



**Public Comment—Rheingold Brewery
City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises
November 12th, 2013**

Mr. Chair, Council members, thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Edison Walkes and I have been a member of SEIU Local 32BJ for 40 years. SEIU 32BJ represents 70,000 members in New York City, including residential workers, security officers and commercial members such as myself. On behalf of my fellow members, I am here today to express support for the Rheingold Breweries project.

I am a maintenance worker in a commercial building on 7th Avenue and I have been at this job for 40 years now. I moved to the States from Barbados 43 years ago, and the first three years were rough. I moved from job to job, but then I got a union job and became a member of Local 32BJ. I went from making minimum wage, which was \$1.68 an hour, to over a dollar more. That meant an extra \$100 in wages every month and back in 1973 that made a big difference. It gave me the opportunity to have savings and to raise a family in this city.

I was able to buy a house right near where this project would be, in Ridgewood, Queens, back in 1979, the same house as I live in now. My wife and I raised our four children there. My children went to P.S. 68 and P.S. 77, just five or six blocks away from where we live and then eventually I sent all four of them to college. I paid for my wife to go to college as well.

Having a union job that paid a living wage helped me tremendously, in particular with the rent and housing payments, and paying for groceries, especially if you have a child. If it were not for this union, I would not have the medical coverage for my wife and children. My family would not have been able to pursue their studies.

I was glad to hear that Read Property Group has committed to responsible development and creating more good jobs such as mine. Being a member of 32BJ has made a real difference for me and my family and if through local hiring more people in our area can have the opportunities that I have had, that will be a real gain for the city.

I also worked with HPD for 16 and a half years as a 32BJ member doing maintenance, and I know the importance of affordable housing. So I am glad to hear that there will be hundreds of units of affordable housing created in the area through this project, because being able to own a house that I can afford has been a real help in raising my family in this city and helping us be longstanding members of our community. The city needs to create

more good jobs such as mine, and so for these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this project.

10/29/2013

**NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP
QUESTIONS AND ARTICULATION OF CONCERNS REGARDING
RHEINGOLD REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
northwestbushwick@googlegroups.com**

This document is the North West Bushwick Community Group's questions and mitigations that they submitted to the Rheingold developer Read Property for their first Advisory Panel Committee Meeting on 10/29 organized by Councilwoman Diana Reyna.

Brigette Blood. (on behalf of neighbors/renters)

1.This Read Properties Rheingold proposal will drastically influence and unbalance the rental housing market in Bushwick. We require a modified proposal & written declarations reflecting the developer's acknowledgment, understanding, and responsiveness to the specific (economic, historic, cultural, manufacturing, and environmental) make-up of Bushwick. This grasp of the reality of Bushwick could only result in a more diverse, just, and successful housing plan for our neighborhood. Factoring in the documented local AMI allows for a clearer understanding of the needs and goals for zoning & housing of Bushwick residents. We do not see this reality reflected in the developers current mitigated plan. We would overwhelmingly prefer to maintain the zoning and tax base as is. We reject this desired detrimental zoning change in our landscape should there be insufficient effort by the developer to respond to our community. How do the developer and Council Member Reyna plan to be responsive to the actual and realistic needs and goals for housing development at the Rheingold site in Bushwick?

2.We require more than the initial 24% below market rate units. A realistic plan would reflect 40% of rental units offered to local residents at a below market rate in perpetuity. We require a range of rental rates accessible to middle and lower earning working families and long term Bushwick residents beyond the 421A 35 year tax abatement term limits. This change will make the proposed residential development more responsive to the reality of bushwick. Do you foresee this development will serve the current demographic of Bushwick? Use of the term "affordable" in bushwick using 60% of AMI is inaccurate. This rate is not affordable by local standards and does not reflect the current rental rates of many who call Bushwick home. We require the 40% of units in the current mitigated proposal be available at 45% AMI. The rate will be adjusted to reflect the local AMI in perpetuity. How will your modified plan consider this reality?

3.The polarizing effect luxury development can have on a community where economic and housing stability are vulnerable to market influences require the developer to make plans and considerations for the community. The long term fabric and pride of Bushwick which Read Properties wants to profit and build on requires Read to build responsibly and build community not just units. Quality of life for those housed in this potential development and those of us who fear the dark shadows these (potential) 8 story developments will cast on our lives; those of us who may be priced out and those of us who will be displaced require space and resources to work, congregate, communicate, and become good neighbors. How will your plan benefit the community, effect quality of life, and allow for neighborly relationships and not serve to create a dichotomy of two kinds of Bushwick?

10/29/2013

**NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP
QUESTIONS AND ARTICULATION OF CONCERNS REGARDING
RHEINGOLD REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
northwestbushwick@googlegroups.com**

Gabriela Rendon. Professor, New School.

1. The housing development is proposing 20% of the housing units to be affordable targeting households earning up to 60% (\$51, 540) of Area Median Income (AMI in 2013 is \$85,900). Other affordable housing developments in the district have targeted households with an specific range, such as 50-60% of AMI (\$42,950-\$51,540 for a family of four). This eligibility criteria has disqualified many households in Bushwick since the median household income is \$35,256 and over 30% of the households earn less than \$20,000 (less than the 30% of the AMI). Is there any eligibility range in this project or is anyone having an income below the 60% of AMI eligible? Affordable housing must benefit Bushwick residents from different ranges of the AMI (ei. less than 40%, 40%-50% and 50%-60%). To mitigate the impact of the market rate housing development the project must provide at least 30% of affordable housing units out of the total units.

2. The community is concerned about the affordable housing units (rent control/stabilized) lost in the district during the last decade due to the pressure of new market rate developments and real estate speculation. Permanent affordable housing is needed to preserve the Bushwick community. Is the applicant already considering the permanent affordability suggested by the Borough President? If this is the case, what type of model are they envisioning to guarantee permanent affordability? and who is going to be in charge of the management of the affordable housing units? In other words, who would supervise or guarantee the permanent affordability?

3. There have been a number of projects in the city with delays in the construction of the affordable housing units once rezoning applications have been approved and tax abatements have been conceded. Are the affordable housing units an integral part of the project (in site)? If this is the case, when are these units going to be constructed in relation with the schedule of the buildings? what is the estimated time of occupation?

Renee Pepperone, Bushwick Eco-Action Network

1. Due to the open space ratios in Bushwick being so dismal as reflected in the FEIS report, would you reconsider the location and quality of open space to a community informed location (not in between the two proposed buildings) sensitive to the context of the proposed site's immediate surroundings? In addition, would you be open to creative solutions for additional green space?

2. Specifically and in detail, how does the proposed rezoning & development conform to highest present Post Sandy NYC standards regarding; open space ratios, stormwater management, hazardous waste remediation, air quality, Green Building/ LEED/ Passive House standards and using local and low impact building methods. Where you are

10/29/2013

**NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP
QUESTIONS AND ARTICULATION OF CONCERNS REGARDING
RHEINGOLD REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
northwestbushwick@googlegroups.com**

willing/required to seek these standards, how will you work with Bushwick's community in order to do so? ie. advisory panels, liaisons, other collaborative and transparent efforts.

3. The proposed rezoning and development will serve to shift Bushwick's culture of manufacturing (making) to a more passive residential and consumer use. We see this as a lost opportunity. As residents, our interest is in strengthening Bushwick as a resilient community where local skilled labor can be incubated in local spaces and green jobs can be trained for and offered, impacting both our neighbors and our neighborhood ecology. In light of this, are you willing to offer commercial spaces for varied uses that support our current neighborhood demographics, interests and affordability?

Matt Mottel - Owner, URBAN DISTRIBUTION

1. The zoning change from manufacturing to residential use of the Rheingold Property will increase the property value for the developer. Also with the inclusionary 'affordable' housing, the developer will see a tax savings (estimated) 15 million dollars per year for 25/35 years. This saving, while profiting from the market rentals, with the increased value of land will be a windfall for the developer while creating further economic disparity within the community. The opportunity for the Rheingold land owner to 'support' Bushwick by directly contributing economic aid to both local long term businesses looking to expand and support new entrepreneurship must be included in the Restrictive Declaration. Bushwick's business community demands to be included in the decision making process for whom the 74,000 square feet of available business space is rented to. Will Rheingold and Reyna be supportive of Bushwick's community based economic needs?

--

2. Bushwick has a long standing relationship of industrial worker's living in the community. The 74,000 square feet of available business space within the proposed development, should be used to serve Bushwick's community needs as a mode to be an economic booster of the local economy. Bushwick does not need additional pharmacies, banks, clothing stores and other national box chain stores that employ part time workers at low hourly wages. Adjacent to the proposed development sits numerous empty retail locations. Bushwick needs opportunities to incentive growth both through City backed development plans such as NYC's Commercial Expansion Program which creates opportunities for qualified commercial or industrial tenants located in targeted Commercial Expansion Areas (zoned M1, M2, M3, C4, C5, C6) can receive a 3 or 5 year rent credit of up to \$2.50 per square foot. Benefits are based on the length of the lease and the size

of the company. NYS Excelsior Jobs Program

The NYS Excelsior Jobs Program provides job creation and investment incentives to firms in such targeted industries as biotechnology, pharmaceutical, high-tech, clean-technology.

Beyond a program such as this, the developer should contribute capital development costs at the sum of 3 million dollars to form a Bushwick community organized non profit

10/29/2013

**NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP
QUESTIONS AND ARTICULATION OF CONCERNS REGARDING
RHEINGOLD REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
northwestbushwick@googlegroups.com**

organization; 'Bushwick Business Development Incubator'.

The capital costs would go to purchase industrial equipment that can be shared among multiple businesses and start up costs that can be used to contribute to Bushwick's growing small business community. Instead of just renting retail space in these buildings to maximize profit, the developer has an opportunity to establish 'good will' and create an ethical and non commercial opportunity for businesses to grow and expand. The non profit organization would manage the 74k of commercial space within the 4 proposed buildings. This organization would provide training, resources, work with other Brooklyn based job training centers to pair employers with employees. This investment on the property site of the developer will ensure that the businesses will be long term growth oriented. Annual contributions of \$500k per year would cover operational costs of the non profit organization.

An example of this type of project already working in NYC is with the Seward Park Mixed use Development Project sponsored by the New York City Economic Development Corporation. If Read Property claims to want to be a 'good neighbor' and active contributor to the Bushwick economy then this type of engagement makes sense, especially since they will still be drawing a large profit each year alone from the savings in taxes. What are Reyna and Read Property's thoughts and comments regarding this stipulation that must be included in the Restrictive Declaration?

3. How do we ensure that current business owners not be priced out of the neighborhood's other rezoned sites that are not on the Rheingold property? For example Borough President Marty Markowitz recommends that the Beaver Street/Bushwick Street/Garden Street location stay as a Manufacturing Zone to ensure that the local supermarket stays in business and does not get turned into another large scale market rate residential development. Bushwick currently has only one large supermarket serving a diverse community of neighbors, and it is threatened to be rezoned out of existence. The other businesses along Flushing Avenue that are in the Rezoning Map also need assurances that they will not be forced out once the rezoning takes place. If they have no other option than to relocate, the developer must pay for both moving and restarting business costs in a new location

Jessica Perez, Homeowner at Rheingold Gardens.

1) The homeowners at the base of the construction, which will directly be impacted by the rezoning and development have the following concerns we would like addressed, discussed, and the agreed upon resolutions documented in a memorandum of understanding with Read Development:

Property and utility damage process: Homeowners incurred damage expenses due to a previous development that took place by another developer on Melrose. We are concerned with all the construction taking place that another issue will arise. We would like to discuss what will be covered, and develop an efficient and effective remediation process.

Construction impact on the Rheingold Garden residents: In addition to the

10/29/2013

**NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP
QUESTIONS AND ARTICULATION OF CONCERNS REGARDING
RHEINGOLD REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT
northwestbushwick@googlegroups.com**

stipulations noted for the E designation, we are concerned about other impacts not included, such as the existing rodent problem getting worse during construction.

Garbage Pickup: It took almost a year for the current building located around the Rheingold Garden homes to switch where the garbage was placed for pick up. We are asking to minimize the rodents and foul order on Stanwix Street by placing the garbage on Evergreen and Bushwick.

Parking garage entrances: To reduce the flow up traffic on Stanwix we ask that the parking garage entrances located on Stanwix Street be moved to Evergreen for Building G and Melrose Street for Building I.

Communication: We would like to have open communication and begin a relationship between Read Development and the Rheingold Gardens Home Owners Association. At minimum, during construction, we would like notification of important information, such as construction dates and areas affected. This information can then be relayed to the homeowners and condo owners within Rheingold Gardens.

2) We ask that rezoning only be approved for the blocks in which Read has noted as the planned development, leaving blocks 3137 and 3138 with current zoning of M1-1. The ULURP process should be used for blocks outside the planned development, at the time a development project is proposed for those specific blocks, allowing the city to more accurately assess the impact of those projects.

3) If the rezoning levels are reduced and/or the garage entrances are moved to Evergreen and Melrose, we ask that the Department of Transportation reevaluate the need for street openings, traffic redirections and parking regulations. In addition to the congestion noted within the DEIS, we believe the DEIS does not accurately reflect the parking issue currently negatively impacting residents. This issue will only be exasperated as more residents are introduced while parking regulation changes remove currently available street parking. Low income residents cannot afford the added expense of having to pay for parking.

Brigette Blood - Bushwick Renter
North West Bushwick Community Group
Public Testimony at City Council Hearing - Rheingold Development
11/12/2013

I am here today a 10 year resident of Bushwick representing the voice of the NORTH WEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY GROUP and the RENTERS of THE RHEINGOLD ADVISORY PANEL.

Since September 3rd, when first learning of Read Property's proposal for rezoning & redevelopment in my neighborhood I have joined hundreds of my neighbors and some of our community organizations some in outrage & all with communal desire for a modified, more inclusive proposal. We have organized rapidly and effectively -gaining Bushwick wide support as we advocate for **locally** affordable housing and real community needs to be met as we are asked by READ to give-up our valuable manufacturing zoning.

We have been in dialogue with READ through the RHEINGOLD ADVISORY PANEL and we have begun to draft a COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENT which we ask the City Council to support & READ to sign before the December 10th COUNCIL VOTE.

The community does not support this project if READ does not sign a negotiated COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENT.

Bushwick's learning curve has been steep and rapid. We have researched, consulted many legal and urban planning experts, outreached, and crunched the numbers with finance and economic experience. We understand the business model of the developer and we see room for an increase in affordable units and REAL Community Needs to be met. With a negotiated & signed CBA the resulting mitigated proposal meets community needs, allows for a viable business model, and a successful IHP & 421A for the developer.

We welcome development that meets BUSHWICK'S COMMUNITY NEEDS
and

We require 35% Permanently Affordable Housing Units at the Rheingold Property.

Traditional avenues for community concerns & voice have been obfuscated during this ULURP. Caught off guard we none the less articulated a clear community response and are currently in dialogue with READ who is "in consideration" of meeting COMMUNITY NEEDS.

We expect this process of mutual understanding & developing mitigations to continue and we expect the CITY COUNCIL to vote YES with READ Properties commitment to a final negotiated CBA.

The Community that proudly makes Bushwick and makes Bushwick home ask for further mitigations, a modified proposal, support of the CBA, and a commitment from the developer to fulfil & maintain their end of the CBA. Bushwick asks for the HUMAN RIGHT of HOUSING in our own COMMUNITY.

Housing is a HUMAN RIGHT. This unmitigated proposal threatens that human right for many who make bushwick and make bushwick home now. The Community Requires 35% Affordable Housing. 40% of AMI is more reflective of what is affordable for bushwick residents. we require a range of AMI's available in the affordable units.

THANK YOU.
Brigette Blood

Matthew Mottel - Bushwick Business Owner
North West Bushwick Community Group
Public Testimony at City Council Hearing - Rheingold Development
11/12/2013

Hello, my name is matthew mottel, i am a 10 year business owner in Bushwick and want to thank the city council for allowing me to articulate a response to Read Property's request to re-develop the Rheingold Property.

Rheingold is currently zoned for manufacturing. It has been a lost opportunity that it has sat dormant for so many years.

The 'innovative economy' needs to come to Bushwick. Brooklyn is experiencing a growth spurt in technology based business, and an expansion of this industrial model into Bushwick will recast Bushwick as the center for development and industry. The goal of Bushwick industry should be to create sustainable, environmentally safe business, employing Bushwick residents with good jobs.

The eye of real estate and the focus to develop Bushwick is upon us. Read has a right as a private land-owner to request that this land be rezoned so they can build housing for a demanding market. As a community of Bushwick neighbors, we have to accept that development will happen. However the cost of this development should not be only on the backs of the long term residents who will be displaced by gentrification.

Ethically, it is Read Properties moral responsibility to care for the community they are building in. Read gains economically from this project in two ways. First, the land value will increase exponentially when the land is rezoned from manufacturing to residential. Second, by offering a yet to be determined % of affordable housing (that North West Bushwick Community Group maintains needs to be at a minimum of 35 % of total units) Read Property will enjoy a tax abatement of 25 to 35 years. These two economic windfalls for Read give the community the moral authority to ask for something back.

The manufacturing and retail space that remains on Read's land must be used to enhance the existing community's economic sustainability. Locally owned businesses must inhabit the retail space that will be developed. Corporate chains have no place in this development. Instead, Read should be obligated to provide capital investment and organizational costs to operate a non profit business incubator to manage industrial space in the Mademoiselle building to allow for Bushwick based businesses to have a chance to compete in the global market.

The city council has the authority to grant Read's request to rezone the Rheingold land. The council must hold Read accountable for transforming the economic landscape of Bushwick, by enabling the long term community the right to co-exist with their new neighbors. The City Council should follow the Brooklyn Borough President's recommendation that the rezoning only happen on the Rheingold land and not on adjacent land that could be re-developed by speculators.

Read must sign a negotiated Community Benefits Agreement. Only through Read's legal agreement to a CBA can the community in good faith support this project. It is my hope that Read recognizes the responsibility they undertake by asking for the community to accept both the rezoning and the scale of their development. With this, they need to provide the community with the economic assets, tools, space and machinery to facilitate our Bushwick neighbors to continue to live and thrive in a proud and diverse neighborhood.

thank you very much,
Matthew Mottel

Morning, my name is Ramon Peguero, Executive Director of Southside United Housing Development Fund Corporation, better known as Los Sures.

For the past 41 years, we have work against the grain to first be part of the development of North Brooklyn, and now to stop the displacement of long time residents by developers that now view North Brooklyn as the new frontier for development.

While many people might not understand the big deal with a rezoning or the value associated with the same, this committee and this council do. Many times we have seen speculators buy properties in the hope that they could later on get a rezoning and either flip the property for a huge profit or building more attractive and profitable market rent residential housing.

The tale of two cities that our mayor elect discussed during his campaign is evident in the housing market. Private developers are getting rich using rezoning and subsidies from the city, while not for profit organizations and the residents they serve are left to fend for themselves.

This committee and this council have the opportunity to right this wrong by mandating real partnerships between private developers and community not for profit developers that understand the need of the communities that they serve.

Language mandating these real partnerships must be the legal foundation for any rezoning in any part of the City.

Developers develop for profit. As such, I believe that they should be required to put money in escrow to ensure that they will follow through with all commitments put on them by this council for any rezoning that takes place.

If you were to ask me, \$1,000,000 will be a good sum of money that will entice any developer to stick to his/her word.

Revocability of the rezoning for failure to adhere to agreed upon commitments should also be part of any deal.

And finally, any developer that requires municipal action that will benefit them should be mandated to provide at minimum 30 percent of the housing units developed as permanently affordable.

Thanks you for your time and attention.

Statement on Rheingold Development Proposal & Associated Rezoning
Renée Peperone, BEAN founder, Bushwick Resident & Property Owner
on behalf of Bushwick Eco Action Network (BEAN)

Submitted Questions by BEAN to Developer via Diana Reyna's Office (unanswered):

1. Due to the open space ratios in Bushwick being so dismal as reflected in the FEIS report, would you reconsider the location and quality of open space to a community informed location (not in between the two proposed buildings) sensitive to the context of the proposed site's immediate surroundings? In addition, would you be open to creative solutions for additional green space in collaboration with the community?
2. Specifically and in detail, how does the proposed rezoning & development conform to highest present Post Sandy NYC standards regarding; open space ratios, stormwater management, hazardous waste remediation, air quality, Green Building/ LEED/ Passive House standards and using local and low impact building methods? Where you are willing/required to seek these standards, how will you work with Bushwick's community in order to do so? ie. advisory panels, liaisons, other collaborative and transparent efforts.
3. The proposed rezoning and development will serve to shift Bushwick's culture of manufacturing (making) to a more passive residential and consumer use. We see this as a lost opportunity. As residents, our interest is in strengthening Bushwick as a resilient community where local skilled labor can be incubated in local spaces and green jobs can be trained for and offered, impacting both our neighbors and our neighborhood ecology. In light of this, are you willing to offer commercial spaces for varied uses that support our current neighborhood demographics, interests and affordability?

Why We Oppose:

1. Overall we reject development without a balanced and sincere effort to buffer the indirect displacement of our community members and neighbors.
2. Due to years of urban planning/development without comprehensive community input we feel changing the zoning is shortsighted and not necessarily in the best interest of present Bushwick residents.
3. We require the zoning change to be motivated by the context of greater Bushwick's needs as opposed to simply the interests of outside investment and real estate speculation. We are a community that deserves consideration.
4. We believe, through informed and careful consideration, manufacturing could be re-envisioned in Bushwick setting the stage for healthy and environmentally sound local industry such as shared co-packing facilities, cooperative kitchen/food hub, shared workspace, a green infrastructure training hub (for example), or green businesses such as those located in Gowanus (Build it Green, LES Ecology Center etc). We support encouraging a culture of makers and job creators vs the more passive and consumer retail and residential combination that serves to strain and destroy neighborhoods.
5. On a fundamental level we cannot have the lack of open space go unmitigated by the rezoning as it is currently proposed. The area being considered for rezoning is already egregiously underserved in regards to accessible open space. What the developer is

proposing is not enough to buffer the impact they will have by adding the estimated 3,000 additional people.

6. We are concerned about the inclusion of all lots in the zoning change other than the ones designs have been submitted for. To preserve our local quality of life it is important that each developer of each lot submit plans and an environmental impact study for consideration on a case by case basis. Each lot's use and impact needs to be considered within the context of Bushwick's continuing development and our existing community as a whole specific to the plans of development for each lot.

Approve (or Disapprove) with Modifications/Conditions:

- Open Space
 - The numbers taken into consideration for the ¼ mile & ½ mile studies surrounding the proposed development we find questionable. This is b/c the data is based on the 2000 & 2010 census. While these numbers are ordinarily acceptable Bushwick is known to have a large immigrant population. It can be assumed that this includes a large undocumented population that would not participate in the census and therefore not be represented in this study creating an even less of an open space ratio per 1,000 people. These numbers should be taken into consideration in order to reflect a more accurate open space ratio.
 - The parks included in the ¼ mile and ½ mile study are predominantly located within existing housing developments or public schools limiting their "public" nature and accessibility. This is inherently less than open and publically accessible space. From the greater community's standpoint we argue that this is not open space in practice.
 - Please note that four of the parks included in the ½ mile study are located on the border of the areas considered.
- Stormwater Management
 - While we acknowledge Rheingold's intention to follow the NYC 2012 Green Infrastructure Guidelines, how this will be implemented has yet to be clearly iterated. Bushwick is presently
- Hazardous Waste
 - E designation is a useful and powerful tool that we support. Remediation, however, requires transparency and rigor to preserve and protect public health adequately. This requires a bilingual Community Liaison and real time air monitoring accessible online and offline until all remediation is complete.
- Air Quality
 - Increased truck traffic is a concern in an already over burdened area struggling with very little green space and existing high asthma rates.
- The absence of Renewable Energy in the plan. (ie Solar, Geothermal for heating/cooling needs)
- The absence of Sewer Abatement in the plan. (ie low flush toilets)
- The absence of any intention to build using Green, LEED, Passive House Standards, local and low impact methods.

Following are some initial recommendations to the proposed plan:

1. Addition of a Green Roof (Open Space Ratio & Stormwater Mitigation, Air quality, & exclusive space for additional population)
2. Relocate Open Space on grounds of development to a community informed optimal location sensitive to the context of the proposed development site's immediate surroundings. Also allow for a community informed use for better integration between existing and new residents. This may or may not mitigate other quality of life issues

brought up by the immediate neighbors directly impacted by the size and placement of the development.

3. Making available additional owned property (Block 3152 Lots 37 through 44) for a community garden or community defined green space.
4. Participatory (community) input on use of capital park improvement funds allocated to Green Knoll Park for mitigation regarding OSR (open space ratio).
5. The offered 350k for such mitigation is not substantially impactful within the fiscal and bureaucratic constraints of the NYC Parks Dept and the open space needs of the community. We are also concerned about upkeep beyond an initial investment.
6. Space for local businesses and local green industry, incubation & training opportunities.
7. Contextual design relevant to the neighborhood not only specific to the lots.
8. Contextual zoning relevant to the neighborhood not only specific to the developer.
9. Binding terms attached to a binding timeline prioritizing all community agreements.
10. Affordable housing relevant and accessible to Bushwick's local existing population.
11. Meeting Green, LEED, Passive House Standards, and using local and low impact methods, communicated in NYC Building Resiliency Task Force report.

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jose Lopez

Address: 45 St. Nicholas Ave

I represent: Make the R

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 951-953 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Aditi Sen

Address: _____

I represent: SEIU 32B

Address: 25 W. 18 St

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 951-953 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Rachel Cohen

Address: _____

I represent: SEIU 32B

Address: 25 W. 18 St.

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ramon Peguero

Address: 213 S. 4th Street

I represent: Los Sures

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Rob Solana

Address: 66 Whipple Street Brooklyn, NY 11206

I represent: Churches United For Fair Housing

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

951-932

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11-12-2013

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Maxio Bella

Address: 792 Hart St. Apt. 3R Brooklyn, NY 11237-3534

I represent: Churches United for Fair Housing

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

Ⓟ

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 952 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: RAUL E. SANCHEZ

Address: 145 EVERGREEN AVE.

I represent: Churches United For Fair Housing

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 952 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Bruno Daniel

Address: 842 Kent Ave Brooklyn, NY 11205

I represent: Churches United For Fair Housing

Address: 66 Whipple Street Brooklyn 11206

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 951 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Debra Medina

Address: 213 South 4th St, Bklyn.

I represent: Southside United Housing DFC

Address: 213 South 4th St, Bklyn

◆ Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms ◆

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

953

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Edison Walkes

Address: _____

I represent: SEIU-Local 32BJ

Address: 25 W 18 St

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

952
953

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 952, 953 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ANTHONY ARMSTRONG

Address: 15 Calder Place

I represent: Design Concept Architects

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

952
953

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Madeline Laureano

Address: 60 DIVISION AVE #25H BROOKLYN NY 11249

I represent: Rheingold

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

952
953

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Eugene Ortiz

Address: 1040 Bushwick Ave BK NY 11221

I represent: Rheingold

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

953
952

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ramirez Alfredo

Address: Knickerbocker & Hancock

I represent: Rheingold

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 9512 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11-12-13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Carolann Johns

Address: 24 Sweeney Road Massapequa N.Y.

I represent: St. Nick's Alliance

Address: 790 Bway Brooklyn N.Y. 11206

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

952

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/2013

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jessica Perez

Address: 13 Noll St Brooklyn NY 11206

I represent: Rheingold HOA

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 952 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jason Younghw Lee

Address: 139-81 35 Ave Apt #2J Flushing NY 11354

I represent: Brooklyn Legal Services

Address: 260 Broadway Brooklyn NY 11211

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

951

953

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Briyette Blood

Address: 319 ELLERY ST #12

I represent: NORTHWEST BUSHWICK COMMUNITY

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

951
953

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Matthew Mottel

Address: 319 Elery St #112 Bklyn NY 11206

I represent: Northwest Bushwick Community Group

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

951-

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: RENÉE PEPEONE

Address: 240 STARR ST BROOKLYN, NY 11237

I represent: BUSHWICK ECO ACTION NETWORK

Address: 240 STARR ST, BR-OKLYN, NY 11237

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

951-953

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Ed Wallace

Address: _____

I represent: Applicant Frost Lots LLC

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

951-953

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jennifer Dickson

Address: 2 Park Ave

I represent: Applicant Forest Lots LLC

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

951-953

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Mitch Korbel

Address: _____

I represent: Applicant Forest Lots LLC

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 951 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: David Casio

Address: 5 Renaissance Ct Brooklyn, NY

I represent: Rheinhold HOA

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms