



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
NEW YORK, NY 10007

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: August 31, 2018

CONTACT: pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov, (212) 788-2958

**TRANSCRIPT: MAYOR DE BLASIO APPEARS LIVE ON THE BRIAN LEHRER
SHOW**

Brian Lehrer: If you were just listening to the BBC, you heard them wrap up by saying time is against us. I guess that means time is for us on the Brian Lehrer Show now as we begin our two hour journey this Friday morning before Labor Day. I would like to start first today – well, we will begin as we usually do on Friday with our weekly Ask the Mayor segment with Mayor Bill de Blasio. My questions and yours and our phones are open at 2-1-2-4-3-3-W-N-Y-C, 4-3-3-9-6-9-2. You can tweet a question, just use the hashtag #AskTheMayor. Hi, Mr. Mayor, welcome back to WNYC.

Mayor Bill de Blasio: Good morning, and happy Labor Day, everyone.

Lehrer: I'd like to start first on New York State politics this week, because I see that you praised Cynthia Nixon's performance in Wednesday night's primary debate, and criticized Governor Cuomo's. So is today the day by any chance that you're going to endorse in that race?

Mayor: Brian, I said when I am ready to say something I'll say it. This is not the moment. But I do want to note, this is literally the first time that Cynthia Nixon debated in her entire life versus a career politician. And I think in that context in particular she did an outstanding job raising real issues and talking about where the state needs to go that's different than where we've been. So I really give her a lot of credit for that, and I think like so many elections. This primary has been a really valuable discussion for this state. And I think it's a chance to hear different viewpoints and she's done a great job getting her view point out.

Lehrer: Remind me why again given who you are, might you not endorse Nixon?

Mayor: Again, I have to think of a whole variety of factors, and I'll make my decision when I feel ready. I have tremendous respect for her she's a friend, she's someone I respect but I've got to take a whole host of factors into account. When I've made my decision I'll talk about it.

Lehrer: Is one of those factors that you're afraid of retribution by Governor Cuomo if you don't endorse him and he's reelected that he would take out in effect on the people of the City of New York?

Mayor: Well, I was asked this question at the press conference yesterday. I said I don't live in fear, and New Yorkers don't live in fear. It's not the way we live our lives. But again, I am going to look at everything and make the decision I think is best all things considered including the work I'm doing on behalf of the people of this city. So, all in good time, Brian.

Lehrer: And, I guess same thing for State Attorney General?

Mayor: Same thing, across the board. You know there is a few of the State Senate races that I've gotten involved in supporting Jessica Ramos in the State Senate seat in Queens. She used to work for me. I think she's a fantastic progressive. She's running against an IDC incumbent, I am supporting Zellnor Myrie in Brooklyn also a proven progressive running against an IDC incumbent. I may get involved in others, but right now those are the two I weighed in on. And I will remind you the vast majority of people do not even start to pay attention to this election until after Labor Day. A lot of people only in the last couple of days, there's still plenty of time.

Lehrer: Alright, and listeners quick programing note. We'll conclude our four one-on-one interviews with the candidates for the democratic nomination for attorney general, plus your calls for them at 11:00 am this morning with Zephyr Teachout. We've already had the other three, and so we'll wrap up that series in a little while this morning. In the Cuomo, Nixon debate they both agreed that the next scheduled MTA fair increase should be cancelled because of poor service. They only disagreed on whether the State should pay for it all together or split it with the City which is obviously Cuomo's position calling on you to fund part of that. But my question is since everyone agrees the MTA needs more money to really address its problems, is cancelling a scheduled fair increase a good idea at all?

Mayor: I think you have to look at it differently. I think there is still a real underdeveloped reality when it comes to the discussion of the MTA. And I want to believe we're finally going to break through here.

There's not been an honest assessment of what we have to do. For the first time we actually have a dollar figure. Andy Byford's plan as I understand – I haven't seen anything final but as I understand it, we're talking about something in the \$30 to \$40 billion range that it would take to fix the subways once and for all. To actually make them run time, to make them the kind of quality that the greatest city in the world deserves. You're talking \$30 or \$40 billion. There is no way on God's green Earth the City of New York can pay a substantial amount of that because we have to provide police, sanitation, schooling, a whole host of things that we're struggling to afford right now with our budget. We have massive infrastructure needs in the city that we have to pay for. Obviously everything we're trying to do to fix public housing. So people have to be honest about it. You cannot ask the City of New York which is already – right now the City of New York is paying a lot more towards the MTA than the State is. The people of New York City as straphangers and tax-payers are paying the vast majority of the cost for the MTA's operations in New York City.

We can't get that money out of our budget period. And people are not stupid. I mean, this is the one thing I really dislike in the way the Governor portrays it. New Yorker's are smart enough to

figure out that we can't keep taking this out of our budget, and we have not historically. The State runs the MTA, the decisions we need whether it's a millionaires' tax which I believe in a millionaires' tax on millionaires, and billionaires in New York City to pay for these solutions which is absolutely an obtainable goal and is very popular. That's a great solution. Some other people believe in congestion pricing. You could do a hybrid of the two. Whatever it is, it only can be decided in Albany. If I could make that decision I'd make that today. But let's be real, it can only be decided in Albany by the Governor and the legislature. So this to me Brian is the decisive moment. What I hope is about to happen is that a Democratic senate – a Democratic-led Senate gets elected in the November elections. And we finally can come to a realization that we need a lasting permanent revenue source and stop this madness of trying to raid the city budget, because it won't work and it will never be enough.

Lehrer: So, that's the big picture. As you see it, I get it. But what about the fare increase. Those were set up not that many years ago to be scheduled so they aren't political footballs every single time. They'll keep up with inflation and things like that. Why cancel a scheduled fare increase if, in addition to those other funding streams you're talking about, the MTA still needs more money?

Mayor: So my answer would be, agree on a long term plan and then the scheduled fare increases make more sense. You're right, obviously the MTA needs money on a regular basis, obviously there is inflation. But where I think straphangers are absolutely frustrated and have a right to be is they're getting a lousy service and there is no solution on the table and there is no action towards the solution. Once you have a solution, once the state government actually steps up and says okay, we're committed to a millionaires' tax or we're committed to congestion pricing or whatever they choose, they're funding that \$30 or \$40 billion plan which I think is over the next decade, then you can legitimately say to people, real help, lasting help is on the way. Now we're going to be able to provide the service you deserve. We do need additional revenue to make that happen. I think that's a world of difference than straphangers being asked to constantly shell out with no light at the end of the tunnel. There is no plan to actually fix the problem and the Governor is saying the City owns the subway, and the City should pay half. That's a smoke screen. He should provide real leadership. The legislature should provide real leadership and agree on a long term plan. Then I think the discussion of straphanger's changes because there is actually a solution on the table.

Lehrer: Alright, you know what happens next week? School opens –

Mayor: Yes sir.

Lehrer: – in New York City among other things that will happen. So we're going to take a call from a teacher before he can't listen to our Friday chats anymore. Jonathan in the Bronx you're on WNYC with the Mayor, hello.

Question: Hi, Brian. Hi, Mr. Mayor. I have a concern about my public school in the Bronx – Archer Elementary School. I've been working here for four years, I've been in the system for 14 years and in this school the air conditioning has not been fixed for many years. And we're getting increasingly warm temperatures and they happen you know longer into the school year at

the beginning and then they start again much earlier at the end of the year. And we have clocked it in at approximately 100 degrees in the classroom many days in a row. And students are really suffering, and it negatively impacts learning. And I am wondering if there's any way we could resolve this issue.

Mayor: Jonathan what school again? Name the school one more time.

Question: This is Archer Elementary School, P.S. 531.

Mayor: 5-3-1, okay. Please give your information the folks at WNYC. I'll make sure we get on this today. The plan I put in place last year is for air conditioning in all classrooms in New York City which we obviously have never had. We have put a tremendous amount of money in the budget to achieve that goal. Students deserve it, teachers deserve it. I am very troubled to hear what you're saying and will make sure the school construction authority gets on this immediately, because obviously where we have air-conditioning we have to make sure it is working. So I am sorry that you and your colleagues and the students have been going through that and we want to definitely fix that, we'll get on that.

Lehrer: Jonathan hang on, we'll get that contact information. Is one reason for putting air-conditioning in all classrooms to get ready for a different school calendar? You know some school reform advocates say the best thing for the kids is a 12 month school year. I know some districts and other places where they do this instead of just having the summer off they are two weeks of a break at different times during the school year. Is it that?

Mayor: No, very simple answer, no. There is an argument for that but again this is where I think the people of New York City are really smart, really discerning, and they deserve a really intelligent discourse. To add to the school year in that fashion would cost a huge amount of money, and it's money we just don't have. And it is money I don't see us getting any time soon. So although it might be commendable academically, I don't think it's realistic for now. Is it something we should examine in the future if we are in a different economic situation? Sure, I think it is a worthy discussion. But, no this is literally about the fact that when kids come back to school it is still officially by the, you know, by the calendar of nature, it's still summer, it remains hot throughout September and October, going into the spring, you know May, June can often be very hot. So a lot of school year ends up being very uncomfortable and we want kids to be able to learn. And we want to give them an environment where it's easy to learn, not hard to learn. So that's what's motivated the air conditioning in every classroom.

Lehrer: Another school related question – Falani in the Bronx, you're on WNYC with the Mayor, hello Falani.

Question: Good morning to both of you. Mr. Mayor, we spoke last year sometime where I had inquired about the absence of bus monitors on the GenEd routes that provide service to the New York City public schools and the charter schools, but today my question is about the response policy when there's an issue on the school bus. My daughter attends a charter school in the Bronx that – it's a newer school, so it currently only serves kindergarten, first, second grade, and this coming fall will be third graders. Late in the school year, last year, there was a situation on

the bus where the kids were being rowdy and the driver felt that it was unsafe to continue to drive and pulled the bus over. My understanding from the driver – that she radioed her dispatcher to advise the situation and the police were called to respond. That didn't sit well with me and I called OPT, Office of Pupil Transportation, later that evening and spoke with the supervisor who confirmed to me that it is OPT's policy to have police respond where a driver says that there's a situation on the bus.

Now when I went to pick up my daughter, she was crying because she thought she was going to get arrested, you know she sees all of these lights and police cars, you know outside the bus. So you know, because of that situation I didn't put her back on the bus for the rest of the school year and it created a hardship for me for you know getting her to and from school. So I'm not really sure what I am going to do come next week, I still have a couple of days to figure it out but I guess my question is given the landscape of criminalization of people of color for ordinary actions, also like statistics that show inequitable discipline given to young black and Latino students, does it make sense for the City to have a policy where the police respond when six, seven, and eight-year-olds are being rambunctious on the bus? Shouldn't there be more of a measure to approach, or some sort of phased escalation policy for when things happen?

Mayor: Yes, Falani that's a great point and I want to thank you – this is part of why this show is very important and town hall meetings are very important because I constantly hear from New Yorkers who alert me to things we need to fix or do better or things that have unintended consequences that may have not been recognized. Your broad frame work, I agree with entirely, we are trying to entirely change our approach to suspension for example, and other disciplinary measures. We have greatly reduced suspensions in schools. We have done a lot more restorative justice which has proven to be very effective at reducing conflicts in schools without the negative effects of either sending kids away from an educational setting with a suspension or bringing police into the situation. So what you are saying is very consistent with beliefs of this administration and I think sometimes what we recognize is, you know, when we change philosophy as a city, as a government, it doesn't always reach every aspect of what we are doing right away and we have to be mindful of that. We have to fix the things that not have yet been fixed. So I agree with you, it does not make sense for the police to get involved with a bus filled with second grade kids. I will talk to the Chancellor I think that policy should be reconsidered.

Look, if it's older kids and if the situation on the bus is one where there's a more physical conflict among older kids – that might be a different situation honestly. But if it's young kids, you're exactly right to say isn't there some other form of intervention. I would only say to you as your fellow parent that you know, I hope you can feel that your child being on the bus makes sense despite this one incident because I believe it is a rarity that something like that would happen. But I think you are absolutely right that we should reconsider if there needs to be a situation where a bus a river needs help, there might be other ways to do it, particularly for younger kids that make more sense. So I really appreciate your call and please leave your contact information with WNYC so we can follow up.

Lehrer: Falani hang on. We are going to get your contact off the air. And a program note, listeners, our first guest on Tuesday morning after the Labor Day weekend will be the New York City Schools Chancellor Richard Carranza who will take your questions as well as mine. So we

will preview the school year and talk about issues in the schools with the Chancellor to start out Tuesday on the day before the kids go back.

Mayor: Brian I just have to interject and say I'm having all sorts of nostalgia right now because I took my son to college for the last time on Monday and this is literally the end of my line as a parent with a kid in school and I just want to say to all parents out there, cherish this time while you have it.

Lehrer: That's before he hits you up to pay the bills for grad school.

Mayor: Well I'm going to hope that doesn't happen although we do believe in further education.

[Laughter]

Lehrer: Still on children, I see there are new numbers from the City on the number of children in New York City public housing and citywide with elevated lead levels, and the number is going down compared to past years according to Health Commissioner Bassett. But the total in NYCHA since 2012 has been revised upward to 1,160. Your administration used to say just 19 kids. It's the cover of both tabloids today as you know with the angle that NYCHA has been lying about the number and is finally admitting – and your administration is finally admitting what's closer to reality. What do you have to say?

Mayor: Now, that's just not accurate and I don't think New Yorkers believe that every tabloid's cover tells them the whole story. This is a really complex issue and it's an issue that did not get attention for a long, long time. And obviously, very, very sadly, had the lead inspections continued as they were supposed to in the previous administration we would not be having this conversation. And I think that really needs to be recognized here.

There was a break in adherence to the law – Local Law 1, city law, says that those NYCHA units needed to be inspected. That stopped back in 2011 and that was a huge, huge mistake. And what we've done now is actually do the foundational things that need to be done to fix this situation overall that were never done.

Lead paint was outlawed in New York City in 1960 but there was never an effort in public or private housing to systematically address the issue. And in fact, public housing is a very small piece of the equation. The rate of lead exposure in public housing is much less than it is in private housing and that's why we're also doing a big initiative to say anyone with a child with elevated blood lead levels in any type of housing, the Department of Health will inspect and we will order remediation, and make sure the child gets health support.

But the bottom line is even in the context of NYCHA, now that we have been able to go and use the most stringent standards – and it's very important to recognize, Brian, the standards we're using now, the exposure levels are so low that we are considering meaningful, they are much, much more stringent than they were a few years ago.

So, we're going above and beyond. We're using a very, very stringent standard –

Lehrer: But it's also because the City finally caught up with the more strict federal CDC standards – Center for Disease Control standard – than the looser one that the City was using.

Mayor: No, that's also – respectfully, that's not the whole truth because the CDC did not instruct, it provided guidance but it didn't instruct localities to implement that. They only – the first time that was made a mandatory standard was HUD last year with the Housing Authority.

The fact is lead is a very serious issue. It's also a very subtle issue. Every single child exposed has a different experience. It's very hard to typify. But what we do know is one – lead paint exposure has been reduced in New York City overall 90 percent for children since 2005.

We are literally at ten percent the level we were in 2005 overall. We do know it continues to go down. We do know that now that we're tracking it so intensely, we're actually able to find a child quickly who has had that exposure, end the source of the exposure quickly, and then those kids' lead levels go back down. So about 85 percent of the kids that we have tested had lead level that have gone back down to normal because we're addressing the issue aggressively in a way that wasn't done in the past.

And we're going to do something that should have been done bluntly decades ago. We're going to test every single apartment in NYCHA that does not have a definitive answer yet on whether there is lead or not. It's 130,000 apartments. We're literally using x-ray technology that could look through all the layers of paint since the building was built and we'll be able to say, "This apartment has no lead, will never have any lead, we're done here, move on," or "this apartment has lead and needs a long term solution."

That's never been done. So, I understand why people feel so much in this issue, I do too as a parent, but I also think there's been a lot of misunderstanding. And the bottom line is now we finally are getting to the point where we can say Vision Zero style – and this is the model we're using, the same thing we've done on traffic fatalities and reducing them – we're going to the point where we believe we can get to zero lead exposure for the children of New York City. Because we've seen it go down 90 percent, we want to finish it once and for all.

Any child who has been exposed gets consistent health follow-up. Every apartment in NYCHA, not only inspected but once and for all knowing which ones have lead and which ones never will have lead. And that's the pathway to solving this once and for all.

Lehrer: Moshia in Flushing, you're on WNYC with the Mayor. Hello, Moshia.

Question: Hi, gentlemen. I'd like to – I grew up in Queens like the Governor. And unlike the Governor I don't understand why he thinks his idea for an air train from Mets - Willets Point to LaGuardia is a good idea. Everyone I know thinks it's a horrible waste of money. So, I'd like to ask the Mayor, is there anything the City can do legally to stop the Governor from wasting between –

Lehrer: Whoops, Moshia, are you there?

Mayor: I think we got the question.

Lehrer: I think so. He certainly doesn't like the idea of the rail link from LaGuardia. Do you?

Mayor: Look, I would say it this way. Anything that helps people get to the airports is a good thing. Is it necessarily the single best way to do that? I'm not so sure. But from our point of view, it's still a value added in the equation. And also, the State obviously has the right to create a project like this.

So, as far as I know, this is something that we would say, if not perfect will still be value added.

Lehrer: Another rail link question in a way from Twitter. A listener writes, "The Mayor keeps pushing BQX as a way for the city to take control of its own transit future. But the latest plan includes an opening date of 2029. This is an absurdly long timeline for construction. Is this a serious plan to which the Mayor is committed?" asks that listener via tweet.

Mayor: Yes and yes. I'm committed. I've been committed since I originally announced it and it is a whole new thing. Look, I get any New Yorker who says why can't things happen more quickly? Pretty much in every meeting I have with people from my agencies, I ask the question why can't this happen more quickly?

We all look back with fondness to the fact the Empire State Building was built in a year-and-a-half, right, back in the 30s. But let's be real about the modern age. There are immense hurdles to any major project. There's a whole land-use review process. There's a lot of community involvement. Some of the stuff is very good. There's a lot of checks and balances, environmental reviews, legal issues that we used to never deal with, all sorts of things that make this stuff more complex, also an infrastructure which has been built upon, built upon, built upon and that creates challenges.

Light rail is a heavy infrastructure project. Now, we think it's a very valuable one because it moves people around quickly and in a way that clearly the public takes so. We've seen this all over the country. People really like light rail and it incentivizes them to get out of their cars and use mass transit.

It's become a huge phenomenon all over the country and the world. More and more light rail – it's obviously a hell of a lot easier to create than the subway –

Lehrer: And if I could jump in just so the listeners know the latest developments here that you announced this week. The – it's smaller than the original idea. You nixed the stops in Sunset Park for example, I believe. But the idea is still dependent on federal funds which are not for sure, right?

Mayor: Yeah, I would say, though – very much to be remembered – this would instantly be one of the largest, if not the largest, light rail system in America just because of the sheer number of people along the route. It's three hundred, four hundred thousand people who live on the route

and about 100,000 jobs along the route, 40,000 folks who live in public housing in Brooklyn and Queens. This one immediately would jump to the head of the line in terms of the ridership levels and the number of people served over the course of the route. Any kind of federal competition for light rail funding – this would be a very, very strong proposal. And so that’s why we think we stand in good stead with this.

I also am someone who believes that the government is going to be changing as a result of this election in November and the one in 2020, and there’s going to be more interest in infrastructure investment because we saw that even – look, before Trump and his big infrastructure pledges that went nowhere, the 2015 Highway Bill actually started to grow for the first time in a long time.

That’s also mass transit funding. That was a bipartisan consensus in the Congress. There was actually some additional infrastructure money in the budget reconciliation last year. We see a lot of things that I think are promising about more infrastructure money eventually being available. But the key thing is this proposal, you could stack it up against any proposal in the country and it would be a winning opportunity in any competition.

Lehrer: Marie in Astoria, you’re on WNYC. Hello, Marie.

Question: Hello, Mayor. New York City is the financial and entertainment capital of the United States but it’s also the great cultural and historic epicenter of this country. Dear Mayor, we need your help to save the South Street Seaport Museum and historic district from going the way of the lost treasure of Penn Station. The South Street Seaport Museum is in financial crisis. Without the ability to fund itself, it cannot make it to the end of this year. Neglect by the EDC and the commercial overtaking by the Howard Hughes Corporation have placed it in a position where it no longer has a fair lease or fair holdings to sustain itself economically.

Lehrer: Mr. Mayor, South Street Seaport?

Mayor: Well, Marie, I appreciate the passion you bring to this issue and I’m pleased to say I’m kindred soul. I have been a believer in the South Street Seaport for many decades, long before I was elected to anything and I think it’s absolutely crucial to say that this – that little stretch of our city is a reminder of how this city began and what made us great and it has to be preserved.

I spoke to leaders in administration about this a few weeks ago and actually we do feel there is a sustainability plan in place for the museum now or at least being pulled together, I should say. We believe the museum will be strong and will survive. Yes, there is some development in that area but I think what’s being done is done in a manner to preserve all of the historic elements and to make sure there is economic sustainability so that those historic buildings can be preserved long term and the museum can be preserved long term.

So, your plea is a very good and fair one but I think the situation is better than you may have heard and I’m very, very hopeful that there will be a long term sustainability plan for the museum.

Lehrer: The Times reported today that the NYPD's Collision Investigation Squad, which investigates crashes where people are killed or seriously injured, is smaller and investigating fewer crashes than it did in 2013 when you were elected and it has fewer officers than it did then. How does this fit in with your Vision Zero campaign? Shouldn't this unit be investigating more crashes?

Mayor: Well, I will check on the exact numbers. I have not seen the article but I will tell you, one – the evidence is quite clear over four years. Fatalities have gone down consistently. Vision Zero is working. The NYPD is intensely committed to Vision Zero both in terms of enforcement and in terms of investigation, and a huge amount of personnel and resources is going to all of that. But Vision Zero is a constantly growing idea.

If we need to put more resources into investigations, we certainly will. The goal is to make sure there's real consequences for any motorist who causes harm to anybody in an inappropriate way. And the fact – and I really want to give the City Council credit too – the fact that things like failure to yield used to be unfortunately way too common. Now, there's strong laws, stronger penalties, and much more NYPD enforcement. Again a shout out to the Council. We all worked well together –

Lehrer: But this –

Mayor: – with the Governor on the speed cameras bill recently. The whole concept is to create consequence and I do think the NYPD is doing a great job on that.

Lehrer: But this in particular – is this news to you?

Mayor: Again I want to see it before I comment on it and make sure I hear the NYPD's perspective but I'm trying to frame it broadly and say there's been no lack of NYPD resources being put into Vision Zero. And if there's any area where we need to do more, we will.

Lehrer: We're almost out of time. Let me touch a couple of things briefly. Next week is the deadline for formulating your charter revision proposal for the November ballot. For people who don't know, New York City charter – it's kind of like the Constitution, not just the laws, of New York City. Any change needs to be voted on by all the voters of New York. And one potential question that we've covered on the show is whether community board members should be term limited, and four of the five borough presidents say, don't do that they need experienced people to monitor the legally sophisticated real estate developers – one of the things a community board does, essentially. Where are you on this?

Mayor: I want to see the final wording that the commission puts together but I want to say that this charter revision commission lead by Cesar Perales, who is a former deputy mayor for New York City – I think it's been a very thoughtful commission. I said to the commission going forward, my focus was on improving public financing of elections, getting big money out of politics which as far as I've seen, so far they've done a great job putting together a strong proposal to really reduce the amount of money that will flow into our local elections and reward

low-dollar contributors, everyday people, and to improve outreach to tell people about elections, about where they can vote, about translation.

I think they've done a strong job on that. But they've added a bunch other proposals that were not part of the original mandate that I put forward and I'm waiting to see the final form. I think though, broadly, the notion of term limits in general in public service is a commendable one. I live under term limits and I think they make sense for mayors and City Council members and borough presidents.

I think there's a lot to be said for them in other areas because it gives new leadership and also younger leadership an opportunity to have a chance but all term limits also need to come with the concept that people, after they sit out a period of time, can come back and continue to serve. And I believe that's what the commission is doing.

Lehrer: And the J'Ouvert celebration this weekend as well as the West Indian Day parade – can you comment both on the celebratory meaning to New Yorkers and the public safety policies especially with respect to J'Ouvert which are still pretty new?

Mayor: Yeah on the meaning – it's intensely meaningful and I think it was very telling to me. We had a press conference yesterday at the Brooklyn Public Library, Grand Army Plaza and talked about why J'Ouvert meant so much to people in the Caribbean community, and it really struck me in the middle of it that we've got more sort of learning to do in this city and more that people have to learn from each other's cultures even in the most diverse, greatest city in the world.

There's still a whole lot of people who don't happen to come from the Caribbean community who don't understand J'Ouvert. I don't blame them. But as I listened to people talk about its meaning, folks from the community, it really reminded me if we were in New Orleans and we were talking about Mardi Gras – a different but somewhat similar celebration – people, everyone would understand it.

But because we have celebrations in a city of 8.6 million people that – Three Kings Day means a lot to folks in some of the Latino communities but a lot of other New Yorkers don't know what that is, J'Ouvert the same way.

We need to do a better job of explaining to people this is one of the paramount celebrations of the year in the Caribbean community and is all about maintaining a connection to their homelands their culture and has been a very positive experience but for a few very unfortunate incidents where bad apples and a very, very small number of people caused a horrible situation for everyone else.

Last year went very well – a plan that was created with the community for starting the J'Ouvert celebration when it was already light out, after dawn, with a lot more police presence, a lot more lighting, a lot more check points to create a more controlled atmosphere but still allow people to really enjoy the celebration. That's what happened last year. We're going to do the same thing with a couple of revisions this year and the community leaders who were with us yesterday like

Eric Adams and Jumaane Williams felt very good about the plan and that it was working and it was striking that balance.

Lehrer: Mr. Mayor, enjoy the Labor Day weekend. Hopefully there won't be any incidents anywhere in the city on any of the days that will require your attention. Talk to you next week.

Mayor: Amen. Thank you. Happy Labor Day to everyone. Take care, Brian.

###