CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

----X

May 10, 2010 Start: 10:15am Recess: 1:15pm

HELD AT: 250 Broadway Hearing Room

16th Floor

B E F O R E:

ROSIE MENDEZ Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Maria del Carmen Arroyo

Margaret S. Chin

Daniel J. Halloran III Melissa Mark-Viverito James G. Van Bramer

APPEARANCES

John B. Rhea Chairman New York City Housing Authority

Michelle Pinnock
Senior Advisor
Office of Resident Economic Empowerment and
Sustainability
New York City Housing Authority

Debra-Ellen Glickstein Director of Resident Economic Initiatives and Partnerships New York City Housing Authority

Earl Andrews Vice Chairman New York City Housing Authority

Erik Crawford Resident Davidson Houses Residents

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Ready? We're going to start this hearing. We're waiting for NYCHA representatives to come, but we're already running 15 minutes late, so we're going to get this hearing started. This hearing has come to order. My name is Councilwoman Rosie Mendez, and I chair the Committee on Public Housing.

Today's hearing is to provide this committee an update on Section 3 employment opportunities for NYCHA residents, as well as to hear testimony on Resolution number 207, introduced by Council Member Diana Reyna, who is to my right--sitting to my right, not politically to my right, which calls upon the United States Congress to enact H.R. 4224, the Together We Care Act of 2009. H.R. 4224 would establish a threeyear pilot program to train public housing residents as home healthcare aides, and create inhome based healthcare services to enable residents to provide covered home-based healthcare services to residents of public housing and residents of federally assisted rental housing who are elderly or disabled.

On October 1st, 2009, the then

2	subcommittee on Public Housing previously
3	conducted an oversight hearing on the Section 3
4	resident employment program. At that hearing,
5	residents and tenant advocates expressed concern
6	that the section 3 program has not been successful
7	and or as effective as it could be. Today's
8	hearing will focus on what, if any, changes NYCHA
9	has made to the program; to determine how many
10	residents have obtained Section 3 employment; to
11	determine how many of the Section 3 employment
12	opportunities was created by stimulus funding and
13	how much was created by NYCHA's capital program;
14	to determine how many Section 3 jobs NYCHA
15	anticipates in the near future through stimulus
16	and capital funded programs, and what if any
17	changes NYCHA will implement to maximize
18	participation and the availability of Section 3
19	jobs.
20	Reso number 207 calls upon the US
21	Congress to pass Together We Care Act of 2009,

Reso number 207 calls upon the US

Congress to pass Together We Care Act of 2009,

sponsored by my congresswoman and Diana's

congresswoman, Nydia Velazquez. Under H.R. 4224,

a home-based health service pilot program will be

established throughout the country. The secretary

of Housing and Urban Development would, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, make grants available to public housing agencies, community health centers, homecare provider organizations, faith-based organizations and labor organizations to train public housing residents on how to provide homebased healthcare. Public housing residents who obtained said training would then provide homebased health services to elderly and disabled residents of federally assisted rental housing.

Furthermore, the legislation provides that \$2.5 million would be awarded for the federal fiscal years of 2010, 2011 and 2012 for the program's implementation.

Member Reyna for a statement on her resolution, I would like to take this opportunity to dedicate this hearing to my former boss and dear friend Allison Cordero. I ask that everyone keep Alison in their prayers; she lays in a coma after suffering a stroke, possibly from a brain aneurism. She became the Director of Organizing while I was employed at St. Nicholas Neighborhood

2.0

Preservation, and she is now the Deputy Director for Community Preservation. She worked tirelessly for the resident of Greenpoint Williamsburg in Brooklyn. She encouraged me to start organizing in public housing, and she continued those efforts after my departure.

When I returned to Williamsburg as a fledgling attorney at Brooklyn Legal Services

Corp A, Alison, the Tenant Association and Legal

Services worked on providing Section 3 employment to residents through the Williamsburg Houses modernization program. So I ask you all to keep her in your prayers.

We've been joined by Council Member
Halloran from Queens, Council Member Van Bramer
from Queens, and Council Member Chin from
Manhattan. And now I turn it over to Council
Member Reyna, who also has a long history with
Alison Cordero. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you,
Madam Chair. I'd like to thank you for those
wonderful, thoughtful words. We are all working
round the clock to visit with Alison, and we're
all making sure she's going to pull through this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

very trying time. As yourself had just mentioned, she was a teacher to you as well as I, as far as the organizing world is concerned. And I give her all the credit for all the progress we have made and continue to strive for in Greenpoint Williamsburg.

Good morning. We are here today to discuss Resolution 207, calling upon the United States Congress to pass House Resolution 4224, the Together We Care Act. This Act would establish a pilot program to train public housing residents a home health aides and as home-based health service providers. It would enable these trained residents to provide Medicaid eligible health services to elderly and disabled residents of public housing and federally assisted rental The bill would create desperately needed housing. jobs for low-income people, while simultaneously providing vital home-based health services in our city. The residents would be trained and employed by state certified organizations, such as homecare providers, community health centers, faith-based groups, labor organizations and public housing agencies.

2 House Resolution 4224 was

introduced in the United States House of
Representative by Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez,
who has been a strong advocate for both public
housing and public health services throughout her
career. Congresswoman Velazquez estimates that
the bill would create 6,000 jobs nationwide,
within a population that is severely underemployed. At the same time in over a third of the
New York City Housing Authority, households are
headed by persons over 62 years of age, many of
whom need assistance to live independently in
NYCHA developments.

As we all know, NORCs are the
Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities. And
prior to becoming Chair of the Small Business
Committee, in my early tenure, I chaired the
Public Housing Committee. And it is important
that we continue to dedicate oversight on the
progress that New York City Housing Authority is
implementing in making sure that as many NORCs are
established within public housing, so that this
particular Together We Care act is implemented
with the most feverish behavior as possible, so

2.0

2.3

that we can both attack the issues of the elderly,
aging in place in a healthy manner, as well as
providing job opportunities for public housing
residents.

The bill would help lift public housing residents out of poverty and provide care for those who need it most. I would like to thank our Chairwoman, Chairwoman Mendez for the Public Housing Committee, and my co-sponsors for their help, and look forward to sending a message to congress in support of Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez's Together We Care act. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you. As NYCHA is not here, anyone who is available to give testimony I will call up, from the public. But you must fill out one of these forms with the Sergeant-of-Arms.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Anyone here to give public testimony? You don't need to have anything prepared. You can just come up to give testimony. We've also been joined by Council Member Maria del Carmen Arroyo, from the Bronx.

[Pause]

Τ	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 10
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Is Michelle
3	Pinnock here? She was seen earlier. Are you
4	ready?
5	[Pause]
6	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Momentarily?
7	Can I get a better idea of what momentarily is?
8	We're going to take a ten-minute break.
9	[Pause]
LO	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you
11	Sergeant. This hearing is coming to order once
L2	again. If the panel could identify themselves for
L3	the record and please give their testimony.
L4	JOHN B. RHEA: John Rhea, Chairman
L5	of the Housing Authority.
L6	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Michelle
L7	Pinnock, Senior Advisor, Resident Economic
L8	Empowerment Sustainability, New York City Housing
L9	Authority.
20	DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: Debra-
21	Ellen Glickstein, Director, Resident Economic
22	Initiatives and Partnerships, New York City
23	Housing Authority.
24	[Pause]
25	JOHN B. RHEA: Turn it on.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 1
2	[PAUSE]
3	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Michelle
4	Pinnock, Senior Advisor, Resident Economic
5	Empowerment and Sustainability, New York City
6	Housing Authority.
7	DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: Debra-
8	Ellen Glickstein, Director, Resident Economic
9	Initiatives and Partnerships, New York City
10	Housing Authority.
11	EARL ANDREWS: Earl Andrews, Vice
12	Chairman, New York City Housing Authority.
13	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Miss? Ms.
14	Glickstein, you'll need to sign one of these and
15	hand it in to the Sergeant when you get a chance.
16	Okay. Good morning, Commissioner Lopez. It's
17	great to see you here.
18	JOHN B. RHEA: Good morning. I
19	want to state for the record, just to acknowledge
20	the presence of my distinguished colleagues, Vice
21	Chairman Earl Andrews and Commissioner Margarita
22	Lopez, in addition to myself. We represent the
23	entire board of the New York City Housing
24	Authority. We are here as a board, as a group,
25	collectively to express how important this issue

is of economic empowerment and employment for our residents is to us as an organization, but also to us personally and individually. I have and a wonderful amount of support from both Vice Chairman Andrews and from Commissioner Lopez on this issue of how do we use every single economic resource that we have at the authority and all our creativity to improve the lives or our residents by connecting them with opportunities that improve their lives financially.

As we were talking, we've talked about this many times, each of us are here today and in the roles that we're in because we've been given access to opportunity. I had my first job for pay that made a huge difference in my life at 12 years old. Commissioner Lopez had her first job, for pay, at 15. And Vice Chairman Andrews had his first job, for pay, at 13. Because of those early experiences in our lives, it put us on a road to not only experiencing the empowerment that one receives from putting their labor to work and receiving compensation for it, but also making a difference in our individual families. And so we know very much from personal experience that

2.0

without access to jobs, it's very difficult for people to not only develop that sense of selfesteem that we all need in order to pursue meaningful careers, but to support our families long term. So I really just wanted to acknowledge that they are here to reflect NYCHA's commitment from a board level to this very, very important topic. So I would just like to state their presence here for the record for that purpose, and I appreciate their partnership in this effort.

Chairwoman Rosie Mendez,
distinguished members of the Public Housing
Committee and to all members of City Council, good
morning. I am John B. Rhea, Chairman of the New
York City Housing Authority. And joining me today
is Michelle Pinnock, Senior Advisor for the Office
of Resident Empowerment and Sustainability, and
Director of Resident Economic Initiatives and
Partnerships, Debra-Ellen Glickstein.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to update the Committee on NCYHA's Section 3 program, as well as discussion how economic empowerment for NCYHA residents is a critical component of strengthening NYCHA

communities. In fact, empowering NYCHA residents through educational opportunity, workforce training and, ultimately, stable jobs that pay livable wages benefits all of New York City. As I have said before, NYCHA is one of our City's vital economic engines, and our residents are at the heart of what drive the authority.

As I approach my first anniversary as NYCHA's Chairman, I am extremely grateful for the support of NYCHA's board and the 12,000 men and women who have dedicated their careers to serving NYCHA families. To meet the charges Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg outlined, as well as fulfill my long-term vision for the Authority, we set an ambitious first year agenda that I believed would lay the foundation for achieving our ultimate goal: ensuring that New York City public housing doesn't simply survive--but that it thrives.

Soon after joining NYCHA, I recognized that achieving financial stability for the Authority was necessary if our other goals were to succeed. Almost immediately, we marshaled departments across the Authority, tapping the resources and expertise of our partners in City,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

state and Federal government, as well as in the non-profit and private sectors to both fully obligate the \$423 million NYCHA received from the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, better known as Stimulus, and successfully federalize the 21 State and City built developments, bring additional funding for desperately needed modernization work.

I also realized that more than just a part of the work we do, workforce training and economic empowerment was integral, not only in the day to day lives of the people we serve, but also to our mission to preserve, strengthen and secure public housing for future generations. Economic empowerment improves families' quality of life and it boosts the overall health of NYCHA communities, because when a resident is employed in work that pays a good wage, he or she has a great ability to care for their family--from providing better access to child care, to nutrition, to internet We also recognize that, as important as it is to help more families achieve employment stability, NYCHA is not an expert in workforce training and job placement. So, recognizing this

2.0

fact and acknowledging the skill of other

government and not-for-profit experts in this

field we began developing a full-scale plan for

how we can improve our efforts in this area s well

as partner with organizations who can help us

maximize NYCHA's workforce investment in our

residents.

Serving the more than 600,000 people who count on NYCHA demands that we develop and implement initiatives that are both broad in scope, but tailored in their execution.

Fulfilling the goals of Section 3, particularly as the country emerges from one of the worst economic recessions in generations is a principal example.

Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, which requires public housing authorities to provide the greatest extent possible job training, employment and contracting possibilities for public housing and low-income residents in connection with the creation of new job opportunities on construction projects and activities within their neighborhoods.

Because HUD mandates the program,

2.0

but does not rund the mandate, meeting the goals
for Section 3 requires a substantial investment of
NYCHA's operating funds each year. Last year,
NYCHA spent \$5 million to administer Section 3.
But, as I will make clear, the plan NYCHA is
developing goes farther than HUD's requirements.
By partnering with our City agencies, such as the
Human Resources Administration, as well as non-
profit and philanthropic organizations, we will
leverage NYCHA's investment and focus, making our
workforce services more efficient while also
increasing their impact on residents! lives

The Authority's commitment to helping our residents gain career skills and find jobs that pay livable wages with the opportunity for advancement is not new. In fact, NYCHA formed the Resident Employment Program, REP, in 2001 to further the goals of Section 3, and since that time has implemented several new policies and program models, as well as instituted additional mandates on its contractors. It is safe to say that workforce development has been a learning process in which NYCHA has evolved as the agency has strived to get better in this vital arena.

In 2007, NYCHA launched the Pre-

Apprentice Training Program, P-ATP, to create permanent, highly skilled and highly paid trades apprenticeship jobs for NYCHA residents. Between 2007 and 2009, 267 residents completed the P-ATP training, and 252 of those graduates were successfully placed in an apprenticeship. NYCHA also stipulates that qualified construction management firms be affiliated with a state-approved apprenticeship program, providing another potential pipeline for NYCHA residents.

workforce training is not new, making resident economic empowerment a central part of the Authority's mission is. As I said in my introduction, helping residents create strong futures for their families through workforce development, asset building and entrepreneurship makes NYCHA families and NYCHA neighborhoods much stronger. That's why I created the Office of Resident Economic Empowerment and Sustainability, REES, in August of 2009, just two months after assuming the role of Chairman.

REES now incorporates the efforts

of Resident Employment Services, reports directly
to the Board through the guidance of Vice Chairman
Earl Andrews, Jr., and leads NYCHA's outreach,
education and implementation of the Section 3
program. REES is charged with developing
programs, policies and collaborations to support
residents' increased economic opportunities in
three broad areas: workforce training and job
placement; financial literacy and empowerment; and
resident based entrepreneurship.

As with all that we do at NYCHA,

REES is committed to developing strong

partnership. For example, HUD sponsored Resident

Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency, ROSS grants,

allow NYCHA to partner with community and academic

organizations to train NYCHA residents for the

workplace. From August 2007 to February of this

year, in partnership with the College of Staten

Island and LaGuardia Community College, NYCHA

provided GE preparation, vocational training and

job search and job placement assistance to 150

residents. And ROSS grants are allowing us to

provide administrative assistant and information

technology training to 175 residents in

cooperation with the City College of New York,
Year UP of Manhattan, and New York Career and
Employment Services of the Bronx; as well as
educational and employment training for 100
residents, working together with Year UP and CCNY.
We are continuing our work with HRA to service the
Back-to-Work program, which helps food stamp
recipients and non-custodial parents who are
unemployed and under-employed find work or advance
in the jobs they already have. This program is
particularly important for helping young fathers
contribute meaningfully to the economic well being
of their children and help break the cycle of
disengagement of many young men.

Furthermore, NYCHA is proud to support Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez's proposed legislation, the "Together We Can" Act that would train tomorrow's corps of home healthcare aides. And we are honored that the Congresswoman has chosen to launch her pilot at the Lower East Side I Community Center. "Together We Can" would allow NYCHA to expand a program the Authority has undertaken with LaGuardia Community College to train residents as Home Health Aides. As we have

recently seen right here in New York, the rising cost of care has forced hospitals to substantially reduce intensive inpatient services. Home healthcare addresses this gap and offers a more personalized approach to healthcare services delivery. We are pleased that NYCHA residents will be among those trained to provide this care, and we look forward to Together We Can joining the historic Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, not only to ensure healthcare equality in our country, but economic equality in an evolving economy as well.

This year, in partnership with the Mayor's Center for Economic Opportunity, CEO, HRA and the City University of New York, NYCHA implemented Jobs Plus, a community revitalization initiative, at the Jefferson Houses to provide targeted employment related services, as well as financial incentives for residents, including changed rent rules. We're particularly excited about Jobs Plus, because it is both an example of the innovated public-private partnerships that are a focus of NYCHA's current agenda--50% of the project capital comes from private sources through

CEO--as well as an opportunity to bring a
nationally successful model to New York City that
emphasizes a neighbor-to-neighbor information
sharing strategy called "Community Support for
Work."

And we are strengthening our partnerships with established community-based non-profits such as Union Settlement, the East River Development Alliance, and the Ocean Bay Community Development Corporation, just to name a few.

Recently we have seen much of our hard work pay dividends in the lives of NYCHA residents. In 2008, only 41 low income New Yorkers were placed in job with contractors at an average wage of \$40.14 an hour. We improved upon that figure significantly last year. In 2009, NYCHA placed 265 low income workers, a 65% increase, including 236 residents in construction jobs at an average wage of \$31.64. Historically, we have also looked to our residents to fill seasonal, part-time and full-time positions. NYCHA residents are hired seasonally to perform work in the areas of grounds and janitorial maintenance from June through October, and to work

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with children attending NYCHA's community center summer programs. In 2009, NYCHA hired 1,398 full and part time staff, including 738, or 53%, who were Section 3 NYCHA residents. Our current forecasts project that we will hire 329 full time

NYCHA's greatest economic

residents to fill a range of positions this year.

empowerment and workforce development success is that the Authority employs almost 3,016 residents as full-time employees, which constitutes more than 25% of NYCHA's total workforce and an even greater percentage of its recent hires. Each of these employees represents a success for the Section 3 program. These residents hold a wide range of positions from central office to field operations at the developments. They include community service workers, clerical and administrative staff, caretakers, groundskeepers, housing assistants and trades personnel. importantly, they represent real career paths--not just a job--with ongoing access to skill development. Many of the Authority's senior managers grew up in public housing and started their careers at NYCHA in entry level positions.

The Section 3 program is also

3 subject to provisions of the 2009 Stimulus Act.

4 In March of last year, NYCHA was awarded \$423

5 million in federal stimulus funds for capital

6 modernization work and systems upgrades for NYCHA

7 elevators, heating systems, roofs, brickwork and

8 the installation of energy efficient appliances.

9 While all Stimulus-funded projects have been

obligated, work is ongoing over a three-year

period, with all work to be completed by March of

12 2010.

According to NYCHA's most

experienced construction professionals, 40% of a

contract's total value goes to pay workers.

16 Subject to Section 3 requirements, NYCHA estimates

17 that 303 residents will be hired on Stimulus-

funded contracts--to date 103 workers have been

19 placed and more are gaining employment daily.

20 Additionally, we required that

21 contractors report the number of jobs saved and

created with Stimulus funds. From those reports,

we estimate that NYCHA saved and created a full-

time equivalent of 147 jobs in the first quarter

25 of 2010 alone.

24

In addition to funding desperately needed modernization work, the Stimulus funds also provided a one-time opportunity to provide ongoing operating and capital subsidies for the 21 State and City built developments by bringing them within NYCHA's federal public housing portfolio.

Not only will NYCHA have more funding to support the more than 45,000 families who make the 21 newly federalized developments home, but we will also create and save an additional 371 jobs--including 170 new jobs, of which 98 or 58% will go

to directly to NYCHA residents.

Even though we are improving service to residents by meeting the goals of Section 3, we know that this is just the beginning. The work we do today lays the groundwork for safer and more financially secure future for public housing in New York City.

That's why Vice Chairman Andrews, Ms. Pinnock, Ms. Glickstein, and the team in the Office of Resident Economic Empowerment and Sustainability have developed an integrated plan for improving NYCHA's implementation, supervision and enforcement of Section 3.

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For the first time, Resident Employment Services is reviewing and approving all contracts submitted for Board consideration with respect to Section 3 hires. REES is working with construction contractors to diversify employment opportunities to include administrative and other non-construction workforce needs. And NYCHA is expanding the scope of Section 3 to further include non-construction employment opportunities.

We are also partnering with Local 79 Laborers Union to provide NYCHA residents entry into Local 70 as journeypersons and ensuring they are given union status through NYCHA's section 3 NYCHA is providing referrals for program. qualified residents to Local 3 Elevator Mechanics Union and RES is now recognized as a direct entry provider for the Elevator Mechanics Apprenticeship Training program.

Collaboration with organized labor needs additional work. Last year, NYCHA worked hard to negotiate acceptable Section 3 terms in a project labor agreement with the BCTC. Despite some progress, we were not successful in resolving all of the legitimate concerns on both sides. As

2.0

a result, we still have an opportunity to revisit a potential agreement that could be beneficial to both parties, but only if NYCHA residents will share in those benefits.

Finally, NYCHA's partnering and contracting with various non-profit, private and academic organizations, including CUNY, to increase access to construction-related training in order to create a pipeline of qualified candidates for jobs created through those institutions' Section 3 programs.

To state it simply: NYCHA is committed to Section 3. The work we to today will help ensure that the new foundation we've created has a multiplier effect to generate even greater returns for the future. That, in a nutshell, is why NYCHA cares so deeply about the partnership sand forging coalitions with outcome drive organizations—like HRA, CEO, and SBS—who know how to identify impediments to work and remove them; who have demonstrated expertise in outreach to targeted groups and providing literacy and adult education services; and who have a history of measurable results in getting low income people

jobs with livable wages, reducing poverty and rebuilding communities.

One premiere example of a new partnership with a proven difference in alleviating poverty for New York City families is the Robin Hood Foundation. With Robin Hood, NYCHA is developing a privately funded Training Academy that will not only prepare residents for work, but will track their progress so that we can use that data to further improve the classroom-to-job pipeline. Phase I of the program will train residents for Section 3 jobs within NYCHA for construction-related jobs with NYCHA contractors. Later phases will help move qualified graduates into jobs in the private sector as well.

We are also working to improve our internal planning process to better match Section 3 related workforce development needs and training resources to upcoming contracts. And we will negotiate with additional unions to gain direct access for NYCHA residents into their apprenticeship programs. And finally, we are currently developing a plan to engage and track Section 3 business concerns—which are businesses

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

of those groups.

2	that are majority-owned by NYCHA residents;
3	businesses whose workforce is formed with at least
4	30% Section 3 residents; and contractors who
5	subcontract at least 25% of their award to either

In conclusion, last week we saw that the American economy added a surprisingly strong 290,000 jobs in April--the fourth consecutive month that the economy added workers. We must ensure that this recovery touches many of the most impacted by the economic recession. Section 3 is a critical tool to ensure that our residents, to paraphrase the famous saying, have boats and are on the job market sea, so that they will realize the Recovery's benefits in their lives. With Mayor Bloomberg's leadership and with the support of the City Council, NYCHA is making that happen--one new worker at a time-programmatically and comprehensively, with new and exciting partnerships.

Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you,

Chairman Rhea. Mr. Chairman, if you can tell me

2.0

2.3

2	how much of the Stimulus funding was used,
3	actually used, not just obligated but actually
4	used in 2009, and how much has been used in 2010?
5	And then, what were the jobs as a result of just
6	stimulus funding? And then the same for your
7	capital funding.
8	JOHN B. RHEA: I can give you the

JOHN B. RHEA: I can give you the numbers for stimulus. The numbers separated for capital funding, I'm not sure we can give you the exact ones, but we'll give you some additional breakdowns.

So all \$423 million of stimulus was obligated, and it was obligated on 75 different projects, individual projects.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: By what time was that all obligated?

JOHN B. RHEA: It was all obligated by the deadline. So we met the required deadline, which was March 17th of this year. And we met that deadline, in addition to meeting that deadline, as I mentioned in my testimony, we also met the same deadline for the federalization.

So all \$423 million was obligated.

Of that amount we awarded--many of those projects

2	will not be completed until, you know, multiple
3	periods between now and 2012. We have completed
4	though about 14 stimulus contracts of the 75
5	contracts that are greater than 90%, up to or
6	greater than 90% of completion. So that would be
7	a reflection of, you know, when you ask how much
8	has actually been not just obligated but expended
9	and completed. There are others that are at 20%,
LO	30%, 40% completion, but when you really look at
11	what's close to completion, 14 of the 75 projects
L2	are 90% or greater of completion.
L3	We think that's a good number to
L4	look at because obviously, ones that are in early
L5	stages of either mobilizing their workforce or are
L6	only 20 or 30% into the construction. They will
L7	continue to add labor as that project progresses.
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Now
L9	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] So of
20	the 14 contracts
21	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
22	Okay. Can I just ask you
23	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] Yeah.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:of the

remainder that has not been started yet, so 14--

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 33
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: But in the
3	future.
4	JOHN B. RHEA: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: You can send
6	it to us.
7	JOHN B. RHEA: Okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: I'd like to
9	keep track of that.
LO	JOHN B. RHEA: Got it.
11	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. Of the
L2	14 that are 90% completed, how much money is that
L3	so far?
L4	JOHN B. RHEA: In terms of actual
15	dollars. Somebody get that number for me? Can
L6	you get that number for me? Let me tell you where
L7	we are with respect to the goals that we set on
18	those 14 projects for hiring, and we'll give you
L9	the exact dollar amounts of theyou're asking for
20	the dollar amounts of the contracts, right?
21	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Expended. How
22	muchif it's \$423 that have been obligated
23	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] Right,
24	you want the dollar amount.
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: 14 equals I

don't know how much of that, and how much of that
has been expended.

JOHN B. RHEA: When we say, well, we'll give you the number—14 equals X million dollars and 90% of that plus has been expended. So we can get you the exact numbers, but whatever number we tell you, over 90% of it has been expended. That's how we measure 90% or greater of completion, meaning that the contract, the actual dollars have been paid to the contractor for completion of services rendered. Of the 14 contracts, we break them into both what we call REP contracts and Section 3 contracts. Six of them were REP contracts of the 14, and eight were Section 3.

We had goals on the REP side which says the labor costs totaled \$118,000. And we set 15% of actual labor costs that needs to go to NYCHA residents. And then on the Section 3 contracts we had goals of hiring ten workers. So what we've successfully completed is that seven workers have been hired on those ten contracts. So we did not complete our full objective. Two out of the eight did not meet their goals, so

2	there were actual eight contractors on these
3	actual 14 projects. Two out of the eight did meet
4	their goals. Five met it and one exceeded the
5	goal. So we anticipated that we would hire ten
6	workers, and we only hired seven.
7	MICHELLE PINNOCK: But
8	Councilwoman, also tothe 14 projects, it totals
9	about \$12.1 million. And then also
10	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
11	Excuse me. \$12.1 million is the total amount
12	obligated and then 90% of that was spent?
13	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes.
14	JOHN B. RHEA: Correct.
15	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And that lead
16	to seven full-time worker positions?
17	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes. But also
18	remember that the requirement is based off the
19	labor costs. So labor costs out of that \$12.1
20	million, came toI'm sorry, 15% of the labor
21	costs comes to \$118,000. So just to clarify, the
22	requirement that NYCHA has put in place on our
23	contractors that are receiving contracts over
24	\$500,000, 15% off their labor costs are to go

towards hiring residents. And so, again, if you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to look to what they were required to hire on, that would be out of those 14 projects, 15% of the actual labor costs came to \$118,000. So seven people were hired, equating the goal or the requirement was to spend \$118,000 towards NYCHA residents.

JOHN B. RHEA: And this is an important point. You know, people see big headline numbers. They hear \$12 million, and they think that means \$12 million is going into peoples' pockets as actual wages, and that's obviously just inaccurate. A substantial amount of the \$12 million that goes on any project is for capital costs--you know, putting a backhoe or whatever it is on a site, you know to construct; it is purchasing of all the materials, the bricks--whatever goes into the actual construction project itself. So a minority of the actual dollars on any construction project is actually for labor. It's less than--more than 60% is for non-labor related costs. So then you're talking about smaller percentages for labor. And then the Section 3 requirements are that a percentage of the new jobs that are created go to NYCHA

residents. And obviously in any construction

contract, you know, we have to negotiate very hard

with contractors around the mobilization of their

existing workforce versus new jobs that are going

to be created. And so, we've worked very hard to

come up with the formula that basically says that

at least 15% of the labor cost must go directly to

NYCHA residents. And then you have to calculate

what types of jobs or what average wage you

believe those jobs will be at, and therefore we

derive a certain targeted number of actual hires.

Based upon this, the \$118,000 that would have been the 15% of the labor costs, we targeted ten jobs. Depending on other sites, you may have a different set of jobs. There may only be five jobs depending on the average wage of the job. And on this job we achieved seven workers out of the targeted ten. And as I said, because two out of the eight contractors actually did not meet their goals, five met it, one exceeded it. And, you know, we can come back to you on specifics about any of those contractors, but that's where we are on the 14 stimulus contracts that are 90% or greater completion.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman,

if you can tell me what happens when a contractor does not meet their goals on Section 3?

MICHELLE PINNOCK: We have a few different options, that the Section 3 requirement and rep are conditions of the contract. And so there's a few different things that we're able to So it includes finding individuals in breach do. of contract--in essence could stop the work. can result in withholding payment, and it also can result in not awarding future work. And so, what we will need to do at this time is to go back, look at those particular contractors that did not meet their goal, and provide the Board with some options that meet our various priorities. resident hiring, but also making sure that we're getting our capital work done. Because in most cases these are very critical jobs that impact people's lives and their homes.

JOHN B. RHEA: This is an important point. Obviously the first one, which is, you know not proceeding and, quote unquote, you know, slowing down jobs, is very problematic for the Authority. We have to get these jobs completed,

any job, any capital project job needs to be completed on a pretty aggressive timeline. But also, but particularly stimulus jobs would have to be completed by a certain time or you lose the money. It makes it very difficult for us to have the hammer and slowing down the work at a worksite.

We've been tracking these projects real time so that we understand which contractors are or are not meeting their goals, and RES is working very closely with their labor and their Human Resources department at these contractors, at these large contractors or with the contractor himself or herself if they're smaller contractors, to ensure that they meet their objectives—and then course correct during the term as opposed to waiting until the end and measuring whether or not they met the goals or not.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: There's a whole bunch of questions I laid out. There were parts of it. I'm just going to ask this and then I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues so they can ask questions, and then I'll come back at the end.

JOHN B. RHEA: Okay. We anticipate

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Of the \$23 million that's been obligated under stimulus funding, since it's all been obligated, how much of that is labor costs? Or how much of that 15% will lead to jobs, and

what do you anticipate that number to be?

that of the--again, of the \$423 million--let me back up. Only \$343 million of it is actually in the form of direct construction work at NYCHA developments. There's money being spent on various other aspects to support that construction work, whether it be administrative work, whether it be other capital projects, capital items that are non-construction related. So for example, we could have--NYCHA could be investing in computer systems that are capital eligible, as an example. So of the \$423, \$343 million of it is construction related projects. Okay? And of the \$343 million we projected 407 Section 3 jobs will be created.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Let me just clarify. \$343 you said is construction related. Does that mean it's labor and the other \$100 or less that \$100 something million is bricks and mortars and equipment or whatever?

on the needs of the contractor, the phase, the

25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 type of work. It really varies.

3 JOHN B. RHEA: Yeah, again, full-4 time job is a misnomer. It's a job that is, you 5 know, going to pay X amount in actual wages over 6 some period of time. Most contracting jobs are not full-time jobs by definition; they are jobs 7 8 that you're hired to complete the contract. Our hope would be, obviously, that in performing that 9 10 function and doing it well that residents are 11 building up not only a work history and a résumé 12 but also building up a track record with a particular contractor--13

14 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
15 But...

JOHN B. RHEA: --who will mobilize them on other jobs.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: But whether they're temp jobs, as most construction jobs are temp until the project is completed, it's usually full-time jobs unless you're doing some part-time work.

JOHN B. RHEA: Oh, if you mean full-time described as kind of, you know, 35, 40 hours a week, the answer is yes.

1	COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HOUSING 43
2	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: They're all
3	full time jobs.
4	JOHN B. RHEA: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you very
6	much. Council Member Arroyo.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Thank you,
8	Madam Chair. I just want to follow up on that
9	line of questioning. Are these permanent jobs?
10	JOHN B. RHEA: I'm not sure what
11	you mean by permanent jobs.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: They will
13	work from now until they retire.
14	JOHN B. RHEA: No.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: So what is
16	the term of the employment of the residents?
17	JOHN B. RHEA: The term of the
18	contract.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: And that
20	could be what?
21	JOHN B. RHEA: I mean, I guess it
22	could go as short as a day and as long as the full
23	term of the stimulus funding.
24	MICHELLE PINNOCK: It also depends

on--

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

[Interposing] Speak into the mic otherwise Nick is going to yell at us.

5 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Just pull it 6 up closer. Yes.

MICHELLE PINNOCK: It really depends on the type of work, the length of contract and also the phase. Different jobs have different phases. For example, putting up the scaffolding, doing the asbestos abatement, etcetera. So really, it depends on that and really, some of the things that we're doing is monitoring that and actually asking contractors for some of that more detailed information on how long do they anticipate hiring a laborer for this phase, so then this way we can--also one of our goals and one of the things we're focusing more on now is the opportunity for career advancement and longer term opportunities. So then this way if we know that a phase is phasing out or a job is about to end, to try connect individuals and residents to other opportunities.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Do you have any examples of individuals whose employment was

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

completed because a contract was fulfilled and then were connected to other opportunities? Does this office that was created upon the Chairman's appointment, or shortly thereafter, track the experience that residents are having when you connect them to a job? It's a short term job—two three weeks, whatever the case may be—but then they get connected to something else and etcetera, etcetera?

MICHELLE PINNOCK: That's--it's a mixed answer. So, yes, because we have some examples also of contractors that have actually taken residents with them to future works and not just NYCHA work. But, the only reason why I say it's a mixed answer, because it's something that we are looking to enhance in our current operation so that we can do it really standardized across the board and to improve our efforts by which we're matching people to future opportunities where a contractor may not have brought something along. And so we're just putting in place, so it's really uniformed and part of our overall practice.

JOHN B. RHEA: So, I mean, to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

answer your question direction, it is one of the things that we have incorporated into the new office, which is to actually track the outcomes of residents who get jobs. We had not been tracking outcomes. It had not been something that was, you know, part of the measurement systems within NYCHA.

And again, as I said in my testimony, this whole Resident Employment Services, REP as well as Section 3 has been evolving at NYCHA. There was no requirement to track it. That's not something that's within Section 3's mandate that housing authorities must track the actual outcomes of residents that achieve employment and to decide whether or not it's a successful program, what worked, what didn't work, how do you maintain active dialogue with residents beyond the initial procurement of the job, how do we interact with SBS, Small Business Services to understand what NYCHA residents achieve employment through SBS and achieve, you know other skills that we can take and use and implement then into our Section 3 program. So we've had to--this has all been a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

real massive effort to not only put what are the measurements that we want to put in place and track, but then how are we going to set outcomes based upon those metrics. So it's an evolving piece of what we do at the Housing Authority. And as I said in my testimony, it's a piece that we are partnering with others who do this for a living. We are not an employment agency. At the end of the day, as much as this is critically important to us--and we're investing huge resources in terms of hiring people with actual expertise and skill in having done it outside of NYCHA and finding new partners--it's critical that we recognize that at the end of the day, you know, NYCHA did not build up employment training, placement and measurement of outcomes as part of its core competencies as a housing authority. And that's something that we have to develop. COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Well, I commend you for at least getting it started. How

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Well, I commend you for at least getting it started. How do residents learn of the opportunities that may available? Because the folks that live in the developments in my district don't know about these. This is news to me. I mean, I'm happy to

hear it, but then the question is how can we be helpful in getting the word out and making sure that we can provide residents with the information so that they can connect to the program and be put on a list for consideration or whatever the process is so that we can educate as many of the residents as possible?

JOHN B. RHEA: Right. So this is an area where we're stepping up our activities.

And part of it is what we do directly, and then part of it, again, is what we do through our partners. And our partners are both, you know, clearly other government agencies like SBS and like CEO, who we have recent expanded partnerships with; and it's also with the not-for-profit world and community-based organizations who do this work and have real legitimacy in the community.

But one of the things NYCHA does directly, you know, just to highlight some, and I would ask Michelle and Debra-Ellen to comment more specifically on how they manifest themselves; we send notices to our management offices and to our tenant association presidents about job opportunities with specific contracts that are

2.0

either NYCHA contractsthrough our Section 3
effortor that are significant private sector job
opportunities in which we've established a
relationship either through SBS, as an example, or
directly with a private employer to NYCHA. And we
provide the information directly to the management
offices, which residents can go into and request
information on, and we provide it to the TA
presidents who do outreach with their residents
around the type of jobs that NYCHA has access to.

We post this on NYCHA's website.

All this is posted on our website. If you go to our website and you go under our residential employment program and our office of Residential Economic Empowerment and Sustainability, you can find access to these opportunities. We post fliers in the developments. Particularly around the stimulus work we're doing and others, we post the fliers about jobs.

We do presentations at the TA, with TA presidents, at TA meetings. Debra-Ellen,
Michelle, Q. Spence [phonetic] and others who have community operations responsibilities, work with both, you now, the TA leaders as well as with

22

23

24

25

2	other duly elected organizations within public
3	housing. And then we do general outreach through
4	our resident newsletters. We send outthe NYCHA
5	newsletter goes out. There's a section in there
6	that talks about jobs and job opportunities in the
7	NYCHA newsletter. And we've done targeted things
8	like when we opened the Ingersoll Whitman Center.
9	The first thing we did in downtown Brooklyn was a
10	job fair in which we had over 100no, I'm sorry.
11	How many employers?
12	MICHELLE PINNOCK: We had about 50.
13	JOHN B. RHEA: About 50 employers
14	and overa couple hundred people attended, NYCHA
15	residents, to connect them with both our
16	contractors as well as with private employers in
17	the downtown and greater Brooklyn area. So it's a
18	number of things. Do you guys want to comment?
19	MICHELLE PINNOCK: And also
20	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

[Interposing] I don't want to take too much time with it. But, I'll reach out to the office and see if we can do some targeted presentations in the community that I represent.

JOHN B. RHEA: We would--

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

[Interposing]] Some of us	s have more housing
developments	than other	types of housing in the
community.	And I think	it would be worthwhile for
us to focus	some energy	on certain developments.

Are we concerned that as we go
through this training and making the connections
with residents and jobs that they may no longer be
eligible for housing because they're making too
much money?

JOHN B. RHEA: Well, no. We don't have--

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO:

[Interposing] I mean, you reported \$40.14 an hour as an average rate for one of the programs and \$30.31--

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] Yeah.

That was 2007 or 08 I think it was \$40, and then

'09 it came down to \$30. But obviously we had

650% increase in the numbers of placements. If

you look at the \$17.8 million that Michelle

referenced as the labor component for Section 3,

that equates, of the 407 jobs, that equates to \$22

an hour.

2.0

_				_
2	COUNCIL	MEMBER	ARROYO:	Okay.

JOHN B. RHEA: So that gives you a sense of the range of jobs and the economic impact. And the short answer to your question is no. NYCHA does not have a policy that once your income reaches a certain level you have to leave public housing, it's just on entering public housing that the income test is an important factor. We would love to see all of our residents achieve real economic growth.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Before I turn it over to Council Member Chin, I just want to follow up with Council Member Arroyo's question, because Section 3 also applies to any federal subsidies, federally assisted. So has this been a problem for Section 8 tenants who've then had an income problem?

JOHN B. RHEA: So one of the things that we have not even scratched the surface on is what we're calling and what HUD refers to as economic self-sufficiency for Section 8 residents. It's one of my pet peeves and I've been pushing

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the organization -- that we are now approaching, you know, a housing authority that has over 100,000 Section 8 resident--households, sorry--and over 250,000 plus residents in 101,000 households. pretty quickly with the growth of Section 8, you know, NYCHA will be as large or larger providing housing, subsidized and low income housing, to Section 8 residents as it is to public housing residents directly. Yet Section 3 as we've implemented it at NYCHA has only historically applied to public housing residents. And clearly the Section i3 mandates say that all low income communities and those who are receiving housing assistance have the same kind of rights under Section 3, with some nuances in terms of, you know, you start with the development where the work takes place first, then in the surrounding community, and then the borough and then citywide.

But the bottom line is as we grow our importance, or the percentage of the population that we serve in non-direct housing through Section 8, we have to implement these same kind of programs for that population as well.

Short answer, Council Member Mendez, is we have

2.0

2.3

not implemented any of these programs directly to
assist and enhance the lives of Section 8
residents.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.

Council Member Chin?

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you,

Madam Chair. Yes, I wanted to follow up on the

same line of questioning in terms of outreach.

For the residents, especially new immigrants or

limited proficiency English-speakers, so how do

you--do you have programs targeting them or

partners that you work with that also create

opportunities for some of the NYCHA residents who

don't speak English very well?

where we will need to make additional enhancements. We do tap into Language Line when individuals call for more information. We try when we're partnering with different community-based organizations to also diversify the type of organizations that we work with. But in terms of, again, ensuring that we're getting information out in connection to the jobs with our contractors, that is something that we need to explore further,

2.0

and how we implement that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Does NYCHA have a budget where you do your own, like ESL programs, educational programs, literacy program?

MICHELLE PINNOCK: The Chairman actually just said that. I mean we do partner with other agencies as well as community-based organizations to try to gain access to ESL classes, also literacy, adult literacy classes, education—so things that try to remove barriers across the boards to gaining employment.

JOHN B. RHEA: It's an area where, to answer your other part of your question, no, we don't have any separate funding that we receive to provide those types of programs. NYCHA does have a substantial amount that we invest though in Language Line and Access. We obviously have a federal mandate that we have to make sure that the programs that we offer are made—that residents are made aware of them. And obviously if English is an impediment that we actually provide them with the translation services that are required in order for them to access those programs. So we spend a lot of time and energy and money on

2.0

2.3

providing not only the written translation, but
having a language hotline that's available, and
doing outreach in our developments around, you
know, particularly Spanish, but obviously in a
number of other languages as wellas the
diversity of public housing languages has
continued to increase.

But this is an area where we don't receive any particular funding for, and so we are working with other not-for-profits and other organizations that do have access to English as a Second Language to try and bring that in to what we're doing here. But we could do a much better job of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So part of like, you do refer students--

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: If they want to take advantage of those opportunities they have--I guess, what is the requirement for a NYCHA resident to be able to access those jobs? I mean, skill levels or just whatever jobs that are available they have?

JOHN B. RHEA: Well, go ahead.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MICHELLE PINNOCK: So there isn't--

I mean there are basic requirements. Well, no, there isn't really, because the jobs vary. And so Section 3 we see oftentimes the opportunity to get that first experience, to build experience, to be able to position you for higher wage or more advanced positions. So it really varies. what we do do, when someone expresses interest, we invite them in to our resident employment services office. They hear about all the opportunities available through NYCHA. So whether it's with our contractors or--because we actually are more successful in placing or having greater placements even outside of our contractors. So we really do In looking to expand economic opportunities we don't only rely on jobs with our contractors.

JOHN B. RHEA: So we work directly with the employer. So whether it's a NYCHA contractor or whether it's a private sector employer, to understand what job are they trying to fill, okay, and what is the skill requirement for that job. And then obviously on the other end, we're working with our residents in our residential employment offices. You know,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

obviously we just opened a new one on Atlantic Avenue. And residents come in, they do diagnostic work around what their skills are, what their work history is, and through that there's a matching process. We also offer programs to help residents enhance their skills. And I mentioned the job training program that we're launching today, that we're going to go public with that we're launching with Robin Hood. And that is all about taking residents and investing millions of dollars against enhancing their skills, so that they will be more attractive to construction employers as well as in the areas of extermination and some other jobs that we know will be prevalent at NYCHA as well as our contractors and in the private sector. And we're going to invest substantially in our residents to give them those enhanced skills.

So we do both. We understand the specifics of the job. We understand the skills that residents currently have and we try to make matches where there is a match, and we try to enhance NYCHA residents' skills in order to ensure that they have access to at least an entry-level

to ask you a couple of questions. The first

relates to the stimulus money and its application

24

25

in the program you were just describing. Had
there not been stimulus money, the unfunded
mandates would have cost the City several million
dollars. Would that be accurate to say, in terms
of the construction projects and the work projects
that NYCHA does need to get done? And but for the
stimulus money, you would have still had the
Section 3 requirements and you would not have had
funds to produce those works. Is that accurate?

JOHN B. RHEA: So I think the

accurate way to look at it is that the entire

Section 3 program is an unfunded mandate. We

don't receive any money to administer Section 3.

So all the work that these women do and all of the

people who are in either REP or Residential

Economic Empowerment and Sustainability do, the

stuff I just described in terms of the metrics we

want to put in place to track the impact, to place

people, to actually train and provide job training

and workforce development—we receive zero dollars

and zero cents to do that work.

So the entire program, even at its most basic level, to just try and ensure that NYCHA residents have access to jobs and to track

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whether or not they did or didn't get it, even if we didn't do zero outreach, that piece isn't funded. And we're trying to expand the work that we're doing. And so part of what we're trying to do is expand that smartly; that's why I talked about the partnerships with not-for-profits and the private sector, and their funding the programs. NYCHA's working with them jointly to develop the programs and to apply them specifically to public housing residents, but NYCHA doesn't have the millions of dollars that it needs to be invested in that programmatic work. So we're working with others who believe workforce development job training and eradicating poverty is their job, and they're using their funds to do it. So, whether it's our normal capital

So, whether it's our normal capital program or the stimulus funded capital programs, we didn't receive any money to do that work.

There are more jobs to be had because of the stimulus projects; but it just means now we have to do even more matching and more training and more outreach to try and ensure that because of these additional projects and additional capital

2	that's being spent, NYCHA residents have
3	opportunity to do that. So the whole program is
4	an unfunded mandate, and more capital work is a
5	great thing for NYCHA, because we need to do these
6	projects in our developments to maintain them and
7	to enhance the buildings themselves. But as that
8	grows, our ability to keep up with that without
9	any funding just actually makes it even more
10	difficult for us to actually finance our
11	residential economic empowerment and
12	sustainability initiatives.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay. I
14	think you went a long road to not answer a very
15	simple question, and I say that with all due
16	respect to you, sir. My question was very simply,
17	you're engaging in \$400 plus million worth of
18	work.
19	JOHN B. RHEA: Right.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
21	Which is coming solely through federal stimulus
22	money. Correct?
23	JOHN B. RHEA: Correct.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.

And you're going to be able to put X number of

2	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
3	So, my question to you, back then, was simply you
4	have a lot of capital projects which obviously
5	need to be done. You're doing some of them
6	thankfully because we've got this stimulus money.
7	We would not be able to engage in these necessary
8	projects, nor put these people to work, but for
9	the stimulus money. Would that be a fair
10	statement?
11	JOHN B. RHEA: That's a fair
12	statement. That's not what you asked me. You
13	asked me about was it an unfunded mandated.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Well,
15	that's the next part.
16	JOHN B. RHEA: So those are two
17	different questions.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And we
19	have an unfunded mandate to administer a program
20	to put people to work within the NYCHA system. Is
21	that correct?
22	JOHN B. RHEA: That's correct, and
23	that's what I answered.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And with
25	recards to that unfunded mandate the component of

2	that will shrink or increase based on how much
3	capital projects you're working on. Would that be
4	fair to say?
5	JOHN B. RHEA: That's fair to say.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
7	JOHN B. RHEA: Which is why I said,
8	it grew. You characterized the question that by
9	receiving these stimulus monies did I actually now
10	have some funding on an unfunded mandate. And I'm
11	telling you just the opposite. I'm telling you,
12	as we get more capital projects, to administer a
13	program to put more people to work in those
14	projects is actually more onerous on NYCHA, not
15	less. So I was very clear in my statement. If
16	you didn't understand it, I apologize.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
18	JOHN B. RHEA: But that's what I
19	answered.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: All
21	right. With regards to the stimulus money, when
22	did we become aware that we would actually receive
23	that funding?
24	JOHN B. RHEA: All housing
25	authorizes were made aware that the stimulus

2.0

pro	ogram	would	apply	to	public	housing	in	February
of	2008-	sorry	7, 2009	Θ.				

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And when did we become aware of how much money we would actually receive from that stimulus package?

JOHN B. RHEA: Same time, same

time.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.

And in your testimony, page 15, you indicate in

2009 NYCHA hired 1,398 full and part-time staff
including 738, 53%, Section 3 NYCHA residents. Do
you mean to say there that you hired an additional
1,398? Because on the next page you go on to say
that the workforce of the Authority employs 3,000
residents, which represents roughly 25% of the
workforce.

JOHN B. RHEA: Yeah. So what it was saying is that we count within our overall Section 3 envelope residents that we hire directly at the Authority. And so, I gave you the numbers that we hired in 2009, that I quoted, which is part of the overall almost 3,000. Remember, some of those residents that I quoted of the 1,300, some are part-time, some are full-time. Right?

2	The 3,000 that I quote is actually full-time NYCHA
3	employees. So a significant number of that 1,300
4	that we hired last year would have been seasonal
5	part-time that, you know, are no longer still
6	employed with the Authority.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
8	And do those numbers include or account for the
9	construction jobs generated in the course of
10	applying the stimulus money vis-à-vis the Section
11	3 program?
12	JOHN B. RHEA: No, those were the
13	separate numbers that I gave you.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
15	All right. So in that, is there a particular
16	reason for a 1,300 person increase in personnel in
17	NYCHA last year?
18	JOHN B. RHEA: It's not a 1,300
19	person increase in personnel. Remember we have
20	attrition at NYCHA, so
21	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
22	[Interposing] What's the attrition rate?
23	JOHN B. RHEA: I'd have to get back
24	to you with that.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.

2	JOHN B. RHEA: But there's
3	attrition at NYCHA. And, as I said, some of those
4	jobs are full-time and some of those jobs are
5	part-time, meaning part-time i.e. seasonal. NYCHA
6	always has a seasonal program, and so many of
7	those jobs reflect that, so they're not permanent.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.
9	I'd just ask that you get back to me with just the
10	data on your attrition rates in response to my
11	question of how much are actually new creations
12	versuswell, let me ask it another way.
13	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman,
14	that will be part of the executive budget hearings
15	next months, so you can provide that information
16	at the next hearing about attrition, reduction in
17	headcounts, as you do at every executive and
18	preliminary budget. Okay?
19	JOHN B. RHEA: Okay. Sounds good.
20	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And
22	finally, Mr. Chairman, just with regards to the
23	costs for the unfunded mandate, assuming we hadn't
24	received the stimulus, can you estimate what that
25	office that was created costs you administratively

on average?

JOHN B. RHEA: So the total Section 3 works costs NYCHA about \$5 million a year.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you,

Council Member Halloran. Council Member Melissa

Mark-Viverito will defer to Council Member Reyna

who was next but stepped out of the room. So if

you're ready, Council Member Reyna?

much, Madam Chair and thank you, Council Member
Mark-Viverito. I just wanted to take a moment to
say how we're making progress, Mr. Chair, on the
resident employment. I believe in the month of
the preliminary budget season you had mentioned
very shyly that you were not happy with the
numbers from previous years and that you're making
sure that the Section 3 program is going to be
better than ever, successful in execution. And
so, for the first quarter to know that you're
already hitting a target that is a third of what
you were able to accomplish in two years, in one
quarter. Do you--what is the projected number for

2.0

the full year, calendar year?

JOHN B. RHEA: That's a good

4 question.

[Pause]

JOHN B. RHEA: And the reason why

I'm saying that's a good question--for example,

the 407 jobs that we will create through the

stimulus work, right, they come online at

different times. And so when you say for the full

year, you have some jobs that will come on in

2010, some in '11, some that will expire before

the year is out. So that's why it's not the

easiest way to answer the question.

[Pause]

MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes, we'll get back to you in terms of the full annual projection. Because what we would want to do is to take some of those things into consideration that the Chairman mentioned, to see how many more we'll start hiring the rest of this year. Because you've got to remember, related to stimulus they have until 2012 for all the funds to be expended. So some jobs are coming online, some are going off, federalization is going to kick in, and then

that doesn't include our other capital jobs as

well. So we would want to be able to provide you

with a more accurate number specific to 2010.

appreciate that. I just, you know, I'm trying to have a positive outlook here as far as the 2010 for NYCHA is concerned regarding Section 3. And so there must have been a plan of action where a projected number was expected in order to achieve certain goals. And so, if you're telling me that you were going to achieve for the first quarter in 2010 150, and now you're far exceeding that goal; we're on target, right? And so what was the projected annual.

JOHN B. RHEA: I'm being very direct; it was not calculated that way. It's not calculated as an, you know, an annual goal. It's calculated as how much construction work will we be administering in a period of time. What kind of dollars does that equate to in terms of wages that will be derived from those projects? And therefore, how do we ensure that NYCHA residents receive, quote unquote, their fare share, X percent, 15% of those wages, over that prescribed

2	period of time. Right? Some contracts, again,
3	they're not annualized. A contract could start in
4	November of 2009 and go through, you know December
5	of 2011.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Correct.
7	JOHN B. RHEA: And some jobs come
8	on and some jobs go off. So we really don't look
9	at it asit's not an annualized number. And to
10	be honest with you, that number will bounce around
11	too, because, you know, we're going to have a lot-
12	-we have a \$2.5 billion dollar capital program now
13	that's being driven, you know, largely by both the
14	stimulus and the federalization that will
15	disappear in a couple of years. Right? And so if
16	you were to just compare it as the annual goal
17	you'd say, well, NYCHA achieved these numbers in
18	2011, 2010, 2011. These numbers are less in 2012
19	and '12. What happened?
20	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.
21	JOHN B. RHEA: Well, we'd have a
22	lot less construction work. So.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I

understand. It's just as far as equating for the sake of oversight, what are the--I won't use the

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

projected number, but the equation of the number

of contracts, you know, for the second quarter?

would need to come back to you with that information.

JOHN B. RHEA: Yeah. If you want us to calendarize when construction--which was similar to the question that Council Member Mendez asked, you know, kind of what level of completion is each contract -- I mean that's literally what we'd have to do. We'd have to go contract by contract, when did it start, what months does it fall into, when do we believe 10%, 50%, 75%, 90% completion will take place. And we'd have to calendar it--put that in months, put that in quarters and then talk to you about it like that. I'm not really sure that that tells you a whole lot. It's a lot of work to kind of convert that to, you know, a calendar. But I'm not sure what you can really derive from that in terms of benchmarks, metrics or--I'm not managing the business that way. I'm not focused on what do we do this quarter versus last quarters. I'm focused on what are we achieving versus the actual money

and economic activity that's taking place.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: But Mr.

Chairman, in regards to stimulus funding, that's a very specific time clock and you have these contractors, and they have to do the work by a certain time, otherwise even if the money has been obligated, you're not going to get it. So I'm assuming at least for the stimulus funding, you have that, you know, you would have that for at least several quarters. You know, you may not have it for your regular capital funding because you'll have more time to obligate and spend that money. Am I...?

asking can I go to Capital Projects and have them take each one of our capital projects, right, and lay out for us the construction schedule, right, and then convert the construction schedule into what is the labor component of that and when does it come online, and then how will NYCHA's resident employment piece of that come online—that can be done. It's not a question of whether we can do it. We can go back and do the work. It's not something that I measure and track that way.

Right?

3	What I'm focused on is if we say
4	ten jobs for \$118,000 are going to be created on
5	these 14 projects over this period of time, where
6	are we, you know, month-by-month, quarter-by-
7	quarter against those 14 projects and that
8	\$118,000 dollars and those ten jobs. That's what
9	I'm focused on, not, you know, how does that
10	calendarize into first quarter, second quarter,
11	third quarter, fourth quarter of 2010; and how
12	does that compare to first quarter, second
13	quarter, third quarter, fourth quarter of 2009.
14	It's just not a way that we measure it. And I'm
15	not saying we can't give you a number, I'm just
16	not really sure what it tells you.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Madam Chair,
18	if I may? Chairman, I'm not looking for a
19	calendar comparison, but what I am looking for is
20	what you just mentioned as far as metrics
21	concerning how many jobs per month.
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: If I may
23	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] But
24	again I'm not sure what per monthyou keep

converting it into--you're converting, you're

using a monthly denominator. I don't understand what that means.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Can I

interrupt for a second? Just for me, if you think at the end of the day the \$423 million stimulus funding is going to get us 407 jobs, and if we have used up half of that stimulus funding and we're not near the 200 jobs, which would be the halfway mark, that would tell me that something's going wrong with your contractors and—

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing]

Couldn't agree with you more, and that's what we measure. That's not a quarterly or a monthly or an annual calendarization. That's looking at when the jobs are deploying, when the money is being let to the contractor for substantial completion, and whether or not work is actually going to our residents as part of that process. And so like I said, I couldn't agree—that's how we look at it. What you just said, Council Member Mendez, is exactly how we look at it.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Yes, but I don't see--if you only have two years to use this money, I don't see why you're not looking at it--

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing]

Because it doesn't happen--you're describing it as a linear function; it's not a linear function, meaning it's a chunky function. For example, you know, on the first half of a job, let's say a job lasts two years an elevator job. The first 12 months of the job may have nobody, almost, going to a construction site that would be a Section 3 eligible type of a job. Right? It could be highly technical people going to that job performing a set of functions, while you're ordering the elevator cabs and waiting for the construction and manufacturing of the cab to be completed for that cab to then be delivered to the construction site, and then for the elevator to be installed, which you then would need, you know, security quards on the site. You would need a laborer; you would need someone in an administrative office.

So the job might actually only happen for NYCHA employees on the back half of that project. Measuring it for the first 12 months might not tell you anything. So I don't understand with where you guys are going with the

2	kind of calendar piece of it. I understand where
3	you're going with the expenditures and analyzing
4	whether or not you believe based upon the jobs
5	that you're creating, those 10 jobs on those 14
6	projects, when you believe they're supposed to
7	mobilize, is the contractor achieving the outcomes
8	and what is NYCHA doing to measure that and try to
9	course correct when they're not achieving it.
10	But I am being very upfront,
11	because I'm not going to tell you we're going to
12	bring you something that is going to give you data
13	to help you, you know, measure what we're doing if
14	it's not how we manage and measure our own
15	program.
16	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Well, you've
17	certainly explained it. If Diana still wants the
18	information, I would ask you to provide it to the
19	Committee.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And Mr.
21	Chair, just for clarification, you mentioned
22	quarter in your report, that's why I mentioned
23	quarter. Correct me if I'm wrong?

24 [Pause]

JOHN B. RHEA: I'm sorry, in one of

hear about it the next hearing. That would be

25

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: -- just the issue on my resolution, Resolution number 207 concerning the Together We Care Act of 2009. particular resolution supporting what is going to be implemented on the Lower East Side is part of the attempt to fulfill Section 3 requirements. Do you find that this is an attainable goal as far as what number of jobs you plan to be able to create and how many household residents may qualify?

JOHN B. RHEA: So a couple of things. One, I would refer the Council to my specific testimony regarding the Together We Can

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Act in 2009. I don't have the exact month when I provided my testimony to--it was congressional testimony actually, not City Council Testimony. July of last year. July of 2009. So I would actually like that to be my principal answer for the record. Additionally though, what I said there was we strongly supported the Together We Can Act. And as I referenced in this testimony, my formal testimony remarks today, we believe that obviously the healthcare arena is a growing field. We believe that the trend away from--it's not outsourcing, but intensive patient care outside of traditional hospital settings will only continue to grow, particularly being able to provide that care to our communities within public housing and low income communities, which have historically been underserved by both primary care and by healthcare facilities. We think that this is a real industry with growth and with unmet demand that our residents can qualify for.

We feel strongly though that our residents are going to need extensive training in order to take advantage of these jobs, and it's one of the areas where we will need to work to

ensure that there's training provided and funding provided for it. We expressed some concerns in the Together We Can Act, in terms of, again, about additional unfunded mandates by strengthening Section 3. Which, you know, we share the objections of strengthening Section 3, at the same time I think the proposal was either \$25 or \$50 million nationally when, again, NYCHA spends roughly \$5 million today already. And that amount of money, you know, would be insufficient to deal with all of the increased administration work that it would require.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And Mr.

Rhea, is there an assessment that is currently taking place or has taken place concerning the number of households over the age of 62 and the possibilities of trying to assess where there's the need to concentrate, prioritize certain developments because they have greater than 50%, you know, aging in place residents that would need a very focused effort to concentrate on making sure that this opportunity with the Together We Care Act would be implemented at those particular developments?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN B. RHEA: So, a couple

answers. The first one is, yes, we are doing an extensive amount of work at NYCHA, in partnership actually with the Department of Health on a pretty groundbreaking piece of research that looks at the quality in health disparities in public housing for seniors. Richard Green, who is a member of our community operations, in partnership with Social Services -- it's run by Nora Resick Lazzarro [phonetic], and then as I said, in partnership with the Department of Health and others. And it's very impressive work in terms of having a deep dive understanding of the disparities and how we can address them. So the short answer is yes, we're doing a lot of work on seniors and on seniors' healthcare needs in NYCHA developments.

That is also overlaid by a side by side piece of work to really understand how we can produce additional housing to serve our residents, senior residents, as 202 is being deemphasized at a federal level, how we can nave new programs to create new senior housing that would allow us to move many NYCHA residents that are in under occupied apartments into new senior housing at

2.0

2.3

NYCHA developments that actually have strengthened
types of care that can be provided to them, not
just the physical needs of the apartment, but also
obviously the services

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

[Interposing] Social.

JOHN B. RHEA: The services component. It's obviously difficult in this environment. I mean we know what's happening with DFTA and with others that we rely on to be our partners in some of that. So we're going to need to find new models to deliver this and new funding streams, but the work is being done. How we're going to pay for it is a different question.

wanted to remind you, we are still waiting for the points of agreement that was laid out by this administration in the 2005 Greenpoint Williamsburg Rezoning where Cooper Park was one of the suggested sites for such housing. And we've yet to have a reconvening of a discussion on that particular site. If you can indulge me and answer our calls when we call your office to meet and discuss this, it would be wonderful. But the

findings of the collaboration that you just
mentioned, will there be a report that will be
published concerning these particular
recommendations or, you know, as far as the number
of households in reference to the number of home
health aides or home attendants that can possibly
be trained to care for the elderly?

JOHN B. RHEA: So we will need to connect these dots. Right? So you know on one end we're doing the work on the disparities and what that means in terms of needs, right? We will need to then take that in to--with other partners--in to what does that really mean for jobs, which is where you were going with this.

The first part of the report will absolutely be made public in terms of the research and the work that we're doing around healthcare needs and the health status of NYCHA seniors.

That will be made public. We will then need to convert that work into the job component, because as I said it also means—there's the demand side of the equation but then there's the supply side, you know, trying to understand what would you need to do for NYCHA residents to put them in a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2	position to actually access those jobs. So t	:hat's
3	another piece of the work that you have to do) .

And then the third piece is, as I was discussing, in terms of the housing component, Which is, as we think about NYCHA households that's work we're addressing in the plan to preserve public housing, which is how do we ensure that there's sufficient housing resources and where and how do we develop those to deliver some of those additional services to the newly located housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And there's no set timeline right now for each of those categories?

JOHN B. RHEA: Well, the first piece, you know, is there is a timeline. I can get it to you in terms of when we would have the, kind of, the healthcare disparity piece completed.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: appreciate it.

JOHN B. RHEA: And there's a first piece that's already been completed and we're continuing some additional work with the Department of Health so we can get you that

information. The second piece I'm not going to proffer a date, but it's coming upon this very large team you see here to really try to put that in a priority along with many of the other things I described that we're doing in terms of the partnerships we're striking to provide employment opportunities for residents. So we'll have to get back to you with a date on that one.

And then the housing side of the equation we will be working on—we are working on it now and, you know, I'll be talking to the Council with some more specificity in coming months around the timeline of that work.

do appreciate those efforts, and you know, on a personal note as far as a story—it's very short—at Cooper Park during the summer last year, I happened to just call one of my residents, a dear friend, Ms. Allen, and she just happens to be suffering from a shortness of breath. She thought she was having a heart attack. And while I had her on one line I called 911 for her. She's elderly living in, you know, a two-bedroom apartment, would love to downsize but doesn't want

2.0

2.3

to just conform to living in another multi-
dwelling. She hopes to go into what would be a
senior residence, but Cooper Park lacks that.

And the good news is that she
wasn't suffering a heart attack; she is doing
well. But her needs are not being met at Cooper
Park and I hope that we can continue to discuss
Cooper Park at a macro level. And just to answer
the question--

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And-MICHELLE PINNOCK: [Interposing]
Council--I'm sorry.

JOHN B. RHEA: Go ahead.

jump and let you know just some of the things that we are doing in line with healthcare. I mean we're partnering with, the Chairman Mentioned, ROSS grants. So we've subcontracted with groups, and one of the areas we've done some training in is around certified nurse assistants. We're looking at other healthcare possible training.

We, you know, are talking with and working with small business services and, you know, working with La Guardia College, they opened up a

Workforce One Center focused on healthcare. So it gets to, again, establishing partnerships and looking where we can leverage training across different sectors.

But even looking at our job

placement so far this year, I think it shows also

that there is a demand, because about eight

percent of our placements in four months have been

related to the healthcare industry. So it is

something that we are aware of, on top of, and are

trying to prepare beforehand, so this way we can

begin to access and place people into training.

JOHN B. RHEA: And the partnerships that I described with the not-for-profits and the philanthropic sector, we've already started it by looking first at NYCHA and our contractors, but as I mentioned, we're going to expand that to the private sector. One of the core areas that we're focused on with that platform is with the area of healthcare. So we would be looking to leverage a partnership with philanthropic organizations that would train NYCHA residents for evolving and emerging healthcare jobs that NYCHA wouldn't actually—we would be raising additional dollars

2.0

2.3

to	the	work	that	we're	alre	eady	doing	to	provide
tho	ose	kinds	of s	ervices	s to	our	reside	ents	S.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Sure.

JOHN B. RHEA: So, we have the platforms to do it, but we're ramping them up.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Well, I appreciate that. And thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to make sure that on page 18, I quote from those reports, we estimate that NYCHA saved and created the full-time equivalent of 147 jobs in the first quarter of 2010 alone, which is where I got the quarter from.

JOHN B. RHEA: So here's the complicating factor. We report that information because that's how the federal government requires that we report money from the stimulus funds. It is not—so I want to be very clear about this, when the stimulus bill was passed, obviously congress needed to use a certain set of metrics to project what types of jobs they either thought would be saved or created from this massive stimulus exercise. They had an input/output model that is not a model that NYCHA uses or that many other agencies use in terms of calculating job

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

creation from capital projects or other forms of spending. That model said that there were going to be 3,000 jobs or something created from stimulus as it related to public housing in New York. That number is not something that is actually in fact related to the way we calculate numbers in our experience.

So for example, the federal government requires us to basically say how many-irrespective of the number of hours worked or the wages paid--you know, how many jobs were either created or saved. So, a person who receives, you know, eight dollars an hour for two days is a job that either was saved or created. Then we have to convert that number by the government's formula to what they call full-time equivalents. And so what we are tracking every month to be in compliance with the federal government's requirements, are the number of jobs either created or saved as it relates to the stimulus money we're spending. what I said is that 630 jobs were created or retained in the last quarter of 2009, which converts to 187 FTE, full-time equivalents. 800 jobs have been created or retained in the

2.0

you.

first quarter of 2010, which equated to 148 full-
time equivalents. So, again, these area job is
not a job is ayou know. Anybody who had some
form of employment with some form of pay for at
least a day, and then you've got to convert that
through the federal government's calculations into
a full-time equivalent, which is not something
that I think we want to have, in terms of how that
math works, at this hearing. But it is not really
reflective of the way NYCHA measures our Section 3
and our REP jobs that we secure for our residents.
COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Understood.

JOHN B. RHEA: Okay.

I just wanted to reference your language. Thank

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Council Member Melissa Mark-Viverito.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you all for being here. And You know, I really want to just echo the sentiments that Diana Reyna started off with, just talking about, you know, obviously any attention and focus that is being put on trying to improve the Section 3 program is obviously very

much appreciated, because it really, truly

benefits our public housing residents by affording

them opportunities, and I think that that should

be really one of the, you know, a real focus of

NYCHA as well--not just providing housing and

managing housing--it's figuring out and I think

you allude to it in your testimony, how we really

can work with our residents to really have them

move one step forward.

So, you know, when we have these hearings, and I hope that you can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, we're doing it in the spirit of cooperation, not adversity. And I think we have a lot to contribute. We have been a very, very strong partner on behalf of NYCHA to advocate on behalf of NYCHA, even before you were chairman. And, you know, we, I think take a lot of credit for a lot of the attention that has been focused on NYCHA and a lot of the attention that has been focused on public housing in general, that it is the cornerstone of affordable housing in the City of New York. And I hope that when you come here it is also in that spirit of cooperation to hear what we have to say. Because I believe that the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

people right here on this panel, at least the elected officials that are here, have a real strong pulse of what's happening in the community. We have a strong partnership with our public housing developments, and there's a lot of constructive criticism that we can provide. So I just wanted to kind of state that.

But I have a couple of questions with regards to some of the information. know, obviously, great concern whenever there's these unfunded mandates. That really poses a hardship, understood, on any agency. And that really is a problem. Do you believe that there is a change in the sentiment at the federal level that maybe there has to be some attention, maybe from HUD and others, as some additional monies have to come in for this type of work in terms of the workforce development, some of the job training, some of the placement? Do you think that that's something that maybe down the line there will be some attention to and additional resources provided based on what you're hearing at the national level?

JOHN B. RHEA: So first, let me

just acknowledge that we are here in the spirit of partnership. We appreciate the Council having this hearing to not only understand what NYCHA is doing but for us to understand how the City Council Members can continue to support us as you have in the past. So we're very appreciative of that.

And we recognize, although we've been doing this since 2001, as I said, it's an evolving program. And many of the changes that we've implemented in the program are direct results of suggestions and recommendations by members of the Council. And I'm working with many of you right now on specific programs in your district with not-for-profits and with NYCHA's resident employment services team. So we appreciate that, and we still will continue to look for your strong support and partnership.

Secondly, the spirit in Washington obviously is positive. The fact that they make stimulus funding available, as Councilman Halloran suggested, means that there's more money going to public housing, which even creates the opportunity for jobs. So on one hand, yes, what's happening

2.0

2.3

2	in Washington is positive. There are also other
3	programs, like the Choice Neighborhood Initiative,
4	which they're looking to fund, which is about
5	reinvesting in communities, particularly in low
6	income and public housing communities, in other
7	serviceshousing and other non-housing services
8	that create jobs.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Is

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Is that through HUD?

JOHN B. RHEA: That's through HUD.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

13 Okay.

Neighborhood Initiative, CNI. There's also other ones through the Department of Education and Promise Neighborhoods. And a lot of these lead to jobs within these communities. So the short answer is, yes, the push in Washington to refocus on urban America, on low income communities, on housing and public housing agencies as a platform to help achieve some of this employment, is very positive.

Having said that, I was just down two weeks ago testifying on our--excuse me, not

breakfast, where we laid our priorities, asking our delegation in Washington to focus in on the people side of the equation, to fund ROSS at a billion dollars—it's been substantially reduced—and to put money back in programs like the Drug Elimination Program that public housing used to receive; because that allows us to hire not only additional law enforcement, but also to put money in community based organizations and tenant based organizations that also can help us eradicate and fight crime and provide jobs to youth who don't have any other options and so they find themselves in illicit activity like the drug trade.

And so very much of what I was talking about in addition to more capital funding was providing additional funding for the human side of the equation, which is really about education and about workforce development.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: So, and you mention ROSS. And I'm seeing all the different interesting—and obviously I welcome that—in terms of these partnerships that you're talking about. So two quick questions, with

2.0

2.3

regard to the ROSS grants, how much came	into	the
City of New York, or at least to NYCHA?	What	was
the total amount granted to New York City	7?	

JOHN B. RHEA: Just a little over a million dollars, I think, is what my team is telling me. And, you know, the program is not projected to be funded at levels that would approach anything towards historical peaks out of Washington.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

You're expecting it to be less moving forward?

JOHN B. RHEA: Yeah, I can get you the numbers, but in the current budget the ROSS program is not being funded anywhere close to where it had been funded at peak years.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: And so then, another question with regards--because you talk about these pre-apprenticeship opportunities leading to permanent apprenticeships, I guess, or apprenticeships.

You're talking about the partnerships with CUNY.

You're talking about the Year Up [phonetic] and CCNY. I mean between all of that--and then you also talk about the employment or the hires that

2.0

2.3

you do, you also consider that towards Section 3.
So taking all of that into account, like, how many
jobs to you attribute to Section 3? Because these
are all different pieces that you're putting out
there, but I'm just trying to get like a more
comprehensive number.

JOHN B. RHEA: Tough question.

First of all on the ROSS side of the equation, you asked how much came directly to NYCHA, that was the number I gave you.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Right.

JOHN B. RHEA: For example, ROSS funds go to other New York City based agencies.

And so there's additional money out there that's being either, you now, received by a CUNY or an HRA or someone else that is eligible to receive ROSS funding. And then we work as hard as we can to help ensure that some of the programming that they're going to do with that focuses on NYCHA residents, even though NYCHA is not administering the money directly. So, I just wanted to clarify that for you.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

2	Wait, Hold on. Let me understand that. So you're
3	saying that there are ROSS monies that go to other
4	agencies directly other than NYCHA? And that
5	maybe working with residents or non-residents?
6	MICHELLE PINNOCK: We believe so.
7	We know that there are others who are eligible to
8	apply.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Oh
10	really.
11	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Under the
12	competitive grant process. So in terms of the \$1
13	million, was really what NYCHA has received
14	through competitive grants over the last about
15	three funding cycles under ROSS. So we've been
16	successful in ROSS '05, '06, '07 to receive
17	grants.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: \$1
19	million a year or \$1 million total?
20	MICHELLE PINNOCK: No, that's
21	cumulative.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: It
23	was over a three-year period.
24	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes. And so one
25	of those contracts or grants ended earlier this

2	year, in about February. The next is due to end
3	in October. We successfully received an
4	extension. And then the last is scheduled to end
5	in 2011. So there are others that can compete
6	and, you know, have been awarded money through
7	ROSS. But to your Section
8	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And
9	hold on. And again the money doesn't really come-
10	-I just want to make sure I can tell you, it
11	doesn't come necessarily directly to NYCHA. It
12	goes to fund the actual training slots.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
14	Right. The partnership, is what it seems like.
15	MICHELLE PINNOCK: We won the
16	contracts.
17	JOHN B. RHEA: Right.
18	MICHELLE PINNOCK: And then we
19	subcontract it out because, as the Chairman
20	mentioned, we're not a workforce development or

MICHELLE PINNOCK: And then we subcontract it out because, as the Chairman mentioned, we're not a workforce development or employment agency, so really get partnering with those experts in this area that can. And all of our contracts are performance based—it's training linked to then job placement assistance and that's really how we have utilized our ROSS funding.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN B. RHEA: So the money is for the actual training slots.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Right. I see that. So then here--then that was one of my questions as well. Because you talk about the ROSS grants. You talk about from 2003--I'm sorry, 2007 to February of this year, you partnered with College of Staten Island, LaGuardia Community College--for GED prep, vocational training, 150 residents. That ends up being about 50 a year. But then as you continue with your testimony, you're also talking about ROSS grants allowing you to provide administrative assistant and information technology training to 175 residents. So under the ROSS grant, over the three-year period, at \$1 million over three years, you're talking about 325 NYCHA residents being placed in jobs. Is that correct?

michelle pinnock: Well 425
receiving training, and then there is a goal by
which each provider is supposed to provide job
placement assistance. And we can get you that
exact number and what the goals are. But I did
want to clarify—those do not count towards

Ι

JOHN B. RHEA: And one of the

reasons I talked about the program, as an example

the Robin Hood program we're announcing, one of

the issues that I looked at with these training

22

23

24

25

providers is that they have a mixed bag record of 2 3 actual training leading to jobs. Right? And one 4 of the things that we don't want--number one, we want to make sure that they efficacy is high; that 5 they can not only provide residents with 6 7 marketable skills, but they also have the ability 8 to get them placed into employment. And many of the training providers are training organizations 9 10 and not placement organizations. And so one of the things I identified as a gap in our efforts 11 collectively--it's not about NYCHA, it's about the 12 13 collective community that's investing in providing skills and trying, at the end of the day we're 14 15 trying to get people in real jobs and earning real wages. And so what we did with the Robin Hood 16 17 program is say we will commit that if people complete this training there's a real job at the 18 19 back end of that program. And we're doing that 20 both with NYCHA jobs, and we're focusing on jobs 21 with our contractors, and then ultimately looking 22 at the private sector to step up and say that 23 these set of skills, if you complete it, you have the kind of skill set that we'll commit to hiring 24 25 people who are graduates or the program.

2.0

2.3

we're committing to is a pipeline, an end to end
program of both identification, removing the
obstacles and barriers, providing you with
training, but then ensuring that you actually get
a job if you complete it.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Correct.

JOHN B. RHEA: And many of these programs don't have that requirement. It's, you complete the training and now you're on that own to take that training and convert it into a job in the marketplace.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Okay. Now just two other questions. The Jobs Plus, which is in my district; the Jobs Plus is happening at Jefferson Houses. I was very excited when I heard that that was happening. I know that's kind of a lot of--half of the money is being raised privately. It's coming through the Center for Economic Opportunity. I know that HUD is also putting in a little bit of money. It's primarily being privately raised.

JOHN B. RHEA: It's private--and there is no money to sustain it right now. So we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are going to have to pretty much either, by what we're trying to do in Washington, get money allocated to--additional money--allocated to programs like Jobs Plus, which is partially why I'd like to see ROSS funded at a much higher level, because that's the natural place to fund it. And then secondly, we're doing an aggressive effort in terms of -- that's why we established, which is not at this table, the Office of Public Private Partnerships at NYCHA, for the first time, which is all about raising millions of dollars of private philanthropic funds in order for us to actually be able to support these programs. Jobs Plus is a principal, primary program that we want to fund in multiple housing developments across the City. And it costs about \$1.2 million a year.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Per year.

JOHN B. RHEA: To rent each Jobs

Plus. But if wanted one of these--we don't need

one in every development--but if you needed one,

you'd need \$300 million a year to support Jobs

Plus.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Now,
3	was that originally envisioned as a one year
4	project? I mean I would think to see results it
5	would need to be for a longer period.
6	JOHN B. RHEA: So the project was
7	originally funded and financed by a collection of
8	philanthropic organizations, including
9	Rockefeller, and it was a demonstration project in
LO	six or seven cities. All of the results were
11	tabulated. It had a substantial impact on not
12	only getting people to employment who had
13	substantial barriers prior, heretofore, to
L4	employment but also in terms of tracking them over
15	long periods of time and seeing those employment
L6	gains stick. So the program once it was
L7	demonstrated to work, the expectation is that the
18	federal government would pick it up and fund it,
19	because it was a proven
20	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
21	[Interposing] Model. Right.
22	JOHN B. RHEA: Model.
23	Unfortunately, the government hasn't quite picked
24	it up and so CEO wanted to bring it to New York.
25	New York was not one of the markets when it was

24

25

correct.

That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

me ask you a question. Is part of any element of

Let

the Jobs Plus also to get people into those, for the Section 3 eligibility or Section 3 jobs?

JOHN B. RHEA: You should talk

5 about that.

DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: We think that Jobs Plus is a great model for that. Again when we think about outreach and recruitment, we talked a little bit about that before, Jobs Plus is a model that really sticks with people over time. And so you know, it's not just sort of, I'm going to sit with you and I'm going to push you off to another job, but really, we're going to figure out what your career goals are and we're going to stick with you for advancement.

And so what's really exciting about Jefferson Houses Jobs Plus is that that's what they're doing. And so right now I think they've actually helped around 70 residents be placed or advanced. And I know one of the neat collaborations we've been able to do with the population at Jefferson is we've been able to bring a partnership we've had independently with CUNY to do some OSHA certification training with that Jefferson Houses population. And so then

2	when we look at that neighborhood of East Harlem,
3	helping to do ladders from the Job Plus program to
4	the Section 3 employment, and then hopefully
5	beyond to other private sector employment.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Are
7	any of those 70 people that have been placed,
8	would that be counting towards Section 3?
9	DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: It would
10	count towards Section 3 if it was with NYCHA or
11	our vendors. And we would actually have to get
12	back to you, I think, on those exact numbers.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
14	Yeah, it would be great to just hear.
15	DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN:
16	Absolutely.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: So
18	then the last question I have is, you know, one of
19	the questions that we have for advocates is
20	whether they feel that they've seen any
21	improvements on the Section 3 program. So what
22	would you say, you know, has been the difference?
23	Because I know it's relatively new. You've been
24	relatively aggressive now as Chairman focusing on

this issue. But what would you say is the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

difference? And how would you say--the difference in terms of the interface, particularly with the residents, between how it was and now how it is?

What would you say are the differences?

JOHN B. RHEA: Well, I mean I hope that the interim sense is that not only is NYCHA much more willing to admit the grow that we need to achieve in this program in order for it to be successful publicly, but also in the spirit of partnership with those community based organizations, social services agencies and advocates who are out in the field doing this work. So whether it ranges from, you know, conversations that we've had with organizations like CSS or Non-traditional Work for Women or with the construction trades, the BCTC, I hope what they're hearing is a willingness for us to not only ask them for their research and their data and ideas around programs, but seeing if there's a group of professionals here who are focused on analyzing what we have, stopping the stuff that's not working and reinvesting in doing things that are working and expanding that, and to go find the resources to support it.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I spend a considerable amount--I can't speak for, you know, anyone, my predecessors, they worked very hard on this since 2001. But I can tell you I'm spending a considerable amount of my time, if I look at my days and where my days are spent and where my nights are spent and how much I'm out advocating for partnerships, funding and measurement and a commitment to employing NYCHA residents I'm spending, you know, a quarter of my time solely on that.

And so, you know, I feel I personally know who many of the critical partners are in this field, both on the elected side and on the advocate side and in the philanthropic community, and we are making those linkages happen. And they're manifesting themselves in programs, not just in, you know, words, but in real programmatic work, with real dollars associated with it that we believe are going to lead to jobs. And, you know, it's early days. wouldn't expect anyone to say anything other than that they have confidence that we are committed to this and that they're seeing some innovation and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that they're willing to take a wait and see attitude and that they're willing to work with us to get real results.

Residents, at the end of the day, I think residents are pretty brass tacks. You know, did you get me or anyone in my family into a job? The numbers say we did and that that is improving significantly versus where it was the year before and the year before that, on a total number and on a percentage of the work that we're doing, it's improving. But at the end of the day, if we've, you know, only helped 500 residents get in jobs and the CSS study says there's 20,000 unemployed people that are in the job market within NYCHA public housing developments, you know, 500 is a big number but it sure doesn't feel like a lot when 20,000 people are searching for work. recognize that we really are making real progress, but if you're a resident, you know, it's kind of proof is in the pudding and in the eating. And, you know, if we've got 500 jobs, there are still 19,500 who are searching.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you for your testimony and thank you for

JOHN B. RHEA:

may not appreciate what I said. 62 years or

[Interposing] They

23

24

25

there are currently--

	_	-		
)	 \cap L	\sim	er.	
	\cup \perp	u	-	

2	older.
3	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Many of those
4	individuals, though not all of them, do have some
5	health, home health aide at this moment. Do you
6	know how many of your current residents actually
7	have home health aides?
8	JOHN B. RHEA: I would hope that
9	that's some of the data that we can glean from the
10	disparity in health study that I referenced when I
11	speaking with Council Member Reyna, so we can come
12	back to you with that, but I can't tell you that
13	off the top of my head.
14	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And of your
15	total population, do you know how many of your
16	residents are disabled with a physical disability?
17	JOHN B. RHEA: We do, but I don't
18	know that number off the top of my head. But yes,
19	that information is reported as part of our
20	household composition information.
21	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Can you get
22	this Committee that number, please?
23	JOHN B. RHEA: Sure.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you.
25	Just, I think Reyna's resolution and our

2.0

2.3

2	congresswoman working on such legislation, that
3	would actually provide funding for the training
4	would be a good way to go. Just from my
5	interaction there are so many residents in public
6	housing, elderly or disabled, who actually need
7	more in-home assistance. So I think that would be
8	a great thing.

In reference to Section 3, can we go back to my question now about focusing on how many Section 3 jobs have been created through your capital program? And, if you have that number for 2009, since we're in the middle of 2010, and if you have any numbers for 2010, knowing that it's not a complete fiscal year for NYCHA, I will listen to those numbers.

MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes, Council
Member. For--

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]

Can you grab the microphone just a little closer?

Thank you.

MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes, there we go. So for 2009 there were 265 Section 3 placements. And when we say Section 3 I'm including what we refer to as REP, that's the 15%

25 mentioned before, is really based on the number of

2	new hires. And that's the whole greatest extent
3	feasible language. And so
4	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And so
5	a contractor that has a, you know, a small
6	procurement contract for \$300,000 we try to
7	understand from them how many new jobs will be
8	created. If they say, you know, three jobs then
9	they will we require that one of those jobs will
LO	be for a NYCHA resident to meet the 30% objective.
11	MICHELLE PINNOCK: And then thus
12	far for 2010, January through April, with our
L3	contractors there has been 93 placements. And so-
L4	-and we would have to get back to you on the NYCHA
L5	direct hire number.
L6	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: And these
L7	numbers are exclusive of stimulus funding created
L8	Section 3 jobs, correct?
L9	MICHELLE PINNOCK: No, it's
20	inclusive.
21	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: It's
22	inclusive.
23	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes. Because
24	again, as was mentioned in testimony, the stimulus
25	funded jobs, a portion of that, a large portion.

not our fiscal year.

2	are subject to Section 3. So if the Committee
3	likes, we can provide an actual breakdown that
4	separates the two. But the numbers that I just
5	provided are inclusive.
6	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. So the
7	407 full time jobs that I got earlier, that would
8	be for Section 3, I don't know what percentage of
9	this 265 is that 407I mean for 14 jobs I know it
10	was 8.
11	MICHELLE PINNOCK: So for 407, that
12	was again, the jobs that would be created through
13	the stimulus funding. So we know that there have
14	been 103 placements from just the stimulus funded
15	projects to date.
16	JOHN B. RHEA: So the tough thing,
17	right, is
18	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: [Interposing]
19	That's inclusive of 2010, right? To date means
20	MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes. Yes, to
21	date.
22	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: You know,
23	since you got the money in March or April of 2009.
24	So it's been a year, but not your fiscal year and

) 1	MICHELLE PINNOCK:	77 ~ ~
/	IVI (H H.I.I.H. P I NINIC) (K •	YES

3	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Maybe the
4	state's fiscal year, possibly. But who knows?
5	JOHN B. RHEA: And so remember,
6	right, you know for jobs that are, you know, being
7	created, you know, mobilized on a construction
8	site in 2009 in our normal capital program,
9	because you have, you know, a four year period;
10	two years to obligate and two years to actually
11	spend the money. You know, those contracts could,
12	you know, and it could have been awarded, you
13	know, literally four years ago, that did or didn't
14	havewhich I know we didn't, we weren't measuring
15	contract by contract back then, you know, what was
16	a contractor committing to in terms of resident
17	hires. We knew that a contractor received a
18	contract, the jobs was going to go on, and we did
19	our best to ensure that we matched up our
20	employees with an opportunity at a jobsite.
21	So, numbers that you're going to
22	see in 2008 and 2009 are based on a lot of
23	activities happened in previous years on the
24	traditional capital program side. So 407, only a
25	small portion of that is related to, you know, the

2	jobs that you're looking at. So in 2010 you'll
3	say, you know, how many jobs did you do in 2010.
4	Only a small portion of that 407 is going to be in
5	2010 from stimulus. A lot of it will be from, you
6	know, capital project jobs that were committed to
7	in prior years.
8	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: The 15% of
9	labor costs that NYCHA hasso that's a NYCHA
10	requirement, that's not other public housing
11	authorities across the country, right?
12	JOHN B. RHEA: That's correct.
13	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Do you know if
14	any other public housing authority has a higher
15	percentage that they're requiring through Section
16	3?
17	MICHELLE PINNOCK: No, we don't
18	know.
19	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: You don't
20	know. Could you find out? Because I'd like to
21	say that my housing authority has the largest
22	requirement
23	JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And if
24	you go back and look at the
25	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ:and is on

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

its way to fulfilling that.

JOHN B. RHEA: If you go back and look at the testimony and the congressional testimony from July of 2009, we weren't the only one who testified, that they provided testimony-there are at least another agency that represented public housing in New York State. And you know, one of the things from our work with CLAPHA, the Council on Large Public Housing Authorities across the country, many of them don't even have a real effort at all to try and do what we are describing here in this committee. They don't have an They do their best to make sure residents office. have access to, you know, economic selfsufficiency and that they are aware of jobs, and that, you know, they post that a job is, you know, that it's going up on the site, and encourage residents to do their best efforts to try and get into that employment pipeline.

So as much as we feel that we need to grow and improve, and we do feel strongly based on a lot of benchmarking that we've done, that very few housing authorities across the country have anything close to what we have here in New

2.0

York.

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And none of them, none of them are coming in anywhere close to the quote unquote 30% target of Section

3. People don't even track it, let alone actually come close to hitting it.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman, how did the Authority come up with its 15% as a benchmark? Anyone?

mICHELLE PINNOCK: It started-really, that requirement was put in place in 2001
as a pilot program. But I can't, you know, say
that I know the rationale behind 15% versus 10.

JOHN B. RHEA: So I've done what I call, you know, non-scientific research on this from talking to people who are in the Department, who were in senior positions at the Authority. Part of it was around negotiations with organized labor and the unions and trying to get to a number that was aggressive from the Housing Authority's perspective, and that but on the other hand was viewed by organized labor as something they could at least aspire to in terms of what percentage of

jobs they would be able to work with residents to try to get them the kind of training they needed through their programs and through the preapprenticeship type programs that we're creating, and then the types of what we would call entrylevel jobs on a construction site. Because most of this was related again to capital projects and construction work; so the goal was actually to try and come up with what number of those jobs would actually be newly created jobs as opposed to a contractor deploying his existing manpower on a site, and how does that equate into actual wages paid and can we come up with something that we can actually put some hard targets around.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: I'd like to know if--well, you weren't here for my opening statements. I made some comments about my former boss and your colleague, Alison Cordero, who, if any of you have met her, she's in a coma right now. So we're sending her all of our best wishes. When I started at Brooklyn A, Alison and I and the Tenant Association worked very aggressively to get residents to apply for Section 3. We were doing the first, NYCHA's first modernization, it

happened at Williamsburg Houses. And it was a really concerned effort of at tenant meetings and having hours at the tenant office so that residents could come and fill out their applications. And that was back in 1995, just to date myself. So what is a list like that that, that was compiled at Williamsburg Houses, how is that list used today for Williamsburg Houses or for other developments in the Williamsburg, Bushwick, Greenpoint area, and for the City at large, how do we utilize those application of residents who, you know, hopefully many of them have jobs now, but who may still not have jobs or may have some seasonal work?

MICHELLE PINNOCK: There's a few different things that we do, so--in working with anybody who wants to work with us in terms of obtaining people who are interested in Section 3 opportunities. So we do obtain lists from a variety of sources - - tenant association presidents, and then we have that information as well as we look at individuals that we place and who have completed training, and those who have received certifications. So then when we know

jobs are coming up, we look at the positions that the contractors are looking to fill, and then do a match to fist look if there is anyone from that development who has expressed interest or that they've completed training or their experience matches the jobs that are being sought to fill, and then we'll broaden the net. But this actually something that we're looking at.

The Chairman mentioned that we're undergoing really a full assessment of our operations, including Section 3 to see is this most effective, are there other things that we need to put into place. And so it was asked earlier also about our relationships with residents and other advocates and how would they say we're doing. We've been spending a lot of times over the last several months also receiving feedback from those different entities on how we can enhance what we're doing, be more responsive, have greater customer service and at the end of the day really result in greater job placements.

JOHN B. RHEA: And Debra-Ellen, could you just talk a little bit about, I mean there are other agencies--and we've been spending

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a lot of time, for example with SBS, to understand how they're seeing NYCHA residents and assessing them and how we get access to that information for our...

DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: Yeah, absolutely. As part of, again over the last few months, this has been a really intensive process both internally and externally to say how can we better leverage external resources. And obviously the one major partner out there is Department of Small Business Services with the Workforce One Centers. And so I think it was the first time in a very long time there's actually been a data match between NYCHA and Department of Small Business Services to see actually how are they serving NYCHA residents and then how can we partner to better improve those services. And so we were really actually, you know, I think pleased to get the results to some degree, to find out that 10% of--sorry. Yeah, 10% of the overall people that come into the Workforce One system in 2009, around 10%, were actually NYCHA residents. And actually 7% of placements in Workforce One overall in 2009 were NYCHA residents. And so that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at least gives us a benchmark to start from to say
how can we better leverage those services, and
then also ask the question, are those the right
services and what do we need to do to bring in

other partners to the table to improve those.

JOHN B. RHEA: And to try and have a real profile, which NYCHA residents are taking the initiative to actually go into a Workforce One Center and go through the process of trying to get into a job and what kind of skills do they have, versus many--and we have a hypothesis--versus many other NYCHA residents that we would describe as harder to place with more impediments to work, and how we take services and programs like Jobs Plus and the things that we're doing with the Robin Hood and target those to the population that's not finding their way into a Workforce One Center, and able to leverage some existing resources that the City has. And so it's about not only sharing information but then being very targeted in terms of how we apply our resources and the kinds of programming that we're creating to help NYCHA residents who have greater impediments to gainful employment.

DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: One more

thing to that. We're also having similar conversations with the Department of Education's Office of Adult and Continuing Education, to the point before that the Council Member made, and really to understand, especially given the sort of percentages of high school attainment and other things—and I know that CSS has put a lot attention on how can we better support those linkages, and also, not just do the referrals, but do closed loop referrals so we know what is happening with outcomes for those residents.

Sit with the Authority outside of here just to take a look at some of my developments that I know have had modernization—I've put a lot of capital funding into my developments—and just to see what kind of outreach is being done. Because I want to improve that outreach in my district and I want to make that commitment. This summer, while I was busy doing that thing we all do when we try to keep our jobs on our side, I met a lot of young men who were out of work. Most of them had been security at buildings or in stores and were

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2		looking	to	get	other	employment	and	other	skills.
---	--	---------	----	-----	-------	------------	-----	-------	---------

3 And so I'm sure some of those young men probably--

4 that was just a couple of months ago--still

5 looking for employment. Would love to try to get

6 them into these programs. And I told them, some

7 Section 3 jobs are going to be coming. They

8 | didn't know what that was. They did live in

9 | public housing. And I said, you know, I will work

10 with the Authority and with my congresswoman to

11 bring the information back to the district to

12 | hopefully try and get them some jobs.

So if we can do that in my district, but also if we could look at some of the other districts, maybe different boroughs, and see, you know, in different districts the outreach may need to be done differently. I'd like to take a look at Diana's district, being that that was one of the first districts that had the modernization program, just to see how those lists are being utilized. That would be helpful to me to see that. And I, you know—and to see how we can work cooperatively and improve that.

MICHELLE PINNOCK: That would be great because we're also looking for, you know,

and open to additional recommendations on various ways that we could be more effective with that.

Because we've tried door to door, postcards and mailings, fliers as well as emails—and so really kind of pose the question openly in terms of other strategies that may be more effective.

JOHN B. RHEA: And we've been less than pleased and underwhelmed with the response rate. So if that's not getting us the information that we need, then we need to touch residents and get additional information.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: I recall in Williamsburg Houses there were 1,600 units of housing there and we got, like, close to 400 or 500 applications. But like I said, it was a very concerted effort between the elected officials, the not-for-profit community group, the tenants' association, and those of us at Legal Services who were working with the tenants, which I think led to--and I think that's a very good response, you know, a little over 400. So that was a little over...

JOHN B. RHEA: Right. And that's great. And so what we're saying is, and that's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

why the partnership approach is very important for the Housing Authority, because what you just described was a labor intensive organized door to door effort just to get a one-time download for an application. So, think about that same level of labor intensity to remain in contact, to update the application, to find out if they've increased any skills in the intervening period. that's expensive and highly labor intensive work, which is why we talked to you about--there are real resources constrains about how you perform that and why we need to do that in partnership with other organizations, because we're not going to be able to hire 1,500 people at the Housing Authority who do that for 300 developments on a continuous basis.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman, at last month's hearing I believe, but I do not recall specifically, that was our hearing on utility costs and more or less what's called the Greening of NYCHA. Do you know how many residents have attained jobs in NYCHA through its greening efforts?

JOHN B. RHEA: We'll have to get

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you an exact number on greening overall, but I can give you an example of somewhere where we have a substantial green initiative going on, where large dollars are being spent. Castle Hill is an example where we're doing substantial retrofitting of energy efficient systems and additional other green work on the facades and the building. there we have 13 section three jobs that have been created for that project alone. Many of the jobs that we described in the 407 jobs that are going to be created in the stimulus work, because such a large portion of the stimulus work is around broadly defined green jobs, whether it be, you know, roof work or systems, a large portion of those 407 are going to be green jobs. So if we want to do a diagnostic on green alone we'd have to come back to you. But I can tell you a large portion of the 407 are, quote unquote, green related.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay, thank you. Council Member Reyna is going to ask a last question.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you,

Madam Chair. I just wanted to understand, because

2.0

2.3

I didn't hear it mentioned, I don't know if
there's still the existence of the Construction
Commission, where NYCHA was a participant in, and
it was spearheaded by the Administration to create
a job expansion apprenticeship opportunity. Has
the Commission continued to meet and is NYCHA
still at the table as a participant? And what
were the results of the Commission in relation to
NYCHA?

JOHN B. RHEA: Well, I wasn't here
for that.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I understand that.

Chairman Andrews has any, you know, specific color he'd like to add. I can tell you that I had a meeting, Debra-Ellen Glickstein and I, less than ten days ago with Commissioner Walsh and his team. And one of the statements he made was that, you know, in hindsight it's a disappointment in what we were not able to achieve through that work, you know, collaboratively.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: In regards to the Construction Commission?

the table.

JOHN B. RHEA: In regards to the results and the outcomes there and ensuring that as we sit down with, you know, organized labor, BCTC, others going forward and what commitments are made around ensuring that low income residents are, you know--gain full access to pre-apprenticeship programs and jobs that will lead to long term, you know, Union representation, that we make substantial progress on some of the pitfalls that we experienced the first go-round, even though I wasn't part of that. But that's the type of sentiment I hear from my partners who were at

it up very, very well. I will mention that one of our new programs, or not so much new, I have been personally interviewing and spending time with the chairmen of a lot of the large construction companies. They have never had contact with board members before and they have been very, very constructive in making suggestions on how we do business, how we should work with them. They've given me pledges to grow the Section 3 programs. They are taking on additional people. I think in

the next few months we're going to see people not just doing construction work but working in offices, working in the computer labs. We've expanded that part of our whole operation. So I think it's going to be very exciting the next time you have us in here.

we can have, again, you know metrics is the only way to be able to have an appreciation for what you're saying that you're so excited for. And so I hope that we are able to document a lot of this excitement to see that there's an actual full time--position being developed and retained in the pipeline. And so I look forward to your efforts in reaching out. And, you know, as far as the Construction Commission, it was--the latest in fashion as far as job producing mechanisms that didn't result in much. And I hope we're not reinventing the wheel to go that route again.

And--your mic, Chairman?

JOHN B. RHEA: Not to cut you off, but we'll point you back to my formal testimony where I said in 2007 NYCHA launched a preapprentice training program. And between 2007 and

individual members to be able to--I, myself, would

25

2.0

want to see to it that there's a collaborative		
effort. We're ready for the collaborative effort,		
on behalf of NYCHA's side, I don't know if it's		
ripe time to sit down and go over a portfolio in		
my district of the five developments and contracts		
and timelines, and working our way backwards to		
figure out with our local workforce development		
we don't have a Workforce One; we have our local		
non-profit workforce development under the St.		
Nick's allianceto be able to duplicate what we		
already know we know how to do.		

And so, on our side, we're ready, willing to go. On your side, can you meet us and collaborate with us? And that's always the question.

JOHN B. RHEA: So, in all fairness to, you know, resource constraints--

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

[Interposing] They have the resources.

JOHN B. RHEA: We only have so many resources. So, if you're asking us, do we have the capacity right now to sit down with every City Council Member and go through every single housing development in their district and come up with a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plan--

3

[Interposing] I'm not referring to every one of them, because I don't know if every one of them are ready.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

JOHN B. RHEA: I just wanted to give you--that would be something that I would be very shy about making a commitment to. If you're asking, can we work with a handful of City Council Members and pick some representative geographic or however we decide we want the representative sample to be developed, and look at how we can partner better, what the metrics should be, what additional resources exist within the communities, not for profits and others to help us with that effort, the answer is yes. And we are doing that right now. Let me give you an example. We've established the Lincoln Center Collaborative that we are doing in concert with Council Member Gale Brewer and with the Community Board. And we've organized the CEOs or Executive Directors of all of the major employers and institutions that surround our Upper West Side developments-principally obviously the developments directly

across the streets from Lincoln Center. But also there's Wise and there's Douglass that we've added in addition to the conversation.

And what we are doing there is working very collaboratively with those large scale employers like the hospital, like a Fordham, like ABC TV, and we're working on what kinds of job tracks can we identify, from security to customer service, to, you know, technology, that then we can create programs to you know, not only train our residents for, but have large scale commitments from those employers that they will hire NYCHA residents that come out of these training programs directly into real jobs at those organizations. And we're doing that jointly with Council Member Brewer.

So we would like to pick a couple of other places to pilot what we're already doing there.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.

JOHN B. RHEA: And in your districts, and look at some of the other things that you know already work. But we are prepared to do that with you and a representative handful

of places, so we can learn from that and expand it as appropriate.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: appreciate that collaborative effort and 5 6 commitment. And I know that Ms. Pinnock had 7 participated in a hearing where we referenced the 8 issue of lifting certain obstacles that are preventing, you know, households from 9 10 participating in the Section 3, because it's 11 almost a penalization process as opposed to an 12 encouragement and self-sustainable effort where, 13 you know, if you're not on the lease and there are 14 reasons for wanting not to be on the lease--15 because your rent increases, the issues of ex, you 16 know, formerly incarcerated and the issues of you 17 will automatically not qualify due to that -- these are some of the reasons why, perhaps, we need to 18 19 take a closer look at noticing whether or not 20 we're creating a positive environment or a 21 negative one. And so, if you as an authority have already dealt with these issues in other areas and 22 have lifted them and have been able to see more 23 24 success or would like to pilot such a program 25 where these requirements are going to be on a case

2.0

2.3

2	by case basisI need to understand how we're
3	going to be able to collaborate in a way where
4	we're not hurting the residents.
5	JOHN B. RHEA: Very complicated

JOHN B. RHEA: Very complicated set of issues you brought up.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I completely understand.

JOHN B. RHEA: One of the reasons why we're doing outreach with partners is if a resident finds it better for whatever set of objectives they're trying to maximize to go to a Workforce One Center to seek employment as opposed to going to NYCHA--because they're not reporting or whatever the set of issues are. We don't want to be an impediment to that process.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.

JOHN B. RHEA: We want to be constructive in that process. At the same time, we have a separate, completely separate responsibility to ensure that every resident that's in a NYCHA apartment is on the lease, and that ever single dime of income that they receive is reported. And, you know, do we have, you know, some conflicting objectives? Do people want to

2.0

2	underreport income because they pay their rent
3	based upon a 30% percentage of their income?
4	Sure. But NYCHA has a responsibility to ensure
5	that people are adequately reporting their income
6	and paying the appropriate level of rent in
7	subsidized housing. But that is a separate
8	responsibility of NYCHA from helping our residents
9	and the broader low-income community have access
10	to job opportunities based upon the economic
11	vitality that we're partially responsible for
12	creating.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Sure.

JOHN B. RHEA: And we're committed to both of those objectives, and trying to work in a way in which they aren't in conflict, even though we know, Council Member, they are in direct conflict at times.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Correct.

Mr. Chair, right now, correct me if I'm wrong,

NYCHA is participating in taking a closer look at
these conflicting issues?

JOHN B. RHEA: Yes. But if we're asking if we're looking at it to make policy pronouncements--

adequate rent. Are we looking at ways to ensure

that residents have access to employment help that

24

25

2	may not come directly through NYCHA and therefore
3	maybe if that's something they see as a conflict,
4	that hopefully won't be part of an impediment to
5	them seeking employment counseling, help and
6	placement.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.
8	JOHN B. RHEA: We have a
9	responsibility on the other end to do what we have
10	to do around enforcing our rules. We don't want
11	that to be an impediment for people getting in to
12	work and into jobs. Now, other things. Formerly
13	incarcerated individuals, can we come up with
14	things that are like Jobs Plus that make
15	adjustments to rent rules for a period of time in
16	which you are becoming gainfully employed and
17	increasing your wagesthose are things that we're
18	absolutely prepared to explore in the context of
19	us, you know, doing what we have to do as it
20	relates to being in compliance with federal law.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right. I
22	appreciate the update. Thank you.
23	JOHN B. RHEA: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Mr. Chairman,

just one question. As these jobs become

available, right, so you have your list that you may have in a particular development. Right? And depending on what the types of jobs are you look at those lists, you look at the qualifications and sort of match them up to see whether they're in fact capable of doing this work or whether they could do it with some training. Is that how it's done?

MICHELLE PINNOCK: Yes. Because if it's a laborer's position, for example, that doesn't have a lot of prerequisite experience required. And so if someone has expressed interest in doing demolition work or becoming a laborer, then it's easier for us to place someone from the development or surrounding developments into those types of positions. But if it's something that's highly technical, like electrician, those are many of the cases where we oftentimes have to cast the net wider to see about specific licenses and training. So that's why we-

JOHN B. RHEA: [Interposing] And even though, you know, even within the entry level laborer designation, we're hearing from employers

that they need workers from NYCHA that have	
greater skills. And so, as I talked about, you	
know, the training programs that we're in the	
process of putting together now, we are focused on	
ensuring that we can provide them with general	
construction training, even if they're going to be	
hired as a laborer on a construction site, because	
that is the entry level, and they're asked to	
perform various, you know, general labor	
responsibilities that if they haven't had some	
form of basic training in carpentry or masonry or	
obviously OSHA certificationsome of the basics	
actually the employers don't want to hire them, or	
once they do hire them don't feel that they can	
actually put them to productive use on the	
jobsite.	

So we're trying to ensure even in the laborer designation that NYCHA workers, residents, will have substantially greater skills going into those even entry level positions.

Which we believe will lead to hopefully not just that first job but then being retained for additional work beyond the NYCHA project.

DEBRA-ELLEN GLICKSTEIN: And I just

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wanted to really echo that, that this focus on advancement and not just this one-shot deal for that laborer position in the short term is--it's a challenge to be able to put the structures in place sort of to make that happen, but that is one thing that we're very focused on and very serious about.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Thank you very much. As the Chair of this Committee I'm going to take a few minutes just to say some things because I can. And earlier when Council Member Halloran was here, who was asking a lot of questions about the stimulus funding and whether it was helpful, I think we all agree stimulus funding is helpful. \$423 million in much needed capital work is helpful. It doesn't make up for the \$611 million that NYCHA did not receive during the Bush years. So we're still a couple of hundred million short of needed capital work in public housing. That is still necessary. And I know on our part we've been trying as we can to put some capital dollars for our residents in our development. And we still have a long way to go. That's all I have to say.

Committee that comes under the Section 3

25

requirement for the Housing Authority. And at first I wasn't planning to speak, but of course after hearing comments that came from the Authority, I thought it was important to make note from the residents' standpoint, as well as a resident leader, that feels that—and I have met with Michelle and her team regarding the Section 3—and I could say at the board meetings that I do attend of the NYCHA Board, I do see that the Chairman and also the Commissioner and Earl Andrews seem to be on top of making sure that Section 3 is part of those contracts that they do approve.

But in addition to that I do feel that there is more that can be done on the outreach level when it comes to informing and advising residents of the opportunities that's available. I also believe that the Authority can do a better job in reading out to the youth when it comes to these jobs. We know that the youths, as they get to a certain stage in the game, they find themselves occupied with other activities, those that are note wholesome and beneficial for the up-building of our communities. And I do

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

believe the Authority can address that a little much better than what's being done. In addition, I have made recommendations to the Housing Authority that besides always focusing on the contract work, I believe all federal funding that the Housing Authority spends out could be attached to a Section 3 requirement. For instance, we heard the preaching of \$70 million that the Authority spent annually on New York City Police Department. Well, we believe that they can attach a requirement for Section 3 to help bring training into that area. This is an annual payment that goes out to the Police Department, and I'm sure that that type of training and that type of resource can secure ongoing opportunities for public housing residents.

In addition, the Housing Authority spends \$1 million on sanitation annually. That's another area in which the Authority can bridge a Section 3 requirement and training opportunities for residents of public housing throughout the city. Department of Community Operation is known for spending probably the biggest chunk of money in the public housing authority outside of capital

improvement, and the Authority seems to always continuously spend out over thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars on outside agencies, but none of those agencies have a Section 3 requirement.

For instance, coming up on the board calendar this week, Wednesday, Department of Community Operations is proposing \$335,000 to be spent out to John Jay University. This is a subsidy that they've been spending out for the last six years that I'm aware of. These areas can become attached to a Section 3 requirement that can bring some type of opportunities to our youth as well as to our residents of public housing.

So I believe when we start looking forward, we need to look at the big picture of things, not just quoting numbers here to the Council, and not just giving out documentations and testimony that just says this is what we're doing; but to reach out to the residents at the local level to make sure that every resource, as the Chairman quoted in his statement on page 15, is used and tapped in to in order to provide accurate and life-sustaining careers and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

opportunities to our residents, and not just oneshot deals that have been done.

And just in closing, I believe that many of these contractors hire a Section 3 requirement because it's required. Do they really want them there? No. So I believe they put a lot of these obstacles in the way to ensure that they don't give residents jobs. For instance, coming in to my development looking for a carpenter that's unemployed, you might not find it in Davidson Houses in the Bronx. So why is it that this contractor can't open up an on-the-job training type of program to still compensate and teach these people as they go along on a contract? So I believe there are some things that the Authority can do to put in place and to ensure that residents get the most effectiveness out of the Section 3 requirements.

At this time they are doing what they can do, but I don't think that they're doing the best job that they can do in order to ensure that public housing residents across the board, starting with our youth, up to our seniors, can get the opportunities that are available out

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 there. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Hello? Thank 4 you, Mr. Crawford. Your testimony, I'm so glad 5 you did step up to give testimony. Many things-what you said is very important and I'm going to 6 7 follow up with the Housing Authority on some of 8 these suggestions, particularly with some of our -well, some of the funding or money that they 9 10 Housing Authority pays to the City on these 11 different levels that could lead to jobs for NYCHA 12 residents.

As you know, some tenants are more active than others and some tenant leaders are more active than others. You certainly sound like you're working very hard for your development and for your community. And I appreciate your comments. Can I ask you--do you know who your Council Member is?

ERIK CRAWFORD: Yes. Carmen Arroyo.

CHAIRPERSON MENDEZ: Okay. So, what I was asking earlier of the Housing Authority in looking at how we're doing outreach, I think I wanted to narrow it to, like, one Council Member

in each borough so that we can get an idea of what's happening in the boroughs and what's happening in that council district in terms of stimulus funding, in terms of prior modernization or future modernization, and any other capital work, and looking at what efforts were done to get Section 3 applications, how many of them have been put to work and what else we can do to get more Section 3 applications. It sounds like we have the great makings of working with the Council Member, who was here earlier, with this young man and the Authority to do the kind of efforts that we did in Williamsburg Houses some years ago, to bring all those residents in with applications and try to get them placed in jobs.

So I look forward to meeting with you, Ms. Pinnock, in the future, and identifying which council members in what boroughs we can sort of start looking at, and then moving towards that way. And I look forward—and if I can get your number when this hearing is over, so I can reach out to you myself. Okay? Thank you very much. The matter of Resolution number 207 is being laid over for a vote, and this hearing has come to an

2 end. Thank you.

I, Erika Swyler, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

the fit

Signature_____

Date ____5/26/10_____