

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING
New York City Loft Board Public Meeting

November 20, 2025

The meeting began at 2:07 PM

Attendees: Charles DeLaney, Tenant Representative; Heather Roslund, Public Member; Elliott Barowitz, Public Member; Lenny Singletary, Manufacturer Representative; Samira Rajan, Public Member, Linda Rzesniowiecki, Owner's Member and Chief Emanuela Rogers, FDNY and Guillermo Patino, Chairperson Designee.

INTRODUCTION:

Chairperson Patino welcomed those present to the public meeting of the New York City Loft Board on November 20, 2025. He briefly summarized Section 282 of the New York State Multiple Dwelling Law, which established the New York City Loft Board, and described the general operation of the Board as consistent with Article 7-C of the New York State Multiple Dwelling Law.

VOTE ON MEETING MINUTES – October 16, 2025 - Public Meeting

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any corrections or comments to the October 16, 2025 minutes.

Mr. DeLaney asked when we would have the fire egress certification numbers.

Ms. Cruz responded that the numbers would be provided in January.

Mr. DeLaney asked about the status of the online portal for submissions to the Law Department for rules.

Ms. Cruz responded that the Loft Board used the portal for the first time recently.

Chairperson Patino then asked for a motion to accept the October 16, 2025 minutes.

Mr. Singletary moved to accept, and **Mr. DeLaney** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Mr. Barowitz, Chief Rogers, Ms. Rajan, Mr. DeLaney, Mr. Singletary, Ms. Roslund, Chairperson Patino (8)
Members dissenting:	0
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink (1)
Members recused:	0

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1. Personnel

Ms. Cruz introduced David Montminy, the Loft Board's new Deputy Executive Director and Deputy General Counsel. David came to the Loft Board after spending 15 years at HPD litigating against owners for violations of the Housing Maintenance Code. He also helped start HPD's Anti-Harassment Unit. Between his time at HPD and the Loft Board, he stayed at home with his two young children and settled sibling disputes daily.

Ms. Cruz introduced Michael Diomede, the Loft Board's new paralegal. Michael comes to us from the Law Department, where he worked in the Child Support Division.

2. Legalization / Narrative Statement Conferences

Since the October Board meeting, we had 14 legalization/narrative statement conferences and 2 site visits.

3. Case Statistics

Despite our staffing shortages this year, we closed eighty-one (81) case dockets, and the Board removed eight buildings from its jurisdiction in 2025.

Ms. Cruz thanked the staff for their dedication to the work of the Loft Law.

THE CASES:

Reconsideration/Appeal Calendar:

Chairperson Patino announced the case on the reconsideration/appeal calendar as:

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
1.	16 Cypress Ave. Realty LLC	476-498 Jefferson Street, Brooklyn	R-0392
<i>The Loft Board denied the appeal application.</i>			

Ms. Oyegue presented this case.

Chairperson Patino stated there were to be two corrections to the proposed order. The first correction was in the second paragraph of page two, the name "Griesemer" was changed to a possessive "Griesemer's". The second correction is in the footnote on page 2. The word prove was changed to proof.

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any comments on the case and motion to accept the case, and for a second.

Mr. Barowitz moved to accept this case, and **Mr. DeLaney** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Mr. Barowitz, Chief Rogers, Ms. Rajan, Mr. DeLaney, Mr. Singletary, Ms. Roslund, Chairperson Patino (8)
Members dissenting:	0
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink (1)
Members recused:	0

Summary Calendar:

Chairperson Patino stated there is one (1) case on the summary calendar.

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
2.	David Coventry	473-475 Kent Avenue, Brooklyn	TR-1348 and PO-0060
<i>The Loft Board deemed the protected occupancy application withdrawn with prejudice.</i>			

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any comments on the case and for a motion to accept the case.

Mr. DeLaney moved to accept this case, and **Ms. Rajan** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Mr. Barowitz, Chief Rogers, Mr. DeLaney, Mr. Singletary, Ms. Rajan, Chairperson Patino (7)
Members dissenting:	Ms. Roslund (1)
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink (1)
Members recused:	0

Master Calendar:

Chairperson Patino stated there is one (1) case on the master calendar.

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
3.	Maria Nazor and Peter Mickle	544 West 27 th Street, New York	TR-1430 and PO-0175
<i>The Loft Board denies the protected occupancy and coverage applications.</i>			

Ms. Oyegue presented this case.

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any comments on the case and for a motion to accept the case.

Mr. Singletary moved to accept this case, and **Ms. Roslund** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Mr. Barowitz, Chief Rogers, Mr. Singletary, Ms. Rajan, Ms. Roslund, Chairperson Patino (7)
Members dissenting:	Mr. DeLaney (1)
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink (1)
Members recused:	0

Chairperson Patino introduced Howard Edelbaum, the Loft Board's auditor, and stated that the purpose of the presentation was to give a brief overview of the Loft Board's auditing of applications for rent adjustments based on compliance costs and share ideas and suggestions to simplify and improve the application process for these rent adjustments.

RENT ADJUSTMENT CODE COMPLIANCE AUDIT PROCESS

1. Overview

Under the Loft Law, property owners must convert their commercial or manufacturing buildings to legal residential buildings. Tenants are required to share in the reasonable and necessary construction costs if owners apply for rent adjustments based on the construction and other related costs. These applications must be submitted within nine months of the issuance of the residential certificate of occupancy. The application filing must include proof of payment of the expenses attributed to legalization of the residential units and the common areas.

2. Audit Process

The audit process is documentation heavy. Owners must submit extensive records, including detailed cost breakdowns for each residential unit, the common areas, and if relevant, the commercial spaces. These costs may also include architectural, legal, and filing fees but the focus of the presentation would be on the construction costs of the audit.

3. Chart of Necessary and Reasonable Costs

The application requires that owners complete what's known as the Chart of Necessary and Reasonable Costs. This chart is a comprehensive list of every single expense associated with construction, for every residential unit, common space, and commercial area. The chart's main purpose is twofold: first, to demonstrate that each expense was necessary for code compliance, and second, to verify that every charge is reasonable.

4. Cost Calculation Using Outdated Price List

For each expense, such as installing a door, a sink, or a window, the owner must provide the vendor's name, invoice number, date, quantity, and the amount actually paid. This is where the process gets technical. The Loft Board still uses a price list from 1977 to set the maximum recoverable cost for every item. There has never been an update to this list. Instead, the Board uses an inflation index to bring those 1977 prices up to present-day values and applies a fixed constant of 1.283, which has itself been in place since 1990.

5. An Example of Cost Calculation

An owner purchases a 40-gallon electric hot water heater to be installed in a unit. On the *Chart of Necessary and Reasonable Costs*, the owner must list the vendor from whom the hot water heater was purchased, attach the invoice, and show the actual cost of the item, which in this example was \$1,600.00.

- A. The 1977 maximum cost for this item is \$450.46. This amount is multiplied by the index factor of 3.125, which represents the inflation rate as of the installation date. The result, \$1,407.69, is called the Index Maximum.
- B. The Index Maximum (\$1,407.69) is then divided by 1.283 to determine the Adjusted Index. In this example, the Adjusted Index is \$1,097.19.
- C. The owner must record whichever amount is lower - the Adjusted Index or the actual amount spent. The lower figure becomes the Allowable Cost.

In this case, since the Adjusted Index of \$1,097.19 is less than the actual cost of \$1,600.00, the Allowable Cost is \$1,097.19.

6. Audit Submissions

To apply for the rent adjustment based on code compliance costs, the owner submits the form, and the supporting documentation to the Loft Board. Initial submissions are often incomplete, or the calculations are inaccurate. For example, in one audit involving twenty-three (23) units, I received three large boxes containing thousands of pages. On review, I found the Chart of Necessary and Reasonable Costs was calculated incorrectly - the index factor and 1.283 constant weren't applied at all. This triggered a lengthy round of communication between attorneys, the owner, and the Loft Board causing processing delays. Even after the chart was revised, the index rate used was incorrect and required yet another revision. On top of that, invoices and payment records were missing. The example underscored how, before the Loft Board can even begin to determine rent adjustments, procedural and documentation issues delayed an audit.

7. Audit – Next Steps

The first step in every audit is to confirm receipt and completeness of all required documents. Once this is done, the Loft Board must review the chart line by line, often dozens of items for each unit, matching each expense with a valid vendor invoice. The next steps include:

- Confirming the date when the work was done.
- Verifying that each charge applies to the correct unit or area.

8. Document Review and Verification

The remainder of the process falls into several main stages:

- Document Review: Each expense is checked for completeness, looking for a matching invoice, proof of payment, and all vendor details.
- Cost Verification: Every line item is compared against the 1977 price chart, indexed for inflation and adjusted using the 1.283 constant.
- Allocation: Costs must be proportionally divided among residential units, common areas, and commercial spaces. This requires calculating what fraction of the building is used for residential use. For example, if residential floor space is 3,295 square feet out of a total of 13,000 square feet, which would be 26%, then 26% of common area costs should be billed to the tenants. So, all common area costs are multiplied by 0.26 to calculate the share allocated to residential tenants. Expenses for commercial areas are only allowed if they directly benefit tenants.

9. Additional Charges and Amortization

After totaling the construction costs several other charges are considered:

- Municipal fees

- Architectural and engineering fees (which must be documented) - using whichever is lower: the actual total fees or 7% of the allowable construction costs.
- Legal fees - again, whichever is lower: the actual total fees or 7% of allowable construction costs.
- Any extraordinary legalization costs, using the lower of the total incurred or 7.5% of allowable construction costs.
- Amortization comes next: The per-unit total is divided by one hundred and twenty (120), so increased rent can be spread over ten (10) years and remain manageable. If the owner includes financing costs, the term is extended to 15 years.

10. Preparation of Audit Findings

Once the rent adjustments for each unit are determined, tenant letters must be prepared for every unit. Each letter outlines the findings, all supporting documentation, and guides tenants through the objection process.

The tenant letters include the calculations used to determine the initial legal regulated rent including how the Rent Guidelines Board (RGB) increases are applied. The letters also outline how the rent adjustments based on code compliance costs are calculated. This transparency helps tenants understand the rent owed and ensures that all adjustments are consistent with governing law. The rent adjustment based on code compliance costs does not become part of the regulated rent, but it is additional rent that must be paid.

In accordance with Loft Board regulations, tenants are offered leases under the same terms as rent-stabilized tenants. Each tenant has the right to choose either a one-year or two-year lease term. If no selection is made within the required time, the lease automatically defaults to a one-year term. The tenant letters will also explain the retroactive and prospective rent payments.

Retroactive Increase: Pursuant to 29 RCNY § 2-01(k)(1), the retroactive increase begins on the first day of the month following the issuance of the residential certificate of occupancy and continues through the end of the month that the final rent order is served by the Loft Board. Tenants must begin paying the retroactive increase the following month after ten (10) days following service of the final rent order. For example, if a Certificate of Occupancy was issued in January and the Loft Board mailed its final order on October 10th, the retrospective period would run from February 1 through October 31, with the new prospective rent taking effect November 1.

Prospective Increase: This increase is calculated by dividing the total approved code-compliance costs for each unit by 120 months (10 years), resulting in a monthly charge. For example, if the Loft Board approves sixty thousand (\$60,000) in allowable code-compliance costs, the monthly prospective increase would be five hundred (\$500) a month ($\$60,000 / 120 \text{ months} = \500).

11. Audit Challenges

The audit process is labor-intensive and plagued by recurring issues: missing invoices, incorrect application of index factors, omitting the constant, or charging costs to the wrong unit. Every mistake or missing document triggers a time-consuming communication loop

between the auditor, attorney, and owner. This back-and-forth can draw out an audit for months.

Complicating matters, many owners pay expenses from several different bank accounts - sometimes under more than one company name - which makes expense tracking difficult. Not only does missing or inaccurate records delay the process, but the use of an outdated methodology and a forty-eight-year-old cost chart only makes matters worse. Items like HVAC installations, roof replacements, or accessibility lifts, which weren't even included in the 1977 chart, must be researched individually by the Loft Board to determine whether they were reasonable and necessary costs.

The process is clearly overdue for modernization. Current reliance on an old cost chart and a long-standing constant creates inefficiency, inconsistency, and adds unnecessary time and cost.

12. Proposed Reforms

Here are several specific reforms to help modernize and streamline this system:

1. Eliminate the Chart of Necessary and Reasonable Costs and instead require the owner's architect to provide a written justification explaining why any high-end items, perhaps those costing over \$5,000, are necessary. The reasonableness of each cost would then be determined using certified cost benchmarking software. This approach would help prevent the approval of inflated or unsupported charges.
2. Simplify auditing by excluding minor expenses under a set threshold. The administrative time and legal fees saved would outweigh the minor costs involved, making the process more efficient overall.
3. Mandate a dedicated bank account for all legalization funds, with monthly statements and all invoices submitted to the Loft Board. This reform would dramatically increase transparency and speed up verification.
4. Move to online document submission and end the requirement to deliver boxes of paper materials. This mirrors the best practices of modern audit firms, which use secure digital portals to track documentation, automate calculations, and catch errors early. This would minimize paper use, reduce email delays and back-and-forth correspondence, and result in faster, clearer audits.
5. These suggestions would improve the process for owners and the Loft Board. Owners would save on legal fees and the Loft Board could charge an application fee that would support the creation of an online portal system for these applications and implementation of the software that would supply reasonable costs for construction in real-time, allowing for the elimination of the old price list, the inflation index, and constant. This approach would cut down on paperwork drastically and decrease the time it takes to do an audit. Adopting these reforms would align the Loft Board's audit process with current standards in accounting and compliance.

13. Conclusion

In closing, it's important to remember the goal of any audit, not to punish either side, but to achieve fairness. Tenants deserve transparency and confidence that the rent adjustments are justified; owners deserve clarity and a prompt path to recover legitimate costs. The Loft Law was designed to balance both interests: safe, legal housing and fair expense recovery. Unfortunately, today's audit system is still anchored to outdated prices, formulas, and procedures that don't reflect the realities of modern construction. The true cost of this inefficiency is not just in wasted time and increased legal fees, but also in delayed recoupment and growing frustration for everyone involved.

By embracing digital tools, streamlining approval procedures, and enhancing oversight, this system can be transformed into one that is efficient, and equitable. Modernizing the process will strengthen transparency and trust in the Loft Board's work. Ultimately, the Loft Law's purpose is to guarantee safe, legal homes for tenants while ensuring that owners can recover legitimate and well-documented costs. By updating the system, we can make the process fair, accurate, and efficient, not only for owners and tenants, but also for the Loft Board and the community at large.

Mr. Barowitz asked if we could update the price list.

Mr. Edelbaum agreed that an updated list was necessary. The costs must be updated, and the new items must be added to the list. **Mr. Edelbaum** also suggested that labor and other additional expenses should be added. The use of software that would assist with this process.

Ms. Roslund asked if there was a way to connect the auditing process to the narrative statement process. During the narrative statement process, the parties develop a scope of work for each apartment, the common areas, and the commercial spaces and an infrastructure can be created based on the scope of work. As the expenses are paid, the owner can plug the numbers in.

Mr. Edelbaum agreed that would be a great idea. If it were automated, the prices for the items could be updated automatically. Responded that technologically it is possible, but that he couldn't do that, but that would be a great idea for price to be updated automatically. If we did that, then the whole process of how we do audits would be completely transformed. The audit time would be drastically reduced.

Ms. Roslund stated that with this system, audits for construction costs could be calculated in real time. She also asked who is deciding on whether this update is going to happen? How does it get implemented?

Ms. Cruz responded that rulemaking is required.

Ms. Rzesniowiecki asked if the Board is required to vote on the application.

Ms. Cruz responded that the application would have to be updated and noted that before the Board's drafting new rules, there must be an agreement about what the rules should be. The presentation was an introduction to the rent adjustment process. She agreed to provide the relevant rules to the Board.

Ms. Roslund asked if this software exists.

Mr. Edelbaum responded that there are a few, and each has a different specialty. Free software is not robust. There is software that does calculations in real time. If it were programmed to match the narrative statement process, and numbers are put in real time, then what could happen, is one of the reasons it is suggested to have a separate bank account, is that as they pay expenses, they would submit those invoices or a bank statement at the end of every month. By the end of the construction project, the audits would almost be complete.

Mr. Barowitz commented that he has been a proponent of artist housing and supports changes that would improve fairness in the process because New York City needs housing.

Mr. Edelbaum agreed the proposed changes would make the process fairer. Owners will begin receiving the recoupments sooner and tenants would benefit because they will have information about the potential recoupments early in the process with the understanding that the costs are necessary and reasonable.

PROPOSED RULE CHANGES

Chairperson Patino requested that we now turn to a discussion on several proposed rules, which include the proposed amendments to Title 29 of the Rules of the City of New York, Sections 2-01.1, Section 2-08(s), Section 2-11.1, and Section 2-12. Ms. Cruz will start the discussion about the proposed changes.

Ms. Cruz summarized the proposed changes:

Section 1 would amend the definition of “Article 7-B Compliance” in § 2-12 to remove the option of filing a sworn statement from an architect or professional engineer and the option of submitting DOB records of alterations as evidence of compliance with the fire and safety standards of Article 7-B of the Multiple Dwelling Law.

Section 2 would amend § 2-01.1(b)(6) of 29 RCNY to clarify a date referenced in § 2-01.1(b)(6)(i).

Section 3 would amend § 2-01.1(b)(6) of 29 RCNY to add a new subparagraph (vi). This new subparagraph would provide an enforcement mechanism against Owners, Landlords, or Responsible Parties of IMD buildings that filed a sworn certification of Article 7-B compliance but have not obtained a residential certificate of occupancy. Any such Owner, Landlord, or Responsible Party would have to obtain a temporary or final certificate of occupancy within twelve (12) months from the effective date of these amended rules. If the temporary or final residential certificate of occupancy is not obtained within this time frame, the Loft Board may pursue enforcement and impose fines.

Section 4 would amend § 2-11.1(b)(5) of 29 RCNY:

1. To add a fine for the failure to file a narrative statement after filing the alteration application with the DOB for the legalization work required under Article 7-C.

2. To remove the cure period for failure to file a timely quarterly legalization report on the Loft Board form.

3. To add an incremental annual penalty for failure to obtain a temporary or final residential certificate of occupancy within twelve months after the effective date of this amended rule; and

4. To make corrections to the sections of law referenced in the penalty schedule.

Ms. Cruz asked if there were comments or suggestions.

Mr. DeLaney wanted to confirm if these are not yet public documents.

Ms. Cruz responded that these are not yet public documents.

Mr. DeLaney asked when can they be shared with the public?

Ms. Cruz responded that if there are no changes to the proposals and we were ready for publication and a hearing of these proposals, it would become public. The Law Department issued preliminary certification. However, if there are significant changes, the rules must be sent to the Law Department for a new certification.

Mr. DeLaney opined that the proposed amendments are doing two things: first, the Board is removing the architect's affirmation and the DOB records as proof of Article 7B compliance and second, the proposed changes are setting rules for how that the thirty-two (32) identified thus far buildings will have to proceed because they used the affirmation as proof of Article 7B compliance.

Mr. DeLaney opined that twelve (12) months is too long. He suggested six (6) months and noted that once these rules are public, the Loft Board should notify the thirty-two (32) buildings identified thus far and these owners should act quickly. The rule might go into effect in April, May, or June of 2026, and to give owners to April, May, or June of 2027 to comply seems overly generous.

Ms. Rzesniowiecki agreed that a notice should be sent to the owners prior to the effective date of the proposed rule but disagreed that a year from the effective date was too much time. She stated that an owner should be given an opportunity to explain what steps have been taken and the obstacles encountered because the Article 7-B certificate may no longer be accurate.

Mr. Singletary asked if circumstances have changed, why hasn't there been any progress on legalization.

Ms. Cruz stated she has concerns about shortening the time-period. What if it's not the same owner? What if tenants made changes in their spaces that could affect legalization?

Ms. Roslund asked if there could be a series of steps?

Mr. DeLaney stated that if more time is needed, let them apply for an extension.

Ms. Cruz stated that it would require more rulemaking.

Mr. DeLaney commented that if we notify the thirty-two (32) owners now that we're moving in this direction, if we give them twelve (12) months in the rule, that is way into the year 2027. That seems excessive.

Ms. Cruz responded ok.

Mr. Singletary asked what is the benefit of removing the cure period for the quarterly reports?

Ms. Cruz stated that there are owners that will only file after they receive a Loft Board violation.

Mr. Singletary asked if this was meant to be a means of removing the obstacle to enforcement?

Ms. Cruz responded yes and further added that these reports are essential in determining whether to grant a letter of no objection.

Mr. DeLaney made a motion to change the twelve (12) to six (6).

Mr. Barowitz asked if it was possible to make the change.

Mr. DeLaney asked Mr. Barowitz to second the motion.

Chairperson Patino suggested that the Board make the time change after the public hearing.

Mr. DeLaney stated he would like us to vote to amend what we put out there is six (6) months and if there are good reasons why it should be longer, we can consider it.

Mr. Singletary commented that if there is a new owner with a new legalization plan, the new owner will now be in a predicament to get the legalization done in a shorter time.

Mr. DeLaney stated that by being a new owner, that would give grounds to seek an extension based on being a new owner.

Ms. Cruz responded yes and noted that an extension is only for one year. It is possible that in year two of a new ownership, the relatively new owner will be required to get their residential certificate of occupancy in six (6) months because fifteen (15) years ago the then-architect certified that the building was 7-B compliant.

Ms. Cruz added that the fine amounts are sizable. If the time is shortened to six months, she suggested that the proposed fines be reduced.

Mr. Singletary asked when it is stated, one is supposed to file for an extension; what is the period for the extension?

Ms. Cruz responded that a new owner could file within three months of acquiring title.

Mr. Singletary asked the extension goes for how long?

Ms. Cruz responded one year.

Mr. DeLaney stated there was a motion on the table.

Chairperson Patino responded that we are going to amend and move forward and vote on both rules together.

Ms. Cruz introduced the discussion for the proposed changes to the protected occupancy rule and noted that the proposed amendments would codify the Loft Board's precedent by adding that no single one document will determine the outcome, including a tax return.

Mr. DeLaney commented about Section iii and read the section: "The Loft Board should consider all relevant evidence presented, including but not limited to", Section C says, "whether the individual listed the IMD unit as a residential address on official documents filed with government agencies. Such documents may include, but are not limited to, a tax return, and we're adding employment records, school records and bank records" and noted the bank records are not usually with government agencies.

Ms. Cruz responded good point.

Ms. Rzesniowiecki suggested crossing out the word "filed with government agency".

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any other comments on the rules?

Chairperson Patino stated seeing none, can we get a motion to move forward with scheduling the two bills presented before us for a public hearing with the amendments we discussed today, which is amending the First Amendment Section 201.1(b)(6), to shorten the time period time period to obtain a final residential certificate of occupancy to six (6) months from the twelve (12) months in the proposed rule. The Second Amendment Section 208 (s), to remove the terms filed with government agencies, in section 208.

Ms. Rzesniowiecki asked if we can have separate votes on the amendments.

Chairperson Patino stated motion to move forward with the proposed amendments to Sections 2-01.1, 2-11.1 and 2-12 with the shorten the period from twelve (12) months to six (6) months.

Chairperson Patino asked is there a motion to move forward with the proposed amendments.

Mr. DeLaney moved to accept this case, and **Mr. Barowitz** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Mr. Barowitz, Mr. DeLaney, Ms. Roslund, Chairperson Patino (4)
Members dissenting:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Chief Rogers, Mr. Singletary (3)
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink, Ms. Rajan (2)
Members recused:	0

Chairperson Patino stated motion to move forward with the proposed amendments to Section 2-08 (s) as amended. We are also removing the term "filed with government agencies" in 2-08 subparagraph 3, item (C). It will read:

Whether the individual listed in the IMD unit listed the IMD as a residential address on official documents. Such documents may include, but are not

limited to, a tax return, employment records, school records, bank records, motor vehicle registration, driver's license or a voter registration.

Chairperson Patino asked is there a motion to move forward with the proposed rules?

Ms. Rzesniowiecki moved to accept this case, and **Mr. Singletary** seconded.

The vote:

Members concurring:	Ms. Rzesniowiecki, Chief Rogers, Mr. DeLaney, Mr. Singletary, Ms. Roslund, Chairperson Patino (6)
Members dissenting:	Mr. Barowitz (1)
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	Ms. Piscopink, Ms. Rajan (2)
Members recused:	0

Mr. Barowitz stated that the NYS Court of Appeals heard arguments in the litigation brought by the Soho Noho Coalition.

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any further comments. Hearing none, he ended the meeting at 3:28 pm and announced that the next public meeting will be on January 15, 2026.