority of the 13 tenants did not want this development, and they moved forward with it even after multiple-multiple with 14 15 the-tenants and-and multiple meetings. The majority 16 of the tenants said that they did not want it, and 17 I'm very confused because in this deal Fetner is 18 giving NYCHA \$25 million when NYCHA needed about \$32 million and the projected deficit for our development 19 Holmes Towers is \$59 million. So, if you cannot make 20 a deal where you are going to get enough capital to 21 2.2 preserve Holmes Towers, which is just two buildings, 23 how are you going to move forward and help NYCHA? This woman sat here and said that the Mayor is the 24 high NYCHA. I find that hard to believe when you are 25

making deals where you can't even get enough money to
preserve our buildings. I live very close to the
Mayor and I sat and I watched him sit next to Shola
as she lied about the children with lead poisoning.
I was terrified that my son was going to have lead
poisoning, and every time he goes to the doctor I say
test him, test him, test him. And now you are going
to run for the President of the United States of
America, and you have-you can't even protect NYCHA
so, I have no faith in him whatsoever, and then you
want to talk about accountability and you—there is no
accountability because time and time again NYCHA just
lies. They say, Oh, we-we-we did meetings. We-we
listened to the people, but you did not because
again, in this development we said we did not want
this building, and they—they are still moving forward
with this building to the point where they just
with this building to the point where they just bypassed ULURP, which I'm sure if they went through
bypassed ULURP, which I'm sure if they went through
bypassed ULURP, which I'm sure if they went through ULURP, this building would not be built. This
bypassed ULURP, which I'm sure if they went through ULURP, this building would not be built. This building is going to be 50 stories and that's 25
bypassed ULURP, which I'm sure if they went through ULURP, this building would not be built. This building is going to be 50 stories and that's 25 stories taller than all the buildings around it. So,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

have here. So, you cannot sit here and tell me that this Mayor is for NYCHA because time and time again this is proving that he is not for NYCHA. [bell] So, I have so much I want to say. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: You can have one more minute.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: Oh, thank you so much. [laughs] So, let's talk about the elevators. We just got new elevators in our development. From day one these elevators are only two years old, if you press 25 it stops on 24. We-we spend time and time again reporting this. It's still not fixed. Hot water. I just spent-I just saw-I just saw Channel 11. I had to call them in order for them to come and fix my hot water. I started reporting the hot water problem in January. It started—it was so bad that I had over 12 tickets for the month of February. February is only 28 months. This is ridiculous. When I went to our tenant association meeting oh well, you're the only one. I'm not the only one because I had my group of friends there. So when I have a ticket, I call about five people and I know at least five people are calling it. Then let's talk about the robocalls. Your robocalls are-you're calling and we're calling

2 you back and telling you your hot water on. My hot water is not on so I have to call you back and 3 4 tell you my hot water is not on. So, this is 5 ridiculous. This is just again a bait and switch of 6 let me tell you what-what I want you to hear. 7 this is not correct. This is just B.S. 8 again them trying to make you think that they are doing what they're supposed to be doing. So, again, 9 10 this NYCHA again bait and switch trying to make you feel like they're doing their best when they really 11 12 This is not and then they leave the tickets are not. open. I had time and time again where my ticket is 13 14 open, oh, because we're still working on it. But 15 you're not fixing the problem, and again, if I 16 started complaining about this in January, why do we 17 have to wait until February when the-the boiler it's 18 broken now. Again, let's be proactive. You want to talk about accountability, where's your 19 20 accountability if I'm telling you in January. see my son have a hole in his coat, I'm not going to 21 2.2 wait 'til the sleeve falls off until I buy him a new 23 This is ridiculous. How come we have to keep going this far? Contractors. Let's talk about these 24 25 contractors. Like you say, the contractor of the

2 elevator I told them beforehand there's a problem. The-the superintendent told me don't hold the button. 3 Excuse me. It's an elevator. How am I supposed to 4 get it to come if I don't hold the button, if I don't 5 6 press it? Well, if you press it too many times it's 7 going ax out the whole system. That doesn't make any sense. I've seen these contractors in big buildings 8 downtown. This is a NYCHA development. So, you're 9 telling me we're getting a big contractor here, but 10 in a NYCHA building I can't press this button too 11 12 many times? That makes no sense. So, now let's talk 13 about the fact that you're putting things on your 14 website. I'm sorry. How many 92-year-olds do you 15 know are on the web? Not many. I'm sorry, that 16 doesn't help them. I'm not going to be at home 17 checking my phone every 15 minutes for these updates 18 that you claim you are putting on your website. is not logical. This is not helpful. 19 This does not 20 help your every man. So we need to come up with a better system. Your robocall system does not work. 21 2.2 don't want you calling me every 15 minutes. 23 call, I want you to call me and say okay, I'm sorry, Ms. Taylor it's not working, we're going to fix it. 24 25 I shouldn't have to wait five days. When this-when

2 our hot water went out, I had hot water for one hour over two days, and then I had two days where I had no 3 4 hot water. It took them I think about five days to 5 fix my hot water, and again let's go back because I 6 told you I started telling them in January that there 7 was a problem, and it took almost until my-actually, it took until March for them to fix it, and they 8 didn't tell me anything. It's broken. We're working 9 10 on it. It's broken. We're working on it, and it's not until I called Channel 11 and I was like I have 11 12 hot water problem and it was like okay, no, no, no, 13 we're working on it. And then, they put up the 14 notice at 7:00-at 7:00 at night one time. 15 I'm in my house. I have two children. I'm home. 16 are you putting up a notice at 7:00 at night that I 17 don't have hot water? I know that because I'm in my 18 house, and I know I don't have the water, but what kind of notification is that? People-some elderly 19 20 people don't leave their house sometimes for two days at a time, but again, like she said yes they do have 21 2.2 a roving system of people that work, but again, 23 that's not helpful if I'm in my house. You put one notice in the lobby. I have 25 floors in my house. 24 25 That doesn't help me. I live on 25. If I didn't

2	leave my house, it doesn't help me. You put that
3	notice at 7:30, I'm in my house already. It doesn't
4	help me and again, the work will start at 1:00 and go
5	to 7:00, and when those people can't do it, because
6	they couldn't because they couldn't figure out what
7	the problem is and they still don't know. So, any
8	minute now I can go home and I have no hot water, and
9	I can be in the same predicament of no hot water for
10	two days, and I think that's ridiculous. It's
11	unacceptable and it's like again just like the lead,
12	oh, it's two years. Who wants to live like that?
13	Who wants to live like that? It's unacceptable, and
14	this how it is. We at home deal with this every
15	winter. Every winter it's like oh, we're changing
16	from summer to heat. So, we know that there's this
17	cushion of one month where they have to figure it out
18	of we have to give heat and hot water. So, you have
19	one month of no hot water for today, no heat for
20	today, no hot water for today, and then you have no
21	water at all, and this is-this is NYCHA. This is how
22	they do it. This is how they run it, and this is all
23	the time, and now you have no money from the
24	government and it's okay, and I'm suppose to put my-
25	my thoughts and prayers into the Mayor who's done

- this forever. You sat next to a woman who lied about lead poisoning and testing, and she was, "Oh" and now she's just gone, and doing something else, and I'm supposed to be like, Okay, I believe you now, you-
- 6 you-you-you love us now. I don't. I'm sorry.
- 7 Thank you.

- 8 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you, Ms. 9 Taylor.
- 10 LAKISHA TAYLOR: Thank you.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Mrs. Brown.
- MRS. BROWN: Well, the wind's been
- 13 | knocked out of my sails, but that's alright. I'm
- 14 | very sympathetic, and I'm sorry that you're going
- 15 | through that--
- 16 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I am, too.
- MRS. BROWN: --and I want to add to that,
- 18 and I want to add to that Fetner started out with 33
- 19 stories in the proposal. It's now up 50. The
- 20 capital get at that was \$32 million, and he only gave
- 21 \$25 million for a 99-year lease, and if you calculate
- 22 | it, it comes out to \$88.00 per square foot. That's
- 23 | better than the-selling-buying Manhattan. So, I'm-
- 24 I'm very empathetic with what's going on there
- 25 | because they have not been telling him the truth, and

that is privatizing housing, but I'm-I'm here to
address some of my concerns in addition to hers, and
I wanted to thank you, Chair Ampry Samuel and the
Public Housing Committee and the one member that's
left for the opportunity for all stakeholders to
respond to the oversight examining NYCHA's new
agreement with HUD. I am Mrs. Brown affectionately
called Mrs. B, member of NYCHA's CCOP RAD and a
member of Community Board 8 Upper East Side. I have
a disability. I suffer with TBI, Traumatic Brain
Injury. Therefore, I'm requesting that you be
gracious and allow me to finish my statement, which
is short. (1) What was the process in selecting the
Monitor? (2) What was the reason why the CCOP RAD
was not included and/or invited to sit at the table
in the decision making process?

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Uh-hm.

MRS. BROWN: This demonstrates unintentionally a lack of respect. (3) How many names were on the shortlist? (4) Was Atris (sp?) considered as Federal Monitor and/or included in the conversation? If not, why not? It was Atris that believed in the residents, supported the residents and, therefore, filed the 958 Complaint, which brings

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 all of us here today. (5) Does the Monitor understand the full scope of Section 3 programs, 3 which goes beyond reach? (6) Does the Monitor 4 understand that the PLA is in conflict with the 24 5 CFR 135 Regulation and, therefore, the PLA is deemed 6 7 non-compliant? (7) Were there any names of individuals who have more than 15 years of public and 8 assisted housing experience on the list? For 9 example, Sean Donovan--

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: [interposing] Yes. MRS. BROWN: --Lordes Castro Ramirez, Sandra Raquez (sp?), Marilyn Sullivan, Alia Maganaco

(sp?) they have experience in housing and/or receivership.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: [interposing] They do.

MRS. BROWN: (8) Does the Monitor have total independence? If not, why not? [bell] How effective would the Monitor be under the city's authority? (9) Why was the Mon-why has the Monitor reached out to certain TA presidents as opposed to meeting with the CCOP RAD? The CCOP RAD is an elected body of 50 people who represent the developments and assisted housing. To bypass this

2	body shows disrespect and it must be corrected now.
3	In conclusion, I am of the opinion that receivership
4	would be a god thing because it would hopefully
5	remove the politics and serve the residents. Boston
6	Housing Authority, BHA successfully went through
7	receivership under the direction of Sandra Henriquez.
8	BHA's Executive Director is William McGonagle, and he
9	continues to make BHA one of the most efficiently run
10	PHAs in the country. Another option: Break up NYCHA
11	by having east borough be accountable for its needs
12	and operations. Each borough would have a general
13	manager, a manager of operations and manager of
14	construction and maintenance and their own budget, a
15	mini version of NYCHA as it is today. This would be
16	more efficient because each borough has different
17	needs, and each borough's needs would be addressed
18	accordingly. Presently, everything is moving towards
19	RAD, privatized housing

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MRS: BROWN: --which is Section 8, by no one is talking about RAD--

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

MRS. BROWN: --assisted housing and it's problems. There are approximately 250,000 Section 8

2.2

residents in NYCHA's portfolio, and no one is addressing their needs, lack of units, lack of mobile vouchers, slum landlords, et cetera. It is critical that the Monitor and NYCHA start telling residents the truth about converting in place first with demolition, the cost of demolition versus conversion and more importantly, where is the space to house displaced residents? You would need a vacant whole building or an island. At the end of the day we can agree that our home is our castle, and when we put the key in the door, we want to be peaceful—peacefully enjoy our abode. Please keep this in mind, and take the politics out of this, and listen to the residents—

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

MRS. BROWN: --but more importantly, show them how to take advantage of HUD's Self-Sufficiency Program so that they could move forward, and make room for the next group. Public housing should not be generational. A start for Federal Monitor, and Katherine Garcia must meet with the total CCOP RAD leadership--

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

25

2	MRS. BROWN:all 50 at the same time
3	instead of reaching out to a selective few. If the
4	Monitor-Federal Monitor does not have the correct
5	oversight, we will be at the same conclusion and end
6	up in receivership. Thank you very much.
7	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you so
8	much, Mrs. B for your testimony. Before you leave,
9	can we get a copy of that? Can we make copies?
10	MRS. BROWN: I will have a copy made for
11	you
12	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.
13	MRS. BROWN:and bring it back for you,
14	but—and I also want to say that they have already
15	started privatizing, and under Sean Donovan
16	JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Hmm.
17	MRS. BROWN:and Sandy Henriquez, they
18	brought Mr. Norvell and 75 other people, myself
19	included from across the nation to come up with TRA,
20	PETRA, CBR and Rental Assistance Demonstration.
21	JOHN DEREK NORVELL: [interposing] and
22	BC. Yes.
23	MRS. BROWN: And we had portions to write
24	and I was responsible for tenants' protection rights.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Uh-hm.

2.2

MRS. BROWN: So, the-the RAD Regulation as you see it today, I was responsible for tenants' protection, but I don't support RAD.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Neither do I.

MRS. BROWN: I think it's wrong, but this is what we have to deal with especially in New York because where are you going to put displaced people--

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

MRS. BROWN: --and converting in place is not good. The walls are concrete. When they drill, they're only going to do Band-Aids on—on the plumbing. All that plumbing needs to be tear—torn down. The stock is 75 plus years old.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{JOHN}}$  DEREK NORVELL: We have floods all the time.

MRS. BROWN: And—and so it's—it's—it's really a problem, and they need to start telling the residents: We don't know what to do. Let's get together and talk about options—

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

MRS. BROWN: --but instead they come up with different acronyms for PACT, RAD and everything else only to confuse--

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

- 2 MRS. BROWN: --the residents, and they 3 confuse you, and it's not right.
- CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Were you at
  the Community Board public hearing? I guess it was
  maybe two weeks ago or so with—
- 7 MRS. BROWN: [interposing] No, I was not. 8 Unfortunately, I was out of town.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay.
- MRS. BROWN: Yes, but--
- 11 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: How about you,
- 12 Ms. Taylor? (sic)
- MRS. BROWN: But—this—this—this is—I'm
- 14 sorry.

- 15 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Ms. Taylor,
- 16 were you there?
- 17 LAKISHA TAYLOR: The what? With-
- 18 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: The public
- 19 hearing with the Community Board related to the
- 20 | Fetner Project?
- 21 LAKISHA TAYLOR: I, well, I had to leave
- 22 | early. I know it went on until about midnight.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Uh-hm.
- 24 LAKISHA TAYLOR: But I was there at the
- 25 | beginning, and I want to just touch on that because

MRS. BROWN:

Uh-hm.

2.2

LAKISHA TAYLOR: --but again 1780 is further down. We are a little bit higher and that is the problem. The basement continues to fill with water. So, it took them much longer. It took them about two to three weeks longer to shore up the basement of those buildings, and so that the biggest problem, and this is the lied that they keep telling us: Oh, we-we're not starting to build yet. We're not starting to build yet because, again, they have to figure out what they're going to do with that ground because the ground is not buildable, but they're not saying anything, but we know that this is a problem.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Also, we also have a problem with—they have no carpenters. Can you imagine that? No carpenters from NYCHA. A—a door fell on my niece who is blind and she—and she was seriously injured. She's been injured for three weeks, and because it was a door to one of the—the broom closets, and they—we begged them. We said she's blind, and she could get hurt, and they said, I'm sorry. We have no carpenters. Can you imagine no carpenters at a housing development, and niece is—is—

_	COMMITTEE ON TODETC HOODING
2	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL:NYCHA and
3	the Administration testify, and so we-we-we made an
4	attempt to do that, and we had to start the hearing.
5	MRS. BROWN: [interposing] Yes, and I
6	want to thank you. Side bar, I want to thank you for
7	your newsletters. I look forward to them every
8	month. [laughs]
9	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you.
10	Majority Leader Cumbo.
11	MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: A lot of pressure
12	on there.
13	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: I think that
14	there's going to be another starting, another hearing
15	at 2:00. So, we're going to try to wrap up.
16	MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I'll make it
17	brief. Just wanted to ask you in terms of-because
18	this is an issue that I'm very concerned about. It's
19	an issue that our residents speak about quite often.
20	What is your understanding of the Extermination
21	Policies within NYCHA? How would you describe what
22	it is, how it happens on the ground? Just want to

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: It's by appointment.

It is by appointment that we call in, and then there-

23

24

25

know.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

and then if there's a bed bug problem, and there was bed bug problems in our building and stuff, they will come three times by appointment set but what is terrible is that if you're there in the apartment and they start to use that stuff, it gets into your body, and you get sick, and then it's like a sort of a-a-as contamination of-of yourself, and so I got sick, and that was last year, and so I called them of my fear. They said call the poison place if you've been poisoned in that. And so, I said wait a minute, you know, this-this is really unacceptable, but it's by appointment. We have a very good man at Lincoln Houses, but-but the problem is the leaks. The leaks bring on the roaches, and so we have roaches like in the cracks and corners, and so it's something that must be continually done, as was said, and it should be done every two weeks.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: But it's funny that you say that because years ago it used to be a monthly thing—

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: [interposing] That's right.

MRS. BROWN: -- and then it became by appointment. We just had our Tenant Association

2.2

meeting last month, and there was a young lady begging for an appointment because she said she signed up for an appointment, and the person number one did not show up. Number two, gave her a time, which could not work for her, and this was a problem because it seems like now they're changing the company in which that they're working with, and it's—you—you cannot pick the appointment on like what the Chair was just saying. It's not you pick what is convenient for you. They were assigning the appointment for hear. So, again, we talked about in the meeting that like you said, you have to do this to the building. You can't just—

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Uh-hm.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: --go for whoever wants it because again, the roaches are in the lobby, the roaches are in the hallway, the roaches are on the elevator shaft. So, again if—it doesn't matter how clean my apartment is—

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Right.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Right.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: --because if the person

24 next to me is not clean,

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Exactly.

2.2

LAKISHA TAYLOR: --it's going, it's going to come and try and get into my apartment. So, we spoke about that, and promises were made, and I'm sorry to say NYCHA is NYCHA and promises are not kept.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Exactly.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: So, this is a problem because they are not trustworthy, and it's going to be very hard to believe in someone when they are not trustworthy and this is—this is years of broken promises. So, when you cannot even hire someone who is going to be truthful, and you have a history of not being truthful yourself, so what are we to do?

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And which

development are you from again and where are you from?

LAKISHA TAYLOR: I am from Holmes, Holmes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And where is that located?

LAKISHA TAYLOR: It's on the Upper East

Side [bell] at 92<sup>nd</sup>-92<sup>nd</sup> and Eastern (sic) [bell]

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: And I would say--

2.2

2		MAJO:	RITY LEA	DER (	CUMBO:	[int	terposing]	You
3	should	consider	running	for	office	one	day.	

LAKISHA TAYLOR: [laughs]

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: I live in Abraham Lincoln in Harlem. That's  $132^{\rm nd}$  Uptown  $35^{\rm th}$  and from Fifth Avenue to—to the river to the Harlem River.

much for your testimony today. This was for me and for the six years that I've been here there have been so many tenants, residents folks from our community that have articulated the issues of NYCHA so eloquently and so clearly and the fact that it continues to happen year after year after year after year with the most concrete, specific and eloquent speakers that you ever want to meet that are detailing the issues. it's Unfortunate that when NYCHA presents before us, that it's as if they're hearing these issues for the very first time, and these are issues that residents have lived with for decades.

LAKISHA TAYLOR: And I think that's the—
that to me is the saddest part. That's the saddest
part of this whole situation. You hear these things.
It's not new.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

LAKISHA TAYLOR: It's not changing and the only thing that's changing is their plan and it doesn't seem to work. It doesn't change the problem, and you—they want you to say okay, yes, I believe you now, but it doesn't work that way.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Right.

JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Just like this business with the boilers. Now all this boiler stuff. You know, we had new boilers and the problem is we get no heat at all in winter. When had the arctic blast we froze, but in the summer or when it's hot, we get heat. We have the whole story, but there was-after the 4<sup>th</sup> of July several years ago, we had heat during heat wave. We were complaining and complaining, but we were making a joke. (sic) finally came out and they said, what are the pipes doing hot? I said that's what we want to know from you. We're dying in here. Now today it's warm and my place is hot. I mean it's so hot we can't breathe and I blows around the lead dust. We call it the white powder. It blows around. That's why we put in a lot of air things and ventilation and stuff because we were choking with it. It doesn't only hurt children.

	COMMITTEE ON FOBLIC HOUSING 20
2	MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Right.
3	LAKISHA TAYLOR: It hurts adults, too.
4	This now is (sic) several speeds full of lead, you
5	know, and-and so we have that, we have that-we have
6	that problem real seriously.
7	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you,
8	thank you, thank you so much and as you know, it's
9	very important for me to be able to have the
10	residents' voice speak during these hearings. So, I
11	really do appreciate you Mrs. B, Ms. Taylor and Dr.
12	Norvell for coming. We have three more
13	JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL:and we'll be
15	able to get out in time. I-I know the sergeant-at-
16	arms there.
17	JOHN DEREK NORVELL: Okay, alright.
18	Thank you all.
19	CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, next we'll
20	hear from our final panel, Lucy Newman from Legal Ai

hear from our final panel, Lucy Newman from Legal Aid Society, Victor Barr from Community Service Society as well as Anna Loft from Neighborhood Defender Service of Harlem, and then that will close out our hearing today, and we'll just do two minutes on the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- 2 clock so that we'll be able to leave at 2:00.
- 3 | [pause] Who would be good with that?

LUCY NEWMAN: Hi. Good afternoon. name is Lucy Newman from the Legal Aid Society. Thank you so much Chari Ampry-Samuel for holding this important hearing the Legal Aid Society, as I'm sure many of us in this room and throughout the city breathed a big sigh of relief on January 31st when notwithstanding that the HUD Secretary declared NYCHA to be in substantial default of its obligateobligations to provide safety and sanitary housing. At least they were not moving at that time to impose a full HUD receivership or possession of the Housing Authority. We truly believe that an Administrative receiver at this time would not be the best thing for the 6 of 700,000 NYCHA residents that call NYCHA home and certainly for the future of public housing in New York City. With that being said, we do have some comments. I'll focus just on a couple of areas I think that my colleague Vic Barr is going to talk about the resident input, but I wanted to talk about the Monitor. As you know, the monitorship is kind of central to this agreement and could be the key to,

you know, successful oversight and supervision of the

2 reforms and improvements that are going to be coming to NYCHA. We met with the Monitor las week, and we 3 4 had a productive meeting with him. At that meeting 5 we urged him to appoint to his team that he is assembling an individual or number of individuals who 6 7 have a track-a long history of running public housing authorities. So, that there is someone who is part 8 of h is team who understands public housing 9 10 construction, operations and management. We really think that that's key to one of the successes of this 11 12 Monitorship. In terms of the expenses, we're happy to see that in this agreement, the City is the one 13 that's responsible now for paying for the monitorship 14 15 and not NYCHA, which it was under the prior Consent 16 Decree that have been rejected by the judge. But that being said, there are no caps in that agreement 17 18 to the expenses of the Monitor. While the Budget has to be issued publicly, there's no limitation on the 19 20 fees that can be charged. We are very concerned that without caps on expenses, they could easily get out 21 2.2 of control, and cost the city a lot of money. As you 23 know, in 2011, NYCHA hired Boston Consulting Group to do a report on some of its management structure, and 24 that report ended up costing \$10 million. So, we 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

would urge HUD and the City to come to an agreement on putting caps on that expenditure so that the money that is being spent to help reform NYCHA goes to all of those reforms and not-not just to consultants and other industry players. As to the federal and state funding issues, as you know, the agreement [bell] is silent on any additional federal funding, and we're very concerned that without additional federal funding the obligate—the obligations that NYCHA is committed to undertake in that agreement they're not going to be able to comply with, and that through no complying with them, HUD will move for a receivership and at that time city obligations for funding will fall away. So, we urge the Monitor to work with HUD to secure additional funding, and we urge the Monitor to work very quickly with the state and state leaders to release the \$550 million that was allocated to Hunter (sic)-to NYCHA in the past couple of budgets. And—and that—that money when released to NYCHA come without any other ties for review by other state agencies. And then just a little bit on NYCHA 2.0. The success of this agreement is very, very closely tied and co-dependent on the success of NYCHA 2.0, and in particular to the conversion of the 62,000

units from Public Housing to Section 8. NYCHA, as
you know, initially called these conversions, and had
conversions that then started calling the PACT
conversions because they started relying on Section
18 of the U.S. Housing Act to do these conversions
and not just RAD. Section 18 they were forced to use
because the city hasn't been giving them any low-
income tax credit allocations, and so they needed to
do Section 18 so that they could get tenant
protection vouchers. So, we urge the Monitor to work
with the city to get access to those low-income
housing tax credits so that they can make those
richer-the deals richer so that they can more
successfully complete those conversions, and also to
work with HUD to get access to more tenant protection
vouchers so that again they can make the conversions
a success so that at least the remainder of the
reforms that are undergoing onto the agreement can be
successful.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you, Ms. Newman and I look forward to reading your testimony.

VICTOR BACH: My name is Victor Bach.

I'm with Community Service Society. From the start with the original Consent Decree we viewed the

2 Monitor as an opportunity, not only as an opportunity to again provide decent basic living conditions for 3 4 NYCHA [cell phone ringing] residents, but as-excuse 5 me one moment. [cell phone ringing] [laughs] Sorry 6 about that. Not only as an opportunity to provide 7 decent basic living conditions for residents, but to influence changes in the way NYCHA is organized, and 8 much needed reforms in its property management 9 10 operations. But perhaps most importantly, the Monitor serves as a point of accountability for NYCHA 11 12 a point at which NYCHA would be required to account for residents to elected officials and to the broader 13 concerned housing community about the progress it's 14 15 making or the lack thereof. The-Lucy and my 16 colleague Lucy Newman raised the question of the need 17 for additional HUD funding. We know the NYCHA Plan 18 2.0 still has an \$8 billion gap in meeting the \$32 billion capital need. IBO just came out with a 19 20 report this morning indicated that the resources available for the monitoring will probably not be 21 2.2 enough to meet the monitoring objectives. 23 hoping that Bart Schwartz the appointed Monitor will be an ally in making the case to Washington, but we 24 are concerned that if the monitoring effort fails for 25

any reason then HUD, which has declared NYCHA to be
[bell] in substantial default has the-has the right
to put NYCHA into total receivership under HUD, which
would—which would be a very, very sad outcome. So,
we're concerned about the funding question and either
the Monitor and the delegation securing additional
special HUD funding for NYCHA or getting public
housing included in the National Infrastructure
Initiative. [coughs] Finally, we want to strongly
support the need for a stakeholder oversight entity
in the monitoring process. Under the agreement, the
Monitor is required to meet with and produce a report
every three months, a quarterly report. We think
there should be additional opportunities for
accountability and feedback in the kind of hearing
that Judge Pauley held at which NYCHA residents could
come and testify about whether the monitoring is, in
fact, meeting their needs. So, I think not only the-
the stakeholder entity, which should include resident
leaders and activists, but there needs to be
additional accountability mechanisms that would
incorporate the voices of the resident community.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AMPRY-SAMUE	EL: Take us home
	CHATRDERSON AMDRY-SAMII

[laughs]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ANNA LUFT: Hi. My name is Anna Luft and I'm from Neighborhood Defender Service of Harlem. I'm going to keep this very short because I know we're on loaded schedule, but in my written testimony I have a ton of case examples that I do encourage you to look at. I want to speak directly to the ongoing concern about the disconnect between tenants and 250 Broadway, the need for a commitment for transparency, and also the ability not just for the Monitor to hold NYCHA accountable, but for tenants to hold NYCHA accountable in a very real way. The best overseers of NYCHA are the men and women living its towers. They are acutely aware of what they need and when. However, when they're denied services, they seek from the Housing Authority, they're often left without recourse. In our years representing tenants in NYCHA Housing, one of the most apparent systemic flaws in the inability of lower level NYCHA management to apparent-to understand and enforce its own policies and regulations. So, what we see time and again are our clients putting in all different kinds of requests whether it's a reasonable accommodation

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

request, whether it's them asking to have their rent recalculated, or to have a lead inspection or to add a family member to the household, to add children to the household. They put in these requests, and it just doesn't get done. Sometimes those requests just sit in their tenant file for years and years and years. Other times they're given bad advice by their housing manage or housing assistant. Sometimes they're given advice that's actually contrary to NYCHA's own policies, and they have no recourse when that happens. [bell] What they can do is they can grieve that request, but when they grieve that request that-or the that decision, but when they grieve it, they're actually submitting it to the person who made the decision in the first place. you put in a request for a reasonable accommodation, they don't do anything about it, or what they do isn't what you want. You have a problem with that. You submit that to the person who just made that decision, and that person has to accept that request in order for it to get knocked up to the next level. I mean that to me is totally unacceptable, and really speaks to the problem of transparency. What we would like is for the city, for NYCHA for anyone with any

2.2

sort ability to effect change in this arena to
install safeguards, procedural safeguards in order to
increase accountability, and to also provide
trainings to NYCHA housing managers and assistants in
order to ensure that they actually understand the
policies and procedures that they're supposed to be
enforcing, and also protections for tenants to-would
right now be penalized for NYCHA's own lack of
follow-up when they've done everything to comply with
NYCHA procedures and expectations of them. Thank
you.

everyone for your testimony and we do have our testimony, your written testimony available, and we will review and get back to you with any questions, and—but thank you so much for your advocacy and all that you do on behalf of the NYCHA residents. I also want to thank Madiba Denny, our Counsel; Jose Conde, Senior Legislative Policy Analyst; Ricky Charlie (sic) from the—the Legislative Policy Analyst who's new, Sarah Gastelum, our Principal Financial Analyst who worked on this hearing, and that will conclude the oversight hearing on examining NYCHA's new

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 211
2	Agreement with HUD, and we look forward to the
3	conversations in the days ahead. Thank you. [gavel]
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

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

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



Date April 14, 20<u>19</u>