

Housing and Human Services Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Thursday, January 2nd, 2020 at 6:30PM.

Committee Members Present: Barbara Frazier, Waldys Cruz, Carolina Charles, Ashley Fernandez, Ariel Miranda

Public Members Present: Marshall Vanderpool, Alexander Melendez, Richard Habersham

Committee Members Absent: Richard Allman, Jonathan Nunez, Karen Taylor

Committee Members Excused: Naysha Diaz, Christopher Ventura

CB12 Members Attending: Rud Morales, Ayisha Oglivie, Osi Kaminer., Sara Fisher

Barbara: Only 4 present board members, we don't have quorum. We will continue forward to discuss business in the interest of time. We are happy to conduct this meeting in the Y today, in Inwood, and we have a great turn out today. We will try and conduct meetings in Inwood when it is germane to Inwood.

Barbara: Before we begin, can we catch up on the backed up minutes? At least 1 within the next month? I'd have to have Paola resend the voice recordings over.

Committee unanimously agreed to catch up on backed up minutes of one each this month.

Barbara: Okay, so Philip for about 15 minutes we're going to give the floor to fill up to report on the lawsuit. In your presentation, I'd like to make it very clear what the nine points that were won in the lawsuit. Paul Epstein is here to also speak about the Inwood United plan a little bit.

Phillip: Okay. Barbara thank you for this opportunity. I want to first of all recognize Paul Epstein, who are the CO chairs of the legal action. And what I have prepared is about a 15 minute or so overview of the lawsuit.

Phillip Simpson and Paul Epstein give presentation on Inwood United lawsuit legal decision and Uptown United platform:

Phillip: The origins of the lawsuit go back to September of, 2017 when a group of local residents under the name of uptown's Inwood United submitted over 60 pages of comments on the city's draft scope of work to prepare an environmental impact statement because the proposed rezoning had the potential for serious environmental impacts including socio economic conditions, such as housing and business displacement. The city was required to prepare for the environmental impacts that the ultimate decision maker, which in this case was city council,

would be able to consider a potential adverse impacts of the rezoning as well as potential mitigations in order to decide whether to approve or modify or disapprove the rezoning before preparing a draft. The city was required to accept input from the community on both potential impact and potential mitigations. So, the city prepared a draft scope of work for what impacts it would examine it and then ask for public comment on the draft scope of the work. Many of you may remember there was a huge public hearing at the IS 52 auditorium, that hearing was on the draft scope of work. In addition to the public hearing, the city took written comments and it was a group of people who came together to submit comments on the draft scope of work. Many other people from the community submitted comments asking that the city examine a number of specific potential impacts and mitigations. Unified Inwood encouraged the city to examine these impacts, not because we're trying to set up a lawsuit but in order to get the city and the City Council to take a clear and honest look at what our concerns were and really think about them and change the proposed rezoning. So, when the draft environmental impact statement came out, we saw that the city had just flat out refused to examine many of the impacts that we thought and Unified Inwood thought were important and other members of the community thought were important. So, we repeated our requests in response to draft environmental impact statement. At that point Unified Inwood's comments ran to about 100 pages on the draft, he is. But the city's final was also refused to examine many of the impacts that we had requested. So, ultimately, the lawsuit was based on the city's refusal to examine eight specific impacts: Number one was the racial impact of residential displacement. Another was the impact on minority and women owned businesses. Another was the impact of traffic congestion on emergency at first responders such as ambulances and other was the impact of closing the library for three to five years, and the need for a full interim library as a mitigation. Another was the impact of preferential rents on displacement. Another was the differences between the city's previous predictions and past rezoning and the actual results, such as in Long Island City, and Williamsburg, and downtown Brooklyn. They were also asked that they consider the cumulative impacts of the rezoning with other major land use actions that were taking place in Inwood. And finally, the impact of speculative purchases of residential buildings and the run up to the rezoning, such as 125 Seaman Avenue which changed hands twice in a two year period. I want to be clear - we were pressing the city to examine these impacts. But that was only one of several ways. Community members tried to either stop the rezoning or reshape it into something that would work for him. Nonetheless, as we all know City Council passed the Inwood rezoning. And after that happened several people who are members of northern Manhattan is not for sale which was the umbrella organization that was really organizing the fight against rezoning along with people from Unified Inwood came together as well as Inwood Legal Action who hired Michael Sussman, an experienced civil rights and housing discrimination lawyer to sue the city. The lawsuit was brought under a procedure known as article 78, that's a term. Some of you may hear article 78 as a procedure to challenge decisions by a governmental agencies, in this case the city of New York, and the suit had two theories. First theory was that city hall, had completely failed to study important impacts the rezoning despite requests by community members to study those impacts and that was the impacts that I had mentioned a few minutes ago. The second theory was that the city council actually jumped the gun and voted on the rezoning before the environmental review process was even complete. The vote on the rezoning was on August 8, but the environmental impact

statement was not certified as complete until October 17. We said in the lawsuit that under both theories the rezoning was illegal and was a nullity. Now there been other lawsuits that have challenged rezoning, one was in East Harlem, one was in the Broadway triangle of Brooklyn. A key difference between the inward lawsuit and for instance the East Harlem lawsuit, or the Broadway triangle lawsuit is that we didn't ask the judge to substitute her judgment for the judgment of the city. We didn't ask the judge to say your analysis was faulty or was wrong. Instead, we focused on saying that there were important issues that needed to be addressed but the city completely failed to address them. City Hall refused to look at any of these issues, and you have to ask what is it that they didn't want to see, if the city would not want to examine the racial impact of housing displacement or the impact on minority and women owned businesses, or how much ambulance response times would be slowed down by traffic congestion, or whether the city's past estimates of growth in other areas have any basis in reality. In any event, Michael Sussman filed the suit on December 10, just making the statute of limitations for an article 78 lawsuit. The plaintiffs in the lawsuit, are northern Manhattan is Not for Sale and 14 Inwood residents and business owners. The city opposed the lawsuit. The city claimed that the rezoning was beneficial for Inwood, which frankly was not even an issue in the lawsuit that the city's review process was thorough and that the city's environmental review manual did not require that it study the impacts that we asked for August 5 2019. The briefs were submitted in support of our lawsuit by State Senator Jackson. Both of the briefs spoke from a personal level of issues that were important to the congressman. In the case of the congressman the racial impact of the rezoning, and to Senator Jackson, the issues of education and deprivation of library services. The case was argued in court on August 13 before justice Verna Saunders. Justice Saunders was a recent recently elected to the Supreme Court in Manhattan. She had been a housing court judge before that. On December 19 Justice Saunders decision was released and Congress agreed with us. And then all the end would result in both series, three number one that the city should have studied the effects we requested and theory number two that city council acted prematurely by voting on August 8 before the is with the final.

Phillip: Here's what justice Saunders had to say in her decision she said that the public review process. This to allow the residents of the community who will ultimately reap the benefits and or consequences of this proposal to have meaningful involvement in the process and provide the agency with feedback regarding important issues to be reviewed in order to determine what, if any, impact implementation of the proposed plan will have,

Barbara: So where are we now?

Phillip: The rezoning is revoked. That's with justice Sanders help. And what that means that the rezoning has no effect and the zoning goes back to the status that it had before the city council vote. What the city can do now, is it can either comply with Justice Saunders decision and study the eight impacts that we sued on revives the environmental impact statement we submitted to the city council or take an appeal and the city has filed a notice of appeal filing a notice of

appeal is a pro forma step that preserves the city's right to appeal the big thing they have to do is actually file what's called the record on appeal which is probably about this thick in file briefs.

Phillip: Once all of the briefs are filed the city, we would file a response brief. The case would be scheduled for arguments and it could be argued to the appeals court either the spring, or in the fall. The point I want to make is that, first of all, Michael Sussman, our attorney has already said that he's eager to handle the appeal. As I said, the appeal could be argued this spring or in the fall. Once it's argued we could get a decision within a matter of weeks, or a matter of months, there's really no way to predict how long it would take the court to reach a decision. I've had appeals that were decided in weeks and appeals that you didn't get a decision for months at a time. Personally, I'm optimistic about our chances on appeal because we didn't fall into the trap of asking the city or the court to second guess city hall's analysis. Instead, we targeted the failure to consider common sense issue and the judge agreed. I think the appeals court should agree as well. Another point I want to make is the city doesn't have to go through with the appeal. It can accept the judges decisions study the eight issues, update and send the rezoning back to city council. It could also come to the table and negotiate adjust rezoning. Personally, I think that if the city does go through with the appeal. It's going to show that the city doesn't really care about the racial impacts of rezoning's, or the impact of rezoning's on minority and women owned businesses or first responders and the people who depend on them who could be anybody in this room. Frankly, I speak from personal experience from about two and a half months ago, or whether their estimates of new housing even come close to reality. That they go through with the appeal, they're saying we don't care about these issues. I think that also showed the city doesn't really care about the input of community boards or community members, and that they feel free to ignore community driven plans. Community boards have a very specific role in the Mueller's process, that's the process of land use review and CB 12 took its role very seriously in the end with rezoning. I think the judge's decision also means that community boards can and should take an active role in the environmental review process by identifying potential impacts mitigation measures, needs to be examined and pressing for those impacts and mitigation measures to be considered. This decision, if it stands on appeal, is going to be a very strong precedent for that. Meanwhile, here in Inwood no permits can be issued based on the rezoning. The zoning goes back to pre-rezoning status. Some of you may have questions about four three or four different potential building sites in Inwood.

Barbara: Okay, in the discussion. Yes. Alright,

Phillip: So I can answer questions about that.

Phillip: With all of that said, I'd like to introduce Paul Epstein and ask Paul to speak about the Uptown united plan.

Paul: I wanted to comment. Some of you may have. Thank you for the very concise and I think very good overview. I think it was helpful for the committee.

Paul: What are the alternatives, because some of you may have heard, either live or replay of Mayor de Blasio and Brian Ira show the day that we were holding a press conference about winning the lawsuit. And one of the things he said and we fact checked but I don't have the full factcheck with me, was you take your time with that. But one of the things he said would be worse than the city's rezoning. He said that's always the case. That's a false choice, a community driven alternative plan would be better than the city's rezoning in with legal action in Northern Manhattan Not For Sale do not want to prevent growth and development in Inwood. We're not taking NIMBY action. We want us to adjust and fair rezoning. So in early 2018 some of you who were on the fourth and may remember that a coalition of community organizations including several members in North Manhattan Not for Sale completed the Uptown United platform which is an alternative plan for rezoning and development that's fair to existing Inwood residents and business owners, and we thank community board 12 because we did deliver. Some of the boards have recommendations that were consistent with Uptown United maybe you would have come to those conclusions on your own, but they were consistent with ours, so we thank you for those. The borough president Brewer also considered the Uptown United platform and make recommendations that were consistent with Uptown United, the city administration and then City Council ignored it. Since the judge's decision and the article 78 became public, we've been reminding people that a community alternative plan exists. We want people to know the mayor's rezoning plan is not the only option for developing Inwood. However, we are not quite ready to dust it off from two years ago and rerelease it, because a lot has changed in the almost two years since it was released for reconsideration of a plan. For example, the rent laws changed dramatically. Federal opportunity zones came into effect, the final environmental impact statement is flawed as it is, has some findings that we did not challenge we may want to consider, and also the cities and cities letter of commitments that you were all talking about a little bit before, just before the rezoning, provide some interesting considerations we might want to consider for the Uptown United plan. So we'd like to use updated economic demographics for Inwood and also update Uptown United plan. We also in, and I'm speaking more from myself and a few of us more of Manhattan Not for Sale, absolutely full groups because we haven't met yet since we were trying to schedule a leadership meeting, maybe next week. So, this may this idea may become more official so I'm speaking more from myself. But one of the things we were some of us discussed was bringing a sort of a technical update to uptown united that I just described is bringing it out more generally to the community and getting more community input and review and engagement than was possible. When we did it to prepare for the EULA because we were under very strict deadlines at that time, so those sites we may bring it back to you. At a later meeting, I don't know, maybe March, we can be in touch with you about bringing it back. Sort of the technical update of Uptown United and what the plans would be for a broader community review process of that, and perhaps even community board we want to get involved in that. I'll leave it there I have some highlights I could share of Uptown United in general, but I'll leave it there for now.

Barbara: Okay, so I think that the next step would be the board members who I think also Jonathan you're here, you want you want to join us up here.

Barbara: Okay, fine. So anyways, the next step would be for committee members here, and board and CB 12 members to see if you have questions that you would specifically like to ask Paul or comments you'd like to make to elucidate for you for the about the rezoning. I have about eight questions here but I'd like other people to ask questions. My first one would be about the preferential rent from the documents I sent you over Christmas after one of the housing committees. One of our main objections about the rezoning was how it would impact people who were on preferential rent. And of course, my first question for Phil is now that the APTA passed in Albany, which makes preferential rent the base rent. How does that affect the possible appeal of the Inwood rezoning suit. And also, that's step one step two is, I had been told, correct me if I'm wrong, that yes, a person who is in place, let's say I pay 800 for an apartment is preferential rent and the legal rent is 1100. As long as I'm there. It's 800 plus whatever the rent guidelines board increases it, but if I move out. It then is jacked up to the 1100, and that becomes the new base rent. It's only at that lower rent while I'm in there. And then once I'm out. It goes back up and starts, adding at what had been the legal rent, which to me tremendously incentivizes a landlord to get me out. So, Phil Can you comment on that. Is that the case is that is that the case. And your landlords have an incentive to get you out.

Phil: Correct.

Barbara: Okay. Right I want to know.

Barbara: There, there are very few ways for landlords to deregulate apartments anymore but there are a couple of ways thoroughly after this kind of protection law was passed, I saw locations from landlord oriented lawyers saying that if you take two small apartments and combine them. The new apartment is a new apartment. And it's off regulation on market. So, if you take a studio in one bedroom and put it together. Now you've got a new apartment. Presumably that would also apply if you had a three-bedroom apartment and whacked it up into one two bedroom and one studio. So there's that out there. But I think you're right there's still an incentive for landlords to try to push out people with preferential rents it's just going to work differently. The city tried to argue in in our lawsuit that because the rent laws effectively substantially reduce the potential impact of preference programs that shouldn't be considered. The problem with the argument is, is that that happened before that happened after the is that happened after the rezoning was adopted by the City Council. And so the only way really that the city can advance that argument is to accept the judge decision, go back, do the analysis, and then analyze preferential rents and say well preferential rents aren't quite as terrible as they used to be. But there's still this issue that you just read or 30% of the rezoned dairy 30% of Washington Heights inward. Okay. Next person on here ask questions.

Ariel: I know there was a bit mentioned about the estimate changes to MCI's in the state laws, but is Northern Manhattan not for sale and Legal Action, involved with landlords to ensure people are not being pushed out? Sort of given the estimate as to how they think how MCI's are being changed into a smaller percentage, do you think that that's still going to be effective in terms of trying to make sure that landlords are not continuing the same process of forcing people out?

Phillip: You know you're asking a question area I'm not the person to answer it and I think that it's more of a question that goes to the development in the Uptown united platform. And, as Paul was saying, we really need to have the community come back together, take a hard look at uptown united platform and make the adjustments to it that needs to be made. As Paul said, we now have more time to do this and we can do a better job. For example, the closure rate on mom and pop businesses, these empty storefronts right. Yeah, it's hard to elaborate on that because the simple answer is yes, the judge said, if you're going to go through this far with this result, you've got to go back and do the analysis. Where there are other options appeal and try to get the decision reversed, so they can go right back.

Barbara: Well, wait till the companies that have secondary gain to that. Last March when Adam Mayor came to the Housing Committee meeting, I specifically asked him, have you investigated the effect on preferential rents that the rezoning would have and he said well I don't have to. It's not in there so we don't look at that. So, my question is, how will, if the suit is won on appeal, how would that affect the structure of the environmental impact statements going forward.

Phillip: My response to you with exactly, you remember it, the argument that this city made in opposing our loss, they said, it's not in our manuals, or city environmental quality manual, so we don't have to study it. And the judge said No, you're wrong. Now I'm going to get a little bit technical and the airport not a rule, meaning it doesn't have the force of law. It guide meaning it's something more powerful than a suggestion, but it's not the force of law and the manual itself says you can go beyond the manual, and go on to say specific things that the middle tells you to look at in the right case and preferential rents was certainly the right case and March.

Philip: So that argument and a bit of history. The argument builds unfortunately for the people in the song that builds on that he started the lawsuit where they challenged the manual by saying it was a rule that had not been adopted properly, under the rulemaking procedures of the city and the judge in that case said no, it's not a rule, it's a mere guidance.

Phillip: So, the city having won on that, and they can now come back and say, well, it's really a word it's not a rule that doesn't have the force of law. It's a strong suggestion, but it also says, use your common sense, go beyond it. Look at what common sense tells you to look at. Adam Maher was just wrong, and this judge agrees with what I just said.

Barbara: Another question from the committee here?

Barbara: I'd like to move on to this the issue here and take a look at the commitments, and each table should have a list of a table have one of these and/ or to share it together. Each committee member should have a list of these commitments. Nicholas you should have one. This is the list of the 32 or whatever commitments that the EDC gave to improve inward. Now I have here a letter from Alicia Glenn, people know who she is, the Deputy Mayor for Housing

and Economic Development. She's the one who wrote the letter in that capacity at that time. And she said, said sent to Corey Johnson and Ydanis Rodriguez. I will paraphrase the letter very quickly.

Barbara: "For nearly three years we've worked with you in the inward community to plan for the future. The attached includes investments for parks and open space that adopt pursuant to legislation passed in 2016. Every city initiative, aided neighborhood rezoning will be subject to a public commitment tracker. My office will work closely with the mayor's office of operations to input all commitments made into an online public tracker within 30 days after passage, including timeline and funding and will produce annual progress reports to community members and stakeholders." Now, my question is this. Judge Saunders did not allow the money. But this says pursuant to legislation in 2016. Every city initiated neighborhood rezoning will be subject to the commitment tracker. So, is the money contingent on the rezoning.

Paul: Letter doesn't say anything about change for the rezoning right there is, what is this 2016 legislation commitments that made public way to track those commitments. Right now we know that we don't have it. So, so right now we don't have a resign but judge Saunders decision does not undo all the commitments. Okay, let me put it that explain why briefly.

Barbara: Please explain that that's important for them.

Phil: There were certain actions that the city was proposing to take the trigger the requirement of an environmental impact statement, those actions were the result of changes to the zoning map changes to the zoning text. Sometimes changes in the city map in other words there's some streets that dead end on the Harlem River City wants to de map those streets tournament Park Parkland so they're no longer streets site acquisition and or site disposition specifically the library. And, they wanted to do a swap of with Charter Communications, aka Spectrum at ninth Avenue between 218 to 219 to swap out a piece of land up there as an urban development area designation for the library. The is 52 parking block and getting a title wetland permit from New York State etc. in order to have a waterfront access. Those were the actions that required. Those are the actions that are now on all because the GIS. It's faulty everything and the commitments, though, is one of the commitments. other than whatever went along with the library fall within these actions, so you you'll give all these lists some of the I will email you the things they are planning to do with the George Washington campus. They've done a lot. Right. And it's not it's not part of the resulting arts, not part of the reason not technically part of the resulting.

Barbara: Sally and Paul and a lot of people in this room can talk about the smoke and mirrors

Paul: Oh yes, I'm very familiar with that we don't know that, but the bottom line is, only those only the vast changes the zoning changes, and the acquisition is on sale or sale with an acquisition of the library and the charter communication spot, or what the subject is.

Barbara: Okay, excellent. That's extremely illuminating and thank you. Now, on here, if people see at their tables. This is for board members, as you see there are many of these, which I just want people to be aware of. Many of these so-called commitments are actually things. Oh, no, actually, please sit up here, this is Ashley Fernandez, a new member of the Housing and Human Services Committee, who I want to tell you was on vacation and flew in and came directly here from the airport. I thank you for your commitment. Thank you very much. Very much Ashley. I appreciate and then 1234567 we now have quorum (7:21PM). Thank you for rushing here Ashley she got off the plane at past five o'clock.

Ashley: Thank you, rushed over here.

Barbara: So many of these commitments here so called have really been previously funded from other sources and are. For example, the Anne Loftus playground was funded through council money has nothing to do with the so called rezoning. Some of the others like the repair and reopen the Highbridge Tower is something that's been going on for several years in the parks department that has nothing to do with the map. The amenities at Highbridge Park, same thing, the adult fitness center at Inwood Hill Park same thing that's been going on, that was approved two years ago, in the parks committee, completely independent of the Inwood rezoning. If someone is here from the business committee, they could tell me which ones had just been ongoing stuff that had been going on so I'm just making a point that if you look at this, I mean, there's someone else can someone else in the group here contribute, which were things which had already been nothing new. The 30 million for Highbridge park on here. Yes, that was that was funded through the five borough parks commitment by de Blasio to pick one park in each borough and commit \$30 million to the park. And that was the city park, you know, pick a park initiative by the mayor, nothing to do with rezoning. Anything else Sally you see on here? Oh, the upgrading the broadband and technology in district six that's ongoing, and that's been ongoing for some time, and so forth. So, can you stand up Sally please, and talk louder,

Sally: From City Council and the mayor's office there's no funding attached to it that's why you see the funding call for the vast majority of these no new funding is required. And that's because they didn't have words.

Barbara: Well, things like connecting with residents to training programs in the healthcare industry. Yeah, or take a take a one-week home attendant class at the place at 5030 Broadway. I mean, you know, what does that mean right. To me, that would start with having a comprehensive CTE program that trains, young men and women at George Washington High School, to graduate with LPN licenses. That would be a start. Right. You know, guaranteed jobs at the hospitals in the Bronx and Upper Manhattan. They used to have that at Mabel Dodge High School. You know, and the Bronx hospitals would just line up in high schools and at that time only girls were nurses, hire the girls right out of there, a five year program, five and a half year program, and you graduated as an LPN. Now that's, that would be a commitment to the health care industry. I haven't heard anything about that. Right. So, as a start, or a comprehensive five year high school diploma, preparing students for pre-med college education, where they end up with AP courses in physics and math and chemistry before they

start college with a five year high school diploma. Right. That would be a commitment, but I don't see any of that, you know, smoke and mirrors. Okay, um, the other questions here on the committee. Questions to ask: the sites, the Pathmark site and the site is as I call it the the Fordham bridge, University heights bridge, 207th Street Bridge, whatever you've called it the lot, that is right below there where all the trucks are right. That is owned by Madd equities, and they intended to build a, I believe a 30 story, 860-unit building.

Barbara: Now they have stated that if there. If the rezoning does not go through that they would probably build an industrial distribution center there, you know like, you know, maybe ups or Amazon or something some form of distribution center there, you would not be able to build any housing there, you're saying it. Right. Would you may not know the answer I think something that the community board should have inquired to, for example, to the Board of standards of appeals, you know, we have some friends there. Would that be the kind of place where you could get an individual waiver?

Phillip: I want to profess to not be an expert on what's allowed or not sure what waivers might get through or not, but I wouldn't be surprised if they'll get a waiver, and get an increase density in and residential use. Ok. I think that would be helpful if you could give them a 60 second tutorial on what the waiver looks like for the people here who don't know, people on the record is uniform land use review process, which were procedure which any major land use change has to go through. Anyway, it's not as of right. And I think it's pretty sketchy between what is allowed and what kind of waivers are allowed, but I would not be surprised if they didn't go to try to get some labor to change it into something that they want to do, or even under the green zone. So that could be something to look for in the future that would have to be a whole new process of certification through city planning, only process of applications, whole nine months, or whatever it is, seven months I think is the process. Back to the planning back for the council and so on. So, it's not easy, but don't be surprised if you don't see that coming up.

Barbara: Aright. Any other committee member comments or questions, anything, people want to ask anything?

Committee: Actually, not, not right now.

Barbara: I think we should open up the floor to questions from Osi first. Osi by the way is a member of the land use right. Yeah.

Osi: So, what's going to happen to everyone as long as the judge's decision stands? Are any of the permits on file under the rezoning? Give us an opinion that any permits that were issued under the new zoning are not valid because the new zoning doesn't have any permission to continue these developments. Are they going to stop the constructions?

Paul: I'm not sure.

Phillip: Mad Equites have a permit to do potentially do a production center. They applied for a permit to do the 30 story building, but it has not yet been completed. That's what they have a permit for foundation slab with pilings, theoretically, they could put a distribution center on that foundation slab, they could put any number of things on the foundation slab would be conforming with the M one dash one zone. So I don't know that they would be required to stop what they're doing. They applied for a permit for this service storage building was that purpose was not yet granted now It shouldn't.

Ayisha: However, and I want to be a voice in the room. That's probably not going to change anytime soon. However, it occurs to me some of these questions can be answered here, as, as much knowledge that we have been presented. You know, some of the community can get an update. But really, this is not the purview of housing services. Most of these things for in other committees, but really, as the resolution left this board and was voted on. So to me, it's a zoning issue under land use and I am absolutely for as much space, being given for continuing the conversation and opening it up. For those that don't know, I'm the former chair of Housing and Human Services, which is the community that we're in right now. And there was a trajectory of many things that got dropped by the wayside and this is for the community to be a part of that conversation as well. There we discussed what housing reform was settled in June, part of that effort that I went I put my body on the line from rezoning, I've gotten arrested. Right now, citizenship is tribal and federal government is trying to increase citizenship 61% so that the cost of assistance application will be \$1,170 and we are pulling straws trying to find questions to ask about this rezoning matter that just happened last week. We're not reviewing that issue that affects our community because this is a community of immigrants like I want to cry right now. This is negligence. Yes, let's talk about that but it's the only thing on the agenda. Like if it's more important that we get home early. People who are eligible their applications are not being reviewed they're not being accepted; we're not talking about that in this committee. Why is NYCHA overcharging people who lose their jobs, or who are retired. They continue to overcharge them, but they don't they don't change it, even though they appeal to them, it's not being discussing this committee, why. So explain that to me I don't understand.

Barbara: Coming back to us, going back to the original zoning. Yeah. Maybe some commercials, property, like commercial like supermarket. There's like manufacturing warehousing distribution. We would like to see how. Yes, but not what we do not 30 storytellers. Whoa.

Phillip: They left the health sector. On the bill, and the zoning plant sector is in one unreasonably supply to make the whole thing residential equity the whole thing because they are seven eight with the affordable equity success stories from certain developers they are part of the platform for the properties. Just very briefly regarding the 30 stories, how they are trying to present as affordable housing? And so, I question how much we could actually trust. What kind of housing he would build with this 30 story building? I also want to define what he vaguely promised to build, as affordable with as I understand it from what little information we

got from him. It sounds good, and you can correct me - people who know more about this than I do. It sounded like the housing he was planning on building would be tiny, and it would essentially be the people in the community who need housing would not even earn enough money to qualify to apply for it. So, we have income distribution in our households in this community that's barbell shape. About 30% of the people in our community, the households are \$30,000 a year or less, and 30% who are poor, the rest is distributed. But there has to be a filament for people who are households that earn \$30,000 a year or less. So, I object to calling that proposed building, being the building of affordable housing. And in the alternative plan, we, we introduced a number of strategies. There's public land and there's a land that we can use to build authentically deeply that our community needs. Also thank you.

Adele Oltman: Sorry, I had a question. Going back to your presentation began. And that is, if the city were decided to go back not to the appeal but let's address these eight points, it's not clear to me maybe I just was Miss hearing with those eight points today they'd have to take them from meet with a community discusses a point. Does the community get to weigh in on those eight points or is that something that the city gets to do with itself and then go back to the courts and say we've done? Would it be where the community would begin a dialogue and be part of the discussion input by the city.

Phillip: I think there would have been. I think they'd have to go back through the environmental review process, incorporating those data points. We are in somewhat uncharted territory here this was unusual in that we want on a theory of, they didn't study certain things.

Adele: Yeah, manual rules, that's the thing I understand like you explained it very well sort of makes it be used to our advantage or not be used to our advantage. I'm not talking about those eight points, I understand where those eight points come from, that's a single space thing that long process and all that kind of stuff. The thing was that the environmental impact statement had to use the manual as a guidepost.

Paul: Right, right. They would have to go back, and I believe I don't know if they would have to issue a new graph scope of work and see comments on the graph scope of work and bother them. I decided to go that route. That's what I was basically saying we want community. Go ahead and do the analysis and publishes graph the statement that addresses those data points and then get comment and input on that. Aaron, and then community board both city council both, certainly, I think maybe for us.

Phil: Well, yeah, Paul, I'm not sure but probably not because we were both not part of environmental impact statement like I said, we are in are uncharted territory.

Adele: I do think there would have to be an integrative process of doing what we should do. What do you think what we'd do fine tuning it, finalizing it and presenting it to city council? Whether it has to go through community board or presidents and fine commission. I don't know. So, I would certainly have to go back to City Council, and at that point.

Paul: Our president whether they have to go to city planning or think so possible. The city could conceivably treat this as a technical memorandum which they done. And the final technical memorandum did not go back to the GIS just said there were there were some changes by the City Council. We've looked at the effects and update the is what it is. They didn't give any chance for common. I would hope they would reach back to the stage, do the studying and give us a chance to comment. We don't know, and I think your point is well taken. At least and Phil's point one thing we haven't prepared for every eventuality, should the city go that route. We probably should be demanding that this community engagement in this whole process shouldn't be just saying to do what I would call the two-week bs study. They just do quick assessment, say we have this expert opinion, and none of this is going to matter it's probably going to have no impact. Okay city council vote voter. That's legally following what the judge said it would be harder to sue on that because the city would have as inadequate as men club.

Maggie Clark: So, with regard to one of the arguments. Well, sort of addressing both of you as well but with regard to the argument, the environmental argument that was made that traffic was going to become so bad. Even according to the city itself that the emergency response would be degrading considerably life and death. Death issues, fire ambulance, and so forth. So the question that I have is because the city arrogantly decided not even to do a new traffic study. They relied on an old traffic study. I don't know the summer before the draft scope of work came out. And so, you know what they have to go back and do a full traffic study and then, you know, based on that the evaluation of the, you know, emergency response times because you know a traffic study is not something you do in two weeks. That's months. Okay. And if it's done right it's a year. So, that's the question, but can you tell what the rating was you picked up on the environment. So that you know what was in the environmental impact statement about this. It was really amazing that they actually committed it to paper. It was so damning you know as to how much traffic there would be but because most people don't know how to read this and certainly, they weren't going to help. There were a number of ways that they measured impact on the 45 intersections that they looked at and that's not all of them but that's most of them. One of them was, they, there was a rating of A through F for each intersection – A is good, can't put any more traffic there, and F is gridlock. Before the rezoning, most of the 45 just eyeballing it were like B through D. That's good too bad. Then another thing that was an additional delay at each intersection. Some, there were several that have more than 10 minutes of delay. And some of these were near the hospital.

Barbara: That's an example of the human services aspect of this because it's where we overlap with health and environment, because part of our human services constantly overlaps. And one of my major concerns, was the delays of getting people, in a sense, deaths that would occur because ambulances would just be stuck in gridlock and unable to get to hospitals. Also, the ambulances have to get out of Inwood because St. Barnabas, and the other hospital in the Bronx and Montefiore our trauma centers. So, if someone you know is seriously I mean gunshot or a huge traffic accident, a near death traffic accident, they're not necessarily taken to New

York Presbyterian. The ambulance would take them to the nearest trauma center available to help. And that's where they're taken. So you cannot have any kind of gridlock to get in and out of here.

Ariel: I wonder what history can teach us if I understood correctly this was not a suit about an effective land use review process. This was a suit, about a defective environmental impact statement. And that is a narrower consideration, but we have so many potential environmental impacts in this community based on this proposed city rezoning, you know, we have a lot of hooks and I'm wondering, What does history teach us about other communities that have brought suit against the city for effective, or lawful environment, impact statements. What were the issues they were facing similar to ours? Were they different and how are they different? What was the appeal resolution, if there was an appeal? And what if anything did those communities, get back from the city in concessions. As a result of the community taking all of this legal action against the city in the first place. So, can you address those matters. Now, these Parliament suits was within the last two years ago or so. Don't quote me on the exact time arising out of this lovely triangle area, where the community was successful in getting an injunction early on and then sued dragged on for about 10 years and ultimately, the community settled with the city This is the first lawsuit I'm aware of where the judges just has come to the final decision said city you lose.

Ariel: Okay, push the components that was brought up during this process was, how are they looking to develop housing amongst the property that was going to be involved in. One of the key findings that the judge in that case had been looking at was really how these taxes were being set up to develop apartments. One of the concerns that was brought in mind you this is actually a rezoning that went through under the past administration, Bloomberg at that time they had found that they were trying to focus on apartments that were focused, a little bit more on three, four bedroom apartments that often cater to what was demographically view to the more in line with essentially a more wider more Jewish demographic that was alongside the East Williamsburg area there. What had happened was that the community board that was essentially sitting right alongside it had wanted a lot more of those apartments that were there within the plan, but the community board that was right beside it had actually been predominantly a lot more of colored individuals, a lot of Latinos, and they had actually found that this would be discriminatory if it was allowed to continue being essentially set up for those families that had a lot more wealth. On top of that, they could afford these apartments that were then being set up to be part of the rezoning. So that's one of the key findings that essentially led the judge to then make that decision. You know, I couldn't necessarily say exactly what was the plan here because what's one of the big issues, we talked about Ella, Ella is an extremely low income tax credit that essentially gives people opportunity to make roughly about 45K and under the ability to live in those apartments. So right now I think that's something that's a little bit different I wouldn't say that's necessarily. One of the arguments that are being brought forward in this case here, but it's something to think about.

Barbara: Okay, thank you, very important, very important.

Public Member: Can you just explain what you mean that these commitments are smoke and mirrors as you described earlier, I don't fully understand that, because the council member was selling this rezoning as look what I got for the community. I know what you're saying is that most of this money had already been allocated to this project, or the result was completed. Is that the case?

Barbara: Yeah, I would say first of all, this list of 32 commitments. You would think it was the city hall sat down and opened a bank account and said, here's, here's, here's millions, hundreds of millions of dollars. And now we're going to create new stuff here. That's not what happened. But some of this is double bookkeeping, like I said, the \$30 million for Highbridge Park was something decided, I don't know, at least four years ago...Hmm. Not that it's not an inward right let me finish Maggie, at least four years ago when Mitchell Silver the parks commissioner said I look around this city. Why do we need to always create new parks when there's such beautiful, wonderful parks that exists just in disrepair? And he picked the anchor park in each borough. That would be incredibly refurbished and he picked Highbridge Park, which is fundamentally in Washington Heights, I mean, a little bit of it is there as you come down Dyckman Street, but it's fundamentally a magnificent Washington Heights Park, that's listed as one of the Inwood rezoning commitments. So I mean, you know, or for example at Luperon High School, which is a high school for immigrant exclusively Latino immigrant students to transition them and support them in coming to the United States and learning English in such a marvelous idea for a school has a marvelous principal, but the students there come from either the Washington Heights or the Bronx. They really don't have any students from Inwood, and they got a \$200,000 robotics lab which is wonderful. And I'm glad they have that and that will really help them learn the technological skills and such they need, but that has nothing to do to support what would be a large increase of population in Inwood, which we would hope would be a lot of people with young families and high school students it's serving a much needed population of newly arrived, Latino students in the Bronx and Washington Heights. So, it's one commitment that have nothing to do with him would or things that were many things that were already accounted for. And you can go through, I would hope we don't really have time tonight to go through this list one by one of many much of this. Many of these items, some things are the and Loftus playground money for that was several years ago, and I actually worked on that project, and nothing not really anything to do with the Inwood rezoning.

Public Member: I think when they had the city council vote. It was almost unanimous, but all the city council people are saying well we defer to the Councilman but district, and our illustrious council wins was all for this rezoning. And I don't know if there's any chance of changing his mind but see it almost two years from now.

Francesca: My name is Francesca Cristianos and I've been living and I was raised in Washington Heights. I went to junior high school 52 so I've been living all my life in the area. But I think we need to look at a strategy to try and make sure that the appeal goes past, two, three years, if possible. Yes, if there's a way that I'm using these eight coins and whatever we as

a community need to start looking at that this is a possibility because we know deep down inside that politics is not done. At this level, we're talking about the state and we're also talking about the Congressman, because a lot of these things were planned. So I think the eight points and all we need to get together, try the secret to the different alternatives and strategies to push this over so that when there are new connections.

Maggie Clark: So, we have an environmental subcommittee. And you know the answer both of the selling a number of different things to the outside of the loss of don't cost money to pursue. We've got a raft of about two dozen pieces of legislation that we started talking about with our state representatives and at least one local representative now, you know what that could undo the rezoning and other ways. For example, there was something there was a resolution that passed this organization CB12 a couple of years ago, which Osi there, you know, spearheaded, which basically says that, you know, one person can build a 30 story building and wipe out somebody else's ability to collect solar energy on their roof.

Maggie Clark: Well, since we're pretty much uniformly six stories you know if you build above that you're going to be cast the shadow of that would have passed, that would kind of effectively, stop, you know, having outside filming. We also put together a letter to the State Department of Environmental Conservation, and that was to be tough to tell them what EPA has given you the authority to enforce the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act here in the state, and looking here you've got a mayor who is busy running roughshod and population more toilets more tailpipes, you know this, it's going to make things even worse we've been out of the compliance of the clean air and water act since the very beginning. And this is just making it worse. And we got our best buy to send a version of that. Yeah, I know. So we're working on we've got a new version, we're going to soon as we don't have enough people by the way if anyone's interested in joining the environmental committee comes to me afterwards. We need more manpower to be able to pull off all these many things we're trying to do. And as to your point, you know, we had a meeting with the chair of the zoning committee subcommittee Maura. And, you know, almost around the time after the time when we met was that even though he voted for the rezoning. He started to show that he's having doubts about this method of countdown to the local elected. And I say, at least from my point of view that that would be one of the things that we should be pushing you know talking reaching out to council members one at a time and saying look, you know, you really can't just take your brain and throw it in the garbage for the, you have to be, you know, listening to us. Maybe the court case will help that.

Tanya Bonner: I wanted to ask the question I had a question.

Barbara: Oh, Tanya. Yeah.

Tanya: Like what is our purpose here? I'm just kind of I'm just trying to determine like what is it. What's the plan of action like going forward like what is it that he wants to do because I'm hearing all these different things and people are commenting and that's wonderful. But what is the game plan, what is our objective coming out of here tonight. But what is the objective what

is it that you're asking, What is your ask to go the community board and more like what is it that you want, coming out of this, because otherwise we're just talking to go around and hear all of this and we know what the deal is, but we need a strategy and a plan of action so I was asking what is your ask with this community sitting here?

Phillip: I'll take a stab at that. This decision came down December, was released December 19 was a huge surprise. Since then, we've had Christmas, New Year's and better couple of parties to celebrate it. My belief is that we need to take advantage of that we no longer have our head inside the tiger's mouth. To paraphrase Winston Churchill. And we should take advantage of that as you start by moving forward and advocating to be more specific than that. I know that there are efforts going on right now to try to organize meetings so that community organizing and development can get going again can restart. To take advantage of the opportunities that we have. So, I think I haven't asked my ask, it is to jump in and be ready to get involved. We don't have I don't have any specific specifics. And I'm not going to be the person who will have some like other people.

Barbara: Tanya, you came late tonight. Yeah, so you weren't here. You weren't here for his presentation, you weren't here for his presentation, in which, in which he went through important legal points that had to be clarified for the committee.

Tanya: But that wasn't part of my question. Right because I know that they have a strategy in terms of how they're going to proceed going forward. Right, so I'm just saying like for us to be in the room. What should we be doing and what do you want from us and I think that's an important point because we can organize all day but if you don't have a vision. But if you have a strategy is that 100% committed to be very organized and very loaded up, we would be good.

Barbara:
Call on Chris, because he's got your hand up.

Chris: Too early for us to tell just as Phil mentioned. Just to paraphrase and put another spin. Excuse me, what I was saying. It's too early. For those of you who don't know me I'm Chris, I'm Senator Jackson's Deputy Chief of Staff. Our offices already talking about ways that we can support the kind of organizing demands that are going to come out of the meetings. I think this, I'm not inside workers mind with my understanding in these meetings, I was focusing on the rezoning because it's about getting information out there, but I think I know that we've had conversations that we'd love to come back to the community board with concrete tasks like maybe you can sponsor a couple of the block names block by block meetings and hash out what this new plan will be, like, let people know about the meetings the planning meetings. Put it on your Facebook put it on your email lists, what have you. But those are those are just the basic bare bones we can do. But overall it would be premature and actually like irresponsible for all of us I think if we jumped right into it.

Barbara: What we need to do because I'm not sure how many people in this room are actually impacted directly by the rezoning, and in the sort of ways that we want to be centering the conversation. And that's not an indictment of any of us it's just kind of a reality and so we wanted to make sure that in the organizing we center the voices who are going to be most affected if we don't organize. But surely let me speak with another round robin thing excuse me to call on first, I want to say that the I handed out each table should have a copy of the resolution from March 23 2018 of community board 12 on the rezoning, which was the governing document for community board 12. At this time, which is our, in a sense, are asking our to do to switch your hands. And one of the major put points in here, which is, in a sense, and I'm not sure if the if the lawsuit can address this, is that we had demanded that developing new affordable housing is a priority but affordability must be defined by what is affordable to local residents. And that's a major, major requirement of what our resolution was and which is our governing position in terms of what do we want to do. And I know in terms of the nine points that you talked about, I don't think that the laws, I mean in terms of the impact on local residents and how that will affect them. I think that that's a major thing with a community where it has to act in cohesion with others, that there be a demand or a success for deeply affordable housing, and the question I raise is what the possibility of for example is, some eminent domain. That's one thing, and then also in the Inwood commitments list. One of the things that was listed, and we have to be on top of this is properly done. I know Scott Stringer have done some of it or have tried to do some of it was the advance affordable housing development on publicly owned land, and there was supposed to be, which was again part of our resolution here a complete survey and commitment that all publicly owned land would be for deeply affordable housing. And I think that that would be part of important housing picture, that it defines what Inwood is and what it would look like. And there is over in those areas over there publicly on land. Well this is what we see here. Now we don't see a Columbia bill building for residents, or something like that, we see, you know, I see a mix senior and veterans housing development for, you know, with Ella, you know, or something like that. I think that that that would start to make a more focused picture. Okay, that's great, maybe, very quickly.

Public Member: I would just say that, you know, from day one for the day of the court's decision. We know that our primary ask is that every single one of the defects, the environmental statement, be correct. And that's going to take quite a while, we have time to consider this carefully. We don't have time to stop pressing that basis, that the court records decision on the sound, and we want that corrected.

Carla: Hi, my name is Carla and some of you may be aware that the Blasio and the DC are trying to run through similar resellers and other working class neighborhoods of color throughout the city. They're following the same playbook. Every single community is Bloomberg. If you want to know how the city has continued to try to do it, try to do it got his book Zoned Out. I think was really excited about this and about not being forced to all the horrible impacts that are going to happen with the rezoning, but it is part of the entire city in inspiring activist groups. In every part of the city they're finding residents in their own community in Bushwick, and Sunset Park in Chinatown, two bridges in in the fall in southern Boulevard. That's next on next on the list is

inspired, all of our allies, all over the city and illegal action as a constituent member of really Manhattan stop for sale months ago reached out to churches United for fair housing, Alex, is one of the leaders in our organization. She came and spoke. Two of our events in our forum and also the filtrating. And we joined with the coalition that she founded to support Jamal Williams racial impact study bill in City Hall. And this, this is incredibly exciting. So this is an opportunity to build a citywide coalition to shop. These predatory rezoning's down. You know, this is, this is, this is big, not just for our community, in Washington Heights is this is a billion-dollar city, and really for our country. Because these kinds of predatory designs that are forcing people out of their homes and making housing affordable for people happening everywhere. And so this, I just want to reaffirm this we've been going into details of the lawsuit, which is important. We're already prepared. They're already prepared, we need to raise some more money, but we'll do, we'll do that. So I just want to let you all know, remind you about what an incredibly exciting moment this is for bringing people together bringing a community together, bringing the city together.

Barbara: I want to say that. One reason we have an abbreviated agenda tonight is that the Y while very gracious to give us this space and why we started 630, is that they really want us out before nine o'clock. It's the difficulty of having a meeting here, and they really wanted us to exit by a little bit past 830 so that the room was completely empty and closed by about 840, so they could, so that the workers and everybody leaves at nine. So just keep that in mind in terms of, you know, this meeting. Okay, so I just wanted to say that.

Barbara: I do think that based on the, what we had before from our community board 12 resolution. What we support I think that what the what the lawsuit points toward is may possibly and again this a legal issue, demanding where the community is involved, demanding that housing affordability is an issue. And so that therefore, the community is involved now. This is my neighborhood and if you don't have housing this way, that means I'm going to be gone. So, that the housing must be tailored to a good chunk of it toward the people that are already there in the neighborhood stability. And so I think that that is something that could possibly be looked at. I know it's how much can neighborhood stability and neighborhood maintenance become a sort of demand of a seeker, and also a balance because I know that there's some neighborhoods like out in Brooklyn where you would also want to bring in some higher income people, because these are neighborhoods that are more fragile, right.

Barbara: I think we'll follow up, I want to talk to our new board chair of Eleazar Bueno, about it if it would be appropriate for the community board to have a resolution specifically about the lawsuit, I'm not sure about that. Like in favor of the lawsuit or something that, you know, claiming the lawsuit. And I'm not sure about that. How's the committee feel about that would you want me to pursue asking him.

Committee: It's a great idea but I'm just not sure if we endorse lawsuits you know I'm not I'm not.

Barbara: So, I will call him and ask him based on that. I mean you guys like the idea. Okay, so then we can take that up at our next meeting and, maybe, maybe we can start to write the resolution. So, you can write a resolution next meeting. You know, for claiming the decision and wanting to pursue it. And, how parts of the decision reflect on the community board twelve's resolution here, and so forth. I think that that would be the way you know we would want to go. And also, you know, urging the city on the nine points. Parts of the resolution which has to be further, you know, looked at in terms of those nine points would be the way a question. yeah, we technically are a city agency. Yes, we practically called Community Board planning agency. So we're technically agency of the city. And that's why I point that out with the lowest level body of the city. Little City Hall. Exactly.

Barbara: we're going to I'm going to have a motion to adjourn.

Ayisha:
Actually, agenda allows for new business. Okay.

Barbara:
All right. Okay so let's move to new business.

Ayisha: We had someone do a presentation on mortgage, and how it impacts various things that I believe one of those things being the school system. Another being just loans, and debt, in general, and there was a factor for conversations with a very big comments, it's my opinion that he was be rated. I'm not going to specify those members that we made it in. I would in about how some of what he spoke about actually pulled from efforts that were actually created by forces are from it, Senator Robert Jackson, when he was the Councilman at the time, as well as other dynamics related to markets. This gentleman, actually, is a former employee of Merrill Lynch, I believe that he was the vice president there, so he has the knowledge in economics. When the minutes were completed in September and submitted to the general meeting one sentence was written to summarize that entire. I am saying this probably for maybe the fifth time now, because I said it in September is now January, have those minutes been updated to properly reflect the true conversation that took place in the committee.

Barbara: We felt that the presentation could be summarized in one sentence.

Ayisha: I'm interested to know the committee's position on that being that it speaks to the city charter spirit.

Waldys: Yeah, I don't know who wrote the minutes.

Ayisha: Looking at the next meeting. As I was instructed because I was in September. By, I was to bring it to committee, I would have thought that by now, I wouldn't have as great as a committee I said it in September, but to raise it so I am here raising it yet again. It was the

understanding at the meeting other members of the meeting also said yeah one sentence doesn't sound like it so it's interesting to find that you still think that one sentence is appropriate. I would kindly request that the minutes to be updated to properly reflect what was said in that meeting. So that is the old business. When new business comes up, unless someone else has old business or have something else.

Barbara: So new business.

Ayisha: New business well actually this is old business. There was a resolution related to HDfC that has not been tabled twice. It was tabled, the understanding was that it was brought back to the committee to at the general meeting the problem. And at that point gave specific instructions of exactly what was to happen related to tabling that motion and bringing it back or not taping because we don't say anything anymore. We are referring to the committee. He gave specific directions, those directions were voted on by the entire board that will present that day, and by vote majority rule. It was sent back. It was the part of that instruction was that it was to be put on the agenda, it's not on tonight's agenda tonight because we're debating here. So, in my understanding of the gentleman was that it was a timely matter. This while I am so much about this effort for the resulting may not have been such an urgency or may not have had to dominate two hours of time. Therefore, pushing out other relevant topics and more time was rewritten to simplify it so people could understand.

Barbara: So, that's old business. Does anybody else have old business?

Barbara: New business.

Ayisha: So, actually, so in new business, as I raised before some of the concerns I have which are things that have been overlooked by the committee, one of those being for me citizenship application fee being raised 61% to \$1,170 making it very unaffordable to most people in our district which is a very large immigrant population, which concerns me considering we having so many deportations that are happening. This is a major issue. However, there are there's a list that I just grabbed my attention that the women to also consider not only the things are forming now but things as a committee actually we're looking at some of the things that committee was already looking at was in previous conversations we stated in September. We would be looking at what was happening, especially considering that we had a major win in the legislature and Albany, and that we were going to be looking at addressing how the DHCR needs to be overhauled, especially with the considerations about the changes that came out of Albany. That's one. The other part is DOB and HPD and how they act in concert to address those regulations and housing, in general, are also things that we planned on discussing. We have not continued that path. So, the trajectory of that was disrupted the census is also another matter. This community is affected because there's digital divide, 50% of people do not have broadband but yet the census is becoming digital, we're not discussing that I connected you to the woman from the digital equity lab from the new school who I learned from in depth via visualizations of the type of impact that digitizing the census can have, which means it would lower the funds that come to our community because it would not be properly counted

as far as what the proper appropriate funding that should come to the communities will be that is just.

Barbara: You can submit those topics, so that they can be put on the agenda and I encourage anyone in this room who has ideas or topics to champion the housing effort to reach out to the housing and human services committee to submit them, so that we can include them. Okay. All right, anyone else. Francesca. Yes.

Francesca: Oh yes. So that's something that I would like to see people talking more about is the resources that very low-income people have in the community. I really don't see much action with the exception of one organization that is trying to organize them so that's something that we really need to start working with them and their concerns on the table. Second HPD inspectors, are not coming to our community. I've had to call them. Instead of them coming by and being more proactive. This is totally different. Now, in the past, I used to be calling them, and they would call me like you know right away but now they're not they're not coming at all, and addressing the issues and the problems that we're having in the buildings and a lot of the landlords are not doing the repairs.

Barbara: Ashley is taking the lead on that. In terms of some of the digital work she's doing consumerization she'll be sort of leading that effort, really stepping up on that. Okay.

Osi: My name is Osi. I just have an announcement that the convention that I came in late. The next land use committee meeting is next Tuesday, boom. And we have a new representative from the city planning that promises that they will be there every month, and potentially professionally look at the 87 items on rezoning and possession about those. So I encourage everyone here, and your friends and your family to come to the committee from here on. You know, I mean, last at the last meeting we had like three or four people. And it was on the agenda, so show to land use committee. Next Tuesday.

Barbara: Okay, like I said, quickly, so just also to attack on to one of the things that he was mentioning, we do need to also discuss the census, a lot of what we get regarding housing services. I know I mentioned taxes a lot, but has to deal with a lot of light tech. If you are not familiar with it, it is low income housing tax credits, they actually support a great number of families that receive those services and benefits from it. People that live actually in gutter in apartments right above where the essentially, some of the members, offices, they receive that. So, you know, we do want to encourage that kind of conversation to go on for 21 agent j for the one. Those are also very important to us to know about more, more so moving forward and talk so the census. All right, thank you.

Barbara: Motion to adjourn.

Waldys: Second.

Barbara: Okay. All favor.

Committee: "I"