| 1  | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZON                  | IING AND FRANCHISES        | 1 |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 2  | CITY COUNCIL<br>CITY OF NEW YORK    |                            |   |
| 3  |                                     | Y                          |   |
| 4  | TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTE            |                            |   |
| 5  |                                     | S                          |   |
| 6  | Of the                              |                            |   |
| 7  | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING A FRANCHISES | ND                         |   |
| 8  |                                     | X                          |   |
| 9  |                                     | er 15, 2018<br>10:02 a.m.  |   |
| 10 |                                     | 2:57 p.m.                  |   |
| 11 | HELD All Committee                  | roo Doom City Holl         |   |
| 12 | HELD AT: Committ                    | _                          |   |
| 13 | B E F O R E: Francis Chairpe        |                            |   |
| 14 |                                     |                            |   |
| 15 |                                     | G. Constantinides          |   |
| 16 | Rory I                              | S. Grodenchik<br>. Lancman |   |
| 17 | Antonio                             | n T. Levin<br>o Reynoso    |   |
| 18 |                                     | n J. Richards<br>a Rivera  |   |
| 19 | Ritchie                             | e J. Torres                |   |
| 20 |                                     |                            |   |
| 21 |                                     |                            |   |
| 22 |                                     |                            |   |
| 23 |                                     |                            |   |
| 24 |                                     |                            |   |

|    | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES                         | 2 |
|----|--|---|
| 1  |  |   |
| 2  | APPEARANCES  |   |
| 3  | Raymond Levin  |   |
| 4  | Slater and Beckerman Land Use Council                        |   |
| 5  | David Velez  |   |
| 6  | Matthew Feldman  |   |
| 7  | CP VI Crown heights LLC                                      |   |
| 8  | Dale Ferdinand   |   |
| 9  | Harlem American Supplier                                     |   |
| 10 | Sam Pierre<br>Brooklyn Borough Director                      |   |
| 11 |  |   |
| 12 | Rabbi Eli Cohen<br>Executive Director of Crown Heights       |   |
| 13 | Alicia Boyd  |   |
| 14 | Crown Height   |   |
| 15 | David Cohen  |   |
| 16 | New York Real Estate Community                               |   |
| 17 | Sakia Fletcher<br>Medgar Evers College                       |   |
| 18 | Medgal Evels College   |   |
| 19 | Jennifer Sun<br>Co-Executive Director of Asian Americans for |   |
| 20 | Equality   |   |
| 21 | Geoffrey Davis   |   |
| 22 | Demitralis Hakins  |   |
| 23 | Richard Label  |   |
| 24 | Brownsville  |   |

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 3             |
|----|--|
| 2  | Genevieve Michael                                  |
| 3  | Associate Director of External Relations           |
| 4  | Lisa Gomez<br>L&M Development Partners             |
| 5  | nam beveropment rarthers                           |
| 6  | Joshua Weisstuch<br>L&M Development Partners       |
| 7  | Clovis Thorn                                       |
| 8  | Director of Development                            |
| 9  | Zamir Khan   |
| 10 | 32вЈ   |
| 11 | Cyrus Smith  |
| 12 | Brownsville Think Tank Matters                     |
| 13 | Dylan Sandler<br>NYC Department of City Planning   |
| 14 |  |
| 15 | Cecilia Kushner<br>NYC Department of City Planning |
| 16 | Edith Hsu-Chen                                     |
| 17 | Manhattan Borough Office                           |
| 18 | James Patchett                                     |
| 19 | President and CEO of NYCEDC                        |
| 20 | Michelle Feinberg                                  |
| 21 | Owner and Designer at New York Embroidery Studio   |
| 22 | Tom Block<br>499 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue            |
| 23 | Steve Boxer  |
| 24 | Consulting Pachyderm                               |

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 4                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | William Silverman  |
| 3  | Otterbourg Properties                                    |
|    | Andi Udis  |
| 4  | ABS Partners Real Estate                                 |
| 5  | Brian Weber  |
| 6  | MCB4 Manhattan Community Board 4                         |
| 7  | Elizabeth Goldstein                                      |
| 8  | Municipal Arts Society                                   |
| 9  | Joanna Crisp   |
| 10 | On Behalf of Susan Chin<br>Design Trust for Public Space |
| 11 | bedryn frade for radfre opade                            |
| 12 | Marc Benqualid<br>Ownership                              |
| 13 | -  |
| 14 | Kenneth Fischel<br>Renaissance Properties                |
| 15 | Barbara Blair  |
|    | Garment District Alliance                                |
| 16 | Matt Coudert   |
| 17 | George Comfort & Sons                                    |
| 18 | James Lloyd  |
| 19 | Manhattan Borough Presidents Office                      |
| 20 | Ginny Louloudas  |
| 21 | Executive Director of the Alliance of Resident           |
| 22 | Theaters   |
| 23 | Michelle Feinberg  |
| 24 | Owner and Designer at New York Embroidery Studio         |
| 25 | Dan Dilmanian  |
| -  | George Comfort & Sons                                    |

| 1   | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES          |
|-----|---|
| 1   |   |
| 2   | Jessie Bodine                                 |
| 3   | Manhattan Community Board 4                   |
| 4   | Joe Restuccia<br>Manhattan Community Board 4  |
| 5   |   |
| 6   | Wally Rubin<br>Manhattan Community Board 5    |
| 7   | Adam Friedman                                 |
| 8   | Pratt Center for Community Development        |
| 9   | Phil Lavoie                                   |
| LO  | Gotham Organization                           |
| L1  | Chris Jaskiewicz                              |
| L2  | Gotham Organization                           |
| L3  | Paimaan Lodhi<br>REBNY                        |
| L 4 | 1 D 1   |
| L 5 | Jonathan Bowles<br>Center for an Urban Future |
| L 6 |   |
|     | Eric Gural                                    |
| L7  | GNA Garment District Alliance                 |
| L8  | Yeohlee Teng                                  |
| L 9 | Yeohlee                                       |
| 20  | Steven Epstein                                |
| 21  | IATSE   |
|     | Casandra Diggs                                |
| 22  | CFDA  |
| 23  | Angela Sung Pinsky                            |
| 24  | Association for a Better New York             |

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES    | 6 |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | Susan Chin                              |   |
| 3  | Design Trust for Public Space           |   |
| 4  | Elizbeth Goldstein<br>MASNYC            |   |
| 5  |   |   |
| 6  | Samuel Friedfeld<br>Olmstead Properties |   |
| 7  | Zach Bommer                             |   |
| 8  | AAFE                                    |   |
| 9  |   |   |
| 10 |   |   |
| 11 |   |   |
| 12 |   |   |
| 13 |   |   |
| 14 |   |   |
| 15 |   |   |
| 16 |   |   |
| 17 |   |   |
| 18 |   |   |
| 19 |   |   |
| 20 |   |   |
| 21 |   |   |
| 22 |   |   |
| 23 |   |   |
| 24 |   |   |

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Good morning and oh, I'm sorry. [GAVEL] Good morning and welcome to the meeting of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises.

I am Council Member Francisco Moya. The Chairperson of this subcommittee and we are joined today by Council Members Levin, Richards, and Grodenchik.

If you are here to testify on projects that are on our calendar for which the hearing was not already closed, please fill out a white speaker slip with the sergeant at arms in the back and indicate the name or you LU number of the application you wish to testify on the slip.

We will now start our hearings. Our first hearing is on L.U. 262 an application pursuant to Section 20-226 of the Administrative Code by 931 Manhattan Café LLC d/b/a Citroen, for a new revocable consent to maintain, operate and use and unenclosed sidewalk café located at 931 Manhattan Avenue in Council Member Levin's district in Brooklyn.

I now open the public hearing on this application and I want to turn it over to Council Member Levin for some remarks.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you very much Mr.

Chairman. We appreciate your working with the applicant in my office as well as Land Use staff

Jerry Levin[SP?] and Amy Levitan to make a compromise possible on this application and I will read this into the record. This is from the applicant 931

Manhattan Café LLC at 931 Manhattan Avenue. This is an application for a sidewalk café and the letter reads.

Dear Honorable Chairperson Salamanca, Council
Member Levin and members of the Council. Please
accept this letter. Its confirmation of our
agreement with Council Member Levin. There shall be
no more than three tables and six chairs, and all
such tables and chairs shall be arranged parallel to
and flush against the building. No table or chair
shall be placed more than 24 inches from measured
perpendicular to the building wall.

No more than two tables and four chairs may be placed on the south side of the restaurant door and no such table or chair shall occupy more than 18 inches measured along the building wall.

No more than one table and two chairs may be placed on the north side of the restaurant door and

2.2

2 no such table shall exceed 24 inches measured along 3 the building wall.

If anything, else is required, please contact my representative. And its signed by Craig Kaftan, member of 931 Manhattan Café LLC. We think this is an appropriate compromise.

The application was for five tables and ten chairs that would have jutted out further into a very busy pedestrian walkway along the sidewalk of Manhattan Avenue, and this will allow the business to have some outdoor seating particularly during warmer weather but we believe wont impede pedestrian traffic and so, we find it to a an appropriate compromise and thank you very much for your time.

Thank you and I'll turn it back over. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Council Member

Levin. We've also been joined by Council Member

Rivera. Are there any members of the public who wish

to testify on this issue?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application. Our next hearing is on L.U. 260 an application pursuant to Section 20-226 of the Administrative Code from By the Glass INC for renewal of a revocable consent to maintain, operate and use

2.2

an unenclosed sidewalk café located at 1486 2<sup>nd</sup>

Avenue in Council Member Kallos's district in

Manhattan.

I now open the public hearing on this application. Are there any members of the public who wish to testify on this application?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application. Our next hearing is on L.U. 261, an application pursuant to Section 20-225 of the Administrative Code from the Three Decker Restaurant limited for the renewal of a revocable consent to construct and or maintain operate and use an enclosed sidewalk café located at 1746 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Council Member Kallo's district in Manhattan. And I now open up the public hearing on this application. Are there any members of the public who wish to testify on this application?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application.

Our next hearing is on L.U. 263 an application pursuant to Section 20-226 of the Administrative Code from 27 East Restaurant Holdings LLC, Fleming Le Bilboquet, for a revocable consent to construct and/or maintain, operate, and use an unenclosed

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 sidewalk café located at 27 E 62<sup>nd</sup> Street in Council
3 Member Power's district in Manhattan.

I know open the public hearing on this application. Are there any members of the public who wish to testify?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application.

Our next public hearing is on L.U.'s 270 and 271 the 1451 Franklin Avenue Seacrest Rezoning. Applicant Cornell partner seeking rezoning of the western side of Franklin Avenue. Bounded by the midpoint between President Street and Carroll Street on the north and Montgomery Street on the south and the south train tracks on the west to an R8X and an R8X C2-4 District. The designation of the mandatory inclusionary housing area of the proposed R8X, zoning would permit up to 17 stories and a 7.2 FAR and would facilitate the development of approximately 518 apartments of which 378 would be market rate and 140 would be affordable under the MIH Option 1. property affected is located in Majority Leader Cumbo's District in Brooklyn and I now open the public hearing on this application and I would like to call Ray Levin, David Velez, and Matthew Feldman.

2.2

I now ask the Council to please swear in the panel.

name into the microphone and make sure the red light is lit. Do you each swear or affirm that the testimony that you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth and to answer all questions truthfully?

10 RAYMOND LEVIN: I do.

COUNCIL: And just please state your name.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Raymond Levin.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I'm Matthew Feldman, I do.

DAVID VELEZ: David Velez, I do.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: You can begin, thank you.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Good morning. I am Raymond

Levin with the firm of Slater and Beckerman Land Use

Council to CP6 Crown Heights LLP an entity created by

Carmel Partners represented here by Matthew Feldman,

Vice President.

The CP6 Crown Heights LLP is a successor applicant for a zoning map amendment for the area bounded by Montgomery Street to the south Franklin Avenue to east line midway between Crown and

2.2

2 Presidents streets to the north and the Franklin 3 Avenue Subway cut to the west.

CP6 owns vacant property at 46 Crown Street and is the agent for Cornell Reality Management, owner of vacant property at 931 Carroll Street.

If you look at the image, the property outlined in red to the north is whats owned by Cornell. The property outlined in red to the south is CP6. The property in the middle of this rezoning area is Tivoli Towers, a project that was built in the 1970's.

The two properties are currently zoned are 6A, which is a residential zoning district which allows development of approximately 280 apartments in buildings up to 70 feet in height. The apartments developed pursuant to the As of Right are 6A Regulations would not be subject to any of the city's inclusionary housing income leasing or rent restrictions.

Next one please. The proposed R8X District would allow development of an additional 240 apartments. Of which, pursuant to the proposed Mandatory Inclusionary Housing area designation, 140 of which would be income targeted.

2.2

All of the apartments, inclusionary and market rate, would be subject to rent stabilization with mandatory lease renewals and rent increases controlled by the rent guidelines board. As you can see on this chart, it outlines the development of the two properties and the number of units in each bedroom category that would be developed.

The proposed buildings are located in a 33  $\,$  Tivoli Towers -

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Can you just go back to that last line number 20? Okay, thank you. I just needed to -

RAYMOND LEVIN: Oh, okay. The proposed buildings are located amid the 33 story Tivoli Towers which you can see in this image in the upper center. The proposed buildings are 16 stories, so that's proposed, and they are on either side of Tivoli Towers, sort of looking orangey.

The 26 story Evers Field Towers which are just to the south in the lower left-hand corner of this image, across the street from the proposed project is an undeveloped parking lot that's part of Medgar Evers College and between the project and the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens are basically six story

2.2

apartment buildings. I guess, close to our apartment buildings.

Next, we've reached out to our neighbors, had meetings with most, have also engaged with the broader Crown Heights community over the last four years, making everyone aware of the project. We have letters of support from the Asian American Council, Tivoli Towers Tenants Association, Crown Heights Jewish Community Council, Brothers in Growth, and Saint Francis de Sales for the Deaf on East and Parkway, and we can provide those letters to the Council.

This image just shows the same as the last image except from the other direction, from looking at it from the west, you can see Tivoli Towers in the center. The two proposed buildings on either side and the six story apartment buildings between the Towers and the Gardens. At this point, there is a 12-story building being built As of Right between the building on Montgomery Street — proposed building on Montgomery Street of property that the Garden sold a couple years ago.

2.2

The next image, this shows the building on the Crown site looking from Medgar Evers College with Tivoli Towers on the right-hand side of this slide.

Next please, the proposed 40 Crown Street

Building, you can see here this is a — the lower

level has parking and some retail or community space,

first floor as the entrances, which there are two

entrances, one on Montgomery and one on Crown and

space for either retail or community facility.

On top of the parking, there's open space available to all units in the development and this just shows how those go up. The site is wider than a normal city block and given the contextual zoning, it pushes the development to the street wall.

One of the reasons we asked for the R8X, which has a little more height is because of that. Because the center of the site really doesn't accommodate itself to a building footprint.

Next please. This is on the site, the Carroll Street site. Its in the middle of the block, parking below, entrances off of Crown Street and apartments above. There is open space available to all the tenants on the northern part of the site above the garage.

2.2

Next please. And the building just goes
straight up. So, the building on Crown Street is 390
units, 105 of which would be inclusionary, 190
parking spaces in that garage and on the [inaudible
22:24] Street Building, 128 units, 35 inclusionary,
64 parking spaces. Both buildings will be broken
down with five percent studios, 40 percent one
bedroom, 35 percent two bedroom, and 20 percent three
bedrooms.

In summary, the proposed rezoning and MIH designation will allow buildings containing approximately 518 apartments, 140 of which will be income limited.

Next slide please. As shown here, you can see the monthly rents depending on the size of the unit in the different AMI categories. So, you can you know, see that someone who wants a two-bedroom unit who earns 60 percent of AMI, there are so many units available for that family. So, its kind of a mix and match is how MIH works, but this is the breakdown and then on the bottom it shows how many units in each category would be part of this project.

An environmental review was prepared by [Inaudible 24:02] Associates of which Mr. Velez here

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

| represents, and it was prepared in accordance with    |
|---|
| the [Inaudible 24:13] methodology and a negative      |
| declaration was issued by the Department of City      |
| Planning stating that no significant negative effects |
| on the environment were found.                        |

Thank you very much. Matt can speak a little bit about Cornell and who they are and then we're certainly here to answer any questions you may have.

COUNCIL MEMBER MOYA: Great, thank you. Just before we go into that, we just need to go into a quick vote here.

Okay, I now call for a vote to approve L.U.'s 260, 261, 262, and 263. The local members are in support. Council, please call the role.

COUNCIL: Moya?

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I and all.

COUNCIL: Levin?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I.

20 COUNCIL: Reynoso?

21 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I and all.

22 COUNCIL: Richards?

23 COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: I and all.

24 COUNCIL: Rivera?

25 COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: I and all.

2.2

COUNCIL: The Land Use are approved by a vote of five in the affirmative, zero negative and no extensions and referred to the Committee and — oh, Council Member Grodenchik?

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: I.

COUNCIL: The Land Use items are approved by a vote of six in the affirmative, no negatives and no extensions and we'll leave the vote open.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you and I also want to acknowledge that we have been joined by Majority Leader Cumbo and now we can proceed with the rest of the testimony.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Thank you. In addition to what Ray said, I just want to highlight some additional project benefits that this project can offer to the community in addition to the 140 apartments, income targeted at 60 percent of AMI.

In addition, we have met with Impact Brooklyn and discussed sponsoring workshops for the community to make sure that applicants can be prepared when the community preference apartments become available and to make sure people have their required information ready for the lottery and that people can get help filling out the applications if required.

2.2

We also plan on meeting MWBE goals that can as if this was an HPD finance project. We also will commit to union staffing post completion if this project is up zoned and we will also, even though it wasn't on the plans, include a community facility on the project that can be rented to community groups either below market or free depending on their needs.

In addition, you'll hear from the opposition that has attended prior public hearings. Most of the opposition is being concerned with shadow studies on the Botanical Gardens. I just want to say that the Botanical Gardens issued a letter on October 11<sup>th</sup>, stating this project has no impact and that they have no objections and with that, I'll be happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, thank you. Thank you, just a couple of questions in regards to this in particular — can we just go over what the proposed unit's size and mix again is going to be?

RAYMOND LEVIN: Let me get my - I can't read that from here, so give me a second. Okay, you want apartment sizes?

2.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Yeah, right, what is the — you gave the breakdown before, if you could just over that again.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Yeah, the targeted apartment sizes are studios at 400 square feet, one bedroom at 575, two bedrooms at 775, and three bedrooms at 950.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, so have you had conversations to partner with some local and non-profit organization to be the administrating agent for the affordable housing?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes, as I said, we've met with Impact Brooklyn to discuss workshops and assuming we proceed with the up zoning, we assume that they're going to also be the local administrative agent.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Got it, and do you think that its important for members of the Crown Heights areas to have good jobs? And if so, are there concrete commitments that you're willing to make here regarding that?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes, as I've said, for both local hiring and for subcontracting, we will adhere to the HPD guidelines as if this was an HPD sponsored project.

2.2

| CHAI      | RPERSON M | AYA: A  | nd wha | at is | s your p | olicy     |
|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|-------|----------|-----------|
| around re | sponsible | contra  | cting  | for   | buildin  | g service |
| workers?  | And if yo | ou have | one,   | can   | you mak  | e it      |
| publicly  | available | to us?  |        |       |          |           |

MATTHEW FELDMAN: So, if this project gets up zoned, we'll commit to union staffing.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: And you have been in conversations with -

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes, and we've let 32BJ know that if this project gets up zoned, we will commit.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: And what are the conversations that you have had with the Brooklyn Botanical Gardens — I know you have mentioned that briefly in your presentation, but regarding the possibility of shadows?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: So -

RAYMOND LEVIN: We've reached out to Gardens over the last several years. We haven't had direct conversations with them. They have been a little reticent over time. They seem mostly concerned with a project that's being proposed to the south of ours and they issued the letter, which we can provide the Committee with indicating that they reviewed our shadow studies that were prepared and agree with them

2.2

and also agree that the shadows cast by the proposed project will not have an impact on the Gardens and the plantings within the Gardens.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: And one last question is, why do you think 17 stories is an appropriate height for this block when the city established a 7-story height limit back in the 1991 rezoning?

RAYMOND LEVIN: A lot of things have changed since 1991. MIH came in which the city is supporting the development of affordable housing and is part of market rate housing. So, that's one element that leads to higher height because we intend to participate in that program.

The buildings that we're proposing by the way,
we could build 17 under the zoning, we're only
proposing 16. Part of that has to do with as I
explained, the site configurations and the
implications of the contextual zone, which pushes the
development out to the edges of the property.

Next to us is a 33-story building, a block away are Ebbets Field houses which are 25 stories. Next to us on the other side of the cut closer to the Gardens, that 1991 rezoning allowed 12 story buildings closer to the Gardens, so its hard to

2.2

understand that allowing 12 stories across the street from the Gardens and 7 stories a block away, was done because of the Gardens.

What was done in 1991 was they took the existing zoning districts and made them all contextual, basically taking an R8 and making an R8A, taking an R6 and making an R6A. So, that was the major impetuous for the zoning although they do mention the Gardens as well, but as I said, 12 stories are permitted closer to the Garden and these are further away. So, the combination of existing development, site conditions, MIH, are what led us to request this R8X zone.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. I now want to turn it over to Majority Leader Cumbo for some questions.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you, Chair Moya.

I thank you all for being here today. This

particular proposal has attracted significant

concerns from the Crown Heights Community as well as

the elected officials who are feeling the pressure of

development.

Every year, every month, every week, more and more new developments are coming in with market rate

2.2

apartments far above what our community can afford to pay, and we wanted to have this particular hearing to gain a greater understanding of this proposal as there have been many changes and many shifts since this original proposal was introduced and certified.

So, I want to ask some key quick questions in terms of — that are just number questions and then I want to dive deeper. Chair Moya asked a few of these but I just want it to be on the record.

So, without this proposed rezoning, what would the size of the development be? So, if this doesn't happen, what would the size of the development be at this time?

RAYMOND LEVIN: If this doesn't happen, the As of Right would allow us to build 7 stories I guess, 7 story buildings and those 7 story buildings could accommodate approximately 280 apartments, which could be condominiums without any rent renewal or any other sort of governmental controls.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Could be or would be condominiums?

RAYMOND LEVIN: I'd have to turn that over - MATTHEW FELDMAN: Right, I mean it could be, based on market conditions at the time we start

2.2

| development, financing available, the determination   |
|---|
| will be made, what makes the most economic sense at   |
| that time. We prefer that the up zone is approved to  |
| require the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, so we can |
| develop 140 units for the community                   |

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: What is the market rate for what we would call, market rate/luxury condominiums in this particular community? What would be the going rate for one-bedroom luxury condominium in Crown Heights?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: As I understand the Crown Heights market right now, condominiums would sell for approximately \$1,200 a square foot.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Do the math for me.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: It's just short of \$900,000 for a one bedroom.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How much?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Just short of \$900,000 for a one bedroom.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: \$900,000 for a one bedroom.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Short of that yeah.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Short of that. So, you would be building approximately 280 apartments which

2.2

on average would be bringing in approximately 900 people, 3 people in an apartment, some will be studios, some will be three bedrooms to, just a guestimate. So, 900 people would be coming in that would be purchasing on average, on the low end, a \$900,000 condominium or one bedroom?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: It could right. That's the way this could go, yes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: What impact do you think that that will have on the Crown Heights Community?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I mean to a point — we understand your concern Majority Leader, this is not the direction that we want. Gentrification is an issue throughout the city and its our goal to develop this project under Mandatory Inclusionary to make that there's apartments affordable at every income level. Both incomes targeted for 40 AMI, 60 AMI, 100 AMI, and of course, the market rate units that are subsidizing these income targeted units.

However, if the up zone does not happen, we have to develop this project as its best economic use which at this time could be condo's, even if that has a detrimental effect on the character of the neighborhood.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

| 2 | MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I'm going to put on my         |
|---|---|
| 3 | Dr. Phil hat for a second. How do you feel about      |
| 4 | that? How do you feel about the fact that you         |
| 5 | potentially could be building 280 luxury condominiums |
| 6 | in a gentrifying community where the character is     |
| 7 | changing, and displacement is happening rapidly? How  |
| 8 | do you feel about that?                               |

MATTHEW FELDMAN: As I said, our goal is to develop -

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: No, your feelings? MATTHEW FELDMAN: I'm telling you my feelings are based on my goal to develop affordable housing.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Hmm, hmm.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: That's our preference. A former mentor of mine used to say that if landlords want to get rid of rent stabilization, they should build, build, get the vacancy over 5 percent so its sunsets all by itself and that'll automatically drive pricing down. That's the reality. The more housing, we build, the more we can safe communities and that's part of what Mandatory Inclusionary was allowing for.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Have you seen that in anywhere in New York City actually happen?

2.2

| MATTHEW       | FELDMAN | : There | ıs stı | lll incom | ne         |
|---------------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|------------|
| restraints.   | I mean, | there's | still  | vacancy   | restraints |
| at this time. |         |         |        |           |            |

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, let me just go on with the math and I'll get back to your feelings afterwards.

Now with the proposed rezoning, how many units, how many affordable units, and how many stories?

Now, I know you answered that question, but I just want it on the record. So, with the proposed rezoning, how many units?

RAYMOND LEVIN: Total?

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Yeah.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Total units approximately 518.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: 518. How many

affordable?

RAYMOND LEVIN: 140.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And that would bring the building to how many stories?

RAYMOND LEVIN: The building as proposed are 16 stories.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: 16 stories. How many — okay, so we can do the math there. Would all of

2.2

2 these units be permanently affordable, or would they
3 expire at some point?

RAYMOND LEVIN: A Mandatory Inclusionary Housing is permanent.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How do you define permanent?

RAYMOND LEVIN: Under the zoning, I mean, your going to do an agreement with HPD. I believe that permanent is permanent.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: As long as the buildings are standing.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Yeah.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Permanent has different definitions, just like affordable. We'll come back to that.

What is the purposed unit — the bedroom mixed.

You spoke about that for Council Member Moya, but if you could just do it for me again, that would be appreciated.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Sure, the bedroom mix, the currently proposed, studios 5 percent, one-bedroom 40 percent, two-bedroom 35 percent, three-bedroom 20 percent.

2.2

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Can you talk to me a bit

- one of the things that we have all been in

discussion with and I know that we left off with

conversation about this which I'm very interested in

is where your negotiations are currently with AFI.

In terms of the ability to include a not for profit

partner into the project for my purposes to increase

the level of affordability but also to reduce the

density. Where are you all with those particular

negotiations?

RAYMOND LEVIN: Well, going back in history, a little over three years ago, there was a memorandum of understanding that was circulated with AFI who owns that out parcel. In fact, we met in your office to discuss the contours of that proposal.

That at a point, AFI withdrew from those discussions and recently, we've reengaged them. We reached out to them on a number of occasions and finally had a discussion with them within the last several days, where they were going to look at how from their prospective, we might come to some agreement. They were going to get back to us, they haven't as of yet. There were some impediments in the short term because there are restrictions on the

2.2

AFI site that — deed restrictions that HPD put on that site when they sold it a number of years ago.

So, that —

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Can you give me an example of what those would be? Like, what would prevent them from -

RAYMOND LEVIN: Well, there was accelerated UDAP as we understand it that was done to sell it to actually a predecessor to AFI and they limit the number of units at the time that that sale went forward. There were buildings on the property and basically at that time, they were an intent on rehabbing those for one reason or another, which I'm unaware of. The buildings were taken down and the site was transferred from that owner that bought it directly from HPD to AFI. I believe that under the current Deed Restriction, something in the area of 16 units could be developed.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: That's it?

RAYMOND LEVIN: I believe so. Going back again to three years ago, when we were working with AFI and HPD, HPD prepared a draft of an ULURP application to remove those restrictions and the notion was that they would put different restrictions on the site

2.2

that AFI would develop at that time, but as I said, those discussions evaporated. So, now, in terms of the discussions with them, we are waiting to hear back as to what they think. It seemed from the discussion that they were concerned about their independence, I guess is how I would say it.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Fair.

RAYMOND LEVIN: And that they believe that with the rezoning and with HPD's concurrence, they believe that 50 units could be developed on their property under those conditions and we talked to them about squaring off properties, about additional properties. We discussed a number of things in a relatively short telephone conversation with them the other day, and their going to get back to us. So, we will see where it goes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And so, if the zoning that you're looking for today were to be allowed on AFI's site, they would potentially be able to build 100 percent affordable units. 50, 100 percent affordable units?

RAYMOND LEVIN: They are mission driven, not for profit, which the believe — we'll have to see, but

2.2

they believe that they've had discussions with HPD where HPD would fund an affordable housing project.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, let me just say the partnership where the AFI is very important to me. So, I would like for you all to continue to invest the time, energy, and resources to understanding what an AFI partnership would actually look like and HPD lifting those restrictions, so that we could understand what a partnership would look like from my perspective, to increase the affordability but also to decrease the total density of the entire project. That's my goal. You all have your goals, that my goal.

Can you talk a bit about the Borough Presidents recommendation? So, the Borough President recommended that a portion of the commercial space be set aside for local not for profit organizations.

Such as arts or cultural organizations at below market lease terms. Have you considered this recommendation? Integration of local business and not for profit organizations into new development is an important priority of mine but is often overlooked by developers and city agencies.

2.2

So, the community has been looking at opportunities for more and for myself as well, space for not for profits, ground floor affordability, also with the dynamics that we're seeing with so much of our particularly institutions and businesses of color have closed with much of the development that's happening. Is there an opportunity to have below market rate leases for not for profits as well as local business in the area?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes Majority Leader, as I said in my statement, the designs are being further refined for the building from the designs we showed here and at this time, we are including 1500 square feet on the first floor of community facility that can be given to community groups either at below cost or for free depending on the use and how many groups are sharing the space.

In terms of the retail, we believe that for the neighborhood character, we would strive to find a local business and to the extent that doesn't affect our ability to get construction or permanent financing for the project. We'll be using best efforts to set aside space for that purpose.

2.2

| 2 | MAJC      | RITY I | LEADER | CUMBO: | Set | aside | space | at | belov |
|---|-----------|--------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-------|----|-------|
| 3 | or low co | sts?   |        |        |     |       |       |    |       |

MATTHEW FELDMAN: For local community businesses akin to - a community facility, yes below cost or for free.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Now, let me just say

1,500 square feet is very small. That's about the

size of a standard store front space. So, that would
only be like one space. So, that's not really
impactful. We're talking about impact.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: This again, I mean all these questions sort of come down to where the zoning falls out. We would want to maximize the space as we can within the constraints of the zoning.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, 1,500 potentially for community facility or a not for profit organization and what is the square footage for the retail that would be remaining?

RAYMOND LEVIN: The overall square footage of retail is 15,000 square feet on the ground floor.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Now we're talking 15,000 square feet.

2.2

| 2 | RAYMOND LEVIN: On the ground floor and in th      | he |
|---|---|----|
| 3 | basement. So, its split because the site has a ba | ig |
| 4 | slop to it.                                       |    |

5 MAJOR

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, have you thought of any — from the conversations that you've had, and I understand that you've had multiple conversations with community leaders in the neighborhood. Have you thought about how to program or to curate that 15,000 square feet?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Its up to 1,500 right now, the basement is not being fully  $-\$ 

RAYMOND LEVIN: 15,000.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: 15,000 right. Its not - I believe its 7,000 at grade and up to 7,000 below grade if the building gets constructed that way.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Okay, in terms of our discussions with community groups, immediate neighbors and others, that issue hasn't come up.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: The issue has not come up in terms of community needs?

RAYMOND LEVIN: In terms of curating the space for specific users, no.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, so the next time that we're in this space together, I would like to

| have a further understanding of how your going to     |
|---|
| program that and how its going to be a representation |
| of the needs of the community. You have Medgar Evers  |
| College, A Stone Throws Away. You have over 10,000    |
| families in Ebbets Field. You have Tivoli Towers,     |
| you have many different services that need to be      |
| fulfilled there. Anything from healthy food options   |
| to senior centers, to daycare centers, to retail      |
| components to better service, let's say. Medgar       |
| Evers College, there's only maybe one or two and I'm  |
| just saying two because I'm not familiar with what    |
| the second one might be, but there's only one sit     |
| down restaurant in that area. So, there's a need for  |
| different programs and services in the community and  |
| would like know everting from Pediatricians to        |
| different specialties that could be a program there   |
| would certainly like to see that.                     |

Can you describe for me your plans for local hiring?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: So, for during the construction period as I said, will be following the MWB guidelines as if this was a similar financed HPD project. I can't speak particularly to how the mechanics of the local hiring, but we will hire a

2.2

consultant to work with our general contractor to ensure that the guidelines are followed to use best efforts for local hiring.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Have you had any experience doing local hiring in New York City?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I personally have not hired for construction jobs.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I know.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I personally do not, no.

issue particularly in the Crown Heights community.

If you look at Ebbets Field, if you look at Tivoli

Towers, unfortunately there are dozens of young

people, predominantly African-American men who are

unemployed in that community and a project like this

has the potential to be able to train, hire, employ,

and give the expertise that many of them would need

in order to work on this job as well as many others.

So, to not have a plan at this stage is problematic. So, I would certainly want to see moving forward a plan of action in terms of what local hiring is going to look like, because that is a critical component to development in our area.

Making sure that there is real affordability, making

2.2

| sure that there are real jobs that are happening  |
|---|
| that there's training, that there's a pipeline to |
| take people out of many of the circumstances of   |
| nemployment that many are facing.                 |

And as Council Member Moya talked about, is there a commitment to good jobs and prevailing wage for future property service and maintenance workers after the project is completed?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes, if the rezoning is approved then we will commit to union labor for project staffing post completion.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, and you're willing to put that writing?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Absolutely.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: As part of a contract?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, the other aspect that — if you could talk to me a bit about the transition from Cornell Reality to your company Carmel as well as the interests that the previous developer maintains in this project?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I'm not sure exactly what your question is. We purchase the site from Cornell, who

2.1

2.2

| 2 | had  | started  | this  | process, | it | was | at | arm' | S | length | at |
|---|------|----------|-------|----------|----|-----|----|------|---|--------|----|
| 3 | mark | et purch | nase. |          |    |     |    |      |   |        |    |

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And what was that purchase price?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: I don't recall at the top of my head. I wasn't involved in the purchase.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: That's very problematic. Well, while we're still here at the hearing, text someone and find out that information because there's got to be somebody that has that information, and we'll wait.

But in the interim also, I am also very interested because it hasn't been made clear to me, the interest that the previous developer still maintains in this project, because I haven't been able to figure out but somehow you all are still connected through all of this.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Well, as you know, there is two sites covered by this rezoning. The prior owner still controls the smaller site to the north.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, how do they plan to benefit if this rezoning happens? How do they benefit or do not benefit if this rezoning does or does not happen?

2.2

| 2 |      | MATTHEW | FELDMAN: | Well, | their | site | _ | did | you |
|---|------|---------|----------|-------|-------|------|---|-----|-----|
| 3 | want | to?     |          |       |       |      |   |     |     |

RAYMOND LEVIN: Well, their site would be rezoned, and they would be subject to MIH and they could build 93 market rate units and 35 units would be inclusionary totaling 128. That's what they could build if this rezoning were to be approved.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And would you have an interest or a stake in their development?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: No, we own our site, they own their site.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, and if the development does not happen — excuse me, if the rezoning does not happen, how does that impact Cornell?

RAYMOND LEVIN: Hold on one second — I will get you that answer.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: No problem and I hope we're looking for the other answer. I hope someone's texting someone feverishly.

RAYMOND LEVIN: Okay, I'm sorry, okay, so let's see, the other site without the rezoning — no action. 69 apartments.

2.2

2 MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, and to my other 3 question.

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Sure, so the purchase price for the As of Right for the larger site was \$40.5 million. If the sites get rezoned up to the R7X, the purchase price for the large site becomes \$64 million.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, \$64 million if the rezoning does happen?

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Correct.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, those are all the questions that I have. I think I've been very clear in terms of what my interests are. What I want to see, I'll just reiterate as well. I definitely want to continue to see how the partnership with AFI unfolds. I want to understand what your real local hiring plan is going to be and how it will be executed and what partners you plan to utilize for that. I would like to understand and have a better — in writing, understanding of how hiring will happen post the completion of the project and how you will work with our unionized workforce in order to make that happen. I want to have a real understanding of how the AFI partnership will increase affordability

2.2

| and to reduce the height of the buildings and I want  |
|---|
| to have a real understanding of how the commercial    |
| and retail space will be utilized for not for profits |
| as well as local businesses in the area in a way that |
| is both affordable as well as permanent as it relates |
| to the entire project. Thank you.                     |

MATTHEW FELDMAN: Thank you Majority Leader, we look forward to talking with you about this.

RAYMOND LEVIN: And we'd like heat next time we're here.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: It keeps you awake and alert.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, thank you for your testimony. I want to call up the next panel Dale Ferdinand, Sam Pierre, Eli Cohen.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Excuse me before the previous panel leaves, if you all could leave a representative to hear at least the first two panels, that would be effective so that you could take this information back. Okay, I just want to make sure. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you so you have two minutes and we're going to start on this side, you name? You have to push the button.

2.2

2 | SAM PIERRE: Thank you. Sam Pierre.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Sam, you may begin.

SAM PIERRE: Thank you. Good morning Council
Members and the Community. I'm very excited to be
here. My name is Sam Pierre. I am the Executive
Director of the Asian-American Caucus, also the
Chairman of the Asian-American Supply Diversity
Taskforce and I just want to be very brief about the
points that we have on this project.

We are actually in support of this project.

This is the first time that the Asian Community has actually been brought to the table with a developer on an opportunity to do an affordable housing project in addition to helping with the management of the community space that will be developed. Yes, we do understand that there is a large opposition against this project; however, we have yet to hear what are the recommendations or the solutions from the opposition.

We have sat at the table with the developers and understand that this is an opportunity to bring 140 affordable housing units to our community. You know, we've gone back and forth, and we said okay, we always have fights. We have conversations about

2.2

bringing affordable housing but there's no other solutions. I've spoken to, and our organization has spoken to so many different community partners and everyone has told us that yes, they have concerns and we should have concerns and we need to keep the developers' feet to the fire; however, this is an opportunity to bring affordable housing to our community.

The Asian Community has lived in Crown Heights for a very long time. Many of them cannot come back. After the students graduate and go away to school, they can't come back because they can't afford it.

Having affordable housing and market rate housing would be a great way for members of the Asian community to come back and live in Crown Heights.

The last point I also want to make is that the Asian who supplied the Rescue Taskforce is going to be sitting with them. Is going to be sitting with the developer so that we can hold their feet to the fire to make sure that they actually do what they say.

Many of times, the opposition, we say we don't want it, but we never sit with the developers through the lifeline of the project. We're committed to doing that and I understand I might be divinized by the

2.2

community but I'm not afraid. We're going to fight.

We're holding strong and we want to make sure that

our community has access to 140 affordable housing

units. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. Dale, just state your name and you may begin.

DALE FERDINAND: My name is Dale Ferdinand.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Just go from there.

DALE FERDINAND: My name is Dale Ferdinand. I am a small business owner and also, a member of the Asian-American Suppliers Diversity Taskforce and I'll be real brief.

I'm actually hear today as a proud AsianAmerican. A proud lifelong resident of Crown Heights and also a proud servant of the needs in my community.

I know firsthand living in Crown Heights that rent has gone up dramatically. Where a lot of my peers were forced to like, move down south because you know, they couldn't simply afford it. I was actually in the situation where I was unable, and I had to make a decision whether to pay my rent or to buy groceries to feed my daughter.

2.1

2.2

So, I'm a firm believer that if anyone doesn't understand the needs of our community, there's no reason for them to be there. And so, as a community, being from Crown Heights that we refuse to have our needs ignored. We refused to have our concerns thrown on the backburner and we also refuse to not have a seat at the table. Taken all of this into consideration, actually speaking with the developers, this is why I and the members of my community also agree that this rezoning proposal should be approved.

I do also know that this Committee and the City
Council has also made a lifetime worth of good
decisions and choosing to approve this rezoning
proposal will be yet another good decision that they
can add to the list of good decisions that they make.

And with that that's the rest of my time.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

RABBI ELI COHEN: Good morning Council Members, especially our own Council Member Cumbo who is here.

I'm Rabbi Eli Cohen and I'm the Executive Director of the Crime Streets Community Council and we're also coming to speak in favor of the project and I'm assuming this goes for all of the projects that are under current consideration under this rezoning.

| so, the real behelft that we see to the               |
|---|
| community is that housing. We speak to everybody,     |
| all our clients. If their African-American,           |
| Caribbean-American, Jewish-American, whatever,        |
| whoever. The primary concern that everybody has is    |
| the housing and anything that can replenish the       |
| housing stock and bring more housing to the floor is  |
| to be appreciated. Of course, most of our community   |
| residents are not able to afford the market rate      |
| housing, but having the inclusionary housing being    |
| part of the mix and a pretty decent affordability     |
| rates and upgrade, but some of the younger people who |
| are going into going the professions, who are able to |
| afford these and we do see in some of the other       |
| projects that have been built recently on Franklin    |
| Avenue and the one that's being built on Bedford and  |
| also, in the southeast quadrant sort of towards       |
| Council Member Samuels district, there's been some    |
| building over there and our clients of all different  |
| races and creeds are finding housing.                 |

So, its not hundreds of people but it's taking the pressure off. There is stuff out there for people to look for and find and I think that's the biggest benefit.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I certainly support the Council Members attempts to get the maximum benefit to the community that we can, and I think that's good. Obviously, the developer stands to benefit and some of that benefit would be great if it could be shared with the community and the availability of other amenities like, community space etc., I think is also a positive thing. So, moreover, I think - oh, I just want to say one more thing and that is to some of the negative that's been said about the height and the density and so on, I live right across the street from Carrol Gardens which is a very similar building to Tivoli Towers. It's the best neighbors you could Its calm, its quiet, it has parking, it really gives the ability for us to enjoy our standard of living which is better than the neighborhood around.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I just have a follow up question for both of you — all three of you. Mr. Pierre, if you could in terms of your question, could you explain to me more clearly in terms of what your relationship or your organizations relationship will be with this development project with more clarity? And then for all three of you, what is in this — what

2.2

is not in this project that you would like to see moving forward? What is an element of this project that would improve this project, or would make it more appropriate for the community?

I'll start with your Mr. Pierre.

SAM PIERRE: Thank you Majority Leader. So, we are in communication serving as their housing advocacy group, so that we can consolidate a lot of the different housing non-profit organizations that are looking for affordable housing opportunities for their clients, or for the constituents.

So, we are in communications with different housing organizations all over Brooklyn and bringing them to the table because one of the biggest issues that they have is that if their clients are looking for affordable housing, if they don't have projects where they're in partnership, right? With the developers and they don't have a list to even offer their clients.

So, we're trying to create a relationship where okay, there's 140 potential affordable housing units that are going to be available. We have organizations such as an HS who have hundreds of clients who are looking for affordable housing. How

2.2

do we bring them to the table and say, okay, here is a project that's available for you to apply for?

We understand that there's no preference, right, it's a lottery we understand that but we're bringing an opportunity to the table which is what we should be doing.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How will you work with Medgar Evers College to achieve those goals?

SAM PIERRE: We'd love to work with Medgar Evers College. We've already had a few conversations with Medgar Evers College and we will see what their needs are as well, because I'm sure Medgar Evers College and their students, they have lists of folks who are looking for affordable housing. So, serving as the housing advocate, we would definitely bring everyone to the table and show them how that they can apply for this and show them that there's a real opportunity.

We have people who come to us and say that affordable housing is an issue and there's no affordable housing opportunity. We want to be able to give them that opportunity.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you and something that's not in this project that you would like to see

2.2

that would make it more applicable to the community would be what?

Something I'd like to see is like a tech center.

We all understand that technology is a new wave and having like a tech center there for the community, so they can learn about coding, they can learn about stem, the can learn about different things like that I think would be great because now the community can benefit and learn a skill that they can actually use right away.

So, that's one of the key things that Supplier Diversity Taskforce is doing, the MWBE piece, right? We are going to be working directly with the developer to ensure that on our taskforce. We have MWBE consultants that will ensure that all the suppliers that are on there, right that they've gone through the MWBE checks. So, this is an opportunity for us to be able to work on a real project and get real results.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you.

DALE FERDINAND: As to something I would like to see included in this project in particularly — well, speaking for you know, the members of my community.

There are really two things. The first thing kind of

2.2

addressed is making sure that the affordable housing units are actually affordable because speaking from experience as many members in my community as well. Like, rent is like a very, very big burden. And the developers are actively working to make sure that these units are actually affordable.

So, that's the first part. The second part, also to see that there are actual programs that allow the members of the community to enhance this so that they can potentially and gain employment or create new opportunities for themselves.

So, the first part would definitely be, make sure that the affordable housing is actual affordable for the members of the community and then the second thing is to implement programs that sharpen the skills of the members of the community.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you, thank you.

SAM PIERRE: So, to answer the question, I think that the first part is that the fact that there was an outreach done by the developers which we didn't see in other projects. To come and meet and find community partners I think is encouraging. I think if there is some kind of mechanism that could you know, sort of enforce that kind of relationship or at

2.2

least to memorialize it as something that we can refer back to in the future that could be useful. I think your ideas about — and to specifically focus on the local groups you know, we have housing projects that we have currently from an earlier period and we have a beautiful mix of different races and nationalities living in that housing and its really a very positive thing that I think can be a model of living together.

So, that's something that we would want to propagate and work on. And to that end, I think — I don't know if it was mentioned here but the idea of a community set aside for Board 9, if that's possible to do that. I know there's some legal question about it, but a community set aside would be something that we would like to see. Plus, some of the things you spoke about in your questioning about community — availability of community space and other facilities and amenities that could be brought into the mix.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, Majority Leader and thank you all for your testimony. I'm going to be calling the next panel but before I do, I just

2.2

want to recognize that we have Chair Salamanca who has joined us today as well.

Alicia Boyd, David Cohen, and Sakia Fletcher.

And we can start with Sakia.

SAKIA FLETCHER: Good morning. My name is Sakia Fletcher. I am currently a student at Medgar Evers College.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Move the mic closer, yeah, thank you.

SAKIA FLETCHER: Hello, good morning. My name is Sakia Fletcher. I am currently a student at Medgar Evers College. I'm a public administration student and I'm here today in opposition of this project and I'm also the President of the Public Administration Club and I stand with my members that we are also in strong opposition of this project.

So, just to speak about the project, so as you can see from right here, our colleges, this location that's adjacent to it in the front, just the impacts. So, the developer spoke about impacting and he gave a lot of numbers but I want to speak on the perspective of the students and the children, and the park, and the schools that are in the neighborhood and mostly the emotional, mental, and impact of the people

2.2

within the community, especially the community that represents largely single mothers and I also represent a single mother household.

140 affordable housing as the developer has proposed is bar minimum to what is needed. The Borough President came to our college and actually broke down the current laws that are going on. So, right now under the current laws, the developer gets to pick who he wants to be in the development. From my own self, I've been rejected for over eleven applications.

There's a lot of discrimination going on in particularly if you are a woman of color. Even more, if you're a woman of color with children. So, they get that preference of who they want to come into the building even if you have the income. Even if you meet all income levels and also, just to talk about the emotional and just the affect of the projects, when you see projects like this coming into an area, it's very disheartening because it shows you that they're basically pushing you out of your area and just really — just telling you blatantly in your face that this area is not for you. When you go and fill out the applications, when you talk to them, they're

2.2

very rude and the project is way to big, its way to tall. You have a playground that's right in front of it that is going to really impact the children that is playing in that playground and also a Charter School that's right in front of it and as a student, the affect that it has on the Franklin Avenue Station.

So, the station already is packed. People, new people influx of people that have to use that particular station. This station will primarily probably be the only station that is used because its right down the block. It just has a very impact with the influx of people and I'm definitely opposed to this.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

ALICIA BOYD: Hi, my name is Alicia Boyd. I'm a resident long time Brooklyn Knight. I represent the movement to protect the people. I'm flat [inaudible 1:30:43] levels against corruption.

I have presented to you a document from the State Senators Office; do you have that in front of you? This document was written and sent to Laurie Cumbo and a whole set of other elected officials. It concerning the fact that we have been documenting

2.2

through the entire process that Cornell Reality
Application has violated the State Environment
Quality Review Laws.

They are Laws Council people and as a City

Council Agency, you are obligated to adhere to the

state laws and these state laws are very specific

about environmental consequences.

So, Senator Parker — this development is in Senator Parker's Jurisdiction, so his letter should hold some weight when it comes to any decisions that the Council is going to make but I will just read some of the paragraphs for the audience.

Cornell Reality Environmental Assessment

Statement that is required by the New York State Law

SEQR, there appears to be gross errors and a serious

misrepresentation of the facts in the statement.

This in turn has prevented the application from being subject to an environmental impact analysis to determine the negative environmental consequences to the community, the garden, our water and sewage facilities.

On the second page, fourth paragraph. Pursuant to Section 6 NYCRR 617.7 and .8 State Environmental Quality Review, a lead agency must check to ensure a

2.2

| proper analysis is done to determine if an           |
|--|
| environmental impact statement must be conducted in  |
| the New York City Department of City Planning is the |
| lead agency  |

Thus, he requested that Cornell Realities

Application be reviewed for accuracy to determine if
the EAS had been conducted appropriately and that he
be kept informed and also, that the department of
City Planning was supposed to then provide a
description of the rational and the qualitative data
that informed the agency's determination.

None of this was done. The main issue yes - CHAIRPERSON MOYA: We have to wrap it up.

ALICIA BOYD: The main issue is that on Cornell Realities Application, there is a section in the Environmental Assessment statement what asks very clearly, is your development going to make more than 400 residential units? Cornell Reality said no. As a result of that, and that's on the second —

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: We have to keep it to two minutes. Just wrap it up.

ALICIA BOYD: What they did is they stated no and as a result of them stating no, they did not do

2.2

| L |  |
|---|--|
| 2 | an Environmental Assessment Statement on the water |
| 3 | and sewage.  |
| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay.                            |
| 5 | ALICIA BOYD: This is a direct violation.           |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, thank you.            |

ALICIA BOYD: Additionally, additionally -

ALICIA BOYD: I understand that, but you gave a lot of other people a lot more time past the two minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Actually, I've been giving everyone the same amount of time and I've extended it for you -

ALICIA BOYD: Also, the shadow study. I would like to make one more statement about the shadow study. The shadow study that they had performed did not include the Bulkhead.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

ALICIA BOYD: This is a violation of the SEQR laws.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony.

DAVID COHEN: Good morning Chairs. Majority

Leader Cumbo, Council Member Barron. My name is

2.1

2.2

David Cohen, I represent 32BJSEIU. 32BJ represents over 80,000 people who clean and maintain buildings throughout the city.

I'm going to speak about good permanent jobs.

We're here to express our concerns about this rezoning CPVI Crown Heights LLC, an affiliate of Carmel Partners and the Lead on the ULURP has failed to give sufficient assurances that building service jobs at this site will come with job protections, prevailing wages and other responsible employment practices like job training and safety standards.

Recent experience at another project owned by

Carmel Affiliate gives us great pause at 19 Dutch, a

rental project owned by that affiliate. The

contractor at the building committed to paying

prevailing wage was terminated and most of the

existing workers lost their job. We find this

alarming particularly given that building service

jobs are typically filled by local residents and

we're concerned about what that means for the project

before you folks today.

The rezoning is not just about the building that the developer has proposed, it would change three blocks in Crown Heights and has a potential to expand

2.1

2.2

the footprint of other property owners who have been accused of mistreating tenants and violating rights.

These concerns extend to Carmel Partners itself, an affiliate of which reportedly has a history of evicting students and families in California from affordable housing in order to build luxury condos.

40 seconds, okay. We believe that these are compelling reasons to keep the zoning in this area as it is rather than allowing landlords and developers with questionable track records to expand. Its also worth noting that if this rezoning is not approved, new residential construction that happens As of Right, may use the 421A tax credit. If this occurs, affordable housing could be created without MIH and without a rezoning that would add additional market rate units to the neighborhood.

We know there's a lot of development happening in Crown Heights and we believe that any project that is being proposed should deliver serious benefits.

We have about — in and around the project, we have about 1,000 of our members live there.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: You can wrap it up.

DAVID COHEN: So, additionally we think the developer is seeking a change. The neighborhood

2.2

should make a meaningful effort to address community concerns. This application is substantially similar to a previous one withdrawn in 2017 and once again, the rezoning was unanimously rejected by the Community Board, disapproved by the Borough President and we believe it's a problematic precedent for development in Crown Heights without those strong, good job commitments. We urge you to vote against it.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I just want to say I'm very impressed that you are here today representing Medgar Evers College and speaking on behalf of the student body and as you stated also, as a single mom.

I just wanted to ask you, just from the testimony that you heard today, what are your thoughts in terms of the opportunity — the opportunities, if you would call them that, of building either a seven story building with 280 luxury apartments that will be going — lets say for an average of \$1 million each or the ability to create 518 units with 140 of those units being affordable. The options are with this particular

2.2

development project which are so difficult is that
something will be built there regardless.

Once as it was stated, someone spends \$40 million on property, they want to see something realize there. So, what are your thoughts in terms of either a luxury building of 280 units with no affordability or the option to have 140 units?

Because this is what is my every day challenge.

And I'd like to propose the same to question to you Mrs. Boyd as well. Absent of the technicalities that are very real around the ULURP process and how things were adhered to or not. But I would like to start with the young lady first.

SAKIA FLETCHER: So, in particular, those two options are actually not even good options either way, when you say affordable, as you said, that word has been hijacked and is no longer affordable. Our incomes are in that particular area and in boroughs such as the Bronx and other areas, we've been mixed in with Nassau County and people who make more high income.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Correct.

SAKIA FLETCHER: So, even the affordable as we call it affordable, is still not a feasible option

2.2

especially when the developers have all of the — they have all of the chips and all of the marbles because they have the option of setting the AMI. They also have the option of saying who applications are approved. When you go in and even if your application is approved based on income, which they base it on income, when you go in for the interview, they have the option of saying whether they want to move forward with your application or not.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Let me ask you this question because you also stated that you had been rejected eleven times. Have you made it to the interview process?

SAKIA FLETCHER: Yes, I have, four times.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Four times and what happens at that interview process? Are you explained as to why you were not able to move forward because we do hear this particular issue come up quite frequently?

SAKIA FLETCHER: So, the first time when I was rejected, I made it to the process of being able to actually have a sit-down interview and they told me, you know what, this project is not for you. The preference actually is not set for you. So, they

2.2

also have the option of saying which preference — well, your zip code doesn't fall within the preference. So, you meet the income level but because of the preference, you don't fall within the preference that they set for that particular project.

So, that was one of them. Another one, they didn't give me a definite why I don't meet it. The only thing that they said, we're going to further review your application and based on I think, they only set — it maybe either 100 — so, let's use this project for example. If they say 140, you have one bedroom. I'm a single mother, I live by myself Head of Household in my category, it might be only four. Four, four person that meets single one person, head of child, it might only be four actual apartments for my particular — because then you're narrowed down also.

So, if those four apartments are gone, then even though you meet the income level, you're out. You don't meet any other. So, that's the way they set it down. They cut it even more based on also, the component who's in your household — how many people are in your household.

2.2

2 So, its not only income, but household composition also.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, just in closing, both options on the table. Both are horrible options?

SAKIA FLETCHER: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Which option do you chose?

SAKIA FLETCHER: I definitely don't choose to raise it to 17 feet, that's definitely out.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, you chose the luxury condominiums?

SAKIA FLETCHER: I don't chose either option but if that was on the table, so if that was on the table as you stated, there is going to be something on the table, that we go back into the negotiation in particular with Medgar Evers College, seeing that if they wanted to put another application instead of those condominiums, maybe adding a component that would even be a higher benefit to the people that's in the community.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I hear you. Alright, thank you very much. Ms. Boyd.

2.2

ALICIA BOYD: First and foremost, that area is rezoned to protect the garden and the shadows studies that were produced by the City in 1991 stated that anything past 13 stories will be detrimental to the garden.

So, now we're proposing 17 stories because we want a few affordable housings, which is never affordable to us when we look at the AMI of \$104,000 where our AMI is \$40,000. So, we know the affordable category does not apply to us. It actually applies to a community that will come into the community.

So, I don't buy the affordable and I do not think that we need to be endangering our public green spaces for a few crumbs of affordable housing.

This developer wanted to build affordable housing, there are lots of pieces of land all over Brooklyn that they could buy, have affordable housing and not impede upon our green spaces but they don't do it because they want affordable housing. They do it because they want park views and that's why they're doing it and we all know that. This is about park views and getting as much money as they possibly can because of those park views.

2.2

So, no, I do not take the option and like my colleague said, they'll be looking for the 421A tax break, you can bet your bottom dollar on that one. They'll be putting aside some affordable units, so they can get some money from that and so, no.

In 1991, the city said we're going to protect the garden. We're going to put height limits in this community because there three major places that could be developed. The land, the sky, the sun has not moved. We still have the same ecosystems. We still have the same impacts.

We have produced documents that show that

Cornell Reality lied on their EAS, that they failed
to apply to the state and city regulations and yet,
everybody that we have went in front of refuses to
pay attention to that. Just like you will not pay
attention to that. What you will say when you
approve this plan, because we know this is what you
will do. You will say that 135 affordable units is
great for our community and we just need to have that
because we have an affordable housing crisis,
completely ignoring the fact that it will have a
detrimental effect on our public green spaces and
also have a detrimental affect on our community.

| Because we will wind up with 500 units that are not |
|---|
| affordable to our community and we'll have about 10 |
| apartments that somebody in our community will be   |
| able to purchase.                                   |

Cornell Reality bought that piece of property with the six to seven story height limited zone.

They knew what they were getting into. Let them build As of Right.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you very much Mrs. Boyd. We are going to call up the next panel.

Council Member Barron has questions.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: We'd like to recognize Council Member Barron.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much.

Just briefly, your representing the student body of Medgar. Are you a part of the student government there or just a student there interested in this project?

SAKIA FLETCHER: And so, I'm the President of the Public Administration Club.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Oh, great.

SAKIA FLETCHER: So, I also sit on the SGA in leadership of my department.

| COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Good. I'm glad to hear         |
|---|
| that because I am the Chair of the Committee on       |
| Higher Education and I'm always pleased to see that   |
| students are involved and raising their voices. So,   |
| I just wanted to clarify that and in terms of Ms.     |
| Boyd, your position of inaccuracies, in the           |
| application. The application then said that they      |
| would not go beyond a designated number of apartments |
| and now the project is beyond what they had said they |
| would do?   |

ALICIA BOYD: Yes, I can show it to you. If you look at page — this is the second document that I produced to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, the clerk will give it to me  $-\$ 

ALICIA BOYD: And on page seven of that document — did the clerk give it to you?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: He'll give it to me afterwards.

ALICIA BOYD: Okay, underneath the water and sewage infrastructure it asks, does this project produce more than 400 residential units? And they checked no.

2.2

As a result of them checking the no, they did not have to take a look at the water and sewage analysis that's required by the city and the state.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay.

ALICIA BOYD: So, that means is that we will have 565 residential units that will be putting strain on our water and sewage systems which are out of compliance as it is with the federal government and not having the developer take a look at that and talk about how they can litigate that.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, and finally, I'm very concerned about density all across the city and we had a project in my district that — I don't remember the proposed number of stories, but it was across the street from a garden and the city at that time tried to say the garden was not protected but as God would have it, we had someone do some research and find documents that attested to the fact that the city had at some point conducted that property as a garden.

So, we were able to get the garden protected and preserved because the city was not going to keep it.

And a part of that requirement was that they had to do the shadow analysis for the entire year, and show

2.2

what the impact was on that particular garden and based on that information, we did have them reduce the height and we did have them enter in agreement with the gardens that would give them benefits for the duration of the time that they're there.

So, I'm very much concerned about gardens and protecting them and not loosing open space and we look forward to further investigation to find out if in fact, there was some misrepresentation or change from the document that was initially submitted.

And if there's change, then they need to comply with the requirements of the change.

ALICIA BOYD: Well, what we did is we conducted two independent studies that we have given to this ULURP application and both of our studies showed that the potential impact on the garden would be negative based upon Cornell Realities Application.

So, we have provided that documentation. It is a part of the ULURP process records and so, we will move forward with challenging anything that the City Council does because we're basically saying that we have proof that this development will have a detrimental effect.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. Thank you all for your testimony today. I'd like to call up the next and last panel Geoffrey Davis, Demitralis [SP?]

Hawkins and Jennifer Sun.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I just want to say or to add to the record, just so that those that are watching or viewing at home, the proposed units for the affordability, the permanent units would be approximately 52 units at 40 AMI. So, 52 units "affordable" at 40 AMI for a family of four would be a combined household income of \$41,720. So, there would be 52 units set aside for a family of four making \$41,720 a year. There would be 26 units at 60 AMI and that would be for a family of four \$62,580, and there would be 52 units at 80 AMI, which would be \$83,440.

So, right now, minimum wage is \$31,200 a year.

So, one person making — working at let's say, a fast food industry, a restaurant, a McDonalds or a Wendy's in the near by area, making \$31,200 would qualify. A couple together, both making minimum wage, would qualify at the 60 AMI and potentially for the 80 AMI,

2.2

that would be maybe an early childcare worker and a partner potentially at the \$83,440 area.

So, that's whats being proposed here. So, I just want people to understand what the "affordability" is. Again, for a family of four we're looking at 52 units at \$41,720 for a family of four. 26 units for a family of four, its \$62,580 and 52 units at 80 AMI for a combined household family of four at \$83,440.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. We're going to start with Jennifer.

JENNIFER SUN: Good morning Chair, Council

Member Cumbo and Council Member Barron. Thanks for
the opportunity to submit testimony. I'll read an
abbreviated version, but you do have a fuller version
of our testimony there.

So, my name is Jennifer Sun and I am the CoExecutive Director of Asian Americans For Equality

AAFE. I apologize at the other Co-Executive Director
Thomas Yu can not be here. He actually leads our
affordable housing development work at AAFE.

We are an established 45-year-old non-profit organization providing social services, community development, small business lending, and affordable

2.2

housing development for New York City's Asian

Americans, as well as for low income communities from
all background in needs of our services.

I'll also note that we're an experienced nonprofit affordable housing developer. We've developed
and preserved about 600 units of affordable housing
and almost 40 buildings primarily in lower Manhattan.

We are the owners of a parcel of land located at 141 Montgomery Street in Brooklyn. This is adjacent to 40 Crown Street. This is within the rezoning area adjacent to the applicant's property. We had purchased the parcel at a nominal fee from Enterprise Community Partners several years ago, for the purposes of long-term affordable housing development. The land comes with deed restrictions that require consent from New York City Housing Preservation and Development for development, and it has always been our mission and intent to create fully affordable housing.

Over the years, we have attempted negotiations with our neighbor. First Cornell Reality, and now Carmel Partners, to see if there was an opportunity for partnership to increase the number of affordable units and positive community impact. Unfortunately,

2.2

we have not reached terms that were agreeable to our organization's non-profit mission, and no partnership was ever realized. We have followed the series of public hearings and events over the past weeks and have heard the concerns raised by the local community. AAFE does not wish to become a wedge during this contentious process, and through careful internal deliberation with our board, we have come up with the following guidelines whereby we would be receptive to a partnership with Carmel Partners.

You have those guidelines there, so I won't read them.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I would like to hear them. That's pretty critical.

JENNIFER SUN: So, those guidelines include that

1. Carmel, via a land swap or land contribution to

our site, contributes to a doubling of affordable

units built under the proposed R8X rezoning, more

than what is possible under the current lot

configuration and current R6A zoning.

2. Carmel must also fulfil their minimum

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing requirements and not

count the affordable units created by AAFE towards

the required MIH affordable unit number.

2.2

- 3. AAFE and Carmel would commit to direct public input with the local community board, elected officials, and local residents to determine the ideal bedroom types, unit types, and AMI bands.
- 4. To the greatest extent possible, the design and massing of the new larger development should have no shadow impact on the Botanical Gardens.
- 5. The affordable units on both AAFE and Carmel's sits should have the maximum local community preference in the housing lottery allowable by the Fair Housing Law.
- 36. All affordable units generated from this rezoning will be affordable in perpetuity and fully enforceable by City deed covenant and regulatory agreements.

We thank you for your attention and allowing us to submit our testimony.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you, I have one additional question. I am extremely pleased that you are here today. Is part of your partnership or idea, and when you talk about massing, is it to combine the properties to build let's say, one development or that your thought process would be to keep the spaces separate?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

JENNIFER SUN: I guess, on one hand it would be sensitive to the developer and the fact that they're in the middle of this land use review process. Presumably, they would not want their project to be delayed.

So, from a practical perspective, assuming that, I think we're envisioning a scenario where they might contribute other property that would then allow us to build a larger project and therefore produce more affordable units and ensure that all of those units are permanently affordable.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you very much and I look forward to having further conversation following this hearing and hoping that the negotiations continue to move forward with the recommendations that you've put forward.

JENNIFER SUN: We are looking at development scenarios and so, we look forward to the opportunity to share that with you and with Carmel.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you.

JENNIFER SUN: Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: District Leader Geoffrey

Davis.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: One second, one second. We are also joined by Zach Bohmer [SP?], you're also part of AAFE. Are you here to? Alright.

ZACH BOHMER: I don't need to speak.

GEOFFREY DAVIS: You don't need to speak Zach if you don't want to.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Just turn on your mic.

GEOFFREY DAVIS: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon, good morning, good afternoon everyone. Alright, Geoffrey Davis. A long-time resident of Crown Heights, 50 years or so. 25 years activists improving central Brooklyn, particularly Crown Heights. 15 years as a victim/survivor of violence and four years as democratic district leader in this particular area. So, I got a handle on whats going on in this particular area.

We're faced with a project of As of Right. As of Right, 200 or so apartments whether we engage or not, but their willing to do affordable housing with some extra apartments that we can benefit from.

I'm for it because there is a housing crisis.

People need a place to live. Simple as that. If
their willing to give more apartments for this
particular community to have a place to live, that's

2.2

wonderful. Right down the block is a shelter that we fought for to have permanent affordable housing as opposed to temporary housing. This gives an opportunity for the people in the shelter to transition to permanent affordable housing which is right down the block. They get a chance to stay in this particular area. I am a supporter of the garden. Brooklyn Botanic Garden, I do a lot of things there over the years and we have a letter from the president stating that it has no impact. This particular project has no impact on the garden.

So, the garden says, not this project but other projects, they'll be testifying for but not this particular project. So, they did their study and they submitted a letter to city planning and it said that it has zero impact, this particular project on our garden. So, I'm comfortable with that. We need affordable housing if 25 percent from this project, 25 percent from the other project, 25 percent from the other project, 25 percent from and people have a place to live.

Now, yes, training programs are extremely important. My thing is training programs in the healthcare field. Personal care assistant, home

2.2

health aids and scholarships. We will continue to address violence in this area through partnering with developers with scholarships, training programs, healthcare programs and the like, and people from the neighborhood when they do construction and so forth jobs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

DEMITRALIS HAKINS: Hello, my name is Demitralis [SP?] Hakins. I was a resident of the Crown Heights community. I'm now living in a shelter in Manhattan and I think this project would help us out a lot because it would help us to get permanent housing with low income.

We've been in a shelter for awhile now and it would just be a good thing just to have our own place and be able to afford the apartment. So, I think this project would be very helpful for us.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Let me ask you a question. Have you — during the time that you have been in shelter, have you been assisted or supported in applying for any of our housing lotteries?

DEMITRALIS HAKINS: There is very little assistance, but there's a website that you can go on and if you're connected to the website, they send you

2.2

all the different apartments that you're able to apply for. The apartments for lottery and different housing.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: But where you are in Manhattan and shelter, is there a system set up where you're constantly able to have access to support to individuals, to people that can help you along the way throughout the application process, whether its helping to fill out the forms, whether its helping to create an application that makes you eligible?

DEMITRALIS HAKINS: There are people, but I don't think there's enough. I think they need help in that area.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Okay, I'd love to talk with you more about that.

DEMITRALIS HAKINS: Okay.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: But thank you. Chair Moya.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Councilwoman Barron has a few questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a question for Ms. Sun, and you say in your testimony that you purchased the parcel at 141 Montgomery Street. How much did you pay for it?

2.2

JENNIFER SUN: I don't know the purchase price, but I can find out.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, when did you purchase it?

JENNIFER SUN: A few years ago. So, I have to apologize, I was appointed COED in July and I am just learning about our real estate portfolio in terms of the details, but again, I'm happy to follow up with the information.

COUNCIL MEMEBR BARRON: And where are you in your project to develop housing — affordable housing. How far along are you in that goal?

JENNIFER SUN: For this particular site or just in general?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: That site.

JENNIFER SUN: For this site, we have not been actively looking at redeveloping this site. We were interested in seeing how this process might unfold before pursuing it further.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, so what is your position on the project as it currently exists?

JENNIFER SUN: I think we share the community's concerns about the amount of affordable housing that would develop as a result of this rezoning.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And what about the density, the height of the project?

JENNIFER SUN: I think also we're sensitive to the community's concerns about the impacts that it might have with the surrounding community and the garden.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, thank you very much.

JENNIFER SUN: Your welcome.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. Thank you to the panel. Are there any other members of the public who wish to testify?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application and it will be laid over. Thank you.

Our next public hearing is on L.U.'s 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, the Marcus Garvey Village rezoning L&M Development Partners seek a zoning map amendment to change portions of the existing R6 zoning district to an R72 and R72 C24 districts, a zoning text amendment to establish a mandatory inclusionary housing area. A special permit to modify allowable lot coverage, height set back in distance between buildings and a special permit to

2.2

wave parking requirements in order to facilitate the development of seven new, mixed used buildings with approximately 676 affordable housing units on unused portions of the existing Marcus Garvey Village Housing Development in Brownsville.

NYC HPD is the applicant for this position of city owned property to allow L&M to require and incorporate two small pieces of city owned vacant land into two of the development sites and the NYC DPR is the applicant for site selection and acquisition approval for a 5,200 square foot parcel located across Bristol Street from Betsy Head Park to become a community garden.

Folks, if you could please close the door or keep it down.

The proposed new, mixed, used development will create seven new seven to eight story buildings to be built in at least three phases with approximately 676 affordable dwelling units. The property affected is located in Council Member Barron's district and in Council Member Ampry-Samuel's district in Brooklyn.

I now open the public hearing on this application and I will call up — well, before I do that, Council Member do you have any remarks before we begin?

2.2

We will call up the first panel. Richard Label, Joshua Weisstuch, Genevieve Michael, and Lisa Gomez.

Council, if you could please swear in the panel.

name, making sure that the red light is on, on the mic. Do you each swear or affirm that the testimony that you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and to answer all questions truthfully?

RICHARD LABEL: I do.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Genevieve Michael, I do.

LISA GOMEZ: Lisa Gomez, I do.

14 JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: Josh Weisstuch, I do.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: You may begin.

RICHARD LABEL: Thank you Chair Moya, Council Members. I am Richard Label from [Inaudible 15:54] Label and I'm joined by L&M in Development Partners with regards to the Marcus Garvey Extension.

Briefly this proposal involves a series of zoning actions which require us to go through ULURP, which include rezoning of parcels from R6 and R72C23 as well as a large-scale general development and in addition, certain other zoning actions including a

2.2

text amendment to map the area with a Mandatory
Inclusionary Housing designated area.

So, I would turn this over to Josh who will run through the presentation and the panels available to answer any questions.

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: Thanks Richard. So, I'll give a brief history first. Between 2014 and 2016, L&M rehabilitated the 625-unit complex. It spans 10 city blocks known as Marcus Garvey Village.

Since completing the rehab, the near 100 vacant units which are one of many symptoms of the disrepair at the complex in 2014, is now over a one-year wait list. Safety enhancements across the sites with security cameras and increased staffing has significantly decreased crime and overall quality of life for residents is improved.

Additionally, we exceeded state, local, and WB hiring goals during the rehab work. L&M makes every effort to engage with residents. Marcus Garvey's family day is back, as a result of their strong TA and ownership listening to residents.

Residents continue to pay rents no greater than 60 percent AMI as governed by the state low income

2.2

2 housing tax credit and Michell Lama regimes. And the 3 project will remain affordable for 40 years.

L&M involved other organizations at Marcus Garvey. A needs survey was conducted by the [inaudible 2:18:14] group that provided helpful information of what residents would like to see at the site.

In response, we brought on Project **Deets** that has provided the community with affordable fresh produce and now has a fresh juice café.

There is a summer camp and after school program in the community room at Marcus Garvey provided by Grand Street Settlement and BCJC built and now runs a youth club house and center in response for the need for youth programming.

While the Marcus Garvey project is running well, we aim to further enhance the neighborhood and facilities and activate the Brownsville community with the council's approval of this proposal.

So, one of the actions — Richard just went through a few of them. Essentially, we are adding a commercial overlay to the existing residential district to allow retail along Livonia Avenue. There is a zoning text amendment to establish Mandatory

2.1

2.2

Inclusionary Housing to ensure affordability. We're looking to increase the open space and green space and add density for the open space and green space and create efficient buildings.

So, to that end, there's a special permit to blend law coverage throughout the development. We both are in agreement with the green thumb from the Department of Parks. They have a site that's 3,000 square feet adjacent to one of the developments and we're swapping that with a 6,000 square foot site owned by the applicant. So, there doubling in size and they have a space — its actually closer to the operator, the MHDA Academy.

There's a disposition acquisition of the HPD owned vacant lot adjacent to site E and a special permit to wave the existing parking requirements.

So, here's a site plan. The dark grey, seven dark grey buildings are the development sites. A, B, C, D, and E go up and down along Livonia on either side. F and G are at either ends on the left and right of the T-shape of the development. The lighter grey and green are the existing Marcus Garvey.

What are the benefits to the Brownsville residents? This project will maximize opportunities

2.2

for affordable housing, generate ground floor retail in community facility. There are jobs generated both in the construction ongoing maintenance and generate also by the occupants of the retail and community facility. Will eliminate underutilized space from the lots and inherent with the development, there's improved security and lighting along Livonia and the project includes youth and senior programing and other opportunities for resources to be used by the community.

Here's a rendering of the site going down

Livonia. You've got — we're not saying that these are

going to be the uses but its just a rendering to

activate the corridor along Livonia.

Numerous versions of this plan that started with a twelve-story development a couple years ago, now tops out at eight stories at the two outer buildings F and G and seven stories at the rest.

Don't bother squinting your eyes, this diagram is for illustrative purposes and I'll detail them in a moment. The point is after meeting with the Council Members and we've made many cuts to the building massing's, we have increased parking in an

2.2

effort to achieve a development that works for the community.

Based on our conversations with the Council
Members, we worked with the Community Boards Equity
Planning Committee on an MOU. We agreed to
incorporate 32 BJ as part of the ongoing maintenance
of the site once its completed and we've reached out
to tenants with backyards facing the development
sites.

So, the development includes between 625 and 627 units of affordable housing across seven buildings to be built over the next six or so years. As mentioned in the prior side, city planning certified a denser development. Efforts were made to reduce bulk and increase parking at the costs of community facility space. We now have financeable buildings that max out at eight stories.

To exemplify the cuts have pulled out to typical conditions. One, is along Livonia, this is a building that we pushed the rear wall away from the existing Marcus Garvey Building and we introduced a setback at that same location at the request of the Council Members and at buildings G and F, an example, building G, we've eliminated the top floor. So, its

2.2

2 now eight stories high and we've decreased the street 3 walls to five stories.

The large-scale plan consists of buildings similar to other city sponsored sites and developments along Livonia. Both in size and AMI levels.

This is the projected unit distribution, it will conform to the available term sheets, or city or state term sheets at the time and as far as distribution, we're assuming something like this; it's in line with the Council Members in that there's a healthy mix of two- and three-bedroom units.

There has been discussion of a senior building which would skew the mix somewhat to the studio one-bedroom sizes and we continue talks with city and state agencies on available funding for senior housing.

The project will have rents as low as \$215 for studio units and have AMI levels tiered at 60 percent and below for 80 percent of the units. The balance of the units will be between 60 and 80 percent AMI. The projects will be funded phase one, we're anticipating HCR's shop term sheet and then phase two would be HPD and HDC's LL term sheet.

2.2

So, at the beginning of the ULURP process, we signed on MOU with the Community Board Equity

Planning Committee which highlights working together to identify retail and community facility operators, maximize affordability, increase parking, which you've already done, and we strive to hire local and MWBE entities.

Should we receive a green light to move forward, we anticipate closing on phase one at the end of 2019. So, construction would anticipate starting in early 2020. Phase 2 potentially mid-2020 and phases three and four would stagger between a start date of 2021, 2022 with an estimated completion in 2024.

So, thank you for your time and we look forward to questions. Oh, I'm sorry, maybe not questions.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: So, L&M spoke about the project as a whole, I want to just quickly speak to the city's actions. My name is Genevieve Michael from HPD. So, as you heard the project area consists of private sites as well as city owned property located at block 3287, lot 27 and block 3588, lots 32 through 36.

The city owned property accounts for approximately 5,517 square feet of the development

| area or approximately four percent of the project     |
|---|
| area. The city owned lots were once designated Urban  |
| Renewal sites as part of the Marcus Garvey Urban      |
| Renewal Plan URP which was approved in 1968.          |
| Although the URP expired in 2008, the city owned      |
| sites will be developed with residential uses as      |
| originally envisioned to briefly summarize a portion  |
| the ULURP action in which HPD is a co-applicant. We   |
| are seeking approval of disposition pursuant to 197 ( |
| of block 3587, Lot 27 and block 3588, Lots 32 through |
| 36 in order to convey the land to the sponsor,        |
| Brownsville, Livonia, south housing development fund  |
| corporation currently block 3588, lots 32 through 36  |
| are a green thumb garden currently under the          |
| jurisdiction of Department of Parks and Recreation.   |
| And block 3587, lot 27 is an unimproved vacant lot    |
| under the jurisdiction of HPD.                        |

The sponsors proposing to develop the project under HPD is extremely low and low affordable program under the other program sponsor purchase city owned or privately-owned sites and construct multi-family rental housing affordable to low income families with a range of incomes from 30 percent to 80 percent of the area median income. Projects may include a tier

2.

of units with rents affordable to households earning up to 100 percent of AMI and subject to project underwriting up to 30 percent of the units maybe rented to formally homeless families and individual.

The buildings that will be developed on the city owned sites and adjacent privately-owned lots on development sites C and E will have a mixture of unit types which L&M spoke to.

Additionally, the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of City Wide

Administrative Services are co-applicants for the site selection and the acquisition of the property located at 3559 Part of lot 1, given the city will be conveying the existing garden site, which measures approximately 3,000 square feet to the sponsor, the acquisition, and site selection by the city of the 5,236 square feet acquisition and the 892 square feet easement area for use as a community garden.

The new community garden on the acquisition site and easement area will be approximately 6,128 square feet. More than twice the size of the existing, approximately 3,000 square feet community garden.

And now, I think we can open it up to questions.

2.1

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. I just want to acknowledge that we have been joined by Council Member Ampry-Samuel. Just a few questions before I turn it over to my colleagues. I know that you had mentioned in the presentation the modifications to the setbacks, are those in line with the recommendations from the local members and the borough president?

LISA GOMEZ: Basically yes, we've met with the Council Members I guess, ten days ago, two weeks ago and reviewed them. There were some discrepancies between what the borough president and the council members calculations, but I think they're in the spirit of what the borough president was recommending. We did speak to the borough presidents land use staff and let him know that we were in discussions with the Council Members.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, for the sites on Lavonia Avenue, how will the project mitigate the noise from the elevated subway tracks?

LISA GOMEZ: So, we built a number of buildings along subway tracks pursuant to SEQR and other environmental regulations. Windows have to be double and triple glaze. We're going to minimize the amount

2.2

of windows that we need to put along Livonia for example, if you're at a corner facing Chester and Livonia, we'd have a blank wall on the Livonia side.

There are a number of projects up and down Livonia that have been built in this fashion.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, and this is a large-scale project with you know, seven development sites and I know you touched a little bit about senior housing, but can you go into a little bit deeper of those conversations in regards to bringing in senior housing to this project?

LISA GOMEZ: So, we know that there is a need in many, many communities across the city for aging populations and aging in place. There are not a ton of available funding programs and we certainly can't say that anyone's committed to funding it. We know its an interest. It's something we're going to pursue and hopefully with the help of the community and the elected will be successful. You know, we're very happy to do it, we think it would be great for the neighborhood, but we cannot represent that anyone has committed to fund it yet.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Got it and what resiliency

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MOYA:

and sustainability measure our plan for this project, Solar panels, rain gardens?

RICHARD LABEL: We always consider solar panels in all our rehab and new construction at the existing Marcus Garvey, we brought in a 500-kilowatt solar grid as well as a fuel cell, the first in the city that produces electricity for natural gas and we also have a battery that helps shave peak loads and get off of comets grid during peak hours. So, there is potential to actually tap into some of that existing. Structure at the existing Marcus Garvey and of course we'll do enterprise green communities and fixtures and LED lights in the suite of available efficiencies for the new buildings.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Great, I'm also very glad to hear that there's been a commitment to good jobs on this project. I think that's, a great way to start and the last question is, can we just go back to the AMI breakdowns and the size of each unit.

LISA GOMEZ: Did you have a specific question, or did you want us to review it?

Yeah.

LISA GOMEZ: Okay, just review it.

2.2

| J(      | OSHUA 1 | WEISST | UCH:   | Okay,  | so t | this is | the   | ren | t     |
|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|---------|-------|-----|-------|
| range : | for the | e typi | cal st | tudio, | the  | three-k | pedro | om  | based |
| on the  | AMI's   | of 30  | to -   | I bel: | ieve | that's  | for   | 60  |       |
| percent | t AMI a | and -  |        |        |      |         |       |     |       |

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: The three bedroom is at what?

LISA GOMEZ: Well it depends on the different

AMI's.

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: So, 60 percent AMI - do you want rents or incomes?

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Incomes.

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: Okay, so incomes would be for 30 percent for a single person \$21,900 for a family of four. It goes up to \$31,000 and then at the max for 60 percent its \$43,800 for a single person up to \$62,580 for a family of four.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Got it.

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: And as far as the tiering for the 60 percent and below, we're going to work with the agencies to meet their term sheet and also make sure that we can finance the buildings.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Great, thank you very much.

I'm now going to turn it over to Council Member

Barron for a few questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I'll defer to my colleague because she's still in her hearing.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Oh, we will now turn it over to Council Member Ampry-Samuels.

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: I appreciate that. First, I want to say, thank you so much. We've had a lot of meetings over the past several months and I appreciate the back and forth and making every attempt to incorporate our ideas and feedback.

I have a question about the local hiring piece.

Can you just describe the conversations that you've had with local groups or residents related to the hiring with this project as well as opportunities for folks in the community to be employed on other projects that you have throughout the city because you are working on a good number of development projects throughout New York and I just feel like a Good Faith gesture or a way to really be able to partner with the community is seeing if there are opportunities right now today on some of your other sites. So, can you just speak to the conversations that you have had?

LISA GOMEZ: Absolutely, I'll take them in pieces, so we maintain a team of folks within our

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

company whose job is to handle outreach, make connections, and help companies becomes certified,

MWBE companies. We are required to — when we do a state job, we must use state certified companies.

The city's more flexible, the state's less flexible.

So, we have already begun to attend local job fair - sorry, hiring fairs. We've been to LDC New York, I think we've been to three so far and we know our job is fairly far out. So, we haven't done a ton. Usually those get going probably nine months or so before we actually start bidding our work, but we have made some of those connections. We have built in this neighborhood before, so we do have some of those relationships. I'm very proud of our MWBE hiring record. We've hired - we spent this year alone, we spend about \$400 million to MWBE companies throughout all of our projects, not just on any given project and that represents about 20 - I'm not sure exactly where we are in the overall denominator but plus 20 percent of our total spend.

On the local hiring phase, we work primarily through building skills, which is a city-wide non-profit that helps connect people to training and jobs. We fund some of the training, the OSHA

2.1

2.2

training and that's available. We'd love to talk more about that. We're happy to refer people now, even though we don't have a job, we can certainly help with referrals of neighborhood residents into the building skills program.

We also work with green city forests where we've had a really great track record. We started with them on the NYCHA buildings. Some of my favorite stories are when somebody comes in as a youth who is underemployed or unemployed, goes through a training program, works in construction and gets a job. We have some working in the building and building services and then works his or her way up and we do have a number of those success stories.

Another of our partners, Grand Street Settlement has worked with us, both in the lower east side and — COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: So, not to cut you off, just in the interest of time. So, we have organizations that are currently working right there in Brownsville.

LISA GOMEZ: We will work with them.

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: We work directly with MAN- so have you had direct conversations and worked directly with young people, young men and

2.1

2.2

women who are in their programs and said, okay, can you send me a list of folks that have this particular skill set and we can get them employed on this particular site in the Bronx or this particular site

think Brownsville— is here as his grand street. I can answer if we've gotten anyone employed. I will find out the answer to that for you. We have these conversations with every elected in every neighborhood in which we work. Everyone wants their folks in.

ask that question is because I had conversations in the past with you all and I remember having the conversation about building skills and when I went to the website, I saw that there was — I want to say maybe in August, there was an opportunity for a job fair and dug deeper into the number of positions that were available and at that time, it was 74 positions that were available and they listed the type of jobs and they were all, if you have a OSHA 30, if you have you know, a license or a certificate as a plumber and these were all jobs that when I looked around the

2.2

| community, you know, folks have that skill set and   |
|--|
| then the conversation turned into, well, if you      |
| submit the names of folks, then we can get them      |
| hired. So, we sent our people to the fairs and       |
| whatever this particular fair was with building      |
| skills, and no one was hired. So, I'm just trying to |
| figure out if there's some like conversations being  |
| had with the organizations and maybe the people that |
| we sent directly just weren't connected or not part  |
| of the network because they didn't know that they    |
| were coming from our office or coming from our       |
| community. So, I'm just trying to get some kind of   |
| concrete -   |

LISA GOMEZ: I don't know, I can't speak to that

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: And I don't want to take up too much time but -

LISA GOMEZ: I'm happy to follow up afterwards and figure out forensically what happened there and if that process broke, we'll fix it.

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay, alright, and the last thing, I see on — that's part of phase one, sites B and D that sit on my side of the tracks, my district literally. That's with shopping state

2.2

funding and there's also support of housing included
with these developments. So, can you just speak to
the populations that are going to be targeted within
the support of housing and is there a set aside for

6 homeless families or individuals -

LISA GOMEZ: So, I think that's something we want to — it's something we heard sort of both sides of throughout the conversations with the community in terms of concerns as well as opportunities. So, I think before we sort of settle on a population, I think we would want to talk with you all about sort of what makes sense as well as providers who make sense.

So, I think that's a conversation that you know, we'll want to engage with you all and probably others a little bit more deeply.

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: Okay, so you have not had these conversations?

LISA GOMEZ: No, we have not had these conversations. The states not even going to talk to us until early in the new year, so I think we've got time. You know, we're probably over a year away from closing.

3

4

5

6

COUNCIL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: And this is really my last. We mentioned like our goal to make sure that there's real ownership in our community and everyone has a part of the process and have a piece of the pie. Can you speak to your ideas around

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

2.2

23

24

community land trusts?

LISA GOMEZ: Sure, as we've talked about in over the past few months, its an idea we're more than willing to explore. We've spoken to folks at HPD as well as some academics. I think there needs to be some further work done. I think the industry is nascent. There isn't a community land trust group in the neighborhood yet. We remain open to that conversation and we will help to work on it.

I know you've had more recent conversations with HPD, I think?

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: Yeah, there are city efforts to kind of get this thing off the ground and moving and we're happy to stay plugged in, but this is something that comes from the community. The community develops the community land trust and then works with the developer. So, we are open to working with a local community land trust.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

I think there's also some technical 2 LISA GOMEZ: 3 assistance providers, Genevieve can you speak to that

a little?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: I can't speak in depth because I am certainly not the HPD Community Land Trust expert, but I know that folks are definitely working on it. We've heard you know, I think loud and clear from several council members that there is an interest in strengthening community land trust and figuring out a way to make it work. So, certainly happy to continue those conversations and I can you know, help push to help make sure that that's happening the way that it should be.

JOSHUA WESSTUCH: If I could add one more thing. Timing of developing that is - there is a long lead time, but this is something that you know, we will remain open to, its not something that has to get set in stone when we close. So, we're willing to be flexible.

COUNICL MEMBER AMPRY-SAMUEL: Thank you so much Chair Moya for your leadership and thank you so much for allowing me the time Council Member Barron.

24

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Council Member.

Now I turn it over to Council Member to follow up
with questions.

thank you to the panel for coming and its been a battle, struggle getting here but I want to echo the comments of my colleague that we've had a very good working relationship in terms of making adjustments to the plan that was originally presented, perhaps some three years ago or their bouts. So, I do appreciate that, and I also want to acknowledge the improvements that have been made at the existing Marcus Garvey Village and that you now have 100 percent occupancy and waiting lists for people to get in, so we want to make sure that that's on the record.

As many people probably know, you know, my target is six stories and you came with twelve, which was twice as much as what I have but I do appreciate the fact that you went back, made modifications, and reduced the height to eight and seven story buildings and that has not gone unnoticed. We do thank you for that. We also want to acknowledge the fact that you did respond to the request to increase parking —I

| don't know if that came up earlier in our discussion |
|--|
| and that is a very critical issue. When you're       |
| talking about bringing in 600 more units, we         |
| certainly need to recognize the fact that there's    |
| going to be parking that's needed. I want to         |
| acknowledge you have reduced the bulk, as we talked  |
| about and also that your history talks about MWBE    |
| local hires and we're looking to make sure that that |
| same record that you have brought continues. I       |
| believe in looking at people's history, looking at   |
| their past. You can make all kinds of promises about |
| what will go on in the future, but your past speaks  |
| to me as what I can expect to go forward, to see in  |
| the future going forward. I do have other questions. |

So, in terms of the AMI bands, I see your chart here which talks about affordability and which talks about the rent range and a studio apartment ranging from \$215 to \$837 that's important to me because in our community as you know, the AMI is about \$34,000. That's the median income basically in my community. So, that speaks to recognizing I'm not supporting shifting the people who have gone through the hard times and not have an opportunity to participate in

2 n

square feet.

 $\operatorname{new}$  - not luxury but well apportioned properties to be able to benefit from that and to apply for that.

What is the size of the studio apartment?

LISA GOMEZ: We know that you don't like small studios, but our plan is to follow the HPD design guidelines which is a minimum studio size of 400

of your commitment to 80 percent of the housing at or below 60 percent of the AMI, I would still want to know what were the income bands? How many at 30, at 40, at 60, at 70? I would like to know what you're projecting to be the number of apartments at each of those bands?

LISA GOMEZ: So, I think its — without sort of having the financing nailed down, it's a little bit difficult to tell you specifically by building. I think we have it for B and D, right? Do you have it for B and D?

JOSHUA WEISSTUCH: Yeah, its — again, its based on what the conversations are with the state. So, we can discuss where we are today with B and D, and again, there's always new term sheets that come out, so we'll be subject to those in the future.

2.2

2 LISA GOMEZ: Everyone sort of follows the same 3 term sheets and the agency sort of prescribe the 4 different levels. Do you have the shop term sheet?

5 I think we have the shop term sheet.

I know you ran these numbers. So, we'll come back to you. We have a better breakdown for B and D then we do the rest because that's further along in the conversations.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, so we'll look to see what it is for A, C, and E which as has been noted is on my side of the tracks and we mean that literally for those people who are not familiar because there is a train track. The number three train goes along Lavonia and the northern part belongs to my colleague and her district and the southern part is in Council District 42.

LISA GOMEZ: So, on A, C, and E, which would theoretically HPD and HDC tell us, remember we haven't committed to you yet, the term sheets read at 10 percent at 30, 10 percent at 40, 10 percent at 50 and the remaining units up to 60 is the current term sheet.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: 10, 10, 10, for 30, 40,50.

2.1

2.2

| T.T.S.A | COME 7. • | And  | 10             | for                     | formally    | homeless.      |
|---------|-----------|------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| TISA    |           | Allu | $\perp$ $\cup$ | $_{\rm T}$ O $_{\rm T}$ | TOTILIATT \ | , 1101112TE22. |

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: 10 for formally

homeless.

LISA GOMEZ: So, that's basically 40 percent below 60, with the remainder being at 60.

questions that I have regard the senior building.

Where are we in terms of getting a firm determination on the senior building?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, and the other

LISA GOMEZ: We won't be able to sort of have those financing conversations until early in the New Year with either the state or the city.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. So, phase one will include which sites?

LISA GOMEZ: B and D.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: B and D. And we had spoken about additional community benefits in terms of an agreement that your company might offer, so that the community will not just get the opportunity to have these beautiful new apartments but also, other general community benefits. So, where are you in that kind of discussion?

LISA GOMEZ: So, as we mentioned, we will continue some of the programming that we've done at

2.2

| Marcus Garvey in terms of after school, youth, anti-  |
|---|
| violence work. We will work with a subcommittee of    |
| the community board to advise us on ground floor      |
| uses, be the community facility or retail along       |
| Livonia. We will continue dialog with the community   |
| board in terms of making sure their updated-on        |
| progress, as we have been and if there are other sort |
| of specific things that folks are interested in,      |
| we're more than willing to engage.                    |

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: In terms of phase three, do you expect that that same affordability will be applied in phase three as in the other phases?

LISA GOMEZ: Generally, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And the larger buildings that are a part of phase three, we had talked about more than just two elevators based on the fact that these are the long buildings, have we talked about adding additional elevators so that people don't get up in the middle and have to walk long distances?

LISA GOMEZ: So, we haven't really massed those buildings beyond you know, really what we've shown you. As we get further in development, we will study how those units break out and we'll elevator them appropriately.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And the commercial space that's going to exist — I'm really excited about the project. I think that it reflects what our community is entitled to in terms of having nice, new construction and it reflects the population that currently lives there which as I said, has an income of about \$34,000 for a family of three.

In terms of the commercial space on the ground floor, have you given it consideration to having affordable rental fees for the commercial activity that will take place there?

understanding how we could make that happen. I think its pretty tough for affordable housing to cross subsidize commercial space, so I think we're open to creative ideas. I think we'll apply to the state for what they call Sit [SP?] funds which is commercial revitalization funds that help sort of buy down the cost of construction. There are not a ton of resources out there for commercial stuff, but I think we're all ears and would be eager to work with you and Council Member Samuel in terms of identifying other ones.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you, I just want to again, commend you for all of the accommodations that you've made to the requests and concerns that my colleague and I have had and look forward to coming

6 to the conclusion. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, Council Member
Barron. Thank you for the panel, thank you for your
testimony today. We're going to now resume the vote
and I just want to acknowledge Council Member Torres
and Council Member Powers have joined us today, thank
you.

COUNCIL: This is a continued vote to approve Land Use items 260, 261, 262, and 263. Torres?

TORRES: I vote I.

COUNCIL: The land use items are approved by a vote of seven in the affirmative, no negatives, and no abstentions and referred to the full land use committee and we'll leave it open again.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, I will call up the next panel now. Clovis Thorn, Zamir Khan, Cyrus Smith. The last name Smith.

Let's start with Zamir. Just turn on your microphone. State your name and you may begin.

2.2

ZAMIR KHAN: My name is Zamir Khan. afternoon Chairman Moya and members of the subcommittee. I am here speaking on behalf of local I'm a doorman from the upper east side of Manhattan. I've been working with 32BJ for the past nine years. I'm here representing the members of our union and our 19 union brothers and sisters who are porters and handymen at the Marcus Garvey apartments. 

32BJ as you may know, we represent 80,000 building service workers across the city and we're here today to express our strong support for the Marcus Garvey infill project proposed by Brownsville, Livonia Associates LLC, an affiliate of L&M Development Partners. Marcus Garvey Preservation LLC, and the City. We estimate that the infill project with generate about ten new building service jobs that will most likely be filled in the local community. We're hoping that it is filled in the local community.

We're happy to report that the applicants of this ULURP have committed that these jobs will be good jobs that pay prevailing wages and give workers dignity. That hits close to home for me because these are the kind of jobs that enabled my father.

2.2

40-year member of 32BJ to provide for myself and my siblings growing up and now as a 32BJ member, I'm allowed to provide for my two children and my family as well.

HPD's commitment to support community objectives around affordable housing and an economic opportunity throughout the Brownsville plan is thoroughly executed by the Marcus Garvey infill project and we at 32BJ believe that the project should be looked at as an example for affordable projects that are subsided throughout city financing. The creation of 724 units of affordable housing and a commitment to good. Prevailing wage jobs sets a precedent for affordable housing projects that uplift working families.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to approve this project. Thank you for having us.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

CYRUS SMITH: Alright good afternoon. My name is Cyrus Smith, I'm a program advisor with the Brownsville Think Tank Matters. We are a local reputable community-based organization. We do receive joint funding for our workforce development in our balance reduction initiatives are from both

2.2

| LAM development and a done development. We are        |
|---|
| currently working the L&M Development and Marcus      |
| Garvey residents on those initiatives and we have had |
| great success. To date, we've been able to train      |
| over 120 people in public safety careers, that        |
| focuses on our security and what that allows is the   |
| residents to secure like the eight to sixteen-hour    |
| security license and go onto entry-level careers that |
| start paying about \$15 to \$16 an hour. After three  |
| months of employment, they go into union positions    |
| and their wages go up to about anywhere from \$36 to  |
| \$42,000 dollars and we're seeing a great success     |
| there.  |

With our OSHA training and certification, we do enjoy a good relationship with our building skills.

Our records indicate that we have successful placements with building skills as our participants completed their 30-hour OSHA training. Those who have more experience was able to go through the building skills process and find some employment.

However, we do have a lot of resources in community where we do ask residents to build on their social capital. So, once we have our OSHA training, our residents are prepared to go into their own

2.2

network and find employment on their own, but we do
use other resources such as Workforce One, the Jobs
Plus Center and again, our participants tend to find
work in their area.

We do support this initiative as we are in community and we feel if you activate those lots with additional housing, it will increase public safety concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Great, thank you.

CLOVIS THORN: Thank you, good afternoon. My name is Clovis Thorn. I am with Grand Street

Settlement. Grand Street Settlement is a 102-yearold community services provider in New York. We

provide inner generational services, everything from

Pre-K to senior centers around 10,000 families in New

York City a year across the lower east side and

Brooklyn at 28 different sites and over half of our
sites are in Brooklyn.

We've been involved at Marcus Garvey apartments since L&M has been involved as a grantee directly from L&M to an afterschool programs in the community rooms at the apartments. That has proved very successful in fact, it was so highly sought that they gave us an additional grant to add summer programming

at the apartments. This is just one example of the

incredible need in the area for community services.

neighborhood. Nearby in east New York at [inaudible

3:11:20] Plaza our community center is oversubscribed

So, we have waiting lists for these programs.

NYCHA Cornerstone Community Centers in the

We run several other community centers mostly

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

We very much support this project and this expansion. L&M has been a thoughtful partner on this and other

projects and we are interested in continuing this

partnership to bring high quality community services to families in Brownsville. Thank you for your time

today.

by 200 percent.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your testimony. Are there any other members of the public who wish to testify?

Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application and it will be laid over. Thank you and we'll resume in a few minutes. Thank you.

Okay, thank you. Now for our last hearing, which is on LU269, the Garment Center Text Amendment Department of City Planning and the City's Economic Development Corporation are proposing a zoning text

| amendment to modify the special Garment Center        |
|---|
| District to lift manufacturing preservation           |
| requirements that exist on side street blocks.        |
| Standardized sign regulations modify bulk regulations |
| to ensure conformance to historical context and       |
| establish a special for hotels. The property          |
| affected is located in Speaker Johnsons district in   |
| Manhattan and I now open the public hearing on this   |
| application. I just want to make sure we have all     |
| the panelists here. Dylan Sandler, Cecilia Kushner,   |
| Edith Hsu-Chen and James Patchett. Great, Council,    |
| please swear in the panel.                            |

COUNCIL: Before responding please make sure the light on your mic is on and also state your name. Do you each swear or affirm that the testimony that you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and to answer all questions truthfully?

JAMES PATCHETT: James Patchett, I do.

CECILIA KUSHNER: Cecilia Kushner, I do.

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Edith Hsu-Chen, I do.

DYLAN SANDLER: Dylan Sandler, I do.

2.2

remarks.

2 CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Great, thank you and now I
3 want to turn it over to Speaker Johnson for some

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you Chair Moya for the opportunity to deliver a few brief remarks before we hear from the administration. I want to begin by acknowledging the partnership that we have had with Borough President Gale Brewer, the administration myself and many of the stakeholders and other local elected officials.

The Borough President has over the course of more than two years, pulled many of us together to debate and develop strategies for preserving the fashion incubator that is the Garment District.

I also want to recognize the hard work and dedication of many of the participants of the Garment Steering Committee who developed the ideas and recommendations that we now have in front of us and I want to thank the agencies that are with us today. The Economic Development Corporation lead by President James Patchett, who has been a great partner in this work and the Department of City Planning for their willingness to accept feedback and to change course when needed and necessary.

2.1

2.2

Before we hear from the agencies, I want to offer a few thoughts on the text amendment that is for us today. Many New Yorkers have deep ties to the Garment District. For decades, it was the place where people came from all over the world and found their first job and in many cases, built a company.

A hundred years ago, most women's clothing made in the United States of America was made in the Garment District. The energy of the Garment district created the impetus for parsons and later FIT and is where the Council of Fashion Designers was born.

There are countless stories here of fashion designers like Ralph Lauren doing their first production run in the Garment district and literally rolling a rack of suits up to the stores like the Bonwit Teller Department Store to sell their first order.

It is a place inextricably linked to our city's history but also, our present and I very much believe our future, which is what brings us to this hearing today. For a variety of reasons like financial realities around Garment production in midtown that have changed and now we have a much smaller collection of Garment Manufacturers then we had 30

2.2

years ago when the zoning we're discussing today was initially put in place. My goal over the course of the next several weeks is to build on the work to date to make sure we have a stable foundation as possible for garment manufacturing if we are to lift the zoning.

Based on much of the feedback from the community boards who are here today. I want to thank community boards 4 and 5. I see Wally the District Manager of CB5 here and I see [INAUDIBLE 3:29:49] my friend from Community Board 4 in the back as well and Jesse Bodine, the District manager of CB4. I want to thank the community boards of course our Borough President Gale Brewer and the other Garment stakeholders.

We have I believe five goals in mind over the course of the next few weeks as we are in the stage of ULURP, as we prepare to make a final decision here at the council. The first goal, number one, is preserve as much additional square footage for manufacturing space in the Garment district as possible and I know that EDC has been working very, very hard on this in securing as much square footage as possible. Number two, ensure long term and a stable funding stream for Garment support and there

2.1

2.2

2 have been conversations with the city and the bid on 3 maintaining that revenue stream in the future.

Number three, explore opportunities for preserving the architectural legacy of the district, which we believe there is an architectural legacy to the Garment district and want to preserve that as much as possible as possible.

Number four, we want to make investments to improve the sidewalks and public spaces in and around the Garment district where of course, because of its location it is heavily trafficked and congested. We want to make sure that the public upgrades that are needed are gotten during this process and lastly number five, address a variety of zoning inconsistencies that we believe have been raised by the community throughout this process.

Again, I really want to thank everyone for coming today. We have a very, very busy day here at the Council with a multitude of hearings across the street and here in City Hall and I'm going to be going to some of these hearings so, I'll be in an out, but our Land Use staff will be listening closely. I want to apologize to the Committee Council for having to wear a jacket during today's

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

hearing because of the temperature in City Hall and I look forward to continuing to work together to make sure we push as hard as we can to achieve the right outcomes for the people who work here and for the broader needs of the fashion industry.

You know, this has been a vexing problem for decades now and I believe that that status quo zoning is not an answer for the future. I do not believe its how to actually preserve the existing Garment manufacturing that we have, and so, this has been a sometimes-painful conversation because it's complicated and because there are many different factors at play. I really again, want to commend the borough president who I think took a leadership role about a year and a half ago in saying we need to pause here, look more deeply into this, bring together a steering committee of stakeholders with EDC and the Department of City Planning at the table, and have a more granular in depth conversation about what we can do to preserve the existing space and you know, at the time, I think there were folks that were concerned about taking that pause and wondering if it was really a temporary pause or it was going to be something that ended up killing us being able to have

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

a conversation about changing what I think is outdated zoning that exists right now and I believe it was actually very, very positive for all of us to be able to collaboratively work together.

Again, I want to thank James Patchett who has shown I think enormous leadership throughout this process and his staff and of course Edith, who I've worked with for many years at the Department of City Planning and Cecilia, who has worked on this before James was President of EDC. She had been on this project and I was having conversations with her about this, I think in my second year as a Council Member. It's been a long road to get here. We are still not done. There are still outstanding questions that I raised in my opening remarks, but I believe that in the good faith negotiations and hard work that we've all put together on this, if we continue that work over the next month, we're going to be able to hopefully get something that is good for the existing manufacturers in the Garment districts supporting them and securing their place in the future and having a conversation about other necessary uses like Class B office space for tenants that need it in that part of town.

2.2

So, again, Chair Moya, I want to thank you for having this hearing. I know it has been a long day at this committee so far and I look forward to hearing the testimony and I'm going to have some questions as well.

I also want to thank my colleague Keith Powers whose district is adjacent and shares part of the zoning that we're talking about today and so, I'm gland that he is here to be part of that conversation. Thank you, Chair Moya.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you speaker and thank you for your words and working so diligently on this project. So, now we'd like to open it up to testimony.

JAMES PATCHETT: Thank you. Good morning City
Council Speaker Johnson, Chair Moya, and members of
the Zoning and Franchises Subcommittee, which in this
case is Keith Powers. My name is James Patchett, and
I am the president of the New York City Economic
Development Corporation.

At EDC, it is our goal to make the City the global model for inclusive innovation and economic growth, fueled by the diversity of our people and businesses. We are dedicated to bolstering the

2.2

City's economy, strengthening our neighborhoods, andincreasing economic opportunity for New Yorkers.

The Garment Center holds a remarkable place in our history and remains a crucial part of our economy. It has been the home of fashion for more than a century, as the speaker said, and has allowed New York to claim the title as fashion capital of the world. It also has offered a critical point of entry to work for generations of immigrants around the world. Still today, fashion manufacturing plays an important role in ensuring the sector continues to thrive in New York.

However, there has been a steep decline in fashion manufacturing since 1950. It is important to note that these changes are not unique to New York City, and declining trends are similar to those in the rest of New York State and around the country. Today, people want to spend less on fashion and change clothing more regularly. These systemic trends in the fashion industry, which have coincided with changes in foreign policy and the expansion of globalization, have profoundly affected the sector around the globe and in New York in particular.

That is why EDC and the City are making historic investments in the sector through a variety of initiatives, including ones that support the industry in the Garment Center and beyond.

Today, I will discuss the current state of the fashion industry and garment manufacturing in New York, recent economic trends in the Garment Center and how the City is supporting the industry, background on the history of Garment Manufacturing and finally, the historic package of investments and programs the City unveiled this past June that will support the fashion manufacturing industry.

Before I go into more detail, I really want to recognize the leadership of the Speaker, who has been an enormous partner in this process. We would not be where we are today without you and we wouldn't have the fantastic package that we've collectively worked on together and certainly needs additional work.

I also want to thank your staff, Jason, Eric, and [inaudible 3:39:33] for being really great partners in this. Its been a team effort and I agree with you that Borough President Brewer has been a real leader on this bringing together the members of the steering committee who I'd also like to thank.

2.2

They've all had important ideas. I think many of which are reflected in the comprehensive package that we're discussing today. Its this leadership that has greatly influenced our support for the city and made our proposal stronger.

Fashion is an iconic part of our DNA and a critical component of our economy. Fashion Week alone generates tens of millions of dollars in revenue and continues to make New York the fashion capital of the world.

Local garment manufacturing is a critical piece of the New York City fashion ecosystem. It makes us competitive by ensuring we can turn around quality items quickly and conveniently. It also supports the entire industry's design and innovation through prototyping and sample making. It provides emerging designers the ability to produce their collections locally in small samples, and to make their name in the competitive industry. It also allows more established designers to make products in real-time for fashion week and other shows, in addition to differentiating their brand by producing locally.

Since 2014, the City has heavily invested in education, real estate, and programmatic initiatives to support he industry.

Early in the administration, we committed \$74 million to build FIT's it first new building on the campus in decades.

Through a variety of initiatives, the

Administration also tripled direct industry

investment from \$5 million to \$15 million. Through

partnerships, our goal is to create and retain

quality jobs, as well as catalyze innovation and

support business and entrepreneurial growth.

Under the umbrella of the Made in New York brand and promotional campaign, EDC has launched a range of initiatives to support eh entire value chain of the fashion industry. Some of the highlights include: the Future Fashion Graduate Showcase, Micro Manufacturing and retail activations, the Fashion Manufacturing Initiatives, one of the largest initiatives which was developed by one of our key partners, the Council of Fashion Designers of America, and over the past five years, FMI has distributed \$2.8 million to 25 factories and is looking to expand its support and investment of

2.2

fashion manufacturers through the next phase of this program.

During its heyday in 12950, 90 percent of women fashion garments sold in the US were made in the Garment Center, 90 percent. But the vast majority of New Yorkers today are wearing clothes that were manufactured overseas.

In 1987, more than 30,000 garment workers occupied nearly 9 million square feet of production space in the neighborhood, and this was still way after the Garment Center's peak.

But today, we are left with only about 4,400 employees, who occupy 1.4 million square feet of production space in the district and about half the number in the Preservation Areas. This represents an 85 percent decline in employment and a 92 percent decline in square footage I just three decades.

The Garment District remains a hub for fashion manufacturing, design, showroom, and wholesale businesses, all of which covet the area for historical cache, proximity industry businesses and great transit access. However, in New York, we have also watched the garment industry declutter and form multiple hubs across the boroughs. This is a take

2.2

2 advantage of real estate opportunities and labor 3 proximity.

Today, Sunset Park represents the second largest cluster of garment manufacturing firms outside of the Garment District, with over 100 companies.

The administration is committed to helping to stabilize and grow local garment manufacturing in New York City. One of the most effective and easiest ways for us to achieve that goal is to leverage our assets in existing garment manufacturing clusters.

In Sunset Park, we are investing \$136 million at Bush Terminal to transform 200,000 square feet into a dedicated garment manufacturing and film hub. At the Made in New York Campus, we will maximize our double bottom line and offer tenants affordable rents of \$16-25 per square foot; long-term leases, and a range of sizes from 2,000 to 20,000 square feet accommodating both small and large firms. We have already started demolition at the property and are targeting construction completion in 2020.

This investment complements those we are making at the Brooklyn Army Terminal, where we already leased over 250,000 square feet of space to fashion tenants. Since last summer, FIT has been providing

education classes at BAT. We regularly speak to businesses who are interested in moving to these campuses and are excited to continue growing the second largest fashion manufacturing hub in the City.

The ability for the city directly provides real estate affordability and stability in the Garment Center is much more complex. We do not own real estate in this neighborhood. On top of the that, manufacturing properties are scattered and often mixed in with office uses in the same building.

While the Garment Center remains the largest cluster of garment manufacturing in the city with approximately 700,000 square feet of production, representing 250 firms, left in the Special Zoning District preservation areas. This is also approximately the same amount of square footage located outside of the preservation areas. These firms encompass all subsectors including patternmaking, sampling, jewelry, accessories and wholesale.

Additionally, because of its central location in the heart of Midtown, the district has seen a significant increase in hotel construction; there have been more than 5,000 rooms built since 1999.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

For context, that is almost two per block in the Garment district.

As the president of EDC, I would be remiss not to address the incredible job growth the district has experienced over the past decade in sectors outside of manufacturing. As the speaker noted, the district has seen an extraordinary influx of new office space in loft buildings, which has led to the creation of thousands of new jobs. This represents a 56 percent increase in jobs from 2000 to 2016. approximately 12 block area now contains over 66,000 jobs. Over half of the employment in the district is now in the creative economy. There are many non-forprofits, education, healthcare, and tech start-us, and architecture engineering firms that are starting to grow. Many of these jobs are small firms, generally less than 15 employees, and occupying less than 3,000 square feet. In a city that has lost more than 6 million square feet of class B office space into 2000, the Garment district's stock of historic buildings with smaller floorplates has proven attractive to these firms.

To respond to these changing economic trends in the Garment Center, and in particular, the continued

2.2

decline in garment manufacturing, Speaker Johnson and Borough President Brewer convened and co-chaired the new Garment Center Steering Committee. It identified non-zoning-based solutions to help stabilize garment manufacturing in this historic home of fashion. The Steering Committee was comprised of a group of stakeholders representing the industry, community boards, advocacy organizations, and real estate interest. The group met for three months during the summer of 2017 and released a report in August of 2017, which identified a set of recommendations for three topics: real estate, workforce development, and placemaking.

Real estate stability proved to be the Steering Committee's main priority. Real estate stability is critical to any business, but particularly for garment manufacturing, where it helps enable longterm business decisions.

Continued programmatic support in workforce development, marketing assistance, and placemaking were also discussed and deemed important for the future of this industry.

As I mentioned earlier, given this lack of cityowned real estate in the Garment Center, the Steering

2.2

Committee coalesced around the need to be creative and study the possibility of using other real estate tools, such as the IDA and acquisition, to incentivize and partner with landlords to allow for longer term leases in the Garment Center.

One of the first and major initiatives we developed in response was a custom tax incentive program. Through the program, property owners are required to offer long-term leases at a minimum of 15 years, capped at maximum of \$35 per square foot. This price includes all utilities and any fees for property management.

First and foremost, the program was conceived to support fashion manufacturing. However, the Steering Committee pushed us to think beyond fashion manufacturers and look at every type of business along the fashion production supply chain. So, we expanded the fashion manufacturing definition to include suppliers and costume makers, which are also integral to this ecosystem.

Our IDA program will be overseen by a dedicated compliance team in my agency. Annual compliance review under our program includes annual

2.2

certifications from both the property owners and the tenants.

The IDA program was officially launched in June, with the target of preserving 500,000 square feet.

It is important to note that the Program is eligible within the entire Garment Center BID boundary.

Zoning preservations are not a predictor of actual location. As I mentioned, half of garment manufacturing occurs outside of the preservation areas.

As mentioned, the program currently requires that participating property owners give their tenants long term leases, and under guidance form the Speaker and the Borough President we are looking to extend options to encourage terms beyond 15 years.

Starting at 25,000 square feet of fashion manufacturing, property owners will receive a tax abatement for setting aside gross square footage in their building.

We are actively working with multiple owners to secure 300,000 square feet of garment manufacturing space. In September, the IDA Board authorized three properties totaling 200,000 square feet of fashion manufacturing space and I believe a few owners

2.2

enrolled in the IDA Program or are with us today.

For fashion manufacturing businesses in these

buildings, this means considerable real estate

security and longevity.

We are also in active conversations with property owners to enroll more space into the program and are fully committed to continue aggressively marketing this program. Our goal is to sign up as many buildings as possible and provide long-term stability in the district.

Another long-term goal of the Steering Committee was to secure a building in the Garment Center. This was a priority the Speaker made clear. We have made good on our promise to help achieve this goal by releasing a RFEI last month. This will provide up to \$20 million in city capital to acquire a building and secure a non-profit partner.

We are confident that the City's historic commitment of \$20 million in funding will enable the acquisition of a sizable building for dedicated garment space.

For the RFEI, we purposefully created a procurement process that would allow as much flexibility as possible, considering the variability

2.2

of the real estate market and the need for a strong partnership.

At the suggestion of the Steering Committee, we expanded the eligible geographic boundary for the RFEI beyond the Garment Center Special Zoning District and BID boundary. The boundaries are now all the way south to West 26<sup>th</sup> as far west as 11<sup>th</sup> avenue and east of 5<sup>th</sup> avenue. The public benefits for tenants are clear and will match the IDA Program. At minimum, these will be fifteen-year leases capped at \$35.

Finally, I'd like to touch on programmatic support, the last element of the committee's recommendations.

The City, the CFDA and the Garment District
Alliance, which is the BID representing the area,
have agreed to fund and deploy a set of programs to
support garment manufacturers and designers. This
builds upon many years of collaboration between the
city and the CFDA. To date, these grants have
supported more than 30 businesses. We are currently
working with CFDA on a new scope of work that would
total \$14 million of direct investments. We are very
proud and excited about this collaboration.

2.

Priority areas have been established as continued technology modernization and workforce development, to support competition and innovation, and to train the next generation of skilled workers.

Additionally, the BID was approved by the City

Council just yesterday for up to \$2.5 million per

year over 10 years, which is a unique commitment from
this district to support this critical industry.

This suite of programs in addition to custom real estate programs, represents an unprecedented and comprehensive approach to providing stability for and growing the garment industry in the Garment Center.

We are proud to be part of this new chapter for this industry and the district.

Thank you for your time. Now I'd like to turn it over to my colleague Edith Hsu-Chen, the Manhattan Borough Director of City Planning.

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Thank you James. Good afternoon Speaker Johnson and Chair Moya. My name is Edith Hsu-Chen. I am the Director of the Manhattan Office at the Department of City Planning.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Edith, if you could put the mic a little closer.

2.2

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Oh, excuse me. Thank you,
you'd think I would know that by now. Okay, let me
repeat a little bit. My name is Edith Hsu-Chen. I
am the Director of the Manhattan Office at the
Department of City Planning. I am joined here by my
colleague Dylan Sandler.

I'm here to present DCP and EDC's proposal for a zoning text amendment to the Special Garment Center District. Our proposal updates the zoning regulations of the Special district by removing the requirement to preserve manufacturing space. We believe the preservation requirement is not reflective of the land use in the area, which includes the evolved needs of the fashion industry.

The Garment Center Special Zoning District was established in 1987 with the goal of preserving apparel manufacturing and fashion related businesses. Within the district, preservation area was created on the side street blocks. Within these areas the uses were restricted to industrial, retail, or wholesale show rooms converting to office use within these preservations areas was permitted only with a CPC Chair Certification and a restrictive declaration

2.

\_ -

confirming that an equal amount of space for a manufacturing use was preserved in perpetuity.

Along the avenues, the underlying M16 zoning applies which permits commercial office As of Right.

You may recall the district was amended in 2005 in conjunction with the Hudson Yards rezoning to allow for a broader mix of residential and commercial development west of eight avenue.

Despite these zoning efforts to bolster the industry in the Garment Center, apparel manufacturing continued to decline significantly over the next few decades. This is a consistent trend nationally and in New York City and as James noted, the decline was precipitous. In 30 years, the manufacturing decreased 85 percent.

As the fashion industry has evolved, a portion of space that was previously occupied by manufacturing has converted to show room and allowed use which has been on the rise over the past few decades. Similarly, there has been an increased demand for office space for fashion related companies within the Garment Center. That has led to some illegal conversions of some previously industrial space.

2.2

2.5

Even though Garment Production has declined, it remains an important part of the fashion ecosystem in Midtown Manhattan.

The apparel manufacturing companies that remain, tend to be small though with an average size of 5,000 square feet and about ten employees per company.

Approximately half the space devoted to Garment

Manufacturing that remains in the Garment Center is located within the preservation areas and is located outside where there is no preservation requirement.

The real estate program is being implemented by EDC are designed to provide affordable space for these types of apparel manufacturing businesses.

The Garment Center has also seen a growth in office space sectors including fashion companies, non-profits, architecture, software companies and others. The proposed text amendment is intended to ensure that zoning is reflective of the mix of uses in the Garment Center which includes thousand of office space tenants.

So, to our zoning proposal, the proposed text amendment would reinstate the underlying M16 zoning district and the preservation area between Broadway and  $8^{\rm th}$  Avenue creating what we now call A1.

2.2

This would eliminate the manufacturing preservation requirements and allow many existing property owners that are currently non-performing office uses to receive the proper certificate of occupancy and to cure outstanding use violations.

We are also proposing modifications to create bulk envelopes that better match existing buildings and neighborhood character.

The preservation area between eighth and ninth avenues would now be called A2 and the underlying C64M Hudson Yards Regulations will continue to apply.

However, in the A2 area existing regulations that restrict office and residential conversions of buildings greater than 70,000 square feet would be modified so that these larger buildings could be converted to office use.

Residential conversion in these existing large buildings will continue to be disallowed. And then across the entire district, we are proposing sign regulations that are consistent with C64 districts, which is more restrictive then the underlying M16. This would reduce the allowable height and size signs. Within A2 where there are more residences, we propose that flashing signs be restricted.

2.

2.2

Finally, the proposed text amendment would also create a zoning special permit for hotel use within the district and this would be consistent with the proposed M1 Hotel Special Permit. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. I know want to turn it over to Speaker Johnson.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you Chair Moya. Thank you for your testimony today and a few questions that I think we can get through pretty quickly.

As you know, and as you acknowledged James, the Borough President and I and almost in the entirety of the Steering Committee pushed very hard at the beginning of this process for the city to do everything in our power to acquire a permanent home for Garment Manufacturing.

You mentioned the RFEI went out, can you talk a little bit more about the process, the timeline, and any reassurance you can provide us that we're making progress on finding a permanent home and dedicated building for Garment Manufacturing within the district that you outlined in your testimony.

JAMES PATCHETT: Absolutely, so the RFEI went out last month as a result of your and Borough

2.2

Presidents advocacy for this. We committed \$20 million as a part of this. So, we've looked at the financials of this. The average building in the Garment district area is between \$75,000 and \$100,000 square feet. Prices per square foot range from \$500 to \$700 per square foot. What that means is that a price for a building could be anywhere from \$40 million to \$70 million. \$20 million as a portion of that from the City is an enormous down payment on that, because it would be married with some investment from the purchasers as well as that financing.

We're very confident that the finances of this pan out and at the same time, I'll tell you, you know, as we have discussed, it is not uncommon for people to put proposals in that have funding gaps and we regularly work with them to resolve those between ourselves and the parties who are bringing the proposals. Members of the Steering Committee even express an interest in partnering with us on this. They were only a little more than a month into the RFEI, so we would not have expected any responses yet, but we're keeping this open for an extended

2.2

period of time and we're committed to getting a
resolution and are confident that we can.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: How long will the RFEI process be open for?

JAMES PATCHETT: So, the RFEI is open for one year and we started accepting submissions beginning at the beginning of this month. We did not expect anyone to be able to put together a proposal within 30 days, but we're in conversations with some folks and we're hoping to see a proposal early next year.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: But you are committed to over the next year working with potential respondents and being creative and thoughtful and strategic with them to find a building to ensure that any issues that come up around financing on a potential building, you're going to work with them because you all support finding this building?

JAMES PATCHETT: We support this. I think it was a critical concept to preserving the industry overall. We support it, we will work with them to resolve this. We know it's a critical priority of yours and we're committed to working with respondents to getting a result that is a permanent home for the Garment District in this neighborhood.

2.2

SPEAKER JOHNSON: You also mentioned in your testimony the progress that's been made on the IDA front, in securing currently 200,000 square feet of manufacturing space that we preserved through the IDA program. There was an aspirational goal through the Steering Committee to try to get up to 500,000 square feet, though I think people acknowledge that that was going to potentially be difficult to get to that number, but I think there was a level of expectation and hope that we get to 300,000, 400,000 square feet.

Can you talk a little bit more about — in a more specific detail, about some of the challenges that has presented itself on getting additional square footage through IDA and what you all are doing over the next month in ULURP to continue to try to get folks to participate in the IDA program to preserve additional existing manufacturing space?

JAMES PATCHETT: Absolutely. So, you know, the challenge is frankly that there are many, many different property owners in this neighborhood. Some of varying levels of sophistication and comfort with working with the city. We know every property owner, we have identified every single property owner that has manufacturing space in this neighborhood and we

2.2

have reached out to all of them. We have knocked on their doors. We have met with any and all of them that will take our meetings. We have done this repeatedly and that's whats resulted in the transactions we have before us and whats resulted in the additional — the 200,000 square foot that we have approved through the IDA and the remaining conversations that we're having.

We are in active conversations with a series of property owners. We are going to continue to aggressively pursue those. Ultimately it is up to the property owner to be comfortable with the structure and we are doing everything within our power to encourage them to come to the table, to reach a resolution, and we are committed to getting as close to 500,000 square feet as within the city's power.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you, you know, 200,000 is not the number that I want to end up at. I want to end up at a higher number, closer to somewhere between 400,000 and 500,000 square feet. I know, and so I'm not saying this in a critical way of you all, because I know how hard you've worked in engaging property owners to get people to understand the

2.2

benefits of the IDA program and to sign up for the preservation and the benefits that are transferred to them if they do that but we have to sort of redouble our efforts over the next three or four weeks to continue to press folks to understand those benefits and if there is anything that I can do or that other stakeholders, the community boards, the borough presidents, other folks can do, we really want that number to be increased.

JAMES PATCHETT: I understand. We will do
everything within our power, we're laser focused on
this. I have a list of everyone and we're going to
work together, and we'll appreciate your offer of
assistance and we'll certainly be taking you up on
that, thank you.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you. I have a question for DCP, City Planning. I've heard from the local community and to the great community boards who are represented here and who I have the pleasure of working with everyday Wally, and Jesse, and Joe and other folks that maybe here that there are some significant details relating to the location of residential space and commercial space. I don't want to get into all the details here, but successfully

2.2

| resolving some of the issues that have been brought  |
|--|
| by these community boards is very, very important to |
| me and I've mentioned this to the president of EDC,  |
| to James, that these are not in my estimation hugely |
| complicated or significant issues that shouldn't be  |
| able to be resolved with some thoughtful             |
| collaboration between the community boards, the      |
| Department of City Planning, and the Department of   |
| Buildings. I think these are things that should be   |
| able to be resolved pretty quickly. So, I wanted to  |
| see if you've heard of some of these concerns and    |
| whats being done to address these concerns over the  |
| next few weeks in ULURP?                             |

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Thank you Speaker Johnson.

Yes, we've heard of these concerns and we are happy
to continue to work with the community and with
property owners to come up with a solution for the
issue that you speak of. So, we'll be in close touch
with the community boards in particular.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: So, we need to get this done.

This is important to me, it's important to the community boards, its related to residential and commercial space for projects that I don't think are crazy or their asking for anything special. Its kind

2.2

of minor stuff that because of the outdated zoning that exists in this area, has been difficult for the community boards to get through projects that have community support. So, its really important to me that we resolve these issues and I hope Edith, you and your team with Danielle can sit down over the next couple weeks with the community boards and with the Department of Buildings to figure these issues out.

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Yes, will do. Thank you.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you, and then under the zoning that is in place today, some property owners have converted their manufacturing space to commercial space and they've enjoyed the benefits of legal conversion. Can you tell us how much space in the preservation areas have been legally, not illegally? Legally converted and how much space has restrictive declarations on it that governs the preservation of manufacturing space?

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Yes, 180,000 square feet of space was legally converted in the preservation areas and those properties also do have the restrictive declarations.

2.2

SPEAKER JOHNSON: 180,000 have been legally converted to — for manufacturing the commercial space and all of that space has restrictive declaration on it?

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Yes, the conversions required a CPC Chair Certification as well as a restrictive declaration.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: So, why would we not keep these restrictions in place?

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Well, frankly, we believe that the underlying zoning that created the preservation requirements are no longer appropriate and Speaker Johnson, I appreciate your blunt language when you talked about the ineffectiveness and the outdated zoning in your introductory remarks. We don't think its good policy to continue to hold the property owners to the requirements that we think are inappropriate and this policy is consistent with precedent when we illuminated the preservation requirements in Chelsey, around 23<sup>rd</sup> street a number of years ago.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: So, one of the issues that we ran into in this entire conversation and that I really think showed the inadequacy and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ineffectiveness of the existing zoning was that there were millions of square feet that was out of compliance on preservation that was happening every single day, every single year, and that number kept growing. Has DCP checked to see whether building owners who did the legal conversion that they're complying with jurisdictions that they've recorded against their properties?

DYLAN SANDLER: I'm Dylan Sandler at Department of City Planning. So, there are 100,000 square feet of space that have restrictive declarations preserving them as manufacturing. Those were mostly preserved in the early to mid-90's, and for a time, did have manufacturing space but a large portion of those actually have converted to - illegally converted to office. We think it's about 60,000 is currently manufacturing and 120,000 is currently office. We did look at the certificates of occupancy of those spaces and they do note the restrictive declarations and many of them have been issued violations and penalties for illegally converting, but the property owners chose to go ahead and illegally convert. And I guess, one other thing to add is that the enforcement is complaint based, so

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

presumably some properties did convert and if there were no complaints there was no recourse that would immediately happen from that conversion.

JAMES PATCHETT: I think that any of this speaks to why the IDA program that the you and the Steering Committee and the Borough President have advocated for makes so much sense. The IDA program is an incentive-based system with specific financial penalties and is a proactive reporting requirement from not just the landlords, but also the tenants. We have to receive every year a certification from the tenants that their landlord is complying with the terms of the IDA agreement. So, that is a significantly greater bar and a much higher level of certainty that we'll know specifically whats happening and know the moment that anyone steps out of line with the regime that's set-in place.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: So, I just want to go back.

That's very helpful and I agree with you James. So,

I just want to go back Dylan, so its complaint driven

but the building owners who have done these

conversions with the restrictions, with the

restrictive decks that have been recording the

properties, are we proactively going and checking on

2.

2.2

that square footage and making sure that they are complying with the restrictive declarations?

DYLAN SANDLER: No, that is not a part of the process. So, because the restrictions came about through a zoning application, its technically — it's a zoning violation, and so it's on the Department of Buildings in the same way that they typically enforce noncomplying properties. Its on the Department of buildings to inspect and issue violations when there is a complaint, but there isn't a system to proactively go out and monitor those spaces, like there would be with the IDA program.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Should there be a system in place that -

DYLAN SANDLER: I don't think I can respond to that.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Okay. Well, I'm grateful that we're having this hearing today. There are a lot of very important stakeholders that are in this room today that were really an incredibly important part of this process over these last many years who I think again were able to mold the proposal we see in front of us today into a much better product and so, I would ask of course that as City Planning and EDC

2.2

| that some of the folks from the agency stay and       |
|---|
| listen to the folks that are here that may have other |
| concerns that we're going to try to be responsive to  |
| over this last phase of ULURP and I look forward to   |
| working with all of you. I look forward to working    |
| with all of you to hopefully get this done, but       |
| again, we want to help secure that permanent home     |
| over the next year through the RFEI and we want to    |
| push that number up from 200,000 to somewhere between |
| 400,000 and 500,000. We want to respond to the        |
| community concerns that are not really part of this   |
| but are tangled up in some of the zoning around this  |
| and I look forward to resolving all of that with you. |

I have one final question which is, I know it was part of the presentation that was given, what is the current status of where things stand on Sunset Park and Bush terminal and how that compliments the proposal that's before us today?

JAMES PATCHETT: So, the status of that is that we're currently in demolition of the buildings to try and advance them to construction completion in 2020. To us, it's a critical component of the overall plan. Its in the aggregate 200,000 square feet, which will

2.2

accommodate both fashion manufacturing tenants as well as film tenants.

I think its really important to have a sort of complimentary solution to this. We recognize that even with all of the programs that we have and our collective efforts to strengthen the Garment Center. Your \$35 per square foot will still be to expensive for some businesses which is why having them in city owned property in Sunset Park can help to strengthen the industry overall. In no way do we see this as a replacement for the Garment Center. WE see this as complimentary ensuring that the industry and the city collectively is stronger. We think that they can function effectively together preserving both as a part of a city-wide strategy.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And there was already a significant migration of manufacturers from the Garment District to Brooklyn and the neighborhoods that we're talking about. There was a migration to some neighborhoods in Queens. We've seen some of the light manufacturing areas which has been important to Council Member Reynoso in his district and preserving some of that manufacturing. So, some of this migration was happening on its own even before we had

2.2

fully contemplated and gotten to all the details of the proposal before us today.

JAMES PATCHETT: Absolutely.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: How much has been set aside in the City's budget for the Bush Terminal and the money associated with Sunset Park?

JAMES PATCHETT: \$136 million.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: That's a lot of money, \$136 million, and how much money do we think is it going to cost through the IDA program on the issues that we've talked about today as part of the preservation in the Garment Center?

JAMES PATCHETT: So, the IDA program alone, we don't have a specific estimate because you know, we don't know the extent of it but its tens of millions of dollars for the IDA program, just the buildings alone that we currently have approved and so, we could expect it to hopefully be significantly higher than that. We have the \$20 million investment in the building the city has prepared to make. The \$14 million collectively in funding for programs through CFTA, over \$70 million we invested in FIT as a part of this effort to expand as well as the commitment as

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

10

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 2.2

23

24

25

a part of the bid efforts to invest in another \$25 million in the industry.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And would you categorize those programs as incentive programs, subsidy programs, how would you categorize the programs that we're talking about today?

JAMES PATCHETT: It's a variety of things. so setting aside the investment of the building, which is investment in real property as it relates to the other efforts, you know, we see them as a combination of incentives to encourage people to preserve businesses as well as investments in businesses to strengthen them. So, its to improve the - you know, to give technical assistance to businesses, to help them invest in modern manufacturing equipment so they can be more successful over time, to help them market and advertise, investments in workforce development, all of those are a critical part of the plan.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And the vast majority of the businesses that are taking advantage of these programs are small manufacturers?

JAMES PATCHETT: Absolutely, in the Garment District.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Within the average of how many employees?

EDITH HSU-CHEN: Yeah, I think [inaudible 4:27:01], there is a range but there are a lot of small factories in the Garment Center where you have 15, 20 employees. So, a lot of the businesses that have been helped through the FMI grant program for example, the last 30 businesses that we helped with two and half million dollars through the CFDA where generally small firms. So, for them to be able to receive a half a million to a million dollars of new equipment, which is equipment that they would never be able to purchase themselves is a really tremendous direct benefit to their firm and it really translates into being able to produce more garments and being able to sometimes to hire someone that otherwise they wouldn't be hired. So, direct programing and direct funding given to manufacturers is really, a really important compliment to the real estate stability for IDA.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Well, I'm really glad this is going through ULURP. I think the public review is very important.

JAMES PATCHETT: I understand.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Its important that we have public review of land use projects that involve a significant amount of money and investment and subsidy which I think has been a good process.

JAMES PATCHETT: I understand.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And I think we've gotten to a good place through the process, which I think is completely counter to what we're reading about in the news and this is not a personal attack on you James. You and I have a great relationship and I have deep respect for you but this process has showed what you can do when you engage stakeholders, elected officials, when public dollars are involved compared to a cloaked, secretive, in the dark process, that cuts out the public charter mandated review of the City Council and again, these are not exactly the same things, nothing is but we're talking about tax payer dollars. We're talking about a significant geographic area. We're talking about a complicated issue that involves multiple neighborhoods and stakeholders. We're talking about infrastructure. We're talking about all these things which is what we should be talking about in Long Island City. Its what the Council should be talking about in Long

| Island City. Its what public review is for. It was    |
|---|
| not your decision to go through the general project   |
| plan process, but I think it is a very stark contrast |
| that today after multiple years of conversation,      |
| we're able to get to a place that is going to benefit |
| small businesses, not multibillion dollar or trillion |
| dollar evaluated companies for the good of the city.  |
| For the job market of the city, for the ecosystem of  |
| the city and we're going to get a lot of benefit out  |
| of it compared to - I think, a deal that I understand |
| of course, we disagree on this, but you know, there's |
| a pretty broad disagreement on you know what the      |
| potential benefits are. So, today's not about Amazon  |
| but I think its important to give the comparison      |
| between when land is involved, and dollars are        |
| involved, the important of a transparent process. I   |
| think that is sorely lacking and what we're seeing in |
| Long Island City, but I'm grateful we've had that     |
| here today.   |

JAMES PATCHETT: Thank you.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Your welcome. Thank you, Chair Moya.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I couldn't agree with you more Mr. Speaker. Thank you so much and thank you

2.2

| for the panel for your testimony today. Before we go |
|--|
| to the next panel. I just want to open up the vote.  |
| We are joined by Council Member Rory Lancman.        |
|  |

Council.

COUNCIL: To approve 260, 261, 262, and 263, Lancman?

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: I.

COUNCIL: The Land Use items are approved by a vote of eight in the affirmative, no negative and no abstentions and referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. The next panel,

I'd like to bring up James Lloyd from Manhattan

Borough Presidents Office as well as Ginny Louloudas,

Michelle Feinberg and Dan Dilmanian.

Ginny? Michelle?

MICHELLE FEINBERG: Yeah, I'm Michelle.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: And Dan. So, we're going to start with James Lloyd. James you can take your time because you're here on behalf of the Borough President. I just want to remind everyone that we have a two-minute timeframe for your testimony.

JAMES LLOYD: Good afternoon Chair Moya and members of the Subcommittee. My name is James Lloyd,

2.2

Deputy director of Land Use for Manhattan Borough
President Gale A. Brewer, and I am here to make a
statement on her behalf in support of our plan for
preserving a significant core of garment
manufacturing in the Borough Manhattan.

The application for a zoning text amendment to the Special Garment Center District before you today are a component of our plan. However, the success of the Garment Center depends on the success of all the components, including the purchase of a building for permanent manufacturing use, an IDA tax abatement program, and significant financial commitments from the Garment District Alliance and the Council of Fashion Designers of America.

I call the plan our plan because the Garment

Center Steering Committee, formed by Speaker Johnson

and the Borough President, has played in instrumental

part in the proposal before you today. I would like

to thank all the elected officials, Community Boards

4 and 5, the New York City Economic Development

Corporation and representatives, manufacturers,

designers, unions, and real estate for their

continued efforts. Their recommendations have

provided valuable guidance for addressing the needs

2.2

of the garment industry. Through their collective efforts, we have come a long way from the original proposal to lift the zoning restrictions and not provide any accompanying assistance for the garment industry and specifically manufacturers, located in Manhattan's historic Garment Center.

The EDC programs that accompany the rezoning are a result of the Steering Committee recommendations, which prioritize the preservation of manufacturing space in the Garment Center through a tax incentive program and building purchase. I would not be supporting this application to lift the current reservation requirement if there were no assurances that manufacturing space would be maintained through these methods. These EDC programs, which incentivize the provision of affordable manufacturing space, are available only within the general Garment Center area. An Industrial Development Agency incentive will provide property tax abatements for landlords who sign 15-eyar-leases with manufacturing tenants.

A second program designed to assist in the acquisition of a garment manufacturing building will benefit from \$20 million in City funding. Both

2.2

2 initiatives will provide garment production space at 3 affordable rates of \$35 or less per square foot.

Together, the building acquisition and IDA program will provide stability to the garment companies that have recently had to deal with escalating rents and evictions resulting from so many landlords illegally converting their buildings into offices. Without these two commitments, the future of the Garment Center will be greatly at risk. My office has been hearing from firms that are having difficulty renewing their leases and are facing rising rents.

Additionally, financial commitments from the Garment District Alliance and the Council of Fashion Designers of America will provide valuable support to the manufacturers themselves. Such commitments involve incentives to produce in the city as well as programming to foster the fashion industry in the Garment Center.

In my official recommendation dated August 20,2018, I noted that the following three conditions must be accomplished prior to approval of the zoning text amendment: 1. EDC must demonstrate that it has or expects to receive one or more credible responses

2.2

to the RFEI and feasible sites must be having been identified or EDC must be making any necessary changes to the RFEI to accomplish those goals. 2.

The City must also commit to a reasonable amount of additional funding beyond \$20 million should that amount prove inadequate. 3. The IDA must have approved or have pending before it, applications for the 300,000 square feet of space for which EDC currently or then, had signed letters of intent.

Additionally, EDC, with the assistance of the Garment District Alliance, must make every conceivable effort to obtain as much additional square footage for the IDA program so that at a minimum 500,000 total square feet is preserved.

On September 18<sup>th</sup>, the IDA Board approved
Participation of three buildings in its program.
These buildings total 200,000 square feet. I know
that EDC staff are working very hard and they are
currently in talks with landlords in the area to get
those 300,000 total square feet. We absolutely need
to preserve as much manufacturing square footage as
possible, and that requires participation, not just
from the City and the Garment District Alliance, but
the real estate industry as well.

2.1

2.2

EDC released its RFEI in October, which is a crucial step towards securing affordable garment manufacturing space. But if it appears that the \$20 million committed by the City may not be sufficient, or that other forms of support or flexibility are required to make the building acquisition a reality, we need to be committed to pursuing such support or flexibility. I remain hopeful that the City will make additional resources available as necessary to secure the acquisition of a garment manufacturing building.

I strongly encourage everyone to work together
To ensure that the fashion industry, which brings
Incredible vitality and economic activity to our
City can stay in the Garment Center. We very much
need participation from the area's landlords in both
the IDA program and the RFEI, as we need to secure
more affordable garment manufacturing space to bring
this plan to fruition. The Council of Fashion
Designers of America and EDC are partnering to commit
millions of dollars to incentivize local
manufacturing and we look forward to seeing their
programs take off.

Additionally, as we stated yesterday to the

2.2

Finance Committee as it considered an assessment increase for the Garment District Alliance, the BID must make a reasonable long-term commitment to collect and spend \$2.5 million each year to improve economic conditions for all businesses in its catchment area, particularly garment manufacturing businesses, provided that there continues to be demand for such assistance. Moreover, we have requested that the BID commit to working with our office and the Speaker's office to ensure that we design programs that will prove effective.

The core of the fashion industry has long been Manhattan's Garment Center, and it must remain that way. In speaking with members of the Steering Committee and hundreds of garment manufacturers and employees, it became clear that without the central ecosystem of businesses that exits in the Garment Center, the New York City fashion industry is at risk.

After a thorough process that involved extensive engagement and input from stakeholders, we have arrived at a proposal that lifts the old zoning requirements while addressing the needs of the garment industry. We need the EDC programs and the

2.2

CFDA and BID programs to be successful for the sake of the New York City fashion industry and the city as a whole. I urge that in the remaining month of the land use clock: the landlords in the Garment Center step up to participate in the IDA program, all stakeholders work together to ensure the highest likelihood of a successful building acquisition and that the Garment District Alliance commits to working with us on programs to benefit businesses and especially garment manufacturers over the next ten years in order to foster the continue health of the garment industry.

Again, the Borough President would like to thank the staff of EDC particularly Cecilia Kushner, DCP, the Council Land Use staff and the Speaker staff for their excellent work.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important matter.

DAN DILMANIAN: Good morning Chairman Moya and member of the Committee. My name is Dan Dilmanian. I am representing George Comfort and Sons, a family owned real estate company now in our 100<sup>th</sup> year of business. We are the longtime owners of two properties in the Garment District, 498 Seventh

2.2

Avenue and 307 West 38<sup>th</sup> Street, which is in the Preservation area. Until 1994, we also had a 50-year leasehold interest in 239 West 39<sup>th</sup> Street, which is also in the preservation area.

We support the zoning text amendment and the proposals to provide direct support to the garment manufacturing industry because we believe these actions take a fair approach to all the interests involved and we believe that the outcome will be good for all of us in the Garment District and for New York City.

Our company has witnessed the decline of garment manufacturing and firsthand, and indeed our business has become impacted by it. Both of our properties within the preservation area were once 100 percent occupied by garment manufacturers or garment related businesses, but, by the late 1980's production had started moving overseas. Our garment business tenants were struggling to pay just \$8 per square foot in rent, and there were frequent business failures and defaults on leases. Despite our good faith efforts, our occupancy by garment tenants declined every year, and by 2000 there were no new garment manufacturing businesses coming in.

2.2

During the 1990's, other types of tenants started gravitating to the Garment District, seeking more affordable rents for a convenient, midtown location. These small businesses included construction companies, packaging companies, and early software outfits. More recently, we have seen creative companies, arts and non-profit organizations attracted by affordable loft spaces and proximity to excellent transportation options.

These alternative uses kept the Garment District from going into steep decline, yet in much of the neighborhood, they remain prohibited. The restrictions should be lifted because it will legitimize these critical tenants and increase our ability to find others and I am also confident that legitimizing this mix of uses will lead to improvements in the neighborhood, and that would be good for everyone who live, works, or does business in Midtown.

But, equally as important, we think the restrictions should be lifted because they didn't work and it seems that the programs and supports that EDC is proposing will work by providing assistance directly to garment manufacturers, through tools that

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

address everything from workforce development and equipment to rent guarantees, the City is offering the industry a realistic way to stabilize and modernize within its historic home.

I urge you to support both these proposals, as they will benefit everyone in the Garment District. Thank you.

MICHELLE FEINBERG: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Michelle Feinberg. I own New York Embroidery Studio. I've been on 36th street for close to 30 I've been in my current space now for close to 16 years. I've won the FMI grant several times. Its enabled me to invest in technology and investing in the Garment Center has helped keep my business relevant and help it grow. I have new customers, I deal with all the shows in both New York and in The new equipment has helped keep business domestic that would have had to have been done off shore. We are one of the only factories to have a fiber metal laser. So, the FMI grant has enabled us to bring technology here that otherwise wouldn't have been in New York.

The EDC is helping us partnering with my landlord and negotiating a long-term lease for us.

2.2

We'll be able to retain employees and give our current employees a better life.

We're hoping to invest in our infrastructure with better electric, power, and possibly even some air conditioning, which would make life a lot better for us in the factories.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: You can walk outside today if you want air conditioning but -

MICHELLE FEINBERG: Yeah, heat we have, air conditioning we would like to have, but thank you so much for hearing us.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony.

GINNY LOULOUDAS: Hi, I'm Ginny Louloudas and I

am the Executive Director of the Alliance of Resident

Theaters New York. This is my testimony, it looks

like this.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I gotcha.

GINNY LOULOUDAS: The service and advocacy organization for New York's nonprofit theaters, we have 400 plus members. I want to thank the City Council Committee on Zoning and Franchise for allowing me to testify at this hearing.

A.R.T. New York was founded in 1972. Over the years we've earned a reputation as a leader in

2.1

2.2

providing progressive services to our members from shared office, rehearsal and performance space to the nation's only revolving loan fund for real estate, to technical assistance programs for emerging theaters, which have made our organizations an expert in the needs of a non-profit theater communities in New York City.

A.R.T. New York supports the initiatives set forth by the Mayor's Office of City Planning and the Office of Economic Development to remove the preservation restrictions in the Garment District and replace it with programs to directly help garment manufacturers.

Like New York City's garment manufacturers, New York City's nonprofit theatres have struggled for years to find affordable office rehearsal and performance space. The Off Off-Broadway movement had its origins in the East and West Villages and has traveled to Soho. Hell's Kitchen, the Lower East Side, Tribeca, and now Brooklyn and Queens. Those of us who are fortunate, found homes in the Garment District in the late 1990's. In 2001 A.R.T. New York signed a 20-year lease with Gural Family Properties to transform 36,000 square feet of space at 520

2.2

Eighth Avenue into 20 offices for our member companies as well as seven rehearsal studios. The neighborhood was quite different than it is today. Side streets were dark; and some parts of Eighth Avenue were safer than others.

Despite these small inconveniences we loved the area, which was not only adjacent to Broadway but blocks away from Penn Station and Port Authority as well as dozens of Subway lines. We quickly attracted 20 companies to rent offices for us and our rehearsal studios have done a brisk business seven days a week from 9 am to 10 pm.

I know my timing is coming to an end, so I'm just going to repeat that we completely understand what the garment manufacturers are going through and therefore, we are supportive of these incentives to lift the restrictions, so that you can help ensure the future of the garment manufacturing industry in New York City. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony today. I don't have any questions, but I am descended from two people who work in the garment district a long time ago, so — and my brother is an actor, so full disclosure.

2.2

GINNY LOULOUDAS: Perfect.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I'm going to call up the next panel. I want to thank you all for being here today. Get home safely. The next panel is Jesse Bodine, I hope I got that right, from Manhattan Community Board it looks like four or eleven. Four, okay. Joe Restuccia also from Board 4, Wally Rubin from Board 5 and Adam Friedman from the Pratt Center for Community Development.

Jessie, if you'd like to begin.

ADAM FRIEDMAN: I'm Adam.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Please turn on your mic. Is the red light on?

ADAM FRIEDMAN: Thank you. We're good to go.

I'm Adam Friedman, I'm the Director of the Pratt

Center for Community Development. I was also a

member of the task forces past, present, into the

Garment Industry Development Corporation and I worked

on the Board of Estimate when this zoning was

originally passed.

I think the zoning was successful and that's why you have this incredibly vibrant ecosystem. I'm just going to do my best to summarize the testimony.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

We support this alternative approach to the zoning, the city is putting in place tax incentives, a non-profit ownership model and a program to improve the competitiveness of the industry and that's the approach we've supported for over a decade. However, there are some really critical issues which have not yet been resolved.

First of all, we strongly support the City's efforts to subsidize the acquisition of space by a non-profit that will tenant and curate that space in the industries and interest. Its not going to be The city has committed \$20 million but I expect another \$40 or \$60 million will have to be added to that to make it reliable. That seems like an outrageous amount of money for the acquisition of a building but let's remember whats behind this. It's the protection of an industry and its also the creation of a new office district. I mean, that piece of the puzzle, that piece of the vision has kind of gotten lost here. The city and the office and the building owners are going to reap a tremendous benefit from what this area evolves into, and they should contribute to the acquisition of this building cost.

2.

\_

- -

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, thank you for your testimony.

Second, the city needs to get a firm commitment that the BID will provide funding two and a half million a year for the next ten years.

Third, that funding stream has to be used in the best interest of the industry and we need to come up with a mechanism, the city needs to come up with a mechanism to ensure that is spent in the industries best interests and that there's accountability to the industry and I don't think the BID is the right mechanism for that. There's not even a manufacturer on the BID board.

Finally, the IDA needs to ensure that the tenants as they move out will go out of business, that that protected space is re-tenanted by another apparel company.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Are the manufacturers paying into the BID at this time or  $-\$ 

ADAM FRIEDMAN: I don't think there's a manufacturer on the BID board. Of course, they're paying, their tenants. So, in fact, the BID contribution, a piece of it is actually being paid for by the industry.

/

WALLY RUBIN: Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. We've come a long way since this proposal was first announced and we want to thank EDC, DCP, Borough President Brewer, and Speaker Johnson for all they have done to make the proposal a better, more holistic one.

Our goal at Community Board Five has always been to preserve the Garment District and its over 5,000 production jobs and tens of thousands of jobs related to and dependent upon those production jobs. These jobs may not pay an average of \$150,000 a year as in some other industries we deem worthy of billions of dollars of subsidy, but they are perhaps even more crucial to New York's economy and certainly to the laborers, many of them immigrants, who depend upon these jobs to feed and clothe their families.

The Steering Committee that was created to allow all stakeholders a chance to weigh in on this proposal zoning change determined that it was imperative to create a mechanism that would keep a minimum of 500,000 to 700,000 square feet of garment manufacturing space in the district. Without it, the very fabric of the district, pun intended, would unravel and New York would be in danger of losing the

2.2

entire industry. Maybe this won't happen next year or in five years, but with economic in midtown what they are, it was clear that in order to keep the industry in New York, government incentives were necessary, the same situation that applies apparently, to the tech industry.

We were encouraged this past summer when we learned that it looked as if 300,000 square feet would likely be saved through an incentive program that EDC had devised. In addition, thanks to the encouragement of Speaker Johnson, the administration announced its willingness to put aside \$20 million toward the acquisition of a building devoted solely to garment industry use.

Such a building might preserve an additional 100,000 square feet of space, but more importantly this space would be permanent. We were getting closer to our minimum of 500,000 square feet and remained hopeful.

Unfortunately, this week we learned that one of the building owners backed out of the IDA incentive program. What looked to be 300,000 square feet was reduced by a third, to only 200,000 square feet of preserved space.

2.2

In addition, it appears that in reality, \$20 million may not be enough to allow for the acquisition of building and while a request for expression of interest has been released, there is still a long road to travel before we get anywhere near the goal of acquiring a building, if we ever do.

It is unacceptable to Community Board Five for this zoning text amendment to pass and for the real estate industry to get what they came to the table for, while the garment industry and the thousands of workers who rely on it are still at such loose ends and utterly unsure of their future. This is far too one-sided a deal.

We implore the Council to come up with some mechanism to ensure that before the current restrictions are removed, we have in place at least the minimum of 500,000 square feet of garment manufacturing space that is needed to preserve this industry. If not, Community Board Five cannot in good conscience support the passage of this text amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Mr. Rubin.

JOE RESTUCCIA: My name is Joe Restuccia and I am the Co-Chair of the Housing Community Manhattan

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Community Board 5 and a member of its land use committee. I like Adam Friedman, was in the room in 1984, at City Hall when the Garment Center deal was approved as part of the Time Square Rezoning and then two years later when the actual text was approved. Yes, it has not worked because it has not been enforced, simply that.

As the Speaker mentioned, the issues of restrictive deck in a case where manufacturing square footage was preserved, not even those restriction declarations were enforced. That is something that is done all the time. If someone builds a plaza and decides to close that plaza, it is a restricted declaration and its enforced, and its kept open. here in the Garment Center. So, I return you first to that issue of 180,000 square feet, that maybe one of our solutions to secure an additional 200,000 square feet to bring this number up. Our board only learned yesterday that the number is now down to 200,000. We echo Board 5, it is simply not acceptable. If we have to return to the idea of a trigger mechanism, that the portion of the zoning that lifts the restrictions is delayed, unless and until, a certain amount of square footage is put in

2.2

place, that may end up being some sort of compromise solution and further incentivize also EDC and the administration to actually keep this part of the compromise deal. We really are serious about this and feel very strong about it.

The next thing is, the Speaker mentioned, we also have not just manufacturing preservation, but in our district, in P2, residential preservation. There are approximately 28 buildings containing 500 apartments. They're all scattered, small five story tenements. These buildings, there is a specific revision put in 2005, to prohibit demolition of those residential buildings. The Department of Buildings in Error has issued multiple permits for demolition and we have tried and engaged with both City Planning and the Department of Buildings to make sure not only does it not happen, things get revoked and there are specific ways to figure out to fix this problem and to create affordable units.

We have not been able to resolve this and just this week, we learned again, that the Department of Building was indicating the best way to fix it is to have a demolition and build a new building.

2.2

It remains a major issue for us on our Board and we thank you for your help on it.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony.

JESSIE BODINE: Greetings Council Member, Speaker

Johnson, and members of the zoning Franchise

Committee. I am Jessie Bodine the District Manager

for Manhattan Community Board 4. I am testifying on

CB4's long standing advocacy for garment related

manufacturing, residential mixed-use development, and

the preservation of the built environment in the

Special Garment Center District.

manufacturing uses in the District since 1985. CB4 further strengthened portions of the district by insisting that certain text amendments relating to preserving the mix of residential and manufacturing in the districts were included in Hudson Yards rezoning in 2005. Unfortunately, besides putting these protections in place, the city has done little to enforce neither the manufacturing nor the residential preservation.

In March 2017, the Administration presented a plan to lift the manufacturing preservation requirements in the District and incentivize and

| facilitate the relocation of the Garment Center to   |
|--|
| Brooklyn. Neither Community Boards 4, 5, nor a       |
| number of the important Garment Center Stakeholders  |
| were included in the creation of that plan. There    |
| was a strong negative reaction from the Community    |
| Boards, the elected officials, and the Garment       |
| Center's business associations, unions, and          |
| designers, all of which attended our public meetings |
| on the topic. Thanks to Manhattan Borough President  |
| Gale A. Brewer the plan was paused, and the Garment  |
| Center Steering Committee was formed to conduct a    |
| true planning process. CB4, along with other         |
| stakeholders attended semi-monthly tow hour meetings |
| over the summer of 2017. The Steering Committee's    |
| rigorous debate resulted in a number of              |
| recommendations.                                     |

To the Administration credit, with the help of Borough President Brewer and Speaker Johnson, there has been substantial progress in preserving the exiting manufacturing space in the District and the acquisition of new manufacturing buildings in the District.

However, CB4 cannot support a plan that lifts the protections of garment manufacturing uses in the

2.1

2.2

district now based on future promises. CB4 stands by the recommendations of the Steering Committee to preserve between 500,000 and 800,000 of existing manufacturing space and to further support the acquisition of the Manufacturing Building and the promotion of affordable residential mixed-use development.

If we all agree that the Garment Center is a vital and world-class ecosystem of garment related businesses and preserving a core of the garment manufacturing in the Garment Center is a priority, then we must secure it now before the protections are lifted.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimonies. I appreciate that and I'm sure Speaker Johnson will as well.

Our next panel is Phil Lavoie of the Gotham
Organization, Chris Jaskiewicz of the Gotham
Organization, Tom Block of 499 seventh Avenue and
Steve Boxer of Pachyderm Consulting.

Could you just identify yourself, so I know who's here and who's not here?

STEVE BOXER: I'm Steve Boxer.

2.1

2.2

CHAIRPESON MOYA: Okay, so Chris is not here.

So, I'm going to add this panel, Andy Udis, I hope I pronounced your name right. Close enough for government work. He is with ABS Partners.

Mr. Boxer, if you'd like to begin.

STEVE BOXER: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Boxer.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Is that microphone, is the red light on.

STEVE BOXER: How about now. Much better.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Perfect.

STEVE BOXER: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Boxer, I am the owner of Pachyderm Consulting an IT Consulting Firm located in the heart of the Garment district. I support the proposal to lift the use restrictions of the garment district because I feel we need more office space for companies like mine that are growing in this wonderful neighborhood and have a real need to be located here. I moved to the Garment district in the summer of 2001 because of its central location and excellent transportation network are essential for my business.

I and my employees spend our days going back and forth to clients. So, having a garment district

2.1

2.2

location makes my business significantly more efficient. In addition, my employees predominantly come from Brooklyn and Queens. The convenience of my location helps me to attract and retain talent in a competitive field. Moving into the garment district was among the best decisions I have ever made for my business. Indeed, several of my clients happen to be in the neighborhood as well. There interesting nonfor-profit uses working hard to make the city a better place. Some of these clients were already mine before I came to the district and others, because of my proximity to them.

In the time since my offices have been located in the Garment district, I have doubled my number of employees and I'm on my second office in the garment district. I believe that the amount of space currently being restricted has limited the number of places where my business could locate. Over the past 17 years, I've seen the changes that have taken place and how this area has slowly become more diversified.

We're getting more places to eat, and there is certainly a lot more people on the streets when I leave often late at night. All of these changes should be encouraged, especially in the central

2.1

2.2

midtown neighborhood and I believe any reasonable steps to promote or accelerate these positive changes should be pursued. I believe that diversifying the business base and increasing options for all businesses will ensure the future of the neighborhood for everyone and that is why I am here to support the proposal to lift the use restriction in the garment district. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Mr. Boxer. Just identify yourself.

PHIL LAVOIE: Good afternoon. My name is Phil Lavoie, from the Gotham Organization. I am the Chief Operating Officer of the Gotham Organization which is a family owned real estate development firm in its  $107^{th}$  year of operation. Gotham developed and owns the Atlas Building in the Garden District located at  $38^{th}$  Street and Sixth Avenue and it contains 373 apartments in addition to 46,000 square feet of office space on three floors and 16,000 square feet of retail space, with frontage on both Sixth Avenue and  $38^{th}$  Street.

The buildings home to approximately 600 residents and over 100 people work there, 15 of whom are directly employed by Gotham. I support the City

2.2

Planning and the EDC initiatives because they represent a fair compromise for all parties. The proposal ensures the continued presence of the Garment Industry in the neighborhood while also allowing the expansion of alternate uses which will create a more dynamic neighborhood for its residents.

Many residents in our building have mentioned that they would like to see more diverse uses in the neighborhood, especially those which would activate the streets in the evening hours and provide new privately-owned public spaces for everyone to enjoy.

Other uses are growing organically throughout the surrounding neighborhoods and that should be allowed to happen in the garment district as well.

As those conditions have changed since the Special Garment Center District was created over thirty years ago. The neighborhood needs to adapt in that intelligent way. I think the Borough President and City Council Speaker put an excellent plan together with EDC and DCP and it really makes sense for all stakeholders to get this approved. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimony. Next.

2.1

2.2

ANDY UDIS: Good afternoon. My name is Andy
Udis, I am a partner at ABS Partners Real Estate.

I'm a leasing and managing agent for over nine
buildings in the garment district and I'm speaking
here today on behalf and support of the City Planning
and Economic Development Initiative to remove the
preservation restrictions in the garment district and
replace it with programs to help directly help
garment manufacturers.

The families and owners that I represent have owned these buildings for many years and over time, we have all seen the decline and deterioration of garment manufacturing first hand. We simply don't see the demand in our buildings for the types of garment manufacturing that used to exist.

Once production started moving overseas, the pressure on local manufacturers became insurmountable, they could no longer afford the rent. Advances in technology have exacerbated the problem. My clients would like the restrictions lifted because they limit the ability to find tenants. Lifting the restrictions will lead to building improvements. They will be able to reinvest capital in the buildings creating a more inviting garment district.

2.1

2.2

Whats good for the garment district is good for New York. I also would like the restrictions lifted because they don't work, and it seems to me and my clients that the programs and supports that EDC is proposing could by providing assistance directly to garment manufacturers through tools that address everything from workforce development to rent guarantees. The city is offering the industry a way to stabilize and modernize that zoning never could.

We urge you to support these proposals because we believe they take a fair approach to all the interest involved and we believe the outcome will be good for all of us and for New York City. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimony Mr. Udis. Mr. Block?

entire life 74 years in New York City. In the last two decades, I bought two commercial buildings in the garment district. One is on Seventh Avenue, 499
Seventh Avenue and its not in the preservation zone.
The other one is on West 40<sup>th</sup> Street, well its in the P1 zone, its not subject to restrictions because it was an office building at the time the Special Restrictions have started over 30 years ago.

2.2

For the last decade, I've been on the Board of the Garment District Alliance and currently a Vice Chairman. As all of you know, there are about 700,000 square feet occupied by garment manufacturing within the P1 and P2 zones and another 700,000 outside within the Garment District Alliance but not in the P1 or P2 zones.

The amount required under the current P1 and P2 zone restrictions, devoted to manufacturing at four and a half million. The new proposal drafted by the EDC, and strongly supported by the Garment District Alliance, and improved by Manhattan Borough President, Speaker Johnson, and their staffs, has many benefits.

It helps manufacturers with support of programs and provides that strong manufactures remain in the buildings and that will have space dedicated to manufacturing in the garment district and does not require anyone to leave.

The plan opens up space for new and varied industries which will attract more diverse workforce. For those new employees will demand more diverse and vital retail, the whole neighborhood will improve.

2.2

| One might say my comments are self-serving and        |
|---|
| not altruistic. Actually, it works the other way.     |
| My tenants at the end of the leases, will have more   |
| choices to move within the district than they do now, |
| and because of lifting the P1 and P2 restrictions,    |
| I'll have more competition for new tenants.           |
| Nevertheless, I support the program because I         |
| committed to the neighborhood and I'm dedicated to    |
| seeing it continue to evolve and a great place for    |
| tenants of all kind to locate. An improved            |
| neighborhood will help us all therefore, I strongly   |
| support the EDC proposal. Thank you.                  |

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimonies today. We appreciate you being here.

The next panel Brian Weber, I think it says MCBY but I'm not sure. Susan Chin — MCB4, okay. Susan Chin from the Design Trust for Public Space and Elizabeth Goldstein from Municipal Arts Society.

Elizabeth, you're the first person I've Chaired two separate committees to hear testimony from, so — just three on this panel. I'd say ladies first, but its up to your guys.

BRIAN WEBER: Hi and thank you for having me.

I'm Brian Weber from Manhattan Community 4.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Oh, okay.

BRIAN WEBER: My support is of course predicated on the conditions laid out by Joe Restuccia and Jessie Bodine, and I'm here to address one other facet of preservation. We've talked about preservation of jobs, we've talked about preservation of space, a big concern to the community is preservation of our existing current built environment.

Early Councilman Johnson spoke about the history and legacy of our neighborhood and as part of that we recommend that landmarks commission reviewing calendar the following specific properties to be designated as New York City landmarks. There were seven sites that we identified. Three of them were identified in the ESA done by the DCP in relationship to this rezoning, those were the Manhattan Center at 311 West  $34^{th}$  Street, the New Yorker Hotel at  $481~8^{th}$ Avenue, the Sloan House, YMCA at 360 West 34<sup>th</sup> Street. We identified four additional sites, and this is all just the tip of the iceberg, but four additional sites that we identified were a commercial building, three story commercial building, 300 West 38<sup>th</sup> Street, the former New York Edison Company

2.2

of Susan today.

| Building at 308 West 36 <sup>th</sup> Street. The former Barbour |
|--|
| Dormitory at 330 West 36 <sup>th</sup> Street and the Webster    |
| Apartments at 419 West 34 <sup>th</sup> Street. Several of these |
| sites are what is currently considered over built in             |
| zoning but several of them are also soft sites, these            |
| are historical sites for Social Service reasons,                 |
| cultural reasons and infrastructure reasons and they             |
| all merit consideration, its important to the                    |
| community that should a rezoning occur that we not               |
| lose these historical assets in our built                        |
| environment. Thank you.  |
| CHAIRPERSON MOYA: That was pretty good timing                    |
| there. Ms. Chin?   |

SUSAN CHIN: Good afternoon. My name is actually Joanna Crisp.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I didn't think you were Susan, but you know, I've seen her name so many times, I don't know if there was - there's another Susan Chin that I do know but she's not here either, so -JOANNA CRISP: I am reading testimony on behalf

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, and your name again? JOANNA CRISP: Joanna Crisp. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony for the Garment

2.1

2.2

Center Zoning Text Amendment on behalf of the Design
Trust for Public Space. Design Trust does not yet
have confident that the City will fulfill its
commitment to implement a plan to keep garment
manufacturing in Manhattan and bolster this creative
industry and distinctive neighborhood.

Since 2009, the Design trust has worked with fashion designers, garment manufacturers, suppliers, property owners, government officials and industry leaders to determine the value and interdependence of this core R&D hub and unique business cluster that nurtures fashion start-ups and innovation. Its seminal studies, Made in Midtown and Making Midtown made clear that this is the foundation of our city's creative economy and fading manufacturing sector, and if we do not preserve this complex design and prototyping ecosystem, NYCH stands to lose our standing as a global fashion capital, a \$98 billion business that employees 180,000 people or 6 percent of the city's workforce.

The City assured the Garment Center Steering

Committee and key stakeholders that lifting the

zoning restriction in P1 and P2 would be contingent

2.2

upon its Plan to secure at least 500,000 square feet of production space.

When the Department of City Planning issued its certification for lifting the Zoning Text Amendment, the City assured key stakeholders that 300,000 square feet of garment manufacturing space had been secured through IDA. Now we learn there's only 200,000 square feet.

The most critical part of the Plan is to purchase a building which has not yet advanced. And with the specter of lifting the zoning text amendment in this area, will whats now a \$700 per square foot property soon sell at \$3,000 per square foot.

The City and GDA's additional investment of \$14 million in the Fashion Manufacturing Initiative with CFDA is to be lauded, but the timeframe is vague and must go hand-in-hand with IDA for an entire ten-year period to succeed.

So, just quickly, Susan has outlined a few key recommendations. Delaying approval of the text amendment until the components that will preserve the District are in place. Providing additional City capital funding and seeking State and Federal support for a building purchase. Continuing to push the IDA

2.2

| tax incentive program. Ensuring that the FMI program |
|--|
| is in place for a ten-year period and continuing to  |
| work with the Steering Committee to significantly    |
| advance the entire Plan. Thank you.                  |

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Your testimony you said this is a \$98 billion business, is that in New York City?

JOANNA CRISP: I believe that's the intent.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Okay, thank you for your testimony. Ms. Goldstein?

ELIZABETH GOLDSTEIN: Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you this afternoon. I'm Elizabeth Goldstein, the President of the Municipal Art Society.

In the summer of 2017, the Garment District
Steering Committee concluded that the District needed
a minimum of 500,000 square feet of affordable space
protected for manufacturers for the industry to
continue to thrive.

Today, we are encouraged by the City's commitment to preserve the District through tax abatement; business development programs and an initiative to seek a non-profit partner to purchase and manage a co-o for manufacturing tenants.

2.2

Progress has been made, 200,000 square feet have been secured under the IDA tax incentive program, but the critical mass of 500,000 square feet has not been achieved and the final most critical element of the three-prong strategy: the acquisition of a building to create a permanently affordable space for businesses is encountering some bumps in the road. There is no consensus in the community that the City's investment in such a venture is adequate to make sure that the project actually pencils out.

Before you today are the City Council's first step to removing the text amendment that was designed many decades ago to protect garment manufacturing at the core of New York City's garment industry. We are still a very far way away from achieving the minimum square footage recommended by the Steering Committee. This should give the Council pause, it gives MAS pause.

You have tools that must be used to ensure that the lifting of the text amendment remains an incentive to achieving the full minimum commitment to manufacturing in the District. You may postpone the date this legislation becomes effective, or you may make this proposal conditional on further progress

2.2

| being made towards the purchase of a building and the |
|---|
| enrollment of additional landlords in the tax         |
| abatement program. Or, you might recommend that the   |
| greater City capital commitment be ready should it be |
| required.   |

MAS welcomes the progress towards the preservation of production space in the District. However, we call on this Committee and the City Council more broadly to ensure that we truly hit the mark that we need to ensure a robust future for the Garment District in Manhattan. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very, very much.

Thank you all three of you for your testimony. Ms.

Goldstein, if you could come up here, I just want to ask you a question about another matter. In the meantime, — I got her here, I got to ask her another question right, so —

Mark Benqualid, I hope I got that right. Kenneth Fischel, Matt Coudert, and Barbara Blair.

Good afternoon.

MARC BENQUALID: Good afternoon, thank you very much for allowing me to speak members of the committee. My name is Marc Benqualid. We're definitely in favor of the support for the proposal

2.1

2.2

before you and we've heard a lot of testimony to now about what should or should not be done but I would like to share a little bit of an anecdote what we see in the Garment District.

First of all, my father was in the district. You know, he was a shoe manufacturer. He designed, manufactured and sold shoes. If you remember Tom McCann, Kenny Grant, those were the people that my father did the shoes for.

In 1980's and 1990's, you know Taiwan, China came around and he was unable to compete, so he closed that portion of the business, which is the manufacturing and basically had a small office. On the flip side of it, my father-in-law was in the Garment District. He was a Play it Again Sam, Happy Legs, those were the production he had there. Again, he had a lot of manufacturing here but again, when Vietnam, Taiwan, and China came around, he was unable to compete with that and all the manufacturing left the District and again, he just had a small office and eventually sold the business.

You know, in terms of having a real estate, you know, we see constantly this in our building. We have people who are in the manufacturing or designers

2.2

that come to us basically saying that we can't maintain the amount of square footage, we give them less square footage. They can't maintain that and basically because of businesses changing, they eventually closed their business or basically are going elsewhere.

So, we're definitely, you know, in support of the amendment proposal before you. The restrictions of the zoning that was placed here really did not work and did not satisfy what it intended to do. We think that what is before this committee actually will benefit everybody there and as well the Garment District and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you.

KENNETH FISCHEL: My name is Ken Fischel. I'm the owner of 264 West  $40^{\rm th}$  Street, which is a 20-story building between  $7^{\rm th}$  and  $8^{\rm th}$  Avenues. Before I talk about the building, I want to talk about me.

My father and grandfather started a Sports wear manufacturing company. We made ladies bathing suits and we were the largest supplier to Sears and Montgomery Ward and the Spiegel catalog among many other catalog companies in the 1960's and 1970's. It

2.2

was a business that employed over 100 people. We were a union shop, we had 40,000 square feet.

By the mid-1980's the business was not a viable business any longer. We face competition from abroad and we had to close shop and we ended up renting out the space.

The next phase of my life was when I purchased 264 West 40<sup>th</sup> Street in 2003. The building had been a scaffold building. There had been a sidewalk bridge in front of the building for over ten years. The facade was crumbling, the building was 50 percent vacant. Nobody wanted the building, it was nothing, but a headache riddled with violations, but I wanted the building because I had faith in New York and I had faith in the garment district. I went in and I repaired the facade, removed the bridge, upgraded the elevators and tried to rent out the space and there were no takers. I tried to comply with the law.

So, I faced the possibility of losing the building to the bank for nonpayment of my mortgage because there was insufficient income to cover it or renting to tenants that actually wanted the space.

Now, those tenants were not manufacturing tenants. I had to then spend additional money which I really

2.2

| aran e wane to do to apprade that space from         |
|--|
| manufacturing level space to otherwise commercial    |
| space and the building rented up and today the       |
| building is fully rented. I'd like to say that I     |
| support this proposal for on a number of different   |
| levels. I support it not only as a property owner,   |
| but I support it as a former manufacturer, because I |
| could tell you right now when we were making ladies  |
| bathing suits, if these proposals had been in place, |
| chances are we would have been able to retain that   |
| business and keep those jobs in New York City.       |

So, I fully support he proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much Mr.

Fischel.

MATT COUDERT: Members of this committee. My name is Matt Coudert, representing George Comfort & Sons and I support the proposal before you today.

George Comfort & Sons is a family owned real estate company now in our 100<sup>th</sup> year of business. WE have owned or had a stake in properties in the Garment District since 1944. Since that time, our company has been our building tenancy shift from 100 percent garment related businesses to a diverse mix

2.1

2.2

of office tenants. Including non-profits, arts organizations, tech and media firms.

This shift occurred in response to the dramatic decline in garment manufacturing. Forty years ago, at an accelerating rate, garment production began moving out of New York and ultimately out of the country.

This left local manufacturers with too little work.

Even the Garment District's below market rents and protective zoning could not keep our manufacturing tenants from going out of business. As their companies failed, often defaulting on their leases, we saw building vacancies rise.

Over time, affordable rents and close proximity to transportation drew other uses to the Garment District, preventing this central midtown neighborhood from going into a steep economic decline.

We support the zoning text amendment.

Legitimizing and encouraging a diverse tenant base in the Garment District make sense for the neighborhood, for Midtown Manhattan and for New York City. This proposal looks to the future of the neighborhood and the concurrent EDC economic development initiatives

2.2

| will  | insure  | that | the | garment | industry | retains | its |
|-------|---------|------|-----|---------|----------|---------|-----|
| nlace | e in it |      |     |         |          |         |     |

These actions take a fair approach to the interests involved, and we urge you to vote in favor.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Mr. Coudert. Ms Blair?

Thank you for your time.

BARBARA BLAIR: Good afternoon Council Members.

My name is Barbara Blair. I'm the President of the

Garment District Alliance. On behalf of the Alliance

I thank the Committee for holding this hearing today,

Speaker Johnson, Manhattan Borough President Brewer,

EDC, DCP, and Industry stakeholders who working with

the Steering Committee has brought us to this moment.

The Alliance supports the Zoning Text Amendment being proposed. The amendment acknowledges the evolution of the district and addresses the challenges faced by the Garment Manufacturing Sector.

From 2000 to 2016, the district lost nearly
13,000 manufacturing jobs. In the same time period,
there's been a remarkable growth in other job
sectors. 60,000 new jobs in the district. The
highest employment numbers since 1950, generated
across a broad section of business sectors. Apparel

2.2

manufacturing has been declining for 40 years, not only in the garment district but in the city, state, and nation.

The Steering Committee Plan asked that in tandem with the Zoning Amendment there be initiatives to mitigate the continued loss of apparel manufacturing in the district. There are four main recommendations we support, and we've been working diligently to advance the IDA program, the purchase of a dedicated building, business development programming to support the manufacturing sector and public realm improvements.

We've taken steps to collaborate with industry organizations and academic institutions to identify programs that will help stabilize and promote manufacturing the district within the scope of permissible activities for BIDs and within the BIDs mission.

As a show of commitment, the GDA requested and received finance committee approval for two and a half million-dollar assessment increase with authorization going forward. This ongoing increase will enable the BID to potentially fund programming, support the goals of the Steering Committee subject

2.2

to annual BID Board Approval. We've also initiated plans to consider public realm improvements and celebrate the industries heritage in the neighborhood and the neighborhood continues to be identified as the Home of American Fashion. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimony. I appreciate you being here today and waiting to testify. Thank you, I'm going to dismiss this panel. The next panel is Mr. William Silverman from Otterbourg Properties, Samuel Friedfeld of Olmstead Properties, Jonathan Bowles of the Center for an Urban Future. We are also going to call at this time Eric Gural also with the GDA.

If you start now, you'll get an extra few seconds because the sergeant at arms isn't ready but go ahead.

WILLIAM SILVERMAN: Great I'd like all the time that you'll give me. Good afternoon Committee

Members. Thank you for accepting my statement and letting me testify. I am a member of the firm of

Otterbourg PC, but I come now as the co-manager of

JLJ Bricken LLC, the owner of the Bricken Arcade at

225 West 37<sup>th</sup> Street and 230 West 38<sup>th</sup> Street which is right in the heart of the Garment Center.

2.2

My family has been in the real estate business in the Garment District for four generations.

I submit this statement in support of the City

Planning and Economic Development Corporation efforts

to eliminate the preservation of existing restrictive

zoning in the Garment District and to replace those

anachronistic zoning provisions with programs to

directly assist garment manufacturers.

I was born in New York City in 1942. I am almost 77 years old and during that time, I have observed the decline of garment manufacturing in the city. Another branch of the family was involved in garment manufacturing and it was really unsustainable in the City because of costs. I remember the time Hand trucks really carts filled the streets of the Garment Center loaded with garments and fabric. No more.

First, in the 1960's garment manufacturing went to the Southern part of the United States where labor and other costs were lower than in New York City. To remain competitive, garment manufacturing moved again, primarily to Central and South America and after that to Asia.

It is entirely appropriate to lift the zoning — is my seatbelt unfastened?

2.1

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: No, don't worry, I'll let you know when I've had enough.

WILLIAM SILVERMAN: Thank you. It is entirely appropriate to lift the zoning restrictions not only because they are not in step with business reality, but also, because the zoning restrictions limit the ability to attract tenants that want to be in the Garment District and have different businesses that are not involved in garment manufacturing.

In addition, the zoning restrictions don't work because market conditions no longer support such artificial restrictions. We certainly don't want to go back to sweat shops where the workers are paid a dollar a day and that would've been competitive now with the markets in Asia. Removing the restrictions will lead to building enhancements and a better more friendly Garment District.

I think that the EDC programs that have been proposed would be highly beneficial to the City and its people by providing assistance to garment manufacturers as well as programs that provide for workforce development and rent guarantees, amount other things. The City and the EDC are offering the garment industry support to stabilize and update the

2.2

business of garment manufacturing that zoning or
rezoning cannot do effectively.

I request that you support these proposals, because I believe that the proposals recognize the realities of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and are fair and reasonable for all parties. The proposals of the City and the EDC will benefit the City, its inhabitants and really everyone including the more than 63 million visitors to the City in positive and constructive ways. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony.

SAMUEL FRIEDFELD: Distinguished Members of the Committee. My name is Samuel Friedfeld and I work with Olmstead Properties. I handle leasing and management for 525 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Olmstead Properties has extremely deep ties to the Garment District as we have owned 575 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue for close to 80 years and 525 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue for 20 years. We also manage and help lease several other properties in the district. As you can see, I have not been around as 575 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, but I have bee around long enough to see the changes in the neighborhood and understand its true potential.

2.2

At 525, we made a business decision to stay a fashion Showroom building. As time went on, we realized there were less sample and manufacturing tenants and more high fashion and showroom tenants.

Some of our tenants include Hugo Boss, Valentino,
Nicole Miller and Columbia. None of them have manufacturing components within our building. Can I have a tissue, my nose is running. Sorry, sorry to keep sniffling. Thank you, I appreciate it.

At the same time, these companies represent everything that is great about the Districts historic past. I am here today to support the City Planning and Economic Development initiative.

I believe lifting the district zoning restriction is critical because it prohibits property owners from investing in the neighborhood. All the adjacent neighborhoods including Bryant Part, Times Square, the soon to be Hudson Yards and Chelsea have benefited from the decade's long uptick in economic activity, but the Garment District has been partially, and in many cases fully, left out of the equation. I believe that all laws are created with good intent in mind, but as time goes on, a law may become less relevant, so much to the point where it

| begins to hurt the people it set out to help. I       |
|---|
| believe this is the case with the Garment District    |
| zoning laws. There is factually no proof that any     |
| law has helped keep on manufacturing job in the       |
| district, or in the state, or in the country. What    |
| there is proof of however, is that new and exciting   |
| opportunities in the form of tech, advertising, and   |
| media and internet companies are coming to the        |
| Garment Center and they are bringing with them new    |
| jobs and the potential for investment. I believe      |
| these companies are the future of the Garment Center. |
| With current zoning restrictions on the books, I      |
| believe we will stall all the potential growth of the |
| TAMI companies. The economic plan that EDC has        |
| presented will be the most efficient way to provide   |
| support to garment manufacturers.                     |

I urge you to support both these proposals because I believe they represent a fair and balanced solution to the problem at hand. Manufacturers will receive a more meaningful form of assistance and the Garment District will finally be able to live up to it's full potential. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Mr. Friedfeld.

2.1

2.2

ERIC GURAL: Hi, my name is Eric Goral and I'm the CEO of GFP Properties and I'm one of the owners who are putting in their buildings into the IDA program. We own five buildings in the district and I didn't prepare a statement today because I wanted to come and try to respond to some of the things that have already been said.

So, one thing I think is really important as far as treasuring the history of the Garment Center is basically right in front of you on that TV. If we're going to landmark anything, we should landmark the button in the needle. That's the most iconic piece of garment related history in that area and that should be the only thing that's landmarked in the area to show exactly how special it is.

These other buildings that these people are talking about have no history going back to the garment related activities in the area more than that does. So, I think that's really important to point out. The other thing, there's generally a mischaracterization of sort of how these things work. So, people think there's two group. There's like a landmark group and then there's a sort of fashion group. There's not, there's four groups. There are

2.2

the landlords who didn't comply and then there's the landlords who did and then there are the fashion people who support the manufacturers and the manufacturers themselves and then there's all the other fashion people who do not. Those groups are not equal. So, the advantage of what this program does is this program connects the two people who have done the right thing. Which are the landlords that comply and the manufacturers and the fashion people who support them. The only benefit should go to them, that's it.

What government should be doing here is not drawing the line between us, you should draw a circle around us. Put us together in this program, let us work together. We've been doing it for years, but don't let any of the benefits get outside of the area of those two groups and that's really important. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Mr. Gural.

JONATHAN BOWLES: Good afternoon Council Member Grodenchik. I'm Jonathan Bowles, I run the Center for an Urban Future. We're a think-tank, we publish studies about growing in diverse fine New York's economy and expanding economic opportunity. We've

2.2

| written a lot over the years about the importance of |
|--|
| manufacturing to New York City's Economy. In fact,   |
| in February of 2000, I authored a study about the    |
| apparel manufacturing industry, it was called the    |
| Empire has no clothes, rising real estate prices and |
| declining city support threatens the future of New   |
| York's apparel industry. So, if you would had asked  |
| me a couple of decades ago, how to support the       |
| apparel manufacturing industry, I would have said we |
| need to protect the Special Garment District. In     |
| fact, this report back in 2000, one of our key       |
| recommendations was to do just that enforce current  |
| zoning laws in the garment center.                   |

I think a different approach is needed today.

When I authored the report in 2000, I honestly
thought that the garment industries job loses were
hitting a bottom. I was hopeful but since 2000,
since the year we published this report, the apparel
manufacturing industry in New York City has lost
another 102,000 jobs. This actually represents 99
percent of all the manufacturing job losses in New
York City during that period and its also a period
when the city overall gained 750,000 jobs.

So, I think that the Special Zoning District no

longer reflects the realities of today's garment district, but its obviously an important part of our economy. Its long been an entry point to immigrant. Its long been a point where immigrant owners have been able to kind of climb up the ladder. Its important for the boarder fashion industry which is important and that's why I support the plan that's under consideration now. As a couple other people have mentioned today, I think its also important that the Garment Center has increasingly become a place where companies from other industries that can't afford Union Square, Flat Iron District, Chelsea,

They have been moving to the Garment Center and those are growing industries that we as a city need to support as well and I think this plan does that.

Thank you.

Architects, Graphic Design Firms, Tech startups.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you Jonathan. It's good to see you. I thank you. Get home safely, its snowing out. We have six more people to testify.

Marty Frutch, he left, okay. Casandra Diggs, Michael Brady, and Yeolee Teng. And either they have very

2.2

similar hand writing our one person filled out all of these, so -

Just two? Just two of you here? Well, if that's the case, so, I like things cozy. We're also going to call Angela Sung Pinsky. Pinsky —I've never met a Pinsky, so — I got to get a spokesperson maybe and Steven Epstein from IATSE. He left too? Alright, okay, she's speaking for her. Marty is obviously not here. Casandra you're here?

CASANDRA DIGGS: Yeah, I'm here.

CHAIRPESON MOYA: Michael Brady, last call.

Yeohlee Teng? Okay, and Ms. Pinsky also has a

spokesperson here. Okay, Ms. Diggs why don't you
begin.

CASANDRA DIGGS: Okay, thank you so much. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Casandra Diggs. I'm the Chief Financial and Operating Officer of the Council of Fashion Designers of America Foundation. On behalf of Steven Kolb, President and CEO of the CFDA, I'd like to read a statement in support of the New York City Economic Development Corps initiatives outlined for your consideration today.

As the governing body of the American fashion industry, the CFDA not only supports its 500 plus

2.1

2.2

CFDA Members and emerging brands through its robust programming, but also stands as a front line of support for the fashion manufacturers.

Through impactful programs such as the Fashion

Manufacturing Initiative in partnership with the New

York City Economic Development Corp and industry

stakeholders like Andrew Rosen of Theory, the Coach

Foundation and Ralph Lauren, we have made significant

strides to support the local NYC fashion

manufacturing sector since 2013.

\$2.8 million to 25 fashion manufacturers, of which 13 have been located in Midtown Manhattan, to incest in advanced technology, as well as manufacturing showcases, collaborations, and workforce development programming. FMI has brought local manufacturing to the forefront of the industry's conversations and helped build crucial relationships between designer and manufacturer which ultimately leads to more economic growth for the city.

The CFDA will expand its programming greatly to not only continue to help manufacturers acquire new technology to remain competitive in the global market, but also aim focus at other ways to increase

2.1

2.2

local production, enhance the city's fashion
manufacturing workforce and market these incredible
manufacturers to the fashion industry at large.

We believe the future of the industry is a citywide ecosystem, but we remain committed to supporting
factories in Midtown. This is why the CFDA fully
support the EDC's ideas put forth, including the IDA
program and the building procurement. Mechanisms
such as the zoning preservation have been proven to
be a lacking system for the fashion manufacturing and
we believe these modern ideas will help preserve
fashion manufacturing for the New York's Garment
Center. These solutions were researched thoroughly
in the direct response to the Garment Center Steering
Committee this last summer and are viable options to
help move the fashion manufacturing sector forward.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony Ms. Diggs. Next.

MORGAN PEARLMAN: As I covered my name is Morgan Pearlman and I'm speaking on behalf of Angela Pinsky. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of an Association for a Better New York ABNY. We're a 47-year-old civic organization

2.1

2.2

that promotes the effective cooperation of public and private sectors to improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers. ABNY would like to express our support for the rezoning proposal put forward by the EDC and Department of City Planning.

The fashion industry and garment district have ben critical components of New York City's economy for hundreds of years. As New York's dynamic economy continues to evolve, it is important to deeply consider the changes taking place from both a land use and economic development perspective. We believe that the rezoning proposal put forth takes a comprehensive look at the future of the garment district and fashion industry at large.

The rezoning of the garment district is a project the city has been deeply considering for decades. We believe that this proposal put forth is a product of those years of contemplation, and we appreciate the consideration given to the evolving nature of the fashion industry in New York City, the inclusion of incentives for businesses to remain in the garment district, and resources and support for businesses moving to other parts of the city that also represent opportunities for the fashion industry to thrive.

2.1

2.2

While we would have encouraged higher densities in a well transited core of the city, we believe that overall this proposal thoughtfully considers the area's evolving uses and will lead to smart and respectful growth in the garment district.

We look forward to productive and inclusive discussion of the proposed development and encourage this subcommittee and the New York City community at large to support the project. Thank you for your time, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. Thank you very much.

JOANNA CRISP: Hello again. My name is Joanna Crisp and I am reading this statement on behalf of Yeohlee Teng who's a member of the Garment Center Steering Committee and a Fashion Business owner.

As a fashion company designing and producing in NYC, I assure this Council that the Garment Industry is a vital component of New York's Fashion economy. This is clearly evidence by its continued presence in the face of an across the board decline in New York's other manufacturing sectors.

Our garment companies have relied upon the current zoning text to maintain their presence for

| the industry. To fift that text without first         |
|---|
| securing the promise space is a disservice to them.   |
| The industry and the process that created this        |
| agreement. I continue to be in favor of this          |
| agreement but strongly ask that the 300,000 square    |
| feet be secured first, along with the promised        |
| permanent dedicated building. I wholly support the    |
| statements made by the Design Trust for Public Space  |
| without whose guidance, the zoning text would already |
| be history and the MAS for determining the effects,   |
| the proposed changes will have on this industry, and  |
| the Steering Committee for their recommendations.     |
| The city has made genuine progress in these goals and |
| I ask, what is the harm in waiting a little longer to |
| ensure the spaces in place to secure the industry for |
| another 30 years? Thank you.                          |

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Your last but not least.

Yeah, I hope not least.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Go ahead.

PAIMAAN LODHI: Good afternoon. My name is

Paimaan Lodhi representing the Real Estate Board of

New York. REBNY's here today to support the zoning

and Economic Development proposals for the Garment

Center.

EDC has developed a two-part program in response to the communities long standing desire to preserve apparel production in Manhattan's garment district.

program that will generate 15-year leases at reasonable rents for 300,000 square feet of apparel tendency and participating buildings. EDC's second initiative is the commitment of \$20 million for the purchase of a building in partnership of a non-profit entity to provide space for apparel production long into the future. Both of these programs were developed in response to the recommendations of the Garment Center Steering Committee and represent the most meaningful commitment the city has ever made to preserve apparel production in its historic home.

In addition, the city will also lift the zoning restrictions set in 1987, that imposed severe restrictions on permitted and expanded commercial uses. This restrictive zoning ultimately proved to be an inadequate tool in aiding the apparel industry as did other manufacturing zoning designations throughout the city. However, these restrictions did nothing to slow the decline of apparel production in the area over the past 30 years, including the first

2.2

five years in which the restrictions had regular enforcement.

Zoning is simply an ineffective tool in protecting an industry from the larger and evolving local, national, and global economic forces. The city imposed a unique but well-intentioned burden on midblock buildings to holt the decline of apparel production jobs. However, 30 years of evidence shows that these restrictions did not achieve its goal.

Instead, the city has developed a robust economic proposal at the behest of the community and industrial stakeholders which will retain a core of the apparel manufacturing industry in the Garment Center for the long term. This special Garment Center text amendment and the EDC proposal represents our best chance to assist the apparel manufacturing industry and we urge the Council to approve these actions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you very much for your testimonies today. Anybody else wish to testify that hasn't? Okay, seeing none, I am going to close this hearing now on this application and it will be laid over. This concludes today meeting and I thank the members of the public, my colleagues on the

Committee, our Speaker, the Council and the Land Use Staff for attending. This meeting is hereby adjourned. [GAVEL].

\_ \_

\_ .

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