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

### BOARD MEETING

12<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room

100 Church Street

New York, NY

July 28, 2016

9:40 a.m. - 10:24 a.m.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ellen Cooper, Esq. - Dept. of Sanitation
Fidel F. Del Valle, Esq. - Chair, OATH
Shamonda Graham - Dept. of Buildings
Elizabeth Knauer, Esq. - Appointed Member
Harminderpal Rana, Esq. - Dept of Health & Mental Hygiene
Elisabeth Prael, Esq. - Fire Department
Russell Pecunies, Esq. - Dept of Environmental Protection
Thomas D. Shpetner, Esq. - Appointed Member

#### ALSO PRESENT:

Simone Salloum - Assistant General Counsel, OATH
Frances Shine - Secretary to the Board, OATH
Helaine Balsam, Esq. - Deputy General Counsel, OATH
John Burns, Esq. - First Deputy Commissioner, Supervising
ALJ, OATH
Heidi Chain - Finance Department

Kelly Corso, Esq. - Asst Director of Adjudications, OATH
Melek Dunn - General Counsel Intern, OATH
Fana Garrick - Creative Services Coordinator, OATH
David Goldin, Esq. - Administrative Justice Coordinator,
 Mayor's Office

Diana Haines - Assistant General Counsel, OATH
Jonathan Jacobs - Business Integrity Commission
Dara Jaffee - Finance Department
Vivienne Kahng - Staff Attorney, Appeals, OATH
Mark H. Leeds, Esq. - Special Senior Counsel, OATH
Nancy Lin - Office of Management & Budget
Mariko Matsuyoshi - Data Analyst, OATH
Hassan Mirza - General Counsel Intern, OATH
Ashford Morgan - Computer Service Technician, OATH
Tynia Richards. Esq. - Deputy Commissioner, General
Counsel, OATH

Peter Schulman, Esq. - Assistant Director of Adjudications, OATH

Amy Slifka, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner, OATH Sydney Schein - General Counsel Intern, OATH Thomas Southwick, Esq. - Supervising Attorney, Appeals, OATH

Doris Stewart - Department of Transportation Ariel Yoo - General Counsel Intern, OATH

Page 3 July 28, 2016 INDEX Page Fidel F. Del Valle, Esq. 4 Simone Salloum, Esq. 5 Elizabeth Knauer, Esq. 6 Dara Jaffee 7 Amy Slifka, Esq. 9 Shamonda Graham 10 Helaine Balsam, Esq. 11 Kelly Corso, Esq. 24

2.2

2.3

2 (The board meeting commenced at 9:40 a.m.)

MR. FIDEL F. DEL VALLE, ESQ., CHAIR,

OATH: All systems go. Good morning. Welcome to

another exciting meeting of the board of -
Environmental Control Board. Is there a motion

to adopt the minutes of the June 30th meeting?

One abstention. Oh, okay. So it's unanimous.

What the minutes say is what happened.

MS. ELIZABETH KNAUER, ESQ., APPOINTED MEMBER: One abstention.

MR. DEL VALLE: One abstention. One abstention. The first item on the agenda is a resolution to say that we concur with the Department of Finance's efforts to collect debt that's owed to the City of New York that's a consequence of several years of, of ECB hearings. The outstanding debt right now I believe is in the neighborhood of \$1.5 billion dollars. Some of it obviously will never be collected because some of those people are dead, if for no other reason, and there's no estates and there's a whole bunch of other reasons. But the, the

2.3

feeling is that if they offer sort of an amnesty waiving of penalties and interests and stuff like that there, some folks will come in and take care of business, then the Department of Finance can clean its books and we can start fresh again until we get to another 1.5 billion dollars and we'll do the whole thing over. The authorizing legislation, as will be explained in a second, calls for, asks for a resolution from us concurring that it's a good idea for the city to offer a deal and to collect the debt. And it'll be explained in a second.

MS. SIMONE SALLOUM, ESQ., ASSISTANT

GENERAL COUNSEL, OATH: Simone Salloum, Assistant

General Counsel with OATH, and as the

Commissioner explained, the Local Law 45 requires

that we pass this resolution in order for the

Department of Finance to establish this program.

I'll read the resolution and if anyone has

questions about specifics of the program, I

believe that our -- a representative from the

Department of Finance is here and can answer kind

of those more specific questions. So the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

resolution is that: Pursuant to local law 45, which establishes the temporary program to resolve outstanding judgments imposed by the Environmental Control Board, the Board hereby concurs the Commissioner of Finance establish a temporary program to resolve outstanding judgments for a 90-day period to be effective during the fiscal year that commenced on July 1, This temporary program will permit 2016. respondents who are subject to default judgments to resolve those judgments by payment of base penalties without payment of default penalties and accrued interest. It will also permit respondents subject to judgments entered after an adjudication and finding of violation to resolve those judgments by payment of 75 percent of imposed penalties without payment of accrued interest. Does anyone have any questions - yeah?

MS. KNAUER: Hi, Elizabeth Knauer,
Citizen Member. I'm just wondering, I, I take it
that there was a previous amnesty back in 2009, I
think. So I just wondered what, you know, what
the success rate of that was for -- was there a

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

lot of collection as a result of that?

MS. DARA JAFFEE, FINANCE DEPARTMENT: Му understanding, I don't know the success rate but.

MS. SALLOUM: Can you identify yourself?

MS. JAFFEE: Hi, I'm Dara Jaffee from the Department of Finance from Legal Affairs. It's my understanding that we collected about \$14 million but I can get a more exact number if you want.

MS. KNAUER: \$14 million out, I mean, what, in comparison to what amount of debt.

MS. JAFFEE: Whatever the existing debt number was at the time. I don't know.

MR. DEL VALLE: My understanding is that that was pretty dismal compared to the amount of money that was owed, but I believe DOF this time around is going to more aggressively advertise the, the program and hopefully they'll collect a little bit more than that, but it, one way or another, at least it, it cleans up the books and they can, they can discharge a lot of uncollectible debt that, that it looks like, it looks like the city is in the hole for 1.5

2.2

2.3

billion dollars, when in reality we know that that's not really true because a lot of that is uncollectible stuff and it's businesses that don't exist anymore and people that don't exist anymore and a lot of the stuff like that there. But last time around, it was nothing to brag about from what I understand, but it's better than nothing. It's \$14 million more in the piggy bank than they had before.

MS. KNAUER: I, I'm just wondering if it encourages people, you know, to wait it, after this period ends and then there's additional judgments or default judgments, it would encourage people to just sort of wait for the next one of these instead of paying the judgments in a timely fashion.

MR. DEL VALLE: That's the same question that always occurs to me when I hear about amnesty programs, but --

MS. TYNIA RICHARD, ESQ., DEPUTY

COMMISSIONER, GENERAL COUNSEL, OATH: I think if

it were more used last time around, maybe there'd

be an argument, but since it seems that not a lot

2.2

2.3

of people used it last time, I don't think a lot of people are sitting around waiting for it to come around.

MR. DEL VALLE: Well, this time, you know, yeah?

MS. AMY SLIFKA, ESQ., DEPUTY

COMMISSIONER, OATH: Yeah, I just want to add

that it seems like the enforcement, Amy Slifka,

the enforcement agencies are taking a more

aggressive path also to see that these, these

debts are paid, because they're not going, the

Buildings Department is going to start looking at

this as far as issuing permits. So things are

changing within the enforcement agencies to make

sure that if you're found in violation or you

receive a violation and fail to show, you will

pay that penalty.

MR. DEL VALLE: Yeah, something, something that's not part of this legislation which was legislation earlier this year that really didn't come across our table because it was -- didn't really relate to us directly is new legislation that says that certain people who --

2.3

certain categories of people who have licenses or need permits from the city who have not paid their fines to the city, and there's a whole list of categories that they fit into, within an appropriate period of time cannot, will either have licenses suspended or revoked or they will be precluded from getting like a building permit until such time as they, they take care of whatever they -- was it they had to take care of. So I think this is part of that package, although it seems to be discrete, and hopefully that will encourage people to do the right thing. Preferably not do the violation in the first place. Silly concept.

MS. SHAMONDA GRAHAM, DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDINGS: Language is on the front of the -Shamonda Graham, Department of Buildings. The
language is on the front of the violation that
that was part of that. So the public is already
aware of it. So that's an effort of not just -of many agencies to take.

MR. DEL VALLE: You're talking about the new summons forms?

	Page 1
1	July 28, 2016
2	MS. GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
3	MS. KNAUER: You're right, I remember
4	that.
5	MS. GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
6	MS. KNAUER: And the Department of
7	Finance is in favor of this?
8	MS. JAFFEE: Yes.
9	MR. DEL VALLE: It's their idea.
10	MS. KNAUER: Their idea, okay.
11	MR. DEL VALLE: Any other questions? Is
12	there a motion to tell the Department of Finance
13	that we think this is a lovely idea and they
14	should sally forth and do their thing? I think
15	it's unanimous. There is a proposed rule to
16	repeal for the repeal of littering, sweep out,
17	throw out charges from the sanitation penalty
18	schedule. And where is it now is the question.
19	MS. HELAINE BALSAM, ESQ., DEPUTY GENERAL
20	COUNSEL, OATH: Good morning. Helaine Balsam,
21	Deputy General Counsel for OATH. This proposed
22	rule is part of the Criminal Justice Reform Act
23	that was passed earlier this year. There are

several pieces of the Act. One of those pieces,

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Local Law 75 of 2016, made changes to the Administrative Code regarding some of the sanitation provisions. Section 16-118(1) which covers littering, throw, sweep out, and throw out, was split into two sections. So there's now a section 16-118(a), which covers littering, sweeping, and throw out, and there's a 16-118(1)(b) which covers spitting. In addition, there was a carve out made to noxious liquids which is section 16-118(6), for public urination which is a subset of noxious liquids. So these new charges, the new ones and the littering, sweep out, and throw out charges are going to have new penalties. The first offense penalty is a flat penalty of \$75. The second offense penalty is a range from \$250 to \$350 and the third offense penalty is \$350 to \$450. The default penalties are capped at 150 percent of the base fine. Without a rule setting the default penalties, that would make the default penalties the 150 percent of the higher end of those ranges, because New York City Charter 1049(a) says that upon default, the Board will impose the

1	July 28, 2016
2	maximum penalty under the law. Because the
3	current charges for littering, sweep out, and
4	throw out in the penalty schedule do not reflect
5	these new penalties, we are asking to repeal
6	those charges and that's what this rule does. I
7	gave you a new copy this morning. The Law
8	Department will be certifying this rule. It's
9	just had a couple of grammatical changes and the
10	addition of a chart concerning what accessibility
11	options are available at the site of the public
12	hearing. Questions?
13	MS. KNAUER: Elizabeth Knauer, Citizen
14	Member, and, I'm sorry, I got a little bit lost
15	in what you were saying, but these penalties are
16	now in some other book code or
17	MS. BALSAM: They are in the
18	Administrative Code.
19	MS. KNAUER: They're just in the
20	Administrative Code?
21	MS. BALSAM: That's correct.
22	MS. KNAUER: Okay.
23	MR. DEL VALLE: They pre-empted us.

MS. BALSAM: And I should actually say

24

2.3

that 150 percent of \$75 is \$112.50, but we can't program change, so the default is going to be \$112. So --

MR. DEL VALLE: Oh well.

MS. BALSAM: Oh well.

MR. DEL VALLE: Got to get ConEdison to figure out how to program our computers. I'm sure they can do it to the tenth of a penny. Any other questions? Discussion? Is there a motion? Well considering everybody's making the motion, I guess it's unanimous.

MS. BALSAM: Thank you.

MR. DEL VALLE: Thank you. Now, DEP will present Cease and Desist Order motions.

MR. RUSSELL PECUNIES, ESQ., DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: Okay, thank you.
Good morning. I'm Russell Pecunies, Assistant
Counsel with the Department of Environmental
Protection. This month, DEP is requesting that
the Board issue Cease and Desist Orders in 28
cases involving failure to install backflow
prevention devices. In each of these cases, the
building owner has been ordered to install the

2.2

2.3

device, and has also been issued a Notice of Violation for failing to install the device, which has been adjudicated in violation. They have still failed to install the required device. So in each of these cases, the Department is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist. These should all have been dated for today instead of June 30<sup>th</sup>. Because the batch for the May meeting didn't get approved and had to be moved over to the June meeting, these didn't get re-dated so they have last month's date on them. They should have today's date on them. So the Department is asking the Board to approve these 28 requests collectively.

MR. DEL VALLE: Any questions? Motion? It's unanimous with one ex- --

MR. PECUNIES: Okay, next.

MR. DEL VALLE: -- abstention.

Abstention.

MR. PECUNIES: Next, DEP is asking the Board to approve a Cease and Desist Order in the matter of Zion Farm LLC, which is the owner of a restaurant located at 55 East 59th Street. This

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

restaurant has some grease traps; however, upon inspection, it was determined that the existing grease traps are not properly equipped with the required baffles and vents. In addition, it was determined that a number of items of equipment in the kitchen: three floor drains, a threecompartment sink, two woks, and a one-compartment sink all lacked required grease interceptors. series of orders and violations have been issued to the respondent to correct these conditions. There has still been no compliance. And in view of the series of enforcement actions that have been taken and the continuing failure of the respondent to comply, the Department is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.

MR. DEL VALLE: Questions? Motion?

It's unanimous with one abstention. A wok has a, a grease interceptor?

MR. PECUNIES: Yeah, I have seen it before. Apparently, it's a separate station where they use the woks and the grease from that separate wok station goes into a drain for that section of the kitchen.

2.2

2.3

2 MR. DEL VALLE: Hmm.

MR. PECUNIES: So --

MR. DEL VALLE: Must be one serious wok.

MR. PECUNIES: Yeah, I actually don't know what this does business as. I don't know what the restaurant's name is. I don't know if it -- Okay, next, we have a request for a Cease and Desist Order under the Noise Code for Fasta NYC LLC, at 36 Saint Marks Place. This location has been cited for noise from the kitchen exhaust three times this year. They have not complied by correcting the condition. In view of the repeated violations and continuing failure to correct, the Department is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.

MS. KNAUER: I actually had a question about this one. How many violations were there? It seems, I think the, the affidavit only described two, so I --

MR. PECUNIES: Normally, and in going way back, the required number of violations that need to be issued before we ask for a Cease and Desist, was, is three. So for, for noise and air

	Dago 1
1	Page 1 July 28, 2016
2	
3	MS. KNAUER: Right.
4	MR. PECUNIES: conditions. That's
5	what we've been going with for a long time.
6	MS. KNAUER: Okay. Just, it, I think
7	that the, the affidavit in support only mentioned
8	two violations.
9	MR. PECUNIES: Well, the affidavit in
10	support only mentions the original violation
11	MS. KNAUER: Right, right.
12	MR. PECUNIES: and the most recent
13	inspection that resulted in the violation. It
14	doesn't
15	MS. KNAUER: Okay. So it doesn't
16	reflect all the different violations?
17	MR. PECUNIES: Yeah, it doesn't refer to
18	all of them.
19	MS. KNAUER: Okay, okay.
20	MR. PECUNIES: Mm-hmm.
21	MR. DEL VALLE: Any other questions? Is
22	there a motion? Again, it's unanimous with one
23	abstention.
24	MR. PECUNIES: Okay. The next one is a

1

2 little bit of an unusual one because it involves music from a commercial establishment. We usually 3 do not ask the Board for Cease and Desist Orders 4 5 for music from commercial establishments, because it is so easy for them to replace the equipment, 6 7 and since these are equipment specific, one of the ways that you can correct the condition is to 8 9 just replace the equipment. In the case of 10 music, all you have to do is unplug the amplifier 11 and put a different one in or take down the 12 speakers and put up different speakers, and 13 technically you've removed the offending 14 equipment. So we usually don't ask the board for 15 cease and desist orders for music. However, in 16 the case of Lucky Seven Restaurant and Bar at 17 1447-1457 Saint Nicholas Avenue, we have cited them for excessively loud music from this 18 19 location four times in the last two years, 20 including three times this year. There are also 21 two violations that are more than two years old. 2.2 So they have a total of six violations. They have 2.3 not paid any of the penalties so they have nearly 24 \$20,000 in unpaid penalties. And at this point,

2.2

2.3

instead of just continuing to issue summonses, this one has gotten to the point where we felt it was worth a try to at least have the Board issue a Cease and Desist Order to try and get some kind of response from this business to the fact that they are continuing to plague their neighbors with excessively loud music. So although we usually don't request cease and desist orders in this -- for this type of violation, in this case, due to the long history of repeated violations and the continuing failure to comply, we are asking the board to issue a cease and desist order.

MR. DEL VALLE: Any questions? Motion?

MR. PECUNIES: Okay. And finally, we have a request under the Air Code for Acropolis

Gardens Realty at 2105 33rd Street in Queens.

The situation here is that they have a

Certificate of Operation for their boiler, which has been expired for six years. They are, they do have a certificate to use number four oil, which is currently permitted. This is not one of the ones that relates to the use of number six oil.

1

2 However, we have cited them for having this expired certificate four times. One of the 3 reasons that we've done that is that this is --4 5 this particular building has been the subject of repeated complaints regarding smoke from the 6 7 chimney. We have not yet been able to actually catch the chimney smoking, but we've been doing 8 9 inspections in response to complaints, and so 10 when we go, we, we haven't been able to see the 11 smoke, but we issue them a violation because they 12 still haven't renewed the Certificate of 13 Operation for the boiler. And since we are still 14 getting complaints and they still have not 15 renewed the Certificate that has been expired 16 for, for over six years at this point, seven 17 years actually, it's from 2009, the Department is 18 asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and 19 Desist, in the hope that that will provoke them 20 to renew the Certificate and by -- in order to 21 renew the Certificate, they will have to pass 22 certain emissions tests, so they would have to 2.3 fix the smoke problem that the neighborhood is 24 complaining about. So we are asking the Board to

1	July 28, 2016
2	issue an Order to Cease and Desist.
3	MR. DEL VALLE: Any questions? Motion?
4	Unanimous with one abstention.
5	MR. PECUNIES: Thank you very much.
6	MR. DEL VALLE: I have a question.
7	MR. PECUNIES: Yeah?
8	MR. DEL VALLE: Relating to Lucky Seven,
9	can't the city take advantage of the nuisance,
10	nuisance abatement law for some, after a chronic
11	problem like that to simply padlock a premises?
12	MR. PECUNIES: I don't know that we
13	would have the authority to do that. The police
14	department might have the authority to do that.
15	I don't know since this is not generally the type
16	of noise complaint that NYPD responds to
17	MR. DEL VALLE: I was thinking like
18	MR. PECUNIES: whether they have done
19	any inspections here.
20	MR. DEL VALLE: I was thinking like the,
21	the Office of Special Enforcement getting into
22	that.
23	MR. PECUNIES: Yeah, I mean, we, we do
24	participate with them in, in the March details

1	July 28, 2016
2	which focus on the night life heavy areas, but I
3	don't know if this is located in one of those
4	areas.
5	MR. DEL VALLE: It's kind of frustrating
6	for an outfit like that to be basically torturing
7	their neighbors like that consistently, that's
8	what
9	MR. PECUNIES: Yeah, I also don't know
10	how they
11	MR. DEL VALLE: That's broken windows.
12	MR. PECUNIES: how they renew the
13	liquor license with these noise violations
14	either, but
15	MR. DEL VALLE: Hm, okay, yeah, just
16	wondering. Is there a motion to adjourn for
17	executive session so we can
18	MS. SLIFKA: Wait, wait.
19	MR. DEL VALLE: Whoop, I miss something?
20	MS. SLIFKA: Presealing reports.
21	MR. DEL VALLE: Oh, presealing reports.
22	I'm so eager for the executive session. My
23	favorite stuff.
24	MS. KELLY CORSO, ESQ., ASSISTANT

2	DIRECTOR OF ADJUDICATIONS, ECB: Good morning,
3	I'm Kelly Corso, Assistant Director for
4	Adjudications for OATH. We have ten pre-sealing
5	reports today and one post-sealing report. The
6	ten sealing reports consist of cases involving
7	one Sewer Code violation, five backflow
8	violations and four Air Code violations. The
9	sewer case, DEP recommended that the proceedings
10	be discontinued, because the record has the
11	records have shown that the respondent has come
12	into compliance with the Sewer Code. On the
13	backflow and Air Code cases, the DEP recommended
14	and the hearing officers agreed that there would
15	be no sealing or other action based on the
16	evidence of the respondent's compliance that was
17	presented at the hearings. So that's the ten
18	presealing cases. The one post-sealing case we
19	have is pertains to a Noise Code violation and
20	the respondent in this case is New York Mart Mott
21	Street Inc., and the premises involved is located
22	at 128 Mott Street in Manhattan. This respondent
23	received a summons in October of 2014 for
24	operating a kitchen exhaust system in excess of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

42 dba. This summons resulted in a stipulation and an order of compliance forthwith. An inspection report following the issuance of the summons showed that in August 2015 respondent had not complied. The Board approved a Cease and Desist Order for this in October of 2015, and the respondent did not appear for the October presealing hearing and subsequently DEP sealed the equipment. Since that time, there was a postsealing hearing on July 5th of this year, and at the hearing DEP submitted an inspection report from June showing that the old kitchen exhaust equipment had been removed and new equipment was installed and DEP's inspection also showed that there was a noise reading taken and it showed the new equipment was in compliance with the Noise And DEP is recommending and the hearing Code. officer agrees with that recommendation that there be no further action and that the equipment remain unsealed.

MR. DEL VALLE: Motion? Can I get a motion? Unanimous with one abstention.

MS. CORSO: Okay.

1	July 28, 2016
2	MR. DEL VALLE: Okay, thank you.
3	MS. CORSO: Thanks.
4	MR. DEL VALLE: Now we'll go into
5	executive session if we concur.
6	[OFF THE RECORD]
7	[ON THE RECORD]
8	MR. DEL VALLE: We are now back in
9	public session. Is there a motion or discussion,
10	is there any discussion on the appeals? Is there
11	a motion to accept the appeals? It's unanimous.
12	Is there a motion to go out and enjoy the
13	weather?
14	MR. DEL VALLE: Yes, I think we're
15	adjourned. Thank you.
16	(The board meeting concluded at 10:24
17	a.m.)

## Environmental Control Board, July 28, 2016 CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Lea Simmons, certify that the foregoing transcript of Environmental Control Board Meeting on July 28, 2016 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Lalfin

Date: July 29, 2016

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

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