

MINUTES OF COMMUNITY BOARD # 16, TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024
PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT MT. OLLIE BAPTIST CHURCH,
LOCATED AT 1698 ST. MARKS AVENUE, BROOKLYN, NY

Attendance:

Donna Allen-Arnold (E)	Ivi Lewis (A)
Renee Archer (A)	Albion Liburd (A)
Mark Arthur (A)	Tiffany Martin-Lobban(P)
Rhotochia Atkins-Jones (P)	Sabrina Massey(P)
Jillian Atkinson(A)	Celeste Mathis (P)
Pastor Dwayne Barnes (P)	Elizabeth McIlwain (P)
Latonya Baskerville (P)	William McKethan (P)
Dr. Kevin Bond(P)	Gail McLeod (A)
Margaret Brewer (P)	Melanie Mendonca (P)
Dr. Cleopatra Brown(P)	Tyra Mendonca (P)
o Monica Cassaberry (P)	Genese Morgan (P)
Adrainger Coleman(P)	Franklyn Patterson (P)
Sahara Constaste (A)	Marie Pierre(P)
Byron Davis (P)	JoAnn Sexton (P)
LA Cherokee Dickens (P)	Tijuana Shropshire (A)
Kashmere Fraser (P)	Kamille Stewart (P)
Uriel Griffin (P)	Niani Taylor (P)
Chanel Haliburton(P)	Sydore Thompson (P)
Karlana Hamblin (P)	Christopher Toomer (P)
Balinda Harris (P)	Rev. Dr. Miran Ukaegbu (P)
Zalika Headley (A)	Jere Upshere (P)
Michael Howard (P)	Deborah Williams (P)
Shanti Jimenez (P)	Kencina Nicole Williams (P)
Joan Johnson(A)	Councilmember Darlene Mealy
Tiffany Jones(P)	Representative from Brooklyn Borough President's Office
Pamela M. Junior-Baptiste (P)	Malcolm McDaniel, Representative from Mayor Eric Adams Office

Chairperson, Genese Morgan, called the meeting to order at 7:02pm followed by invocation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Floor was opened for public comments and announcements.

Speaker Unknown: Discussed concerns as to trees growing towards home structure, tree root problems, their effects on the cement sidewalks, maintenance by NYC Parks Department and insurance requirements as to street safety for homeowners. Further discussion evolved around having insurance added to water bills that would cover pipes in the street that might need maintenance due to the tree beds roots, as homeowners have had to pay exorbitant prices upwards of \$10,000 for maintenance of their sidewalks who did not have the additional insurance offered by NYC Water Department. Madam Chairperson Morgan assured that CB16 would follow-up on this issue as the tree beds may be too small and NYC needs to take 100% responsibility.

Franklin Patter brought to the attention of CB16 that he has a Foundation called “We’re Done.” The Foundation will be collaborating with the 73rd Precinct and will host an event at the 73rd Precinct Summer Jam on Saturday, June 29th, 2024 from noon to 5pm. They will provide food and prizes. Donations of food and water from the community will be appreciated.

Jonathan from The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce announced that for anyone that owns a business or is looking to start a business that The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce can assist. Jonathan highlighted that there is a program called “The Open and Online Program” where they actually build websites for business owners (i.e. e-commerce website or just a basic website). The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce will pay for the first full year of hosting.

Miss Beverly, from the NYC Department of Health, shared that they had information and resources as to educating the community as to high blood pressure levels and was hosting a course for community residents, which upon completion residents would receive a brand new high blood pressure machine for free.

Christine Burke discussed the crosswalk at East New York Avenue and Mother Gaston which, because there is no crosswalk by the Dollar General store that people in wheelchairs are having a hard time navigating crossing the street as it is unsafe. Madam Chairperson Morgan assured Ms. Burke that the CB16 would address this issue.

Community Resident Monica, discussed that crossing guards are needed near the Ascend Charter School, which is by the Zion Triangle (by Saratoga Avenue and ENY Avenue). While there are stop sigs there, cars do not necessarily adhere to the stop signs, of which she is very concerned. Madam Chairperson Morgan apprised her the CB16 would look into this dangerous situation.

Speaker Unknown, discussed trees in the backyards of residential properties. Discussion entailed around trees that are in the backyard are considered personal property and not the responsibility of NYC. If the backyard trees are in need of pruning, homeowners can call a private company to trim the tree. As to the tree root situation in the backyard, which sometimes can cause damage, CB16 can ask the NYC Parks Department to meet with the homeowner to give guidance, but the NYC Parks Department is not responsible for trees in the backyard.

Sarah McNatt from the NYC Health Department apprised everyone as to where the NYC Health Department is located in Brownsville, which address is 259 Bristol Street, across from the Betsy Head Park. This facility also has a diabetes program, hypertension program, mental health program, activities for children and youth, and cooking classes, social services programs, amongst other initiatives. They also have a location at 45 Throop Avenue in Brooklyn.

No further public comments or announcements.

Madam Secretary called the Roll Call of CB16 Board Members.

THE CITY OF YES PRESENTATION BY FRANKLIN PATTERSON AND BEN HUFF OF THE NYC DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

Franklin Patterson and Ben Huff from The NYC Department of City Planning prepared a PowerPoint presentation as to The City of Yes Housing Opportunity and handed out approximately 30 copies of the PowerPoint presentation. As to Community Board No. 16 which covers Ocean Hill – Brownsville, they were here to present for a 2nd time the City of Yes for Housing Opportunity, a citywide text amendment that will change zoning to allow for more housing development which changes are intended to enable a little more housing in every neighborhood across the city, by removing some of the zoning related barriers to housing growth.

The City of Yes, a housing opportunity, is a citywide plan that will encourage incremental housing growth over a wide geography. Tonight, I'm going to be giving a broad overview of the proposal to the community with the hopes that CB16 will vote on in June 2024.

New York City faces a severe housing shortage. The vacancy rate for rental apartments, is historically low, only 1.4%, far below a healthy vacancy rate that will provide New Yorkers with housing options. In Brooklyn, the vacancy rate is only 1.27%. Our housing demand is greater than our housing supply, and it is one of the core reasons New Yorkers are experiencing very high housing costs. Over half of New York City renters are rent burdened, meaning they spend

over 30% of their monthly income on rent. Not having enough homes is also a direct cause of homelessness. Each night of 2023, over 92,000 homeless New Yorkers slept in shelters.

Most of New York City's housing was created in the first half of the 20th century. Since that time, housing production has fallen dramatically. That is in part because of zoning that has become increasingly restrictive since 1961. While housing production has decreased, the demand for housing has increased. There are a number of reasons for this. For examples that households across the city are smaller today than they used to be, meaning that even the same amount of people take up more space. We do understand that's not the case in every neighborhood, but we're looking at this from a city wide perspective. What recent housing production has occurred has been limited to only a few neighborhoods in 2023. Ten community districts. And you can see that those neighborhoods on the slides here in darker blue. Ten community districts produce as much housing as the other 49 combined. When some neighborhoods stop producing housing, that puts additional pressure on the other neighborhoods to produce more and more new housing. The proposals in City of Yes for housing opportunity emerge from the goals outlined in Where We Live New York City, the city's fair housing plan.

Where We Live NYC was created by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development in collaboration with over 250 community organizations. It highlights how the city's housing shortage and affordability crisis have severely limited New Yorkers housing choices. In a tight housing market, landlords can charge high rents and existing tenants are vulnerable to tenant harassment, poor housing quality and displacement pressure as they compete with each other for a limited number of units. When there are few apartments to choose from, renters pay more. In Brooklyn, 52.6% of renters are considered rent burdened. The average New York City household makes about \$70,000, but the average two bedroom apartment in New York City is over \$2,700 a month. This means that your average working family would have to spend about half of their income on rent to get a home for their family. We believe New York City's dire housing shortage has direct human consequences. These have been underscored in our extended community engagement process around City of Yes Housing opportunities.

City agencies work on policies and programs that aim to address New Yorkers housing needs. The Department of City Planning is responsible for the city's zoning. Zoning regulates what can be built on a particular site, both how big the building can be and what uses it can have residential or commercial, for example. Sometimes zoning includes other things like requirements for income restricted affordable housing. But zoning does not fund new housing or directly control what will be built. It only establishes rules for what can be built. How much housing gets built depends on many factors. Other tools the city uses to support good housing outcomes include subsidies or tax incentives. Promote income restricted affordable housing programs for affordable home ownership and tenant protections to guarantee New Yorkers rights. And again, I want to stress that zoning is one tool that can be used to help increase housing production. We realize there are serious limitations and that there are many other factors at play. Changing our zoning can respond to these issues by increasing the number and types of homes available in every neighborhood across the city. If each neighborhood adds a little more housing, New York City can add a lot more housing overall without a single neighborhood experiencing dramatic changes or overtaxed infrastructure. This text amendment will be the biggest pro housing change the Department of City Planning has undertaken, and it would touch the zoning for every single part of the city.

In medium and high density zoning districts, which you can see on slide ten in yellow. If the universal affordability preference, known as UAP, would allow slightly bigger buildings for affordable housing. In low density areas. And you can see those areas in blue on this slide. The proposal would also allow for more missing middle housing or low rise apartment buildings, and it would provide flexibility for homeowners by allowing them to add accessory dwelling units, known as ADUs or tiny homes, to their homes across the city. The proposal would remove residential parking mandates, which we believe are making housing more expensive. There are also a range of smaller proposals, including enabling conversion of non-residential buildings, allowing more small and fair departments, and allowing for residential campuses to add height limited buildings. This map shows the low and high density areas in Community Board 16. The medium high density areas are shown in yellow and the low density areas in blue. I want to clarify that when I say low density or medium high density, that low density refers to our five zoning districts and below, and medium high density refers to everything above our five. I want to acknowledge that there are cases where a zoning district that is mapped does not match exactly, is built in a given area. But what we are going off here, when I say medium or high density or low density, is strictly the zoning that is in place currently.

In the medium high density areas of New York City, which make up much of Community Board 16, our focus is on creating more opportunities for housing, including affordable housing. To do this, the proposal introduces the Universal Affordability Preference, or ULAP. It would allow apartment buildings to be at least 20% larger, so long as all that extra space is occupied by permanently affordable or supportive housing. ULAP is modeled after current rules that allow bigger buildings for affordable senior housing in some neighborhoods. ULAP would allow incremental housing growth in neighborhoods and encourage affordable housing throughout the city, rather than concentrating it in a few neighborhoods. And I just want to take a second to say that with ULAP, the existing far amounts per zoning district for market rate development would not change. So what is submitted as far as the amount of square feet and the height and bulk of a building that is market rate would not change under universal affordability preference again from market rate. This map shows which districts have an existing senior housing preference today, and that's shown in light orange, which is across much of the district. Ground truth. Through the ULAP framework, all forms of affordable and supportive housing would be able to take advantage of the higher fares already provided to affordable senior housing in these districts.

However, there are a few districts that don't have the senior housing preference today and they are shown in dark orange. It's just a little dot there. In these areas. The proposal would create new firms to enable the growth of affordable and supportive housing in every neighborhood. The proposal would also make sure that zoning provides room to build the extra affordable housing required through the universal affordability preference, so there will be limited height increases where it is necessary to make room for these affordable homes. ULAP would have an affordability requirement of 60% of area median income. Area Median income, or AMI, is a measure of affordability established by the federal government at 60% AMI, or \$76,000 for a family of three. ULAP would serve lower income New Yorkers than the existing. The existing zoning tool voluntary inclusionary housing, which is in some parts of the city. ULAP would replace voluntary inclusionary housing program, but the mandatory inclusionary housing program known as MIA, which requires a percentage of new developments to be income restricted affordable housing would continue to exist and be mapped when there are significant increases in residential density.

And I just want to take a moment to say, as was raised by the executive committee last night, when we say affordable, we are referring to that 60% AMI number. We do understand that many folks do not view that as explicitly affordable and I want to acknowledge there are shortcomings and there's different perspectives on what affordable actually means. When I'm saying that tonight, I'm referring to that 60% AMI number. And I just wanted to acknowledge that upfront. ULAP would also serve New Yorkers at even lower income levels through income averaging. Income averaging means that instead of only including homes at the required affordability level, which is at 60%, a building can include homes at a range of incomes so that they average to the required affordability. So, for example, a building could meet ULAP's 60% AMI affordability level by including a mix of homes, some at 30% Ami, which is roughly \$38,000 for a family of three, some at 60% AMI. Like what I said is roughly \$76,000 for family three, and some at 90% AMI, which is roughly \$115,000 for a family of three. Again, it can include a mix.

Average to that 60% number, broom ups, deeper affordability requirement and the introduction of income averaging up can help to serve the low income New Yorkers for most in need of affordable housing. Here is one example of how universal affordability preference works. If a church located in an R6 district affordable housing today they get 3.0 far, regardless of whether they are developing market rate housing or affordable housing. This will allow them to build about 35 units under ULAP. They get 3.94, but the additional 0.94 could only be used for affordable housing. If it is, they can build another 10 to 12 affordable units. 10 to 12 more affordable units may not sound like a lot, but this is functioning at a city wide scale. If every project has a few more affordable units, New York City can add a significant amount of affordable housing and no single neighborhood will experience drastic changes. This is a rendering of how ULAP might play out without ULAP. The building is built according to the base far for market rate housing. The result is this eight story apartment building with ULAP. The building can be about 20% bigger, which for this example translates to an additional two story's, so long as the extra space is permanently affordable.

We can make a big impact on our housing crisis. In our preliminary calculations, we determined that had ULAP been in place since 2014, with tax incentives and public subsidies fully in support, an additional 20,000 or so income restricted affordable homes could have been created, housing some 50,000. Mandatory inclusionary housing known as MIA areas would remain in place and continue to be mapped when there are significant increases in residential density. This proposal would introduce some improvements. First under this proposal, MIA option three, previously known as the affordability option, would could be applied as a stand alone option. Today, it has to be applied as an alternate with MIA options 1 or 2. This will allow future actions to ensure deep affordability. Some, my fears would

be raised to meet up far so they could build the same amount. For example, R-6a has an MRE far of 3.6, which could be raised to 3.9. The options would remain in place, meaning the same percentage of affordability will continue to be required.

The current MIA program is incompatible with the tools that facilitate affordable home ownership. This proposal would exempt 100% affordable home ownership projects from rules that prevent them from financially penciling.

We're now well into the second half of this, so thanks for bearing with me. When I switch gears here to the low density areas, a reminder that this refers to the areas where the zoning districts are five and below.

[We saw on the last slides, much of Community Board 16 is medium high density per the zoning. However, I want to present on all of this so that folks know what's being proposed across the city. This affects various other neighborhoods of the city much of southern Brooklyn, and neighboring community districts. I just wanted to note that and we're going through it, even though it only applies to some limited portions of Community Board 16. So for low density areas, exclusionary zoning rules have made it virtually impossible to build new housing in many of these low density neighborhoods, placing additional pressure on the high density parts of the city to produce more housing. This wasn't always the case. Small apartment buildings and 2 to 3 family homes are common in all of New York City's lower density neighborhoods and were allowed in many places until as recently as the 1990s and early 2000 2000, when stricter zoning prevented them. City of yes for housing, opportunity would reintroduce modest buildings that are more naturally affordable than other types of construction and apartment buildings at a scale in which they could take advantage of the existing affordability programs. Together, these changes would allow for the creation of more housing in low density areas without concentrating an overburden of housing production in one specific place. So again, this shows the low density areas in Community Board 16.

This slide further shows the low density areas across the rest of New York City. So these are our low density proposals. Our town center proposal aims to create more missing middle housing in low density areas. Missing middle refers to a category of housing that's modest in scale and often affordable to middle income residents. It was once a common type of housing that's not often built in a city anymore. This proposal aims to re legalize mixed use apartments or buildings with a ground floor commercial use, and a few stories of housing on top. This is a classic New York City building type that exists along many low density commercial corridors. Overly complex zoning rules make it almost impossible to build new ones. This proposal streamlines zoning rules, including restrictive limits on floor area and height, so that is once again feasible to build 2 to 4 stories of housing above a commercial ground. Of second low density proposal for missing middle housing is transit oriented development. Transit oriented development would allow for low rise buildings, and that's roughly 3 to 5 stories, depending on the underlying zoning on sites that are near transit and meet specific criteria. First, the site must be in a block within 0.5 miles of a subway or rail station. Second, the lot must be over 5000ft. And finally, the lot must be located on the short end of a block or in a wide street, which zoning defines as being over 75ft wide.

In the rest of the low density areas. The proposal aims to give homeowners more flexibility. Under this proposal, a 1 or 2 family home would be allowed to add a small accessory dwelling unit, or ADU. There are a range of types of ADUs, including backyard cottages. Some folks call those tiny homes garage conversions and basement apartments. These small units would provide important housing options for small households, like a young person moving into their own place for the first time, or an elderly resident who wants to age in place because of their small size. They can also serve different income levels than a large single family home. Successful ADU programs and other places, including Austin, Texas. Seattle, Washington, and the state of Connecticut tell us that these units can give multigenerational families a little more space and help middle class homeowners with household expenses. The proposal includes rules to ensure that ADUs are safe. New basement ADUs would not be allowed in the coastal floodplain, and no ADUs would be allowed in the special coastal risk districts, the areas of our city with the most severe flood risk. Outside of these coastal areas, ADUs would be subject to additional regulations or review and of course, subject to rules from the Department of Buildings.

The same rule changes that enable ADUs can also help homeowners who don't want to add an ADU, but need more flexibility to adapt or renovate their homes to meet their needs. Our research shows us that many existing buildings are out of compliance, meaning they're not in line with today's rules. For example, in some districts there are two family homes or two family districts allowing semi-detached buildings like the ones you see in this slide. But buildings like these built three 1961 like these pre 1961 duplexes could not be constructed today because they have more square

footage than is currently allowed and their rear yards are too small. These non-compliances can cause big headaches for homeowners if they need to borrow money from the bank, or if they want to make simple changes to their home, like renovating an outdated kitchen. The proposal would fix these rules, which would have dual benefits. First, home owners of existing buildings wouldn't run into the issues when they first go in to make the alteration to their building, because the zoning would better match what's on the ground. And second, you'd actually be able to build a two family home in a two family district or multi-family home in a multifamily district. Today, the only thing that will be feasible is a single family home.

Finally, I want to present on our parking proposals. This proposal would make parking optional for new housing everywhere across New York City. Following the example of many other major cities today, New York City requires new housing to include off street parking even where it's not needed. These mandates mean less space for housing and increased construction costs, which result in less housing being built.

The diagram on the slide you see here represents how parking takes up a lot of space. Two parking spaces is equivalent to the size of a studio apartment. Building. Parking itself is also expensive and is an obstacle to housing growth, especially affordable housing. This proposal prioritizes housing over parking, and we want to be honest and up front about that. We would still be allowed, and we anticipate that many developers will respond to market needs and continue to provide parking in areas where there is demand. Removing parking mandates can help reduce the cost of housing and construction, and enable the development of more homes in each new building. Moving on to slide 26 and we're almost done here. There are additional proposals in the City of Jasper housing opportunity that will provide more housing opportunity and a wider range of housing types. First conversions today. Outdated rules prevent underused non-residential buildings like offices from converting to housing. For example, many buildings that were constructed after 1961 are located outside the city's largest office. Centers, which are located outside the city's largest office. Centers cannot be converted to housing. City of Jasper housing opportunity would make it easier for underused non-residential buildings, such as offices, to be converted into housing. To do this, we make a few changes to the adaptive reuse regulations. First, the proposal would expand these regulations citywide to go beyond just office district districts. That way, a broader range of underutilized buildings like bacon schools or former religious buildings can be converted into housing. Second, the proposal would move the eligibility cutoff date from 1961 or 1977 to 1991. This allows more recently constructed buildings to be converted into housing.

The Proposal would enable the conversions of all types of house to all types of housing, including supportive housing, shared housing and dorms. The proposal would also allow small and fair apartments by eliminating the dwelling unit factor, a measure of the minimum average unit size in areas with good transit access. This will provide more housing opportunities for New Yorkers who want to live alone, but do not have that option today. We currently force too many people who want to live alone, to find roommates and occupy family size units in many parts of the city, enabling more small and shared apartments and relieve some of that pressure. And the intent is that some of the larger units that can be occupied by larger families will be freed up. Previous development often took place under power in the park style regulation called height factor zoning. Although the Department of City Planning has developed a more recent set of regulations for contextual buildings that have height limits and result in better designs. Some sites, like Mitchell-Lama and NYCHA campuses, do not have access to these rules. The proposed changes would allow height limited infill on sites that would otherwise be forced to develop tall, skinny buildings or nothing at all. I want to emphasize, though, that this is just a change in the zoning. Any processes that are in place around campus infill, whether it be NYCHA or Mitchell-Lama or anything else, still remain in place. This is solely limited to the underlying zoning.

Overall, this text amendment aims to create a little more housing everywhere so that each neighborhood does its part to address our housing needs, and a few neighborhoods don't feel the intense pressure they do today. It's not just about more housing, though. It's about more types of housing, multifamily housing where it's currently not allowed because of exclusionary zoning. Homes of different sizes to meet different people's needs and crucially, are more affordable and supportive housing. I just want to say thanks so much for listening tonight. We look forward to your questions and comments. You can find more information, including recordings of previous presentations and more detailed information on the presentation at nyc.gov/us-housing-opportunity.

And the final thing I want to say is that there, you know, we're willing to we're happy to take any questions tonight. We do hope that, you know, when the board votes and creates their recommendations, please make sure that your opinions that you share tonight make their way into that recommendation. These get read by the City Planning

Commission, but also by your council members, your elected officials. And we want your comments, your feelings on this proposal to be officially memorialized in that document. So I just wanted to encourage that. Thank you very much for listening.

Questions / Comments as to The City of Yes from Community included Gentrification taken over Ocean Hill Brownsville and how would The City of Yes benefit the Ocean Hill Brownsville community.

Response from The City of Yes: We understand there are a lot of forces that drive gentrification, that drive displacement, and we realize that zoning is one small piece of the puzzle here. The intent with this proposal is that the market rate, the underlying like what you are allowed to build currently, would not change the medium and high density areas. All it would allow under universal affordability preference is that extra bump in how much you're allowed to build and if that additional amount that you're building are income restricted units. Now we realize that 60% AMI is a number that got landed on here and that many folks do not see that as particularly affordable. I just want to be forthright that the number we landed on the research propelling this proposal is the idea that housing supply is so tight and people want to move to New York City from across the world, and people are going to move here for jobs, for opportunities, because it's the draw of New York City. So the idea behind this is to increase the amount of homes that can be built so that the people, whether they're moving here or moving from a neighborhood or moving from a different part of the city, to start a family in another neighborhood so that there are more homes that they can move into and not displace the people who are currently there. That said, there are many, many factors that do lead to displacement. We want to present what the information is in front of us and what the purpose of the proposal is and what the underlying logic is. But it is also something where we encourage you to, to make sure that makes its way into the recommendations and your concerns, make their way forward and are voiced in that.

Question / Comment from Community: You said parking won't be mandated for new construction, but how would this affect alternate side street parking? There is going to be more people coming to the community. Will alternate side of the street parking change from four times a week to maybe two times a week, as ticket agents are coming giving tickets to people who can't afford the tickets.

Response from The City of Yes: So as far we have no control over alternate side of the street, parking and ticketing, etc., I think what we want to be up front in saying that by making parking optional, the intent is and the kind of the highest priority of this change or proposed change to the zoning is to make housing more affordable. And we understand that there are trade-offs, and we do want to be up front with what our highest priority is here.

Question / Comment from Community: For homeowners who choose to add tiny homes to their properties, does this affect their property taxes and the value of their property?

Response from The City of Yes: Property taxes are based off the assessed value. So if a property owner adds an additional unit their property value increases and their taxes would increase alongside coinciding with the value of their property. But if someone doesn't choose to add anything because the assessed value of the home is not going up, then their taxes would not be going up. A 1000 square foot home is likely not assessed the same way as an 8000 square foot home. That's the kind of underlying logic of it. There are small changes to taxes or unfortunately not the Department of Finance but the general idea is that increases to value like of the property and what the assessed value of the property is would drive what the taxes are.

Question / Comment from Community: Where did you get the number of the AMI from?

Response from The City of Yes: We use basically HUD, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, from the federal government. It's a calculation that takes into account a broad area like all of New York City, including some of Westchester. It includes a lot of high income neighborhoods that are not explicitly part of the city. But the reason we use that number and the reason we use the HUD numbers is essentially city programs, state programs and federal programs. You know, there are certain buildings where they receive sort of funding from all these different, like all different levels. And the idea is to use a standardized kind of metric for that.

Question / Comment from Community: In terms of the lottery, is it fair to say that anyone wins, even if they don't live in the community, get an opportunity to get an apartment if they chose it?

Response from The City of Yes: When they're in the lottery and their name is chosen in the lottery, they win an opportunity to get that apartment. As to how the NYC Connect Housing lottery works, it would be administered again for these income restricted units by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development in the same manner that it's being like administered currently.

Question / Comment from Community: The one just thing I wanted to add is the hope is that more income restricted units be produced, as those waitlists are outrageous. There are just too many people who are in need of those units.

Question / Comment from Community: And I have a question. I am a little bit confused because last night, at the CB16 Executive Committee meeting you said that the other neighborhoods were not yet adapting to these changes and that you hope they would get on board.

Response from The City of Yes: So right now this proposal is going through public review. These changes have not been adopted in any part of the city yet. We are bringing this out to public review to every single community board for boards to vote on it. Then it goes to the Borough Board, as well as The City Planning Commission and the City Council. So there's lots of voting on it. That said, all of the proposed changes for the medium high density districts like the districts in Brownsville or Ocean Hill, if it's an R6 District in Community Board 16, it is getting the same proposed treatment as an R6 district in downtown Brooklyn, in downtown Manhattan, in Queens, it is all again citywide. But none of the proposal has been adapted in any one place.

Question / Comment from Community: So we're not the guinea pigs. It is going all over.

Response from The City of Yes: Yes, all over the city. One of my colleagues is in Sheepshead Bay tonight. I have another colleague who's going to be in Park Slope on Friday. All of this is all across Brooklyn. The whole borough's hearing it as well as all of the other boroughs.

Question / Comment from Community: If you change the zoning, will it give the homeowners more flexibility. Right now, what will homeowners benefit from adding on to their home? What homeowners can afford to do that. So is that for the current homeowners or is that what it will going to come into the neighborhood because we can't afford to add on to our home, right. So who's going who is going to be benefit? We're not.

Response from The City of Yes: I want to acknowledge that by changing there are many other factors in terms of actually, you know, building things. Financing is a huge part of that. The idea here is increasing the flexibility in the zoning to allow for that. We do realize that there are barriers to reaching that, and there are tradeoffs in the proposal. I acknowledge there are shortcomings and there are financing hurdles. The intent is for the zoning to not be a hurdle.

Question / Comment from Community: I would like to know why is it that y'all do medium to high as opposed to low to medium in Brownsville, knowing that we do have a lot of senior citizens and elderly and disabled because a lot of them cannot afford medium rent, period. There is a lot of people that are on fixed incomes, and it's not fair to them. If this does come about or we decide to vote on this, because what it's going to do is bring other demographics where we live at, and it's going to raise everything. We're already having a problem of getting healthy food and/or finding apartments. We live close to trains. Other people are moving here, to where we are at, to get close to certain things. So I'm just trying to figure out how is it going to benefit us.

Response from The City of Yes: I just wanted to clarify a quick thing, which is that the density it's sort of a technical term referring to the what the underlying zoning district is. And so there are a lot of what is considered R-6 or what is called R-6 zoning district in Brownsville and Ocean Hill. And that is the sort of medium high density. A lot of what this proposal is because it's a citywide approach, it's not singling out any neighborhood for really sort of specific changes. It is a blanket citywide approach, but the idea is that the changes that would apply to an R-6 district in Brownsville or Ocean Hill would apply in Brooklyn Heights. It would also apply in Tribeca. And the idea with that, we understand there are a lot of housing cost which is an incredible issue, but how it might help in any given neighborhood is the idea that some more income restricted units could be produced, and our hope is that they are made. That said, if there is a lot of worry about displacement pressure from other neighborhoods, some of the idea with this proposal is that allowing more production, especially in neighborhoods that are very wealthy, where people might be moving, you know, priced out of a neighborhood in southern Brooklyn or in lower Manhattan, Midtown Manhattan, that more apartments being built in those neighborhoods can ease some of the pressure on moving to other

neighborhoods so that people can potentially stay in place more. But we do understand that in a citywide approach, there can be tradeoffs.

Question / Comment from Community: I have argued about this many years ago in the community about how we are going to afford them. I am a homeowner and one of the things that you said was that the prices is going up for the renters, but the reason why the homeowners have to increase it is because their property taxes are due. I'm talking about my neighborhood. My property value has gone up and I would rather rent apartments to people that could afford it, so that I could afford to pay the taxes. So the truth is that we're being taxed out of our houses. That's why we have to stand up and fight in order for us to survive. So if you want to point the finger at somebody trying to figure out where this is coming from, this is because the community is being gentrified. We have to fix this. There's a lot of people in the neighborhood that need an apartment. There is a lot of people that want to come into our neighborhood, because this neighborhood is the most valuable asset right now.

Response from The City of Yes: With this proposal again, where the rubber meets the road, there are real tradeoffs. The intent here is to, again, what is permissible to be built as a market rate building would not change. The idea with this is to if a developer wants to build a slightly bigger building, and those extra units are all income restricted, that is what this is intended to permit. The idea of this being citywide is to spread some of that development to areas where it is currently not happening, and to make sure that more of it is happening across the city to ease some of that rental burden. But your question, your comment is noted, and I just want to say, please, you know, there's a recommendation that the community board will issue and we encourage you to share your concerns widely in the community and with your elected officials.

Question / Comment from Community: I am a member of the Brownsville Nehemiah Homeowners Association and I really am trying to understand the impact of this proposal on specifically the Brownsville Nehemiah homeowners. And so what I will say is right now, an issue that we are facing, really as a result of the last zoning that we went through in the city, is that a lot of Nehemiah homes are being bought and knocked down, and multi-unit buildings are being built. I want to understand the impact that this proposal might potentially have. Will this incentivize developers to purchase our corner homes, or multiple Nehemiah homes and knock them down because they have the opportunity now to build multi-unit building.

Response from The City of Yes: I know Nehemiah Homes is a really historic and meaningful project, and a lot of homeowners who live in Nehemiah Homes have anchored Brownsville for a really long time. I just want to note that history. Currently the zoning in Nehemiah Homes is R-6. What would change in this proposal, as far as what is permitted for a market rate building would not change in the zoning districts where the Nehemiah Homes and Brownsville are currently located. The universal affordability preference could be applied, you know, want to be up front about that? That is how it could potentially be affected, but again, what is permitted as of right now is that the market rate would not change. It would only be what is additionally permitted under the universal affordability preference. I just want to be straightforward, as for my analysis of that of what is then permitted.

Question / Comment from Community: You are mentioning a lot of trade off, but the reality of it is what the community is going to be from the tradeoff. I mean, I think that we're already giving our taxes and our property value. Commercial communities are being gentrified in which they are losing and essentially the quality of life is being destroyed. What do we get? What are we going to receive now? I am a property homeowner and you mentioned the additions. You have to work with developers that you have to work with regulators, type of things and places in place which you're aware of. I'm sure you work with PMI. So that's kind of misleading because the reality of it is there's more to it than that. And just being able to add on to your property. So what are we receiving.

Response from The City of Yes: I think with universal portability preference which applies to much of CB16 and the idea is to allow for the production of more income restricted units. The idea for every neighborhood where there's medium and high density is the addition of more income restricted units, averaging 60% AMI.

Madam Chairperson Morgan: We have to wrap us with this. We are not voting on this tonight.

Question / Comment from Community: I think my question really kind of encompasses a lot of the arguments that have already been raised, but essentially my ask is you've talked about the fact that the current proposal only gets at zoning laws. So if you're able to propose these changes to zoning laws, my question is in order to make sure we get

the benefits in that proposal, also include the tax breaks or incentives for homeowners. So when they add the ADU the property tax doesn't go up. Can it also include some sort of incentives that you can get whether it's a grant or a low interest loan. Can some of these things be built in so that you can actually effectuate some of the change they're proposing and CB16 without going broke or our neighborhoods changing because we can't afford to make the additions..

Response from The City of Yes: That's a great question and a great point. We don't control any of the tax related matters or the financing. We realize again, that it's a potential shortcoming here but the intent, again, is to allow for more flexibility in the zoning for these other things to potentially happen. But yes, we are we are limited to just zoning and our department.

Question / Comment from Community: If you look at a graphical schematic, you would find that a disproportionate amount of black people are placed strategically in areas that are lucrative to developers. This is going to be City of No. Being honest with them, okay. Because I've been in this community almost 40 years. My family owns several homes here. Okay, so what I'm saying to you, Sir, how can we give you the opportunity to build up which we already lost our air rights? And people from Atlantic Avenue to the Conduit split. There are six stories along this corridor. We are going to be displaced black people. That's what they're coming here to do to us. Okay. So what you're going to do is identify what you already are doing because we lost that air rights and you're going to bring 20, 30, 40 stories. Where is my niece. my nephew, my brother or my sister supposed to go.

Response from The City of Yes: The idea behind this, and I am just responding to just a point of the comment you made. You're saying there's nowhere to build up, and, and so I guess the intent here is to allow a little bit more building and in addition of income restricted units in a place where new building might happen. So again, the additional would allow an addition of a 20% or more of income restricted units on buildings that are being built. I hope that your sentiment that you're just voicing out here makes its way and is memorialized in the recommendation by the board, which gets the vote. And your elected officials and your council members will also have a vote on this proposal.

Question / Comment from Community: What about the commercial developer that wants to come in and put a factory next to my house?

Response from The City of Yes: If someone wants to locate a factory, the underlying zoning or, you know, a factory, let's say a car factory or something needs to be manufacturing. The only places where industrial uses or manufacturing uses can locate are in manufacturing zones. There are some small portions of Community Board 16, and actually it might be Community Board 5. It might be the neighboring part, like the East New York Industrial Business Zone that are zoned for manufacturing and industrial uses. This proposal is not changing what uses are permitted in what places. It is just about residential uses, just about housing.

Question / Comment from Community: I want to commend you on your presentations. You guys are always coming to our community and you are always treating us disrespectfully. First of all, most of the people here probably don't even understand what these zoning laws are that have been enacted. And they always send a person that looked like us to try to convince us that this is the best thing for us. I heard my sister say she is the homeowner. I'm not. I just live in an apartment here. However, when you guys come down here, you bring the whole team. If there's no tax abatement in that proposal, stay with it. Don't come here. Give us what we want, what we deserve to have, and treat us like we are human beings on the planet. You guys don't do that. You come in here and you're always saying the same thing over and over. This is the proposal. Well, give us the facts. No proposals. Tell us exactly what you're offering, and then let us counteract the offer. That's what you guys need to be doing. You don't have anything to do with tax. Tell the people downtown that the folks over here want some tax abatement on those properties that they own. The folks over here want whatever they want. Stop saying, put it in a proposal. You guys already know what you're going to say yes or no to, but you have to make a presentation. If you make a presentation for the people on the other side and give them what they want from you and do the same thing for us.

Question / Comment from Community: I have a couple of questions. I want to piggyback on what you discussed earlier in the presentation., I understand that using HUD AMI values to determine how that will be applied to this project. However, Brownsville has a significantly lower AMI than the rest of the city. So, you know, on Slide 15 where you have it very tiny with the different AMI levels and the amount of rent. So the concern and most people are not making \$38,000 or \$78,000 or \$114,000 a year. So you want this to be a universal plan that's going to impact all

neighborhoods within the five boroughs. However, it directly and disproportionately impacts this community because you cannot afford this kind of rent. So who are you catering to exactly? It's not to us. In addition, I want to touch on the fact that you mentioned something about homeowners who have properties up until 1991. Can you explain that portion of it again? You said something about regarding modifications to property.

Response from The City of Yes: I believe that was the office conversions. It would be basically the proposal is for office by current office buildings or similar kind of buildings are only allowed to convert to housing if they were built before 1977. And then in some 1991. And in some places even earlier. This proposal would allow buildings built before 1991. So its basically allowing slightly newer buildings to be converted into housing.

Question / Comment from Community: :Lastly, I know that in East New York there's a proposal or I don't know if it's in place already where property owners can convert their basements into apartments. For the current property owners within CB16 who may have violations in place because they expanded their basements what will happen with those people who have pending violations since this will effectively go into place maybe by the end of the year? Because on the last page where you have the timeline for when this will be enacted and voted on and said by end of 2024, which is roughly six months from now. So once this is passed, because it's going to be backed through the city council, right? When will this affect us? Immediately? When can we anticipate this happening? When will this impact projects that are coming up?

Response from The City of Yes: I believe the program in East New York might be a state level program. And I need to familiarize myself with that. As far as if the City of Yes Housing Opportunity proposal is adopted this year, the zoning then does change. That said, it is just allowing in terms of it changes what is permitted legally and as far as you know, the intent is to give pathways to legalization under the zoning or accessory dwelling units of which some of those are basement units. Some of those are tiny homes in the backyard. That said, there are a lot of other components that have to do with building code.

Question / Comment from Community: Once it's passed what's the time frame for it to be enacted? We need to anticipate how this is going to impact us tax wise with our homes being targeted and with our existing buildings being targeted. When can we anticipate all these changes applying through the building department, etc., through taxes? Like when can we anticipate this really impacting us as a community?

Response from The City of Yes: If the resolution gets adopted, and I'll note that the last one is currently being voted on tomorrow by the City Council. There are quite a few modifications as a part of it. The zoning would change immediately. That said, as far as what actually takes place, what building takes place that has to do with any number of factors as far as the financing, the arrangement of the building code, etc..

Madam Chairperson Morgan: We have to wrap us with this. We are not voting on this tonight.

The City of Yes asked the community that they send any additional questions to their office and that they be more than happy to try and answer them.

Madam Chairperson Morgan: We will now have the Equity Planning Workgroup Report. There is a presentation in that report that will include the Artwork that is going to be included at 444 Thomas F. Boyland that is being redeveloped to the Girls Empowerment Center.

Chairperson of Economic Development, Christopher Toomer, read the Equity Planning Work Group Report.

The Equity Planning Work Group met on Tuesday, May 14, 2024 via Webex with the representatives from the Mayor's Office of Talent and Workforce Development (NYC Talent). NYC Talent partners with private and public organizations to help find good-paying jobs in the economy in collaboration with the Mayor's Office. Mr. David Mandell and Jazmine Hayes was also present to do a presentation for New York City Cultural Affairs for Brownsville Youth Empowerment Center and Community Hub Artwork Conceptual Design update. The location of the site project will be located at 444 Thomas S. Borland Street. They are virtually present to give a brief presentation (or answer questions at this time). The next Equity Planning Work Group meeting will take place on Tuesday, June 11, 2024 via Webex at 6:00 p.m. Have a blessed and safe Memorial Day.

PRESENTATION BY DAVID MANDEL AND JAZMINE HAYES FROM THE NYC DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

I am David Mandel from Department of Cultural Affairs Art Program and I am here with Jazmine Hayes, who is an artist. We are very glad to be back with you. We gave an in-depth presentation on May 14th, and as an item that came out of that, we were hoping or asking for a Letter of Support from the Community Board in response to the artwork design for the Brownsville Youth Empowerment Center and Community Hub by artist Jazmine Hayes. Tonight, we have a condensed version just to give you a recap in an overview of that presentation and Jazmine's vision for the site.

For the full presentation you can refer back to the community board who has those materials and I believe the meeting we had on May 14th may have even been recorded. But just a quick recap. We're talking about public art and the art program. This finds that as a successful intersection between three important components which are the spatial qualities and design of the public space, the art and the artist's vision in creating something site specific in the community at the site where the artwork will be located, and the ultimate users of the facility who will be experiencing the art on the daily basis. So here's just some milestones that are coming up for this project. This project initially kicked off in March of 2023. We came to the community board and we invited the Community Board to join us in the process. We asked for artist suggestions and panelist suggestions, and then we held two artist selection panel meetings where we first looked at a larger pool of artists, and then we invited finalists to make site specific proposals.

After that second panel meeting where there were the artist proposals there was discussion and voting and ultimately Jazmine Hayes was selected. During what we call the design development period is when the artist takes their initial proposal and refines it with feedback from the project partners and what they turn it into is called their conceptual design, which you'll get a look at tonight from here. The next important next step is to go to the Public Design Commission, who will also review the conceptual design. Following that feedback more detailed drawings and plans and material studies will take place to plan all the specifics. Then we'll go back to the Public Design Commission for what's called a preliminary review and approval, which is then really where you get the notice to fabricate and then ultimately install the final artwork. Then there are public hearings, where we are looking forward to keeping you in the loop as to the projects progress. I also want to say that Jazmine, as a local artist, is also very interested in engaging the community, so you will be hearing a lot more from her about how you can get involved in her process.

Jazmine Hayes introduced herself and stated that she was born and raised from East New York, Brooklyn and that this project is very personal and hits home for me. I am an interdisciplinary multimedia artist, arts educator, poet, and musician and my practice focuses on cultural traditions as preservation of African diasporic histories ranging across a range of mediums. For this project, I want to just stress some personal history. I have lived in NYCHA my entire life. I've lived in East New York my entire life. And I really want this project to speak to the community in ways understanding that there will be youth who will grow up in this facility. And so there are parts of this project where personally, I'm speaking to my inner child and I hope that the community board receives this with care questions, love and respect. The project site is in East Brooklyn, which all of you know. The four sites of the location for Thomas Boyland will be the garden, the entrance and then the HRA and CB 16 lobby, as well as the youth empowerment lobby and the planetarium lobby. My themes are to activate the four lobbies and entryways, thinking on the energy entering in and out of this space.

And so these are just an overview of the activations for the Garden Wall, Lobby, Youth Empowerment Center and the Planetarium. As to the project overview, with four sites of activation, my proposal is to build intergenerational, gender expansive installations that culturally reflect the local youth, community and history of Brownsville. I am focused on an emphasis of pattern, repetition, and symbolism as tools of communication, of the ways infrastructure and architectural designs affect the psyche of the people and inhabiting the environment. The plan is to activate the four main entryways, the garden lobby, the Youth Empowerment Center, and the Planetarium lobby. Activating these four entryways is use of art as prayers of affirmation, protection, healing, and reclamation for the people who will walk in and out of these spaces with local youth and community engagement. I will hold workshops and information sessions to inform the designs, ensuring they serve the community effectively. So the themes for this are protection, reclamation, healing, and art as prayers, as mentioned above for symbolism, you'll see, repetition or repeated symbols using the braid, which is intergenerational weaving of histories, a common identifier of cultural tradition or practice. The cowrie shell, which represents currency protection and divination, and then repeating pattern, communication through symbol, the coded language of protection across diasporic histories. This is the garden wall concept where there is pretty much a deity or feminine energy or protector of this space, having conversation with this young

gardener. And so you can see the gardener planting something. And then there's a back and forth conversation of cowrie shells between this deity or protection symbol.

In this design, I am basically incorporating pattern, and the materials I am thinking on is a copper relief sculpture. This relief will be about two inches out from the wall. I am hoping to use copper and then also concrete to create embossing or engraving on the flat surface of the wall. There is a pattern there that I will speak about soon in my design. Basically there is a comparison of nitro developments in relation to Rikers Island. Brownsville has the most concentrated public housing in all of the nation so thinking on instead of a school to prison pipeline, thinking specifically on a development to prison pipeline. So in relation to the designs you can see on the left side this is an aerial view of Rikers Island and connection to Brownsville houses. And so with this project I'm focusing on a reclamation of pattern and architectural design. This design was created for Brownsville Houses. It lived for a very short period of time thankfully, because its construction. There was a reclamation of the NYCHA maps used as pattern and communication across the designs, and this has influenced much of the designs that I am presenting to you.

The second design is shaped in a spiral, which represents protection through growth, rebirth and evolution. The sculpture will be casted in cowrie shells. This is also a reclamation project looking at the history in Brownsville and poverty stricken neighborhoods alike, receiving budget cuts firsthand from the city, specifically in areas of sanitation causing a lot of littering. And so thinking on how this can use upcycled plastic as material to be a reparation or conversation of environmental justice and relation or connection to racial injustice. The third design is based off of reclamation of pattern, as mentioned previously.

This slide you have rebuilt nitro maps, which is specifically Brownsville Houses. But thinking on this reclamation of this pattern in New York City, schools and probation facilities, as well as NYCHA and Rikers Island, they all have the same exact colors, designs and architecture. In using this same concept for the Youth Empowerment Center where this will be a relief of the braided patterns, this will also be an opportunity for community involvement where the youth can reshape maps of NYCHA developments and reclaim the patterns to create symbols that they may want to create or say in this space.

This slide is just a detail shot of what the pattern will look like. In the design there will possibly be fiberglass, metal or plastic. This planetarium space is the final design. The inspiration for this design is the Moko Jumbie, thinking on, like, culturally, the people who inhabit Brownsville. The Moko Jumbie represents protection. In the planetarium, there is a two story relief that will be placed on the wall where the planets are textures which is also an opportunity for the youth to have involvement to build constellations or planets. I would like for it to be very textured, because there are going to be children who will touch this wall. The color palette used is different shades of blues and black, and then also possibly using copper or gold relief as well. These are the four overall projects.

But just to restate, the third design and the fourth design are possibilities for workshops. The third design I would like to hold three youth involved workshops working with local youth and youth organizations of Brownsville to focus on using the pattern of nitrate developments as reclamation of pride and joy in their community. And then for the planetarium lobby, a one day astronomy based art making workshop using references of constellations and planets. Parents, elders and youth are welcome to attend. I think this is a perfect opportunity for an intergenerational community workshop.

Questions / Comments from Community: Is this the final schematic for the installations that will take place.

Response: No, this is not the final. I think things are open to change. Not too many changes. But if there are things that the community may want to see I am open to try and shift some designs but keeping the main themes in mind of, like, just art as protection and prayer. As someone who is from East New York and has also worked in Brownsville, my sister also lived in Van Dyke Houses for quite a bit of time and so just thinking on the protection of the community, I think there is so much beauty in our community and I want to protect the babies. I want to protect the people of Brownsville. And so just keeping those themes in mind. But I'm open for suggestions.

Questions / Comments from Community: You focused a lot on the semantics from Rikers Island and nicer housing, but what about the other facets of the community like maybe in Ocean Hill, as well as homes and buildings and churches, etc., and how those impact will impact the youth. You know, this will be a girls empowerment center, but I didn't really see those qualities mentioned.

Response: So there are four entryways. The reason the girls empowerment, that specific design, which is the third design that is not a complete design. And so that's why I want to incorporate the three workshops where the youth can think about the reclaiming of patterning, etc., using the braid. So the braid kind of represents intergenerational. I wanted this to also be gender expansive, to be sensitive to the younger generation and their conversations on gender, etc. and so not being specific in colors or certain imagery. But this is also something that if the youth wanted to change, I'm open to it, to the best of my ability. On what the city also allows me to do. But I and of course the community is involved in that.

Response: If any questions arise please feel free to reach out to CB 16. And perhaps they could reach out to me and we could move forward from there. I do really want to also move forward in connecting with youth organizations in Brownsville and I think this is a good opportunity for that connection.

Madam Chairperson Morgan: We have a board member that has a youth organization and she would be an excellent person for you to connect with.

Response: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Chairperson Morgan: So we'll make that connection for you. All right, well, thank you, David and Jazmine.

Madam Chairperson Morgan asked for a Motion to accept the Equity Planning Workgroup Report.

Motion was made and seconded. There being no further discussion:

Yay: Unanimous

Oppose: None

Abstain: None

Motion so carried.

Chairperson of Parks and Recreation Committee, Deborah Williams, read the City Services Planning Workgroup Report.

The City Services Planning Work Group met on Thursday, May 9, 2024 via WebEx and discussed, Floyd Patterson Field, Update on Parks and Playgrounds, A discussion about Chester Playground, Ocean Hill Playground, and Osborn Playground restrooms remain closed due to water main issues and low water pressure. Ms. Williams spoke with J. Locascio of the Parks Department who stated that the problem of the water main breaks could be caused by age and possible deterioration. They are aware of this and are waiting for funding so they can bring in their technical service division. She also discussed Floyd Patterson Field with him and was informed that the field will be hydroseeded for the grass instead of traditional seeding. A heavy metal roller barrel that was seen on the field will be removed and more signage about the dogs will go up. Additional poop bags were requested for the park's poop bins so that bags are available for discarding waste of residents' beloved pets.

Mr. Micheal Howard sent pictures of how the field looked before which will be forwarded to the Parks Department. Councilwoman Darlene Mealy's office is also aware of the problems of Floyd Patterson field. A question was asked about barbecuing in our parks, barbecuing is only allowed in designated areas in some parks. There are no barbecuing areas in any Community District 16 parks.

The Parks Department is still working on options for the BRC construction project and programing when the building closes. Golden Age is only program continuing in the building until a relocation site is found. Once funding is secured they will begin working on the renovations.

The Work Group also discussed volunteer help for some of the parks in Community District 16. We would like to see our parks clean and nice just like some parks in other districts, and seeking to find volunteers and getting our neighbors and maybe creating some friends-of groups involved along with Parks Department and the Department of Sanitation would help a great deal for the upkeep of our district parks. This is an ongoing conversation.

The Work Group also discussed smoking in our parks and playgrounds; there is no smoking in any city park. The conversation came about when it was mentioned that marijuana is being smoked in some of our playgrounds where children play. It was suggested to get Parks Enforcement to monitor our parks more often and maybe issue fines.

Ms. Sydore Thompson, Chairperson of the Transportation and Franchises Committee, reports that since the April 2024 CB16 Executive Board meeting and on May 9, 2024, during the City Services Committee meeting, transportation-related concerns were addressed or brought to the board for an update by the Department of Transportation ("DOT"). Matters addressed include:

1. An April 25, 2024, notification from the DOT that a new traffic control will be installed at the intersection of Rockaway Avenue and Somers Street.
2. In late April 2024, there was a lack of signage and notification to residents by the DOT for milling conducted on Riverdale Avenue, Newport Street, Lott Avenue, and New Lots Avenue from Junius Street to Mother Gaston Boulevard. Proper signage was later posted for the repaving which was completed in the first week of May 2024.
3. A pothole located at 775 Saratoga Avenue between Livonia and Riverdale was repaired.
4. A pothole at 175 Riverdale Avenue was repaired.
5. Signal removal at the intersection of Pacific Street and East New York Avenue was resolved by DOT on or about May 14, 2024.
6. A pothole at Junius Street between Lott Avenue and New Lots Avenue which was reported to 311 and the community board on May 18, 2024 for repair has yet to be resolved.

Thank You all who attended the City Service Planning Work Group meeting. The next City Service Planning Work Group meeting will be on Thursday June 13, 2024 via WebEx.

Are there any questions.

Madam Chairperson Morgan asked for a Motion to accept the City Services Planning Workgroup Report.

Motion was made and seconded. There being no further discussion:

Yay: Unanimous

Oppose: None

Abstain: None

Motion so carried.

Chairperson of Education and Youth Services Planning, Melanie Mendonca, read the Community Resident Planning Work Group Report.

The Community Resident Planning Working Group met on May 8, 2024, by WebEx.

Ms. Melanie Mendonca, Chairperson of the Education Youth Planning Committee provided updates on the events that are taking place in District 23 Community Schools.

New York City Public Schools Chancellor David Banks will be hosting a Town Hall at Kappa V Middle School on Thursday, May 30, 2024. The event will be in-person as well as livestream. Flyers have been emailed to share with the community and parents in the district. The Community Education Council will be heading up this event.

On May 7th and 8th all New York City Public School students in grades 3-8 took the New York State Math Exam. Exam results will not be available to parents until the end of August 2024.

Rev. Dr. Miran Ukaegbu, Chairperson of the Health and Human Services Committee, reminds everyone that COVID-19 is infecting New Yorkers and suggests that we get the updated vaccine. All New Yorkers 6 months and older can now get the updated vaccine at a location near you. If you are experiencing symptoms or were exposed, get tested. If you test positive, stay home and talk to your healthcare provider about treatment.

Please NOTE: MASKS ARE ENCOURAGED NOW.

May is Mental Health Awareness Month, a time to raise awareness of mental health issues and reduce the stigma that people experience. Mental health is important to everyone's overall health and wellbeing, and mental illnesses are common and treatable.

If you or someone you love is struggling with anxiety, depression, or other mental health issues, speak to your doctor for help towards achieving your mental health goals.

May is ALS Awareness Month, and with it comes a round of support and advocacy for everyone who has received the diagnosis. Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also known as Lou Gehrig's Disease.

ALS is a devastating disease that is progressively neurodegenerative. It affects nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord. The disorder affects nerves and muscles, gradually impacting a person's ability to speak, swallow, breathe, and walk - every aspect of their life.

May is also American Stroke Awareness Month, Arthritis Awareness Month, Brain Tumor Awareness Month, and Better Hearing and Speech Month. If you or someone you know have questions about these health issues, speak to your healthcare specialist to help get answers.

The next community resident planning working group will take place on Wednesday, June 12, 2024, at 6:00PM by Virtual Web-Ex.

Madam Chairperson Morgan asked for a Motion to accept the Community Resident Planning Workgroup Report.

Motion was made and seconded. There being no further discussion:

Yay: Unanimous

Oppose: None

Abstain: None

Motion so carried.

Chairperson of the Legislative Committee, Pamela Junior-Baptiste, read the Fiscal and Policy Workgroup Report.

In connection with the Cannabis Application that was submitted to CB16 for the location 180 Rockaway Avenue, between Herkimer Street and Atlantic Avenue, presentations to the Legislative Committee were made by:

- Kareen Leivent and Dr. Craig Leivent, who intend to partner with Daniel Gamil, the owner of 180 Rockaway Avenue, on January 16, 2024. The Committee requested that Kareen Leivent and Dr. Leivent submit a Statement of Intent to the Community Board as to employees, etc. The Statement of Intent is attached hereto.
- Chairwoman Tremaine Wright, NYS Cannabis Commission on February 20, 2024.
- Mr. Daniel Gamil, owner of 180 Rockaway Avenue, on March 19, 2024.
- Stephanie Pierre, Cannabis Account Manager, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce | NYC Business Solutions Center on April 16, 2024.

Additionally, the Legislative Committee held several “*Special Meetings*” during January, February, March and April in reference to this Application and the presentations that were made before us.

The Legislative Committee has recently determined that, at this time, they are comfortable with giving a “*Recommendation*” to CB16 Board Members at the Board’s meeting on Tuesday, April 23, 2024, as to the Cannabis Application that CB16 received for 180 Rockaway Avenue (between Herkimer Street and Atlantic Avenue). As there was no CB16 quorum at the April 23, 2024 meeting, we again bring forth the Legislative’s Committee Recommendation as to a no vote to approve this Cannabis Application for 180 Rockaway Avenue at the May 21, 2023 Board Meeting.

The Legislative Committee’s responses as to whether *to support* or *not to support* this Application are listed below:

Reason NOT to Support

Committee Member 1:

After further discussion with you I have decided to not vote for this application. There are somethings that I have not feel that it will be a great fit for our Brownsville Community.

1. I have not heard so far what are they planning to bring or give back to our community.
2. I think the landlord just needs to have a renter who they can for sure will pay the rent for the storefront knowing what is being placed in the building.
3. Also, I haven't hear much from their presentation of how this is going to benefit once again the Brownsville community.

Committee Member 2:

I am not in favor of it. First, I have a concern with people leaving their own communities and exploiting impoverished communities for their personal gain. Moreover, with the emergence of cannabis/weed shops, it appears that a lot of children under the age of 18 are purchasing these products. Despite being legal, the age of the buyers is not being properly monitored or regulated.

Committee Member 3:

As a Brownsville resident I do not support this application as there are existing businesses in that location that fit the community better and are more needed. Any legal cannabis business should be on a true commercial corridor where the commercial zoning and land use is more significant than the residential use. Belmont, Pitkin, Mother Gaston Blvd and Rockaway Avenue between Sutter and East New York are continuous commercial corridors and that is the desired location of our first legal dispensary.

Committee Member 4:

Foremost, application approval prior to the acceptance of the board regarding the CB#16 Application process and requested format and documentation; would be premature and a disservice to the community. It is also noted that concerns and previously addressed questions have not been addressed.

As it is, The **Letter of Commitment** by Kareen Leivent and Dr. Craig Leivent is “*unremarkable*” as it fails to provide a workable baseline of any true Commitment to the residents/stakeholders of Community Board 16. The letter content stating:

“being owners of two successful dispensaries in Oregon, which have provided us with invaluable knowledge of the processes and requirements essential for the sustainable operation of a dispensary... By providing hands-on experience, we aim to serve as a catalyst for individuals interested in exploring different roles within the cannabis sector, ultimately supporting the community in navigating the early stages of the industry.”

The letter does not address the current occupant displacement, the resident and traffic congestion hardship created this location selection or identify any specific area of commitment.

During Legislative Committee meetings, concerns pertaining to the hardship created for the current restaurant occupants, and inquiry within the commercial corridor has also not been addressed.

The location also has residential homes on both sides of the proposed location and would undoubtedly create traffic congestion, as that portion of Rockaway Avenue is a double lined single lane traffic route close to the corner of Atlantic Avenue. There is also no parking and as the only proposed legal dispensary for CB#16, it does not seem to be feasible for families and/or the community flow of traffic.

In summary, I believe the Application “As -Is” should be denied for a reasonable timeframe once the Recommendation to CB#16 has been presented by the full Board.

In all fairness, Kareen Leivent and Dr. Craig Leivent have demonstrated their ability of the financial means to locate within the commercial district and as such should be given time to reconsider location. As such, they should also be presented with an opportunity to provide an adequate Letter of Commitment *with* consideration to the community inquiries. Afterward, a completed CB#16 Cannabis Application package should be submitted for reapplication and review.

Committee Member 5:

I vote nay on the application. I do not think, I cannot see any clear indication that my community will benefit from this venture.

Committee Member 6:

Nay - To the support of the application

Committee Member 7:

During the Legislative Committee's Special Meeting on Saturday, April 18, 2024, Member 7 expressed that he was not in support of this business but would like to engage in more dialogue to gain additional information.

Reason TO Support

Committee Member 8:

The Applicant has provided every piece of information that we requested in a timely manner. The property is owned by someone he knows which is out of our control, and this will be the first legal shop in our district.

Committee Member 9:

Yay (NO EXPLANATION GIVEN)

Committee Member 10:

Yay (NO EXPLANATION GIVEN)

Pamela Junior-Baptiste, Chair, Legislative Committee:

Agrees with all NAY reasons submitted by the Committee Members.

By a majority decision of the Legislative Committee Members, the Legislative Committee recommends to CB16 Board Members NOT to support this Application.

The Legislative Committee has received a response from the NYC Law Department as to our Cannabis Application, and the Special Provisions that we have inquired about within it. On May 18, 2024, the Legislative Committee asked CB16 to share with the CB16 Board Membership all of the below listed documents, including the response from the NYC Law Department. The Legislative Committee ask that CB16 Board Members review these documents ASAP as the Legislative Committee would like to have these documents implemented on the CB16 Website for CB16 Cannabis Applicants to complete after our CB16 Board Meeting in June 2024. The documents sent to CB16 Board Members were:

CB16 Cannabis Instructions and Application to Applicants

CB16 Cannabis Dear Neighbor Signage

CB16 Cannabis Flyer re: collaboration with 73rd Precinct Community Affairs

These documents were mailed to you a couple of days ago, and we're asking you to please review in time for our June meeting as we would like to implement this come September. In September, these will be on our website, and applicants will be able to go directly into the application, fill it out, and submit it to us.

VOTE 16 NYC

As we did not have a quorum present at the CB16 Board Meeting in February 2024, March 2024 and April 2024, we again present to you that at the Fiscal and Policy Work Group's January 2024 meeting, a presentation was made by Alfred Kurland of Vote 16 NYC in reference to 16-year-olds being allowed to vote in New York State. After extensive discussion, the Work Group expressed a desire to see young adults engaging and becoming more active in their communities, i.e., participating on community boards and in political clubs. The majority of the Work Group feels that most young adults are not mature enough to be granted this important privilege. The Work Group has voted "No" and recommends that the Board not support this request to allow 16-year-olds to vote in New York State, at this time.

At the April 2024 CB16 Board meeting, a few community residents feel that we should reconsider our position. As of right now, the Committee stands by its Recommendation, but the Legislative Committee is open to meeting with Mr. Kurland after our summer recess to again discuss the Legislative Committee's concerns and to inquire if our concerns can be addressed / implemented by Vote 16 NYC.

The next meeting of the Fiscal and Policy Workgroup will be held on **Wednesday, June 18, 2024 @ 6:30pm** via Webex. This will be the Committee's last meeting before September 17, 2024. The Legislative Committee invites CB16 community residents to attend and participate in our committee meetings. We want to hear your voice. Thank you.

Any questions:

Discussion was had as to Illegal Cannabis Shops in the CB16 area and next steps. There are NO LEGAL Cannabis Shops in CB16.

The Chair explained that New York State has recently passed a law about two years ago to make cannabis legal. With that in mind, anyone in New York State can submit an application anywhere in New York State to open up a legal cannabis shop, just like a liquor store. But there is a process they have to go through, and each community board is responsible for the potential legal cannabis shops coming into their community. Community Board 16 has given the Legislative Committee the charge to review each of these applicants. We have to review them. They cannot be ignored. You have the right as residents and as a community board member to vet these people before they come. You can also come before the Community Board and ask the Community Board to vote no as to a particular potential cannabis shop opening in the community.

Madam Chairperson Morgan called for a Motion to accept the Fiscal and Policy Workgroup Report. Motion was made and seconded.

Motion was made and seconded. There being no further discussion:

Yay: Unanimous

Oppose: None

Abstain: None

Motion so carried.

As to Vote NYC 16 Recommendation: Discussion was had. The Legislative Committee will invite Alfred Kurland of Vote 16 NYC to make a presentation to the Community Board in September 2024 before the Board renders a Recommendation as to 16 year olds voting in NYS as CB16 has just acquired 25 new Board Members in April 2024 who have not yet had the opportunity to hear the presentation from Mr. Kurland.

As to the Cannabis Recommendation, the Board will review the Cannabis documentations provided and will vote on the Cannabis Recommendation for 180 Rockaway Avenue at the June Board Meeting NYS as CB16 has just acquired 25 new Board Members in April 2024 who have not yet had the opportunity to review the several cannabis documents that they recently received..

Motion was made and seconded. There being no further discussion:

Yay: Unanimous

Oppose: None

Abstain: None

Motion so carried

Chairperson of the 2024-2025 Nominating Committee, Pamela Junior-Baptiste, gave the CB16 Executive Committee Report and Slate for 2024-2025.

The 2024-2025 Nominating Committee Members were introduced to the Membership.

The Nominating Committee met on May 16th, 2020 and discussed candidates to fill the CB16 Executive Committee Member positions for the period of June 1st, 2024 to June 1st, 2025. We recommend the following candidates.

For Chairperson, Margaret Brewer

For the 1st Vice Chairperson, Adrainer Coleman

For the 2nd Vice Chairperson, Debra Williams

For Secretary, Marie Pierre – Ms. Pierre did not accept her name as Secretary

For Treasurer, there is no Nominee

For Parliamentarian, Karlana Hamblin.

The committee considered the following criteria for nomination

1. The number of years the member has served on the board;
2. The member actively serving on at least one committee of the board; and
3. Is the member in regular attendance at community Board and Committee meeting.

Thank you. The floor is now open for further nominations. Board Members were informed that they can nominate themselves for a CB16 Executive Committee Member position from the floor or can nominate another Board Member for a position. Names for each position was called three (3) times by the Nominating Committee Chair before that particular position was closed to further Nominees.

Names called from the Floor:

Chairperson – Genese Morgan

1st Vice Chairperson – Margaret Brewer

2nd Vice Chairperson – Adrainer Coleman

Secretary – Debra Williams

Treasurer – NONE

Parliamentarian – Balinda Harris and Jere Upshire

As there were names called from the Floor, the Nominating Committee Chair apprised the Board Members that the vote for each Executive Committee position would take place at the June Board Meeting at which time each Nominee would make a presentation for the position that they were a nominee for.

Madam Chairperson Morgan asked for a Motion to accept the Nominating Committee Report. Motion was made by Marie Pierre and seconded by Tisha Atkins Jones.

VOTE:

Greetings from Councilmember Darlene Mealy: Councilmember Mealy congratulated all the new CB16 Board Members and expressed to them the importance of attending meetings, participating in discussions and voting on issues before the Community Board. Councilmember Mealy also inquired as to the status of the CB16 District Manager and was apprised that CB16 has made an offer and that the new CB16 District Manager would be announced to the community shortly as CB16 is in the process of getting all of the paperwork in order. Councilmember Mealy also informed the community that she was partnering with the 79th Precinct for a Juneteenth event. The community was informed that June is Gun Violence Awareness Month. The community discussed problems with gun violence in the community and were made aware of programs in reference to Gun Violence Awareness Month that would be held in Brooklyn. Lastly, Councilmember Mealy discussed the different programs that her office had available to the community to include free immigration lawyers, summonses on homes and her next community meeting which would be held on May 29th at 309 Ralph Avenue.

Greetings from a Representative from Brooklyn Borough President Antonio Reynoso's office were made. On May 22nd from 1pm-6pm Con Edison will be having a Customer Assistance Day and will be able to answer questions as to how to understand your rates and where you can sign up for payment options. The Borough President will also be having a Community Board Swearing-in Ceremony on June 24th @ 6:30pm for ALL New Community Board Members, which will be in-person and virtual.

Greetings from Mr. Templeton. Mr. Templeton brought to the attention of the Community Board that his organization has grants for training and they will be hosting their meeting at the Academy of Urban Planning and Engineering on May 30th. Mr. Templeton further informed the community that they are working on projects for offshore wind will include developing factories and community residents having jobs at the end of the training.

Greetings from Malcolm McDaniel of NYC Mayor Adam's Office. Mr. McDaniel brought greetings from Mayor Eric Adams. Mr. McDaniel apprised the community that he is available to assist the Community Board and provided his contact information.

There being no further presentations, Madam Chairperson Morgan entertained a Motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was made by Margaret Brewer and seconded.

Meeting ended at 10:07pm.