NEW YORK CITY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL BOARD

BOARD MEETING

Training Room 143, 12th Floor

100 Church Street, New York, New York

March 30, 2017

9:27 A.M. to 9:54 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Fidel F. Del Valle, Esq. - Chair, OATH
Shamonda Graham - Department of Buildings
Joseph Gregory, Esq. - Fire Department
Elizabeth Knauer, Esq. - Appointed Member
Madelynn Liguori, Esq. - Department of Sanitation
Jorge Martinez, Esq. - Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene
Russell Pecunies, Esq. - Dept. of Environmental Protection
Indi Savitala - Appointed Member
Thomas D. Shpetner - Appointed Member
Matthew Smith, Esq. - Police Department

ALSO PRESENT:

Frances Shine - Secretary to the Board, OATH

Rachel Amar - Special Assistant to the Commissioner, OATH Vanessa Caughman - Computer Service Technician, OATH Kelly Corso, Esq. - Assist. Director of Adjudications, OATH

Diana Haines, Esq. - Assistant General Counsel, OATH Susan Kassapian, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner/Hearings Division, OATH

Mark Leeds, Esq. - Special Senior Counsel, OATH
Tynia Richard, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner/General Counsel,
OATH

Simone Salloum - Assistant General Counsel, OATH Peter Schulman, Esq. - Assistant Director of Adjudications, OATH

Carmena Schwecke, Esq. - Assistant Commissioner, Hearings Division, OATH

Amy Slifka, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner/Hearings Division, OATH

March 30, 2017	Page 3
INDEX	_
	Page
Fidel F. Del Valle, Esq.	4
Thomas D. Shpetner	4
Simone Salloum, Esq.	4
Elizabeth Knauer, Esq.	5
Russell Pecunies, Esq.	13
Kelly Corso, Esq.	16

Page 4 1 March 30, 2017 2 (The Board Meeting commenced at 9:27 3 A.M.) 4 MR. FIDEL F. DEL VALLE, ESQ., 5 CHAIRPERSON, COMMISSIONER & CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE, OATH: Good morning everyone. There was 6 7 a change that was distributed just before the meeting to the minutes with a correction. I 8 9 assume you've had a chance to look at it. The 10 correction has to do with one member abstaining 11 from a vote last meeting that wasn't properly 12 recorded. With that change, is there a motion to 13 accept the minutes? 14 MR. TOM SHPETNER, APPOINTED MEMBER: 15 Abstention. 16 MR. DEL VALLE: The minutes are 17 unanimous with one abstention because you weren't 18 here. The minutes are adopted. The first item of 19 business has to do with a final rule proposal and 20 Assistant General Counsel, Simone Salloum, will 2.1 put it on the record. 2.2 MS. SIMONE SALLOUM, ASSISTANT GENERAL 23 COUNSEL: Good morning. Simone Salloum, Assistant

General Counsel. So, for your consideration today

24

2.1

is the final rule repeal of the Buildings penalty schedule, which has the penalties found in Section 3-103 of Subchapter G of Chapter 3 of Title 48 of the Rules of the City of New York.

We published the proposed rule in the City Record on February 27, 2017, and a public hearing was held yesterday on March 29, 2017.

Three members of the public did attend the public hearing and two provided testimony. We did not receive any written comments on this rule repeal.

We didn't make any changes because there was really not much to change. It's just repealing the entire penalty schedule.

And the Department of Buildings also held their public hearing yesterday as well. And so we're going to be along the timeline to repeal and promulgate the penalty schedule to the Department of Buildings rules at the same time. Does anyone have any -- yes?

MS. ELIZABETH KNAUER, APPOINTED MEMBER:
Elizabeth Knauer, Citizen Member. Can you
describe it? We didn't receive a transcript
obviously of the comments, since it was just

1 March 30, 2017 2 yesterday. 3 MS. SALLOUM: Yeah. 4 MS. KNAUER: So can you describe the 5 testimony? MS. SALLOUM: It was two, I think, 6 7 attorneys who generally represent defendants -or represent respondents for DOB violations. And 8 9 the bulk of the first comment was really about 10 DOB corrections and wasn't focused on the actual 11 transfer of the penalty schedule into DOB's rules 12 from OATH's rules. It was really focused on -13 they need to focus on correction versus just 14 assessing penalties; you know, comments 15 concerning the AEU and it wasn't focused on the 16 switch. It was really just kind of a critique of 17 the Department of Buildings' ability to certify 18 correction. 19 The second comment was another attorney 20 who represents and he did say that he felt that 2.1 the repeal was removing a check on the ability of 2.2 the Department of Buildings to just increase 23 penalties.

MR. DEL VALLE: Just for clarification,

24

1 March 30, 2017 2 the corrections matter was the DOB procedure where somebody corrects an alleged violation? 3 4 MS. SALLOUM: Right. Yeah, so when 5 there's a hearing and someone is found in violation, oftentimes DOB requires correction. 6 7 And proof of correction has to be submitted to 8 DOB and then they certify correction. And that 9 information gets transmitted to OATH but OATH has 10 no involvement in the actual approval of any sort 11 of correction. 12 MR. DEL VALLE: Okay. 13 MS. SALLOUM: Yeah. 14 MR. DEL VALLE: Any other questions? 15 Comments? Is there a motion to adopt? Opposed? 16 One opposed. One abstention. Okay. You've got the 17 count? 18 MS. SALLOUM: Yeah, thank you. 19 MR. DEL VALLE: Okay, it's adopted. 20 Before we go on, I wanted to give all of you a 2.1

2.2

23

24

heads up on something that's going on. We've got some collateral inquiries by way of the press on what's going on with ICE and immigration and the whole business that's occurring in Washington.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

March 30, 2017

And it's basically along the lines of: What would we do if ICE shows up at an OATH hearing or an ECB hearing or something like that?

I think what precipitated the question is that there were some press reports in the last week that ICE agents were hanging out in courthouses. And after somebody had to make an appearance at the courthouse, after their appearance, they got a tap on the shoulder and were escorted to Iceland or wherever they take them. Very simply, so in case you get any inquires in any fashion, you know what our basic policy is: All our hearings are open to the public, just like the court is. And when people show up at the door, we don't inquire as to what their business is there because that would have a chilling effect on the whole concept of an open system. Even if they show up with a black suit, black tie and Wayfarer sunglasses, we don't stop them. And we're not going to put a sign on the door: Check your guns and badges at the door either.

But as a serious matter, if someone

2.1

2.2

identifies themselves as an ICE agent or if whether it's in-person or by phone or correspondence or whatever, we get a communication requesting information from us, from ICE, the drill for all City agencies is that they will be referred to the Corporation Counsel's Office. And the Corporation Counsel's Office will become the point person, as it were, for dealing with whatever their inquiry is. If there's issues about whether something is a judicial warrant, an administrative warrant or inquiry, whatever, that will be dealt with by the Law Department.

Clearly, if somebody just shows up and is sitting there, they have a right to do that like anybody else does. We will not supply any information to anybody that requests it from ICE without going through the Law Department. That doesn't mean people can't do a FOIL request like anybody else can. I don't know what good that would do them because there's no way to identify the nationality of a respondent just from a summons.

may have an individual in mind and that they're doing further investigation on that individual.

That is again something for the Law Department to worry about. They have basically set up a flying squad to deal with anything like that that might come up. So, they're basically locked and loaded. In the immortal words of José Jiménez, "Ain't my job."

So succinctly, any inquiries from ICE or ICE-related stuff is shifted to the Law

Department and the Law Department deals with it.

And we take our direction in that matter from the Law Department as to where to go. And I think that's a matter of reviewing a bunch of technical stuff that we shouldn't be playing with and it should be consistent across all City agencies.

I'm sorry, Elizabeth?

MS. KNAUER: I just wanted to ask a question about sort of as a practical matter how it works. The hearings are open to the public.

But, you know, back in my earlier life as a lawyer, I occasionally appeared at ECB on behalf

2.1

2.2

of respondents. I just remember being, you know, called for the matter and then we would go into a small room with the ALJ. I guess if a member of the public was sitting in the waiting area and heard that matter called, they can just --

MR. DEL VALLE: Walk into the room too.

MS. KNAUER: They can walk into the room along with the respondent and their representative I guess?

MR. DEL VALLE: Yeah. Yes, they can.

There was an incident before the Taxi Tribunal was transferred over to OATH and eventually absorbed into the Hearings Division. I can't remember exactly what year. But for some strange and bizarre reason, one of my successors banned the public from hearings on summonses at TLC, which resulted in a journalism student from Columbia University, who also happened to be a lawyer suing the TLC on that matter and fortunately he won; also collected a lot of money in the process. And as a consequence of course the Court ordered that all of those hearings — all hearings that we conduct — they conducted

2.1

March 30, 2017

and by inheritance of course us and we would do it anyway, are totally open to any member of the public who wants to come in without question.

We do ask members of the press as a matter of courtesy to let us know, so we can provide them with any backup and background material. But even they don't have to tell us who they are. It's the same thing as you are walking into a courtroom at 100 Centre Street and that's the way it should be. And I don't understand the logic of going into Star Chamber type proceedings when somebody's issued a summons or something like that, unless it's like a family court thing. So, the short answer is: Yeah, they can walk in.

And I was only being slightly sarcastic when I said: "You know, unless you're wearing a black suit, black tie, Wayfarer sunglasses and a white shirt," we probably wouldn't imagine that they had anything to do with Feds or just somebody with maybe a reverend or something who just had cataract surgery. Anything else?

We'll go to the Department of
Environment Protection's request for cease and

March 30, 2017

desist orders.

MR. RUSSELL PECUNIES, ESQ., DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: Good morning. I'm
Russell Pecunies with the Bureau of Legal Affairs
at the Department of Environmental Protection.

DEP is requesting this month that the Board issue
one cease and desist order under the Sewer Code.
The respondent is DuMont Burger LLC, located at
314 Bedford Avenue in Brooklyn. The business was
inspected and determined to need two grease traps
and was ordered to install them by October of
last year. When they failed to do so, summonses
were issued based on that failure to do so.

The respondent has still not installed the required grease interceptors and has also failed to appear as directed for a mandatory compliance meeting on February 8th. So, due to the continuing failure of the business to comply with the Sewer Code requirements to install grease traps, the Department is asking the Board to issue an order to cease and desist.

MR. DEL VALLE: Any questions? Motion? It's unanimous.

2.1

2.2

2 MR. PECUNIES: I can vote "yes" now, 3 right?

MR. DEL VALLE: Yeah. Sure. It's not going to make a lot of difference.

MR. PECUNIES: Okay. The Department is also requesting two cease and desist orders be issued under the Noise Code. The first is for Entre Amigo Restaurant and Bar Corp. at 2244

Amsterdam Avenue. This is for the sound system, for loud music from the sound system. The Department began inspecting this location based on complaints in July of last year. We have issued summonses for excessively loud music in July, August, October, and January. The respondent stipulated to the first one, was found in violation for the next two. The fourth one was just on for a hearing on Tuesday. So, I'm not sure what happened to that one.

The respondent has not paid any of the fines that were imposed on the first three summonses. And due to their continuing failure to comply with the Noise Code and their apparent disregard for the fact that they keep getting

2.1

2.2

summonses, the Department is asking the Board to issue an order to cease and desist.

MR. DEL VALLE: Questions? Motion? Again, it's unanimous.

MR. PECUNIES: And the second one under the Noise Code is for 111 Audubon Food Corp., located at 111 Audubon Avenue in Manhattan. This location has been cited on four occasions since July for loud noise from its refrigeration unit and has still not come into compliance with the Noise Code, based on the most recent inspection, based upon which the Department is asking the Board to issue an order to cease and desist.

MR. DEL VALLE: Motion? Unanimous.

MR. PECUNIES: And finally, the

Department has and I believe I counted 27

requests for cease and desist orders for failure
to comply with backflow prevention requirements.

In each of these cases, the building owner has
been served with an order to install the required
devices. When they failed to do so, they were
issued with a summons. The summons has been
adjudicated in violation in each of these cases

2.1

2.2

March 30, 2017

and the building owner has still not complied with the backflow prevention requirements. So in each of these cases, the Department is asking the Board to issue an order to cease and desist.

MR. DEL VALLE: Questions? Motion? It's unanimous.

MR. PECUNIES: Thank you.

MR. DEL VALLE: Thank you. And Kelly Corso will introduce requests for pre-sealing reports.

MS. KELLY CORSO, ESQ., ASSISTANT

DIRECTOR OF ADJUDICATIONS, OATH: Good morning.

We have 24 pre-sealing reports for today's Board.

Fourteen of those involve backflow violations and ten involve Air Code violations. In all of the backflow cases and in two of the Air Code cases, the hearing officers recommend no sealing or other action based on the respondents' evidence of compliance that was presented at the hearings.

In the remaining eight Air Code cases, the hearing officers agreed with DEP's recommendation that the C&D's be discontinued because DEP had determined that the respondents

1 March 30, 2017 2 have obtained their operating permits, bringing 3 their boilers and burners into compliance with the Air Code. And that's it. 4 5 MR. DEL VALLE: Are there any questions? Nope. Motion? Unanimous. Is there a motion to go 6 7 into executive session? We are going into executive session. 8 9 [OFF THE RECORD] 10 [ON THE RECORD] 11 MR. DEL VALLE: We're back in public 12 session. Are there any questions? Is there a 13 motion to adjourn? We're adjourned. Happy spring. 14 (The Board Meeting concluded at 15 approximately 9:54 A.M.) 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 22 23 24

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Fei Deng, certify that the foregoing transcript of Environmental Control Board on March 30, 2017 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Tei Dey

Date: March 31, 2017

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

256 West 38th Street - 10th Floor New York, NY 10018