

Bronx Community Board 8
Meeting Minutes
Joint Land Use Committee/Economic Development Committee
January 4, 2024

https://youtu.be/eeht4q-pxfo?si=hfXk_7TXWp9qP2hS

Location – Board Office: 5676 Riverdale Ave., Suite 100, Bronx, NY 10471

Hybrid Meeting

Chairmen Moerdler and Fazio called meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Attendance, Land Use:

Present (11) – Charles Moerdler, Martin Wolpoff, Sylvia Alexander, Bob Bender, Carol Blake, Lee Chong, Nick Fazio, Daniel Rowan, Jessica Sosa, Laura Spalter, Omar Murray (EC)

Absent (1) – David Gellman

Attendance, Economic Development:

Present (6) Nick Fazio, Joy Campbell Priveterre, Constance Barnes-Watson, Rhashida Hillard, Julia Gomez (EC), Community Member Miguel Matos

Absent (0)

Community Board Members:

Julie Reyes (CB8 Chair), Robert Fanuzzi, Kelli Buford, Mary Ellen Gibbs

Staff:

Ardy Malziu, Community Coordinator

Guests:

Camila Thomas (Department of City Planning), Jesse Lerer (NYS Assemblyman Dinowitz’s Office), James Power (Kramer Levin), Dan Reingold (Hebrew Home), Valerie Mutterperl (Perkins Eastman) Roberto Garcia (Perkins Eastman), Sherida Paulsen (Riverdale Nature Preservancy), Anne Shahmoon (Sigma Place), Steven Chait (Skyview on the Hudson), Karen Argenti, Margaret Groarke, Dr. Abba Leffler, Deirdre Burke (Broadway Community Alliance), Gary Axelbank, Ariel Pacheco (Norwood News), Timothy Lavin (AKRF Consulting Firm), Skip Piscitelli (CMW Strategies), Robert Press, Efrain Gonzalez

Land Use VOTE to APPROVE December 5, 2023, Minutes – APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

APPROVED (11) – C. Moerdler, M. Wolpoff, S. Alexander, B. Bender, C. Blake, L. Chong, N. Fazio, D. Rowan, J. Sosa, L. Spalter, O. Murray

ABSTAINED 0 OPPOSED 0

Economic Development VOTE to APPROVE November 6, 2023, and December 5, 2023, Minutes – APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

APPROVED (6) – N. Fazio, J. Campbell Priveterre, C. Barnes-Watson, R. Hillard, J. Gomez, Community Member M. Matos

ABSTAINED 0 OPPOSED 0

SNAD Application:

Hebrew Home for the Aged Special Permit Renewal – James Powers Esq., Valerie Mutterperl and Roberto Garcia Presented Renewal of the Special Permit and Authorizations for the Hebrew Home Project at the Riverdale Campus. The original permit was granted on September 26, 2018 (C180321 ZSX), including the following authorizations: 105-421, 105-422, 105-424, 105-425; and 105-432. The project is located at 5701-5961 Palisade Avenue, Riverdale, in Community District 8, The Bronx.

- Not yet certified by the Department of City Planning (DCP); Hoping to get certified soon and be back for a formal public hearing.
- Gave a snapshot of what currently exists on the campus, including an existing site plan.
- The current entrance is on the north site (North Entrance) and will address those changes that are being proposed. The North Entrance will remain the primary entrance.
- The south site will have some changes to accommodate the independent living apartment/residential buildings that will be added to the campus, and internal site circulation changes.
- The Goldfine Pavilion area is where they will be removing a building from the existing plan to accommodate the new independent living units.
- Showed the 2018 Approved Site Plan that included new independent living building of 3 separate wings.
- In 2018 DCP granted approvals for new independent living building of 3 separate wings and are a part of CCRC in R1 District.
- North Campus use is as of right in an R4 District.
- There was a series of authorizations under the SNAD regulations to modify topographic features, alteration of rock outcroppings, modification of tree preservation requirements, and modification of height and setback in the R4 District. There was a certification of a restoration plan also approved in 2018.
- In Fall 2022, an application was filed with DCP to renew the term of the special permit and SNAD authorizations for an additional three-year term. That application is still pending.
- A draft application has been submitted to modify the project in certain respects that they believe the modifications are minor and present improvements to the site plan.
- Showed the currently proposed site plan. No increase in floor area or total units on the project.
- The proposed changes for the North Entrance will allow for two rows of vehicles to stack within the site and still have adequate circulation space for large delivery vehicles.
- Further proposed changes in the south site to internal circulation roads to facilitate movement of delivery vehicles.
- A pickleball court will be added to the north site of the campus next to the river walk independent living building.
- The previously proposed tennis court on the south site would be replaced by two pickleball courts.
- The deteriorated Victorian Home building on the South Campus would be removed.
- All the other changes related to Building 1, located in the R4 District. A slight shift in the footprint of the building (3 feet, 6 inches to the North) to accommodate for the thickening of the walls for energy efficiency purposes. No net increase in building footprint or floor area.
- Additional excavation under the parking garage for Building 1. No change in the footprint of the excavation, just an additional 2 feet, 5 inches of excavation, to accommodate stackers and an increase in parking capacity in the garage from 71 to 138 cars.

- Minor changes to the exterior of Building 1 including bay windows and balconies to enhance the outdoor access of the residence.
- Rooftop terrace and additional rooftop equipment, which would be below the previously approved maximum building height of 139 feet and 8 inches.
- Elevator overrides that would exceed the previously approved maximum building height by an additional 11 feet and 8 inches to a height of 151 feet and 4 inches. These overrides are required for maintenance purposes and to allow for code compliant access to the roof.
- Hebrew Home in discussions with local community groups regarding the modifications.

Sherida Paulsen (Riverdale Nature Preservancy) –

- The planned modifications, including the increase in height to accommodate the elevator room, would not meet with their objections subject to the final plans, the review by the Community Board, and ultimately the City Planning Commission.
- Did specify the height increase should be limited to the location proposed and no comparable increase occur on R1-1 portion of the site.
- Questions raised regarding the proposed conversion from tennis courts to pickleball courts and the proposed removal of the existing house at the south end of the campus.
- Agrees that the modifications for Building 1 are an improvement and would like to see the improved design package move forward to fruition subject to all the reviews required, such as the Community Board and City Planning.
- This statement was jointly signed by the Riverdale Nature Preservancy, Skyview Co-Op, Sigma Place Residence, and the Riverdale Community Coalition.

Anne Shahmoon (Sigma Place) –

- Sigma Place is concerned about the switch from tennis courts to pickleball courts, the noise from pickleball and the increase in ambulances.

Steven Chait (Skyview on the Hudson) –

- Supported S. Paulsen's report and her assessment of this is Skyview's point of view on this as well.

Community Board was asked to form a task force or subcommittee on how to make the public access for the riverwalk expansion happen on the campus. J. Powers will be in touch with the DM to schedule something in regards to this.

B. Bender, M. Wolpoff and L. Spalter will be the initial members.

Discussion of Development at 69 Stevenson Pl, 71 Stevenson Place, 3862 Sedgwick Ave. and 3874 Sedgwick Ave. in Van Cortlandt Village brought by Dr. Abba Leffler

Committee, and community residents, discussed the current and planned development of the properties located at 69 Stevenson Pl, 71 Stevenson Place, 3862 Sedgwick Ave. and 3874 Sedgwick Ave. in Van Cortlandt Village.

- Chair Moerdler went on the record and stated that during a conversation with one of the developers and the Community Coordinator, there was a suggestion that Chair C. Moerdler's son, a lawyer at a law firm that is not the same as Chair C. Moerdler's law firm, was supposedly involved in some way with the developer. Chair Moerdler's son checked and has no involvement with Innovative Development and Construction. The Community Coordinator also stated that the developer, Innovative Development and Construction,

mentioned that Chair C. Moerdler's son is not representing them and that they were only familiar with him as he was used in other projects.

- 69 Stevenson Place has a proposed conversion to an existing four-story residential building. Converting into ten family residential building. No change in bulk.
- Chair C. Moerdler asked the Board Office to communicate with the Department of Buildings (DOB) to be kept advised on all the plans that are filed, as well as communicate with the developers in writing to attend the February Land Use meeting. Chair C. Moerdler also asked to send a letter to DOB for DOB not to approve any applications or permits without first notifying the board.
- Zoning for the properties is R6A with C2, C3 overlay.
- Committee needs to see what is being planned by the developers in the area to understand if there is anything prohibiting them from building in this zoning.
- The Van Cortlandt Jewish Center, located at 3880 Sedgwick Ave, is still owned by the Van Cortlandt Jewish Center. Innovative Development and Construction does not own the site where the Van Cortlandt Jewish Center is currently located. Innovative currently owns 3862 & 3870 Sedgwick Ave. A separate developer owns 69 Stevenson Place. 3874 Sedgwick Ave is also owned by a different developer.
- The committee was previously notified that the Van Cortlandt Jewish Center going to be subject to a sale which generated a significant amount of communication and problems.
- Community residents brought up several concerns and comments:
 - A resident understands that the Van Cortlandt Jewish Center is interested in selling the property to Innovative Development and Construction and they are in talks to do that.
 - In the neighborhood, residents have seen similar conversions that are planned for 69 Stevenson Place and the units tend to be very small studio apartments.
 - What is being built in the community is unacceptable and it is out of context for what the area is.
 - The neighborhood is low rise and low density and over the past years, there has been a dramatic change happening at a quick pace.
 - Parking is already challenging in the local streets. The new developments would add more congestion to an already congested area.
 - The interior demolition at 69 Stevenson Place has begun. The workers told a community resident that they plan on adding two floors on top of the existing structure.
 - A community resident is not opposed to growth, but wants smart growth where there is a balance between building and having open space, green space, parking, etc.

Report by Subcommittee working with Stagg Construction on 3745 Riverdale Avenue:

- A meeting has not been set up for January. The building, as anticipated, should have been finished but there has been delays because of window work that was done out of state and not delivered.
- As a result, they made some changes to the building, as discussed before, such as the statue in the front of the building.
- As soon as the window work is fixed and as soon as Con Edison approves the motorization of the elevator, the building is projected to be completed by the end of January.

- Committee asked what the statue would be. Previously suggested to Stagg to find a local sculptor to keep with the idea of community but they have found a commercial sculptor elsewhere.

Discussion on City of Yes for Economic Opportunity:

Non-Ulurp - The NYC Department of City Planning is proposing a citywide zoning text amendment to support economic growth and resiliency in New York City. This text amendment would facilitate the repurposing of existing nonresidential space by providing businesses with additional zoning flexibility to locate and expand.

Land Use Committee Chair C. Moerdler suggests that since there are two committees in the meeting, the discussion would be between all the committee members in attendance, and if there are to be votes, that they are done separately by each committee.

Economic Development Committee Chair N. Fazio stated that he partially disagreed with the suggestion. Wants to see how the discussion goes and at a certain point may want to ask the Land Use Committee to join Economic Development Committee on their resolution.

Chair N. Fazio states that the resolution is the Economic Development Committee resolution that the committee is bringing up for discussion within the committee and would like to solicit feedback and input from the Land Use Committee before they take a vote on it.

Committee Member asked why it isn't a joint resolution as it is a joint committee meeting and Chair N. Fazio states that then the committee would not have received all the advice, opinions and feedback from the Land Use Committee Members.

Chair N. Fazio states that this is the third joint committee meeting. Because the committee took the responsibility very seriously to provide the City with our recommendations, the Economic Development Committee decided with the Land Use Committee to agree on having the joint committee meetings. In the process, lots of feedback and information was received. Went back to the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity and the 18 proposals. Tried to create a compromise resolution based on the feedback received and that is what the resolution to be discussed in the meeting is. The resolution would answer vast majority of concerns that were brought to the attention of the committees.

Chair C. Moerdler states that not everyone has had the opportunity to read the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity as proposed by City Planning. Those who have read it, hopefully communicated their thoughts with Chair N. Fazio to put the pieces together to accommodate some form of a compromise resolution.

Discussion was had on the summary of the 18 text amendments for the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity. Comments, points of concern and questions brought up by both committees as follows:

- Chair C. Moerdler states:
 - Proposal #2 (Simplify district types) – good idea but is not sure that the proposals that have been advanced do that in any significant way that is positive or negative.

- Proposal #3 (Enable more small-scale production) – not sure if this would be an issue or not.
- Proposal #5 (Allow commercial on upper floors) – Have permits to show people that this can be safe.
- Proposal #6 (Modernize use terms) – wonderful idea.
- Proposal #9 (Nightlife) – has a problem with this proposal. CB8 has had social clubs with dancing and noise in residential areas in the past two years at the upper-end of Riverdale Ave. It has been before the Board and City Planning and the NYPD and others put an end to this as people were complaining.
- Proposal #10 (Amusements) – shared same sentiments as Proposal #9
- Proposal #11 (Home occupations) – controversial as people live in residential buildings, not commercial buildings.
- Proposal #15 (Campus commercial) – would allow ground floor units in New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) to have commercial use. Against this proposal unless the people who live in NYCHA approve of it, and that has not been successful.
- Proposal #17 (Adapting spaces for industries like film) – against this proposal
- Raised a question with Chair N. Fazio regarding the NYCHA proposal to say “disapproved, unless...” The reason being that City Planning when reviewing the conditions that say “Yes, but,” they will just stop with “Yes.” If you do it the other way around, you will get their attention.
- The Housing Committee did a draft resolution regarding the NYCHA proposal and came out against it because it would be taking away community and senior centers that are on the ground Floor of NYCHA. NYCHA already has a program looking into building affordable units in underutilized spaces in their buildings.
- The Economic Development Committee took the information received from the Housing Committee and tried to put it in their resolution with that feedback.
- Comment made that ULURP responses should state “No, unless...” and if that is not done then City Planning and the NYC Council will not review it in the way that it should be reviewed.
- Chair N. Fazio has no problems, pending no objections from the Economic Development Committee, with turning the contingencies within the resolution to “No, unless...” instead of “Yes, unless...”
- Chair N. Fazio agreed to add a nightlife stipulation for the final resolution.
- Concern with what defines a campus according to DCP. A campus is 1.5 acres of land that is owned by one owner. On a campus, you can build 15,000 square feet in a residential neighborhood.
- Marble Hill Houses has a small area in the middle of it where there are benches and trees. They are looking to fill this. Not enough funding has been provided to NYCHA by the government to maintain properties in proper shape, and as such they have declined. They are trying to turn over NYCHA properties to private developers under the following plan. An attempt to privatize to NYCHA.
- Chair N. Fazio states that we can agree to disagree. There is commercial on the ground floor at Parkchester. If that is good enough for them, it is not good enough for NYCHA? Same goes with Co-Op City. Tried to create a compromise and willing to re-word it to have the wording based on the committee members’ expertise and input.
- Chair N. Fazio states that when economic developers use software programming, the industries and multipliers can be ascertained through the data that is created. That allows the economic developers to understand the economic impact of incentives to bring in and cultivate particular industries within various commercial ecosystems.

- Concerns with the ability to have a corner property with 2,500 square feet under the new zoning, which is not allowed now. It would be a tremendous change in the character of a neighborhood. Recommendation to say “no” and why, then City Planning would pay attention to it.
- Concerns with the one size fits all concept of the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity. We are all different boroughs with unique neighborhoods. So much development would happen and would not be able to recognize our neighborhoods.
- Chair C. Moerdler and some committee members have various conditions on the proposals that they would like to work on with Chair N. Fazio via conference call to see if they can come up with an updated resolution before the Full Board meeting.
- Concern with DCP playing a citywide role in economic development at this scale. Question the role and documentation of DCP in the economic need that these zoning changes are designed to meet. Cookie cutter approach will change the neighborhood character. Runs contrary to most inner-city economic development models.
- A lot of the things being talked about are rule changes, not zoning changes such as enforcement issues, DOB issues. These are fixable problems. Are zoning changes a solution to it at this scale?
- City of Yes proposals held focused groups. Who was on the focus groups? Did they come to the Community Board and ask, “what should we do in your community?”
- Before vote, Committee made changes line by line to each of the proposed amendments which is reflected in the final resolution.

A MOTION was made by N. Fazio to VOTE on the Economic Development Committee Resolution based on the amendments discussed during the meeting - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Resolution of Bronx Community Board 8 in Support of the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" Initiative with Stipulated Conditions and Specifics Requiring Attention by the City of New York

WHEREAS, the well-being and prosperity of the community are intrinsic to the residents' quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the advancement of economic development is essential in cultivating a thriving community, fostering job creation, attracting investments, and enhancing overall economic prosperity; and

WHEREAS, the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative endeavors to cultivate a business-friendly environment promoting innovation, entrepreneurship, and sustainable economic growth; and

WHEREAS, Bronx Community Board 8 acknowledges the imperative to revise its commercial and manufacturing zoning, strategically plan for the evolving economy, and collaborate with stakeholders to enact policies and initiatives contributing to the long-term economic prosperity of the community; and

WHEREAS, the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative aligns with the community's vision for a diverse and resilient economy, emphasizing inclusivity, sustainability, and adaptability to dynamic economic circumstances; and

WHEREAS, the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative promotes supply-chain localization, aligning with our city's goals of economic prosperity, environmental sustainability, and decoupling of carbon emissions and economic growth; and

WHEREAS, reducing the carbon footprint associated with long-distance transportation is crucial for mitigating climate change, and localized supply chains contribute to lower greenhouse gas emissions by minimizing transportation distances; and

WHEREAS, endorsing the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative will bolster New York City's competitive advantage, attract new businesses, and retain existing ones, thereby augmenting overall economic stability and growth; and

WHEREAS, Bronx Community Board 8 acknowledges the significance of public-private partnerships, community engagement, and an efficient regulatory framework in fostering economic development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Bronx Community Board 8 hereby expresses its conditional support for the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative and commits to collaborative efforts with relevant stakeholders to implement policies and programs fostering economic growth, innovation, and job creation in our community, provided that the following conditions are met:

- *Proposal 11 ("Enable entrepreneurship for home occupations"), and all provisions therein, are amended to require approval by appropriate tenant organizations, co-op boards, or other such resident associations for each residential building (rental, cooperative, or condominium); furthermore, each residential building's appropriate tenant organization, or association of shareholders, shall have authority to determine the process by which in-home businesses receive such approvals;*
- *Proposal 15 ("Facilitate commercial space on residential campuses including NYCHA") is amended to require a vote of approval by the local community board AND the representative tenant association for each commercial campus (i.e., NYCHA) considered for such approvals. The requirement shall be included in any other draft(s) or set of proposals put forth as amendments to the 1961 Zoning Resolution (ZR);*
- *Proposal 16 ("Create a process for allowing commercial corner stores in residential neighborhoods") is omitted from the proposals outlined in the COYEO in all R1 and R2 zones; furthermore, Bronx Community Board 8 opposes amendments to the ZR pertinent to R1-R2 zones, including amendments that would permit large-scale commercial activities in neighborhoods ill-suited for such uses.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Bronx Community Board 8 hereby stipulates that an emphasis shall be placed on the augmentation of building and code enforcement to ensure responsible development and strict compliance with all land use, zoning, and performance regulations;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Bronx Community Board 8 directs the City Administration to undertake necessary actions to implement the objectives and strategies outlined in the "City of Yes for Economic Opportunity" initiative, contingent upon the aforementioned exceptions and modifications, and to collaborate with local community boards, businesses, community organizations, and other relevant stakeholders.

APPROVED (6) – N. Fazio, J. Campbell Priveterre, C. Barnes-Watson, R. Hillard, J. Gomez, Community Member M. Matos

ABSTAINED (0) **OPPOSED (0)**

Discussion on the Gaming Facility Text Amendment

Chair C. Moerdler is against the Gaming Facility Text Amendment. If they wanted to open up a casino at Van Cortlandt Park, they would have to come to the Community Board. They want to go to the State instead, a suggestion from City Planning and people in the casino business.

A MOTION was made by C. Moerdler and seconded by L. Chong to VOTE to DISSAPROVE the Gaming Facility Text Amendment - The City is proposing a citywide zoning text amendment to allow gaming facilities as a permitted use in certain commercial districts (Section 32-10) and manufacturing districts (Section 42-10) in the Zoning Resolution. This modification would allow a gaming facility licensed by the State and developed through a new State defined siting process to be developed without regard to any potential conflict with the Zoning Resolution - DISSAPPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Approved (10) – C. Moerdler, S. Alexander, B. Bender, C. Blake, L. Chong, N. Fazio, D. Rowen, J. Sosa, L. Spalter, O. Murray

ABSTAINED (0) **OPPOSED (0)**

Discussion on the Citywide Zoning Text Amendment to Add New Manufacturing (M) District Options to the City's Zoning Resolution

DCP states that the manufacturing text amendment is creating a new zoning district, and the rest are additions to the zoning resolution. The vote is coming up sometime in early February, but DCP will give an exact date as it is developing information. Community District 8 has some manufacturing districts already. Not taking away any of the manufacturing districts that exist. DCP is not forcibly mapping any of the proposed manufacturing districts. The same way it happens with any other zoning district – if a developer wants to map it, they would apply.

There are modifications to existing zoning districts. A developer cannot go to City Planning to map a "M1A" because it does not exist so City Planning is putting forward a motion to propose new districts for people who are interested in rezoning to be able to do that. The City is not mapping anything new, just creating the "vehicle" to map the zoning district somewhere.

Chair N. Fazio states that in the manufacturing proposal that is in the City of Yes for Economic Opportunity, understands the intention of what they are trying to do and why, and it is an arbitrage of commercial space by creating that flexibility within the manufacturing district. The fact that they are looking at the market forces is really important if it is ever going to be successful or not.

Chair C. Moerdler asks if this is approved, could City Planning just choose where to map these M-Districts, without going to the Community Board? DCP responds that the way it would work is that if the developer asks for a re-zoning, DCP will evaluate the request/application, they won't choose to map. Secondly, a neighborhood study is conducted (usually Non-Ulurp), but will need to be approved by different entities, including the Community Board approval. DCP will not just map anything without telling anyone. DCP would just create the zoning districts, they are not proposing anything that they would just map at their will. Rezoning lots does not have an "as of right" at all.

A MOTION was made by C. Moerdler to TABLE the Citywide Zoning Text Amendment to Add New Manufacturing (M) District Options to the City's Zoning Resolution (Non-Ulurp). These new zoning tools remove impediments to business location and growth within M Districts by providing a wider range of available densities than the current M districts allow, updated bulk regulations that enabling more loft-like physical typologies, and right-sizing parking/loading regs - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Approved (10) – C. Moerdler, S. Alexander, B. Bender, C. Blake, L. Chong, N. Fazio, D. Rowen, J. Sosa, L. Spalter, O. Murray

ABSTAINED (0) OPPOSED (0)

Economic Development Committee Chair's Report:

Chair N. Fazio reported on the fire on W. 231st Street. Reached out to the businesses and following up with them. We offered to connect them with a commercial lease specialist and the legal aid society has agreed to look at the leases of any of the merchants if they have questions on their rights and responsibilities. Deep condolences to the businesses that lost their spaces. Been in contact with the BID and SBS Emergency Response Unit and thanked Ardy and Farrah for being on top of it.

The committee has the budget items and asked committee members to go on the spreadsheet and make any changes as it will be on the agenda for February.

The goal for the nomination period for the Betty Campbell Adams Most Valuable Merchant Award was to start in January but it has been pushed back to February 1st through March 1st.

The committee will look into doing a commercial corridor walkthrough in March. A walkthrough was done in October that was very successful. That will be in the agenda to discuss where to do the next walkthrough. Would like to have the Bronx District Attorney's Office (DA) and the NYC Department of Small Business Services (SBS) Business Express Team join us again as it worked really well last time.

We connected the NYC Department of Small Business Services (SBS) Business Express Team to the general managers of Silhouette Lounge regarding compliance issues, according to the Public Safety Committee. Silhouette Lounge has agreed to work with SBS and we hope that they follow up.

Next Economic Development Committee will be on Tuesday, February 6, 2024 at Artizen located at 3700 Riverdale Ave, Bronx, NY 10463. Hope to have DOT attend regarding outdoor dining regulations and DSNY attend regarding the new commercial containerization laws.

A MOTION was made by C. Moerdler and seconded by N. Fazio to ADJOURN – APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Approved (15) – C. Moerdler, S. Alexander, C. Barnes-Watson, B. Bender, C. Blake, J. Campbell Priveterre, L. Chong, N. Fazio, R. Hillard, J. Gomez, Community Member M. Matos, D. Rowen, J. Sosa, L. Spalter, O. Murray

ABSTAINED (0) OPPOSED (0)

Meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Submitted by Ardy Malziu, Community Coordinator, Bronx CB8 and Reviewed by Farrah Kule Rubin, District Manager, Bronx CB8