CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

----- X

June 27, 2016 Start: 1:06 p.m. Recess: 3:34 p.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E: COSTA G. CONSTANTINIDES

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Stephen T. Levin

Rory I. Lancman Donovan J. Richards

Eric A. Ulrich

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

Angela Licata, Deputy Commissioner Sustainability NYC Department of Environmental Protection

Eric Landau, Deputy Commissioner
Public Affairs
NYC Department of Environmental Protection

Casey Adams, Deputy Director City Legislative Affairs NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Lieutenant Robert Corbett New York Police Department

Gerry Kelpin, Director Air and Noise Enforcement Units NYC Department of Environmental Protection

Robert Bookman, Counsel
New York City Hospitality Lines

Josh Gatewood NYC Food Truck Association

Melanie McGillick Douglas Manor Environmental Association, DMEA

Lucy Weinstein, Pediatrician Chair, Environmental Health Committee Chapter 2, Academy of Pediatrics

Alan Fierstein, President and Founder Acoustilog

Silvio Calzino (sp?)
Power Tools Distributor

George Pauloff. Small Business Owner Flushing, New York

Allison Blaine Metropolitan Lumber and Hardware

Mike Gannon, President Douglas Manor Environmental Association 2 [sound check, pause]

1

3 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Good afternoon. I am Costa Constantinides Chair of the 4 5 Environmental Protection Committee, and today the 6 committee will hold a hearing on Intro 59, a Local 7 Law to amend the Administrative in the city of New 8 York in relation to the sale and use of gas-powered 9 leaf blowers. Intro 186, a Local Law to amend the 10 Administrative Code of the city of New York in 11 relation to the noise standard for commercial 12 establishments, and Intro 745, a Local Law to amend 13 the Administrative Code of the city of New York in 14 relation to the operation of electronic sound devices 15 on food vending vehicles. Noise continues to be the 16 number one quality of life issue in New York City as 17 evidenced by the number of 311 noise complaints. 18 According to the Mayor's Management Report of Fiscal 19 Year 15--2016, the Department of Environmental Protection, DEP, received a total of 53,862 noise 20 21 complaints in FY15. The number of noise complaints 2.2 has been on the rise over each of the previous five 23 years from 31,400 in FY11 to 35,363 in FY12 to 36,130 24 in FY13 to 45,8--8--584 in FY14 to 53,862 in FY15. 25 Noise pollution causes a variety of adverse human

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

establishments on the basis they have violated the

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1 COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 7 unreasonable noise standard as determined by a city 2 3 inspector. Intro 186 require commercial 4 establishments to comply with the specific noise levels. Noise from leaf blowers often occurs earlier than permitted [coughs] and as it is very loud, 6 7 disturbs the quiet of otherwise peaceful residential communities. The code prohibits the use of leaf 8 blowers before 8:00 a.m. and after 7:00 p.m. or after sunset, whichever is later on weekdays and before 10 11 9:00 a.m. and after 6:00 p.m. on holidays and weekends. The code also prohibits the use of leaf 12 13 blowers that generate and aggregate sound level of 75 14 decibels in the A sign (sic) or more. Many towns or 15 counties have enacted ordinances to regulate leaf 16 blower noise with some restricting blower use to 17 limited times of the day or year. Others banning the 18 use of blowers that emit a certain decibel level of 19 noise, and others banning gasoline powered leaf 20 blowers altogether by allowing electric leaf blowers, which are often less noisy. Intro 59 prohibits the 21 2.2 sale and use of gas powered leaf blowers, which 2.3 exceeds 65 decibels. Noise from food vending machines and ice cream shops have are also a 24 persistent -- a persistent source of complaint.

The

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Mayor Bloomberg Administration considered outright banning the jingle such as Mr. Softee. This proposal was scaled back after there was real concern that was expressed. As a result, the City enacted a noise code that continues to allow food vending vehicles to emit noise for the purposes of attracting customers while such vehicles is in motion. Food vending vehicles may not play their jingles while stationary. DEP works with the Department of Consumer Affairs, which license vendors, to educate drivers to their responsibilities under the Noise Code. Even after the restriction on noise from food vending vehicles were put in place, the city has continued to receive a substantial number of noise complaints due to these vehicles. Through 2011 to 2014, the City received 7,031 noise complaints related to ice cream trucks. Intro 745 prohibits food vending vehicles from operating a sound signal device earlier than 9:00 a.m. in the morning or later than 9:00 p.m. in the evening. Protecting the environmental quality from noise pollution in urban areas is part of the work of this committee. These pieces of legislation are intended to reduce noise pollution, and improve the quality of life for city residents. Now, we'll hear

2 | from the-- Well, first, I want to recognize Council

3 Member Lancman who is here from Queens, and we will

4 | now hear from the sponsor of two of the bills, Intro

5 | 745 and Intro 59 from Danny Dromm, Council Member

6 from Queens.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you very much, Chair Constantinides, and I appreciate your interest in this issue and holding this hearing for us today. Imagine at 7 o'clock on a Saturday when you're trying to catch up on some much needed sleep after a hectic week and then this comes blasting through your window. [Leaf blower] or after spending hours trying to get your child ready for bed she finally appears to be falling asleep and then this comes wafting through her window on a warm summer [Ice cream truck music]. Leaf blowers and night. ice cream truck jingles are two of the more annoying noise assaulting New Yorkers' ears everyday. constant current Noise Code--excuse me--the current Noise Code while fairly comprehensive does not specifically address these vexations of life in New York City. We do live in a noisy city, and anything that we can do reign in noise to a reasonable level would go very far to improving the quality of life in

1	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 10
2	our communities. Looking for a way to address these
3	problems, I have introduced two bills. Intro 745
4	would prohibit the electronic sound devices of food
5	vending vehicles, ice cream truck jingles, for
6	example, from operating between 9:00 p.m. and 9:00
7	a.m. Intro 59 would prohibit gas powered leaf blowers
8	from operating before 12 noon on weekends and
9	holidays and at any point between May 15 and
10	September 15. This legislation would also prohibit
11	the operation and sale of overly noisy gas powered
12	leaf blowers meaning those operating over 65-A rated
13	decibels. Thank you Chair Constantinides for holding
14	this hearing. I look forward to continuing to work
15	with you on reducing noise pollution in our city.
16	CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Thank you,
17	Council Member Dromm. At this time, we'll call the
18	first panel forward. If Eric Landau, Deputy
19	Commission for NYC DEP can step forward. Angela
20	Licata, also a Deputy Commissioner at DEP; Lieutenant
21	Robert Corbett from the NYPD and Casey Adams from the
22	ConsumerConsumer Affairs can all step forward and
23	be sworn in by Samara, our attorney. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, sure.

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

2.2

2.3

2 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: A quick 3 statement from Council Member Lancman.

unfortunately, I have to leave for a hearing across the street simultaneous to this one on the Close to Home Initiative in the Juvenile Justice. So I have to run, but these are legitimate issues. I have some concerns about the—the Mr. Softee bill, but I certainly support the other two, and if anybody is testifying today wants to discuss it further with me, you know how to—you know how to reach me, but I have to run across the street. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Thank you, Council Member.

LEGAL COUNSEL: Can you please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth today?

[background noise]

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Good

afternoon, Chair Constantinides and members. I am

Angela Licata, Deputy Commissioner of Sustainability
in the New York City Department of Environmental

Protection, and I am joined today by Eric Landau,

2 Deputy Commissioner for Public Affairs, as well as 3 other members of my team that I will bring up for the questions that you may, and also by the PD--as--as 4 mentioned. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on these bills before this committee 6 7 relating to noise control and enforcement. As you 8 know, DEP has overall responsibility for the city's water supply and sewer system including providing drinking water to all 8.5 million in-city New Yorkers 10 11 and another one million Upstate residents. 12 Maintaining pressure to hydrants, managing storm 13 water and treating wastewater. In addition, DEP regulates air quality, hazardous waste, and critical 14 15 quality of life issues including the subject of these 16 bills, noise. Intro 186 of 2014 would not permit 17 notices of violation issued to commercial 18 establishments offering music to cite unreasonable 19 noise without including sound meter readers obtained 20 by enforcement personnel that are above the threshold levels for unreasonable noise in the Noise Code. 21 2.2 Administration supports the intent of this bill, but 2.3 it raises an issue with enforcement. Both the New York Police Department, NYPD and DEP enforce 24 violations of the unreasonable noise standard with 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

regard to commercial establishments. Enforcement usually occurs on the street in front of the establishment, but can also be accompanied by taking noise meter readings in a complainant's dwelling. response to complaints from the night life industry, DEP amended Section 24-218 of the Noise Code in 2005 to define unreasonable noise by decibel levels in most situations. Inspectors take readings with noise--noise meters to support the violation of the unreasonable noise standard. DEP issues violations from the street citing the decibel levels contained in Section 24-218(b), which establishes the prescribed decibel limits when a violation is issued under Section 244. There are, however, a few instances when using decibel levels is not practicable, and on those occasions such as when ambient noise masks the A scale music, the meter won't be able to register the noise and, therefore, there is no detected violation of the standard even though the noise is clearly unreasonable. It would be beneficial to have the ability to take readings using the C scale, which is in the Commercial Music Section, 24-231(c), but was not previously added to the Unreasonable Noise Section in 24-218 during the

2 2005 Noise Code update. The C scale follows the 3 frequency sensitivity of the human ear at very high noise levels. The C scale includes much more of the 4 low frequency range of sounds including bass than the A and the B scales. Adding this provision to the 6 7 Noise Code would enable inspectors to use the most 8 appro--appropriate decibel level when the circumstances allow for measurements. However, even still, some flexibility is necessary and our 10 11 inspectors must be able to make decisions regarding 12 the practicality of meter readings based on field 13 conditions. For example, it can be impractical to 14 take readings during MARCH initiatives. MARCH, which 15 stands for Multi-Agency Response to City Hot Spots is led by NYPD, and they only present an opportunity for 16 17 the inspector to issue without taking readings with 18 the inspector witnesses noise that is clearly loud 19 and therefore unreasonable. A violation is then written under Section 20--244(a) which permits a non-20 decibel based standard to be used. DEP will, 21 2.2 however, always use decibel levels when taking 2.3 readings in a complainant's home in accordance with Section 24-231(a). DEP inspectors are trained in the 24 use of the meters and have been at all times. 25

into account the ambient sound level, time of the

2 day, the number of the complaints, whether neighbors

3 have asked the establishment to lower the sound and

4 the residential or commercial character of the area.

5 The preference is always to correct the condition

6 without need for enforcement. We look forward to

working with this committee to achieve the shared

8 | intents of this bill.

1

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Intro 745 of 2015 proposed to regulate the operation of electronic sound devices on food vending vehicles by prohibiting food vending vehicles and cars from operating a sound signal device between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. DEP supports the greater limitation on the use of these devices during the hours when citizens need as much peace and quiet as possible in order to rest and sleep. recently received 1,013 complaints in 2016 to date about these vehicles especially ice cream trucks parked outside parks. But actually issuing NOVs is rather difficult. Inspectors will construct a complaint in order to get a time frame when the vehicle is using the sound device while parked in order to witness the violation, but they vendors' schedules vary or they will often turn the device off when they see an inspector's vehicle. So only one NOV

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

was written in 2016. It would also be beneficial to amend the section to enable DEP to issue violations to the operator or registered owner so that the inspectors are not required to approach the person in the vehicle for license information as that could potentially become a safety issue for the inspectors. Intro 59 of 2014 would regulate the sale and use of gas powered leaf blowers. This bill would prohibit the use of gas powered leaf blowers before noon on weekends and state and federal holidays and would set noise standards for leaf blowers. It would also prohibit the use of gas powered leaf blowers from May 15 to September 15 and limit noise to a maximum of 65 decibels as was earlier stated. DEP supports the expanded restrictions in this bill on when these devices may be used. However, DEP cannot speak to the availability of alternative devices that will meet the specified 65 decibel limit in the bill, and the effect on the businesses that rely on these machines. Further, we believe that the phrase "not equipped with a functioning muffler" should not be removed from Section B(3) as our position is that all leaf blowers should be equipped with the muffler, which is in the current law. DEP defers to the

2 Department of Consumer Affairs on the provisions that

3 would prohibit the sale of gas powered leaf blowers.

4 Thank you once again for the opportunity to present

5 testimony. We would be happy to answer any of your

6 questions.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Is there anyone else from the panel that has testimony to give?

CASEY ADAMS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay.

CASEY ADAMS: Good afternoon. My name is Casey Adams, and I am the Deputy Director of City Legislative Affairs at the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs. I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to testify today. would be responsible for enforcing Introduction 59 of 2014's prohibition on the sale or offer for sale of gas powered leaf blowers rated to produce a maximum sound level in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels measured 50 feet from the source in accordance with the American National Standards Institute commonly referred as ANSI E175.2-2000 Testing Standard. Other jurisdictions have adopted similar approaches including places as disparate as Montgomery County in 2 Maryland and Portland in Oregon. DCA expects that

3 like in these other jurisdictions enforcement of this

4 law would be primarily driven by resident complaints.

5 DCA is grateful for the opportunity to begin a

6 conversation with the committee and the Council about

how this bill would operate and looks forward to

8 discussing issues like the reliability of

9 manufactured and disclose of decibel level ratings,

10 the merits of independent testing of these ratings

11 and the successes and challenges of other

12 | municipalities with similar laws. Again, I thank the

13 ppportunity--the committee for the opportunity to

14 testify today.

1

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

else in the panel to testify. All right. So I will then begin my questions, and hand it over to my colleague Danny Dromm. I think the first place I want to start is on page 2 if your testimony. In the second full paragraph there, you—you make the argument that there—you need to be able to continue with the unreasonable noise to have more flexibility because there are a limited number of officers that are sound device qualified. The bill—the law of

2005 is now 11 years old. Can you explain to me why

14 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

night.

15 [interposing] Right, of course, and I--and I
16 appreciate.

many different things throughout the course the

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: And so--and I don't mean to say that--that, you know, that we are not looking at noise complaints as an important thing, but that's the number currently that is currently qualified.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: And I mean I just--if it's--when it's used as an argument against a piece of legislation that--that just sort of--it's 11 years later. I'm just concerned as to why that's

that case. That--that's my--my point. So, I--I
appreciate work that the NYPD does and I--I work with
my precinct very closely--

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: [interposing]
Of course.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: --on lots of different issues. [laughs] But it's seeing 11 years later and that being an argument against a bill is--is concerning to me. So I'm going--I'm going to point that out. So why is it necessary to use the unreasonable noise standard against certain establishments? How do we--how do we decide who gets the--the handheld device and who doesn't or how do we--how do we sort of carve that up? Who--who goes out--how--how is this sort of deciphered? How do we make those determinations when doing enforcement? I mean what do we--how do we do that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: I'd like to bring Gerry Kelpin up to the desk to help us answer some questions. She is the Director of the Air and Noise Enforcement Units for DEP.

GERRY KELPIN: I do. [laughs] I don't know if you have to actually swear me in or.

2.2

2.3

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

2.2

2.3

2 LEGAL COUNSEL: I think you want to be 3 sworn. Be sure you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: She always tells the truth.

LEGAL COUNSEL: [off mic] Do swear to tells us nothing but the truth today?

GERRY KELPIN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: All right,

I'm--I'm--thank you for being sworn. [laughter]

GERRY KELPIN: Generally, you ask so I

just was following procedures.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: I appreciate that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Do you want to on.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay.

GERRY KELPIN: [coughs] Complaints about commercial music come to DEP after they have been sent to the--the Police Department. The way that it's currently set up through 311 all complaints about music from commercial restaurants, bars, clubs first go to PD. If there is sufficient information about the complainant, we're able to pull a report that allows us to then contact those complainants and

another subset that we then, you know, follow up with

24

the complainant on.

2.3

2 GERRY KELPIN: But it could be a noise, a circulation device. We also come to the apartment, too.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay. So, if--but if--if--so now--now walk me through the rest of it. I'm--I'm trying to understand how this works. Okay.

SERRY KELPIN: So if it's from the street, we do try to take readings on—I looked at some of our violations and about 50% of the time we were able to use the meter and got more than either 7 or 10 decibels depending on the—the time of day.

There were some situations where the ambient noise is so loud that it masks the ability for the meter to pick up actually the music. So we get a reading of something like, you know, 63 to 65. It's just not enough for us to be able issue using the meter.

However, we then use some of this alternative criteria, which 218 actually says you can use—not limited to the—the actual decibel when it's—that are listed in the 218(b)

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: How many-how many unreasonable noise complaints through that

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 section are received every year, or this year? Even
3 this year to date?

GERRY KELPIN: So I think we issued under--for the sound reproduction devices 244(a) we issued 67 fiscal year to date.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: And that's not stake--okay. That's like 67, you said?

GERRY KELPIN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: All right, I guess my, you yeah my--what is the big impediment from the--I know there was a very arduous conversation 11 years ago, and my--my former--the former chair of this committee was very involved with that particular conversation, and--and he was of the mind and--and I was of the mind that this bill is a negotiated desk level for a reason. Not only to make sure that the establishments understand that they have a certain responsibility, but also for the, you know, for the private--for the private citizen to know that it's not going to be a subjective standards. It's going to be an objective standard. Someone comes by with a machine and says this is too loud. It's no--or this study of it. There's a lot of subjectivity in that unreasonable noise. That--

that the same law is applied.

2.2

2.3

that sort of makes me uncomfortable as someone that

calls on a consistent basis. You know, I--no matter

who shows up, I want to make sure that it's--it's--

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Right. So, and that's why we're making that recommendation, as

Jerry indicated when you have the ambient levels

masking the music noise, it's very difficult to get a

10 DBA or greater change--

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: [interposing] Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: --in noise levels from the meters. So, what we would need is for a consideration of adding the C scale. I think we could do, then successfully do more readings taking the C scale, and be able to decipher the noise level changes and noise levels associated with the commercial music noise.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: And as far as the MARCH that—that does—that—that does concern me seeing that—them. You know, there have been a few MARCH operations in my district, and I've been glad that happened, and—and how is this—as the—how does this unreasonable standard utilized that's—

that's unable to use through a--a meter, what is theSomeone walks--they walk into the establishment in
unison. There is music still playing and what is

5 the--what's the impediment there?

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

GERRY KELPIN: So in some cases there's sufficient time between when a DEP inspector gets to the location. Generally, what happens with the MARCH is that the DEP staff go out first, and have maybe five minutes before the rest of the agencies get to their location. So it's set up that way so that the music stays on for us to be able to be assess the situation on the street. In some of the cases, it's sufficiently loud that we can quickly take a reading and get an ambient and the -- the reading with the source on. Sometimes, as I said, and I--it's very hard to predict, there are situations when the inspector is -- can hear the music but the meter is not picking up the loudness of the music component. Traffic plays a huge part in masking the -- the meter's ability to pick out a sound. So the criteria that we've worked with and--and also developed with the Police Department is that [coughs] we have to be able to show something like if I'm more than-- Let's say something -- There's one scenario where we'll go out

2.2

2.3

50 feet, and start to walk, and we can hear it at 50 feet, and then walk into 15 feet, and it's significantly louder that we're hearing. We also may note that the windows and doors of the location are open so the music is blasting out to the street.

Another criteria that we use is we're 15, 20 feet away and we're trying to have a conversation with our partners, and we're unable to hear each other. We

consider that type of volume unreasonable.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Uh-huh.

some cases where we--when can't get an absolute reading, we'll use that type of criteria to demonstrate that the music is very audible on the street, and equivalent to unreasonable. As we said, this other--the--the standard that we're talking about, and our experience with it 11 years ago was very minimal. We had introduced it for apartments for the 231. We've--we've found that it is somewhat successful. We've been talking with a number of people about implementing it on--on the street. Again, as we've explained in the testimony, it tends to focus on the base sound of the music. So we would be able to sort of raise the music portion to be

2.2

2.3

2 audible on our--to show up on our meters using the C
3 scale.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: All right, so I have—I have two questions left. One, I mean I'll—I'll— So I know that the—the entertainment industry sort of establishments states that they—there was an agreement as part of a deal 2005 and I wasn't there. [laughs] I wasn't working for Councilman Gennaro at that time, but if—that the city agreed to conduct enforcement on established entertainment sound based on the objective noise limits set forth in the Noise Code, not the unreasonable noise standards. Do you recall—recall the city making this agreement?

wrote it in is that we left ourselves an opportunity for a case--for cases where it was clearly unreasonable--where the music was clearly loud, that we would determine it as unreasonable using this--these other standards. But for the--for DEP we would try to take readings as often as we could. So for us it's sort of this balance between I know it's really loud. I'm not getting it on my meter. Do I just let it go, and not issue the violation? And then--

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Well, with respect to construction noise, we understand that the Buildings Department is taking a closer look at after hour variances, and we are working in close coordination with—with them now, and we are giving them addresses of sites that we find have routine complaints. In addition, Gerry, do you want to describe some of the extraordinary steps that you've taken to address the carting industry and—?

GERRY KELPIN: Recently or within the last year and a half we've added eight new inspectors. We put out two different shifts to deal with complaints that we are seeing an uptick in. They may or may not be what you are seeing, but one is for construction. So we have an early morning shift that starts at like 6:00 in the morning, and they run-they work Tuesday to Saturday. So we're picking up the construction complaints for Saturday almost--a lot of time on real time. We also added a shift, a later night time shift Monday to Fridays, but they work until 4:00 in the morning. Some of that is--is potentially for music, but one of the other things that we are a lot of complaints about are for private carters. So this allows us to find the locations and

2 take measurements on the-the trucks to see how

3 compliant they are. The rest of the time that

4 they're not doing those things, they are responding

5 to the various complaints that we get. They're--all

6 of our inspectors, as we mentioned, are noise

7 qualified. And we--we set up the shifts to, you

8 know, try to control, you know, to respond to these

9 | various complaints and locations that are--that we

10 see a lot of complaints about. Where there are more

11 | than, you know, we necessarily get complaints about,

12 and we--we follow up with them.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LANDAU: And then

Councilman to--to add to that, our Community Affairs

staff, as I think you know, works very, very closely

with community boards and a elected officials that if

there's an area or a location that there's a concern

about noise, our--our staff works very closely with

those offices to get that information, and then works

closely and coordinates with our enforcement staff.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay. All right, so at this point I'm going to——I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues Council Member Danny Dromm. I know he has some questions in relation to his two bills. So I'll turn it over to him.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you. Just to follow up on what you just said in regard to working with the council members' offices. Is that true also for things like the ice cream trucks and—and the leaf blowers? So you would work with our offices on that? That's outside of the—what the NYPD could do?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LANDAU: Certainly, if there's any issues that you're having in your district to--that falls within our jurisdiction.

Please let us know and--and we'll follow up as quickly as we can.

before I get started with some question that I have,
I just want to if I may, Mr. Chair, list some facts
that I have received—excuse me [coughs]—from the
residents for a clean Forest Hills Gardens. Leaf
blowers pose a serious health threat. Leaf blowers
create pollution. A single leaf blower operating for
an hour emits as much pollution as 40 cars idling
during the same period of time. Leaf—leaf blowers
spew a number of toxic chemicals including, but not
limited to Benzine, carbon monoxide, formaldehyde,
and a whole bunch of other chemical who I can't say

their manes. Leaf blowers arerelease and spin	
contaminants such as mercury, arsenic, lead, and	
Cadmium. That's according to the American Lung	
Association. In one hour, one leaf blower sends over	∍r
five pounds of particulate matter into the air	
including, but mot limited to, feces from cats, dogs	⋾,
rodents and birds, rat poison, fertilizers, fungal	
spores, herbicides, insecticides, mold, pathogens,	
pollen, et cetera. Leaf blowers exceed the World	
Health Organization's acceptable ambient noises by 2	20
decibels at 50 feet. Over 400 communities nationwid	de
including 15 in New York State have already banned	
all leaf blowers during certain seasons and childrer	1
are especially at risk from leafleaf blowers	
because compared to adults, they inhale more air per	<u></u>
pound of body weight, and their organs, which are	
still developing, are more sensitive to environmenta	al
hazards. So I just wanted to make sure that that wa	ıs
in the record as well, and then I guess I'm guess I'	<b>'</b> m
going to just start off with the NYPD. You said	
there were 1,428 qualified officers. What is the	
number? Did we get the number of how many tickets o	or
violations were issued by those officers?	

2.2

2.3

break it down by the specific section of the Admin Code, but year to date 2016 we've issued 1,000 criminal court summonses citywide for noise violations. We do not have a tally on ECB and OVs, but we will in the near future thanks to the summons reform package that has passed recently.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Sometimes when I deal with the precinct one of the issues that has come up with me is that they don't have a noise machine to be able to read these levels. How many noise machines do we have in this city?

precinct has at least one sound meter. Many of the sound meters are older models that cannot get the C scale of frequencies that would pick up base and lower frequencies, which we need for clubs and bars. We are replacing them over the next year or two, and each precinct would have at least one.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So each precinct then by the end of next year have a modern sound machine?

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: I can't--I can't say for sure by the end of next year. I don't

big are those machines? I've never seen any?

2.2

2.3

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: I--I'm not sure. We have three different models. I don't remember what each one looks like, but there is definitely no room left on the cops' belts for anything.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But are they--are they--are-are-are-are the ones that--have you see any of them? Are they large? Are they so large that they have to be carried in a car? Are they in a box or how--?

come in a case. They can fit in a car, in the back seat or a trunk. I don't know if they could be mounted to a belt, but even if they could, we really don't have any room left on the cops' belts.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And I'm--I'm not suggesting that. I just wanted to get the feel for what--what size there was. Do they break down often?

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: I don't know the answer to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Because that's also been a complaint that I've heard as well is that they're not operational. So that may be with the fact that they're older as you're saying, and that

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

may be something we want to look at the Council as well. Now, I feel like these noise complaints are majority quality of life complaints in the city, and I know that the NYPD has been doing a great job with doing with quality of life issues, and I think that this is one of the ones that I think we as a council should look at more carefully, and get a--and get a grasp of it. Because I get a lot of complaints, especially once Mr. Softee starts coming around, and that's one of the--my next set of questions is about So Mr. Softee I think it was said in the testimony or not just Mr. Softee, but these--these-these vending--these vending trucks that have this, you know, sound equipment. So 1,013 complaints and one. I mean that's--that's a terrible, terrible number and I really hope that, you know, when we come back again to a hearing here, that we have more than one--one violation issued. I mean and it just brings me back to who--who enforces that? Is that the NYPD. I've tried to call the NYPD on this as well, and I do understand the issue of these trucks being, you know, able to move around, but often times the complaints come from residents under whose apartment building they sit for hours and that bell and that thing is

2.2

2.3

Mr. Softee.

going on for hours and hours and hours. And as it was mentioned I think even in your testimony, it's also a Parks. I have one—and not only—not only did the issue of the sound coming from these trucks, they leave their motors running and—and the emissions from—from the tailpipes of these trucks is horrible in areas where children play. So what can we do because one is not acceptable. It's just not acceptable. We need to see if we have—are those 1,428 officers qualified to give summonses as well to

qualification refers only to the sound meter—the sound meter use itself. I'm sure if we're talking specifically about the noise, or if—I believe there's a section of the Admin code. I'm not sure if it's Admin code or traffic rules that says they cannot play the music at all when parked. So I don't believe we would need a sound meter for that, and we could address that if that's the case.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So that's--that's one piece of it, but the other piece of it I think is the--the--the volume of the sound that's emanating from these Mr. Softee trucks. So any officer could

refrigeration trucks, though, are tricky because

sometimes there's an auxiliary engine or an engine

24

1	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 42
2	that's necessary to keep the products cold. So that-
3	-that's just something be mindful.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Meaning that would
5	affect the sound level?
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: That would
7	affect their ability to issue for the idling. I just
8	wanted to mention that.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But I believe with
10	the idling, don't theyis there a limit on that time
11	that they're allowed to idle?
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Yeah, but
13	the refrigeration function of the engine that is
14	meant to keep the products cold, thosethose are
15	allowed for a period.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So are they
17	allowed to idle as long as they can
18	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: They're two
19	different engines. Do you want to explain that
20	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: [interposing] Yes.
21	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA:Gerry, a
22	little bit better? So it can be tricky because there
23	are components that are on board those vehicles the
24	products cold.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Just why don't you indentify yourself again for the record.

GERRY KELPIN: Jerry Kelpin--

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: [interposing]

Okay, Gerry

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

GERRY KELPIN: --DEP Air and Noise. So the--the ice cream trucks specifically have to have a generator to run their equipment. A generator is an auxiliary engine. It is not covered by the Idling Law. The Idling Law is specific to the motor vehicle engine. So you do have that. What we did in the new air code since we're going back and forth between air and noise, the -- we are requiring that those generator engines be upgraded to the more recent engines that have--are cleaner. EPA passed regulations about them so that--excuse me--they'll be the cleaner emissions at least because they do have to run if they're going to maintain their business. In terms of refrigeration trucks, those are your delivery trucks. Those are also run on an auxiliary engine. A lot of

trying to deal with.

trucks aren't there, or they turned it off. I don't

2.2

2.3

of it so--

know. Maybe they see us coming. I am not sure, but
it is not for lack of trying to get these, you know,
vehicles—a violation if they are playing. We also
if we do see a truck and it's part of the—a group,
we will give them a notice that explains what the law
it so that, you know, they share it or they're aware

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So that—that

comes down to another question because I do believe
in educating them, but often times there's just too
much education, and they just violate anyway because
they've been educated and this is the same guy who—
and actually I should say in two instances there's—
it's the same truck dealer in two different
locations, two different people, but the same people
always at the same locations in my district, and
they've been educated already about the law, dah—dah—
dah. But still I don't know if they've gotten any,
but obviously I don't think so if there's only been
one violation.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LANDAU: Councilman, we'll happily follow up with you afterwards to get the specific locations, and coordinate some enforcement efforts.

ignored.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LANDAU: Councilman, the--the one point that--that I want to make sure we make is that while there aren't a large number of violations being issued, every single complaint that we receive, this 173 complaints we received we follow up on 100% of those complaints. So we do take it very seriously.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But it hasn't solved the problem. I--I bet you're going to get another 173, and the numbers keep going up according to our chair in many of these noise complaints. So the education is not working. Right, I mean if I was--I used to be a New York City public school teacher for 25 years, and--and by the way, teachers are judged on their test scores, eight. So all I've got to do is look at your statistics, and something is not working. If this--if the number of complaints continue to rise, and--and we have such--so little, one violation for ice cream trucks and two for leaf blowers, something is not work.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: Well, I think this is the general intent of this legislation. These leaf blowers are not--they're not illegal. So there's--we're--we're a little bit hemmed in terms of

1 COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 50 2 what we can do. We do respond as Eric indicated to 3 100% of the complaints, and we do try to make 4 appointments with complainants if they can let us know when does this particular lawn care service come on Tuesday. But these hours vary as well, so it's 6 7 been a very, very tricky business, and I want to 8 assure you that we take--COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: [interposing] I agree and that is the intent of the legislation. 10 11 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: --we do take 12 it--13 COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: [interposing] I just kind of wanted to make that point as forcefully 14 15 as I could, and I do appreciate your testimony in 16 support of the legislation, and look forward to--to 17 working with you on negotiating it. So thank you. 18 appreciate it. Thank you very much. 19 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Really 20 quickly just before Council Member Richards comes 21 back. Just a couple of follow-ups that I have from Council Member Dromm's questions. How many meters 2.2 2.3 does DEP have? This sound meters, how many do you

24

currently have?

meter. We have equipment that is state-of-the-art,

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

current, calibrated. That is one of the efforts that
we take every seriously, and there is routine
training that is done for these air and noise

5 inspections.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: And is there—is—I mean as far as the NYPD coordination with DEP when—when they're going out as well to answer noise complaints is there that coordination there to make sure that those meters that they have in the precinct are—as up to date, are—are—are you working together? I mean how do we make sure that—that—that the meter that the NYPD has is the same meter that DEP has and that they're both equally up to date, and we're not using one that's maybe five years in one instance and one that's more recent and that's up—as up—to—date as you're saying that they are DEP?

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: I don't think there has been coordination with regard to the meters themselves. The NYPD is phasing out the older meters now and will have the most up-to-date modern meters shortly.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: And--and is it an impediment? What--what is the cost of these

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 meters? I mean is it an impediment to have more than 3 one per precinct?

what the cost is. I'm--I'm sure the city could afford it but, you know, I think part of the issue is training everyone and getting enough of them out there. Theoretically, if we wanted to be 100% efficient with these, we would need one in every car on every shift.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: I mean I'm--I'm just see the--the noise complaints going from 36,000 to, you know, upwards of 50,000 in three years. I just want to make sure we have -- if we are going to be dealing with these quality of life issues, that we have all the tools in our toolbox to make sure that they're doing in an efficient way, right. I mean we don't want anyone who's doing enforcement out there that doesn't have the right tools in their toolbox in order to get to the mission that we want, which is protecting the quality of life and make sure there's fair an equal distribution of the law. So that's--that's sort of my point here, and then are there different meters? That--you said, oh, the--the--I guess it's the--a variation of

my question before, but really what both meters need
as you're saying is a C scale, correct? As being
able to measure that—on that C—the C scale that's

5 | the one?

2.2

2.3

about now our A scale. I don't know if they can also do the C scale or if there's a need. They have some versions of the meters can do A, B I guess and C scale as well. The important thing is we buy from different manufacturers. The important thing is that they have a certain qualification to them either a type 1 meter so that we have faith in them. We actually like trying different manufacturers so that we can make sure that we are using the best ones and ones that we prefer.

end of the day, I think we all have the shared—
shared goal of making sure that establishments know
their responsibilities, and that the public citizens
are—you know, the citizens are able to—that
they're—they're relying on law and not relying on—
on subjective standards. That's—that's my—that's
the intent of the bill, and that's where we're

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

55

24

breakdown?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: No, we're-
we--I don't believe either one of us have the

4 | breakdown here with us.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: So we're going to work towards making sure we can get a breakdown and that we're communicating more, and I say that because there's in particular in my industrial area, in Springfield Gardens it's the same hot spot and DEP has been out several times. It just seems like we're getting no resolution to it, but, you know, it's like a broken music box almost now. You know, because we--it's just always a revolving. You know, it gets quiet and it ramps back up again, and it, you know, it has to do with the refrigerator trucks. neighbors complain. You come out. You inspect. sure issue a violation, but I think, you know, I'm--I'm not to be the, you know--stay on this subject for long because we've--we've been here before. just want to say until the city takes it serious and until DEP and NYPD really starts to take this issue seriously, we'll just continue to lead in 311 complaints hypothetically. And I think the city needs to do more here. It is a quality of life issue that homeowners and people who live near these

2 inspectors. So that if there is anybody who gives

3 notice and leaves, then we work very hard to recruit

4 and bring people up, and it's a very daunting task to

5 stay at as high a full complement of staff members as

6 possible.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. I just hope we take this seriously because we've been here before, and like I said I don't want to stay on this, but until the city really gets serious about this, we're going to be here again.

again, I want to just reiterate that we do take it very seriously. We do work very hard to not only address trends, but also to address one off or individual circumstances. I encourage you to work through Deputy Commission Landau's office if you know of repeat locations. We've been working very hard with our colleagues in different agencies. As we testified to in our budget hearing, we've issued over 10,000 NoVs in FY15 and as of April of 16 we have issued over 5,000 so more than half in those four months or so. So, we--we are taking the issue very seriously. We have the inspectors out constantly, and violations are being issued.

2	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: When do we take
3	their property from them? [pause] When do we take
4	property? After a while, after you've given 100
5	summonses, and they pay the bill, you know, when do
6	we get to that point where we make them have to pay
7	for it to get it back in steeper fines for them?
8	[pause] It's a question.
9	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LICATA: You know, we
10	don't have the authority to take property as a result
11	of this, but we do increase the fine. [background
12	comments, pause] Okay, Gerry has some information
13	that you might find interesting.
14	GERRY KELPIN: So, you need towe have a
15	process for cease and desist orders, which requires
16	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Hmm, so you do
17	do it?
18	GERRY KELPIN: Yes, we do.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Okay.
20	GERRY KELPIN: And we have many
21	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: [interposing]
22	Ah-ha.
23	GERRY KELPIN:at ECB over the year.

It requires us to issue multiple violations. They
need to be upheld by the court and then they are they

24

are not authorized to take the vehicle.

[laughter] I wanted to make sure. Didn't want to--

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

2.2

2.3

2 didn't want to short change you. Council Dromm, I
3 know you wanted to come back for another round of
4 questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Sure, sure, as a follow-up to what Council Member Richards was saying. I thought I read in the newspaper that last week a van that had about eight rows of speakers was confiscated. I thought NYPD did it, if I'm not mistaken, and they actually confiscated that vehicle.

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: NYPD does have the authority to take sound reproduction devices depending on, you know, the complaint. I don't know that we would want to take every vehicle for every complaints, but if—if we knew that it was a repeat or chronic violator, we can take sound reproduction devices.

what I read in the papers, which isn't always accurate, I know that for sure, but often times it most times is. They were able to confiscate this also because he was having a street festival with the--with the sound equipment. It was large enough that everybody apparently in the neighborhood was out having an unauthorized party. Does that contribute

to the willingness to confiscate that, or how does it work? When--when--how is the decision made to

4 | actually confiscate?

2.2

2.3

when the noise emanates from a sound reproduction device, our procedure is first to try to get compliance, to try to ask the person to lower the music. We will consider many factors when we come upon something like that such as the number of complaints, the time of day, the type of neighborhood residential verse commercial. It's actually written right into our procedures so that officers know what to do, and—and what to look for. If there's an actual unpermitted street festival going on that would certainly add to our need to take away the vehicle.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So, you know, having, you know, run a few street festivals and parades myself, I know that for any amplified sound you always need a permit.

LIEUTENANT ROBERT CORBETT: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So can it be confiscated just on that basis?

1 COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 65 2 asked for your protocol we have in place where 3 individuals who are chronic, who we get chronic 4 complaints about every summer, we send them a letter before the summer begins, and the letter states we have zero tolerance for anything that comes from your 6 7 specific location. And if you're found to be 8 violating the noise code, we will immediately seize your property. Zero tolerance. So it can be done. It just once again goes back to, you know, everyone 10 11 will have the commitment that an inspector sheriff has that this subject. You know, I think it is 12 13 something that the city can do. NYPD can certainly 14 So maybe, you know, perhaps that is someone you 15 want to reach out. This has been going on for I think going on four years now, and it's been highly 16 17 effective outside of the roughage (sic) area to track. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Council 20 Member Dromm.

21

2.2

23

24

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Well, thank you again, Council Member. When a--a store is blasting music out into the street, the same law could not be

2 everyone. I'm going to dispense today. So I'm going

3 to give you the opportunity to testify. Please don't

4 abuse that right. So, we--I'm--I am going to not put

5 you on a clock, but do not take that as an

6 opportunity to--to abuse that. Okay. [laughs] Thank

you, and I'm--I'm just saying that for everyone who's

testifying as well. Please go on.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: [interposing]

11 | One more thing. If anyone has--I see a lot of people

12 | in the crowd. I know a lot of people have signed up

13 | to testify. If you would like to testify, please see

14 | the sergeant-at-arms. Make sure that you have filled

15 out a slip because if you do not hand in a slip we

16 cannot have you testify. Thank you. Mr. Bookman,

please.

1

7

8

10

17

24

25

18 ROBERT BOOKMAN: Good afternoon, Mr.

19 | Chairman, Councilman Richards. My name is Robert

20 Bookman. I am counsel to the New York City

21 | Hospitality Lines. It's a trade association that

22 represents roughly 2,000 restaurants, bars, night

23 | clubs and destination hotels in New York, and for 20

years prior to that, I was counsel to the predecessor

organization the New York Night Life Association, and

They're easy to hold. They last pretty

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

inexpensive.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

long, and they're reliable. When they are readily available, we seem to be discussing once again why businesses cannot be measured by an objective standard before they get a ticket? I've got to say even my mom--may she rest in peace--who when we were little used to take our temperature by putting our-her hand on our forehead. Even she when they came out with east to use oral thermometers that were reliable bought them and said hot dog. That was, you know, why wouldn't we that. It's more reliable and it's more accurate. So I guess if it's good enough for my mom, it should be good enough for the city of New York. That's always the standard I've always lived with. And this issue, in fact, as you stated in your questions was resolved years ago when the Noise Code was adopted in 2005. The last item holding the entire legislation up was the Council's insistence especially Chairman Gennaro with the support of the small business community that there be an objective standard for a noise violation, and it was agreed to that a new section--now, a new section was added, 24-218(b) and it places businesses on notice of how they will be measured, how they need to monitor their sound on their own when they are not

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

being inspected so they will be in compliance, and what constitutes a violation? And I will point out for the record that DEP is the one in that negotiation that chose that -- the wording of that section. We didn't negotiate it. They chose the seven and the ten decibels at various times of the day. Our position was we just want objective criteria. You're the experts. You tell us what it should be, you--and--and we all--and--and Councilman Gennaro agreed and we agreed. So it's a bit disingenuous for them to come back now, but we'll get to that in a moment. And guess what, we adopted the standard. It went into effect in 2006, and the number of noise violations issued to business dropped precipitously. Businesses now knew what to do, and inspectors and police officers had something to measure us by. Yet, we still see from time to time violations being issued improperly, in my opinion, under the old subjective, unreasonable noise standard. If should not happen, yet it does and unfortunately, they have upheld it at ECB as an option available to their inspectors even though there's a more detailed objective standard, which should be controlling. We argued at an ECB appeal

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that when the Council adopted a more specific criteria for a particular type of noise, it's generally recognized that specific controls generic, and we now have the specific. So for that particular type of noise, commercial sound coming from commercial -- fixed commercial sections is actually controlled. ECB argued otherwise, which is why I--I would--we'd like part of the record. I asked at that point Councilman Gennaro to make sure that it wasn't just my recollection because, you know, in the heat of negotiations sometimes you may want to hear what you want to hear. And he wrote a letter, which was submitted to ECB stating exactly what I've just stated that it was understanding that the law was clear, that the new section would be the exclusive remedy available to the NYPD, and to ECB for that-those limited types of violations. And I say limited because only from the street. We did not deal with, you know, and this bill does not impact whatsoever the more serious violations of a resident complaining about commercial sound and DEP goes to the residence and they take readings 100% of the time as--as--as Jerry said. So this bill doesn't impact that. impacts just those street noise violations that we

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

were getting thousands of years ago unreasonable noise. And Chairman Gennaro quite clearly said in his letter that that was not the intent that they should be able to use that section any long. And, as a matter of fact, he said that the only reason why he didn't take that section on altogether from the new noise code, "We did not retract 24-244 with the understanding from the enforcement agency that the Department of Environmental Protection that Section 24-218 would be used to regulate noise within commercial establishments and 24-244 could remain on the books to deal with other noise issues that may be less defined, and more difficult to measure in an objective manner. And, you know, we also agreed as part of that deal to stricter standards for violations measured in residential units. It's under the new noise code. It's easier to get a violation in a residential unit, and we agreed to that as well as long as we had objective criteria for the street. And the testimony that I heard today from ECB both in writing and in the verbal testimony is very disturbing. Because basically what they told this committee is yes everyone of our inspectors has a handheld meter, the latest equipment available.

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1

2 know how to use it. We go out when the -- you know, 3 on--on a call. We use it, and if we can't get a 4 violation, well, we want to be able to issue something. So we go to 24-244. That's basically 5 what they're telling you that the--this is in 6 7 compliance with the law. They measured it. It's in 8 compliance in the law. They want an ability to issue a violation anyway, and to me that's really That's exactly what we were trying to 10 outrageous. 11 stop, and for years we did stop it, and we can't 12 slide backwards now, and when they say the ambient masks it, as the Assistant Commissioner said, what 13 14 they're saying is you can't hear the commercial sound 15 significantly because it's noisy out on that street. 16 And the Council has determined that if it's noisier 17 out on the street, you know, and the commercial sound 18 might be adding slightly to that, but not enough for 19 it to be heard, well then it shouldn't be a 20 violation. When she says that they can't have--the 21 issue with unreasonable noise was if inspectors are standing 20 feet away, and they can't have a 2.2 2.3 reasonable conversation. Well, what they're saying is that they're on a noisy street. Not that the 24 sound from the--from the bar, you know, or the 25

nothing more than make it clear that what we passed

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Thank you.

2 in 2005 we meant it, and if your guys--you're going to try to come through the back door government and 3 4 try to issue those old violations again. When it comes to fixed commercial establishments, we're going to stop it, and make you use an objective criteria, 6 7 and we thank you for that. It's easy to use. 8 Thousands of establishments have them, and they use them, and that's they know they're in compliance, and that's what you wanted. You wanted all of them to 10 11 have, to use it, to make sure that if it's--if it's warm weather, if their French doors are open that 12 whatever sound that they're producing on the street 13 is within the code and it is. And that should be the 14 15 end of the -- of that conversation it seems to me.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Thank you. Sir.

JOSH GATEWOOD: [off mic] Good afternoon,
I'm--[on mic] Oh, well, thanks. I'm a little new at
this. I'm working on the transition for new New York
City Food Truck Association, and I just want to say,
you know, there are a lot of violations out there.
It's a constant battle on the street for us, and to
add some objective legislation, I don't think it--

2 it's completely reasonable. I mean we are all about

3 protecting the--the--the quality of life for the

1

25

4 people of New York City. I'll give you an example.

Last Friday, I was vending at 46th and 6th from my

6 food truck and, you know, we had the classic rock

7 station going, and some--some guys from the building

8 came out and they said hey your music is too loud.

9 You know what the solution was? I turned down the

10 | music and I--I didn't need someone to come and issue

11 | a summons. I didn't nee someone to come and

12 confiscate my property. It just required someone who

13 said hey, your music is bothering me. Please turn it

14 down. I said is this enough? He said no turn it

15 off. It would be better. You know what I did? I

16 turned off the music. So when I hear this increased,

17 you know, pushes for more regulation, we're already

19 | from vending, from metered parking. You know, it's

20 | for--from selling. I think any time we're talking

21 | about more regulation that's--it's just anti-small

22 | business, and we need to take that into consideration

23 | when you're--you're making these pushes. I was very

24  $\parallel$  I guess leery of hearing about the--the seizure of

property as well, you know, and it's--for it to be a

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

judgment call on an officer, what if it's an--an officer just doesn't like, you know, the way someone's food truck looks. Am I just going to seize his property. I mean that's--you're--you're getting kind of in dangerous territory there, but I'm looking forward to working with you all and--and solving a lot of the problems in our business, and I would like to say from my perspective as a street vendor, you know, the music and attracting customers can be the difference between us making money and not. It might be difficult for you in--in a--in a business where, you know, you don't need to do those types of things. But it's--it's a very real concern for us in--in our livelihoods. So anything that's reasonable, you know, I will do my best to ensure the other trucks are following it. But, you know, as this gentleman said, we already have objective standards. It shouldn't be left up to judgment, and that's--that's my entire position on it. So thanks for your time today, and I'm looking forward to working with you all.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: First, I'll-I'll begin with--I'll ask it's very similar for I'll
take for the testimony of the Administration and have

2.2

2.3

good, bad.

you comment on that. They had talked about supporting this legislation, but instead being able to utilize the C scale to measure the noise in order to sort of come up and make sure that they're getting an accurate objective standard. Is that something that you think would help? Do you think that's something that is unfair. I mean sort of comment on that particular proposal and—and sort of get from the—to the core ministry (sic) tell me why that's

ROBERT BOOKMAN: I'm not a noise expert and you're going to be hearing from one who is I believe after me, and on prior teams, with all respect, that he tells me it's a terrible idea, and so I would agree. My understanding of the C scale is it's more appropriate, and it is when you're inside a residential unit and you're measuring for all types of, you know, types of sound, which we did add to the last noise code. They did an ad—like I said, they drafted this—this section for commercial—you know for commercial noise 218, and they didn't put the C, you know the C in there because at the time they felt it was not appropriate for taking readings 15 feet from a—from a storefront. So my suspicion scale,

2.2

2.3

you know, goes up when all of a sudden they're telling me 50% of the time that they try to get a violation under 218. They can't meaning you're in compliance. So now they want to throw something else in to try to increase the number of violations they can issue. Well, by the way while simultaneously still not committing to you that they—that that would be the exclusive section. I noticed they didn't say that. I noticed they still want 244. So I think let them comply with 218 as amend—you know, as—as amended by this bill, and let them come back at another time and explain why, you know, that's not good enough.

and additionally, what effect—what—what chilling effect does this have for this, you know, 24-244?
What does this—what effect does it have on business currently, and this unreasonable noise is being able to use rather than the objective standard?

ROBERT BOOKMAN: You know, it used to have a huge chilling impact. There were literally thousands of these unreasonable noise violations that were issued before the Council passed the new noise code, and it was horrible because you never knew what

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

you would be--what the standard was, and it was--by definition it was arbitrary, and the truth of the matter is most of them were not DEP violations back Most of them were Police Department and criminal court summonses, and 100% of the time they did not show up in criminal court for those summonses. So you do get them dismissed there, but you now have to go to court and often hire an attorney if it was issued to the corporation, but they then got sent to the State Liquor Authority where they didn't care that was dismissed in criminal court for failure to prosecute. So we are having hearings on this New York City Noise Code at a State Liquor Authority, which is really ridiculous because they are not trained, you know, for--you know, hearing local code. So it had a huge chilling impact, you know, on the industry, and that was why-that is why it--it--it's the single most significant compromise that we got out of the new Noise Code was an objective criteria for when the police or DEP came by in the street to measure, you know, our--our sound. So it's very frustrating for a business owner who has a handheld meter who uses it to get one of these violations right now for all those reasons, and

So we're talking about, you know--

2 ROBERT BOOKMAN: [interposing] A very
3 reasonable amount of money to make sure that a hand,
4 you know, that at lest one officer per shift, you had

5 one, rather than one per precinct.

that—that makes sense. Okay, I guess I'll ask in relation to—to—my colleague is not here to ask his questions. I'll ask of the—on the other bill relating to food truck music, because I know that these are fixed—the correctional established on 186th, the build—out sort of applies through the Food Truck Association is Intro 745. So I assume you are coming here to testify against moving the clock back from 10:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Is that—is that a fair and accurate rendition?

JOSH GATEWOOD: Yeah, I--I don't see anything wrong with that--the clock limit on that myself, but I'm not very familiar with that. I haven't--I'm not well versed, but, you know, I don't see a problem with that.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay, so you--you're--you're against the bill because? Can you--?

2.2

2.3

Member Richards do you have any questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Well, I just

wanted to add, and I thought you were a very good

neighbor when someone--you said someone came to you

and said your music was too loud and you turned it

6 down?

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

JOSH GATEWOOD: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Well, if thousands of other people did the same thing, we wouldn't be here today. So, you know, the City Council in particular and our Chair, you know, we--we have other bills we could be entertaining, but this is an ongoing issue that many of us have to deal with. So, therefore, as legislators it is our job to legislate when we identify in particular an issue. And I'm liking it to having son now. You know, if I fold him no cookies and he takes -- and there are five cookies in the jar and then I go back and there's four, there is obviously a case to sort of understand that he took a cookie. So, therefore, there should be some sort of punishment. What that punishment is I guess we'll find out what that is as he gets a little older. Maybe he'll sit in the corner for a little while.

2.2

2.3

in all seriously, you know, it is our job as legislators to legislate when we identify a specific issue, and that's why there are laws in lace, and I trust our officers. You know, I entrust them to be able to tell if your music is too loud from a curb and disturbing, you know, whether you're in a residential neighbor—neighborhood or a commercial district. And the bottom line is if you're not violation the law, you will not get a summons. So, I mean there's—unless you tell me you're receiving summonses for no reason. Are you?

JOSH GATEWOOD: I--I have in the past received summons for, you know, no cause, but in this particular instance the evidence said was there 1,400 complaints and there was only one actual summons issued for a noise complaint from a food truck. So maybe people are, you know, when their--the complaint is made maybe they are addressing the situation. I mean that suggests and Mr.--

COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: No, I don't think they are. I just think the City is not really taking the issue serious, and that's why, you know, and, you know, as someone who represents a--a very

2.2

2.3

interesting district, I'm right near JFK. So I have industrial, residential commercial and I can tell you, you know, a lot of our residents call 311 and there's just no real response to their issues. So I don't know how they came up with two, but I do know how they came up with two, but I do know how they came up with two. It just means that there's—they're not taking the issue serious. So that's what brings us here today. So I commend you for turning your music down, and I urge you to tell your neighbors to do the same, you know, and—and we won't be here today.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: It's true and one other quick point, very quick. When I always dig down into those tens of thousands of 311 noise complaints—I have—I haven't done it in a couple of years, but I always found that when it comes—when it comes to bars and clubs it's not 10,700—is the number they used—people, different people complaining. It's often a much fewer number of people complaining very frequently not that they may not have cause to, but I just wanted to make—make it clear sometimes people can call hundreds of time number one. Number two is a very small fraction of the noise about late night bars is concerning music emanating from the

establishment. It's generally concerned about street noise because of all the people out on the street talking on their phones, and being loud after having a couple of drinks. So it goes—it's recorded as a noise complaint against a bar that has nothing to do with noise from the bar. It has to do with the smoking ban [laughs] you guys passed years ago, and we warned you there were going to be a lot of people out on the street late at night. [laughter]

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay.

[laughs]

2.2

2.3

ROBERT BOOKMAN: I just had just last week we did a town hall with the Mayor, and I can assure you. So the lady comes to the town hall and complains to the Mayor about this particular club. Has nothing to do with smoking, but noise from the bar. The next day the inspector goes out. The lady was accurate. Guess what they did? Shut them down. It had very little to do with smoking. So, it—it, you know, so I hear you and in some cases maybe the smoking ban does ensure people have to smoke outside, but music and smoking is two different things.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: Absolutely, but they won't be complaint numbers together. That's a fact.

L	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 88
2	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Sometimes you
3	do get the same person calling. I mean if I lived
1	next door to an establishment, I would
5	ROBERT BOOKMAN: [interposing] I call 311
ó	every time.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS:call andand
3	as we do tell them, call every night, you know, call
9	every time, but you know, but it is a real issue

outside of the smoking ban, it is a real issue.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: And I think we have very tough law to control that, which would allow to happen what you just said, offer you proper enforcement, but it was an objective criteria enforcement. They just didn't show up and shut them down because somebody complained that it was too noisy. [off mic] objectives [on mic] is all we're asking for.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Objectives?

ROBERT BOOKMAN: You got a bad actor

take--take action against him as long as it's

objective. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Objective--I love--my--my lungs appreciate the smoking, I'll

2.2

which is the Douglas Manor Environmental Association,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and we're here today to support Council Member Dromm's Intro 59. The constant use of gas-powered leaf blowers has been an ever-increasing issue of concern for our community. These insidious machines are constantly being misused by neighborhood landscapers, and have been the subject of numerous complaints. Results from a survey that we conducted revealed that there's an overwhelming consensus to have landscapers limit their use of gas-powered leaf blowers. The noise and pollution degrade our quality of life. As concerned residents of our community the DMEA has educated ourselves on the harmful health impact by gas-powered leaf blowers. We have urged residents to communicate with their landscapers and have them voluntarily stop using gas-powered leaf blowers during the timeframe May 15th to September 15th gas-powered leaf blowers. We live in our quaint neighborhood and for most of our day we hear the noise nuisance of multiple leaf blowers. machines create noise levels of 90 to 100 decibels at close range, which far exceed the EPA's recommended maximum of 80 decibels at even 50 feet. There World Health Organization recommend ambient noise levels at 55 decibels or less. Not only is the noise a

25

2 nuisance, gas-powered leaf blowers are harmful--have-3 -are causing harmful health effects on our health. 4 Leaf blowers literally scour the earth off top soil, 5 propelling air clouds of dirt, dust, danger con-dangerous contaminants such as mold, fungal spores, 6 7 molecules of toxic chemicals people sprinkle on their lawn and trees, and fecal matter of animals. Some of 8 the particulate matters going into the street straight into our water drains. Eventually, these 10 11 toxins [coughs] another unwanted material is 12 deposited into our waterways. Heat compounds the 13 negative health effects. During the summer months, 14 particulate pollution is at its worst. Particulate 15 matter blown into the air can take days to settle. 16 These particulate aggravate allergies. We have an 17 endorsement from the American Academy of Pediatrics 18 that support the harmful health effects of gas-19 powered leaf blowers. As a community, we feel that 20 it is a reasonable request to restrict the use of 21 gas-powered leaf blowers during the timeframe of May 2.2 15th to September 15th. It is unnecessary to use a 2.3 leaf blower during the spring and summer months. Seasonal restrictions allow for the use of leaf 24 blowers during some periods of the year while

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

disallowing it for others. A significant reduction in noise and air pollution would result from the implementation of the seasonal regulation. Practical steps can be taken both by residents and government to achieve cleaner air. The implementation of seasonal leaf blower regulations is such a step. Please consider passing legislation to restrict the use of gas-powered leaf blowers during the months of May 15th to September 15th. We look forward to have a continued dialogue with our local politicians and move forward to implement a restriction of gaspowered leaf blowers citywide between May 15th and September 15th. [coughs] Excuse me. I also have a letter of support from our Community Board 11 for Council Member Dromm's Intro, as well as I've passed out a local position to support. [pause]

allowing me to speak in support of the legislation to restrict the time frame and restrict the sale of gasoline leaf blowers. I'm Lucy Weinstein. I'm the pediatrician. I have the sense of humor of a five-year-old. Forgive me. I am the Chair of the Environmental Health Committee of Chapter 2 of the Academy of Pediatrics, which includes Brooklyn and

2 Queens, also Nassau, Suffolk. I happen to live out in Suffolk, but I was born in the Bronx, grew up in 3 the Bronx. We also have the endorsement for this 4 issue, which we've been working on for guite a while 5 throughout the state actually. We have letters of 6 7 endorsement in our area from so many other medical organizations and others, Medical Society of the 8 State of New York, and I've handed--handed out a flyer with the resolution that the Suffolk County 10 11 Medical Society put forward with some of the dangers 12 of leaf blowers urging the state, which they did. 13 The state--Medical Society of the State of New York 14 came out with a resolution in favor of limiting 15 gasoline leaf powers looking for alternatives, but bring you to the National AMA meeting. Other 16 17 organizations that have been in support, the Long 18 Island Chapter of the American Lung Association, 19 Cancer Society, Asthma Society, Breast Cancer 20 Coalition, Citizens Campaign for the Environment, the Sierra Club, Audubon Society, Grassroots 21 2.2 Environmental. There's no health or safety 2.3 organization that I know that is not in support of limiting gasoline leaf blowers. They pose multiple 24 environment and health hazards, and basically they're 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

exposing all of us in New York City and elsewhere to unnecessarily to pollutants and noise, and they're certainly unnecessary in the summertime when there are so few leaves. We do understand people really loved their nice clean lawns. I wish people would realize, and it becomes a matter to education that a perfect lawn is actually environmentally unfriendly. But we do understand that when there's lots of leaves perhaps people will agree to use them. In the summertime there's really--they're really--totally unnecessary. Gasoline leaf blowers are a particular kind of engine called the two-stroke engine. to go look that up, but it's interesting that on the website for something called How Does it Work? explaining gasoline leaf blowers it says: "Twostroke engine reduce a lot of pollution, so much, in fact, that it is likely that you won't see them around too much longer. This was an unbiased, you know, just definition of a two-stroke leaf blower. They are inefficient. They don't have emissions They're inefficient at burning fuel. spill up to perhaps 30% of the gasoline that is totally unburned into the environment. They are highly polluting. Americans spill approximately it's

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

been estimated 17 million gallons of gasoline each year filling lawn equipment. That's more than the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill from 1989 in Alaska. It's just a huge amount, and there's a lot of good medical evidence, which is indicating the emissions that are spewed forth and particulates blown up. There's a lot of evidence about particulate matter, these tiny little particles that the leaf blowers blow up that there's an increase--this is medically proven--an increase in early deaths from oil cause from heart attacks, strokes, congestive heart failure, asthma. Particularly asthma and we're concerned about children because there's a huge amount of asthma particularly in New York City and this adds to that. And again, it's just totally unnecessary. Chronic obstructive lung disease. Anybody elderly who has heart or lung disease are--is at risk, and they mostly don't see these particles. You or I when we go around yes we'll see leaf blowers spewing forth dust, and we're--we're upset about it, but what we don't see is like even up to a day later, the particles are still in the air, and people out there playing. the summertime children are out and not in school. They breathe more quickly and so they actually take

and 26 times as much carbon monoxide. And again, it really isn't necessary. We understand that certain machinery in our day and age isn't necessary to--for-for our lives to become more pleasant, more productive, but these are not necessary. So the

gasoline leaf blower use emits 498 times as much

hydrocarbons, 40% times as much particulate matter

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

25

23 major pollution effects are and I'll try to be brief.

A lot of it is summarized in the handouts you have.

Exhaust pollution, fine particulate pollution, noise

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

pollution, which you've talked about quite a bit, and environmental degradation including water pollution, small animal habitat destruction when you blow out the leaves from under the bushes. Just so that I just get this in, in the end of your hand-outs of my testimony, but in terms of what the alternatives are, I hear lots of questions. Well, are they any worse than lawn mowers? Yes, they are lawn mowers are four-stroke engines. They don't pollute as much, and again, they're mowing a lawn. The grass is put down. They're not spewing things up in the air. the alternatives? What are the alternatives? won't landscapers lose money or be inconvenienced? Okay, are they going to lose business financially? The answer is no. Landscapers don't believe this, and I've chatted with many of them, but it's been proven in other areas where there have been restrictions. Not only do they not lose money, they actually save money. They don't need any more employees. They save money on gasoline, which is quite expensive on repairs and maintenance, and they need any more workers. What alternatives are there? There are lithium ion battery now. There is now very good electric commercial equipment, and I see a steel

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

manufacturer represented in the back. We actually-we've been--locally, we've been working with them to help provide buy backs incentives to switch to electric equipment, and they are putting out some very good electric equipment, which is in use in other parts of the country without any--without any problems. And anybody here those old rakes and brooms, they're not even mentioned, rakes and brooms, especially during the summer time. You don't need a leaf blower to just rake up that one little leaf. Good exercise. You know, there's really no problem with using that. In a head-to-head comparison California Department of Water and Power did a--a comparison with a grandma with rakes and brooms against a gasoline leaf blower and an electric battery, a battery-powered leaf blower and the grandma did it just as fast as the battery powered. Not quite as fast as the gas leaf blowers, but just-but a better job and basically just about as efficient. Many municipalities in New York and elsewhere have already banned leaf blowers without any problems, there's--or restricted, rather. shouldn't say banned totally, although there are some complete bans. Westchester County, 16 towns already.

2 In 2008, the Township Rye (sic) instituted a 3 summertime ban against a substantial objections from 4 landscapers. They decided just give it a try. Let's give is a one-year try and revisit the issue. year later only one landscaper -- landscaper came up to 6 object. Most of them found it just fine. 7 8 understandable that change is difficult, and the landscape industry thinks that they can do a better It turns out it's just objectively not true. 10 11 Other--other issues that have been brought, which are 12 realistic, well lithium ion battery powered, don't they spew up stuff? Well, they don't have the 13 pollution of the gasoline. They're not quite as 14 15 powerful so the pollutants don't go up in the air as 16 much. It also turns out that the lithium ion 17 batteries are less toxic metals than other batteries, 18 and it turns out they're generally considered nonhazardous waste and they're recycled. 19 So that was a 20 legitimate concern as well. So we don't have those 21 concerns. So basically yes there are alternatives. 2.2 We don't need them. Why shouldn't we use them? 2.3 Airborne pollutant and volatile organic compounds some of the ones you weren't able to pronounce 24 earlier, Benzene and many of these are considered air 25

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 pollutants by the EPA that may cause or do cause 3 cancer and other serious health effects as the 4 metaldehyde, formaldehyde. Also release nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and carbon dioxide which are considered what's called the 6 7 criteria pollutants. Definitely harmful to the 8 public health and environment, and we just know this. Even low level exposures have been associated with respiratory and central nervous system effects, and 10

in the summer particularly there is heat.

ozone, which we know is harmful.

combines with these pollutants to form low level

I won't address noise, as it has been addressed before, but let me just mention one thing about noise. I know I can go on a little bit too much, but harmful effects of noise, which include, of course, stress, cortisol. They've actually done a study with children in schools. The children, the same type of children demographically in a classroom that's near a noisy outdoor environment do less well on standardized tests than the children in a classroom that's in a quieter area. So noise really is not just an annoyance. It is a public health problem. Particulate matter has been quantified.

measure it with the A Scale, it cuts off the base.

2 It's like the sound has been castrated. You don't get the base any more. This is very important 3 4 because I'm going to describe why you get all these complaints, and why you don't get that many tickets 5 and why the complaints occur again and again and 6 7 again about all types of noise, particularly music. 8 I'm in favor of help businesses in the city. I'm in favor helping residents in the city. I work for I always try to do the same thing, which is 10 11 solve the problem. Now, you asked about meters. 12 Meters range in price from \$40 for a Radio Shack 13 meter, which you can still buy used, to this meter which costs \$10,000. The reason it costs \$10,000 is 14 15 because it has various programs in it. It's like a 16 computer. You can run different applications, and 17 one of the things that you can do with it is you can 18 measure the simple DBA level. The DBA level is 19 showing on the meter right now. So as you can see, 20 when I talk it's in the range of the mid 60s. 21 the typical level you get--even though it's a little 2.2 bit amplified in here--three feet from a voice, 65 2.3 decibels. But continuing throughout this whole hearing every once in a while--a lot of whiles--you 24 get subway trains running underneath this building, 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and you get low frequency sounds. And if you measure on the C scale, that even when I'm not talking [pause] it's just as--it's higher than when I was talking on the A scale because you're picking up very low frequency base, sounds that's not only produced by subways and traffic, but by bars and night clubs that have subwoofers. Now, in 1992, the Noise Code was amended with a local law to add in a measurement base specifically because the code only looked at DBA levels. In 1992. That's a long time ago. measure those specific base sounds or frequencies, you have to use something called a Spectrum Analyzer. I don't know if you can see it too well on this little screen from 15 feet away, but when you do a spectrum analysis it's like a bar graph. I'm going to show you a picture of a screen. [pause] think of a piano keyboard with the base on the left and the treble on the right, this particular sound is mostly base. That's why you see this Empire State Building like spike on the left hand side from the way--where you're facing. That's bass sound. is what drives a lot of people crazy. If you think about it, almost everybody who lives in the second floor apartment in New York City has a very good

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

chance of having some noise making enterprise underneath them. It doesn't have to be a bar or a restaurant. It could also be a GAP Clothing Store. It can be a restaurant, but it could also be a deli. People play music all the time. So the sound comes up through the ceiling usually, sometimes through the walls as well. The issue that 244 addresses is the problem when bar make too much noise people complain. The inspector comes over and he pulls out a meter, and the meters that they use despite what you heard before about Gerry Keplin telling you that they have state-of-the-art meters, many of the meters that they have are like this. This one is from 1970. even before I started Acoustilog. It looks something like this, but it only measures A and C. B no one uses for anything. It uses A and it uses C. cannot measure the individual frequencies, and the reason this is important -- let me just jump ahead. Ιf you're out on a sidewalk and there's noise coming from a nightclub or a bar through their front door with the door closed, the noise that you hear on the sidewalk is largely comprised of traffic and subway and airplanes and all this other stuff, which is a lot of bass noise. If you use the C scale, it's a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

tremendous mistake. You will measure so much garbage that you won't be able to distinguish it from the noise coming from the bar. The reason why people were giving--why the city inspectors were giving out tickets to bars on the sidewalk in the first place was this: They only had these simple meters. They only could measure A or C and didn't really measure C. A ignores the bass. So people call up. inspector comes maybe two weeks later because there's only about 20 teams of inspectors. So what you heard about each inspector has a meter, actually each two inspectors have one meter. They measure the noise in the person--in the complainant's apartment. And then they do this unbeknownst to the noise maker down Then they go downstairs and ask them to turn off the music. So they hear the bass, they hear boom, boom, boom like that. They hear a little bit of voices. Just a little bit, and they go downstairs. They ask them to please turn off the music. If they don't turn off the music, they give a ticket for obstruction. Okay. So the bar owner or the manager turns off the music for 30 seconds, and the sound level of the boom, boom, boom goes away in the apartment. But the traffic noise is still coming

if you're saying that not moving to the C scale is a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

solution that the A scale is the correct--that there--because of this other background noise even that's not--not effective or not-- So what is the--what-what should we take first? There's meters and what is--how do we--how do we measure noise in your opinion -- in your opinion correctly to make sure that the resident who lives in that second floor can have a--a quality of life that is protected and that the business downstairs can understand that they're responsibility is to the City, and they say this-this is my decibel level. I go no more than this, and if so, I'm--I am creeping in territory where I can--rightfully get a ticket because I am ignoring he law of the land. So, how--what--where--where is the balance there. What is the -- is it a better meter? Is not--if it's not the A scale the C scale--what--where do we sort of land here to fix this problem because we have these thousands upon thousands of complaints. So--and I'm---I have this Bill 186 like does that fix the problem? What do we do here? [laughs]

ALAN FIERSTEIN: Okay, let me answer that question two ways. First of all, Section 244, the way you've written it is very good. It's good just the way it is, but you must not modify 24-218, which

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

is the section about unreasonable noise. basically says that you shouldn't penalize music coming from the interior of some establishment that you hear, but it doesn't say where. The problem has always been as Bob Bookman told on the sidewalk. it. Put it right in there. Music on the sidewalk. This 24-244 is to stop the people putting loud speakers in the front of their store facing out onto the sidewalk like American Apparel does on--a block away from y office at the Corner of Broadway and Howard Street, and to stop all of those stores that used to sell CDs on 42n Street, blasting CD. on the sidewalk you cannot make any noise that could be heard intentionally, that that is intentioned. That's the way it was worded for the business advertising purposes. It's right the way it, and just add a sentence saying "This shall not be for unintentional music leakage from a bar, restaurant, nightclub or other establishment." However, the DEP has always held that they don't check the noise level on the sidewalk if the bar--if the door opens momentarily for a customer walking in or out, but if they prop the door open, then they do. So that's obviously good faith. If the --if the bar opens the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

door up, they're asking for trouble. You've already had this issue with the air conditioning leaking out onto the sidewalk. So that's what they should do with that. Now, I want to answer your question even more by telling you that there's a section for music, which they are supposed to enforce. And that's 24-321(b) B--and they referred to this. And, the handout you got from the DEP today refers to 24-231 but they say the letter A after it. A means it's the paragraph that only talks about DBA. They don't have enough of the meters, and they certainly don't have enough of the inspectors trained to use the meters that can measure the individual base sounds, that are the cause of 95% of the complaints in the first place. If they would take those meters that they've got, dust them off, train the inspectors properly how to use them to measure base, they will immediately get these bars to turn down their music and to do soundproofing or to modify their speakers or take them out of the ceiling where sometimes they're recessed into as insane as that may sound. what's causing the problem. Go right to the actual The base measurement will clearly pick up problem. the base. It will not pick up the sound from outside

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

because the windows are usually shut. It will show the actual culprit. You won't be penalizing the wrong person by mistake, and you won't be getting-letting the quilty loud bars, you won't let them off the hook, which is not fair to the residents. that's what you do with that, but 24-218 should not be modified the way you're talking about here because it basically says that 20--they want to modify 24-218. So the only way any kind of establishment can get a ticket for music is if it violates this, these three examples, which are in--in this section you've got here. Your examples 1, 2 and 3, and those examples are continuous noise at night, continuous noise during the day--day and impulsive noise any Those are separate types of problems. You cannot modify that because those are real problems that occur. When a bar, night club or restaurant closes down at 4 o'clock in the morning, what do you think the people who clean up do? They take all the chairs, the turn them upside down. Boom, boom on the tables, on the bar. It makes huge loud noise. not music. So it's not covered by Section 24-231, which is entitled Commercial Music. You have to have a way of measuring those sounds, and you cannot

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

measure low frequency sounds using DBA, which are the examples given in 24-218(b). 24-218(a) However, says exactly: No person shall make or cause or permit to be caused any unreasonable noise. Period. Examples of this are the following--and they're just examples -- that should include but shall not be limited to, is the wording. That means they're examples. That was very wise of them to put that in. It was not meant to deal with sidewalk noise. It was meant to deal with noise that continually too loud because it's 7 decibels or more over at night or 8 or 10 decibels or more over during the day, or 15 decibels if it's a short impulsive sound. And the short impulsive sound doesn't have to be bass. It can be [claps hands] a high frequency sound like that, and you those, too. So that -- that has to be left in because you cannot possibly think of all the different types of noises that can come from any kind of establishment or from someone that isn't one of these bar or night clubs or restaurants. It could be a manufacturing plant. It could be drilling or sawing that is not really construction. So it's not covered by the Construction Code. examples are people singing. That's not necessarily

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Right.

2	ALAN FIERSTEIN: 24-244 leave it the way
3	you have modified it with one addition, say this does
4	not include accidental noise emitting onto the
5	sidewalk or a public street, park or place
6	accidentally from any establishment. Because it was
7	thisthat section was designed for deliberate
8	advertising, attention getting noise onto the street,
9	which we need like a hole in the head. That's what
10	you should specifically say. Sidewalk noise coming
11	from an establishment accidentally is exempt from
12	this provision. That's all you have to do.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: So if someone is playing music, you would—you would consider accidental noise, and being—if someone is playing music in their establishment, but they're meaning it for it to be inside that establishment and not on the street that is—that is accidental noise, not advertising or so on, correct?

ALAN FIERSTEIN: The fellow who was sitting in this chair before you asked the impact on their business--

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: [interposing] Uh-huh.

2.2

2.3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 ALAN FIERSTEIN: -- from doing this. I've 3 had to advise people because they got these 244 4 violations to put up a second sheet of glass in front of their storefront window so they had six-inch air space to reduce accidental sound. The slightest 6 7 sound you can hear. The way they worded it could be cause for a violation, and we fought this many times 8 with the DEP where you--at the ECB where you adjudicate them --10 11 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: 12 [interposing] Uh-huh.

ALAN FIERSTEIN: --and it was upheld, but the inspectors need to be trained in the right stuff, not just--and they cannot have the discretion that they basically outlined especially with DBC in their paper that they handed to you today. So that's what I wanted to tell you about those. The only other thing I wanted to mention to you was on Intro 740--

[interposing] But--but--but if you have a--a--a restaurant that's--has their doors propped open--ALAN FIERSTEIN: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES:

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: --you know, or they're not supposed to do that in the summer with

like this [mimics low steady tone]. Now, imagine

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

hearing that. They're so penetrating these sounds they go through your closed windows. So there's many ice cream trucks where they got the refrigeration equipment and the compressors running inside there, and the generators and the compressors make this pure tone [mimics low steady tone] for hours, and it goes through your window, and in some places in your apartment because they're in effect called standing waves, it's super loud, and in other places you can't hear it at all. So as you walk from end of your apartment to the other the [mimics low steady tone]. It's maddening. You have to find a place to sit where you're in a null point. You see what I mean? Those things have to be regulated, and they can be muffled. They have to muffle those. There's a section in the Noise Code 24-231 called Circulation Devices, an extremely weak section that only refers DBA ignores [mimics low steady tone] because to DBA. that's a low frequency base sound. It really tremendously ignores it, and not only that, I just have to say this. It's not exactly what's in this bill, but I just want to point out the Noise Code has a serious deficiency in that because there's plenty of people who hear fans on the roof, they're droning

your testimony. I have -- when it comes to 59, I think

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 we are--my--my colleagues is not here to ask you

3 questions, but I thank you for your testimony as

4 | well. Thank you for your time. [pause] All right,

5 so the next panel is George Pauldoff (sp?) Allison

6 Blaine, and Silvio Calzino (sp?). Will you all come

7 forward and be sworn. [background comments, pause]

right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth today?

PANEL MEMBER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: I guess you can begin on one side and work your way over.

SILVIO CALZINO: [off mic] Hi, my name is Silvio Calzino. I thank you for the [on mic] opportunity of speaking to the Council today. I own a company that sells outdoor power equipment, and I sell leaf blowers as well as other noisy things that people use to do useful work, and we sell them to all types of agencies, landscape companies. We sell a ton of them to the City. We sell them to the Department of Parks. We sell them to the Housing Authority. We sell them to the Department of Sanitation. We sell them to DEP themselves and we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

have for years, and I'm particularly concerned with the--the amendment that would ban the sale of leaf blowers especially in light that a lot of our sales goes directly to--to the City yourselves. think it's--I think it's just wrong that you can set--you can take one product. There's a--you know, there's a lot of things that make a lot noise, as we heard today, and it just -- just completely talk about one product as it's--as--as the culprit that makes all this noise. And--and by your own statistics you said you said you had 70,000 complaints, and of that 1,173 related to landscaping noise complaints, which probably, you know, of that--I mean there's mowers that are going and Weed Wackers and I'm sure that some of those people could have taken steps to mitigate that noise. I think there are probably-that's--that's like less than 2% of your complaints based on landscaping complaints. I mean I think the education of -- of these -- of these companies is the main thing. I think you have a very good law that's in effect right now. It seems -- it seems that you're having trouble -- trouble in measuring it, which is probably the problem. I mean what really matters is all we hate noise. I mean I was woken--I woke--

2 ironically, a week ago I was woken up dead out of my 3 sleep by some guy that had his Harley cranked up in front of the--in front of the 7-11 making all kinds 4 5 of noise going up and down the street. I mean I think somebody should give that guy a ticket, you 6 7 know, and we all-- I mean nobody wants to be awakened 8 by noise and it's -- we all want quieter neighborhoods, and I think it really comes down to education, educating these people on -- on how to use the blower 10 11 and how to use all the products to make sure they 12 have all the proper emissions devices on them. 13 that they're not making more noise than they need, 14 and--and maybe just, you know, regulating the amount 15 of throttle at certain times. But--and beyond that, 16 I mean the--the--the truth is these landscapers who 17 can't come here today because they're out working. 18 mean, you have a -- a committee meeting to ban 19 something that's -- these people use for their 20 livelihoods, and it--they're--they can't come today. 21 They're all too busy working because this is their 2.2 You know, it's the 4th of July Weekend, and-2.3 -and you guys are having a--a discussion on banning something they use to make a living, it's really 24 unfair to the landscape community that you can do--25

just go in there and write this law while they're-while they're all too busy to show up because they have to make a living, and they're not, you know, this is an instrumental device--I--I can tell you that there's--if there was a different or a replacement for this product, if it was so easy, they would all use them. Okay, it's--it's not as simple as--as-as some other people who here gave testimony earlier that, you know, we can use a broom, and we can go back to using goats or whatever. I mean, these--these--you know, there are hundreds of-hundreds and thousands of blowers that sold every year. It's just, you know, what needs--what needs to be done is more education how to use them, and to come with a system as you are and you already have. As this gentleman testified earlier is that you have a very good ordinance on noise, and we all agree that, you know, we should enforce the current law rather than make new laws because we can't figure out how to measure the noise because there are other things that make noise that need to be addressed that aren't--It's just not leaf blowers. I mean by your own statistics it's purely leaf blowers. So to just

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

come out and ban one product over something else
makes absolutely no sense. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Thank you.

GEORGE PAULOFF: Thank you. My name is George Pauloff. I'm a small business owner as well in Flushing, New York. I feel as though in regards to [coughs] the leaf blower banning sale, we have many customer in the New York City Metro Area [coughs]t that would buy a gas-powered leaf blowers for their summer home maybe in Jersey, the Hamptons or Pennsylvania, some place else. So banning the sale of this hear is also going to--as a taxpayer, as a business, you know I agree it's going to prohibit us from--from selling and making money and, you know, I--I just think that that's not, and it doesn't seem right with me. The 65 decibels. I'm not a scientist or, you know, I'm not an expert in that field, but that pretty much covers all of the gas-powered leaf blowers that we sell. So that means we wouldn't be selling any gas-powered leaf blowers if this was to go through, banning the sale of the leaf blower in the New York City Metro area. From our understanding talking with our salesmen [coughs] supposedly the city agencies would have some rights to purchase

2 We currently do service some of the agencies, 3 the Department of Parks, Department of Transportation 4 but if you're going to ban us from selling it, that 5 means that we can't sell it to the city agencies, which means they're just going to buy it from Nassau 6 County or Westchester or New Jersey for that matter, 7 8 hindering the small businesses in New York City. That's one of our main concerns. I don't think banning the sale. Perhaps for the manufacturers to 10 11 come up with maybe lower decibel rated leaf blowers. 12 They might be something that they could perhaps come 13 up with, but I think the 65 decibels as that 14 gentleman just showed, that's me talking here that 65 15 decibels. 70 decibels was a vacuum, although he 16 didn't use the vacuum backwards. He said to have it 17 suck you can stick the hose on the other side so you 18 can blow. I often do that for my son's inflatable 19 The vacuum is 70 decibels so I--I think that--20 that's 65-A or whatever that code is. I think that 21 should be raised a little bit. Perhaps not--again, I'm not a scientist. I don't know but I think that 2.2 2.3 measurement might be a little on the low side. Perhaps it will brought up a little bit, and maybe 24 not. You know, again I don't know the -- the decibels 25

on the stronger backpack mower--blowers, but there
are often a lot of handheld blowers that we do sell
quite a few of. Maybe that measurement can be

5 | tweaked a little bit. Thank you.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ALLISON BLAINE: Good afternoon. My name is Allison Blaine. I represent Metropolitan Lumber and Hardware. Metropolitan likewise sells these socalled, what we're referring as grass blowers. think it's important to note--know that--to notice that these blowers don't simply only blow grass. if you restrict them during the spring and the summer, that's an assumption that they're only used in the fall to--to blow--I'm--I'm sorry--leaves. These-these are used by the landscapers. used all year round to blow grass. Like I said, there's construction dust. They're sold throughout the city and outside of the city, outside of this jurisdiction throughout the state into New Jersey and Connecticut. Thousands and thousands of these units are sold, like this gentleman said, it would have a chilling effect on small businessmen, and including the landscapers who--a good point. We're leading up to the 4th of July Week--Weekend. They obviously can't be heard because they're out working during

we can't ban--ban them in the spring or the summer.

1

2

3

4

6

7

14

21

2.2

2.3

24

But in pointing to--this gentleman referenced that

were 1,172 complaints that--with regard to these leaf

ban them in the spring and the summer, but obviously

8 blowers, and only two violations. Perhaps there were

9 only two violations because there were only two

10 violations. You have a million complaints in the

11 world. It doesn't mean they're legitimate. So to

12 expand the statute--to expand to solve a problem that

13 doesn't obviously exist, that--that's--that doesn't

make any sense. And going--referring back to Ms.

15 McGillick's comment from the DMEA, she even pointed

16 out that the EPA recommends 80 decibels at just the

17 C. Then why is this Council looking and this

18 committee looking to set the level at 65 decibels?

19 When the EPA itself is saying 80 decibels? I don't

20 know. [pause] And if you have any other questions--

any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

## CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES:

[interposing] I mean do you have any--does anyone have any testimony to submit or do you have testimony

25 to submit at all or--?

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

2 ALLISON BLAINE: No.

3 CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: No, okay.

4 All right.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SILVIO CALZINO: [off mic] I just want to say one thing--

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Uh-uh

SILVIO CALZINO: [off mic] -- about the leaf blower was mentioned as [on mic] all these bad things that leaf blowers do, and I mean obviously you quys--you--you--the committee should--should stick to noise because this is about noise. I mean I'm betting--you know, you can make all kinds of different arguments about all kinds of different things, two-stroke engines and, you know, in a perfect world we should all have goats eat our lawn, and we should all use brooms and we should--You know, but it's not going to happen, okay. And, you know, probably 90% of a--of the handheld stuff that we sell is two-stroke, and manufacturers are--are striving every day. It's a very competitive market, to make much cleaner two-stroke engines, but they haven't figured out a way to eliminate the two-stroke engine. So I mean to say let's just ban the two-stroke engine because it make emissions is ridiculous because I

should and shouldn't be regulated.

2.2

2.3

mean they--it's in every manufacturer's best interest to make--to comply with EPA regulations, and they all have to write very stringent regulations, and very, very stringent regulations on--on-on emissions for two-stroke and four-stroke engines. And to simply just say we should get rid of two-strokes is ridiculous and that's really above the jurisdiction of the-of the New York City law. I mean it goes to federal EPA regulations as to--as to what--what

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay.

Just to pick out one device over others that make, you know, that—that make—there's—there's just so many things that make noise. Garbage trucks and—and lawn mowers make noise and chainsaws make noise and backpack blowers make noise and, you know, these are—these are all noisy devices. I think that you need to stick to the original—your orig—the original law that said just figure out what the noise levels are, and—and fine violators and—and fine the violators who are making too much noise, and what—what—regardless of what that means. Don't pick one thing, you know. It's just that simple. Thank you.

regard to enforcement with regard to truck noise, I--

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

there are two instances where trucks had--ice cream trucks are illegally parked on a regular basis, and they're parked illegally and--and they're operating. One--one--on area, one place is--was north of us, Columbus Circle where Central West comes into Columbus Circle. There's a pretty big ice cream truck that parks there, and you get the tourist crowd, and it's quite noisy, and every time I walk, which is on a pretty basis because to go to the YMCA--the 63rd Street Y, you have to walk through a barrier of noise and, I often wonder why I'm breathing when I go by that truck. Another place is that on 63rd Street and Broadway, they set up a little park area where they set up places where you could sit and eat or do the computer. There's free WiFi there. Boom, the ice cream truck comes and that compression noise is -- is -- is very penetrating and awful, and it's--it sits there and once I made a complaint, and it moved. Another time I---I--I simply walked away, and I was surprised about how far I had to walk away to the other end of this island where they had a park and there were other seats at the other end. I was surprised at how far away I had to--to walk. The point is -- the point I'm trying to

make with regard to these two--two instances is that there's enforcement. This is an ongoing stable business use of the--of--of space. Unless there's a permit that allows these people to park illegally, they--there--there's no enforcement with regard to the use of that space. I would--there's an epidemic. I--I would secondly comments--public health comments with regard, you know, that were There's an epidemic of asthma with New York City and the whole use of--of-of these things have-has to be studied with regard to their public health I mean the -- the whole widespread children impacts. are being affected by that, and this--this is a--so as not to be cumulative, there are two things that-that haven't been mentioned that aren't covered by the bills. One thing that terrifies people that are sensitive to noise is the proposals to make the New York subways--cell--cell phone accessible. is going to be worse than someone sitting across from you regularly and even people that are sensitive to it, still do it.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: If we can we stick to the--the subject of our bill.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

PAUL PELOQUIN: Yeah, well in terms of something for the—the committee to consider in the future, and the others are noise from dogs. Dogs barking. They can be very annoying. I was sleeping in the back of my house a number of years ago. I had a German Shepherd arf—arf, and a little went squeak—squeak. And that's a—the dogs throats can go for hours. So this is something for—for the Council to consider with regard to noise.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Sir.

MEMBERS. My name is Mike Gannon. I'm President of the Douglas Manor Environmental Association, a homeowner's association comprised of 595 families residing in the Douglaston, a community of all R1 and R12 zoned homes in Northeast, Queens. As the zoning implies, the homes are surrounded by grass, shrubs and trees. We applaud the committee's limiting of leaf blowers to 65 decibels. We feel Intro 59 does not go far enough in protecting our community from hazards. We have already heard from the Douglas Manor Environmental Association and the Long Island Society of Pediatricians on the many toxins blown into the air by leaf blowers. We agree with the

2.2

2.3

Thank you.

statements of both the organizations. The DMEA has participated this year in a voluntary leaf blower ban. To our surprise it's raised by landscapers who realized that a 10 to 20-minute time savings at each stop. One landscaper now offers a 5 to 10% discount to his customers who decline the use of leaf blowers on their property. We urge the committee join our neighborhood in the New Merrimack, Yonkers and Douglaston's nearest neighbor the Great Neck Station in Nassau County to ban all leaf blowers from May

15th to September 15th as a transition period to a

total year-round ban with three years.

CHAIRPERSON CONSTANTINIDES: Okay, I definitely appreciate both of you taking the time out of your schedules to come here and testify to make testimony the record. I will definitely take it into consideration as we move forward. Are there anyone else that wishes to testify at this time? All right, with that, we will look forward to speaking further about these three introductions, and coming to a good resolution. Thank you for your time today, and we'll be gaveling this committee closed. Thank you.

[gavel] I thank our Legislative Attorney, Samara

Swanston for always her great work, and our Policy

1	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	135
2	Analyst Bill Murray as well, as well as Council	
3	Member Dromm's staff and my Legislative Director 1	Nick
4	Lozowski, and with that, I wish everyone a good	
5	weekend and gavel this Environmental Protection	
6	Committee closed. Thank you. [gavel]	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

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



Date July 7, 2016