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

BOARD MEETING

12 Floor Training Room 143

New York, New York

June 30, 2016

9:23 a.m. - 10:10 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ernest J. Cavallo - Appointed Member
Ellen Cooper, Esq. - Dept. of Sanitation
Fidel F. Del Valle, Esq. - Chair, OATH
Shamonda Graham - Dept. of Buildings
Joseph Gregory, Esq. - Fire Department
Elizabeth Knauer, Esq. - Appointed Member
Jorge Martinez, Esq. - Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene
Russell Pecunies, Esq. - Dept. of Environmental Protection
Matthew Smith, Esq. - Police Dept.
Douglas S. Swann - Appointed Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Counsel, OATH

Simone Salloum, Esq. - Assistant General Counsel, OATH
Frances Shine - Secretary to the Board, OATH
Lt. Dan Albano, Esq. - Police Department
Rachel Amar - Special Assistant to the Commissioner, OATH
Helaine Balsam, Esq. - Deputy General Counsel, OATH
Scott Bane - General Counsel Intern, OATH
Rachel Beckman - General Counsel Intern, OATH
Denis Brogan, Esq. - Assistant General Counsel, OATH
John Burns, Esq. - First Deputy Commissioner, Supervising
ALJ, OATH
Candice Cho - Law Department

Melek Dunn - General Counsel Intern, OATH Fana Garrick - Creative Services Coordinator Public Affairs & Communications, OATH David Goldin, Esq. - Administrative Justice Coordinator, Mayor's Office Diana Haines, Esq. - Assistant General Counsel, OATH Jaime Kamen - General Counsel Intern, OATH Kevin Lawner - Staff Attorney, Appeals, OATH Mark H. Leeds, Esq. - Special Senior Counsel, OATH Nancy Lin - Office of Management & Budget Maria Marchiano, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner/Chief Clerk, OATH Jacob Meninga - General Counsel Intern, OATH Hassan Mirza - General Counsel Intern, OATH Ashford Morgan - Computer Service Technician, OATH Joanne Rattansingh - Assistant Director of Adjudications for the Hearings Division, OATH

Tynia Richards, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner, General

Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

Mariama Sidique - General Counsel Intern, OATH Sydney Schein - General Counsel Intern, OATH Peter Schulman, Esq. - Assistant Director of Adjudications, OATH

Marisa Senigo - Assistant Commissioner Public Affairs & Communications, OATH

Amy Slifka, Esq. - Deputy Commissioner, OATH
Thomas Southwick, Esq. - Supervising Attorney, Appeals,
OATH

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

here altogether?

24

1	June 30, 2016
2	MS. ELIZABETH KNAUER: Four, there were
3	four abstentions, I believe.
4	MS. AMY SLIFKA: Eight people here.
5	MR. DE VALLE: The minutes are adopted.
6	MS. ELIZABETH KNAUER: Five.
7	MS. AMY SLIFKA, ESQ.: Nine, nine.
8	MR. DE VALLE: Nine, okay. So that
9	works. First item on the agenda is an Amendment
10	to the Building Department's Penalty Penalty
11	Schedule.
12	MS. HELAINE BALSAM, ESQ., DEPUTY GENERAL
13	COUNSEL, OATH: Good morning, everybody. I'm
14	Helaine Balsam, Deputy General Counsel for OATH.
15	We have one proposed rule and two final rules for
16	approval today. The first is a proposed rule
17	which is based on a proposal that Buildings made
18	back in April concerning adding five new charges
19	to the DOB schedule relating to construction
20	superintendents. Do we have any questions?
21	MR. DE VALLE: Is there a motion? All
22	those in favor? Okay, it's unanimous.
23	MS. GRAHAM: One abstention.
24	MR. DE VALLE: There's one abstention.

1

2

June 30, 2016

Buildings. The next item?

MS. BALSAM: The next item is what we 3 4 have been calling the Model Rules. These are, it 5 is a repeal and reenactment of Chapter 3, which was the ECB Rules and most of those rules we have 6 7 moved into Chapter 6, which will be the Hearings 8 Division Rules and we are asking the Board to 9 approve the move of those rules from 3 to 6, 10 which was unique to ECB remains in Chapter 3. 11 have, at the Board's request, preserved the 12 appeals panels. From the proposed rule to the 13 final rule after the public hearing, there have 14 been six changes. In four places, we changed 15 board to tribunal for further clarity. The most 16 important one I guess for you to, to, for me to 17 point out is that we added a definition of OATH 18 Hearings Division to Chapter 6, which would 19 include not only the former Health Tribunal or 20 the former Taxi and Limousine Tribunal, but also 2.1 the former ECB Tribunal, although ECB as an 2.2 entity still exists, and then we also define 23 tribunal and said that that's the Hearings 24 Division. Also on section 613(e), we added

1	June 30, 2016
2	"only," this is concerning motions to amend, so
3	we wanted to clarify that there must be a motion
4	to amend. ALJ's, I'm sorry, hearings officers
5	will not be able to amend on their own motion.
6	Any questions? Yes?
7	MR. ERNEST J. CAVALLO, APPOINTED MEMBER:
8	Just a procedural, Helaine. When we add things
9	like that, does that then require like a new
10	hearing or a republication or, or
11	MS. BALSAM: These are
12	MR. CAVALLO: a new process?
13	MS. BALSAM: That would be the Law
14	Department's call.
15	MR. CAVALLO: Okay.
16	MS. BALSAM: They have certified these
17	changes and have not asked us to hold a new
18	public hearing.
19	MR. CAVALLO: Thank you.
20	MR. DE VALLE: Law Department basically
21	certifies that the action is or is not ultra
22	vires.
23	MR. CAVALLO: Oh.
24	MS. BALSAM: Yeah?
	II

2.1

2.2

MS. ELIZABETH KNAUER, ESQ. APPOINTED

MEMBER: Elizabeth Knauer, citizen member, I

just, and I apologize that I wasn't here at the

last meeting and this might have been discussed,

but I just wanted to hear from Buildings as to

whether there are concerns in the -- in their

comments have been addressed by the changes.

MS. BALSAM: Yes.

MS. SHAMONDA GRAHAM, DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDINGS: The Department of Buildings is okay
with the rules as is and all of our concerns have
been addressed at this time.

MR. DE VALLE: Anything else? Is there a motion? There's a motion. Will all those in favor, please signify? It's unanimous. The next item?

MS. BALSAM: The next item on the agenda is a final rule, which is for the repeal of the Air Code penalty schedule which is at this moment ultra vires, the ECB Air Code penalty schedule, and for an amendment to Section 3-100, Chapter 3 in Title 48 instructing the hearing officers to follow penalty schedules contained in agency

1

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

June 30, 2016

rules if there is no penalty schedule contained in ECB's rules.

MR. DE VALLE: Ouestions?

MR. CAVALLO: I have been opposed to all of these, just for the record, I will state my opposition to it. I think it's a bad government initiative. I think it takes one level of transparency out of the process, and that is the review by the few citizen members that are here on this board. It allows the agencies to make their own rules without any public oversight and I'm opposed to it. I also, last time, as you know, walked out when my motion to table such a -- the previous attempt to repeal some rules was ignored. So I will not be making a motion to table this, because I know what the result will be, but I remind the members that you do not have to second it or make a motion for it. It's not before us. We don't have to vote on it.

MR. RUSSELL PECUNIES, ESQ., DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: I would just point
out from DEP's standpoint, because this is our
penalty schedule, that if this penalty schedule

1 June 30, 2016 2 is not repealed then we do have a situation where there are two Air Code penalty schedules in the 3 4 rules because we have promulgated the new one and 5 the new one has taken effect. So if the old one were to not be repealed, we would have two 6 7 penalty schedules, which when people search for an Air Code penalty schedule, if they find the 8 9 wrong one, or if they find both of them, could result in some confusion, although I think it's 10 11 understood which ones the hearing officers are 12 applying, just in general, to have two penalty schedules in the rules for the same code is not 13 14 obviously an ideal situation. 15 MR. DE VALLE: Well, let me ask you, 16 when DEP adopted that schedule, did they follow 17 CAPA? MR. PECUNIES: 18 The --

> MR. DE VALLE: The, the Civil --

MR. PECUNIES: For the new penalty

schedule?

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. DE VALLE: Yeah.

MR. PECUNIES: Yes, the new penalty

24 schedule is in effect as of May 11th.

1	June 30, 2016
2	MR. DE VALLE: Was there a public
3	hearing where the public could come?
4	MR. PECUNIES: There was a public
5	hearing, yes, and there were no comments that I'm
6	that I can remember.
7	MR. DE VALLE: And was there an
8	opportunity for the public to submit written or
9	oral comments?
10	MR. PECUNIES: It was, it was published
11	and promulgated in full compliance with CAPA
12	procedure.
13	MR. DE VALLE: And did the Commissioner
14	review the results of those hearings or whatever
15	comments came or didn't come?
16	MR. PECUNIES: Again, to my
17	recollection, there were no comments to review.
18	MR. DE VALLE: And the, she signed the
19	promulgation that was published in the City
20	Record?
21	MR. PECUNIES: Yes, it was published in
22	the City Record and all of the CAPA requirements
23	were complied with.
24	MR. DE VALLE: Thank you.

1 June 30, 2016 2 MR. CAVALLO: Question. It was my understa- -- Ernest Cavallo, citizen member, it 3 4 was my understanding that there was supposed to 5 be a simultaneous repeal and then the institution of the new rules. Was I misled or am I mistaken, 6 7 Helaine? MS. BALSAM: Did -- it didn't happen. 8 9 MR. CAVALLO: But it was supposed to 10 happen that way, right? 11 MS. BALSAM: It was supposed to -- it 12 was supposed to and, to be perfectly honest, the 13 delay was in the Law Department. 14 MR. CAVALLO: I think then the 15 confusion is not our issue. 16 MS. BALSAM: Well, to the extent that 17 the EC, the current penalty in the ECB rules 18 contains incorrect penalties. There are 19 penalties that are too high or too low based on 20 the new Air Code, and I think that is an 2.1 issue, because we're materially misleading the

> MR. DE VALLE: The Air Code is in the Administrative Code?

22

23

24

public.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. BALSAM: Right. But the penalty -MR. DE VALLE: Right.

MS. BALSAM: The, the ECB, hopefully former ECB penalty schedule is still in ECB's rules.

MR. DE VALLE: Okay.

MS. KNAUER: Elizabeth Knauer, citizen member. I think that Ernie's frustration, which I, I share is that now we're sort of put in the position that if we don't approve this, there is, there is this confusion that nobody wants, and I think, I think that's unfortunate that the policy of having or removing penalty schedules from ECB review has -- it, it, by virtue of the enactment of or the promulgation of the new Air Code penalty schedule in the, in the DEP rules, we're now forced into the position that we can't really judge that policy. It's more -- it's just an issue of whether we're going to have a -- have two penalty schedules or not. So, I just wanted to voice that my vote or abstention, I'm still thinking about it, is based on the facts as of now and not the overall policy. Because I, I do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

think that while CAPA is an important process, that what, what I've seen from the CAPA review, the CAPA comments that have come in on rules that we've adopted, there are very few comments. doesn't seem like the general public really is aware of these public hearings. The comments usually come from lar-, you know, if at all, from large companies or organizations that have multiple issues before ECB. But where I have, where I in the past have objected to certain penalties, it has been the imposition of really high penalties on individuals and I feel like there's nobody really to speak up for those individuals who, you know, are pretty much hypothetical at the point and time when are rules enacted or promulgated. So I just wanted to speak my piece and that's it.

> MR. DE VALLE: Thank you.

MR. CAVALLO: I have a question. Statutory, if there's two conflicting penalties, doesn't the law require to institute the lower of the two?

MR. DE VALLE: It would more logically

24

1	June 30, 2016
2	require the institution of the most recent of the
3	two.
4	MR. CAVALLO: That's the other issue,
5	okay, that would be another issue, yes.
6	MS. BALSAM: And I would also say the
7	legal penalty because
8	MR. CAVALLO: I'm sorry. What do you
9	mean by that?
10	MS. BALSAM: I would also say the
11	current legal penalty. Some of the penalties in
12	the ECB Air Code penalty schedule
13	MR. DE VALLE: Are statutory, are
14	statutory based.
15	MS. BALSAM: Yeah, well, they're no,
16	they're
17	MR. DEL VALLE: They're ultra vires.
18	MR. CAVALLO: Well, all, all
19	MS. BALSAM: They're too high, the, the
20	penalties changed. So the, some of the penalties
21	in the, in the ECB penalty schedule are too high
22	or too low
23	MR. PECUNIES: I don't
24	MS. BALSAM: based on the new

2.1

2 statutory range in the current Air Code.

MR. DE VALLE: That's what I meant by statutory.

MS. BALSAM: Yeah, I'm sorry.

MR. PECUNIES: Right, and, and just again, Russell Pecunies with, with DEP, the, the existing, the schedule that still exists in OATH's rules does not match the new code. The numbering does not match. The statutory ranges don't match. There are many new provisions in the new code that are not in the old penalty schedule. So the penalty schedule that's in OATH's rules does not match the now current code really at all.

MR. DE VALLE: Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS SWANN: Doug Swann, citizen member. I just wanted to, you know, say that, for the record, I concur with Ernie and Elizabeth and I, I think the CAPA process does allow the public to have representation, but, again, as we have seen those, those hearings are, are, the comments are very few and I think what the Board provides here on a month-to-month basis allows

2.1

2.2

true representation for the public and I would hate to see that -- well, it's unfortunate that that's going away.

MR. DE VALLE: Anything else? Anyone else? Is there a motion? Second? All those in favor? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Those opposed? Two. Abstained? One. Motion carries. Thank you.

MS. BALSAM: Thank you.

MR. DE VALLE: And I believe the next item on our agenda is DEP's request for Cease and Desist Orders.

MR. PECUNIES: Okay. Okay. Again,
Russell Pecunies, with DEP legal. So this month,
the Department of Environmental Protection is
asking the Board to approve Cease and Desist
Orders on a total of 54 requests involving
failure to install backflow prevention devices.
There are 25 that were dated from the May meeting
and 29 that are dated for today, if I counted
these correctly. In each of these cases, the
building owner has been ordered to install
backflow prevention devices at their building.

2.1

2.2

They have failed to do so. They have been issued a summons for not doing so, which has been adjudicated in violation and they are still not in compliance. So in each of these 54 cases, DEP is asking the Board to approve an Order to Cease and Desist.

MR. DE VALLE: Is there a motion? I think it's unanimous with one abstention.

MR. PECUNIES: One abstention.

MR. DE VALLE: Which is DEP.

MR. PECUNIES: Okay, alright. And now, under the Noise Code, DEP is requesting three

Cease and Desist Orders. The first one, which is being brought back from the May meeting, although the cover memo was re-dated for today, involves

Dell's Maraschino Cherries Company, at 175

Dikeman Street, in Brooklyn. This is a company that makes maraschino cherries. They are, according to conversations that I've had with the complainants, apparently not connected to

ConEdison Power for some reason, and they run this facility off of a very large generator, a

Caterpillar generator, of which there is a

1	June 30, 2016
2	picture in the submission. This generator has
3	been cited for creating unreasonable noise on
4	four occasions, dating back to July of last year,
5	and they have not corrected the condition. And
6	due to the continuing failure to correct the
7	excessive noise from the generator, DEP is asking
8	for an Order to Cease and Desist.
9	MR. DE VALLE: Any questions? Motion?
10	MS. KNAUER: I'm abstaining from this
11	one.
12	MR. DE VALLE: Okay. So it, is it
13	unanimous with two abstentions.
14	MR. PECUNIES: Okay. The next one under
15	the Noise Code is for Wise Espresso Bar Corp. at
16	3120 Coney Island Avenue in Brooklyn. This
17	location has been cited for loud noise from the
18	kitchen exhaust on three occasions and due to
19	their repeated violations and continuing failure
20	to come into compliance, DEP is asking the Board
21	to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.
22	MR. DE VALLE: Question? Motion? It's
23	unanimous with one abstention.
24	MR. PECUNIES: Okay. And the last one

2.1

2.2

under the Noise Code is for, the corporate name is Kiki's Plan A Group LLC, which does business as Kiki's, a restaurant at 130 Division Street in Manhattan. They have been cited on four occasions for loud noise from the kitchen exhaust at the restaurant, and again, due to the continuing failure to come into compliance, the Department is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.

MR. DE VALLE: Questions? Motion?

Again, I believe it's unanimous with one

abstention.

MR. PECUNIES: Okay. And finally, under the Sewer Code, DEP is requesting two Orders to Cease and Desist. The first one, which is being brought back from the May meeting is for Saipan Restaurant at 702 Amsterdam Avenue in Manhattan. They have been repeatedly ordered and issued summonses for failing to install and maintain grease interceptors for a variety of sinks and drains at this location. The Notices of Violation have been adjudicated against them. They were ordered to appear for a mandatory

1

June 30, 2016

3 4 5

Compliance Meeting in March, which they failed to appear for. And due to the continuing failure to install the grease traps as required, DEP is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.

7

6

MR. DE VALLE: Questions? Motion? It's unanimous, with again, DEP abstaining.

23

24

MR. PECUNIES: Okay. And the last one which is new for this meeting is Good Vision Taste at 2007 Emmons Avenue in Brooklyn. They have been ordered to do two things and have been cited for not doing them. One is to install and maintain grease traps for the floor drains, and the other thing is to hire a BIC licensed waste hauler to come at least once a month to clean the existing grease traps. They do have some. They're required to install more, but the ones that they have, have been found repeatedly to be overloaded with grease. Again, a series of summonses and orders have been issued and they have failed to comply and in fact have apparently defaulted on most if not all of the summonses. They were ordered to attend a mandatory

2.1

2.2

Compliance Meeting in February, which they did not attend and, based on the continuing failure to comply, DEP is asking the Board to issue an Order to Cease and Desist.

MR. DE VALLE: Motion? Unanimous with one abstention.

MR. PECUNIES: Alright. Thank you.

MR. DE VALLE: Thank you. We will now have a report on presealing reports.

MS. KELLY CORSO, ESQ., ASSISTANT

DIRECTOR OF ADJUDICATIONS, ECB: Good morning.

I'm Kelly Courso, Assistant Director of

Adjudications. We have 66 presealing reports for
today's Board. 29 of these are discontinuances.

These are cases where the Respondent did not
appear for a hearing and DEP is recommending the

C&D proceedings be discontinued based on a review
of records or an inspection showing that the
Respondent's come into compliance, that the
Respondent's no longer on the premises, or that
the premises is being demolished. Of the
discontinuances, three of them are sewer cases;

15 are backflow cases; 9 are Air Code cases; and

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

two are Noise Code cases. So that's 29 of the 66 for today. The remaining 37 cases, the Respondents did appear for hearings for these. Out of the remaining 37, 34 of the cases were back, either backflow or Air Code cases. 27 of those involve backflow violations and seven involve Air Code violations, and all of these 34 backflow and Air Code cases, the hearing officer recommended no sealing or other action be taken based on the Respondents' evidence of compliance that was presented at the hearings. And the remaining three cases are Noise Code cases. two of these cases, the Respondents provided evidence of work that had been done to bring the cited equipment into compliance and based on that evidence, the hearing officers recommend no sealing or other action, provided that DEP's reinspection and further reinspections for a period of 180 days show no violation. In the final case, the final Noise Code case, the hearing officer recommended sealing of the violating equipment. The Respondent in this case is Prime 135 New York City LLC. This case began

1

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

June 30, 2016

back in January of 2015 when the Respondent received a summons for noise from his kitchen exhaust equipment. This kitchen exhaust equipment is located at its restaurant, which is at 135 7th Avenue South in Manhattan. Since no one appeared for the Respondent at the hearing in March of 2015, the case went into default. default order imposed a penalty and order of compliance forthwith. The Respondent did not comply with the order and DEP issued subsequent summonses for the same equipment in March and June of 2015, and the Respondent defaulted on both of those. DEP issued a final summons in October of 2015. A representative for the Respondent did appear for a hearing, and stated that the exhaust fan was going to be relocated to comply with the Air Code. The summons was sustained and the hearing officer ordered compliance forthwith. However, a subsequent inspection by DEP in October of 2015 showed the Respondent had still not complied. So on January 28, 2016, the Board approved a Cease and Desist Order in this case. At the initial presealing

1 June 30, 2016 2 hearing on this case in February 2016 and in each of the subsequent presealing hearings in March, 3 April and May of 2016, including the last hearing 4 5 which was on May 17th, the Respondent's representative did not provide any evidence that 6 7 the Respondent had attempted to come into compliance with the Noise Code. Based on the 8 9 failure to present any evidence that it has 10 attempted to comply with the Noise Code, the 11 hearing officer recommends that the Respondent's 12 kitchen equipment be sealed immediately. 13 MR. DE VALLE: Any questions? Motion? 14 It's unanimous. Thank you. Is there a motion to 15 go into executive session to review judicial 16 matters.? Unanimous. Thank you. And we'll 17 adjourn for a moment as we ask the members of the 18 public who are not part of ECB or OATH to please 19 wait outside. 20 [OFF THE RECORD] 2.1

[ON THE RECORD]

2.2

23

24

MR. DE VALLE: Is the tape back on?

MR. ASHFORD MORGAN: Yes.

Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

MR. DE VALLE: Oh. We are now back in

1	June 30, 2016
2	public session and we have had reports from staff
3	as to existing judicial cases regarding the
4	Environmental Control Board and a report on the
5	Appeals Panel recommendations on appeals. Is
6	there a motion to accept the panel
7	recommendations? And it's unanimous. Before we
8	wrap up today's meeting, I want to acknowledge
9	and thank Daniel Albano, who is here today.
10	He's, I believe your service with the City ends
11	tomorrow?
12	LT. DANIEL ALBANO, POLICE DEPARTMENT:
13	That's correct.
14	MR. DE VALLE: After, after, what 45
15	years or something?
16	LT. ALBANO: Not quite that many, 33 and
17	a half, almost 34 years when I, when I'll finally
18	retire. Matt Smith from my office is going to be
19	taking my place. Matt's an attorney with the
20	Legal Bureau. Matt's, I think, has got over 20
21	years with the Police Department, right?
22	MR. MATTHEW SMITH, POLICE DEPARTMENT:
23	19.
24	LT. ALBANO: 19, close enough.

1 June 30, 2016 2 MR. SMITH: Close enough. MR. DE VALLE: Wow, you don't look that 3 old. You don't look that old. 4 5 LT. ALBANO: Why thanks. I feel that old. I, I would like to thank everybody. This 6 7 has been a great experience. I've grown as an attorney. I've learned from everybody in the 8 9 I always compliment the writers on the 10 documents that are presented to us, just the 11 writing is fantastic. Makes some very dry 12 subjects oftentimes interesting. And it's been a 13 real, real great experience. So I'd like to 14 thank everybody for that. I've really enjoyed 15 it. 16 [Applause] 17 MR. DE VALLE: How long have you 18 represented the Police Commissioner here? 19 LT. ALBANO: About ten years, at least 20 ten years. 2.1 MR. DE VALLE: Is that all? Thank you 22 very much, and I hope you enjoy whatever you're 23 going to be doing on Saturday.

LT. ALBANO: I'm going to be playing

24

Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

Page 30 1 June 30, 2016 2 3 4 Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 256 West 38th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10018

Environmental Control Board, 6/30/16 CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Julia Zappi, certify that the foregoing transcript of the Board Meeting of the Environmental Control Board on June 30, 2016 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Julia Zappi

Date: July 1, 2016

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

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