

FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Beverly Donohue, Chair

November 1, 2022, at 6:30 PM via ZOOM

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=KZOIQzKkZEc

Present: Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Alex Bell, Kristen Berger, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Joshua Cohen, Christian Cordova, Kevin Corte, Kenneth Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Beverly Donohue, Sheldon Fine, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Audrey Isaacs, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Blanche Lawton, Sara Lind, Ira Mitchneck, Klari Neuwelt, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Seema Reddy, Andrew Rigie, Madge Rosenberg, Melissa Rosenberg, Peter Samton, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer, Ethel Shefffer, Polly Spain, Erana Stennett, Kristina Villarini, Benjamin Wu and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** Daniela Alvarado, Robert Espier, Sonia Garcia, Madelyn Innocent and Anthony Thomas.

Chair's Report:

- Beverly Donohue convened the meeting promptly at 6:01PM.
- She began by reading a prepared statement, signed by the Executive Boards (last year and this year's jointly), which expressed regrets for the unfortunate incident that occurred at the last full board meeting on Oct. 3, 2022, expressed deep regrets to those harmed by the incident, and protocols put in place to prevent any other incidents from occurring.
- Other items from the Chair's Report included new co-chairs of committees; two shout-outs to Roberta Semer for all her hard work regarding the new Member's Handbook and CB7's Budget Requests for 2024; reconstituting the bylaws task force for some potential additions.

District Manager's Report:

- Maxwell Vandervliet gave an update on personnel matters, and also thanked Roberta Semer for her hard work.

Minutes:

Minutes from the previous Full Board meeting were seconded and approved.

Public Session *(began at 6:45PM)*

Among those who spoke were Steve Anderson (W. 81 St. Block Association); Borough President Mark Levine; Eleni De Siervo (Lincoln Center); Assemblymember Linda Rosenthal, Peter Arndsten (ED Columbus Amsterdam BID), Zachary Campbell (AMNH); Council Member Gale Brewer; Assemblymember Brad Hoylman, Eric Strazza (Office of Alvin Bragg); Hanna Weirnerman, (Office of Jerry Nadler); Jessica Mates, (Manhattan Borough President's office); Sophia Secor (Senator Serrano's office). Additionally, two people spoke about the loud noise emanating from Tavern on the Green to residents on Central Park West.

Business Session *(began at 7:44 PM)*

Transportation Committee, Andrew Albert and Ben Wu, co-chairs

1. **Re: 520 West End Avenue for legalization of garbage enclosures on W. 85th St. side yard.**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/ Manhattan approves petition EIN# 74-3248472 to the Department of Transportation for legalization of the construction, maintenance, and use of three (3) double metal garbage enclosures on the north Sidewalk of West 85th Street in front of the side yard.

Vote: 36-0-1-0.

Business & Consumer Issues Committee, Christian Cordova and Benjamin Wu, Co-Chairs

2. **Re: 430 Amsterdam Avenue (W. 81-W.82 Sts) Method of Operation application to the SLA for two-year liquor license by Third Avenue Restaurant, Inc d/b/a Jake's Dilemma. Requesting to add a Disk Jockey and Live Music to their operations.**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/ Manhattan approves Method of Operation application to the SLA for two-year liquor license by Third Avenue Restaurant, Inc d/b/a Jake's Dilemma. Requesting to add a Disk Jockey and Live Music to their operations.

Vote: 35-0-1-1.

Preservation Committee, K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairs

3. **Re: 433 Amsterdam Avenue d/b/a RA Sushi (West 81st) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage at storefront cornice with bottom-lit illumination, Illuminated Signage Behind Storefront Glass and vinyl sign on glass door.**

Application to withdraw and referred back to committee.

Vote: No vote.

4. Re: 36 West 85th Street (Columbus Avenue - Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness to infill a portion of the existing "L" rear yard extension and increase the depth of the upper floor rear facade; restore the front stoop; replace existing double-hung windows with casement window and expand an existing rooftop addition.

This resolution is based on the following facts:

- The subject building is a 5-story plus basement townhouse constructed ca. 1897 in the Georgian/Renaissance Revival style by architect George F. Pelham. It is included in and contributing to the Upper West Side – Central Park West Historic District.
- The front façade is primarily composed of light-colored common brick with stone accents and ornamentation, with curved trios of bay windows on the parlor and second floors.
- The rear façade is common red brick with minimal ornamentation. The rear façade includes a typical “L” extension on its east side.
- The front façade application includes replacing the existing modern 1:1 double-hung windows with wood singlepane casement windows; replacing the existing non-historic door with a door matching neighboring buildings and composed of a large rectangular pane of glass with trim surrounding. The front façade work also includes refurbishment of the existing stoop and repair of stone ornamentation and details.
- The rear façade application includes infilling the void to the west of the existing L extension and extending the plane of the existing rear facade to a depth of 30’ from the rear lot line, while retaining the L extension at its current depth.
- The revised extended rear façade would cover the entire height of the rear of the building.
- The fenestration for the revised rear façade is to consist of pairs of operable casement windows with lintels above and with faux divided light. The punched casement windows on the top floor would retain the curved decorative detail above the existing windows in lieu of a lintel to match the windows below.
- The revised rear façade would replicate the brick corbelling/cornice detail at the top of the façade.
- The application also includes a proposed expansion of an existing rooftop bulkhead (and coordinated increases in the height of existing chimneys to conform to code). The revised structure would continue to be less than half the width of the rooftop.
- The proposed front façade repair and refurbishment work, including the replacement front door, as well as the expansion of the rooftop bulkhead, are reasonably appropriate to the character of this townhouse and the Historic District of which it is a part.
- The full-height rear façade extension, together with its bulk, fenestration details and overall impression, are not appropriate to the character of this building or the Historic District of which it is a part.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/ Manhattan resolves as follows with respect to this project:

- A. Approves** the application with respect to the proposed front façade restoration and rooftop bulkhead expansion as appropriate to the character of the Historic District; and
Vote A: 37-0-0-0.
- B. Disapproves** the application with respect to the full-height rear façade extension, window replacement and related details as not appropriate to the character of the Historic District.
Vote B: 31-5-1-1.

5. 48 West 85th Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story rooftop addition and replacement of the rear façade.

This resolution is based on the following facts:

- The rooftop addition and the rear façade are not visible from the public way.
- The rooftop addition will consist of a 20’ x 20’ penthouse set back 20’ from the front and 25” from the rear rooflines.
- The rear facade will be red brick with proposed casement windows.
- The sense of the committee was that one-over-one windows on the rear façade would be appropriate and should consist of “bird proof” glass.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/ Manhattan approves the application as appropriate to the character of the building and the historic district conditioned on the installation of one-over-one “bird proof glass” windows on the rear façade.

Vote: 35-2-1-0.

6. 514 West End Avenue (85th Street) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new AC unit grilles.

This resolution is based on the following facts:

- The proposed grille is to the left and below an existing window since there is decorative masonry below the window.
- The proposed grille is the smallest size available and will be barely visible from the street.

Vote: 37-0-1-0.

Parks & Environment Committee, Natasha Kazmi and Susan Schwartz, Co-Chairs

7. Re: Riverside Park: Reconstruction of the two step ramps at West 78th Street

WHEREAS, the two step ramps at West 78th Street just inside Riverside Park, leading to the Rotunda and the waterfront, are in crumbling condition and severely out of ADA compliance, and

WHEREAS, the adjacent rotunda is currently under major long-term reconstruction, and as a result these two step ramps will not get much use for the next three or four years, and

WHEREAS, the project, which will start in early 2024, will add ADA-compliant handrails to the stairs, full-depth asphalt on the steps with bluestone risers, hex paver landings, and new plantings along the sides of the pedestrian walkway. In addition, small improvements to the immediate area will also be undertaken, such as ADA-compliant curb cuts at the 78th street entrance to the park, and the development of a new park volunteer-tendered area,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT CB7/Manhattan enthusiastically **approves** this project, which is much needed to improve the quality of visitor experience in this area of the park.

Vote: 37-0-0-0.

Health & Human Services Committee, Sheldon Fine, Chair

8. Re: Health Benefits of Mitigating Emergency Vehicle Siren Noise

Residents of our community are being negatively impacted by the frequency and significant noise of sirens from emergency response vehicles:

Police, fire, and ambulance sirens are frequently used at loud volumes during all hours of the day and night, and for continuous periods of time. Vehicles are using sirens when moving with traffic through green lights, or at times at night where there is reduced or minimal traffic, sometimes using multiple types of sirens which are even more disruptive. This has a tangible negative impact on the health of the community despite the intent of emergency vehicles to improve public health. In September 2022, Gale Brewer wrote an opinion piece on sirens’ impact on public health: “With so many working from home since the pandemic, the noise of sirens has become even more oppressive. Sirens perform a critical function, but they do not need to be so disruptive.” CB7 recognizes the importance of the use of sirens for emergency vehicles to help vehicles move expeditiously during emergencies. However, for the wellbeing of residents of our community and all New Yorkers, the use of sirens and disruptiveness of the siren noise needs to be reduced significantly as much as practically possible. Beyond the basic benefits of less disruption, siren-noise mitigation would have extensive health and economic benefits. 1. This barrage of excessive noise is more than unpleasant — it can cause anxiety, stress, high blood pressure, heart disease, other health problems and threatens public health 2. In September 2022, the EPA noted a federal, state, and local interest in the danger of noise to public health in urban areas, restating the relevant statutes in the US Code and Clean Air Act 3. Research done at Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in New Jersey found that people living in noisy areas had 3,336 heart attacks per 100,000 population, compared with 1,938 heart attacks per 100,000 for those in quieter neighborhoods — meaning that traffic racket triggered about 1 in 20 New Jersey heart attacks 4. A 2016 study by Tracy Swinburne at the University of Michigan School of Public Health concluded that a mere five-decibel reduction (less than the sound of leaves rustling in overall noise would reduce the prevalence of hypertension by 1.4 percent and coronary heart disease by 1.8 percent, saving \$2.4 billion annually in health costs and increasing economic productivity annually by \$1.5 billion 5. With around 8,500 NYPD, 2,000 FDNY, and 700 Department of Correction emergency vehicles active on our New York City streets, limiting the fleet’s noise would have a marked effect 6. An unmistakable irony is that, although sirens are often intended to reach people in need of medical help, they are themselves contributing to health problems Given these facts, it is important to address these health risks of sirens by: 1) Necessary Use. Limiting use of sirens as

necessary and during emergencies 2) Alternative Sirens. Leveraging technological developments of alternative sirens to reduce negative impact Necessary Use Given the negative impact on community health, it's important to establish rules to limit use of sirens unless necessary and during emergencies: 1. Emergency Use. Sirens should be used only when there is an emergency whereupon enabling the vehicle to pass through traffic quickly would have a benefit to the responder's ability to effectively resolve the emergency. Using sirens when there isn't a genuine emergency that can benefit from time savings is unnecessarily disruptive 2. Method of use. Even during emergency use, sirens should be limited when situations when a) there is traffic that the vehicle needs to pass through, or b) when passing through red lights to minimize risks of accidents. Emergency vehicles still can use lights to warn other people, and the operator should be able to use loud sound on and off only as needed. Leaving sirens on continuously for many minutes at a time is unnecessarily disruptive Alternative Sirens There are alternative technologies that continue to have efficacy in clearing traffic but limit noise pollution and thus the impact to community health. 1. Hi-Lo Sirens a. Based on European sirens, two-tone sirens are less disruptive because it moves back and forth between two fixed pitches, as opposed to across a frequency of sounds November 2022 Resolutions Page 4 of 6 Community Board 7/ Manhattan 2. Rumbler Siren a. The rumbler siren uses the same tone as a typical siren but at a much lower frequency. The rumbler transmits noise through high-output woofers and produces a vibrating sound as opposed to a shrieking one. A timer shuts off the tone after a short time, further reducing the duration b. The lower frequencies emitted by the rumbler better penetrate vehicles and are less detrimental to public health and quality of life compared to the tones of standard, wailing sirens c. One drawback is the rumbler siren noise heard inside the emergency vehicle is two decibels louder than it is outside of the car, subjecting first responders to more noise 3. Sound level. It is recommended that when operated at the maximum level these emergency signal devices create a sound level that does not exceed 90 dB when measured at a distance of fifty feet from the center of the forward face of such vehicle 4. Our noise complaints are not falling on "deaf ears." Councilmember Carlina Rivera and several other Councilmembers, including Gale Brewer, Shaun Abreu and Erik Bottcher are sponsoring legislation that would mandate the use of hi-lo, "two-tone" sirens by emergency response vehicles.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan requests that Mayor Adams and our City Council members take action to mitigate the effects on health and quality of life of our community residents, workers and visitors to our community as well as all New Yorkers, balanced with the need for emergency vehicles to respond quickly to emergencies.

FURTHERMORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan supports City Council legislation, Local Law - Int 286: Requiring an alternating two tone high and low signal on emergency vehicles.

FURTHERMORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan recommends specifically to our elected representatives that: 1. Use of sirens to be limited to emergency use, and during emergency use, sirens should only be turned on as necessary (e.g., passing through traffic or red lights). Particular attention should be reducing sirens during sleeping hours, e.g., 11am to 7am, when there is less traffic 2. In order to mitigate impact of siren use, the city should mandate that emergency responders use hi-lo as their default siren and cap sirens at 90 decibels and scale up their use of vibrating siren technology 3. City emergency response vehicles should allow the driver to toggle between hi-lo sirens and the vibrating low frequency sirens in response to traffic conditions 4. Institutions should enact policies to ensure that use of vehicle sirens, and the type and volume of sirens, are in compliance with the requirements. 5. Exploring additional policies, such as emphasizing the need for drivers to move for emergency vehicles during emergencies, could also be beneficial.

Vote: 37-0-0-0.

Youth, Education & Libraries Committee, Courtney Clark Metakis and Blanche Lawton, Co-Chairs

9. Responding to Ongoing Needs of District Schools Enrolling Students from Families of Asylum-Seekers

The following facts and concerns were taken into consideration:

New York City public schools have to date enrolled approximately 6,100 students since launching 'Project Open Arms' in August to address the needs of students whose families recently entered this country seeking asylum.¹

- Most of these families have arrived in New York City on buses from Texas, the result of a dispute over border and immigration policy between Texas Governor Greg Abbott and the White House.
- On October 7, 2022, NYC Mayor Eric Adams declared a state of emergency, calling for state and federal funding to help cover costs related to housing and services for the tens of thousands of people who have arrived on the

¹ <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/10/24/migrant-crisis-is-ultimate-test-of-nyc-schools-00062916>

buses from Texas since August. Mayor Adams has noted the influx is expected to send the population of the City's shelters well over 100,000— a city record – and cost up to \$1B during FY 2022-2023²

- Comptroller Brad Lander has estimated the City's school systems will need at least \$49M in additional funds to support schools which have enrolled students from asylum-seeking families, noting that current school budgets were based on enrollment estimates made prior to the arrival of buses in NYC.³
- As many as 120 students from asylum-seeking families are estimated to have already been placed in shelters within Community School District 3 and have been enrolled in schools within the district. The majority of these students have been enrolled in schools with dual-language Spanish-English programs, namely elementary schools PS 145, PS 165, as well as schools without those programs, PS 76 and PS 242. Older students have been placed at M247, the district's Spanish dual-language middle school.
- The oldest students have been placed in transfer high schools citywide. Citywide, only 5 transfer High Schools specifically serve ELLS and none of these are in Community Board 7.
- As the buses from Texas continue to arrive in New York City, more families are expected to be placed in shelters within CB7; it is thus likely that the City and the NYC Department of Education will be looking to place additional children in CSD3 schools.
- NYC public school rosters officially "close" on October 31st, 2022. Traditionally, schools whose final enrollments (i.e., as of 10/31) exceeded earlier estimations would be allocated Fair Student Funding for those additional students, with funds released in January. Conversely, any additions to school registers occurring after 10/31 do not trigger increases in funding to that school, even under the FSF formula, and even when the net addition of students is material. The rate at which these students from asylum-seeking families are arriving in schools exceed all previous norms. Moreover, the influx of these students is expected to continue apace with the bus arrivals, meaning school rosters will continue to expand well beyond the traditional October 31 st cut-off for FSF adjustments.

Community Board 7/Manhattan believes that the needs of these students, who often arrive unannounced and traumatized by their travels and ordeals, are immense – and acute – and schools to which these students are assigned cannot wait several months for the funding needed to provide the social-emotional and academic support these children require without compromising the education of both these newly-arrived students, as well as the education of the existing students already enrolled in the school. Schools which enroll these students will need immediate, real-time access to funding and other resources to support their new students and ensure their current students' experiences do not suffer as a result.

Additionally, this board notes that the experience at schools like PS 145 demonstrates the importance of placing these students at schools with existing dual Spanish-English language programs, and the presence of Spanish-speaking teachers and staff who have the requisite training, language skills, and experience to address the significant social-emotional and academic needs of these students. The commendable and at times heroic work of PS 145 earlier in calendar 2022 in meeting the needs of refugee families from war-torn Ukraine illustrate the need and the capacity to respond. CB7 posits that these factors are critical to the students' ability to transition to the school (and the schools' ability to capably handle the sudden influx of students) that they should take precedence over geographic proximity. Community Board 7/Manhattan notes that PS 145 was well-positioned to handle these students due to both its dual-language program and its status as a Title 1 school, meaning it had the experience, staff, and supports necessary to address issues similar to those experienced by students from asylum-seeking families. It is critical to note, however, that Title 1 and other schools with significant populations of students from lower-income families or those experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity often have strained resources even prior to the influx of additional students. Placing students from asylum-seeking families in Title 1 schools should not present an additional burden on these schools, hence the need for additional (and timely) funding support. Other lessons can be learned from the experience as PS 145, including the importance of selecting schools with open seats for after school childcare programs, or the need to provide funding and space to build out additional after school options.

² <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/10/07/nyregion/eric-adams-migrant-crisis-response.html#:~:text=Mayor%20Eric%20Adams%20declared%20a,of%20migrants%20from%20Latin%20America>.

³ <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/10/24/migrant-crisis-is-ultimate-test-of-nyc-schools-00062916>

Lastly, it should be acknowledged that while New York City is being asked to take on the fiscal and moral responsibility of welcoming and educating the children from families seeking asylum in this country, the underlying issue is – fundamentally – a dispute at the state and federal level. This crisis comes at a time at which this City is struggling to respond and recover from the effects of the COVID pandemic as the federal pandemic-relief funding is expiring. Even before the buses from Texas arrived, NYC children were facing steep budget cuts in our City's public schools, severe learning losses due to disrupted learning over the past 2 ½ years, and reductions to supplemental services due to expiring COVID-related federal funds.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **calls** on the Mayor, the Chancellor, and the NYC DOE to ensure that funding streams be made immediately available to the schools which have enrolled students from families of asylum-seekers up through October 31st.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Community Board 7/Manhattan **calls** on the Mayor, the Chancellor and the NYC DOE to reconsider and suspend and make more flexible traditional deadlines for roster-finalization and FSF allocations, given the likelihood that additional students requiring these heightened levels of support will continue to arrive in significant numbers in the months ahead.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT when considering the schools in which children of asylum-seeking families should be enrolled, Community Board 7/Manhattan calls on the Chancellor and the NYC DOE to weight geographic proximity below factors such as the presence of dual-language programming and experience/staffing sufficient to support children from lower-income families and those who have experienced homelessness and/or significant emotional trauma, and to provide funding for transportation between shelters and schools, where needed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 **calls** on the Mayor, Chancellor, and DOE to provide additional mental health services in the appropriate language at school to meet the needs of students who have arrived seeking asylum and students in temporary housing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **suggests** that factors such as available seats in afterschool programming be considered as part of the school selection process, and that funding to supplement existing afterschool programming or create new afterschool programs available for students be included, where necessary, to accommodate specifically the children of asylum-seekers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **calls** on our state and federally-elected leaders to provide the funding necessary to ensure New York City can continue to respond to the needs of both its newest students – and its existing student population.

Vote: 37-0-1-0.

Report from the Public Safety Task Force on Public Restrooms-Polly Spain

Polly Spain reported that a study of existing public restrooms was made, as led by Community Board 5, and found that there is limited access to many. Polly suggests we form a tri-board task force to attempt to have location input. The city is planning one accessible public restroom per zip-code, though some zip-codes overlap.

New Business

Mark Diller said that he was troubled by the incident that occurred last month during our meeting and wants to make a motion to amend the bylaws. He has written a proposed resolution which will be discussed at the December meeting.

With no further business, it was seconded and approved to adjourn, and the meeting ended at 9:05PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Barbara Adler & Linda Alexander,
Co-Secretaries*

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Andrew Albert and Howard Yaruss, Co-Chairpersons

November 7, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

The entire meeting can be viewed on YouTube at

Present: Andrew Albert and Howard Yaruss, Co-Chairs; Jay Adolf, Elizabeth Caputo, Ken Coughlin, Doug Kleiman, Sara Lind, William Ortiz, Andrew Rigie and Erana Stennett. **Chair:** Beverly Donohue. Non-Committee **Board Member:** Barbara Adler, Alex Bell, Mark Diller, Sheldon Fine, Michele Parker, Susan Schwartz and Roberta Semer. Board Office: Maxwell Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

Discussion of the cross town protected bike lanes will be deferred until the Parks and Environmental Committee Meeting.

Robert Semer - **Fiscal 2023 District Needs Statement and Budget priorities submitted. Fiscal year 2024** process to begin now and will be better tracked into a database. Reminder that when looking at budget priorities it is important to include constituents served, including photos and letters of recommendation. Request preliminary vote in June. More items can be added in the summer. Agencies may not have plans until late August and September. Requesting that everybody participate as best they can. Roberta is seeking ideas and recommendations.

Community remarks related to protected crosstown bike lanes

Michael van der Kloor in favor of protected bike lanes in New York City. Crosstown bike lanes going through the park are required. There should be an integrated network. Delineated lanes will improve traffic flow. Painted bike lanes do not provide adequate protection.

Debra Kerzhner - commutes northbound on CPW. Difficulties transferring from Hudson River Park Greenway to CPW because there are limited crosstown options. Biking with her children is difficult because there is no connection to the Hudson River Park Greenway because there are no protected paths.

Corenzo Wilkerson 64th Street & West End Avenue - proposed installation of accessible pedestrian ramps to make the area ADA compliant on all four corners of the intersection to make the curbs wheelchair accessible, pedestrian signals will be maintained, additional catch-basins installed. Design began last year, scheduled to finish design in June and out to bid in the summer with construction planned at the end of next year. DDC community outreach person will notify community residents and communicate start of construction, and the construction company will provide signage.

No bump-outs, the curb line remains the same. Curb extension criteria is required to shorten the crosswalk, involving sidewalk vaults, vehicle traffic.

Since this is a safety project, CB7 resolution is not required.

Howard Yaruss asks if the Community Board wants to call for a bulk-out here while DDC is doing the work.

Mark Dillier asked why this project requires community board notification. Mr. Wilkerson explained that at the southeast corner, the traffic signal pole will be moved, which will require coordination with utility companies. In response to a question as to why DDC is involved, it was explained that when a design is required DDC is the official agency.

Resolution to make this intersection safer by installing a bump out proposed by Ken Coughlin and seconded by Sara Lind.

Jay doesn't believe we have enough information explaining why NYCDOT did not believe this intersection met the criteria for a bump out, curb extension.

Peter Arndtsen - requested bump-outs in the Bloomingdale area, which was a long, drawn out process.

Roberta Semar doesn't feel we have enough information. Requested tabling until next month.

Ken Coughlin believes shortening cross walks save lives and we should request NYCDOT install the bump outs while the work is underway.

Howard suggested tabling the item until we have more information from NYCDOT.

Sheldon Fine - Community Board 7 endorses bump outs at 64th & West End Avenue as a desirable change on behalf of the community, looking at the feasibility and incorporating it into the design plan. Committee Members: 7-2-1 Non-Committee Board Members: 2-4-2

Mark Diller and Jay Adolf had also suggested tabling until we have NYCDOT criteria to be persuasive rather than reactive.

Resume discussion of protected crosstown bike lanes.

Andrew Rosenthal - suggest community board members familiarize themselves with the crash map website. There have been injuries due to unprotected bike lanes.

Juliette Faber - Lives on West 92nd Street - asked what is a protected bike lane. She was knocked off her bike by an e-scooter at 72nd Street & CPW. The scooter driver was later identified, but did not have insurance.

Patrick Weir - Lives on 108th Street & Amsterdam - the family rode their bikes to Heckscher Playground. Exited Central Park due to the marathon to ride to Riverside Park, but there were no protected bike lanes. The protected bike lanes on CPW are safer.

Merry Rutrick - Lives on the Upper Eastside and also supports protected crosstown bike lanes.

Paul Krikler - Lives on the Upper Eastside, member of CB8, speaking in his private capacity. Asked the Transportation Committee not to wait for a joint meeting with Parks, but to pass the resolution immediately. A woman was killed on East 85th Street because there were no protected bike lanes. Implored CB7 to support CB8 to add crosstown protected bike lanes.

Carl Mahaney- stated there are no protected bike lanes across the Upper Westside. A connected and protected network of bike lanes would make it possible for anyone who wants to ride their bikes safely and have a pleasant experience.

Carole Maisonneuve - does not live on the UWS, but spoke in support of river-to-river protected crosstown bike lanes.

Miriam Rozen - lives in the community. She rides a bike and her husband is disabled. Spoke in support of protected crosstown bike lanes and two-way lanes on CPW.

Matthew Munns - Lives on West 81st Street - electric cars are as dangerous as internal combustion cars.

Trevor Sheade - Lives on the UWS. He and his wife ride bikes. They support protected crosstown bike lanes every ten streets.

Christina Hansen - represents the horse drawn carriage union, opposed to intro 573 to remove the horse drawn carriages from Central Park and replace them with electric vehicles.

Howard Yaruss CB7 has a history of supporting the removal of cars from Central Park.

Elizabeth Caputo - glad this item will be discussed in two weeks.

Anne Gruber - What agency is responsible for enforcing the registration of moving vehicles.

Andrew Albert -New York State is responsible for registration of e-vehicles.

Jay Adolf said CB7 has been in support of registration, insurance, and enhanced enforcement.

Susan Schwartz asked what the projected MTA shortfall will be.

Andrew Albert by 2025 \$2.5 billion

Susan Schwartz asked how much it would cost to install protected bike lanes.

No one seemed to know the costs. Sara and Ken said it's a different pot of money, but the cost is significantly lower.

Andrew Albert - MTA Updates: Thousand of NYC Police Officers are now in the system. Ridership is up, 4 million just this past weekend. Ridership at 60% of pre-Covid percentages. Weekends are at the highest levels, with Mondays and Fridays the lowest with many employees working from home. MTA is at risk without congestion pricing. There will be a new facility below Grand Central/ Madison, with Long Island Railroad service on the east and west sides. Resilience plan in place for the next storm. Cameras will be coming to all subway cars. Preventive maintenance is working, with less breakdown. Estimated fare evasion 2022 costs \$550 million. A fare evasion task force has been set-up. Half fare and disable fare is now available on OMNY at <https://omny.info/> or Stone Street.

Mark Diller - Eastside Access for the Long Island Railroad - Is there service adjustment alerts?

Andrew, many riders may not have to switch to a subway, but service from Jamaica to Brooklyn may mean riders will have to switch up and over, but may instead stay on the subway or take a shuttle.

Ken asked about collection infrastructure. Andrew does not know the exact figure.

New Business

Peter Arndtsen - considering putting in **rolling lidded garbage cans** assigned to buildings for pest control. Will be reaching out to NYC Sanitation, NYC Health Department, NYC DOT, retail businesses, commercial haulers, building managers and service people. Will present to the District Service Cabinet in November. Three corals for ever block space. The cans were successful on West 108th Street.

Michelle said the Preservation Committee may be interested. The Committee will be reviewing a Certificate of Appropriate for metal lidded garbage cans.

What Peter is proposing is entirely different.

Susan Schwartz - question about **63rd Street westside drive** issue. Asked the committee to add this item to next month's agenda.

The **open street barricades** are still being stored on the southwest corner of 71st Street & Columbus.

Nicole Paynter said all the barricades will be removed.

Ken - invited Peter to the Parks & Environment Committee to talk about the bin proposal.

Doug - Big Nicks has been leased by Two Boots.

Doug asked if **Colleen from NYCDOT had been attending meetings**. Max stated Colleen attends the District Service Cabinet meetings and he and Jessie speak with her several times a week.

Lithium Ion batteries - Doug expressed concerns about the proliferation of residents storing their e-bikes and e-scooters in their apartment.

Andrew agreed it is a big safety issue.

Gale Brewer's Chief of Staff - there will be an NYC Council Oversight Committee meeting next Monday to discuss the Lithium Ion battery issue. Information will be shared with Max.

Barbara Adler - Police barricades can be offensive when they are left around after events. There is a number to call to have them removed.

Nicole explained the barricades used for Open Streets are owned by the BID. They will look for alternative storage locations next year.

GarbageStorage - Andrew Rigie - NYCDOT passed a new regulation, after 8pm commercial and residential buildings can leave garbage bags curbside, before 8pm the bags must be placed in containers. The city may have to provide space for commercial canisters.

Sewer Management - Wiliam Ortiz - proposed a joint meeting of the Public Safety Task Force, Transportation, and the Health and Human Services Committees to discuss flushing the sewer systems in preparation for the storm season.

The problem with clogged catch basins can be attributed to debris, and the city's old infrastructure. It was suggested to notify 311 about clogged basins.

The Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) works to keep the catch basins cleaned.

BUSINESS & CONSUMER ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Christian Cardova and Benjamin Wu, Co-Chairpersons

November 9, 2022 at 6:30 PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NiLlkhyCWSM>

Present: Christian Cardova and Benjamin Wu, Co-Chairs; Linda Alexander, Joshua T. Cohen, Doug Kleiman, Andrew Rigie, Erana Stennett and Anthony Thomas. Non-Committee Board Member: Barbara Adler and Aex Bell. **Absent:** Madelyn Innocent. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

1. **286 Columbus Avenue** (West 73rd – 74th Streets.) **Alteration application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by Kissaki UWS, LLC d/b/a To Be Determined. The proposed alteration is for an expansion to vacant adjoining space.** Presenting for the Applicant: Gary “Igor” Kanfer, LLC Managing Member, Garry@explorekissaki.com ; Dan MacPherson, Director, dan@explorekissaki.com

Comments:

- Applicant was previously approved by Community Board 7 for this application but due to construction delays they had to re-file their application with SLA and appear before the Community Board again. There has been no change to the applicant’s Method of Operation compared to what was originally approved by the Community Board, but they added a sushi bar at the adjacent space, 288 Columbus Avenue, which they took over.
- Community Board Member Erana Stennett asked if the outdoor roadway seating would be extended to the adjacent space at 288 Columbus Avenue. The applicant confirmed the expansion to the adjacent space.
- Neighbor Thomas Kelly expressed concerns about potential sound issues and expressed dislike for the aesthetics of their roadway seating.
- Former Community Board Member Mel Wymore explained that there is a cease-and-desist notice on the applicant’s roadway seating and stated that the committee should consider not voting on this application until the matters has been resolved. Jessie Nieves explained that DOT confirmed there are still open violations on the roadway seating. Applicant said they are addressing the issues in the cease-and-desist letter.
- Neighbor Shira Spiewak asked about the closing hours of operation on the application, which is 2:00am.
- Applicants agreed to share their personal contact information with neighbors and said they can contact them if they have concerns.
- Andrew Rigie provided some updates about the state of the Open Restaurants program and status of the permanent program being developed by the city.

*After due deliberation the resolution to **approve** was adopted*

Committee: 6-0-1-0. Non-Committee Board Member: 1-0-0-0.

2. **Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade**, Central Park West. Discuss the float formation site's proposed changes.

Comments:

- Will Coss (will.coss@macys.com) and Kathleen Wright from Macy’s and Dawn Tolson (dtolson@cityhall.nyc.gov) and Twanna Cameron (tcameron@cityhall.nyc.gov) from Citywide Events who oversees events like the Thanksgiving Day Parade and 4th of July Fireworks provided a presentation about the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade and what is new this year.
- Instead of an overnight build, they will build the setup and inflate the balloons on CPW during the day Wednesday and finish at 10pm, instead of working through the night until the event.
- Traffic will close on Wednesday at 7am instead of 12pm like past years. They believe this schedule is safer for workers to work during the day and will causes less noise, lights, and disruption throughout the night for residents.
- Eranna Stennet expressed concerned that the presentation should have been a joint meeting with the Transportation Committee, and they responded that they would have been happy to if that’s what they were advised. They have done outreach to other local stakeholder groups and will remain in contact with the community.
- Linda Alexander and several Community Board Members expressed their support and love for the Thanksgiving Day Parade.
- Member expressed appreciation that they met and presented to the committee about their new plan even though they were not required to do so.

3. Review and update the guidelines for the "Multi-Block Street Festival."

Comments:

- Christian Cordova explained that he'll further review the guidelines and propose changes. He will then share with the committee to review, comment, and edit.

4. **New Business.**

Comments:

- Erana Stennett expressed concern about storefronts that close- and put-up plywood in the windows that get tagged with graffiti and asked if there were ways to address the issue. Doug Kleiman explained what landlords are responsible when the tenant leaves and further explained what can and can't do in these situations. He explained that the location Erana referenced may have significant construction or the building may be demolished. Community Members agreed to investigate the situation.

The meeting ended at 8:04 p.m.

PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Michele Parker and K Karpen, Co-Chairpersons

November 10, 2022 at 6:30 PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NiLIkhyCWSM>

Present: K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairs; Jay Adolf, Page Cowley, Mark Diller, Klari Neuwelt, Madge Rosenberg and Peter Sampton. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet.

Please note that the order of the projects was changed to accommodate applicant availability.

1. 471 West End Avenue (West 82nd - 83rd Streets.)

Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for front and rear facade restoration, re-fenestration, replacement and refurbishment, and the expansion of an existing rooftop addition.

The building is within the Riverside Drive West End Historic District Extension 1 Upper West Side Historic District, and the project was introduced as an "as-of-right project" regarding zoning, as such does not need to comply with street-wall requirements.

The building in this application, constructed in 1885-1886 with alteration in 1912-1913 is a rowhouse designed by McKim Mead & White. [note that that the description provided at the presentation did not include the full extent of alterations, which have been incorporated here for clarity:

"Originally three stories and a basement, a fourth story was added in 1912. The major alterations noted above were made at that time. The fire escape and roof railing were probably added in the 1930s when the building was converted into a multiple-family dwelling. The house appears as it did at the time of the 1939-40 tax photograph."

Presentation by Sam White, FAIA, LEED AP representing the design of the project with Kristin Bauer, also with Platt Byard Dovell & White (PBDW) Architects, and Andrew Katz, representing ownership.

The exterior scope of work presented includes the following: general restorative facade repairs /repointing (brick and terracotta), restoration of the two the lower street facades, replacement of the lower floor windows at the entry level, mansard roof replacement/repair in copper, redesign of a sloped glazed window centered at the upper level of the roof facing the street, as well as a one-story addition. The rear facade is proposed to be all reconstructed in a new design as a "rain screen" with new wood replacement sash windows at the extended and uniform facade (no setbacks).

There are a few material changes with this alteration and addition:

- The roof slates are to be replaced with copper roofing
- The windows facing the street are proposed to be metal framed "Crittall" windows
- Substitute patching material to simulate the sandstone at the street facade
- New uniformly sized windows at the rear also by "Crittall"
- In lieu of removal of the non-original stucco, the proposed scope includes a wythe of brick to cover the non-original facing
- The additional floor and full height rear extensions are to be used for new spaces including a terrace and gymnasium among other enlargements of rooms at the basement level, an extension at the parlor floor and a new additional rooftop floor that is not visible from the street

The applicant described the precedents of the restoration and new work taken from adjacent brownstone details.

The new HVAC equipment and condensers are proposed to be at the new 5th floor rooftop level.

The majority of the comments from the from the neighbors that attended the presentation were as follows:

- Residents of the adjacent property, to the north of 471 West End Avenue, cited a legitimate concern regarding privacy, as the widening and full build-out comes much closer to the adjacent apartment house existing windows.
- Some of the existing windows will be deprived of light below the corresponding 5th floor and below.

- The additional floor at the 5th level and roof the townhouse has a direct view into existing apartment house windows to the north.
- Given the proximity of the new rear extension, there was concern from neighbors regarding the noise of new HA+VAC equipment on the roof and within the narrow setback at the rear of the building.
- Several existing neighbors were concerned about blocking so many adjacent existing windows and losing views and privacy.
- Our committee members did acknowledge the concern for blocking or access to light and air and or privacy in the existing apartment house for the first five floors.
- There were several comments regarding the "quality of life," particularly the noise and operation times for the HVAC equipment on the roof and the hours of operation.
- Several committee members suggested that the placement of windows to the north be re-considered.

The resolution adopted by the committee is as follows:

The scope of work for this project was approved as presented, conditional on the proposed new additions and window placement not interfering with existing apartment building windows, pending additional information relating to the rear yard placement of new windows in the extended rear facade and the location of rooftop HVAC equipment and mitigation efforts to reduce noise and heat during operation.

New window placement at the rear facade and in the narrow alley between the two properties that may impact noise and privacy close to the existing apartment windows needs consideration and confirmation that light and air will not be compromised or diminished and that the current conditions of light, air and privacy / proximity will remain as existing. We suggest that there be further discussion between the new owner and those neighboring apartments potentially impact seek a mutually agreeable solution.

The following committee vote was taken on the above stated issues on what had been presented thus far: 8 in favor of continuing receipt of further information.

2. 520 West End Avenue (West 85th Street.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for legalization of the construction, maintenance, and use of three (3) double metal garbage enclosures on the north Sidewalk of West 85th Street in front of the side yard.

Adrian R Figueroa, a resident of 520 West End Avenue represented ownership. The issue is the placement of six (6) large trash enclosures on West 85th Street. The location is on the side street and are currently placed on the sidewalk set back from the thoroughfare. The committee was informed that DOT has cited this placement as an encroachment of the public thoroughfare.

The concern is the unsightliness of this array of black garbage enclosures in plain sight of and adjacent to the individual landmark, and also listed within the historic district.

The discussion focused on the number of the bins and whether these could be placed behind the low brick wall within the property and rolled out to the street for pick-up during collection days. The discussion followed as to the number and size of the bins and if a different color or within an operable screen / gate could camouflage the bins, still making them accessible to drop garbage at the top via a flexible lid.

Other means to maintain the area and cleanliness were suggested and included daily hosing the area and bins (full or empty), painting the bin cover a different color, as well as selecting a different type of receptacle that was also rat and roach proof.

The resident stated that maintenance was not the issue, just the placement. There was a variety of concerns from the committee ranging from maintenance, making the outer bin more attractive or providing screening.

Maintenance is not the issue. It is the bulk and number of bins. Alternately, a maintenance plan should be required for keeping the area and bins clean. The committee was initially inclined to approve the bins as is, but this was not thought to be the solution.

Ultimately, the vote was as follows:

- 5 not to approve sidewalk placement /bins (inappropriate to the character / appearance
- 2 votes to approve the location and type of bins
- 1 vote in absentia

3. 340 -344 West 72nd Street (aka The Chatsworth Apartments)

This application was presented as three separate scopes of work:

- 1) Review and Approval of Window Replacements
- 2) A Roof top Element
- 3) A Rooftop Addition

These projects were presented by the following client team:

- Cas Stachelberg, Preservation
- Richard DiMarco, Architect
- Jason Jones, Starwood Property Trust (Owner?)

This presentation was an update on the restoration participants and the status of the /scope of work to be undertaken or completed.

The building is an individually designated landmark and within the Historic District. The major issue is that there are several LPC permits that have not been resolved as of the date of this presentation owing to a variety of circumstances.

As an introduction to the project review, the chronology of actions was noted by the applicant as follows:

- 2013: Initial presentation and filing: 2013 (type of permit for LPC or DOB not disclosed)
- 2015-2019: Work started under then ownership/leadership of HFZ and ultimately went bankrupt
- 2020 Work resumes in the property [filing only but no work?] not clear but the work now includes restoration and improvements to both the main apartment building and the Annex.

The current scope of work was stated as follows:

- Work at the roof of both buildings
- Modifying the configuration of divided-lite windows
- Roof additions with access to private apartments
- Addition of a Pergola(s)
- Restoring and replicating the *Cheneaux* *

* *Eaves-gutter with the profile of an elaborate cornice; also, an ornamented crest, as on the ridge of a roof, or associated with a gutter at the eaves.*

The presentation also pointed out those roof-top apartments that would not be enlarged.

- A. As the description of the types of repairs or alterations, the following was confirmed:
- B. The lower three floors would be re-fitted and/or restored as wood window sashing conforming to the original configuration.
- C. All other windows from the fourth floor and above will be in aluminum to replicate the operation and details, where feasible, in aluminum.
- D. Other improvements are 8'-0" privacy screens at the penthouse level.
- E. A 6'-0" set back at all pipe railings

There were several comments:

1. Improving the roof-top access at the 14th Floor between the East/West penthouses with privacy screens.
2. The selection of bronze "louver" screens

3. Improvements to the chimneys that will be round and not square.
4. Were there any additions to decoration(s) to any tone walls as cited in the previous approval in 2015?
5. There was concern that much of the lower floors have been plagued by continuous scaffolding and wanted to know when the work would be completed, and the scaffolding partially removed where work has been completed?
6. How much longer will the scaffolding be in place? Can it be removed as work is completed and still provide safety for workmen?
7. When will the work be completed? Is there a priority of work areas that tenants/owners can rely on?
8. A representative from the project team (Craig Newman) did report on the following and tried to answer some of the questions:
 - a. Work was completed for the requisite mock-ups.
 - b. HVAC Equipment on the Annex Rooftop equipment not yet ready as of 11-16-22.
 - c. The Privacy Screen on the Annex property, only around the northern tower side
 - d. Who is the best contact person? email through the contractor's off or via CB7 Office and we can forward requests / information to the correct party.
 - e. Scaffolding has been up for 10 years. How much longer and at what cost, and paid by whom?
 - f. As to mock-ups, Greg Sefanof offered the following response:
 - Mock-ups only typically remain in place for 24 hours, there seems to be more that what was represented ago.
 - Annex framing and Riverside Drive at street level are now using rendered views rather than mock-ups
 - g. Is there a plan to discuss with Ownership as to next areas of work and protection?
 - h. Question and response regarding ownership:
 - Jason Jones was identified as the property owner of a certain number of shares of the un-finished apartments.
 - Starwood (sp?) property Trust has shareholders and participates in property maintenance (?)... and then HFZ went bankrupt...
9. Is there roof-top access for all owners? Or only to those with penthouse units.
 - a. No response for discussion.
10. When will the facade work start and when will it be completed? The response was that there was no person with the purview to respond.

The committee resolution was generally to approve the changes, with the exception of the privacy screening that did not conform to the historical characteristics of the district by a vote of 5-3-0-0.

There being no further action or questions/ comments, the meeting ended.

Respectfully submitted by Page Cowley

HOUSING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Louisa Craddock and Kristina Villarini, Co-Chairpersons

November 14, 2022 at 5:00 PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-TtMRmLVMZM&t=1953s>

Present: Louisa Craddock and Kristina Villarini, Co-Chairs; Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Melissa Rosenberg and Polly Spain. **Chair:** Beverly Donohue. **Non-Committee Board Members:** Alex Bell, Seema Reddy and Roberta Semer. **Absent:** Kristen Berger, Robert Espier, Madelyn Innocent, Ira Mitchneck and Ethel Sheffer. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

*** Meeting minutes will be forthcoming. ***

STEERING COMMITTEE

Beverly Donohue, Chairperson

November 14, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DB4Tu2seJNA>

The Steering Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met via the Videoconferencing application Zoom.

Full Board Members Present: Beverly Donohue, Chair; Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Daniela Alvarado, Linda Alexander, Alex Bell, Richard Asche, Joshua Cohen, Kristen Berger, Elizabeth Caputo, Ken Coughlin, Courtney, Page Cowley, Audrey Isaacs, Blanche Lawton, Clark Metakis, Christian Cordova, Kevin Corte, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Sheldon Fine, Sonia Garcia, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Ira Mitchneck, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Seema Reddy, Peter Samton, Susan Schwartz, Ethel Sheffer, Roberta Semer, Polly Spain, Benjamin Wu, and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** Robert Espier, Madelyn Innocent, Sara Lind, Andrew Rigie, Madge Rosenberg, Erana Stennett **Board Office:** Max Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

Note that the Chair requested the first portion of this meeting be a Full Board Meeting, as a vote for a potential new employee was taking place.

Max Vandervliet, District Manager, discussed the numerous steps involved in their office search for a new Community Coordinator. Their candidate, Alexandra Crawford, was raised and lived on the Upper West Side until just a few months ago, with a background consistent with CB7 job requirements. A few questions were raised and answered.

Resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Alexandra Crawford shall be the new Community Coordinator of Community Board 7/Manhattan.

Vote: 35-0-0-0.

Steering Committee Members Present: Beverly Donohue, Chair; Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Kristen Berger, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Christian Cordova, Kevin Corte, Louisa Craddock, Sheldon Fine, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Seema Reddy, Peter Samton, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer, Polly Spain, Benjamin Wu, and Howard Yaruss. **Steering Members Absent:** Anthony Thomas and Kristina Villarini. **Board Office:** Max Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

Chair's Report:

- Beverly Donohue remarked on the three Borough President mandatory trainings and apologize for having to push back Steering an hour.
- She announced new co-chair positions: Sonia Garcia will co-chair Health & Human Services with Shelly Fine; and Mark Diller will co-chair Transportation with Andrew Albert.
- The Bylaws taskforce will reconvene after Thanksgiving to discuss a few potential additions to our Bylaws.
- Free breast cancer screening is available for women 40-79 through Assemblymember Daniel O'Donnell's office. Deadline to register is November 18th.
- Starting next month, a new standing item will be added to Steering: *Community Issues Needing Attention*.

II. District Manager's Report:

- Max Vandervliet noted that they have not yet gotten notification from the governor on the Open Meetings Law extension, though to date word has come towards the end of the month.
- The office is looking for one or two volunteers from the board to rep CB7 in a new East/West Task Force suggested by Council Member Gale Brewer.
- Reminder to co-chairs to send into the board office all Agendas as soon as possible.

III. Co-Chair Reports:

Brief reports were made by all committee co-chairs and task-force chairs regarding upcoming agendas and expected resolutions at the next full board meeting:

- Transportation Committee (1 Resolution, joint with Parks & Environment)
- Business & Consumer Affairs (1 Resolution)

- Preservation Committee (3 Resolutions)
- Housing Committee (0)
- Land Use Committee (0)
- Parks & Environment Committee (3 Resolutions)
- Health & Human Services Committee (1 Resolution)
- Youth, Education, Libraries Committee: (0)
- Strategy & Budget Committee: (0)
- In-Person & Remote Task Force: (0)
- Senior Task Force (0)
- Public Safety Task Force (0)

With no new business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn, and the meeting ended at 8:55PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Barbara Adler & Linda Alexander,
Co-Secretaries

LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Richard Asche and Kevin Corte, Co-Chairpersons

November 16, 2022 at 7:30 PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UwtwwCOO5aM>

Present: Richard Asche and Kevin Corte, Co-Chairs; Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Sheldon Fine, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Klari Neuwelt, Seema Reddy, Melissa Rosenberg, Peter Sampton and Ethel Sheffer. **Chair:** Beverly Donohue. **Non-Committee Board Members:** Doug Kleiman, Ira Mitchneck and Roberta Semer.

Absent: Daniela Alvarado. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet.

*** Meeting minutes will be forthcoming. ***

SENIOR TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

November 17, 2022 at 10:00 am via ZOOM

Roberta Semer Chair

Present: Roberta Semer, Chair; Louisa Craddock, Madge Rosenberg, Ellen Amstutz (DOROT), Lisa Beth Miller (Lighthouse Guild), Mark Jennings (Project Find), Paula Seedfeldt (LILY) and Jennifer Cinclair (JCC).

1. Roberta Semer announced that the December Senior Task Force meeting will be on Monday December 12 at 6:30 pm, it will be joint with the Housing Committee, Mark Jennings of Project Find and Paul Freitag of WEFSSH will discuss supportive senior housing on the UWS.
2. A discussion about public benches and audible prompts for traffic lights at street corners. We were reminded to think about where they are needed and CB7 will reach out to DOT. Lisa said that maps of locations are not accessible to blind people or those with low vision. She suggested asking NY1 and local news stations to do PSAs etc. Mark Jennings said some benches are in need of repair, also the residents with disabilities are not able to get off the curb and into vehicles. We will ask DoT if they are able to discuss some of these and other needs for seniors and people with disabilities.
3. Lisa Miller said the the Lighthouse was presenting awards today to several scientist who have done research on vision loss. The Guild Day Care program still has some vacancies. They are also doing presentations to other providers about the services they offer. The optical center is now open - they provide eye exams and eyeglasses.
4. Ellen Amstutz spoke about GENUine Connection which pairs seniors and teens. They need volunteers to help seniors learn to use "accessible" tech. They are continuing their vision support groups via telephone.
5. Mark Jennings said that Project Find is gearing up for the holidays. They are continuing their homeless outreach. Seniors will begin to move into permanent housing in the Fairstead Project Building on 79th.
6. Paula Seedfeldt (LILY) said that volunteers will be delivering 101 thanksgiving dinners, including some to a group who will holding a Friendsgiving.
7. The New York Academy of Medicine will give a training on their ImageNYC data base at the January 19th Senior Task Force.

Next meetings

- Monday, December 12 at 6:30 pm *joint with* CB7's Housing Committee
- Thursday, January 19 at 10 am, Presentation by NY Academy of Medicine.

YOUTH EDUCATION & LIBRARIES MEETING MINUTES

Courtney Clark Metakis and Kristen Berger, Co-Chairpersons

November 14, 2022 at 5:00 PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-TtMRmLVMZM&t=1953s>

Present: Courtney Clark Metakis and Kristen Berger, Co-Chairs; Beverly Donohue, Mark Diller, Audrey Isaacs, Blanche Lawton, Ira Mitchneck and Seema Reddy. **Non-Committee Board Members:** Alex Bell. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet.

Discussion about proposed changes to the NYC school funding / budget process

Guest Speakers: Kaliris Salas-Ramirez, Panel for Educational Policy Member; Nan Mead, The Center for Educational Equity, Teachers College

Nan Mead: Michael Rubell: History goes back to the 90's, original fiscal equity case suing for a funding formula. Prior to that, funding for schools was really more about where the political power lay, generations of communities were starved for resources.

2003 – judgment that yes state had an obligation to provide a sound basic education and the payment was mandated. Sound basic education is language that appears in the state constitution but as opposed to being connected to state paying for it, really not formed until early 2000s.

Formula developed – foundation aid formula intended to be an equity-based funding formula. Based originally on enrollment, there are add-ons for cohorts of students with disabilities, ELL, poverty, homelessness etc. Other components that have to do with value of real estate in the district, as well as COL components. They do apply consumer price index into the formula, but then there's another regional cost index which is CPI like except regional to state of NY. So state divvied up into 10 regions, analysis conducted on how much it costs to live in each. When it was created, NYC and LI most expensive and way up in North Country was some of the least expensive.

Because of financial crisis, amounts not paid into the formula. After crisis was over, politicking about how much do we really need to put into the formula. Because of that, 2nd lawsuit in 2014. End result: NYSER – NY'ers for students' educational rights – was a follow on to original case.

Last year the lawsuit was settled with Gov. Hochul. State agreed to fully pay out amounts owed, think it was 4.3 billion dollars with a 3 year phase in. After next year, what happens? The formula has never changed. Everything just noted is based on data that is 20 years old. From 2000 census. Regional cost index is based on cost of living from 2006.

Other components: disabilities, ELLs, poverty count, homelessness, number ELLs up. Those of us who have lived in NYC for a while know the homelessness count now rivals what it was in the 80s. The number of ELLs increased rapidly and now with migrant and asylum seekers coming in, that number is expected to rise. Been trending for last several years, when we see the asylum seekers coming in, often the children – never been to school. Call those students "SIF" (students with interrupted education). Distinct group within ELLs. Prior ELLs had some education within their own language, now challenge because lack of education. That, plus impact of COVID – social emotional learning but also use of technology, for everyone but specifically for students with disabilities. Some of those technologies didn't exist when formula was created

All of this to say – we have a formula that is completely out of date. It is unknown what the cost of educating student in state of NY today. Proposal – we really need people to work on this, particularly those who work with special populations. To help us figure out what is the best way to calculate the cost of educating a child in NYS and update the formula.

Kaliris Salas-Ramirez: One of PEP's roles is to vote every year for FSF – PEP (Panel for Educational Policy) votes every year which is how schools are paid.

Have a budget of roughly 36.8B dollars, portion of that which goes directly to school communities is dictated to FSF, very similar to, same concept as Foundation aid. Each school gets a base rate of 225k which covers principal and secretary. From there, every student gets about 5K depending on the average teacher salary, and then there's a weight given to IEP

or ELL or is part of certain schools (portfolio schools). Based on that, we do have a per pupil funding formula. Created by Margarite Rosa, she's one of the people that made part of the FSF work group. Head of economics lab at Georgetown and collaborated with Bloomberg Administration to create this FSF.

We realized that we have a fair number of students in temp housing that aren't receiving direct funds, realized after the pandemic that our students have very significant needs. Lack of access to devices, services, Wi-Fi, and school communities really need to have these funds to provide all of this to most marginalized students.

Whether schools have enough students, so in turn can't provide services mandated for each student. Principals can decide what they want to use the money for. SO even if you have 6 students in a grade with IEPs, if they don't have enough money to provide, student may go without services. They have to make these decisions.

A lot of us decided when we got on the PEP, to challenge the FSF formula. Got the administration for a work group. Some of the things we'd asked for was access to experts – offered Margarite Rosa. I was interested in engaging an urban economist. Also wanted to see some modeling happening. They did that.

Info: <https://infohub.nyced.org/reports/financial/financial-data-and-reports>

Member list, meeting reports. First couple of meetings are just foundational knowledge on FSF, how it was created, what sort of things have we looked like. Also can see group goals. Wanted to see how to make this formula equitable, how to address poverty, students in temp. housing, those who are ELLs and have IEPs and live below the line of poverty. They're being underserved.

Gets juicy in meetings 5/6. A lot of modeling going on. Would take one recommendation and then model what it would look like, what districts. K-8 schools and then HS. How that district would be impacted if we changed that 1 variable. Looked at a total of 10 variables.

Did rank choice voting – the ones we would thought would move the needle: top 5 variables, in no particular order:

- 1) Tackle the base rate. If you talk to principals, 225 is not enough in terms of the basic needs of the school. A lot asked for social workers, so that base rate would increase to include a social worker. Maybe you have a principal, a secretary and a librarian because they're better resourced. Some schools larger 500+ – some needed a principal, an asst principal and a secretary
- 2) Concentration weight – thinking of students in temp housing that have IEPs and are also ELLs, etc. can move in and out so there's a tiered model and a continuous model in terms of how funds would go into schools.
- 3) Having a weight for students in temporary housing. There are schools that receive funding for students in temp housing, but not currently in FSF. Do have it as supplemental but comes from state. Not within the formula from the money that the city provides which is roughly 60% of the \$ that comes into schools.
- 4) Also advocated a weight for students below the line of poverty.
- 5) How to get this money for the other recommendations? The portfolio schools – weight that is given to specialized schools. Given same funding as non-specialized schools. Plus also .25 per student. That weight is larger than student with IEP/ELL. Specialized schools have other sources like alumni or endowments. Does this take it all away or only some of that .25.

D3 – overall saw a reduction in funding.

KB: Foundation and FSF – use similar formulas so it's confusing. State allocates by district – NYC is one district.

NM: For the purposes of NYS, NYC is one district. For your purposes, it's really about the total number, and what it costs in the eyes of the state to educate a child in your school district, NYC.

KB – They use similar language and formulas, which is why it's confusing. Once it gets to NYC it gets allocated – but it's not the same weights, assessed separately.

BD: I testified, and was prepared for 6 mos by Michael, and on original panel of people brought in to prepare the FSF formula under Bloomberg. No, they had nothing to do with each other. FSF formula question for the city has been pending

for a few years, grew out of effort under prior administration. In order to make school buildings able to make decisions about their own money, resulted in construction of the galaxy budget system which was innovative in its time, permitted schools to get their own money. Before that, under the old Board of Ed, everything went to the superintendent who doled it out however. And you had a fave principal, you got more. Had a sort of begging going on, kiss the ring, and so on. So this was not related, but grew out of the same overriding feeling that equity should be more at the center of how money was distributed.

NM: FSF formula a lot of that work was done by a consultant out in Oregon.

KSR: we talked a lot about how this has to be consistent. There are schools that were predominantly white and had the resources and the reverse, and now that's changed. And that's not a bad thing when schools lose funding to provide important services for students. Have to continue to look at the populations the schools are serving because it's going to be changing (see 8k new students -- asylum seeker students). In D3, a couple of hundred, which is a lot.

BD: Foundational aid-- still looks at property. NYC frequently at a disadvantage -- value of property washes out that we had portions with poverty. Is that still the same?

NM: That's a perfect example of what is challenging about the formula right now. Not just the averaging out, it's the disparity in property values across the city. Midtown Manhattan vs. SI vs. S. Bronx. Not just an issue in NYC and also in other areas, like vacation hubs - property values may be very high, but income levels people who live there is low

After the financial crisis, they decided to input this whole Hold Harmless provision: no district would receive less money -- this was after 2008 -- than they had the year before. So there's a permanent floor in a lot of places. Districts that are high need that benefit from that, but other districts that are lower need that are benefiting from this 12 14 years on, but other districts that are arguably lower need that are still benefitting. Just one of the things that has to be looked at. Other thing, too, with the wealth factor, the brackets are 1.2x the wealth and .6, so the poorest districts that have that bottom decile of wealth you see less aid relative to less districts.

MD: Picking up on the hold harmless thing we were talking about, once upon a time when budgets were all funded through community sup., it didn't matter if 2-3 buildings shared a resource (IEP services, social worker) didn't matter if on my budget or yours, in one bizarre instance, an Asst Principal on one building was on payroll of another. But then when you had that floor, didn't include the AP, and speech and language therapist etc. Wondering what is the mechanism in effect to start from scratch, can the commission go that deep and how does that align with challenges of schooling being so closely moored to geography.

KSR: I've been surprised that not all districts do this. In District 4, we'll have a social worker, etc. divided between 2 schools. This is a practice our superintendent encourages. In the workgroup we didn't have the opportunity to see how these things will impact individual schools. That is something we need to request.

CCM: These were a tough couple of years across the board. In terms of removing the weight to the specialized schools. I worry about the narrative that we can take from these schools and they'll be okay. All due respect to the 1-2 students on your panel, but 1-2 voices is not an accurate representation of what is the actual impact on those schools. Those schools serve a purpose in our city as well. Worry about the narrative that we can take from them and they'll be okay. That construct really concerns me, for a city where the students really suffered across the board, to greater and lesser degrees, but still really struggled. I really want to make sure we keep an eye on that. I would be really interested to know -- what happens to Stuyvesant -- if the cuts go through, what will the principals do. My 2nd question for you that I'm concerned about, and you referenced it a bit, with the students who have special needs and IEPs, even schools you might deem as "haves" -- parents with kids who have greater needs, have IEPs, have still struggled. Parents have come here and said, when I raise my hand, we get told -- well you're in better shape than other places. How do we solve for the fact that some of the need may get hidden in pockets of a school that has largely -- from a higher income family or lower need base.

KSR: That's an issue that comes up. TAG -- how many special education teachers are at TAG. 1. That means that kids that could potentially excel in that environment, I cannot say that TAG offers... just means that a child that requires additional services, will not... do share a speech therapist. So they're limited resources for those students. And could be that's not the best fit for that child. Many parents wrote -- where you have these schools that are considered good (resourced),

may not be best for students that require these services because they focus on kids who are higher achievers. We talked about how we do we have that money really follow the child and making sure the child is getting the money they need.

I have parent leaders that are constantly – specialized high schools don't serve kids with IEPs, and how do you fight for kids at specialized High Schools to get that. Endowments, and other grants that other specialized schools are eligible for and other schools are not. If we're going to center equity sometimes it means robbing Peter to pay Paul because Peter has a lot of money, and has resources, and Peter will be okay.

KB: Specialized services – that's the most challenging part of the formula because there are unseen needs. Esp. when we look at small schools, because no matter what they do with their money, the budget is not there. Parents should get to pick the appropriate school for their child. The problem is you may choose your local elementary, just cannot provide the special education services they need. If you have ONE special ed kid, suddenly you have a baseline that's much bigger.

KSR: we tried to tackle that with the small school model, that was just missed. Little portion at the end where we were like, and you really should be looking at this. And then you get into the question of – what's a small school? Where do we do that cutoff? Then we get into whether schools need to merge, but def. a concern. Not just about OT/Speech/Counseling/also about math interventionist, reading recovery, lots of nuances that come with students who have IEPs. In D4, tried to share those resources. I like schools that have ICT classrooms, doesn't exist across the board.

KB: we know parents are counseled out of those services.

CCM: and then we need Spanish language speakers on all of those things across the board.

NM: My feelings on specialized schools are really complex, as a graduate of one of them, Kristen and I were classmates. If you catch me at a moment that's really objective, there's a conversation that has to happen – role of specialized high schools. Test prep – now you can't get in unless you do it and come out of a G&T program. All the inequity that's back into G&T. The 2nd thing, though, is that it is true – we have high profile alumni who have thrown all sorts of money at maintaining the status quo. When you hire a lobbyist, how is that furthering equity for students? And parent engagement – all of those high schools have really robust parent engagement models, and other schools do not. Parent engagement really falls off a cliff once you get to high school. So I'm not going to take a position on taking funding away from specialized high schools, but I will say it's a really nuanced conversation that has to be honest and ongoing and includes a lot of those data points.

BD: The way to address some of these issues in FSF formula without doing a zero-sum game across all of our schools is to look in 1 of 2 places: either at the annual city council scrum for dollars, or it's the foundation formula at the state level. And it seems the equity argument is much stronger there, so what I would like to ask – is there anything you feel this board can do to further the seriousness of purpose in addressing the foundational funding issues, upon which hinge our ability to address the city issues without devastating certain interests we think are not overfunded now. What can we do the further the work you're doing around the foundational formula – either the state officials or the regents or the governor's office to begin the process of updating these formulas. That would be likely to yield a better result for NYC.

NM: Consensus is that the formula has to be reviewed. Takes time resources, that's what's holding people back.

IM: Any formula that has any relation to property values going to be defective because value of many buildings in midtown going to drop a lot. 2nd thing: SHSAT schools serve small % of schools. If you cut their funding in half and spread over the rest, not enough money. Spreading that sliver of money out there. Zero sum way is the way we're looking at it, but we have to find some way of making the other 85% of schools not the same, but everything else better. If you take it from one group of schools with relatively less needs, to schools with relatively great need, that middle group of schools we haven't done anything for. I think we have to be cognizant if we take 1% of the money over here – you can make some difference, but have to be honest about what we're taking, who's getting it, and there are so many dif. Levels of need. And some people's need is more housing than education, because if you don't have stable housing not going to have stable education.

MD: Small schools, both by nature and design. Have selectivity that often leads to disparities, and connection with FSF, FSF has always been a problem because it assumes a quantum effect that is also a difficulty when you talk about space

allocations because only so many number of seats who can fit in a classroom with a teacher who can meet the needs of those students. How do we bake that problem in to how we revise our funding formula. My son's alma mater had a dual language program that ultimately had to merge 4/5th grade in order to afford the teacher. Is there a way, or this overcomplicating things, to add another dimension that accounts for the fact that we want one kind of classroom to respond to funding in a way different than another classroom? Difference between equal and equitable.

KSM: The other thing that we kept throwing in there is class size –w hat is that going to mean? What is that going to mean for the formula? School classrooms that can't have more than 20/25 kids in a classroom. Understanding is that the DOE is having conversations internally. Task force to discuss how this is going to occur. Also dual language programs/immersion. Here in E. Harlem have a large population that is committed to having bilingual education. End of the day have to keep pushing not just Foundation aid – a lot of that money goes to charter schools. That distribution is not equitable so we're not getting that money either.

KB: It's almost a Blue Ribbon Panel, where is there public input in that? Where would we have a role feeding back into it.

NM: Like the Regents lens, There will be an opportunity for public comment towards the end of the process. The folks appointed – as long as they are appointed by the full circle of gov's offices, board of regents, state legislature, then on the back end they'll come out with recommendations. There should be a public process at the end. I'll have to look and see what they did with Civic Readiness.

CCM: We sent out a joint letter with the CBs north of us where we banded together to try to amplify our voice. The appalling fact that we've gone 20 years without revisiting the funding, should keep an eye on that as well. How do we ensure we don't get stuck in that again – numbers getting out of date. In a world where none of this is easy, that feels like low hanging fruit to me. If we end up doing something on this, that's an easy one – need to stay real time on data.

Meeting ended: 8:06pm

PARKS & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Joint Meeting with Transportation Committee

November 21, 2022 at 6:30PM via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yvuH3uLZBaU&t=2303s>

Present: Natasha Kazmi, Susan Schwartz, Daniela Alvarado, Barbara Adler, Elizabeth Caputo, Josh Cohen, Kenneth Coughlin and Polly Spain. **Transportation Committee Present:** Andrew Albert, Jay Adolf, Elizabeth Caputo, Ken Coughlin, Doug Kleiman, Sara Lind, Andrew Rigie, Erana Stennett and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** William Ortiz.

1. **Budget and Strategy Committee Update, Roberta Semer.**

2. **Update on Harlem Meer Project, Kaitlin Holt, Lane Addonizio, Central Park Conservancy:** Lane Addonizio (Central Park Conservancy) gave a presentation on the status of the Harlem Meer Project, which includes the old Lasker Rink facility. The new facility is a longer, narrower pool with a building tucked into the landscape which will integrate the facility into the landscape. The new facility will be a swimming pool in the summer to be operated as a public pool by the parks department. After the pool season a riser system will convert the space to usable outdoor space. The rink will then be installed on top during the skating season. The facility will therefore be year-round.

Ms. Addonizio gave details on the hydraulic work done at the Meer as well as the fish rescue. The stream course connection will be restored into the North Woods. The northeast portion of Park Drive will be closed for 2 weeks and there will be a detour through the 102nd Street Transverse.

The completion date is Summer 2024, in time for pool season.

The Conservancy will be operating the Harlem Meer Center year-round, except that it will be operated by the City of New York in the summertime as the pool facility.

Kaitlin Holt continued the presentation to explain the Operations Calendar for the pool and rink facility. The Conservancy is contemplating community-based programming including tours and education. We are in the beginning stages of these offerings.

Guided tours are currently available, and the Conservancy tours are the only tours that directly benefit the Park.

Questions were asked about access to Lenox Ave via the Park Drive, continued programming at the facility and whether design details will be provided to the public (i.e., blueprints).

3. **Discussion on the reconstruction of several features between 107th street and 112th street and the introduction of five new pickle ball courts within Riverside Park. Presenter: Margaret Bracken, DPR:** This project will improve paving conditions, improve site drainage, reduce asphalt and enhance permeability, reconstruct a ramp, replace fencing, install benches and install sealcoat for pickleball courts. A Parks Department initiative will provide for the repaving portion of this project, and the Riverside Park Conservancy is donating half of the funding for this project to finish what needs to be done to get the area in good repair.

The asphalt paths are in poor condition, there are some standing water and drainage issues, the fences are also in poor condition.

5 pickleball courts are planned with 8 feet in between them for circulation. Stairs will be restored consistent with the style throughout Riverside Park, modeled on a historical style.

Questions were asked with respect to the effectiveness and integrity of the planned 4-foot fence, signage and crowd control with respect to pickleball courts, accessibility of staircases and other facilities. (Approximately 7:20PM)

Committees: 8-0-0-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 13-0-0-0.

4. Discussion and resolution in response to resolution approved by Manhattan CB8 on September 21, 2022 which requested that "NYCDOT provide fully protected crosstown bike lanes approximately every 10 blocks between 60th and 110th Streets (the whole length of Central Park) on both sides of the park, and a 2-way protected bikeway around Central Park, and present such plans to Community Board 8 as soon as possible" David Saltonstall, Central Park Conservancy, Deputy Inspector Gallagher, Paul Krikler (CB8 - speaking in a personal capacity): Resolution from CB8 passed in September, refers to Central Park for protection of crosstown bike lanes, the transverses and park drives, but the language used is unclear and confusing. We are responding to CB8's September resolution. We are not resolving on infrastructure on city streets outside of park land, and we are not going to reopen CB7 resolutions of the past.

Mr. Saltonstall spoke on behalf of the Central Park Conservancy. The Conservancy believes in outside roadways to move across the park - the park drives were not designed for fast moving crosstown movement. Transverse roads are the logical solution, but they require design changes for safety.

DI Gallagher pointed out that the most serious accidents occurring in the wintertime occur on the transverses because they ice over most quickly, and cameras for traffic safety should be considered.

Mr. Krikler pointed out that the CB8 resolution does not involve the space in the parks, just requests protected bike lanes in the city streets. However, there is an urgent need to get safe passage, but the idea would be to go around the park and not touch park land.

Questions were asked about signage and repaving of the 96th Street transverse, and the intent of the location of the bike lane and the intent of the resolution drafted by CB8.

CB7 accepted comments from approx. 15 members of the public, each was permitted to speak for 2 minutes, including various individuals opposing the resolution. Overwhelmingly, members of the community are concerned with the lack of safe and dedicated bike lanes within and outside of Central Park. For this reason, many expressed their opposition to CB7's resolution and support of CB8's resolution.

Given the significant opposition to the CB7's resolution and a push to clarify the goals of the resolution in favor of changes all parties wanted to make in order to clarify the actions the City and the Central Park Conservancy should take to provide for safe bike and pedestrian routes, both committees decided to table the Resolution and revisit it.

5. Discussion about upcoming NYC Council legislation to replace horse drawn carriages in Central Park with horse-less electric carriages, Elizabeth Caputo, CB7, Christina Hansen, Carriage Driver: Ms. Hansen spoke to the prior bill with electric vehicles replacing the horse drawn carriages and the fact that it was opposed for various reasons, including safety and additional congestion. She notes that there are two issues at hand, one is looking to improve the carriage industry and looking after the horses and the second is the electric car issue.

One comment from A. Albert was that the Parks Committee should consider asking the proponents of the legislation to present to CB7.

The Resolution will be revised to provide that the committees oppose the legislation as drafted.

Committee: 15-0-0-0. Non-Committee Board Member: 4-0-0-0.

6. New Business:

- a. From Erana Stennett: Food carts that are supposed to be removed in the evening are now staying permanently in Central Park overnight and the Parks Committee should have a representative from the Parks to explain the food cart policy.

The Meeting adjourned at 9:43 PM.
Respectfully submitted,
Daniela Alvarado

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 22, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sCToM_cR6Sk&t=634s

Present: Sheldon J. Fine and Sonia Garcia, Co-Chairs; Audrey Isaacs, Sara Lind, Marilyn Rosenberg and Kristina Villarini.

Non-Committee Board Members: Seema Reddy and Roberta Semer. **Absent:** Robert Espier. **Board Office:** Yassiel Nieves.

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Shelly Fine. He welcomed Sonia Garcia back to the HHS Committee as the new Co-Chair and the other members of the committee.

Shelly invited Roberta Semer, Chair of the Budget and Strategy Committee to address the meeting. We were charged to complete our HHS District Needs Statement section and Budget Priorities by June 2023.

Next, Shelly welcomed Dr. Michael McRae, Executive Deputy Commissioner of the NYC Health Department Division of Mental Hygiene. He spoke about the Mayor's Plan to support New Yorkers living with severe mental illness, especially those languishing in the subways and the streets.

Dr. McRae stated that the overarching goal is to get individuals who are experiencing homelessness and mental illness to a location where they can get services. Those services range from shelter to safe havens to support connection centers or removed to a hospital for evaluation. This is done in a collaboration of a strong team, including DOHMH, DHS and NYPD.

"The program has recently started to home in on individuals with severe mental illness. The goal is to bring those with severe mental illness to dignified care."

In addition, there are outreach teams working in the 125th Street corridor. These teams are working in collaboration with CBO's and businesses in the area. There is a large overlap between people who are homeless and those that use drugs.

Finally, Dr. McRae informed us that Dr. Vasson, the new NYC Health Commissioner, is working on a plan for those with severe mental illness. He entertained several questions from the committee members and the public.

Next, Shelly welcomed Jennie Drossman, LCSW, Associate Vice President, Street Solutions of Goddard Riverside to describe the work of the Manhattan Outreach Consortium (MOC) with Street Homeless people.

The Manhattan Outreach Consortium started in 2007. MOC is funded by the New York City Department of Homeless Services (DHS) to work with the Street Homeless Solutions Division. MOC has four catchment areas in Manhattan and is made up of 3 agencies:

- CUCS, Lead Agency of MOC
- Goddard Riverside Community Center

MOC conducts outreach shifts 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Their caseload clients are individuals who are street homeless and are being targeted for addition to caseload.

The goal for all clients is permanent housing

Components of a housing application

- Psychosocial evaluation
- Psychiatric evaluation
- Identification (Photo ID, Birth Certificate, SS Card)
- Income (Public Assistance, SSI, Paystubs)
- Documentation of Homelessness
- HRA2010E or Gen Pop application

Assistance with other needs

- Medical appointments and referrals to treatment
- Reconnecting with family

Transitional Placement Options

- Stabilization Beds
 - Harlem YMCA
 - Stabilization Bed programs
- Church Beds
 - Rendall Presbyterian Church
 - Broadway Presbyterian Church
- Safe Havens
 - Different locations and settings — Harlem YMCA
 - Stabilization Bed programs
- Church Beds
 - Rendall Presbyterian Church
 - Broadway Presbyterian Church
- Safe Havens
 - Different locations and settings

311 Calls and Community Response

All 311 calls must be responded to within one hour of receipt

Enables community members to alert us to individuals in need of services

311 Provider Response App

Callahan Consent Decree à Right to Shelter

Intake Shelters

- Single Men: 30th Street
- Single Women: Franklin and HELP Women's
- Adult Families: AFIC
- Families with Children: PATH

Drop-Ins

- Manhattan: Olivieri, Main Chance (Paul's Place!)
- Bronx: Living Room, Haven
- Brooklyn: The Gathering Place
- Staten Island: Project Hospitality
- Queens: Breaking Ground

Permanent housing

- Supportive housing (internal vs. external)
- Vouchers (VASH, City FHEPS)
- Nursing homes
- Family Reunification
- Aftercare for at least 3 months

Reasons for case closure

- Successful completion of aftercare
- Missing for over 60 days
- Client is deceased
- Extenuating Circumstances