

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

----- X

September 22, 2025

Start: 1:22 p.m.

Recess: 3:54 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - 8th Floor - Hearing
Room 3

B E F O R E: Amanda Farias,
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Alexa Avilés
Erik D. Bottcher
Jennifer Gutiérrez
Lincoln Restler
Kevin C. Riley
Rafael Salamanca, Jr.
Inna Vernikov

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

Jennifer Sun
NYC Economic Development Corporation

John O'Neil
NYC Department of City Planning

Carolyn Grossman Meagher
NYC Department of City Planning

Leah Archibald
Evergreen: Your North Brooklyn

Christopher Walters
Association for Neighborhood and Housing
Development

Quincy Ely-Cate
Business Center Outreach Network

Charles Yu
Long Island City Partnership

Brady Meixell
Southwest Brooklyn Industrial Development
Corporation

SERGEANT AT ARMS: This is a microphone check for the Committee on Economic Development recorded on September 22, 2025, located on the 8th Floor, Hearing Room 3 by Nazly Paytuvi.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good afternoon and welcome to today's New York City Council hearing for the Committee on Economic Development. At this time, please silence all electronic devices. No one may approach the dais at any time during this hearing. Chair, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: [GAVEL] Good afternoon and welcome to today's New York City Council hearing of the Committee on Economic Development. Today is September 22, 2025. My name is Amanda Farias and I have the privilege of Chairing this Committee. I would like to thank the members of the Committee who are present today, Council Members Riley, Bottcher and Gutiérrez, and the Administration for joining us today for this critical hearing on the progress of implementing the new New York City Industrial Plan.

On September 16th, the Department of City Planning released the draft New York City Industrial Plan. The city's first comprehensive industrial development

strategic plan as mandated by Local Law 172 of 2023, which I was proud to be the prime sponsor.

This plan represents the culmination of 18 months of research and stakeholder engagement, addressing the future of 545,000 industrial jobs across our five boroughs. Today's hearing provides a critical opportunity to exam the plans proposals and ensure that they meet the needs of our industrial business and workers, businesses and workers.

New York City's industrial sector remains vital to our economy despite decades of challenges. While we've lost 75 percent of manufacturing jobs since 1970, our broader industrial sector including construction, transportation, warehousing and utilities, still employes 15 percent of the city's private workforce.

These are good paying jobs with manufacturing workers earning an average of over \$74,000 per year. For the 80 percent of industrial workers who are people of color, these industrial jobs provide an essential pathway to the middle class. The draft industrial plan identifies five strategic goals with several specific recommendations introducing a framework of primary industrial areas for core

industrial uses and secondary industrial areas for mixed commercial industrial activity. These designations aim to provide protection for industrial businesses facing significant real estate pressure. Many industrial properties sell for over \$700 per square foot in some areas but most industrial businesses can only afford roughly \$25 to \$30 per square foot in rent.

So, we desperately need innovative solutions to bridge this gap. Several of the industrial plans key proposals include activating the Blue Highway initiative to shift freight from trucks to waterways, installing climate resilient infrastructure on city owned property and creating 275,000 industrial green economy jobs by 2040.

The draft plan also addresses several of the industrial sectors critical vulnerabilities. Half of our industrial lands lies within flood zones and many areas experience extreme heat, up to 8 degrees above the city's average.

Tackling these challenges requires long-term planning and steady leadership to ensure they are managed appropriately.

We appreciate the community engagement that has occurred to date, including responses from 570 businesses and regular stakeholder meetings. Nonetheless, we recognize that very real concerns remain. Several industrial business groups have complaints that their still needs to be significant additional outreach to the city's industrial sector as well as clarity on the boundaries of the plan to primary industrial areas and the development of meaningful financial incentives comparable to programs like FRESH.

The upcoming townhalls in the Department of City Planning has scheduled will be crucial for gathering additional public input before the December 31st final plan deadline. Organizations like the industrial business service provider network have also proven invaluable in supporting industrial businesses but IBSP's cannot compensate for poor planning or market forces that make retaining industrial businesses unviable. The plan must provide real tools and resources, not just aspirational goals.

Today we look forward to hearing from the Department of City Planning and Economic Development

Corporation about their implementation strategy. We need to understand where recommendations can be provided and proceed immediately how the city will support businesses facing displacement and what specific changes industrial businesses can expect when this plan takes effect.

Before we begin, I'd like to take a moment to acknowledge the Economic Development Committee Staff Senior Counsel Alex Paulenoff, Senior Policy Analyst William Hongach and Finance Analyst Glenn Martelloni for their hard work in preparing for this hearing. I'll now turn it over to our Committee Counsel to administer the oath. And I'd like to call up to the dais Jennifer Sun, John O'Neil, Carolyn Grossman to the dais.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good afternoon, Alex Paulenoff, Committee Counsel. Will all members of the Administration today please raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony today and to respond honestly to Council Member questions? Great, you may begin when ready.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Thank you Counsel. Thank you Majority Leader and Council Members for the

opportunity to testify today. My name is Carolyn Grossman Meagher; I'm the Director of Economic Development and regional planning for the Department of City Planning. I'm joined today by my DCP colleague John O'Neil and by Jennifer Sun, Executive Vice President for Planning at the NYC Economic Development Corporation and we're really pleased to be here today to share an update on the city's draft, citywide industrial plan which as you mentioned was released last week. I believe we have slides that are forthcoming. I want to make sure we give a moment for the technical team to bring them up.

Great, let's go to the first slide please.

Sorry, beyond the title slide. Great. As you all know, this plan is required by Local Law 172, which was passed by the City Council in 2023 and I want to thank the Council, particularly you Majority Leader and Council Member Gutiérrez for your leadership on this issue and for setting a really helpful framework under which we are producing this first of its kind plan. You asked us to create a comprehensive and long range look at New York City's industrial jobs and lands and we have tried to do just that built over on - over really two years of research,

stakeholder input, mapping exercises and a peer city review at a whole series of inputs and the draft plan itself, again as laid out by the legislation, provides a wealth of existing condition information and then offers recommendations, policies, and a land use framework to try and strengthen the industrial sector within today's New York City.

This is an interagency effort. It is being led by city planning but we have convened with agencies all across government, starting with our close partners of EDC, SBS, DOT, MOCJ, DEP, MOME, and many, many others, really the alphabet soup of agencies to make this plan as strong and as effective as possible, inclusive of the ranges of things we believe to be impacting the city's industrial sector.

I realize we're not moving slides with me, so next slide please. Great. There's all of our alphabet soup of agencies. Next slide.

There have been several phases to the development of this plan. When the bill was passed, we kicked off an organizational planning phase to learn really what an industrial plan could be and to engage with in the city government team to create a working structure for coordination. In the fall of last

year, we kicked off our public learning phase where we focused on receiving feedback in a variety of forms and setting a parameter of research and goals culminating in the release of preliminary existing conditions and preliminary goals statement this spring.

Since then, we've been in the creating phase working to put forward recommendations associated with each of the goals and strategies, which I'll discuss more in the presentation. And with the launch of the draft report earlier this week and I really want to stress the word draft; we've kicked off a phase three for a refining phase. This means we're testing and finalizing strategies with the stakeholders, with many stakeholders and the public especially through the plans legislatively required townhall engagements with the intent of releasing the final report as required by the end of the year in a way that continues to be refined and prioritized by feedback.

Next slide. Development of the plan to date has already been grounded in engagement. We have collected over 600 responses to an industrial business survey. We've held over 50 one on one

stakeholder meetings with various organizations.

We've organized or attended and participated in eight panels and workshops and lead ten walking tours of industrial areas all across the five boroughs. This level of input has really helped us identify and hear from on the ground experts about the real challenges and opportunities facing industrial businesses in the city.

Next slide. The draft plan itself, clocking in at almost 100 pages and on your desk or available at nyc.gov/industrial plan is structured around five key challenge areas.

We have a bit of industry history and 101 at the onset of the document and then we look at evolving industry, demand for space, conjunction and trucks, public realm quality and climate threats. We also have the analysis of survey results and other necessary context setting information and then we have a section which contains maps of the designated industrial areas, which are covered on a recommendation basis in Section 2. Next slide.

We've also completed two companion tools to support this work. On the left, the industrial data explorer is an interactive way to view existing

conditions across the city and to see information about designated industrial areas.

In a togglable and interactive map base available to the public, and we've also launched a new feedback tool, which can take the place of the industrial business survey to really hone in and receive specific information about responses to the plan.

Next slide. So, a quick summary of what's in the industry 101 section. We look here again at the total of industrial economic activity in the city, which about a 550,000 workers in 47,000 industrial businesses across the city, which as the Council Member noted - it's about 15 percent of employment in New York City.

We look at a wide range of industrial businesses in the city under either making, moving or maintaining spheres and we also look at the geography in which industrial activity is happening. It is a surprise to us in doing this work. Industry is really everywhere. It is happening in our traditional industrial districts but it is also happening in office areas and it is also happening even in our residential districts and we really drilled down into the geography associated with those

allowances and we take a look at the land use rules, which shape where and how different industrial businesses can operate in each of those settings.

Next slide. Under our first pillar, evolving industry. We really look at the transformation of New York over the past several decades. As we're all aware, we're no longer the global manufacturing capital that we once were as a city but instead, what we see is an industrial economy that has transformed into a diverse mix of logistics, construction, creative production like manufacturing and other industrial support sectors.

And today, our metro region remains the second largest urban industrial economy in the United States behind Los Angeles and Long Beach Metro. Our analysis shows that it remains a robust economy with some sectors experiencing really significant growth, while others are stable or seeing some decline and that you know, the industrial businesses are really central just to today's economic picture but to the transition to a green economy looking at construction of renewable energy infrastructure, modifications of buildings, sustainable building technologies to point out a few, that anticipate growth in industry going

into the future and remaining critical, not just to our economic job growth but to the city's functionality and underpinning other sectors of our economy.

Next slide. So, within goal - uhm section one, we identify our first goal as being able to help as a government enable industrial businesses to continue evolving and innovating and to help transition to green technologies. We know businesses want to adapt; they often face really tough regulatory and resources challenges. Our strategies here focus on strengthening the government's ability to provide support directly to businesses and that includes activating physical sites that can be hubs for green transition, using city owned land for incubation, uhm, aligning our workforce development programs so that businesses can be recruiting locally and that we're preparing workers for the jobs of the future and other specific business supports dedicated to that transition.

Next slide. So, within goal one, there are five strategies and 21 recommendations out of a total of 72 recommendations identified in the plan.

I'll highlight just a few for today's purposes.

We're looking at how the city can provide compliance support for Local Law 97, which is something we've heard a lot about being particularly challenging for industrial businesses that are hard to electrify. We're exploring the opportunities to expand clean energy infrastructure on industrial sites, to use publicly owned assets to create jobs and community benefits, evaluating existing tax credits and other tools to help businesses grow and again, emphasizing focused on workforce development to make sure workers are trained and ready for jobs that emerges as we see industrial transition.

Next slide. Our second challenge is regarding the demand for space. New York City today has more industrial land than any other city in the country but much of our building stock is antiquated and really constrained. New construction is prohibitively expensive and complicated. So, businesses often struggle to find modern and affordable space suited to their needs, even despite that large reservoir of land.

At the same time, demand for space is really strong and companies want to invest here. Rising

rents and limited supply are creating real headwinds. We are seeing you know this forward, not just private service but also essential city services that are also concentrating in our industrial areas, adding to that competition for extremely scarce and limited space.

And in recent decades, we're also seeing industrial activity shifting more towards outer boroughs as this competition for space increases most intensely at the center of the city. Next slide.

So, our second goal is really around building a coherent land use and real estate strategy that's balanced. That means strengthening primary industrial areas so businesses can thrive and really thinking about the areas where we are most exclusively retaining for only industrial space but it also means thinking about how we build new space. We're looking at ways to catalyze investments to leverage mixed use development that includes industrial activity and also to streamline city processes, so it's less complicated to site city operations. Ultimately again, that goal really is about striking a balance to make sure industry has

room to grow, while fitting into the broader urban context.

Next slide, so within goal two, we have 4 different strategies and 12 recommendations. A few of them recommended here really start with creating this new land use framework to guide investment in our manufacturing zones. We recommend identifying priority areas for new industrial neighborhood studies that can unlock future growth potential and launching a study specifically on vertically integrating mixed industrial residential development models. In order to continue to understand how we can deliver those kinds of developments in safe and feasible ways in our dense context of the city. We're looking at streamlining city approval processes for difficult to site operations and each of these is really around recommending updates to outdated regulatory systems. So, the industrial sector can have the space that it needs to compete. Next slide.

So, a little bit more, uhm we're really excited about this updated perspective land use framework that really helps us think about the prioritization of industry in land use policy, something that we really lack tools for today.

1 So, within this plan, we're introducing three new
2 categories. First, primary industrial areas. As the
3 bill helps us identify, these are areas that are near
4 highway access, rail and port access and have a
5 predominantly industrial character today and places
6 where we would really look to preserving for and for
7 wholly or nearly wholly industrial use, really
8 strongly preference and restrict other kinds of uses
9 going forward.
10

11 Second, our secondary industrial areas. These
12 are places where we have a mixed industrial
13 commercial profile today where we're thinking about
14 maintaining them and really continuing to unlock them
15 as job centers.

16 And finally, other M-zones, right? Other places
17 where we have M-zoning but we haven't designated.
18 These are often places where we have the most mix of
19 industry often near transit centers, often near
20 residential areas. These are places where we really
21 want to make sure we are accommodating industrial use
22 within that broader urban fabric and that really
23 means looking at how our mixed-use roles are working
24 to continue to support the potential for industry
25 with other uses in place and we think that this

framework and this calibration and higher structure allows us to respond to the different kinds of local context that we see throughout the city are really solid industrial campuses, are mixed sort of innovative job centers that may have a lot of different industrial or commercial uses, some of which blends together quite seamlessly and our more mixed use pedestrian and residentially focused neighborhoods. Next slide.

Our third challenge is around congestion and freight. Almost all of New York's goods continue to move by truck and that activity is concentrated on a few key bridges and freight routes throughout the city. Businesses constantly tell us that the traffic and road conditions are one of the biggest challenges to operating here in the city. Not only does it challenge their operations, it comes with traffic safety and environmental justice concerns for those living and working in and near industrial districts and significant truck traffic. We see that crash rates are highest along many of our truck routes and the growth of ecommerce and last-mile deliveries is exacerbating the challenges here. Next slide.

So, our third goal is really to support modern and efficient freight movement throughout the city. The strategies here include expanding maritime freight and rail freight in order to take pressure off of city roadways. We're also looking - maybe missed one slide. We also are looking at encouraging the use of micromobility for cargo, maximizing efficiency for truck operations and investing in decarbonization of truck fleets. It is to create a system where goods can move reliably, efficiently and sustainably and many of these proposals are reflective of active strategies currently being pursued by the Economic Development Corporation, Department of Transportation.

There are 5 strategies and 14 recommendations in this section, some of those recommendations include assessing changes to the truck route network, exploring expansion of freight rail system, investing in infrastructure for micro distribution hubs. The Blue Highways Initiative is promising effort being led by EDC, which hopes to shift freight off of our roadways to waterways and we also want to build on existing programs like Clean Trucks to accelerate the shift to lower emission fleets and we think that

these strategies again modernize freight movement and improve the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods. Next slide.

The fourth challenge is public realm quality. Industrial areas you know often have a lot of different users, whether there are over 100,000 people who live in our industrial areas, hundreds of thousands of workers, students, many, many users exist in these areas and we hear from all of them that there are really rising complaints about the conditions that people find. Everything from sidewalks blocked by trucks, trash, cleanliness, public safety. These issues aren't just cosmetic; they're materially making industrial operations harder and areas less attractive to customers and business operators.

And so, we really wanted to look at solutions to improve the quality of life in these areas while keeping industry functional. Next slide.

So, the goal here is to promote clean and safe industrial areas. We're looking at design toolkits. How to enhance the appearance and cleanliness and improving environmental protections to help these

areas really feel safe, functional and welcoming.

Next slide.

Goal four contains three strategies and five recommendations and some of these include adding a freight inclusive street design strategy and typology into the city's street design manual, so that we can ensure that our roads are working better for everyone. We're also looking at partnerships with local organizations that could support sanitation, safety and marketing in industrial areas, and we'd also like to look at in zoning performance standards to reduce conflicts between open uses and provide regulatory clarity. We think these kinds of changes could make a big difference in the daily experience of businesses and communities. Next slide.

Our fifth challenge, areas climate threats. Industrial areas are often located along the water front in parts of the city with very little green space or cooling infrastructure that makes them especially vulnerable to two risks, flooding and extreme heat. On the flooding side, as the Council Member noted, 50 percent of our industrial areas are in the flood plain. They're exposed to coastal storms and storm water issues and on the heat side,

these areas tend to have large expanses of pavement and rooftops, high energy use and very few trees.

And that combination is contributing to a real divergence in heat effect that is directly located in our industrial areas. And so, you know while these are areas are essential to the city's economy, they've also become some of the most climate vulnerable neighborhoods that we have. Next slide.

So, our fifth goal is really to prepare industrial areas for climate threats and we're looking at three main strategies: improving stormwater managements in the public realm inclusive of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces; helping businesses and critical infrastructure themselves adapt to withstand flooding and extreme weather and to tackle the heat urban island effect by exploring ways to bring cooling and green infrastructure into these areas. Next slide.

Under this goal, there are three strategies and ten recommendations, some include evaluating the feasibility of new kinds of green infrastructure like bioswales or permeable pavement along industrial rights of way that could help with stormwater management while being sensitive to the kinds of

operational needs of an industrial area. We're recommending looking at potential changes to tree planting requirements so that more industrial projects could include street trees and we want to support major coastal flood mitigation projects that protect waterfront industrial areas. Next slide.

So, that's the substance of the plan. I want to talk a little bit about next steps. Uhm, in order to gather more feedback and in order to be in compliance with the law, we will be engaged in refinements throughout the next several months, really led by hosting the five boroughwide town halls this fall. These will be sort of science fair-style events with interactive boards and topic stations with a whole team of city experts to help unpack the data and engage with the public about what is happening in our areas and what recommendations we've made. We want to make it as easy as possible for people to explore these issues and receive input. We are in the process of spreading the word about these opportunities and I'll just note what is on the slides. The first will be on October 9th in Manhattan at BMCC. In Brooklyn on October 16th at NYU Brooklyn in downtown Brooklyn. CUNY School of

1 Law October 23rd. The Staten Island JCC on October
2 28th and Bronx Borough Hall on November 6th. These
3 are all evening meetings. They'll all be quite
4 welcoming events and we really hope that the Council
5 will help us and all stakeholders will help us
6 publicize these events and come participate in the
7 opportunity with us. Next slide.

9 And beyond the town halls, we have this online
10 feedback form, the Industrial Data Explorer, and a
11 number of different ways to get in touch with the
12 team and we're really looking forward to hearing as
13 much feedback as we can and really feel that the more
14 perspectives we hear, the more refinement the plan
15 can have over the next few months. Next slide.

16 That's our overview, thank you for the time and
17 again, thank you for the partnership and I'd like to
18 turn it over to the Council for questions.

19 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much for your
20 testimony. I'd like to begin by acknowledging we've
21 been joined by Council Member Rafael Salamanca
22 virtually and Council Members Vernikov and Avilés in
23 person. Uhm so after nearly two years of outreach,
24 you received only 570 survey responses. I know we
25 were all profusely working on how to get more people

engaged and participatory and the survey responses.

I know myself personally and members of this Committee, all really committed to try to help with that outreach but that was really out of 47,000 industrial businesses that we have in the city. So, what do you folks think explains the low response rate from the survey responses?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, I think uhm thank you for that question Council Member. I think what we heard from experts in industry and then encountered quite directly is that this is an industry that is really challenging to reach and that I think that that's what we experienced here. I think as you know, the city both did extensive outreach ourselves. I know the Council themselves also helped us try and reach out directly to businesses. We also had SBS through its contracts with our industrial business service providers, provide additional funding to assist in the outreach to businesses and I know that many of our organizations well, that may not have turned around to a full survey completed response, still resulted in important touchpoints with industry.

1 So, I think we can be pleased by the amount of
2 outreach that was done, even if the numbers you know
3 are still a small fragment and sample of the full
4 industrial business world we have. I would also say
5 the business survey was quite in depth and it did
6 require some significant time to engage with. It was
7 not a lot of yes or no questions. We tried to get
8 real information on how businesses were operating in
9 the city and the challenges they were experienced and
10 so, in the responses we got, there's a real depth of
11 information that I think tells us an awful lot about
12 what's happening and a richness of experience that we
13 think is quite representative, not of 47,000
14 business, each of which has its unique story but it
15 tells us a lot and I think we found that information
16 to be really enriching and helpful to the process.

17 And so, we're proud of the work that was done to
18 receive that but we did anticipate this would be a
19 hard reach - uh group to reach and I think the sample
20 that we've gotten is pretty useful.

21 CHAIPREPERSON FARIAS: So, do you think there's
22 going to be additional outreach in the next three
23 months to try to make that number a bit bigger? I
24 know - I think you're right in terms of the survey
25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, we'd be happy to get that information to you Council Member. I think we provided it a few months back and we can pull a new cut. There are definitely areas where some of the response rates are higher than others and I think that that reflects experience on the ground of how active those business communities are. For instance, I can recall that North Brooklyn and Long Island City industrial clusters had fairly significant rates and again, I think that's a testament to the service providers in that area and the outreach that they

I think the new feedback form is much simpler and asks much more you know less trying to get a real synopsis of business operation in the city and a much more you know uh you know short touch points that I think will alleviate that burden of concern. And I think over the next few months, we do have another opportunity really to get as many people engaged in this process as possible. And that's certainly - certainly our commitment. I think also now that there is a plan to respond to and information that may draw in some new audiences. We're certainly hopeful.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: We do not have a budget for the implementation and I would say it is really our hope working with the Council Member and other stakeholders to think about at not just

refinement of the recommendations. We want to hear where we got some right, where we got some wrong, what we missed but also prioritization. There's a lot in here and likely to do everything that this plan - you know this is a real long-term plan, so it's not one that we anticipated having an immediate estimate for.

Some things in here, the city is already doing right? There's a lot in here around the Blue Highways Network, which my colleagues at EDC can speak about. Some of this, I think, are building on existing efforts but I think we really have to look at the full picture and understand what an action agenda might be and where we're implementing to really understand those tradeoffs.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: What of the major recommendations you think can proceed without any funding currently?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I would have to get back to you Council Member but even any recommendation would ultimately have a staff cost associated with it. So, even those that are more regulatory in nature, I think have some cost associated with it.

So, we'd be happy to - I wouldn't want to speak out of turn without our budgetary teams.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: And you know it is worth noting that this entire planning effort was done without any additional budget allocated. We did that by really using the resources of existing staff at agencies. We're very proud with what we do but of course that is always a limitation.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Uhm, okay. Who has final accountability for implementing the industrial plans recommendations? We know that the final plan is due December 31st, as you mentioned in your testimony, it's just over three months away. Are there parts that maybe are not quite ready and are you hoping that from the townhalls that that's going to - the details that come from those townhalls be incorporated into this timeline that we have?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yes, that is absolutely our intent. We've built the public engagement process, as the bill requires and I think the Council was quite thoughtful on the timeline here to allow us to include additional engagement throughout the fall and to continue to make any

refinements into the final plan before the final report is issued.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And who is accountable for implementing it, the final plan? Is it DC-

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I would say the full Administration. The breath of this plan covers the activities across multiple agencies in different parts of government. And so, you know any implementation of the recommendations is really specific to which part of government we're talking about. City Planning is helping to put forward the coherent vision here but implementation of any and all of these recommendations is a real whole of government exercise.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: The draft industrial plan shows that industrial rents at \$25 to \$30 per square foot but new construction needs are 460 plus per square foot. What financial tools will you folks deploy to bridge this gap and prevent any displacement of industrial businesses?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Sure, I think this is a huge challenge right that we're seeing what industrial businesses can pay and what it costs to build new space is - there's a real divergence. The

city has some financial tools, which I'll turn to my colleagues at EDC to speak about on how we defray the costs of new construction to help balance that gap. One tool that we have that we have only deployed in a very limited way yet as the Council knows, is new zoning districts that provide for industrial incentives.

So, through the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity, we created a new vocabulary for M-zoning districts that have only been mapped uhm in the midtown south rezonings in some really limited perspectives but are also being piloted in the Jamaica and Long Island City rezonings in front of the Council right now and we hope will become more useful in continuing industrial efforts going forward. Particularly, the M2A districts are looking at creating a mix of commercial and industrial but bonusing the creation of new industrial space.

And so, that is one thing that we can do through land use tools to try and encourage a developer to sort of cross subsidize within a job creating project by giving them essentially free extra space for the inclusion of industrial.

So, we're excited that that may be helpful but I think the cost of construction remains a real barrier here for private industry. Jenn, would you like to say anything about the IDA?

JENNIFER SUN: Yes.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: And other programs?

JENNIFER SUN: Yes, I want to start with the Industrial Development Agency, the IDA, that does provide discretionary tax benefits by lowering the mortgage recording tax, waiving city and sales tax, as well as providing property abatements for eligible cost, which include you know acquiring and investing in the renovation of industrial space, so that will continue to be a very important tool for supporting the modernization and development of industrial space, especially on privately owned sites. We've also seen success in the use of the industrial developer fund. So, almost \$40 million has been deployed to nonprofit industrial developers to create industrial space. Most of that was in the form of city capital. Over \$30 million was distributed in the form of grants and then about \$7 million was disbursed in the form of low interest loans.

We will be interested, I think, in the fall outreach of the Draft Industrial Action Plan in hearing whether there's continued interest in having access to an Industrial Developer Fund. In addition to really using the Industrial Action Plan as an opportunity to really further our marketing and outreach to industrial site owners of the availability of these tools.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you for that. Many industrial businesses report that existing incentive programs are a bit too complex. How will you improve industrial business engagement and programs like ICAP and WEAVE to make sure more business get to take advantage of these incentives?

JENNIFER SUN: We've heard some initial feedback about how there are barriers to entry and understanding that these programs exist and also how to apply for them. So, I think one of the recommendations is about streamlining that process, making it relatively easier to be able to submit an application. And then also, with the IDA staff, once an application is in the queue providing a lot more staff support and taking that application through the process and doing it in a more streamlined and sort

of time efficient way to the extent that we can control that, so that we're being as you know sort of business friendly in the application process as possible.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: If I may add on that as well, just echoing what Jenn has said that I think a lot of the feedback we heard was both about uhm accessing the incentives themselves but also the - sometimes bewildering process of putting together multiple incentives for really idiosyncratic kinds of industrial uses and finding government staff that could really understand those idiosyncratic challenges of an individual business, and help them put together that bespoke package. And I think that really speaks to both the work of SBS, the work of EDC, the work of the IBSP partners and really thinking about how we optimize that relationship so that any individual business coming in is really understanding the wide range of supports that can work for their specific need and also any lessons learned from their process are feeding into the larger process of regulatory reform or back end improvements and we have a couple of recommendations that are specific to both of those but I think it

really speaks to the doing what we can to deepen or improve our incentive delivery itself, improving the business support structure for helping businesses access the resources and improving the governments own regulatory reform response to inputs from businesses and those are really three separate governmental activities that we think could all improve.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I appreciate that response. I do think too in the last couple of questions and I feel a lot of this leaning on budgetary associated line items that are going to come down to how do we actually make sure those budget line items in our final budget as a city, along with - I'm hearing a lot of us leaning on our IBSP's. It's like two budget cycles in a row where I've been fighting for expansive dollars, not just on my own. All of us have been fighting for expansive dollars for IBSP's. We're leaning on them a lot. That is their role and that's what we hope to continue to do because they are the ones filling the gap for what the government cannot do for our providers or small businesses. But yet, you know I did not see a lot of support asking

or at least support with my ask to the Administration to get a larger budget for them.

So, I would say to you folks, I'm stressing that as we approach this next budget cycle or even a January plan with this Administration that they have to prepare for maybe any support coming on your end on those expansive dollars and filling that gap that we need would be helpful.

The plan also calls for an interagency working group that includes the Department of Finance, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Small Business Services, and the NYCDC among others to identify that these incentives be improved to better stimulate industrial business activities.

Why didn't we convene the working group as part of the plan and have the recommendations ready to include now?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, just to be clear, the agencies have begun their work of identifying incentives and you know the analysis of what incentives might be improved. We were not ready at this time to go beyond to the recommendations as they were described.

So, we have described a more formal process for continuing that work but the agencies have begun to speak to each other.

A lot of the incentives that we have in this city are controlled by state legislation, and so I think part of the thinking here is really making sure that the entire administration is aligned on what improvements would be most vital you know in advance of any requests that may require a legislative change or other kinds of Administrative changes and that work can be quite sensitive and it would be premature to make more substantive comments at this point.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay. I'd like to be kept in the loop on the state jurisdictional items because as we approach those conversations every budget cycle with the state, I can make sure to elevate those along with the other members of this Committee to our state partners.

The industrial development loan fund is currently available to businesses up to 400,000 square feet. How is that square footage determined and are there plans to expand the IDLF to businesses with a larger foot print?

JENNIFER SUN: I wasn't aware of the square foot threshold, so thanks for making me aware of that Council Member and that's something that we can talk about with our team is whether that's one of the things that we look at addressing as a part of taking a fresh look at making sure that IDLF is accessible as possible.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yeah, we want to make sure that that's actually reflective of and maybe these 570 reports that we - the feedback we got back on surveys can help us with that but that would be great.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I will say to that actually a lot more of the feedback we got was about smaller businesses accessing the program rather than larger businesses. Many larger business from what we've seen I think using it, have been generally larger businesses but perhaps not the most large.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, since 2015, DCP and the mayoral administrations have maintained the policy to not allow any applications for residential rezoning within the city's industrial business zones. The policy of maintaining IBZ's exclusively for commercial and industrial use has been effective in

stabilizing conditions and preventing displacement pressure on businesses.

Does DCP agree that maintaining certain industrial areas for no residential zoning is important for the stability of these areas?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: We do and the framework we've put forward does - it's actually more nuanced than when we've had in the past and really thinking not just about where residences may not be appropriate but also where other commercial businesses may not be appropriate and that's really based on feedback that we've heard from the industrial business community for a long time, that there are some cases where our existing M districts, which are widely permissive of nonresidential uses, themselves can be introducing conflicts that are making industrial operations harder to thrive. And so, the new three-part system is really thinking about those areas where actually we should be even more restrictive than we have been in the past. To really protect those most critical industrial campus type communities of the city. But also, those areas where we think industrial and commercial can thrive and also, it makes important revisions to where we

1 think industrial prioritization you know may not be
2 necessary. You know the industrial business zones
3 themselves were put together 20 years ago, primarily
4 as a tax policy and sort of a land use policy through
5 verbal commitment and that's something we think this
6 bill really gives us an opportunity to rethink and
7 reset, not by eroding the promise of protected areas.
8 We think that philosophy is critical but by making
9 sure that we have a transparent and thorough process
10 as we do here towards making sure we're directing
11 that correctly at the right geographies based on real
12 data about where industrial businesses are, where our
13 infrastructure is, where our growth opportunities are
14 at because we also want to make sure that all of our
15 areas of the city are contributing in economically
16 productive ways and we recognize that this is all
17 really tradeoffs.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And is it current that the
20 plan proposes to replace IBZ's as this geography with
21 the proposed primary industrial areas.

22 CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: The plan has not
23 actually made any formal recommendations about IBZ's,
24 except as a tax policy, which is their formal role
25 but we are recommending this new way of thinking

about where different kinds of land use mixing may or may not be appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and has DCP calculated the area and the number of industrial businesses and jobs within the IBZ's compared to the primary industrial area?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yes, I'm not prepared to share those facts and figures here today. We'd be happy to follow up with you but I can say that the area of preservation represented by the primary and secondary areas is larger physically and I believe larger in terms of total number of jobs than that is covered by the IBZ tax boundaries today.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay and would residential rezonings be considered as a secondary industrial areas because the plan wasn't -

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: No, the secondary areas we've also said would not generally be appropriate for residential. So, what we have said is that an area that is not designated is one that may in some circumstances be appropriate for residential.

Now, I want to step back and say, all rezonings require ULURP and ULURP lays out a whole series -

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Currently, but the Charter revisions could change that dynamic.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I'm prepared to think through the implications of that question but yes, what we are anticipating here, we're talking about areas where residential is not allowed by the underlying zoning. We're talking about the conditions under which somebody might contemplate any future rezoning and there are a lot of reasons why different uses may or may not be appropriate. For some time, as you indicate, we have said that the existence of the IBZ boundaries are a reason for not contemplating any rezoning to residential on the basis of an industrial policy prioritization. What we're saying here is a little bit more nuanced but thinking about the areas that are undesignated as really not contemplating where industrial preservation would be the purpose of holding back a rezoning policy consideration. There may be other reasons; there are lots of places where residential zoning may not be appropriate for other reasons but we're trying to make a prioritization here about where industry itself is most prioritized by the city and then where it is not and we've put forward draft

maps that we expect there will be a lot of feedback on whether we've gotten that geography right. I'm sure, I feel quite confident it's probably not 100 percent but we feel really confident in that idea of the three-part structure and thinking about our most prized you know industrial nothing else areas. Our areas for job centers where there's a mix and then our areas where a lot of different flexibility might be possible.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: You answered my next two questions about the boundaries and whether or not you folks will be considering any changes for the final plan. It seems like you're all open to it.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, we're 100 percent that this is a draft that we're looking forward to a lot of public feedback on.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And how do you folks think ongoing projects like the Brooklyn Marine Terminal or the IBX corridor effect these designations?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Sure. We took both into account in making the maps but I'll turn it to Jenn to speak about the MT.

JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, so we coordinated about the Industrial Action Plan to make sure that it's

consistent with the BMT Vision Plan, which contemplates investing in 60 acres for a modern all electric port. So, the proposed designation of that area in the draft Industrial Action Plan is that those 60 acres are designated as primary industrial area.

Then we also acknowledge that is a part of the vision planning process for BMT. We have created opportunities to create modern and light industrial and also heavier industrial space in Atlantic Basin. So, we've designated those areas as secondary industrial because those industrial spaces are situated within a more mixed-up industrial and commercial area. So, we believe that our designations for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal are consistent with the definitions under the draft Industrial Action Plan. So, that all together over 70 acres would be either in primary and/or secondary industrial areas.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: And if I may Council Member, just add you know what BMT has done from a land use planning perspective, we see as a microcosm of what this plan is really trying to do, right? Not relying on sort of past designations but really think

about how do we create new industrial space, how do we leverage other uses to help us create more industrial space and how we just oppose those uses really closely together including meeting our housing objectives as a city. We really, you know we really think that that's the uhm, the mentality that the entire plan is trying to take.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Got it. The plan also states that 96 percent of M-zone land is capped at 2 FAR and 20 percent of buildings are already nonconforming. The Council had worked with DCP to create new M-zones with greater FAR and more reasonable parking and loading requirements as part of City of Yes for Economic Opportunity. Yet the old M-zones that caused these deficiencies are still in place. Has DCP considered a citywide action to update M-zones or will DCP only consider updating industrial zoning on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, I'd say first the plan recommends updating and I think you're correct to read it and I think it is very much our understanding that the old M-zones are holding back a lot of our districts and that we've made some

attempts to link the thinking about the framework to the new tools right, that we think that when we're talking about our primary areas, we think in general an M-3A may be an appropriate designation. We think when we're talking about secondaries we think the M-2A's may be appropriate. So, we have those tools in mind. We are mindful that when we talk about the intricacies of zoning in any given neighborhood, we can't bypass you know really important stakeholder engagement. And so, there's a component of neighborhood planning that must be done with neighborhoods as partners. Whether that means there are technical ways or environmental ways to consider you know larger actions, it's something that we're certainly interested in. We've certainly seen value in this Administration of more citywide actions. We certainly think that some of the needs for industrial zoning improvements merit citywide consideration as evidenced through this plan. Uhm, but we don't yet know for implementation, you know how those actions should work and how we make sure that we're honoring you know really the process that we go through with neighborhoods to think about growth opportunities with those citywide objectives.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay the plan also projects 275,000 industrial green jobs by 2040. What are the annual milestones and how have - how many have been created as part of the Green Economy Action Plan?

JENNIFER SUN: Oh, so the Green Economy Action Plan, I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question again Council Member?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yeah, so the plan projects 275,000 industrial green jobs by 2040. We're looking at what are the annual milestones and how have they been created as part of it?

JENNIFER SUN: So, the Green Economy Action Plan has lots of policy recommendations that are different stages of implementation. I would have to ask my colleagues for a progress report about how we're performing against those recommendations but I know that we're making a lot of progress for example in supporting the climate innovation hub for example at the Brooklyn Army Terminal, creating a works that can really support startups and more mature companies, industrial companies in really planning for climate change, sort of resiliency in addition to creating quality jobs.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I do want to note that the - I think the characterization of the statistic is a bit as I heard it incorrect. The 275,000 is of the 400,000 future jobs. Those - first of all those are forecasted not promised, right. This was based on an evaluation of economy, not a specific plan from EDC on the growth of those jobs but more importantly those jobs include jobs that are transitioning. So, it's a reflection of many of our existing industrial jobs becoming green in nature and not the creation of new jobs.

As we know, the industrial economy of the city has not been growing at a significant rate at all. It has been stable, which has been good news in recent years but we do not have forecasts that expect nearly that magnitude of future growth. We do expect that magnitude of transition, changing the nature of jobs that adaptation, which is really what goal one is significantly focused on.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Yeah, I mean I think that was kind of the point of what I was going to get to. Is this actually going to be creating any new jobs or is this going to be a reclassification of jobs that are being transitioned from one title to the next?

1 So, thank you for clarifying that and reiterating
2 that and obviously I look forward to following up.
3 We all are trying to keep up to date with how these
4 plans impact some of these larger initiatives that we
5 have rolling out into the city, so. I just have a
6 few more questions and then I'm going to kick it over
7 to colleagues.
8

9 Blue Highways promises to remove thousands of
10 truck trips and create 8,000 jobs. What specific
11 sites are ready for activation today if any? When
12 will the Hunts Point terminal market - terminal
13 sorry, be operational and how much funding has been
14 secured versus what's still outstanding and needed?

15 JENNIFER SUN: Yeah, thank you for the question.
16 So, we have an active Blue Highways facility actually
17 in Hunts Point on a privately owned site. So, Con Ed
18 had announced their partnership with EDC in barging
19 in concrete material by barge, rather than by truck.
20 So, we expect that to reduce truck trips by about
21 1,000 per month.

22 So, they have a temporary operation with plans to
23 make that more permanent over time. The next Blue
24 Highways landing that we expect to be come online is
25 the Downtown Sky Port, formally known as the Downtown

So, for example, food from the Hunts Point Redistribution Center could be transported either by barge or even by fast ferry from Hunts Point to lower Manhattan to supply a lot of the restaurants better in lower Manhattan. And then there's a number of other sites including the Brooklyn Marine Terminal but also we would be looking at potentially the Manhattan Cruise Terminal as being another opportunity as we start planning for its modernization to potentially integrate Blue Highway capacity there in response to industry interest in that location or another location near Midtown Manhattan for reducing truck trips and bringing more freight by water.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay great and funding, secured versus what's needed?

JENNIFER SUN: I'll have to confirm the amount of funding that we've committed in terms of city capital but I, you know can highlight that for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal, you know we have a \$164 million USDOT grant to convert the existing finger piers into a marginal pier. Part of that is creating a flex terminal to support blue highways activity and BMT becoming a major node in the citywide network that's leveraging 100 almost \$10 million in city capital as well.

And I know that some city capital as well and I know that some city capital, I think, is being pledged to Downtown Sky Port. And then remembering that you had asked about the Hunts Point Marine Terminal on the city owned site. We're making progress there, having recently released an RFP for the scraping of the prison bars, so that's the first move that is underway and then continuing to plan for the infrastructure that can support Blue Highway Freight to be received there.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Great, thank you. The law required detailed analysis and recommendations for

different parts of the city, not just citywide strategies, where are the specific neighborhood level recommendations for areas like Sunset Park, Hunts Point and North Brooklyn.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, we - uhm, we're certainly planning to role out additional detail and information at the townhalls that we thought that would allow us for more borough specific look into you know rather than the document already quite long at 100 pages. We wanted to focus at the sort of policy levels but we think that there's an opportunity as we get into borough meetings to go a little bit deeper and of course into the final plan to continue to have more appendices and information. With that being said, we do have a lot more data and information then we've already put forward. And so, certainly welcome Council Member you or you know others who have specific questions about recommendations and how they pertain to each individual area, that we'll be having that conversation in ways through the engagement process.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: That's great. And then so, we should expect that the final plan will include the geographic areas.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: And then just my last question, you know we obviously want to make this plan the best plan as possible. What do you need from the Council to deliver what the law requires? If you could have a magic wand and just -

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Unlimited time and resources. Is that a good answer?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Denied.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I would say Council Member; we really want your partnership and in helping make as many New Yorkers aware of the process and as engaged in the process as possible. We know that this is a huge issue for the future of the city and I think it's one that can be a little bit overlooked by certain constituencies. If you're not somebody - there are some - if you live in an industrial area or you live near an industrial area, you work in an industrial area, you are highly attuned to this issue but many other New Yorkers may not know how this effects them or why industry is so important to their future of the city, so I think the best that we could all do together is really engaging as many New Yorkers in this process as we can in the

months that we have and we would absolutely welcome your and all Council Members partnership in reaching that wide audience.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Great, thank you so much. I'm going to yield at the moment and recognize members for their questions. I'd like to first call on Council Member Gutiérrez followed by Avilés.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you so much Majority Leader and thank you DCP. Before I get to my questions, I do want to acknowledge that you know this is a lengthy draft plan and I know that you all were very genuine in your efforts to do outreach and I just want to thank you. I know that you make sure the surveys were in multiple languages and I just want to acknowledge that because I know that you don't have an infinite amount of time and resources, so thank you.

I do have some concerns and again, I know that this is a draft plan, so I hope that you record all of these questions and concerns into you know your next step but I am concerned that the draft plan as written could accelerate speculation and I'm you know, I'm basing this off of the presentation today and what I was able to read, in the summary and just

the maps that you have in the draft plan. I'm really concerned that with no financial tools being recommended that we're putting vulnerable businesses at risk. First, my first set of concerns is around the new framework and I know that I expressed this to you before. I feel like they're not clearly defined. I need to understand how you got here. How you got to this like primary and secondary industry areas, how the mapping was considered. Uhm and I just - considering the district that I represent, North Brooklyn, Bushwick, Williamsburg, and Ridgewood, I'm concerned about speculation. I'm concerned about residential. I'm concerned about housing. You know the previous versions that we've seen including the response to the North Brooklyn Industrial Study, I mean I think that there was a lot of effort by DCP to like create new framework, kind of every iteration. It was a very cagee(SP?) like oh, this is the transition and this is the core and this is like - and so, now we're here in primary and secondary. That's fine, it sounds like you have tried to narrow it down to less so that there's you know less subzones but I'm concerned how you got here. I would love to know if you can share any of that. I'm

concerned for what I am seeing on the Ridgewood side and I'm not sure if the map in the plan, obviously there's no street name, so it's hard for me to tell what's there but would love to know what's going on in Bridgewood, if there was an elimination of the zone, industrial zone in Ridgewood. I need to know how you all got here, so I'll start there. If you could just share with me that.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Sure, let me start first on a big plug and to those watching at home that the maps are all online and in an interactive form where you can zoom into the street and block level, nyc.gov/industrialplan. Council Member, we'd of course be happy to spend some time walking at a more detailed level through your district and talking about all of the changes.

We were guided in the methodology laid out in the legislation in how we tried to make these maps. So, the legislation told us first to look at the predominance of industry in different areas of the city. We used land use data through Pluto, the city's land use classification system to pull out where there were - you know the levels of industrial predominance on a block-by-block basis. We also

1 looked at the economic data and employment data that
2 we're able to access through contract with New York
3 State Department of Labor, tried to look at where
4 there were clusters of industry present. Where - how
5 industry was changing in different areas and then we
6 looked at really importantly infrastructure access.
7 So, we mapped highway ramps. We mapped marine
8 access. We mapped rail access and we tried to think
9 about the mapped truck routes, both existing and
10 within conversation with DOT through their truck
11 route redesign process and we tried to understand
12 what areas of the city you know were really not just
13 conducive you know had clusters of industry, were
14 conducive to continue to continue but also have the
15 infrastructure to continue that intensification of
16 industrial activity.

18 Areas like Ridgewood did not fare well in that
19 particular because of both an erosion of industrial
20 activity over time but also the local street network
21 and being so isolated in many of the conditions from
22 the highway ramps that are connecting it. And so,
23 there are a few areas of the city that we did not
24 designate because of the - that lack of truck access
25 in and out of them. And the trucks to position that

that's creating between industry and high truck traffic and existing residential communities. So, those are some of the reasons that our maps are the way they are but again, we really recognize that this is the beginning of a process where we're - we're bringing out a draft that reflects an agency perspective and methodology for public conversation.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you and I understand that and again I understand that this is the draft plan but I - Ridgewood, you know two years ago, New York Times reported the most rapidly loss of - the most rapid loss of rent stabilized apartments were in Ridgewood right? And so, you are considering this for essentially the removal of the Ridgewood IBZ. The housing that is going to be proposed there is not going to be for those people that have been displaced because precisely, we are not talking about preserving manufacturing.

I am very, very fearful and very, very opposed to this proposal. I understand that this is the guide that you use but I need you all to like take a step back at DCP and understand the various factors that also affect that neighborhood. So, unfortunately, you know the Ridgewood Manufacturing Zone is in a

1 complicated location. Again, using the rubric that
2 you just shared, but I am very concerned about just
3 the complete kind of walking away from this zone and
4 the impact that that can have for the neighborhood of
5 Ridgewood, the residence and the businesses. I
6 really implore for you all to kind of look at
7 multiple factors there because it is a smaller zone.
8 It's not like some of the other areas in the city but
9 I have all my flags are raised there. I have a
10 couple more questions, sorry let me just pull it up.
11 Uhm, and I think the Majority Leader may have asked
12 this but I'm still unclear on the response. How do
13 you all propose the marrying of what was achieved in
14 the various tax amendments to the City of Yes and
15 kind of what you're proposing the City of Yes,
16 obviously very explicitly it was not mapping. This
17 is that but just what - how do you see that marriage,
18 particularly some of the last amendments that really
19 I think emphasized what was permissible in having
20 manufacturing and what was not versus what we're
21 seeing here in your proposal.

23 CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I'm not 100 percent
24 sure I understand the last point that you made
25 Council Member but let me try to answer and tell me

1 if I'm covering your question. We created through
2 City of Yes for Economic Opportunity three new types
3 of zones, the M-1A, the M-2A and the M-3A at a
4 variety of different densities and scales. Those
5 three districts have now been piloted in three
6 rezonings, Midtown South which was just passed by the
7 Council, Jamaica, and Long Island City, which are in
8 front of the Council. So, those were the first times
9 where we've used and actually all three designations
10 have been deployed. Jamaica represents the first use
11 of the M-2A and M-3 designations in the city.

12 So, we're excited about that. We think that
13 those districts are really helpful to unlocking
14 different kinds of industrial development. It's our
15 hope to use them in the future. We've indicated in
16 the framework that we think that they generally
17 ascribe to the designation of the different levels,
18 namely that we think M-3A is an appropriate zoning
19 tool for the primary areas and we think the M2-A is
20 an appropriate tool for the secondary areas.

21 We have not said block for block that that is the
22 necessary zoning outcome. The plan is a framework
23 and it's not a zoning plan itself and while you know
24 I think - I said we're sensitive of the tension of
25

1 putting forward a citywide plan that necessarily
2 assumes the correct zoning outcomes for an individual
3 given neighborhood. Actually, I think the comments
4 you made about Ridgewood, which we take very
5 seriously, are a really good example of that, right?
6 That it's really important. You know while I think
7 the idea of a citywide framework that helps us
8 understand prioritization is really strong and useful
9 and important in an industry where there's been a
10 concern about a incremental change in policy, uhm
11 that it's also really important when we're making
12 actual decisions about what zone to change to on the
13 ground to be in consultation with local stakeholders,
14 right? That it's very difficult to do that fully at
15 a citywide scale.

17 So, while we're interested in thinking about
18 future implementation that might mean mapping some of
19 those tools in a lot of different neighborhoods. We
20 can certainly see the need for them in a lot of
21 different neighborhoods. We don't yet today at the
22 stage of a draft plan have an implementation strategy
23 for how we would deploy those on a citywide basis, on
24 a multiple neighborhood basis, and how to achieve
25 that. And of course, we're talking about ULURP

actions, the Council's partnership in making those determinations is extremely important.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Yeah, for now that's right, thanks. Uhm, can I ask, what other neighborhood in the mapping were you - did you come to the same conclusion as Ridgewood? Like based on these guidelines. Uhm, they would - we would essentially be removing this industrial area?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I want to push back on the language of that we're removing any industrial area. That's certainly not what we think the proposals are but I think the question you're asking is, are there areas - are there key areas where we have not designated a primary or a secondary industrial district? I would name Greenpoint Williamsburg as another area where there is a cluster of -

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Oh, and I'm sorry to interrupt you but so that I'm clear, in your maps, IBZ's were not removed?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: We have not removed any IBZ's.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: That's right, in the draft. This is like - obviously this is a draft plan but even in the online tool that you have?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yes just to be clear because I don't want to be nuanced on this point. We haven't recommended the removal of any IBZ's. IBZ's are a tax benefit. We think that it's a tax benefit that could potentially be improved but we have not recommended a specific change to those boundaries. In so far as we were recommending a new kind of land use policy, we have recommended differences in that land use policy, then the commitment to not considering residential in the IBZ tax zones represented.

So, I think in effect what you mean, right? We are recommending a different strategy for approaching where residential might or might not be appropriate but it is not technically speaking a change to the tax policy of IBZ's. We have not recommended a change to that boundary map.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: So, what - I just - I appreciate you but you are like overtalking this a little bit and so I'm just not clear. So, what -

what were we just talking about - about Ridgewood?

So, just so that I'm clear.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Ridgewood is not a designated industrial area in this plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Okay, okay and so what other neighborhoods in the city are facing the same suggestion or recommendation that you've made in this proposal?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Right, so -

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: The Greenpoint.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Right so, yeah so there are areas of Greenpoint, Williamsburg for instance in the Council Members district that are today in an IBZ tax zone but are not designated as an industrial area in this plan for instance.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Okay, so I guess I just want to understand since the intent of the bill was obviously to do the study, make recommendations, ultimately with the intent of supporting and growing manufacturing. Where is the tradeoff? Where were the recommendations that we can see where these suggestions live for Greenpoint and Ridgewood but live somewhere else?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, Council Member, I'm glad you asked the question because I think the flip side of this is that we haven't talked about areas which are not currently covered by an IBZ tax policy but are designated as primary and secondary industrial areas. And again, just stepping back, we did not - the methodology of these maps was not directly informed by the IBZ map itself. I suspect 20 years ago, when the IBZ map was made, that the inputs were quite similar looking at the predominance of industry in the city, the economic patterns going on within industry. But we found many areas that were actually quite industrial and deserve designation that had not been covered. And as I mentioned earlier in my testimony, the overall acreage covered by primary and secondary areas is actually larger than the area covered by the tax plan. So, some of those geographies include College Point, parts of Western Staten Island. Components of the East Chester industrial cluster and a whole variety of others.

So, we really looked again with fresh eyes, 20 years on from an attempt to craft a land use policy and tried to identify again those areas that had the

predominance of industrial character and the infrastructure to support it. So, those - you know we did not in many ways substantially, the geographies overlap because we were approaching very similar exercises but with differences in methodology and 20 years of change. We did come to some different conclusions.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Do you have a sense of what uhm the amount of job loss we would be looking at versus jobs gained in some of these newer areas?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I'd be reluctant to put a number to it but I think conceptually we think that job growth will be encouraged by any place that we can intensify the development of new job created spaces and so far, as we've pointed out, that most of our industrial areas of the city today have not been gaining a considerable amount of jobs, have not seen significant economic development. We think the key is really finding ways to create new investment opportunities in areas that haven't seen it.

So, we would anticipate that anywhere where we make those changes, we would be looking at job increases.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Uhm, alright. Have you been able to do an analysis on the property value increases both in and around the areas losing protections to become more housing and mixed use?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: No, we have not done any analysis of property values and I want to stress again today, the plan is not making a specific recommendation about the introduction of additional uses. It's making a recommendation about the prioritization of industry. So, it would be - I'm not sure what the basis of such a study would be but in any case we have not done any property value analysis.

COUNCIL MEMBER GUTIÉRREZ: Okay, I have more questions but I will pass it to the Chair because I know everybody else has questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: I'm just going to acknowledge we've also been joined by Council Member Restler and I'd like to recognize Council Member Avilés.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Thank you Chair. In terms of today, is just a day of abundance for me. In terms of the industrial sector, uhm, you note that there seems to be an increase in the geography but

just today, through the BMT, we're losing 60 acres of industrial manufacturing property. How does that math shake out?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Council Member thank you for the question and it's good to see you. As I mentioned, there are a number of geographies that were not covered by the original IBZ tax policy that we have recommended for primary or secondary designation. Those include uhm amongst places in very large acreage, College Point as well as considerable land on the western side of Staten Island.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: But in terms of - well, in terms of this particular property, there's a full reduction. Can I ask you, you know I'm not going to belabor this. Can I ask you, in terms of one of the things you noted, a big challenge for industrial businesses is rent, right? Is uhm is a 25 percent on discount on market an attractive and sufficient incentive to actually bring in industrial manufacturing business? Like even on current terms. Just as a matter of practice. Would let's say market rate, if you offer a 25 percent discount on a market rate, do you think that would be sufficient to

attract industrial business at the scale that we are trying to do here in the city as a policy matter?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Council Member, it sounds like there are specifics behind what you're asking that I'm not familiar with. Certainly, I would imagine that in any circumstance where I think government action is able to defray the cost of occupying space that will help many businesses.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, well, I'll answer the question because I think you know that industrial businesses require much deeper subsidy because of market rates are so astronomical and it's one of our challenges in our industrial business zones. In order to protect and strengthen them. I think what I'm mainly pointing out which is not necessarily in your bailiwick but in certainly in EDC's bailiwick that they think that that's an actual incentive to economic industrial business growth. When we know that's in fact the case not.

Let me switch it over to as noted by DCP, our IBZ's are often ecosystems with one manufacturer sometimes supplying something of a need of another or even supporting an overall policy goal for the city. I'm curious of whether DCP has given any nuance

consideration to specific districts. I think you said some of that is going to come out later but particularly focusing on my district. Has DCP considered uprose 2.0 grid plan? Which contemplates just transition to a green economy within the industrial business zone and this SMIA's in Sunset?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yes, we've certainly taken a look at it. Uhm it was brought to our attention during the outreach process and we've met with a number of environmental justice stakeholders and it certainly did inform us.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Can you break that down a little bit more clearly? What were the considerations that were - that we could see materializing in any part of this plan at this point?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, certainly I would say with regards to Sunset Park in general, uhm the plan does make recommendations for primary and secondary industrial designations throughout much of the Sunset Park area. Our data shows that Sunset Park today is one of the most important industrial clusters in the city. It is one of the areas where we have seen industrial growth. It has some of the best infrastructure from a rail marine and highway

perspective. Accessing some of the industrial areas, it's seen significant investment from EDC and city assets along the industrial core of Sunset Park. And so, it is one of the areas where we anticipated that there is a likely future potential for significant industrial infrastructure and growth in the future in the plans recommendations to the extent that they are local to reflect that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, I'm sorry, uhm so recommendations from the grid 2.0, are we likely to see DCP actually proceed with any of those recommendations in concrete terms, creating a special district to ensure that we are going to use that property for just transition as opposed to building schools in industrial zones, which is something we have started to see on the west side of 3rd Avenue, which is a true problem.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I think Council Member; we'd have to get into more details with you. I can't recall - we certainly did not lift directly recommendations from the grid plan into here to the extent that it is equally concerned with the potential for green job creation that is considering the position of different kinds of uses. As you

mentioned, schools and industrial zones, those are things that we are making recommendations on and I would say at least philosophically quite aligned.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay.

JOHN O'NEIL: If I could jump in just for a moment to talk to you about really like climate threats and the environmental question has been so central to the development of this plan. So, you know we came to this from this very preindustrial perspective but as we spoke to more like environmental justice advocates, we heard a lot more about you know hey, we have issues with asthma and public health and you guys totally overlooked this. You guys really have to think more about you know what is the impact of heat and flooding and pollution in these neighborhoods. So, that was really the impetus to creating you know an additional and central focus to this plan, which is talking about how do we both support industrial but how do we also encourage the greening in these areas and I think there are ways in which DCP has the ability to act but we are also working very closely with MOCEJ to make sure that we're aligned with their initiatives. But a big thing is thinking about how do we make

these areas say more porous when there is storm water flooding events? How do we make these areas greener?

Certainly, on congestion and trucks, I mean truck safety is a huge issue in your district, particularly 3rd Avenue, where you know we have these freight movements and these businesses need to get their deliveries. How do we make it such that people can actually live in the neighborhood and walk to that IBZ or to the industrial district you know and not be afraid walking under the BQE. I mean we've been to that industrial district many times and it's always stressful to walk under either the BQE or we're up in Port Morris, the Bruckner is stressful to walk under. So, those are things that we're also taking into consideration but as you can imagine, it's a really - it's challenging to say you know we're going to prioritize environmental issues and we're going to prioritize industrial intensification because sometimes not inherently at odds but aligning those things can be really challenging and we've heard that a lot too about Local Law 97 compliance, right?

Everybody supports that perspective and that initiative. We want to decarbonize; we want to be

green. How do you smelt metal without gas? You know there's these difficult questions for us to navigate.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: No, I appreciate that and you can certainly attract and incentivize green business and locally owned green businesses at that in addition to a whole host of other things, which our community has been asking for for a very long time.

I mean in terms of those - the threats around climate change, uhm permeable services don't work in all of Red Hook. So, that's not even an option. I only heard three actually. Could you remind me the three you highlighted? It was permeable surfaces, bioswales and what was the other treatment that was noted?

JOHN O'NEIL: Uh, well planting more trees. I mean right now, we don't yeah, we don't require that in our M-zones but it is one of our recommendations to consider. How do we both either acquire that in new developments or new redevelopment or how do we as a city start prioritizing planting?

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Are there any other treatments that you're considering to address climate change in these areas?

JOHN O'NEIL: Well, we don't have specific instances of it but we also do talk about just further hardening, supporting initiatives where we say harden the waterfront. So, really like working on a more like waterfront protections, but we don't have specific instances of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Can I ask, when you say harden, what do you mean? Because I hear something that is very anti-addressing climate change when I hear harden water front.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, there are certain -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, you might mean something different.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Grey infrastructure interventions in public space, right? Like the Red Hook coastal protections are an example. In some cases of grey - a grey improvement versus a green improvement, right? So, there - you know but I think also equally important when we're talking about climate resilience for industrial businesses, many of them have open components. Many of them are reliant on ground floors, which makes the climate vulnerability pretty challenging. So, a lot of

resilience involves elevating your electricals, finding operational strategies for moving your fleet or your components off site to a flood proofed area or elevating in an issue of flood, right? There's a lot of operational challenges associated with an industry that is you know operating and must operate in the flood plain. So, some of that is capital investment. Some of that is ongoing operational investment. We have done things in past zoning to help businesses elevate when they can but again that requires reinvestment in a site. We think there are other things that can be done regulatorily to make it easier for businesses to do it but it's also a resource constraint, right? So, things like the development fund, things like funding from DEP for upgrades. All of these factor in I think when we're talking about you know somebody who is just trying to figure out you know uh, you know I've got a you know a wire repair business and you know I've got spools you know that I'm moving in and out and you know where are the spools supposed to go when the flood rains come, right? I mean those can just be significant expenses and so, I think approaching that from the how do we allow for businesses to elevate

and make their operational plans but also, how do we get them the resources they need are things that are woven into multiple parts of a plan here.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, for MX districts, can you talk about some of the additional environmental rules that industrial businesses might face when collating with residential?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, that's a great question. So, right now under our zoning, we allow for the colocation of an industrial business with a residential business but you're subject to state DEC tiering requirements. So, only certain types of business emissions profiles would be allowed through the program, as well as certain hazardous materials. If you're working with certain kinds of chemicals or certain kinds of solvents, those activities preclude you from the colocation within a vertical building.

And those rules were written to protect safety. What we found that in practice and a great example I'll give of this is 803 Rockaway, the bridge project done by Greenpoint Manufacturing, a design council opened earlier this year, as the city's first 100 percent affordable building with manufacturing space. In order to put woodworking type uses that involve a

spray booth and other kinds of admittance, even though they are able to design the building in a way that safely controls that kind of environmental profile. The way that our regulations work right now, they actually needed special dispensations in order to be able to achieve the building and so, we have a recommendation in the plan that's really looking at that - sort of testing more of that environmental feasibility of putting additional kinds of industrial uses because we think more types of entities, like a GMDC or a fully private market rate developer may experiment more with a wider range of industrial uses. Uses that have been shown presidentially to be able to be made safe in a contained context, but which our rules are currently precluding. So, that might be anything from woodworking to a coffee roaster, to certain kinds of artist or fabrications, right? Really the controls right now are very generic and specifically working on a sort of outdated mentality of emissions and hazard standards that may be good in a lot of cases but when we're trying to achieve that ability to collocate industry with residential in ways that can

be made safe but through idiosyncratic environmental protections our rules don't currently allow for.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, for sites where a GPP process might be imposed on mixed industrial residential development, how is this city going to ensure similar protections for its residents?

JENNIFER SUN: So, using the example of the Brooklyn Marine Terminal, where we have made a commitment to creating light industrial space as a part of mixed-use residential buildings and BMT North, we would be working closely with DEP to make sure that the kinds of light industrial uses that we will be including in future development RFP's are in fact uses that would not create conditions that are hazardous to future residents in those mixed use buildings.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: But I would echo again that I think what we have seen is that there are these examples now where it really provides an opportunity to leverage the creation of a residential space to create new industrial space. I think this new building that I mentioned 803 Rockaway is a fantastic model. We understand that GMDC is interested in looking at that model in other

locations in the city. We hope that many others will take that model and expand it. It's not a panacea for the creation of new industrial space but it can deliver us small scale manufacturing spaces in places that need it and you know in conditions that really work. I think they've really shown that you know woodworking and residential can live cheek to jowl if you put in the kind of protections like vapor barriers and venting's that make you know that ensure the protection of the residents and nearby users from any potential hazard.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: While transportation and logistics might comprise a majority of growth in our IBZ's. I'm curious if DCP has collected any data around how particular facilities impact the cost of square foot to lease or purchase industrial space.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I think what you're asking Council Member is does the introduction of new users increase the cost for other users and I would say absolutely. I think what we've seen and you know in many ways this is no different than our housing challenges as a city. When you have a very scarce supply and increased competition, prices go up and there are areas of the city where our industrial

space is in high demand and we're not creating enough more of it and in part, that's because we've - our zoning doesn't even allow you to create more space. And I think our markets are constrained and I think prices have reflected that increase in some locations.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, do you think that will continue to constrain incentivization or?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I think our job as a planning entity is to really try to make space for everyone and I think that's what we really want to focus on is the ability of the city to really unlock new opportunities for industrial users but for all users. We think that scarcity is a primary driver of the challenges of affordability in this space.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I'm going to yield back my time and then come back because I have too many questions.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Council Member. I'm now going to recognize Council Member Restler for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you so much Chair and I just want to you know thank my three colleagues who are here today who have really been I think doing

an exceptional job advocating for smart industrial policy and looking to protect industrial areas and through your leadership on City of Yes and beyond. I'm really grateful and as I often say to Council Member Gutiérrez, when it comes to this work, I am just happy that she's taking the lead and that I can support her and she does a terrific job advocating for the industrial communities in North Brooklyn and I'm really grateful for it.

Uhm, a couple questions; a few areas, a few questions, I don't have as many as my colleagues but just broad strokes. In through City of Yes, we in agreement for this planning process. So, could you talk me through the timeline for best case scenario let's just say. I know we don't who the mayor - we don't officially know that Zohran's going to be the mayor yet in three months. Is that the right way to say it? Uhm, uh, I knocked on wood, don't worry. Uhm but best-case scenario from your all's perspective, what's the timing on the steps to go from planning process to ULURP actions?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, it's a great question and I'll buy myself a moment by

congratulating you on a new dais that is wood that you can knock on.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: At least, it seems like wood, I don't know.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: But I think as I mentioned, I'm not sure if you were in the room Council Member so forgive me if I'm repeating myself but you know I think it's very clear, the draft plan is certainly not an implementation plan. It's a policy document and a guide. You know we certainly have hopes in here. I think we've identified many opportunities where zoning changes could help unlock investment in areas that are generally suffering under bad, old zoning. For a variety of different potential outcomes, right? We think there are places where rezoning could achieve additional industrial protection. We think there are places where it could unlock additional job creation. We think there are potentially places where it could unlock housing creation where we have perhaps been too conservative in the past about areas that we've considered off limits. All of those -

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I do know all that but I do want to pin you down more. So, we're in a

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: But best-case scenario, uhm, we - you know we would hope that in 2026, some of the ideas and opportunities that are

identified from the plan can begin their advancement into some form of rezoning in a 2026 agenda. It's certainly something that we'd be looking for to unlock you know at DCP. There were some questions earlier. I think about how we approach that from a sort of neighborhood by neighborhood versus a citywide perspective considering that this plan is itself, citywide. We don't have a good answer to how that should function accept setting aside that we think it's really important of course to be working on any neighborhood change with the neighborhoods that are effected, even if there are multiple neighborhoods effected. But you know, if you're talking about a rezoning that was initiated based on ideas that are represented in the plan and sometime in 2026, that's probably you know typically are rezonings that are in process right now have been a you know a two year or so process. So, I would imagine you know a similar timeline for a future action of that scale. Could be a few more, right several years.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: So, we're planning through the end of the year and then potentially a two-year process to work toward certification for

what could be an individual neighborhood or neighborhoods or could be a citywide approach?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah or some combination of the two. We think that there are things, there are multiple recommendations in here that also speak to text amendments versus straight mapping type actions. For instance, as we were just describing anything where you were changing requirements for planting in an industrial area, is probably text versus a mapping but yeah, generally it will take two years is a good rule of thumb.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: None of this would be subject to the appeals court because the appeals court only does housing, is that right?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I'm not as up to speed on the particulars but I think that that's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Just wondering if we're in the development for the conversation or not.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, it hasn't come up in any prior conversation that I've been in.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I mean I'm being - I'm making light but I'm not really. So, okay. Uhm, you did mention some of the industrial areas in District 33 and mentioning - so when we talk about kind of

some of the areas you mentioned are currently IBZ's and I think what you described is a shift to just M-zones and they'd no longer be IBZ's. Is that what you're envisioning for those areas? Could you speak a little bit more to kind of the Green Point, Williamsburg, North Side IBZ area. When you're talking about maybe a lifting of some restrictions. What - how - could you as specific as possible in the changes that you're envisioning?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I don't suppose we could bring maps back up? That's probably a little complicated, so we're happy to follow up and show you the maps that were in the presentation.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I have them all here.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: They may be in front of you.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I have them all.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Does somebody want to just say what page the framework map is on?

This is the new industrial land use framework.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah so a bit tiny, nyc.gov/industrialplan, we'll allow you to zoom in.

So, as we described, what the plan includes is a framework between primary industrial areas, secondary

1 industrial areas and then other M-areas that are not
2 designated but obviously remain in M-zoning.

3
4 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: But no plan at this time
5 to convert these areas that are currently IBZ's into
6 housing?

7 CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: No, what we have is a
8 policy document that is designating some areas as
9 really intended for the exclusive use of it of
10 industry, as distinctly non-residential as an effort
11 to preserve industry or undesignated and therefore we
12 think that industry and industrial policy is somewhat
13 irrelevant to the outcomes of that area. They remain
14 M, we have not proposed a specific rezoning.

15 So, Greenpoint Williamsburg is an example of one
16 of those areas that was not designated. It was not
17 designated based on what we see today of the
18 remaining cluster of industrial jobs and industrial
19 land use in the area, as well as a somewhat unique
20 lack of access to transportation and particularly to
21 highway ramps through residential areas. And so, it
22 did not meet the criteria that we had identified for
23 the primary or secondary areas.

24 So that means that we are not taking a position
25 within this plan right now as to what its future

should be. We are saying that it is not a priority area from an industrial policy perspective.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay and when Council Member Gutiérrez and others worked on the North Brooklyn Industrial Plan, Industrial Innovation Plan, is that what we called it? Industrial Plan, okay North Brooklyn Industrial Plan. Leah can remind us all the facts. Uhm, the idea then was kind of similar in the idea of let's have some core industrial areas that we're really strengthening protections and putting the most critical industrial uses in those places and in areas that are - that's more integrated into residential communities and other places we might think about, industrial uses or innovation uses, or even I mean, a variety of other things. I'm sure Mayor Adams would like to just put a lot of music venues in those places.

But uhm, yeah, just about. So, could you speak to how your framework differs from that plan that Council Member Gutiérrez and Borough President Reynoso, and others worked on over the years?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, I think that plan actually - it absolutely provides in many ways the geniuses for this thinking of this sort of three

part, which I will just you know reductively the way I think of it as sort of uhm preserve, encourage, accommodate sort of structure. North Brooklyn did a lot of work on this. North Brooklyn of course never fully came to fruition and so, how that would relate to zoning tools was never fully determined. So, we're in an advantaged position now that we have actual zoning tools. So, the M3A tool for instance, the core tool, uhm is actually more I think aggressive than any of the sort of work that was ultimately developed in North Brooklyn. At least as I understand it, in so far as it excludes all non-industrial uses uhm under 10,000 square feet. So, I think there was never quite as radical an approach at that time then the M-3A represents. The M-2A also went through a lot of refinement, really to get to a tool. It's a little bit more informed also by Gowanus mix and by other efforts to think about how we can incentivize on an as of right in more neighborhood basis. So, it benefited from multiple Brooklyn born zoning attempts but that same sort of general framework, very applicable, the geographies are similar, not identical and again that process went through a lot of different map iterations. So,

depending on which we're comparing to but I think you know at a fundamental level pretty uh a similar effort to think about those, where we identify core, where we identify a sort of transitional zone and where we open up opportunity for other uses.

I think one new element that's quite relevant here and again, we haven't taken a position on - in the other areas whether residential is or is not appropriate, but certainly the commercial market in this area has changed since the time of the North Brooklyn studies with the potential right now at least of higher density vertical office development being significantly less than it was at the - I think 2019.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Although, you know Domino is filling up. I think it's 70 percent filled up at this point.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, that's true, that's true.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: There are some -

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Quite the quality, maybe opportunities, but I think we've been on a bit of a hiatus of that development in this area.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: No, I generally agree with your assessment, unfortunately I think it's the assessment for the office market across all of Brooklyn at this point but so uhm the - how do you balance the concerns about speculation and I think us all wanting to ensure that these industrial areas remain affordable, dynamic, vital industrial spaces, with kind of recognition that especially in some of these areas that you're talking about other M-zones and I think you're being a little grey about what could potentially happen in those areas, maybe by design but thinking about potential other uses in those places. Like how do we avoid a speculative market while going through a planning process and considering alternative uses to areas where things have been quite restricted.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, it's a great question and I will say yes, by design, I think we are not taking a position on the future potential zoning outcome of any area.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Yeah, I was just saying

-

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I think we're being very particular about right - like this plan is

asking us to take a perspective on industrial policy and how we prioritize that and so, that's what we're doing by subtraction that may open up opportunities that deserve their own consideration but may have other inputs that are also worthy and it's not I think germane to the exercise we've been asked to do here to sort of you know work through all of those opportunities.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: How do we go through this exercise and not generate a bunch of bad speculation?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, I guess what I would say is to the extent that we're identifying areas for future opportunity, right and some of those may be places where the opportunity has changed because of the opening of industrial territory. That suggests to me an area that may be right for a rezoning study. That is typically how we've approached you know approached looking at an area more comprehensively and certainly in a place like the first Greenpoint Williamsburg rezonings where I recall similar concerns being raised about the you know the market changing and incremental change sort of moving before the public sector could holistically

contemplate what you know a more cohesive vision.

That is exactly why and when the city moved in and I

think that's really been our modus operandi for most

of our neighborhood studies is really when we see

that moment of opportunity uhm, and a need and a

potential is to get in front of it and to try and do

the planning from the public sector side. So, it

sounds to me like describing the opportunity for a

city study. Uhm, uh that to me feels like the most -

the most useful and tried response to that kind of

condition.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Uhm, I think it's just

uh we kind of put ourselves in an impossible

situation, where we recognize that the neighborhood

is changing. We recognize that we need to do some

meaningful community engagement and think about the

application of these new zoning tools that you're

developing and that's a multi-year process that

allows you know for I think potentially really

harmful speculation to happen across the community.

So, I just - and I don't have the insights of how

we stop that but I do think it undermines the goals

that we maybe trying to achieve over the course of

the plan.

Uhm, last question for me and I really just want to thank the Chair for being so gracious. Uhm, the IBIA tool, uhm, we get a lot of applications or we get a good number of applications for these. Uhm, you mentioned the softening of the Brooklyn Office market, especially in North Brooklyn. Uhm, I wanted to just ask the question, do you think about the enhancing or reducing the applicability of IBIA in this plan and if you have any further thoughts? I would just be interested.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, we haven't made any specific recommendations about the IBIA. We did talk about it a little bit in the tool kit of existing tools. As you know Council Member, there is an application for an IBIA Currently in ULURP for 20 Barry. You know I think and we anticipate as that project goes through also to take a little bit more a look at the IBIA in the current status. It's my general understanding that there are a number IBIA projects that have worked. I think we're about to see Brooklyn Brewery move into its facility finally. I think that's a great example of where these tradeoffs can work really well. We've seen a long history of 25 Kent getting to full occupancy for a

variety reasons, some of which may or may not have to do with the IBIA itself.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Occupancy, because that would be news to me.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: I don't think they are at full occupancy.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: No, I don't either.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: No, oh trying to achieve full occupancy, no still not there as I understand it. Uhm, a number of projects that have not moved forward under IBIA prior approvals, both in your district, as well as on the Long Island City side. Uhm, one of the primary challenges I think that has long been associated with the IBIA's is the amount of process and bespoke approvals and reapprovals associated with they special permit process itself, that we may be controverting our desire to bonus the industrial space by making it harder to actually deliver that as of right space. That's something that we think the M-2A zoning districts really do a better job of, which is why I mentioned I think learning a lot of lessons from Gowanus mix, which actually does seem to be in its

still early stages but actually delivering some quite useful space on an as of right basis.

So, we think the M-2A is potentially more powerful, particularly neighborhood wide tool where you can map a generalizable incentive that's achievable as of right without every project having to go through an individual special permit process to try and achieve it.

There may be project in 20 Barry is a great example of that where the developer is choosing to seek the IBIA regardless and there may be certain reasons why that's the more desirable. We don't know yet. We're still sort of looking at whether there are circumstances where the IBIA may be a more desirable outcome. The new M tools also do solve a lot of the bulk and loading challenges that the IBIA was also initially trying to solve. So, we have some new tools that are available, that we think make at least more sense in a sort of neighborhood situation. Whether there are remaining still reasons where the IBIA is a valuable policy device, even aside from those new ones, we don't know yet but we have one example right now where a developer did choose it regardless.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay, I as always, defer to Council Member Gutiérrez. Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you Council Member. Just for a second round of questions, I have Council Member Avilés.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, I'm going to submit a bunch of questions because I won't have time to go through them for the record and would love to get the response from DCP but I'll ask you just a few of them. Uhm, in terms of uh - the need for industrial spacings most acute for businesses requiring smaller footprints, as you said in the report. How do you proposed supporting the addition of more industrial spaces that fit those business needs for the ones that are under 5,000 square feet?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, I think that the - as I - the M-2A and some of the creation of industrial space as parts of more mixed new development could be one really useful tool to this, right? So, uhm, I'll - I mentioned 803 Rockaway earlier, I'll mention 25 Kent that Council Member Restler and I were just describing. Uhm, much of Gowanus mix project. There are opportunities that we have where we are seeing new investment in the city

1 because of the power of other product types like
2 commercial or residential, where we think the
3 creation of a single you know condo or ground floor
4 component that is industrial may help, right? That
5 we can sort of leverage that investment opportunity
6 to create small parcels and we think that actually
7 works best when we're talking about smaller - the
8 delivery of smaller spaces, and when we're talking
9 about industrial uses that aren't extremely truck or
10 extremely environmentally intensive, right? So, your
11 small manufacturer, your wholesaler, your small
12 construction office. These are all things that can
13 occupy a pretty wide realm of different space
14 typologies uhm that we just need people to be able to
15 deliver at a price that they can afford. And so,
16 figuring out how to help the market a little bit to
17 encourage that kind of space to come online, we think
18 could be quite helpful. We also should mention the
19 City of Yes for Economic Opportunity made the largest
20 change to industrial policy since 1961 at allowing
21 for those kinds of businesses to occupy all of our
22 commercial districts.

24 And so, the opportunity to take a vacant
25 storefront space or a vacant office space is not

1 available and really widens the geography of
2 applicability for a lot of users and we're only just
3 now I think starting to see the tip of that
4 opportunity. Again, it doesn't work for everyone. A
5 lot of businesses are still going to be pinned to the
6 ground floor depending on what they are, but there's
7 a lot of deals to be had in vacant office space right
8 now. And so, being a little bit more creative,
9 opening up that playing field as much as possible to
10 deal with the scarcity issue, is one of the ways that
11 we're thinking about how to help those smaller users.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: So, in terms of the
13 pricing and vacancy rates of real estate that
14 obviously very greatly by geography, as you also said
15 in the report. Will you be able to disaggregate
16 these statistics into smaller geographies?

17 CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: The vacancy and
18 typology, we're able to disaggregate them a little
19 bit but samples become an issue when we're looking at
20 for instance IBZ by IBZ but we're happy to talk to
21 you about what we can and can't share.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah, I'd definitely like
23 to see it for our district both Sunset Park and Red
24 Hook in particular. Uhm in terms of the IB- you site

1 that the IBX corridor may need future land use
2 changes to rezone currently industrial land. Given
3 the significant importance of industrial jobs in
4 Sunset Park, this also kind of strikes me as short
5 sided. Historically the IBZ's protected vital
6 industrial areas, such as this from this form of
7 rezoning. How do we ensure that these commitments
8 will be upheld?
9

10 Actually, I can speak to this because we worked
11 pretty extensively with MTA on IBX and obviously this
12 is big project of theirs and we've thought a lot
13 about this corridor and how do we balance like future
14 needs based on versus what's there today. So, I'd
15 like to emphasize Brooklyn Army Terminal, that is
16 something that in the draft, we did call primary and
17 then we've actually expanded protections along this
18 corridor.

19 So, as you know, really at like 60th Street
20 Corridor, Southern Borough Park, Southern Sunset
21 Park, there's a whole viable little industrial
22 district that runs along the IBX. So, I've gone
23 through there, walked it and there's small
24 production. There's actually textile. There's food
25 production. So, that's an area that we designated as

secondary. We saw that as really kind of like this small niche industrial district that's playing the supportive role for housing, construction or you know restaurant operations in Sunset Park. So, we codified productions there as secondary and then we went up to Flatbush flatlands and then we looked at that IBZ specifically and we really went block by block and we designated most of that as secondary but there are some blocks where there's like you know large chain stores or vacant sites where we did not designate secondary but there is - uh to the east of that area it's called flatlands, so the other part of the IBZ. We actually expanded secondary protections there as well because we've seen that that part of the IBZ very highly viable. And then up in east New York, same thing we designated that area as secondary. We visited that IBZ and that actually has some viable freight rail frontage. So, where we think like there is viable, active, ongoing industrial and where there is a site potentially to activate the freight rail, those are areas that we have codified as secondary.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay secondary doesn't ensure full protections or again, can you articulate -

JOHN O'NEIL: Secondary would not allow for residential rezonings so -

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: But it allows for - what's the addition of secondary?

JOHN O'NEIL: So, we've kind of alluded to secondary as being appropriate for maybe like the M-2A. So, that's the area where you would incent industrial through this bonus in the FAR. But effectively the rules would be behalf the same as they do now, right? So, it would be an M-district and it would continue to be an area that allowed industrial and some commercial activity.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Would schools be allowed in M-2A's?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: And I want to note Council Member, again when John has mentioned expansion, particularly in that 65th Street corridor, we're talking about areas that are outside the IBZ

today that have been entered into these new protections.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Okay, well we'll look more closely. Since we have just received this draft plan, there is a lot of in-depth review that needs to go, so we will certainly be meeting because there is a lot of concern with this plan so far.

In terms of the Brooklyn meeting, it says NYU Brooklyn; what does that mean?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: It's 370 Jay Street and I believe we have uh, the full addresses are on our website nyc.gov/industrialplan. We can make sure you have all of the specific information 6:30 p.m..

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Obviously, I know you have a lot of ground to cover with the whole city but one event in a borough is not sufficient community engagement around this, particularly because of the density of the materials. I would encourage a lot more, not just like passive. Send us your comments that go to a great person who reads all those comments but really where there is real community engagement and discussion around what is being proposed to get the real live interaction.

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah Council Member, the townhalls are what was required under the legislation but we'll absolutely be doing everything we can to go above and beyond and we'd be happy to talk to you about those opportunities, including I do believe we've already reached out to your community boards to offer more in-depth briefing.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Yeah, they are contending with a lot and one is not going to be sufficient, so thank you. I look forward to seeing more being put on the calendar. You proposed exploring changes to the BSA process to allow for schools within the M-zones. What's the logic of making it easier to site schools in industrial areas?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: It's actually the opposite and I think speaks to maybe what you were contemplating Council Member. We've heard a number of concerns about the position of schools in industrial areas and we think that there's potential to strengthen the existing BSA process. Schools are not allowed in the M-2 and M-3's today but they are allowed by BSA special permit in the M1's. So, that's specifically we're going to be making a

1
2 recommendation about potentially targeting
3 improvements.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: I'm delighted to hear
5 that. So, we're going to remove that possibility of
6 using the BSA process to site schools, which has
7 happened several times in Sunset Park.

8 JOHN O'NEIL: Well, I don't think that we can
9 promise removal. It is a really difficult
10 conversation, so we've already started some
11 interagency, kind of a working group with BSA and
12 School Construction Authority and DOT. So, DOT
13 obviously is very concerned about like child safety
14 accessibility. I mean everybody is. It's not
15 specifically them but that's a concern. Of course,
16 we have concern about is this an appropriate use in
17 these areas?

18 COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: It's not what's difficult
19 about it. We have safety issues persistent every
20 day. We don't have crossing guards. We have DOT who
21 can't address truck traffic. We have noxious
22 facilities surrounding it. What is difficult about
23 this?

24 CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Well, every I think -
25 first of all, just step back again, the draft plan is

not making a recommendation on a full ban. It's making a recommendation to look at the provisions and see what can be done to strengthen it. That could be a whole range of things and when we meet with you, we should talk about the specific circumstances. We have M-1's all across the city in a variety of different conditions, so there may be places where it's very obvious that like this is not a good location for a school, and there are others where that may not be the case. So, I think what we're looking at is to really figure out what is the right policy to avoid the adverse outcomes that we're hearing about but also make sure that we have a rational land use policy.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Alright, look forward to more conversations. Lastly, what does it mean to not have current and significant IBZ's identified as a primary or a secondary industrial area in the draft plan?

CAROLYN GROSSMAN MEAGHER: Yeah, I think Council Member, this is to what we were speaking about before. The plan itself doesn't make a recommendation about the IBZ's like tax boundaries explicitly. It is making recommendations about where

different kinds of uses are appropriate. In many ways the geographies that we've identified are similar to the original IBZ boundaries, given that 20 years ago when we made IBZ's, we were looking at a lot of the same features, like of the predominance of industry and the accessibility of infrastructure in given areas. But in this planning process and based on the methodology that the legislation helps outline, we've come to slightly different conclusions about where to designate primary and our most exclusive industrial areas, where to designate the secondary and think about job centers that are nonresidential and where we haven't made that designation. So, those maps do not fully align with the IBZ maps and there are areas and we've spoken about a few of them earlier and Council Member Gutiérrez and Council Member Restler's district, where they are in an IBZ tax district and historically that has meant a commitment to not residential but we have not designated them as part of this draft plan. We're not making a specific zoning recommendation in those areas. We're making a recommendation that they are not the priority industrial zones for this policy.

COUNCIL MEMBER AVILÉS: Well, okay so I'll submit the rest of my questions and we'll await a response. I'm very concerned by what we have before here and the fact that from my perspective, the city continues to have these contradictory - we're setting policies, exploring policies, and then in action, actually undermining exactly what we are trying to do and it is crazy making that we would say we're trying to protect and then give it away at the same time or support the poorest and the ability to deteriorate those zones, which have not been increasing. So, we have a lot of work to do on this and I have a lot of concerns that there will be speculation that we are putting our zones even at more at risk here. The words feel pretty but the action is saying a very different story. And so, we will have some more conversations. I thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you so much members. Seeing no other questions, I'm going to excuse this panel. Thank you folks for joining us today. As you have already heard, we have a lot more future conversations to have and work to do together on getting to the final phase of this final umh initiative. So, thank you so much.

I'm now going to open the hearing for public testimony. I remind members of the public that this is a government proceeding and that decorum shall be observed at all times. As such, members of the public shall remain silent at all times. The witness table is reserved for people who wish to testify. No video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table. Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant at Arms for inclusion in the hearing record.

If you wish to speak at today's hearing and you have not already done so, please fill out an appearance card with the Sergeant at Arms and wait to be recognized. When recognized, you will have two minutes to speak on today's hearing topic of oversight of New York City Industrial Plan Implementation Progress.

If you have a written statement or additional written testimony you wish to submit for the record, please provide a copy of that testimony to the Sergeant at Arms today. If you do not have it with you today, you may also email written testimony to testimony@council.nyc.gov within 72 hours of the

close of this hearing. Audio and video recordings will not be accepted.

For in person panelists, please come up to the table once your name has been called. I will now call in our first panel. Leah Archibald, Christopher Walters, Quincy Ely-Cate; I'm sorry for that mispronunciation and Charles Yu.

You can begin when ready.

LEAH ARCHIBALD: You want to start at the end or alphabetically? I'll go, alphabetically order. Hi, my name is Leah Archibald. I'm the Executive Director of Evergreen and we're the local development corporation that works with businesses in industrial North Brooklyn to help them grow so that we can keep high quality working class jobs in our community.

I want to thank you guys for all the work that you did both in developing the IDAP legislation and hosting this hearing to talk about the draft plan. I would like to start my testimony as I always do, putting in a plug for perhaps we could use a little extra help in the budget and I know you guys have gone to bat for the industrial business service providers over and over again but uhm, you know we can't do the work we do without support from the city

1 even though it's a small component of funding of
2 organizations like ours. It really helps us uhm, you
3 know help a lot of businesses plus, uhm, you know
4 swing into action when things like the Industrial
5 Action Plan gets started.
6

7 So, we are hoping for an increase in funds. I'll
8 give you the - the bullet points are all in my
9 written testimony. I think it's more important that
10 I spend the remaining minute I have talking about our
11 concerns with the draft plan. You know I think you
12 guys are right on with the concerns about
13 speculation. Those little blurry, hard to decipher
14 maps are sending a message to the market right now,
15 right and we saw this in Williamsburg in 2005. The
16 biggest amount of business loss did not occur after
17 that zoning was approved in 2005. It was the two
18 year lead up to the rezoning where leases didn't get
19 renewed and businesses moved out, and people
20 warehoused their space. That was - that message to
21 the market is key and I guess uhm, I guess you can
22 read the rest of my points in the testimony. But we
23 are really - I want to close with; we're really
24 concerned about a bunch of things. The fact that the
25 entire Greenpoint Williamsburg Industrial Business

Zone is not mapped and the most job rich section of your district Councilwoman Gutiérrez, where you know Wonton Foods 322 jobs, Bores Head Foods, Bongalo Projects is putting in a massive new film studio. None of that is mapped for any protection. Not to mention four of the five buildings, my organization owns that have 30 year restrictive tax on them to lease out to small manufacturers.

So, uhm, I want to thank you guys for your attention on this. I'm sorry that I went on but as you all know, I could really go on and on and on about this subject at great length. So, thanks so much for your attention.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WALTERS: Thank you Majority Leader.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Press the microphone.

CHRISTOPHER WALTERS: Is that on now? Great. Thank you Majority Leader and Council Members for holding this hearing, offering the opportunity to share our initial thoughts on the NYC Industrial Plan. This will be along the same themes as you all raised and as Leah raised. My name is Chris Walters, I'm the Senior Land Use Policy Associate at the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development,

ANHD. As a key part of our work, ANHD convenes and participates in the Industrial Jobs Coalition fighting to protect, preserve and grow the industrial sector and NYC.

ANHD supported the creation of the industrial plan because we believe in proactive comprehensive planning to strengthen and grow the industrial sector. I want to say this, fundamental goal is acknowledged in the first sentence of the draft report, which confirms the intention of the legislation was to develop a planning initiative to support the growth of the industrial sector. Our hope was that this plan could serve as a roadmap for future actions to achieve this goal, including through zoning changes to map a newly created core industrial zoning districts.

This focus on zoning and land use is crucial as one of the essential challenges that the industrial sector faces is limited in shrinking land in which it is able to operate. This is something that the report itself acknowledges. While there are numerous recommendations in the plan around policy funding and investments for the industrial sector, we want to stress that for them to be effective, we need to make

1 sure we are preserving industrial zone land and
2 limiting the possibility of too many competing uses.
3 This is obviously particularly true within existing
4 IBZ's today. The Draft Land Use framework raises
5 concerns that this will not be a priority and that
6 the city's future land use decisions will run counter
7 to the goal of strengthening and growing the
8 industrial sector. As you all have shared already,
9 we have specific concerns as well that the report
10 does not take a position on the preservation of
11 existing IBZ's and does not include more areas within
12 them as primary industrial areas. While at the same
13 time, including so many others as other M-zones that
14 may be considered for residential use under MX
15 rezonings.
16

17 As an initial and immediate next step, we believe
18 it is important for DCP to clarify what percentage of
19 existing M-zone land it is proposing as primary,
20 secondary, and other M-zones and to break that down
21 within each existing IBZ. And I'll finish in just a
22 moment.

23 While also analyzing how the proposed framework
24 will preserve, grow or reduce industrial jobs if
25 implemented.

I just want to close by saying, we ANHD and the IJC, we look forward to working with you all and with DCP to arrive at a land use framework that we all feel better, acknowledges, and preserves existing industrial business hubs and the good paying jobs that they provide. Thanks very much.

QUINCY ELY-CATE: Hello, good afternoon Council Member Farias and Committee. My name is Quincy Ely-Cate and I'm Director of Industrial Business Development at the Business Outreach Center, BOC Network. We proudly support industrial manufacturing businesses across Central Queens, East Brooklyn, and the Bronx. Areas that span 11 industrial business zones, including East New York and Flatlands, Fairfield and Brooklyn, Maspeth and Ridgewood IBZ's in Queens, and the Hunts Point Port Morris and Zerega IBZ's in the Bronx.

Our work helps businesses expand by supporting procurement development access to capital and financing, navigating incentives and government regulations and recruitment in training.

I also wanted to plug, which thank you for touching on earlier about our budgetary limitations it needs to do the work that we do. I had prepared

more to talk about that but with limited time, I wanted to jump into some - what I think are significant concerns around this plan. The beginning of the report is - says a lot of things that I think we agree upon that the IBZ's need in terms of infrastructure but when we get down to the details and we start looking at maps, is where we start seeing significant issues. The Woodside IBZ in Queens does not exist. The Ridgewood IBZ does not exist. Greenpoint Williamsburg, parts of Red Hook, these places are basically being demapped from maybe not what they are saying technically demapped but in terms of speculation, you're going to see people going out and buying properties now to try to capitalize on future changes to zoning.

This is very harmful for industrial businesses and the future in those areas. So, we would like a lot of time to analyze this but then also really come together and work with DCP to create these maps in partnership with industrial business professionals, with our communities to be able to have maps that make sense and support and preserve industrial businesses.

So, yes, I'll leave it there.

CHARLES YU: Hi, good afternoon Committee and Council Members. My name is Charles Yu and I'm the VP of Economic Development at the Long Island City Partnership. Thank you for this opportunity to testify today.

First, we thank the Council for passing IDAP that made the New York City Industrial Plan possible, which the release of the draft plan last week. We look forward to working with city agencies, the Council, and community partners, like the ones that are here today during the engagement period to fine tune the plan.

We support land use framework for Long Island City and speaking for Long Island City, we think it reflects our neighborhoods unique dynamics and align with what many stakeholders have shared in recent planning discussions. We also recognize that some aspect of the IBZ policies can - may need to be updated to provide more flexibility and better reflect today's reality. While we view the framework proposed for Long Island City as a helpful approach, it is important to continue a thoughtful discussion about how to balance the need to strengthen the industrial areas with the realities of mixed use

neighborhoods. The draft plan also underscores the importance of improving and optimizing industrial business support, offered by the Department of Small Business Services. As a current IBSP ourselves, our organization sees first hand how critical this support is. Over the past year, our team has provided one on one assistance to dozens of local businesses, including many minority and women owned companies, helping them navigate real estate pressures, financing, energy savings and operational challenges. Yet IBSP funding has remained flat for more than a decade despite inflation and growing demands for our services.

To deliver on the city's own goals outlining the plan, we urge the Council to help us increase IBSP funding by 50 percent index future allocations to inflation and extend contract to three year terms providing stability needed to support industrial businesses and preserve good paying and family supporting jobs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Thank you folks for coming today. I just - I think what all of us on the dais at least would really appreciate and I know you folks are probably already thinking about this but giving

us any and all of the defined lines that you think need to be included or expanded beyond. I know we already have some of our IBZ maps but if there are other areas or other streets that need to be included, you know we have three months until this plan is supposed to be final. I mean while we have a list of events that we know are going to happen per borough, that doesn't necessary mean that we shouldn't be engaging in consistent dialogue week to week on some of these items. So, please use us as a resource as usual and I'll take any designs of streets for me to send over as recommendation.

PANEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Of course. Any questions from members?

CHARLES YU: Can we follow up with Ridgewood as well?

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Okay, great. This panel is now excused, thank you. Seeing no other in person testimony, we will now turn to virtual panelists. For virtual panelists, once your name is called, a member of our staff will unmute you and the Sergeant at Arms will set the timer and give you the go ahead to begin. Please wait for the Sergeant to announce

that you may begin before delivering your testimony.

And I'll call the first virtual panelist which is
Brady Meixell.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Starting time.

BRADY MEIXELL: Good afternoon Chair Farias and
members of the Committee on Economic Development. I
am Brady Meixell, the Southwest Brooklyn Industrial
Development Corporation. We're proud members of the
Industrial Jobs Coalition.

Industrial jobs are extremely important to our
communities as they provide strong wages, low
barriers to entry and career pathways for those
without college education and for those whom English
is a second language.

Any strategy for equitable economic development
must consider how to preserve and grow these
important sectors in New York City. That's why we're
enthusiastic supporters in the Council's Industrial
Development Action Plan legislation. A draft NYC
Industrial Plan released last week contains several
strong recommendations for new and continued policies
to support industrial businesses, however notably,
the current draft plan weakens the single most

important aspect of city industrial policy. Land Use productions for industrially zoned land.

Nearly 20 years ago and through three very different mayoral administrations, the industrial business zone policy and its inherent promise to not allow residential rezonings within its territory, has kept industrial businesses and their good paying accessible jobs within the five boroughs. Now with the Draft NYC Industrial Plan that fails to uphold these vital protections and leaves much of the IBZ's outside of the designated primary and secondary industrial areas, a likely market outcome will be a conversion away from industrial use and loss of these quality accessible jobs.

Given Council's directive in the IDAP legislation, the plan to strengthen the industrial sector, we urge DCP to update its final version to uphold the IBZ structure and include all IBZ land as either primary or secondary industrial areas. And the draft plan also seeks to optimize business support through the IBZ program. Year after year it becomes more difficult to continue to maintain our staffing and provide a number of free services while the IBSP contractor we rely on has remained static

and has not been adjusted for inflation in many years.

To ensure that industrial businesses remain and thrive in New York City, uh and the IBSP's can continue to play a vital role in serving them, we ask this Committee and City Council to help ensure that next year, city budget include a three year IBSP contract with a 50 percent increase in its index to inflation going forward.

Thank you for your time today and for understanding the importance of the industrial sector to our city.

CHAIRPERSON FARIAS: Perfect timing. Thank you and I will continue the fight as I usually have had the last couple budgets on the IBSP funding. Maybe we should all convene and scheme on a different strategy this year.

Seeing no one else virtually and no one in person, we've now heard from everyone who has signed up to testify. Okay, if we have inadvertently missed anyone who would like to testify in person, please visit the Sergeants table and complete a witness slip now. If we have inadvertently missed anyone who would like to testify virtually, please use the raise

hand function in Zoom and a member of our staff will call on you in order of hands raised.

Seeing none, I would like to note again that written testimony will be reviewed in full by Committee Staff, may be submitted to the record up to 72 hours of the close of this hearing by emailing it to testimony@council.nyc.gov. And the hearing today is now adjourned. [GAVEL]

C E R T I F I C A T E

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



Date October 10, 2025