

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
MARITIME USES

2 CITY COUNCIL
3 CITY OF NEW YORK

4 ----- X

5 TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

6 Of the

7 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC
8 SITING AND MARITIME USES

9 ----- X

10 May 01, 2018
11 Start: 12:18 p.m.
12 End: 1:16 p.m.

13 HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Rm, 16th
14 Floor

15 B E F O R E: COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS

16 COUNCIL MEMBERS:

17 Adrienne E. Adams
18 Inez D. Barron
19 Peter A. Koo
20 I. Daneek Miller
21 Mark Treyger

22 APPEARANCES: Panelist Silberman, General Council of
23 the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission

24 Panelist Giardina Capehart, Budget
25 Director for the Commission

Joseph Rosenberg and Collen Heimer for
Landmarks Conservancy

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Good afternoon and
4 welcome to this meeting of the Subcommittee on
5 Landmarks, Public Siting and Maritime Uses. I am
6 Council Member Adrienne Adams, the Chair of this
7 Subcommittee. Today, we are joined by Council
8 Members Koo, Salamanca, Treyger and Yeger. Today we
9 will be holding one public hearing and voting on
10 three items. The items we'll be voting on were heard
11 in our April 17th meeting. We will be voting to
12 approve LU63, the application by ACS and DCAS for the
13 acquisition of property located at 4917 4th Avenue in
14 Council Member Menchaca's district in Brooklyn for
15 the continued use of Saint Andrews Community Daycare
16 Center. We will also be voting to approve LU51, the
17 application submitted by Montefiore Cemetery in
18 Council Member Miller's district. Montefiore
19 Cemetery seeks approval to use approximately two
20 acres of land located across the street from the
21 existing cemetery for additional burial space. We
22 will also be voting on a bill related to this
23 application purposed INTRO 212A by Council Member
24 Miller. A Local Law to Amend the Administrative Code
25 of the City of New York in relation to approval of

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 York City Council, we should consider the point. We
4 should have equal opportunity for everyone who wants
5 to buy that part of land in particular cemetery.

6 Thank you.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you Council Member.

8 CLERK: Treyger?

9 COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: I.

10 CLERK: By a vote of three in the affirmative.

11 Zero in the negative and zero abstentions, all items
12 are approved and recommended to the full Land Use
13 Committee.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you Council. We
15 will now move on to our public hearing which is on
16 Introduction number 368 by Council Member Salamanca.
17 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the
18 city of New York in relation to authorizing the
19 Landmarks Preservation Commission to administer
20 historic preservation grant program. LPC administers
21 a historic preservation grant program funding by the
22 department of housing and urban developments CDBG
23 program. This program provides grants of \$10,000 to
24 \$30,000 to owners of designated landmarks who are
25 qualifying nonprofits and individuals. Until
recently, LPC's website indicated that religious

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 institutions were prohibited from participating in
4 the program. This bill would authorize LPZ to
5 administer its historic preservation grant programs
6 using local, state, and federal funds provided it
7 does not discriminate against owners on the basis of
8 their religious or nonreligious character. To
9 maintain consistency with the Landmarks Law and to
10 ensure that such grants do not violate the first
11 amendments establishment clause. The bill would
12 restrict the use of grant funds to the maintenance
13 and the preservation of exteriors of religious
14 institutions and prohibit the use of such funds to
15 maintain the interiors of spaces used for religious
16 worship. I now recognize the bill Sponsor Chair
17 Salamanca.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: I want to thank you
19 Chair Adams and good afternoon to everyone. I just
20 want to talk a little bit about – I just want to give
21 a briefing on this bill and how it came to light.
22 When I first got elected in 2016, one of the first
23 tasks that I had was approving the Landmarks of a
24 church, Immaculate Conception in my district which
25 was built in the late 1800's and I met with Landmarks
and I was in favor of landmarking it. It was a

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 beautiful structure and so I got a visit from the
4 local pastor Father Skelly who is community oriented
5 and is a staple in our community and Father Skelly
6 asked that this application be removed from being
7 landmarked because his parishioners – they don't come
8 from wealth and therefore the contributions that they
9 give to the church was not something to what other
10 more prominent communities are afforded to give and
11 his concern was that the building needed capital
12 improvements and landmarking the building was going
13 to handcuff them to putting capital improvements at a
14 higher cost than they can afford. So, I told Father
15 Skelly that I will support him and the Archdiocese on
16 this request. However, we would have to come to some
17 type of agreement because this was a beautiful
18 building and it deserved to be landmarked. So, it
19 took me two years and after two years, we were able
20 to get to a good place where we have a bill that
21 gives religious institutions the ability to landmark
22 their buildings but gives them that access to funding
23 where they can fix the structure of the building and
24 ultimately, we can do what we are tasked to do which
25 is to preserve that building. So, I am extremely

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 excited that we are finally here to hear this piece
4 of legislation. Thank you.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you very much
6 Council Member Salamanca. We will now call on our
7 panelist for the morning. Mark Silberman and Ms.
8 Capehart, please step up. Mr. Capehart.

9 CLERK: Please raise your right hand and please
10 state your names. Please state your names.

11 PANELIST SILBERMAN: I'm Mark Silberman.

12 PANELIST CAPEHART: Giardina Capehart.

13 CLERK: Please raise your right hands. Do you
14 affirm to tell the truth, the whole true, and nothing
15 but the truth in your testimony before this committee
16 and in response to all Council Member questions?

17 PANELIST SILBERMAN: I do.

18 PANELIST CAPEHART: I do.

19 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Good afternoon Chairs,
20 Salamanca, and Adams and members of the subcommittee.
21 I am Mark Silberman, General Council of the New York
22 City Landmarks Preservation Commission and with me
23 today is Giardina Capehart Budget Director for the
24 Commission. We are here on behalf of Chair
25 Srinivasan[SP?] to provide testimony on INTRO 368.
The purposed legislation amends the landmarks law by

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 expertise and assistance for when applicants seek to
4 make changes to a property. We are also currently
5 working on a series of rule changes that would
6 promote preservation by making the application
7 process for work more efficient and less costly. The
8 Archdiocese of New York and Diocese of Brooklyn
9 testified in favor of the changes on behalf of the
10 Catholic Church which owns over 140 landmark
11 structures throughout the five boroughs. We are also
12 proud that under this administration, the city has
13 been a strong supporter of Federal and State Tax
14 Credits for the rehabilitation of historic properties
15 which were at risk in the recent budget cycles. On
16 behalf of the commission, we thank you for allowing
17 us to testify today and are happy to answer any
18 questions you might have.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you very much. Mr.
20 Silberman, LPC's website for its CDBG funded historic
21 preservation grant program once stated that buildings
22 used for religious purposes were ineligible for
23 grants. LPC recently changed its website to state
24 that Federal Regulations may restrict the use of CDBG
25 funds for such buildings. Is LPC currently accepting

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 grant applications from religious institutions and if
4 so, what is it doing with those applications?

5 PANELIST SILBERMAN: We are currently accepting
6 grant application from any eligible not for profit.
7 We are waiting. We have not awarded any grants, we
8 are waiting to get a response from HUD to see what
9 restrictions and how we can properly you know, apply
10 those finds to religious applicants.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you. You've
12 referenced in your testimony a wait on HUD. Is there
13 any response as far as follow up or a timeframe from
14 them at this point?

15 PANELIST SILBERMAN: We have not heard of any.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay. How many houses of
17 worship have been landmarked to date?

18 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Well its an interesting
19 question. There are approximately 490 buildings used
20 known by religious entities that have been
21 designated. That includes both individual landmarks
22 and buildings within the districts and that's
23 buildings. Specifically, houses of worship our data
24 base shows that there is 319.
25

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay. Now you've
4 mentioned in your testimony that LPC landmarks
5 interior portions of houses of worship only.

6 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Exteriors.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Exterior, I'm sorry.
8 Exterior. How does or can LPC ensure that grant
9 funds will not be used to improve interior spaces
10 used for worship?

11 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Well, grants are awarded
12 for specific work and we have a grant - our grant
13 program staff is very, very involved in these grant
14 applications. We are working with the contractors,
15 we are working with the specifications. So, you
16 know, we're very - we monitor closely the scope of
17 work that's happening. So, that's the way we would
18 know that its not being used.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay, and what types of
20 restoration work are typical of religious
21 institutions that are different from nonreligious
22 institutions and how do those differences effect the
23 cost of maintenance?

24 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Well religious buildings
25 tend and not always but tend to be you know fairly
robust mason rebuilding's with ornamental designs on

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 the outside. So, in that sense, they tend to be - a
4 lot of the cost has to be masonry repair and
5 restoration to the extent that sculptural detail and
6 other kinds of ornamental detail need to be
7 addressed. They can be more expensive for that
8 reason.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: And has the city ever
10 authorized the use of expense or capital funds for
11 historic preservation?

12 PANELIST SILBERMAN: For historic preservation?

13 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Historic preservation.

14 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Of religious -

15 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Has the city ever
16 authorized the use of expense or capital funds for
17 historic religious institution?

18 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Do you want to answer that
19 Giardia?

20 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, for the grant program
21 there has been one grant awarded to the complication
22 of [inaudible 16:54], that was for a cemetery wall
23 and so that grant was approved because it wasn't for
24 religious purposes. The cemetery obviously it was to
25 prevent [inaudible 17:09] conditions and also to
protect the public safety. So, the grant program

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 you only use \$80,000 or \$100,000, where does that
4 extra \$15,000 go?

5 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, that money is in a
6 general CDBG funding pool that comes to the city.
7 That is managed by the Office of Management and
8 Budget OMB. So, for whenever there is underspending
9 in one area, so our historic preservation program
10 being one area of that, if it is underspending in one
11 area, OMB has the ability to transfer funding to
12 another area that will need additional funding, which
13 will be - it could be another city agency or within
14 LPC. If that money is not spent, that's something
15 that is left up to OMB to decide how its spent but
16 that's not money that goes back to the Federal
17 Government.

18 PANELIST SILBERMAN: Just so it's clear. So, if
19 money is unspent two different things can happen.
20 One is that we roll it over for use in the next year
21 or there is also the option I guess that OMB can take
22 that money and then use it for other eligible CDBG
23 you know activities by other agencies.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: The first option is
25 the ideal option but that's not whats occurring.

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, its occurring so the way
4 that option works is that in order for it to roll
5 over funding to the next Fiscal Year, it has to be
6 funding that was allocated for a project that is not
7 finished yet. So, if its something – if its funding
8 that is already allocated to a grant project that was
9 approved, and that work has not been completed before
10 the end of the Fiscal Year, we have the ability to
11 roll the funding over to the next Fiscal Year for
12 that project that has already been allocated for to
13 complete that project. But funding that has not been
14 allocated for a specific project because we don't
15 have a lot of applicants that qualify for the grant
16 program, that got approved for a grant, that funding
17 is something that is in the hands of OMB.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Whats the dollar
19 amount that has been rolled over to OMB from this pot
20 in the last five years?

21 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, there are two different
22 things in terms of both OMB – so when it comes to
23 roll over, its not rolled over to OMB. Rolling over
24 means its staying within LPC projects.
25

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: I understand but OMB
4 - the OMB agency is responsible for managing that pot
5 of money?

6 PANELIST CAPEHART: Yeah, money that's not spent
7 by LPC, yes.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: In the last five
9 years, how much money from this grant has not been
10 spent?

11 PANELIST CAPEHART: I can provide that
12 information to you later on. I can look at the
13 numbers for you later on.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: My concern is again,
15 I'm really excited about this piece of legislation
16 but I feel that the \$115,000 is not enough. Should
17 now other religious institutions realize hey, I
18 qualify for this and I want to do now capital
19 improvements to my building and landmarks will turn
20 around and say, wait a minute, we've met our cap in
21 terms of what we're allowed to spend annually when in
22 the last five years there is a dollar amount which we
23 don't know and you'll get back to us, which should be
24 readily available to everyone now that we're opening
25 up to a more broader audience.

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 PANELIST CAPEHART: I just want to point out
4 Council Member that as far as the funding available
5 to LPC, if we are ever in a position where we have a
6 lot of qualified grant applicants coming in and meet
7 the requirements and we need additional funding, that
8 door is open to us to go back to OMB to ask for
9 additional funding. In the last few years, we
10 haven't had that experience. That's why the amount
11 we have that comes in every year is based on what
12 we've spent over the past years. So, if there's an
13 uptake in the number of qualified applications that
14 we receive, and we review this application and they
15 warrant a grant and we need additional funding, we
16 have the ability to go back to OMB to seek additional
17 funding. We haven't been able to do that -

18 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: It hasn't happened
19 because you haven't used it all.

20 PANELIST SILBERMAN: I just want to point out
21 that we have given grants to almost every eligible
22 applicant. So, we are -

23 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Yeah, and now you're
24 opening up the door to other applicants which is
25 exciting. I just really want to know what's the
dollar amount and I'm surprised you don't have that

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 on how the property is being used and what the
4 purposed work is being applied for.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: When the private
6 homeowner or a not for profit who is eligible for the
7 community development block grant, when they apply
8 they have to meet certain income thresholds. Will
9 there be an income threshold for religious
10 institutions? There certain more prominent
11 communities in my district who have the funds to put
12 in for capital improvements versus religious
13 institutions in my district who Immaculate Conception
14 the example, who ask not to be landmarked because
15 their contributions that they get from the
16 parishioners will not meet the needs to fix what
17 needs to be addressed. So, will you – how would you
18 balance this out?

19 PANELIST SILBERMAN: So, to clarify regarding
20 the nonprofit organization that apply for a grant,
21 its not based on a nonprofit organization. Its not
22 based on income. It's based on the services they
23 provide. So, when it comes to nonprofit
24 organizations we look at, will it provide benefits to
25 low-moderate income persons on area. So, its not
based on income because it's a nonprofit

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 PANELIST CAPEHART: You mean in terms of
4 religious institutions?

5 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Yes, uhm hmm. Do you
6 expect an increase – a substantial increase?

7 PANELIST CAPEHART: What we can say for sure in
8 terms of what we can expect from it because based on
9 need of repairs, as far as religious institutions for
10 now like even with the changing our grant the land in
11 which our website, we haven't received any
12 applications for any religious institutions as of
13 yet. So, I really can't say.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: So, you haven't really
15 seen any movement in the area yet?

16 PANELIST CAPEHART: No.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay, thank you. We'll
18 now go to questions from my colleagues. I will as
19 for the sergeant in arms to give us five minutes on
20 the clock. First questions coming from Council
21 Member Koo.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: Thank you. First of all, I
23 support this bill. This is a really good bill for
24 Chair Salamanca. The question I have from the
25 administration is the grant money is too small in the
\$115,000. I mean it cost more than a million dollars

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: So, how many pages is on
4 the application for applying this sense of plan? So,
5 a hundred page or?

6 PANELIST CAPEHART: It's a two-page application.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: Two-page application, okay.

8 PANELIST CAPEHART: Two-page form, exactly.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: So, how long does it take
10 you approve usually?

11 PANELIST CAPEHART: Well so we typically receive
12 application through the course of the year and we
13 have a board the grant program board that needs to
14 review applications in the fall. So, it would depend
15 on what time of the year the application was
16 received. So, for instance, our board usually meets
17 in the fall. So, that's around September to October
18 of the year. So, if we got a grant application that
19 came in say, July or August that application will be
20 reviewed by the full board in September or October
21 and a decision is made on whether they are awarded
22 for a grant but I also want to point out that the
23 first step is we have a grant team, a staff, that
24 reviews the application initially to ensure that they
25 meet the HUD requirements and as long as they meet
the requirements we let them know that they have met

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER YEGER: Thank you Madam Chair.

4 First, I wish to associate myself with Council Member
5 Koo's comments. I think the grant program is too
6 low. A number of months ago, on the Council I voted
7 against the landmarking of premises known as the
8 Liberty house I believe in Bushwick because the owner
9 disapproved of what I viewed as an unconstitutional
10 taking in violation of the fifth amendment. A
11 landmarking of a property is a taking because it puts
12 up all kinds of brick walls to what the property
13 owner can then go about and do to his or her
14 property. More so of course with a nonprofit, which
15 has far limited funds. An owner of a property can
16 simply want to do more work, doesn't have enough
17 money, get another job. A church can't really go and
18 do that so, I do agree that the program should be a
19 little more, but I'd like to focus a little bit on
20 the questions about or the statement that you made
21 with regard to the HUD regulations and as I
22 understand it and as I believe you described, HUD
23 regulations don't actually prohibit it they just -
24 they don't speak in favor of it. They don't speak
25 against it. They don't care. They don't say. So,
my question is because that was a statement. My

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 with practical repairs to their buildings. We're
4 very sensitive to the fact that many of these
5 entities have small congregations and have limited
6 funds and so we at a staff level, we have a dedicated
7 staff person that works primarily and solely with
8 religious organizations to the commission. In the
9 rare case where they do come forward. You know the
10 commissioners have expressed and indicate and approve
11 all sorts of very practical solutions to particular
12 problems so, we certainly have no - we want to be
13 able to give money. We want to provide money to
14 eligible applicants. We just want to make sure that
15 we're doing it in a way with full compliance with
16 Federal Regulations.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER YEGER: Same here. On the church
18 that my college spoke about The maculate conception
19 in his district, you know one of the things that I
20 found fascinating on the houses of worship question
21 for landmarking is that the houses of worship that
22 are likely in most need of protection and repair of
23 their very aging premises are usually the oldest -
24 not obviously the oldest but usually the smaller ones
25 in neighborhoods where they're not necessarily
 getting the financial support that they did when they

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAM: Thank you. I'd like to
4 thank our panelist for your testimony today. Thank
5 you very much. You may step down. Okay, we're going
6 to call up.

7 PANELIST CAPEHART: You got the dollar amount
8 that was unspent over the last three fiscal years,
9 they add up to \$55,000. The three fiscal years. The
10 unspent. Not spent.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Not spent. So,
12 \$55,000 not spent.

13 PANELIST CAPEHART: Yeah that was not spent.
14 Over the last three Fiscal years.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Okay thank you. Make
16 sure you get that money back.

17 PANELIST CAPEHART: No, no I just want to
18 clarify that's money that was not spent by LPC so
19 that's money that was up to the Office of Management
20 and Budget to spend on all the eligible areas that
21 require funding. Not with LPC.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: So, you, in the last
23 three years there was a total of \$55,000 for three
24 years combined that was sent back to another pot that
25 OMB runs?

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, that's money that was
4 left in the general yeah, in the general pool that
5 only be determines how that money gets reallocated
6 but that's money that LPC did not spend. If I
7 understand your question well is how much of our
8 grant program money over the last few years we did
9 not spend so it was \$55,000 over the last three years
10 that we did not spend.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: Does OMB in return if
12 they spend that money reach out to your agency and
13 say hey we spent this money.

14 PANELIST CAPEHART: No that's not something -
15 that's OMB, they manage, the OMB unit manages the
16 CDBG funding for all citywide agencies. They
17 allocate to respective agencies based the CD programs
18 that each agency has and so if an agency in our case
19 doesn't spend all of our CD funding or it gets to
20 determine where it is reallocated but not come back
21 to us and tell us where it was reallocated. That's
22 up to OMB to determine that.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: And I find that a
24 little disheartening because this is not money that
25 the city got from - its tax payers. This is grant
money that they got from the Federal Government and

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 for OMB to just automatically this money goes back to
4 this fund and they have how can I say, within their
5 rules they can just allocate that money where they
6 choose without reaching back out to you and saying
7 this is how we spent money that the Federal
8 Government sent your agency –

9 PANELIST CAPEHART: Council Member just to
10 clarify. OMB is the city Office of Management and
11 Budget.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: I know who they are.

13 PANELIST CAPEHART: So, they manage the CDBG
14 funding that the city receives from the Federal
15 Government. So, they have the oversight of that – of
16 that pool of funding. Not the individual agency so,
17 if an individual agency depending on what CDBG
18 program they have, get allocated a certain amount by
19 OMB. Now, if there's underspending in one area in
20 another city agency, OMB has the ability to
21 reallocate funding to another city CDBG program. So,
22 the money is not going back to the Federal
23 Government. It's still being spent –

24 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: No, I know the money,
25 but your agency is not making a decision as to where

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 that money is being spent. OMB is making that
4 decision.

5 PANELIST CAPEHART: Yes.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: And I'm just curious
7 to know, how do they make that decision? What
8 criteria do they use, and this is for another
9 conversation?

10 PANELIST CAPEHART: Yeah that's something that
11 OMB --

12 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAMANCA: You should have
13 access to this money. OMB should not be reallocating
14 this funding elsewhere. Alright, thank you.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you very much.
16 Okay, we would like to ask Joseph Rosenberg and
17 Coleen Heimer[SP?], please step up. Good afternoon,
18 please state your name for the record.

19 JOSEPH ROSENBERG: Good afternoon. I'm Joseph
20 Rosenberg.

21 COLEEN HEIMER: I'm Coleen Heimer.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you very much. You
23 may begin.

24 JOSEPH ROSENBERG: Okay, thank you. Good
25 afternoon Chair Adams, Salamanca, Koo, and Council
Member Yeger. I'm Joseph Rosenberg, Director of the

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND
2 MARITIME USES

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Okay, thank you very
4 much. I'm going to turn it over to Chair Salamanca.
5 We're going to put five minutes on the clock and
6 we're going to come to colleagues for their questions
7 as well. Council Member Yeger?

8 COUNCIL MEMBER YEGER: Thank you Madam Chair and
9 I'll be very brief. Ms. Heimer, you support the goal
10 of the legislation.

11 COLEEN HEMIRE: Yes.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER YEGER: And I'm very grateful for
13 the conservancies and great work with the money that
14 it raises to support landmarking and preservation for
15 historic structures in New York. I would echo the
16 Chair's comments regarding waiting for HUD as you
17 heard. You were in the room, you heard earlier I
18 said, well what happens if HUD never gets back to LPC
19 and that's you know who knows I mean right. Somebody
20 gets a letter at HUD and they throw it in the garbage
21 and they decide they're never going to get back.
22 That's a realistic thing, it's possible. HUD is the
23 government. You know, it's in Washington, things go
24 in the garbage in Washington. So, the question that
25 I have is you know as I described earlier, HUD's
regulations state "faith-based organizations aren't

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 April 1, 2018