

NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
Citywide Event Coordination and Management

Public Hearing Regarding Proposed Amendment

=====
August 8, 2016

10:00 A.M.

100 Church Street, 12th Street

Hearing Room A
=====

APPEARANCES, Affiliation/Title

Mr. Michael Paul Carey, Executive Director
Ellen Canfield, Director of Events
Vicki D'Angelo, Deputy Director of Events
Twanna Cameron, Project Manager

Public Testimony:

Dorothy Le
Ellen Baer
Michael Linziata
Tim Tompkins
Clayton Smith
Gerald Scupp
Sebastian Maguire
Ernest Winick
Alexandra Sica
Tanya Rynd
Edward J. McMahan, III
Melissa Chapman
Robert Ferris
Michael Lambert
Eirik Gislason
Yisrael Galdstein
Dan Pisark
Laura Hansen
Phillip Kellogg

Transcribed by: Geneva Worldwide Inc

1 MR. MICHAEL CAREY: Alright, good morning
2 everyone, it is 10:01 so we'll get started. We'll
3 call this hearing to order for the pros and rules for
4 events on Pedestrian Plazas. I have the awesome Ellen
5 Canfield next to me helping take time and Vicki
6 D'Angelo and Twanna Cameron helping collect testimony
7 and also for those that are signing up. Today's
8 recording, oh, sorry, today's hearing is, of course,
9 being recorded and it will be transcribed and posted
10 on CECM website. As of 9:30 this morning the
11 following folks have submitted testimony in writing.
12 A letter from the stakeholders in the New York City
13 Plaza program, the Times Square Alliance, Community
14 Board Two in Manhattan, the Queens Museum, Jackson
15 Heights Green Alliance, the Flat Iron 23rd Street
16 Partnership, the Village Alliance, along with Win-It
17 Productions.

18 Just a reminder that written testimony could
19 be submitted to up until about 5:00, until 5 p.m.
20 today and a reminder that testimony shall last no
21 longer than three minutes here today. So we'll begin
22 hearing from the public right now. Ms. Vicki, who is
23 first to testify?

24 MS. VICKI D'ANGELO: Dorothy Le, you can come
25 up to this first.

1 MS. DOROTHY LE: Hello.

2 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

3 MS. LE: Good morning, I'm, my name is
4 Dorothy Le and I work for the neighborhood Plaza
5 Partnership, but I am testifying on behalf of the
6 Jackson Heights Green Alliance who could not be here
7 today and I think they submitted testimony as well.
8 So the Jackson Heights Green Alliance is a community
9 based 501.C three group who is all volunteer and they
10 manage the 78th Street Plaza in Jackson Heights and
11 the mission of the group is to support open space in
12 their neighborhood and the plaza has hosted a number
13 of events like Yoga classes, art classes and
14 community, other community benefits. The Jackson
15 Heights Green Alliance has a few main points. The
16 first one is that they are concerned with the
17 classification of the 78th Street Plaza as Tier B
18 Plaza. As from their understanding the criteria for a
19 Tier B Plaza is 30,000 square foot as well as being
20 located near a transit hub, commercial area or civic
21 area. The 78th Street Plaza, the Jackson Heights
22 Green Alliance is responsible for about 12,500 square
23 feet. From their understanding the square footage
24 supplied by DOT is after Capital Construction, which
25 there's no current schedule for and may take up to

1 five years to complete. In addition the Plaza is
2 located in a residential area near a private school
3 and a neighborhood park, Traverse Park and is not, is
4 about 0.8 miles to the next train, subway station or
5 train station and is not near a commercial area or
6 civic area. So the recommendation from the Jackson
7 Heights Green Alliance is that they urge to review
8 and modify this classification to better reflect
9 their size, location and the community needs.

10 Also, the classification as Tier B does not
11 take into account the organization as a volunteer
12 organization, they urge you to consider the type of
13 maintenance partner. So whether it's a bid, other
14 non-for-profit or a volunteer group when you
15 determine tiers or to create a specific tier
16 structure or a specific tier that only, that includes
17 only plazas run by small organizations and
18 neighborhood groups. The next point is about the
19 application deadlines. There's a proposed 60-day
20 deadline for civic event, which makes it almost
21 impossible for a neighborhood organization to plan an
22 event. Sometimes funding does not come in until a few
23 weeks before an event should be programmed and it
24 makes it difficult for an all-volunteer group to
25 adhere to the 60-day deadlines. The recommendation

1 from the Green Alliance is that they support the
2 neighborhood plaza partnership suggested revision to
3 bring the application deadlines to 14 days for Plaza
4 Partners --

5 MS. ELLEN CANFIELD: It's been three minutes,
6 so I suggest you wrap up.

7 MS. LE: Okay, oh, three minutes already.
8 Okay, so I'm wrapping up, so the other point is about
9 small, medium and large events in that the
10 organization events may not neatly fall into such
11 categories.

12 MR. CAREY: Thank you. Ms. Vicki?

13 MS. D'ANGELO: Ellen Baer.

14 MS. ELLEN BAER: Here?

15 MS. D'ANGELO: Yes.

16 MR. CAREY: Perfect, good morning.

17 MS. BAER: Good morning. Hi, my name is
18 Ellen Baer and I am here in my capacity as co-chair
19 of the New York City Bid Association, which I co-
20 chair with Michael Lambert from the Bedstuy Gateway
21 Bid, I'm from the Hudson Square, this is improvement
22 district. The Bid Association was formed in 1995 and
23 we represent all 72 of the city business improvement
24 district, I won't go into all the wonderful things we
25 do, which you've heard before, but the important

1 thing is that bids have served as the city's partner
2 since the inception of the Plaza Program nearly a
3 decade ago and the Bid Association strongly supported
4 legislation this year to ensure that the Plaza's
5 would remain a permanent part of the city street
6 scape. In fact, about half of the association's
7 members participate in DOT's Pedestrian Plaza program
8 and several others are working towards establishing
9 new plazas within our districts. And as you know each
10 Plaza Partner holds a contract with DOT that requires
11 it to manage and maintain a program and program
12 Pedestrian Plazas for the benefit of the public. This
13 is a substantial obligation that each partner has
14 willingly embraced working hand in hand with city
15 agencies and a broad array of community stakeholders,
16 the Bid Plaza Partners have transformed what were
17 really former street beds into neighborhood oases and
18 thriving community gathering places. It's critically
19 important that city rules for events on pedestrian
20 plazas are crafted to support this work of the
21 partners and facilitate community based programming.

22 The Bid Association truly appreciates the
23 outreach that has occurred over the past months with
24 regard to the topic of event permitting but believes
25 the proposed rules fall short in several regards.

1 Primarily we're concerned that the review framework
2 is overly burdensome for plaza partners and will
3 inhibit the local programming that our neighborhoods
4 have come to know and enjoy. The proposed deadlines,
5 mandatory site visits and comment process seem to be
6 excessive for the vast majority of events. As
7 community based organizations that work very closely
8 with our community boards, local precincts and other
9 stakeholders such as small businesses, healthcare
10 institutions and schools, we support consultation and
11 transparency in our programming, but believe these
12 added layers of process for each and every permit are
13 not a good use of resources. In fact, they will
14 prohibit many of the organic local events that arise
15 in our communities.

16 Two, we ask that the event definitions be
17 clarified in accordance with our August 2 letter,
18 which you have. Three, many of our members
19 particularly those outside Manhattan have asked that
20 the proposed fee schedule be revised based on
21 transparent data and metrics. Our concern is that the
22 combination of the new fees and the proposed block-
23 by-block assessment of those fees will have a severe
24 impact on the ability of some plazas to attract large
25 events. Finally, we ask that the rules acknowledge

1 the role of Plaza Partners and their ability to set
2 those fees. Thank you very much.

3 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

4 MS. D'ANGELO: Michael Linziata [phonetic].

5 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

6 MR. MICHAEL LINZIATA: Michael Linziata,
7 stagehand, seasoned, I work the big shows, audio
8 mostly. We earn the city millions of dollars and
9 provide thousands of jobs. Michael Linziata, Esq.,
10 attorney in good standing, I'm licensed in the State
11 of New York. Today, I represent only myself. When I
12 pick a client in this matter, I will, of course
13 notify the Court, good morning. The Court should send
14 back consideration of the rule, its fatality flawed.
15 The provisions conflict with the stated purpose. The
16 stated purpose conflicts with itself and creates a
17 legal impossibility. It runs [unintelligible]
18 [10:12:50] over the city requirements of 1042 and
19 1043 and it seems to ignore constitutional guarantees
20 of notice and comment. It appears to improperly grant
21 powers to unelected and unpaid MGOs. It appears I say
22 because it's poorly written and we really can't make
23 it out. It conflicts with the stated purpose, the
24 stated purpose of the rule, page two is to maximize
25 city events, sorry, maximize opportunities for the

1 public to hold events in plazas. Everything in this
2 room seeks to restrict opportunities, it maximizes
3 nothing. It takes away many chances, it provides
4 increased costs and it's going to scare away a lot of
5 corporate clients. Stated purpose conflicts with
6 itself, not only does it say we maximize it also says
7 while also ensuring that the plazas remain available
8 for everyday use and enjoyment by the public. This is
9 impossible. How can we do events and have the plaza
10 be used every day. The rule itself creates
11 definitions for extra-large or large events, those
12 events say that there would be significant impairment
13 of these plazas. There's no way that we see and we've
14 talked about this, how can we satisfy all parts of
15 the rule?

16 We're not sure what the rule means, it
17 repeatedly mentions from a [unintelligible]
18 [10:14:33] writing city around [unintelligible]
19 [10:14:35] design, we think it meant designated
20 filing on 19-157. There's not much time to talk about
21 this, it's badly written, it's without a clear
22 purpose or point. It's apparently on a whim, these
23 are the definitions of completions. If the city
24 intends a rule that to maximize the events, to
25 separate out the good from bad we agree, we're with

1 you on that. The professionals can help the city,
2 perhaps you can submit a license scheme and we'd like
3 to help you through it. If the city intends to
4 squeeze events, thank you, then it should say so and
5 we'll argue that too. We look forward to working with
6 the city, thank you very much.

7 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

8 MS. D'ANGELO: If everybody who just came in
9 could sign in, if it's okay with you, we could
10 [unintelligible] [10:15:30]. You can sign in and then
11 start using the seats here in this row.

12 MS. D'ANGELO: Tim Tompkins.

13 MR. TIM TOMPKINS: Hello --

14 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

15 MR. TOMPKINS: -- first I just want to say
16 thank you for, we know this is very complicated and
17 we appreciate the enormous amount of listening and
18 improvements that you've done and hope that these
19 rules ultimately will incorporate many of the
20 positive things you've done sort of informally in a
21 more formal way and thanks also to court counsel for
22 your work. We submitted along with this a pretty
23 detailed legal memo, which the thrust of which says
24 that, that because the SAPO rules were initially just
25 about street permits, but the Pedestrian Plazas are

1 more park-like spaces our key argument is that, is
2 looking at some of the legal precedence which the
3 city has successfully litigated with respect to
4 creating a proper balance between commercial and
5 civic activities in parks as a framework for
6 strengthening SAPO's tools for regulating and
7 choosing events. And so that's a core thing that we
8 encourage you to look at closely in terms of those
9 legal arguments that we make, and we, one of the key
10 parts as well, another key element point that we make
11 is that to, as explicitly and affirmatively as
12 possible to allow for the use of data and analysis
13 and facts about what, what's specific conditions
14 exist in a particular place even variations by time
15 and day for instance, you know, Saturday in Times
16 Square, it's a two-show day, different set of facts,
17 and using that analysis in connection with the Plaza
18 Partners when they have those information, to give
19 you guys the tools to be able to have more nuanced
20 non-content based feedback and decision making about
21 events.

22 There's a few specific things we just want
23 to touch on based on some of those park precedents we
24 think that some of laid the grounds for denial or
25 conditioning of a permit can take in some additional

1 factors like the location, the date and time of
2 improvements allotted. In the previous two years the
3 applicant has knowingly validated a material term. We
4 also think that special knowledge of the Plaza
5 Partners throughout the city should be acknowledged
6 more clearly in the revised rules. The partners
7 input, while not determinative should be
8 consideration because of the unique facts,
9 circumstances and community driven nature of the
10 plazas. So ideally referencing the Plaza Partner
11 event is a defined term, the, having the DOT based
12 rights and requirements of the, the rights and
13 requirements based on our DOT agreements acknowledged
14 explicitly in the rules would be great and that the
15 permit won't be issued unless those, those conditions
16 are met. We'd like the Community Board and Plaza
17 Partners to have again sort of more explicit
18 opportunity to weigh in on non-content base things,
19 but you know, to reflect on the impact of these
20 events and perspective events on the plazas. We also
21 do feel that for Time Square in particular we still
22 are interested in having a reasonable cap on large
23 and extra-large events, either having that done
24 explicitly through separate Times Square rules or
25 simply explicitly saying that if there's a powerful

1 set of facts that shows the accumulative effect of
2 multiple large events in a particular place, then
3 there can be a non-content based way of capping that,
4 and we do understand that there may be a need for
5 occasional exceptions if, that are also non-content
6 based so we understand that there's some complexity
7 there.

8 MS. CANFIELD: Thank you.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay, thank you.

10 MS. D'ANGELO: Clayton Smith.

11 MR. CLAYTON SMITH: Good morning.

12 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

13 MR. SMITH: Hello, I'm Clayton Smith, second
14 vice chair of Manhattan Community Board Five and
15 chair of the board's committee on parks and public
16 space. It's my honor to represent Manhattan Community
17 Board Five and thank you, Michael Carey and CECM and
18 SAPO for their continuing work on these important
19 rules. The legislation this year that allowed for the
20 promulgation of these rules is an important step
21 forward. First and foremost we're very pleased to see
22 language in the rules that explicitly grant SAPO with
23 the authority to say no to an event application by
24 taking into consideration its impact on the
25 community. As you know, we've advocated for that for

1 seven years so we're onboard with that, although we
2 do believe the language could probably be
3 strengthened and made more specific so that SAPO
4 would have no hesitation no matter who's employed at
5 SAPO citing grounds for denial or conditions for
6 those reasons. There are some concerns we had. We
7 agreed that a cap should still be on the table
8 especially for large and extra-large events. For any
9 partnering bid that requests it. Additionally, we
10 also agree with Bid Association that the rules should
11 include Plaza Partner Event as a defined term
12 acknowledging the distinctive role of the bids and
13 the management of these spaces. Community based
14 programming does not need to be subject to the same
15 requirements as commercial events. In particular, the
16 event permit deadlines being proposed, but commercial
17 event applications we strongly support the extended
18 deadlines. They'll greatly help us evaluate the
19 benefits or impact of an event.

20 We are also pleased to see language
21 requiring the community be advised of event permit
22 applications but this brings to our most important
23 concern. It appears that the rules will not
24 materially improve, the capability we have today to
25 review the applications. For years we've been told

1 that the current system allows for public review, but
2 to be clear the meaning of public review is when an
3 application is evaluated in the public setting of a
4 community board committee or full board meeting.
5 Today this is not the case. When a permit application
6 is received by SAPO it is entered into the CECM
7 database. The only person affiliated with CB-5 is
8 capable of seeing that is the board's one staff
9 member who uses the one computer that has been
10 approved by the city to access the database; her name
11 is Kim. There are several hundred entries with more
12 added every day and the information that Kim can view
13 is extremely limited; the name of the event, the date
14 and the plaza. So for example, product launch, August
15 8, Flat Iron. This is not enough for Kim to know if
16 the board might be interested in more information on
17 the application and it isn't her role to do so
18 anyway, it's the boards. So as it stands now there's
19 no realistic way that the volunteers who comprise the
20 membership of community boards including myself as
21 chair of the committee who is responsible for
22 evaluating for the applications can determine whether
23 or not we even need to learn more about a proposed
24 event let alone call them into a public hearing. Only
25 after that would we call them in. If the system

1 doesn't change the proposed rules aims of allowing
2 for public review will actually be meaningless. We
3 may go through all these legislative improvements
4 only to end up still hampered by a system that
5 renders that public review mode. We must have more
6 initial information as part of the system and now we
7 believe is the time to make that change.

8 Finally, there are just a few outstanding
9 specific questions about the rules that we would love
10 to have addressed. One, if the board recommends
11 denial and the applicant fails to file written
12 comments then the application shall be deemed -- I'll
13 submit these questions later.

14 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

15 MS. D'ANGELO: Gerald Scupp or Gerard Seupp.
16 If anybody who had just arrived that would like to
17 testify you have to sign this sheet.

18 MR. GERALD SCUPP: Hi, my name is Gerald
19 Scupp and I am vice-president of the Garment District
20 Alliance. We thank SAPO for undertaking the complex
21 issues related to the co-management of public space
22 and I am testifying in opposition of the outcome of
23 these otherwise thoughtful discussions that took
24 place for new rules. Our overriding concern is that
25 there's a lack of consideration for the special

1 relationship that bids share with DOT and SAPO. The
2 rules do not reflect that the bids are year round co-
3 managers of these public spaces contractually bound
4 and responsible for their maintenance and all the
5 furnishings, plantings and whether or not there are
6 events. These rules do not reflect the day to day,
7 the reality of our day-to-day relationship with these
8 spaces. In addition to cleaning, furnishing, planting
9 and maintaining we also provide a program to enhance
10 the neighborhood. We deal with complaints even for
11 events that are not ours and we deal with the
12 problems that come with providing free and open space
13 to immerse to go into at this time.

14 The plazas are an all-weather 24/7
15 responsibility that goes beyond budgeting and
16 planning for events. In our district the plazas are
17 the only open space and what occurs there including
18 non-bid events, non-bid events are often attributed
19 to us and reflect upon the image and value of our
20 organization and neighborhood. There are several
21 matters in the rules just to name a few that should
22 be adjusted to recognize the special relationship
23 that the bids share with the city, including the bid
24 should not be required to pay permit fees for their
25 own events. Bids should be, should be required to

1 only give two weeks' notice for a bid event because
2 of the need for, to be opportunistic and flexible.
3 The city fee applied to any event should be nominal,
4 reflecting only application process costs unless the
5 city, upon reviewing an event application, determines
6 that other city services are needed. We have never
7 seen any city services provided at any event on any
8 of our plazas although we know that these fees are
9 paid. The city fees should be low enough so that they
10 do not influence an event producer's decision on a
11 location. The determination of the location's value
12 should be left to the organization that invests and
13 manages it.

14 The fees a bid can charge should not be
15 static as expenses related to the plazas are subject
16 to frequent change. Bids should be allowed the final
17 say on whether events are approved or not. The
18 appearance and activities of the plazas can be
19 influential on the surrounding businesses and can
20 also impact the public's overall impression of the
21 neighborhood. If the city requires that a public
22 plaza be used for a large city sponsored event the
23 bid shall be paid in advance to ensure that the bid
24 actually receives the payment. In the past there have
25 been instances where the alliance has experienced

1 considerable, expended considerable time and money on
2 events based upon the city's good faith and we
3 received either a non-negotiated greatly reduced fee
4 or we did not receive any payment at all.

5 The alliance recoups only a small fraction
6 of the 1.3 million a year we spend on plazas. Despite
7 this we and our constituents are happy to have this
8 much needed public space. Likewise, we are happy to
9 make the investment which benefits not only the local
10 employees and tourists and other visitors, but we do
11 not treat the plazas as cash cows and we do not think
12 the city should do so either, and thank you for your
13 time.

14 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

15 MS. D'ANGELO: Sebastian Maguire.

16 MR. SEBASTIAN MAGUIRE: Today I'm reading
17 comments on behalf of New York City council member
18 Daniel Drum. As the city council member representing
19 district 25 in Jackson Heights and Elmhurst Queens,
20 I'm submitting the following comments to the proposed
21 SAPO rules for Pedestrian Plaza events. My district
22 is home to thriving pedestrian plazas, the 78th
23 Street, Play Street managed by the Jackson Heights
24 Green Alliance and Diversity Plaza managed by Suki
25 and the Neighborhood Plaza Partnership. Both plazas

1 provide vibrant programming to my diverse communities
2 and are vital resources to the neighborhood. As
3 written the proposed SAPO changes will create
4 additional hardship for Plaza Partners especially the
5 many under resourced partners like those in my
6 district, which struggle to produce the kind of
7 locally produced programming out community's desire.

8 Along with the Jackson Heights Green
9 Alliance, Neighborhood Plaza Partnership, I support
10 the following recommendations. Review and modify the
11 definition of Tier B plaza classification to better
12 reflect the size, location of our community's needs.
13 Consider the type of maintenance partner, for
14 example, bid other nonprofit volunteer group when you
15 determine tiers, or to create a specific tier that
16 includes only plazas run by small organizations in
17 neighborhood groups. Bringing application deadlines
18 to 14 days for plaza partners as recommended by the
19 Neighborhood Plaza Partnership, which is the system
20 in place currently, this allows groups to
21 successfully program their contractual obligations.
22 Review and consider the event classification proposal
23 in accordance with actual plaza activities and to
24 include the ability to have amplified sound for small
25 events especially since the sound permit is already

1 required from the local police precinct. Review the
2 proposed fee structure to reflect the needs of the
3 outer boroughs. The type of fee structure that is
4 being proposed will make it impossible for local
5 commercial event producers or local small businesses
6 to sponsor events if they are required to pay the
7 city a fee and a partner fee to be in the plaza.

8 I hope that you will consider implementing
9 the proposed changes to acknowledge the needs of
10 smaller pedestrian plazas outside of Manhattan
11 especially those managed by small neighborhood and
12 volunteer organizations that serve low and moderate
13 income communities and immigrants. I urge you to
14 remove any potential barriers to participation and,
15 excuse me, participation and inclusion and to be a
16 true partner with our communities in making
17 pedestrian plazas a resource for all. Thank you.

18 MR. CAREY: Thanks.

19 MS. D'ANGELO: Elliot Winick.

20 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

21 MR. ELLIOT WINICK: Good morning. My name is
22 Elliot Winick, I'm the owner of Winick Productions
23 and I have been a special benefit producer in New
24 York City for over 40 years and handle hundreds of
25 street activity permits a year of various types. I

1 welcome this opportunity to comment on these proposed
2 regulations and commend CECM and SAPO in an attempt
3 to better code for rules and regulations. Regarding
4 the proposed definitions and stratifications of the
5 Pedestrian Plazas, I support those efforts in
6 general. I do believe it is a little bit too complex.
7 Right now there's four tiers, A, B, C and D, three
8 different sizes, large, medium and small and
9 geographic distinctions between the boroughs and
10 Manhattan. I think they can be simplified a little
11 bit more and not as complex as it seems, but I agree
12 with the trend in general and the definitions.

13 I strongly disagree with the trend to
14 requiring a longer deadline to submit applications to
15 support the Pedestrian Plazas and street events. It
16 wasn't that long ago in the early Bloomberg
17 administration that SAPO applications were submitted
18 on 8-part carbon forms, faxed to NYPD and other
19 agencies and meetings were set up by phone calls and
20 voicemail. Since then the applications are now filed
21 and paid for electronically, accessed by agencies on
22 a citywide database and most communications documents
23 are sent via e-mail. I have always praised CECM on
24 these ongoing technological improvements but if
25 anything these advantages should be having SAPO

1 office and other agencies working more efficiently
2 not less.

3 In these days when you get a
4 [unintelligible] [10:30:43] luggage in minutes and
5 even a temporary place of assembly permit from
6 Department of Buildings, which is quite complex, you
7 can get that in ten days, I believe that SAPO could
8 do it better than proposed. Perhaps the office should
9 consider streamlining their internal processes or
10 hire more staff from all these events that were
11 happening. The special events industry has grown in
12 normalcy in New York City in the last few years and
13 has a great impact economically for the city and the
14 city should be encouraging special events and not
15 putting up some of these [unintelligible] [10:31:15]
16 deadlines, which will discourage clients from
17 investing in special events and spending money in New
18 York City. While, in fact, most major events in, on
19 the plazas have a lot of lead time such as the NFL
20 kickoff or the Superbowl Boulevard or the Olympic
21 Promotions, many clients especially in marketing
22 related events and product launches do not have the
23 lead time that the city wants to require. If these
24 deadlines were implemented I believe there would be a
25 negative financial impact about SAPO, the local

1 business improvement districts and the local economy.

2 Even though SAPO states that they need more
3 time to properly review the application, provide the
4 applicant more time to plan and organize their event,
5 there has been no evidence that this additional time
6 will help clients in any way. I don't believe going
7 from 60 to 90 days for instance, from a one block to
8 a two day plaza event, I don't know what those extra
9 30 days provide it's still going to be the same
10 meetings whether, whichever way it goes.

11 My additional comments I submitted
12 electronically --

13 MS. CANFIELD: Three minutes, Mr. Winick.

14 MR. WINICK: Okay and I do believe that
15 there needs be better definitions on the small,
16 medium and large street events. Thank you.

17 MS. D'ANGELO: Alexandria Sica.

18 MS. ALEXANDRIA SICA: Good morning and thank
19 you. I want to echo the sentiments of a number of my
20 colleagues in saying thank you for taking our input
21 over the last year and we are very enthusiastic about
22 a lot of the changes in these regulations and
23 appreciative, but of course, there are several issues
24 that we'd like to point out now. I'll keep this
25 pretty direct by saying that support all the points

1 in the Bid Associations testimony and letters, but
2 have some very DUMBO specific requirements. I'm the
3 executive director of the DUMBO improvement district.
4 We manage two spaces, a lovely small skinny plaza on
5 Old Fulton Street and a very grand large space under
6 the Manhattan Bridge, which includes the archway into
7 the Manhattan Bridge.

8 The DUMBO specific concerns that I'll
9 highlight right now, of course, the issue of timing I
10 just want to highlight three kinds of examples of why
11 these longer lead times are going to significantly
12 compromise our ability to put on quality community
13 programming. So the first example is with arts
14 organizations. Often we partner with arts
15 organizations and many times just signal artists
16 themselves to put on an event. One example is that
17 last year a puppeteer, Belanarka [phonetic], brought
18 this amazing giant whale puppet for free to the
19 Plaza, delighting hundreds of local children,
20 creating a wonderful spectacle, that permit was filed
21 29 days in advance of the event and just as the
22 artist was passing through New York City we were able
23 to take advantage of her willingness to do something
24 good for our community and we really feel strongly
25 that those kinds of events should continue to happen.

1 We oppose the 30 days extension going up from 14 and
2 ask that it should, that for a Plaza event partners
3 it go back to the 14 days. Two other stakeholders
4 that I'll just highlight for that reason; we work
5 with a lot of local startups who are scrappy, they
6 have small budgets, they often want to do something
7 to promote themselves and give back to the community.
8 We want to provide those opportunities and we've had
9 to, you know, there was a rabies awareness event for
10 local dogs a startup wanted to put on, we've had to
11 reject that event based on the 30 days lead time.
12 Finally our small businesses who, you know, often
13 don't know when they're grand opening is going to be,
14 often don't have budgets to really set out ahead of
15 time to plan for something, want to coordinate with
16 us and want to do good things in the community.

17 A couple of other DUMBO specific provisions
18 that I want to highlight, the small events that are
19 without amplified sound were under the Manhattan
20 Bridge and so the idea that we wouldn't have
21 amplified sound at any kind of event is an exception.
22 I think there are many justifications for why the
23 fee, the long lead times and some of these
24 administrative burdens --

25 MS. CANFIELD: Your three minutes up.

1 MS. SICA: -- sure; should be waived based
2 on hour, our intimate knowledge of these spaces. I've
3 outlined a lot of those reasons in my testimony which
4 I'll be submitting, thank you.

5 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

6 MS. D'ANGELO: Tanya Rynd.

7 MS. TANYA RYND: Okay.

8 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

9 MS. RYND: Good morning. I want to thank you
10 for having the hearing and I'm happy to be here. I'm
11 here as a resident and small business of DUMBO and
12 I'm in support of what the bid has, DUMBO bid has put
13 forward. I've been in the neighborhood for 22 years
14 and I'm one of the owners of Superfine, which is
15 pioneer business for the last 18 years in DUMBO and
16 I've seen the development for a tremendous amount of
17 time. I came to the neighborhood as an artist and I
18 am in alignment with a tremendous amount of small
19 businesses and other arts, organizations that are
20 fielding information through me and through the DUMBO
21 bid. I love what has been happening in the Plaza in
22 terms of what the DUMBO bid has been able to
23 facilitate and I think primarily the amount of
24 flexibility and availability for them to make
25 decisions to support artists and community events

1 would be compromised with the new timeline that's
2 outlined. I have a, I'm a part of the Plaza in terms
3 of having a concession stand there and we are so
4 excited about what has been able to happen, but we
5 don't feel that we fall into the larger category,
6 it's really important for us to be able to work with
7 the small businesses that are there. So we would like
8 to have some kind of, some awareness to the
9 specificness of DUMBO. Thank you.

10 MS. D'ANGELO: Edward J. McMahan, III.

11 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

12 MR. EDWARD McMAHAN: Good morning. I'm Eddie
13 McMahan, business manager of Local 1, International
14 Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. We represent
15 over 3360 members I'm here representing as well as
16 over 100 vendors and employees who do one of special
17 events contracts throughout our jurisdiction. Our
18 main objection is as written is the key element
19 extending the lead time to file the applications. We
20 believe in this day and age it isn't necessary I
21 firmly believe this would restrict employment
22 opportunities for our members, the union as well as
23 the non-union members. This is an industry where we
24 do over \$20 million worth of business, another \$6.8
25 million in benefits, which is, this is a, it would

1 have a crippling effect on us on the amount of work
2 that we would lose with just the deadline alone. We
3 also provide our medical coverage for our members,
4 we're self-insured, so in this day and age we all
5 know that talks of medical coverage what you hear. So
6 that's a key element there, but as I said the biggest
7 thing is restricting the lead time. We do special
8 events in Times Square, Military Island, I sign
9 contracts for movie premiers, one-offs anywhere in
10 the street, anywhere in Manhattan where there's a
11 vendor coming in that knows Local 1 is looking to
12 reach out to do their job cheaper and more efficient
13 and professionally. So as I said this would have a
14 severe economic impact and we would like in this day
15 and age to be encouraging people to keep work in
16 Manhattan and New York City. We're not trying to time
17 barriers that would discourage them. Thank you very
18 much for your time.

19 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

20 MS. D'ANGELO: Paul F. Dean, Jr.

21 MS. PAUL DEAN: I'm going to decline my
22 comments, thank you.

23 MS. D'ANGELO: Melissa Chapman.

24 MS. MELISSA CHAPMAN: Good morning, Mr.
25 Carey and guests. I'm Melissa Chapman and senior vice

1 president for Public Affairs at the Brooklyn Chamber
2 of Commerce. I bring comments on behalf of our
3 president and CEO, Carlos Lasora [phonetic]. The
4 Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce is a membership business
5 assistance organization that represents the interest
6 of over 2100 member businesses as well as business
7 across the borough of Brooklyn. Today we respectfully
8 seek amendments to the proposed rules for events on
9 Pedestrian Plazas that would provide a less rigid
10 permitting process for neighborhood based activities.
11 Pedestrian Plazas are prized public spaces that
12 create a safe space for locals and tourists alike.
13 Strengthen the bonds of community and provide a
14 conducive environment for business development. Like
15 many other New York City advocates for economic
16 development, the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce was
17 pleased with the adoption of local law 53 earlier
18 this year, which made Pedestrian Plazas a permanent
19 feature of the city's streetscape. However, we have
20 some concerns related to the event permitting reform
21 through SAPO as currently drafted.

22 While well-intentioned these regulations
23 will place excessive strain on already limited
24 resources of many community based partners,
25 entrepreneurs and small businesses. For example, the

1 proposed requirement that all events permit be filed
2 at least 30 days in advance will deter many community
3 groups from even applying for a permit. All of the
4 information pertaining to the event may not be
5 available that early in advance. This time
6 requirement may even discourage commercial event
7 producers who will bring fewer events to Pedestrian
8 Plazas and will create a major missed opportunity for
9 generating for traffic in struggling neighborhoods.
10 Another provision that will further complicate the
11 process is a mandatory site visit for any event
12 occupying less, more than 25% of space, sorry.
13 Despite the fact that these two groups worked
14 together on almost a daily basis a simple review via
15 from e-mail could eliminate the need for an actual
16 site visit.

17 In closing, we would like to say that we
18 support the New York City Business Improvement
19 District and other stakeholders and respectfully ask
20 for the following amendments. One, to waive the lead
21 time requirements and reduce administrative burden
22 for Plaza Partners, rationalize fees and acknowledge
23 existing practices on partner fees. These amendments
24 would go a long way encouraging community
25 enhancements and economic development in Pedestrian

1 Plazas in our city. Thank you so much for the
2 opportunity to testify on this matter.

3 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

4 MS. D'ANGELO: Robert Perris.

5 MR. ROBERT PERRIS: Good morning.

6 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

7 MR. PERRIS: As stated my name is Robert
8 Perris and I'm the district manager for Brooklyn
9 Community Board 2. I have been told indirectly that
10 the Mayor's office of Citywide Event Coordination and
11 Management consulted community boards as it developed
12 its rules governing the issuance of permits for events
13 held in Pedestrian Plazas created by the Department
14 of Transportation. However, Brooklyn Community Board
15 2 was not consulted. Brooklyn Community District 2
16 includes more business improvement districts than any
17 other community district in the city. The district
18 management associations that oversee the bids are
19 frequently designated by DOT as the management
20 partners for the Pedestrian Plazas it develops. The
21 large number of bids in community district 2 in
22 combination with certain physical characteristics has
23 resulted in a large number of public plazas in the
24 district.

25 Specifically, over 15% of all the plazas

1 tabulated on the tier list 40% of the plazas in
2 Brooklyn and almost a quarter of the tier A and tier
3 B plazas are located in Brooklyn Community District
4 2. Perhaps a Manhattan eccentric approach might
5 explain in part why the proposed rules seems to be
6 poorly defined and likely to have un-intended
7 negative consequences. How the tiers are defined
8 seems inelegant and insensitive to the
9 characteristics of individual plazas and the context
10 in which they are situated. If left as written some
11 plazas in Brooklyn Community District 2 may become
12 dominated by commercial events while others because
13 of the tier and fee structure may become un-attracted
14 to commercial events, a source of revenue for plaza
15 maintenance.

16 The most significant efficiency of the
17 proposed rules is the failure to legally define the
18 Plaza Partners and the events they sponsor or to
19 recognize their unique roles pursuant to existing
20 agreements with DOT and the Department of Small
21 Business Services. I believe that CECM can grant
22 considerably more flexibility to the district
23 management associations to program events because
24 they're means for sanctioning those who do not
25 operate responsibly. In particular, the Plaza

1 Partners need shorter filing deadlines if they're
2 going to be able to continue to take advantage of
3 spontaneous opportunities, often a partnership with
4 local churches, schools and other neighborhood
5 groups. The filing deadlines as proposed will likely
6 result in fewer community based events and increased
7 homogeneity.

8 Since the 60 plazas are a finite group known
9 to the street activity permit officer staff, site
10 visits may well be unnecessary. I have been told that
11 the Office of Citywide Event Coordination and
12 Management states that there has been an epidemic of
13 complaints from community boards citywide about
14 events held in plazas. This has not been my
15 experience. I note also that very few of the plaza
16 events in Brooklyn Community District 2 have required
17 a significant police presence. I respect completely
18 how difficult it is define terms and typologies that
19 can be applied citywide, I am nonetheless asking the
20 Office of Citywide Event Coordination and Management
21 to continue its conversation with the District
22 Management Associations and community boards --

23 MS. CANFIELD: Three minutes.

24 MR. PERRIS: -- so that the, you are
25 correct. Thank you for opportunity to comment.

1 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

2 MS. CANFIELD: Well done, thank you.

3 MS. D'ANGELO: Michael Lambert.

4 MR. MICHAEL LAMBERT: Hey, Michael, good
5 morning.

6 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

7 MR. LAMBERT: I'm going to try and keep this
8 as brief as I can and I know you've heard my coach,
9 Ellen Baer earlier. So, good morning, my name is
10 Michael Lambert, I serve as the executive director of
11 the Bedford-Stuyvesant-Gateway Business Improvement
12 District. Which is the home to almost 400 small
13 businesses along Fulton Street between Troy and
14 Clauson Avenues and along Milton Avenue from Atlantic
15 Avenue to Halsey Street and the central Brooklyn
16 neighborhood of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn. I also
17 serve as a coach of the [unintelligible] [10:47:04]
18 Bid Association, a member organization of the city's
19 bid directors created collectively address issues
20 faced by the CECM's 72 business improvement
21 districts. I know you heard a little bit from Ellen
22 Baer, my coach here a short while ago.

23 I'm going to first thank Michael Paul Carey,
24 the staff at SAPO and the many others involved in the
25 process for their leadership regarding the proposed

1 amendments of Chapter 1 of Title 50 of the Rules of
2 New York City. The Bedford-Stuyvesant Gateway
3 Business Improvement District is a 64th of city's 72
4 business improvement districts and was fortunate to
5 have been selected to participate in the first round
6 of the city's public plaza program in 2008. Marcy
7 Plaza, the bids public gathering space is an 8000
8 square foot plaza that has provided Bedford-
9 Stuyvesant's main commercial corridor with a place of
10 respite from the surrounding urban environment. Since
11 it's opening in 2013, Marcy Plaza has provided the
12 area with a place to take a break from a busy day of
13 shopping, running errands or scurrying to the next
14 appointment. A greenspace with plantings and flowers
15 and a space where community programming has included
16 plays, musical performances, farmer's markets,
17 clothing drives and other community building
18 activities. As one of the city's smaller and
19 [unintelligible] [10:48:08] public plazas we do not
20 face some of the event permitting issues faced by
21 some of our larger and more experience plaza partner
22 colleagues.

23 However, as our young plaza continues to
24 evolve with increased programming activities that
25 further support and enhance economic development

1 while creating a vibrant public space, the need for
2 thoughtful rules that will allow us to continue to
3 increase local programming and activation of Marcy's
4 plaza is critical. While our plaza is not the type of
5 plaza that can accommodate a large commercial event
6 we've learned especially over the past several months
7 the support from the Mayor's one NYC plaza equity
8 program, which provided resources to promote the
9 frontal beautification and activation of the plaza
10 there there's a demonstrated need for a flexible
11 rules process that with regard to programming of the
12 space. As people get more familiar with the plaza as
13 their public space I have been approached with
14 greater frequency on a number of occasions on short
15 notice by community partners who seek to partner with
16 the bit to program the space.

17 Requiring large windows for event permit
18 filing will only minimize the number of events that
19 will be produced in conjunction with our efforts to
20 foster community engagement, a key reason why these
21 spaces were designed and created. They will also need
22 to be clear and flexible rules with regard to how the
23 physical space is used by community partners to again
24 maximize utilization of this public community space.
25 As the major partner for Marcy Plaza with the City of

1 New York, we will be critical if the bids directly
2 involved in decision making and the programming of
3 the space including the rules for how the space is
4 programmed. In Bedford-Stuyvesant, the bid prides
5 itself on strong and supportive relations with
6 Brooklyn Community Board #3, the City's 79th and 81st
7 police precincts, also community councilman Robert
8 Corey, Jr. and various other elected officials.

9 I'm just going to close by saying that will
10 all this being case I think that the proposed rules
11 should not be codified without further collaborative
12 discussion with other community partners such as the
13 Bid Association and others. Thank you again for
14 giving me the time to testify this morning.

15 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

16 MS. D'ANGELO: Eirik Gaslason.

17 MR. EIRIK GASLASON: Good morning, my name
18 is Eirik D. Gaslason, thank you for the opportunity
19 to speak on behalf of friends of Diversity Plaza and
20 Diversity Plaza in Jackson Heights, Queens. Last
21 month time magazine featured an article called the
22 250 Reasons to Celebrate America Right Now, and
23 Diversity Plaza was listed as number 46 of those
24 reasons. I assure you that is not because of the
25 esthetic beauty of the plaza itself, but rather the

1 programming that occurs there and happens there.
2 Diversity Plaza represents a very large and diverse
3 community in Jackson Heights and Queens in general
4 and the programming on Diversity Plaza ranges from
5 [unintelligible] [10:51:00] expos, that's influences.
6 Coffee and Chai hours, community board meetings,
7 demonstrations, vigils, animal and family day and
8 tree lighting events, a uni-popup library, prayer
9 services, cultural events and holiday celebrations,
10 to make music New York, LGPT celebrations and art
11 installations. It's incredibly important to our
12 community and these are not large events, these are
13 small, these are locally produced, small events that
14 require a lot less lead time than 60 days
15 unfortunately.

16 That is, that is I think our main concern
17 with this proposal is the extension to a 60 day lead
18 time. What will that do to a plaza like Diversity
19 Plaza and I, and I recognize that there are many
20 people in this room who have plazas that are equally
21 as important to their community as Diversity Plaza is
22 to ours, and what will this do to plazas like
23 Diversity Plaza. The programming would be very, very
24 difficult, far more difficult than it is now, to
25 educate the community on what is necessary already is

1 difficult, but this would make it very prohibitive
2 and we feel that the necessary lead time should be
3 much less than 60 days. I thank you very much for the
4 opportunity to speak and have a wonderful day.

5 MR. CAREY: Thanks, you too.

6 MS. D'ANGELO: Yisrael Gladstein.

7 MR. YISRAEL GLADSTEIN: Good morning, I'll
8 be speaking on behalf of City Council member Rad
9 Lander. Dear Mr. Carey, along with my colleagues,
10 Council Members Johnson, Girodnick and Rodriguez have
11 worked with a wide range of stakeholders to craft and
12 pass enteral 1109-2016, the council's legislation
13 which codified the Department of Transportation
14 Pedestrian Plazas. New rules by DOT and new rules by
15 SAPO were critical steps to ensure that the
16 legislation has its full time. I appreciate your
17 timely response and commitment to that process.
18 However, significant amendments to the proposed SAPO
19 rules are necessary to ensure the positive change we
20 all envisioned when crafting enteral 1109-2016.

21 To that end I support the New York City Bid
22 Associations comments as well as the comments
23 submitted by the Horticultural Society as
24 neighborhood plaza partnership program and its 12
25 community based plaza partner cosigners. I urge to

1 seriously consider making changes to the rules based
2 on suggestions from those with on the ground plaza
3 management expertise. The two Pedestrian Plazas in my
4 district along with the other 70 plus plazas citywide
5 have been phenomenally popular and successful. They
6 host a wide array of events year around from small
7 book giveaways to large scale arts and culture
8 festivals. Those events attract local residents and
9 visitors, they increase economic activity around the
10 plaza and they build and promote strong communities.
11 The plaza partners are the lynch pin in making all of
12 that happen. We cannot afford to undermine their
13 efforts by creating a burdensome permitting process.
14 We cannot afford to put at risk their ability to
15 attract, host and produce the kinds of local, civic,
16 free activities we all want to see in these
17 neighbors.

18 With each year these plazas become more
19 popular and more attractive as event spaces for local
20 organizations and businesses as well as outside
21 commercial events producers. Because it is unlikely
22 that these rules will be changed again in the near
23 future, it's imperative that we get this right and
24 create rules, which enable the Plaza Partners to
25 carry out their responsibilities efficiently and

1 without undue financial and administrative burden.
2 Avenue C Plaza and Kensington Plaza in my district
3 are managed by a committed but sorely un-resourced
4 volunteer civic organization. I know many of my
5 council colleagues have similar situations in which
6 community based nonprofits are investing a great deal
7 of their own time and money with little outside help.
8 If SAPO rules create more hardship for them, we are
9 all, SAPO, DOT and the council missing the
10 opportunity to leverage the relationship for the
11 betterment of our city. I urge you to amend the rules
12 in keeping with the comments provided by both the bid
13 and non-bid plaza partners. Thank you very much.

14 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

15 MS. D'ANGELO: Dan Pisark.

16 MR. DAN PISARK: Hello, good morning, my
17 name is Dan Pisark. I'm with the 34th Street
18 Partnership BID, thank you for the opportunity to
19 testify today. I have a statement to read. The City
20 of New York has a long history of underpricing
21 permits for commercial activity in public spaces such
22 as newsstands, food carts and events as in the case
23 of Harold Square our immediate concern today. The
24 34th Street Partnership has major concerns that this
25 practice will continue under the proposed rules for

1 events on Pedestrian Plazas. The proposed rules show
2 little acknowledgement of the management agreement
3 that the partnership holds with the city. Our plaza
4 doesn't have any problems attracting event producers.
5 The proposal to reduce fees owed to the city by an
6 event applicant would be traumatically lower, would
7 dramatically lower the overall cost of holding a
8 commercial event at Harold Square. This will
9 undoubtedly increase the number of applications for
10 commercial events taking place in our public plazas,
11 taking the space away from the public on more
12 occasions.

13 When paired with the lengthy and regimented
14 review process also being proposed we foresee an
15 enormous administrative strain on the Plaza Partner
16 staff. We ask that 34th Street Partnership have the
17 ability to set our own fees as set forth in our DOT
18 management agreement. The city should recognize the
19 Plaza Partner's role as advocates for the best
20 interest of these public plazas. We should be given
21 the first opportunity to comment on any application
22 received by SAPO. Plaza Partner review should come
23 before the community board review process. We support
24 community consultation on events but a lengthy review
25 process is not practical. We also echo the Bid

1 Associations' comments that a separate category be
2 created for Plaza Partner events. We produce many
3 free public activities such as dance and fitness
4 classes, sketching meet ups and performances. These
5 events should not be subject to burdensome delays.

6 In closing I would like to say that the
7 proposed SAPO rules make it difficult to honor all
8 management commitment with the city because the new
9 rules further weaken our ability to fund our
10 activities. It will open the flood gates to too many
11 low quality, low budget commercial events. When we
12 are given the right, the 34th Street Partnership has
13 successfully priced at market rates in other spaces
14 such as in Bryant Park. In these spaces we meet our
15 financial goals by allowing a small number of high
16 quality, high paying events. If these rules are
17 enacted our bid may be forced to turn the management
18 of the plaza back over to the city. Thank you.

19 MR. CAREY: Thank you.

20 MS. D'ANGELO: Laura Hansen.

21 MS. LAURA HANSEN: Good morning. I'm Laura
22 Hansen, managing director of Neighborhood Plaza
23 Partnership, which is a program of the Horticultural
24 Society. Thank you for you and your staff's time and
25 energy that you spend on these rules and for engaging

1 the stakeholders over the past year. I'm here today
2 representing our work across the city with close to
3 20 plaza partners, we provide sanitation,
4 horticultural and organization of development
5 services, and our comments are based directly on
6 their expertise on the ground as the day to day
7 managers of these public spaces on behalf of their
8 communities. Thirteen of partners have cosigned our
9 letter, which we've submitted, 10 of them are located
10 outside of Manhattan. All of them care deeply about
11 these rules. You have heard and will hear from a few
12 of them directly this morning, but the vast majority
13 of them cannot be here, they don't have the staff or
14 the time to attend this hearing.

15 We understand the city's obligation to keep
16 these plazas and public spaces open to all kinds of
17 programs, but the proposed rules seem dismissive of
18 the integral role of the plaza partner and the local
19 conditions and circumstances of each site. We all
20 feel there should be significant amendments to the
21 rules as proposed, our key recommendations include a
22 plaza partner event category as the Bid Association
23 has also suggested just as civic and commercial
24 events are a particularly typography, which take into
25 account the particular needs related to that type of

1 event. We feel the Plaza Partner event category would
2 go a long way toward improving the proposed rules. We
3 recommend a 14 day application deadline for Plaza
4 Partner produced or co-sponsored events. We recommend
5 Plaza Partner notification from SAPO and via the
6 website encouraging applicants to contact the Plaza
7 Partner directly, and the Plaza Partner and the
8 community board should have the same review period
9 for commercial and/or third party applications.

10 As you know DOT Plaza Partners are
11 contractually obligated by the city to maintain and
12 program these spaces. Many of our groups are
13 cosigners, do this willingly, they do it well, but it
14 is challenging. They are under resourced, they do not
15 have the luxury of long review time for planning
16 events, their funding sources are unpredictable,
17 inconsistent and often not in hand in time for quick
18 decisions about programming. The many programs that
19 really effect and improve quality of life in these
20 neighborhoods are small and they're produced by small
21 local groups from an hour of flute playing in
22 Brovartis Plaza to a family board game day at
23 Diversity Plaza, which our staff by volunteers, those
24 are the kinds of events we want to encourage and make
25 easy. Let's see, this is important on the

1 notification, the cosigned community partners that we
2 work with do not have the same privileges as the bid
3 partners. That means there's no official e-mail
4 address by which they can be automatically notified
5 when an outside event producer requests a permit for
6 the plaza. This is problematic for many reasons
7 including the maintenance burden that is put on
8 plazas and their own inability to plan around outside
9 events. Thank you.

10 MS. D'ANGELO: Phillip Kellogg.

11 MR. PHILLIP KELLOGG: Good morning.

12 MR. CAREY: Good morning.

13 MR. KELLOGG: My name is Phillip Kellogg and
14 I'm executive director of the Fulton area business
15 alliance, which is a business improvement district on
16 Fulton Street in Brooklyn's neighborhood of Fort
17 Green and Clinton Hill. We help create and currently
18 maintain program activate and energize to Pedestrian
19 Plazas, Fowler Square and Putnam Triangular. FAB is
20 in complete support of the New York City Bid
21 Association letter on the need for changes to the
22 proposed plaza rules. I would also like to add
23 comments that are specific to Fowler Square and
24 Putnam Triangle and how two aspects of the new rules
25 will have negative effects on the communities that we

1 serve. They are overly long lead time for event
2 applications by plaza partners and contradictory
3 fees. The SAPO event application deadline for Putnam
4 Triangle already extended from 14 to 30 days would be
5 extended to 60 days. FAB is working very hard to
6 activate Putnam with three community based events. A
7 60 day application deadline would prevent some events
8 from every happening. Opportunities come up and we
9 want to be nimble to take advantage of them. It's all
10 part of our work of bringing positive activities to
11 this corner of southeast Clinton Hill, which is by
12 the way a world away from midtown Manhattan.

13 For example, the art making activity called
14 the cardboard challenge that a local school wanted to
15 do at Putnam Triangle so the community could see the
16 children's beautiful work would not have happened
17 with a 60 day application deadline. A jazz concert we
18 did a few weeks ago was such a big hit with over 300
19 people coming out and the community immediately we
20 began discussions about doing another concert the 60
21 day deadline would severely limit options. And last
22 Halloween we put on a small festival of students from
23 a nearby college as part of their community service
24 work, it was something we were able to pull together
25 on very short notice. It was good for the area

1 residents and business of the bid and it activated
2 the plaza. It would have been a shame if that had not
3 happened simply because of a 60 day application
4 window. For Plaza Partners the SAPO application
5 deadline for free civic events should be shorter not
6 extended. We are known entities with proven track
7 records that should be a significant value as work to
8 manage and activate these plazas. These are amenities
9 that benefit the entire community.

10 As to the rules related to the fees for
11 filing for Putnam, the cost to put on an event at
12 Putnam Triangle is actually too expensive as a Tier C
13 plaza the calculations don't take into account the
14 fact that foot traffic is less at Putnam than Fowler
15 Square. Again, we want to encourage use of Putnam
16 Triangle for so many reasons. The residents and
17 businesses nearby tell me they want more movies, more
18 concerts, more dance parties at Putnam, these fees
19 will limit those possibilities. Conversely at Fowler
20 Square, which is a Tier D plaza perhaps because of
21 its relatively small size, however, its location is
22 going to be very high in demand because of its
23 proximity to the Brooklyn cultural district in
24 downtown Brooklyn exploding population growth, with
25 its lower fees we fully expect Fowler Square to be

1 overrun with commercial events and third parties
2 events to the detriment of the residential and
3 business communities. So FAB supports the business,
4 the position articulated in the letter from the Bid
5 Association and recommends that you revisit many of
6 the rules in collaboration with the city's Plaza
7 Partners so New Yorker's in all neighborhoods get the
8 maximum benefit of these wonderful public spaces.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. D'ANGELO: Unless anybody would like to
11 speak that was it for testimonies.

12 MR. CAREY: Did we forget anyone? Alright
13 then, I will close this hearing and remind folks that
14 you have until 5 p.m. today, eastern time to submit
15 your remarks in writing as well. Thanks everyone,
16 have a great day.

17 MS. D'ANGELO: If you didn't sign in, we
18 will have sign-in sheets at the front.

19 [END OF HEARING]

20
21
22
23
24
25

1

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Lea Simmons, certify that the foregoing transcript of the Office of the Mayor CECM Public Hearing Regarding Proposed Amendment on August 8, 2016 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By



Date: August 9, 2016

GENEVA WORLDWIDE, INC

256 West 38th Street - 10th Floor

New York, NY 10018