



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

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:** August 24, 2018

**CONTACT:** [pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov](mailto:pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov), (212) 788-2958

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

**Brian Lehrer:** Good morning Mr. Mayor, welcome back to WNYC.

**Mayor Bill de Blasio:** Thank you Brian and I have to tell you I am invigorated this morning, we just did the last event of our City Hall in Your Borough week and I just took a ride around Prospect Park with Borough President Adams. So I'm alive and awake this morning.

**Lehrer:** So that was City Hall in your borough, did you learn anything about your borough, Kings County?

**Mayor:** Every time, every one of these City Hall in Your Borough weeks have been really powerful, really helpful, bring out new ideas. I mean, I'll give you an example, last night we had a town hall meeting in Canarsie and a woman got up and said there's a lot of confusion among parents about vaccination and we want to hear more from the City Health Department, we want to hear more reminders of what the timelines are and explanations and we want answers to our concerns and the Health Department should be out in our communities, talking about this issue and answering our questions. And honestly that is the first time I heard that idea. I think it's a fantastic idea. So we get things like that at every town hall meeting and we have these resource fairs which is like an open house where anybody can come from the borough and raise whatever concerns, you know step up and talk to me and commissioners and all. We did that a couple of days ago at Ingersoll Houses for the whole borough. And every time we get ideas and critics and concerns that weren't on the radar and it really helps us do this work better.

**Lehrer:** I see you are going to Wisconsin today to campaign for the democrat hoping to win the house seat vacated by none other than Speaker of the House Paul Ryan. What's your role out there? Do voters in Jamesville, Wisconsin care what the Mayor of New York City thinks?

**Mayor:** Well actually I'm going to be in Racine, Wisconsin with Randy Bryce. We are doing a rally there. I think it is a couple of different things. First of all Randy Bryce is an amazing candidate, he is an iron worker, union activist, strong progressive democrat who believes that that district does not need to be a republican district. It's leaned republican for several years but there's a lot of working people and a lot of democrats who are ready for something different. A lot of independents ready for something different. I think he's exactly the kind of progressive candidate who can speak to working people that we need.

And I'm also going out there to help Tammy Baldwin, the sitting U.S. Senator who's got a lot of money being spent from outside against her by republicans and these big money PACs and I'll going out to help her both with fundraising and with organizing on the ground. And look I think in a lot of states just people appreciate support, they appreciate folks coming in to remind everyone of how important the stakes are and how good there candidates are. I mean I really think one of the reasons I'm so excited to help Randy Bryce and to help Tammy Baldwin is that they are both consistent progressives. And I think it does help when you are talking about volunteers, when you are talking about folks who are trying to make up their mind to hear other voices say here's why this is someone who has been consistent, who's been on the side of working people, who stood up against a lot of, you know powerful interests – that validation, that reminder is very, very important to people.

**Lehrer:** You're raising those issues – news this week has been so focused on Trump related scandals, from Michael Cohen to Jeff Sessions, to his first presidential tweet about Africa being about the fate of white people there but arguably most voters see that as Washington dramatics, especially the you know, Michael Cohen and appointments drama, that doesn't affect their lives. How much or how little do you plan to bring that stuff up and how much do you think it is even productive?

**Mayor:** It's a great question. First I would say part of why it is so important that we all engage in these national elections in every way is because nothing will be more important to the future of New York City than the hopeful change in the House of Representative and the Senate. You know we can flip the House alone that has huge ramifications for New York City and our future. If we can flip the Senate and Chuck Schumer becomes Senate Majority Leader, even more so. Obviously in this state flipping the State Senate from republican to democrat – I'm going to be putting a lot of time and energy in the next few months because this is really the thing that will have the biggest impact, you know whether you are talking about money for infrastructure, or you are talking about fairer education policies federally, or you are talking about stronger rent laws here in the state, all of it runs through these elections around the state and around country. We have got to focus on it.

But to your question – no voters, I don't think they want to talk about Donald Trump anymore. I said this when I went down to the Netroots conference in New Orleans and this was my argument to progressive activists – stop talking about Trump, talk about a positive vision of the changes we want to make. Talk about single payer health care, talk about stronger protections for working people, talk about higher wages and benefits, taxing the wealthy at a higher level, repealing the republican tax legislation. These are the things that actually move people and energize them because the question is really will democrats and democratic leaning independents show up to vote? If they do it's ballgame over in favor of the democrats. But those folks need to be motivated to vote and they are not motivated to vote and they are not motivated to vote just by Donald Trump is doing bad or crazy things. They are motivated to vote by a positive vision of change that will affect their lives. So that's what I am going to be talking about, in fact I don't intend to talk about Trump hardly at all on this trip to Wisconsin or any of my other trips.

**Lehrer:** Okay, closer to home, there are plenty of inequality based issues that are making news right here in the city right now – one is whether kids in certain Hasidic community yeshivas are being given a decent academic education as required by law even for religious schools. We had a

guest representing the yeshivas among other guests on that this week who seemed to say the 15 schools that would not let the City have access to inspect their academic programs for the last three years are now changing to a more cooperative stance or prepared to change. Are you seeing any evidence of new cooperation?

**Mayor:** I'm seeing verbiage that suggests new cooperation but I want to see results. I'm very unhappy with the 15 schools that did not allow our DOE officials in. It was perhaps their legal right but it was not the right thing to do for the kids and for the relationship with the city. Bu the 15 schools did and, in fact, not only let our folks in, but they engaged, now over two or three years, in a very productive, consistent dialogue and you saw the results; that's been documented in the letter that the Chancellor sent to the State Education Commissioner where they – those 15 that did work with us changed their professional development approach, changed their curriculums, they, they – curricula – they did a series of things to upgrade their work and in the eyes of the DOE their either where they need to be or well on the way to where they need to be in that substantially equivalent place. But the other 15, by not allowing us in, of course it begs the question why on Earth wouldn't you do that? Is there something you don't want us to see? So the solution is easy: let us in right away, and if there's a problem let's address it. We have problems in some of our traditional public schools too and we're working to address those. We're not afraid of problems. We don't want you to be ashamed of a problem. But if you're not letting us in there is a lack of goodwill and a lack of resolve and that's what we've asked the state to address. What to do if we really are not let in permanently? I do think, to your point, there is now suddenly some give and hopefully it will manifest as, you know, us – our folks being let in very quickly.

**Lehrer:** Trump thinks he can block access to investigators investigating him. Is it a fair parallel to ask, if the reporting is accurate on the timeline, why did the city allow the Yeshivas, I guess you're saying they are for some reason allowed by law to deny access to education inspectors for three years trying to see if they're complying with the law?

**Mayor:** So one, I think the law is a little unclear here, and that's part of why we've asked for guidance from the State Education Department. Look, what people are under-noting in this discussion is these are not public schools. These are religious schools. There are real questions of religious freedom that are at play here. There are constitutional questions. It's not an open and shut dynamic. We do not take the position we can just bust down the doors. So one, there's a lack of clarity and I think it's an understandable lack of clarity. We don't want to bust down the doors. We want to work with people and, by the way, we think that real lasting change is not going to come from a contentious situation; it would come from a cooperative situation. This, I think, is really being underplayed in this discussion. And I respect the advocates that raise the concerns but I think they are not portraying the whole picture because if you want any institution – think about any institution in our society where there is a difference. If you want lasting change you have to move hearts and minds, you have to show people a better way, you have to show them it will work. We had a scenario with Pre-K that was very similar where Yeshivas were not interested in participating in our universal full-day Pre-K program. It took a year or two of dialogue and now a lot of them are very, very actively participating and we've got that now for the long haul but in this case, why we took the time we took was we saw the 15 that were moving forward. We hoped that that would inspire the others to come along and get to a real, lasting cooperative solution. Being, if you will, forceful, in this case, to me, was the last resort because I want something that's going to stick. I don't want short term gratification. I want a

decision on the part of the Yeshivas to make these changes and to believe in them and to sustain them.

**Lehrer:** Megan in Brooklyn, you're on WNYC with Mayor de Blasio. Hello Megan.

**Question:** Hello?

**Lehrer:** Hi there, you're on the air.

**Question:** Okay. So, I've been riding my bike to work for two years now from Flatbush to Borough Park and I go early in the morning, I'm 58-years-old, and I sometimes go on the sidewalk because some stretch will be too narrow and too dangerous to me. So I recently got a summons at 6:38 in the morning from two policemen and, because I was on the sidewalk, and I just find that it's a bit of a dilemma, you know, because I feel I'm at risk riding on the street in some areas, but then I get a ticket so I just wanted your comment.

**Mayor:** Ok, I will say a couple things. One, I think it is a dilemma and I appreciate you raising it because although we've done a huge expansion of bike lanes and there will be a lot more, clearly there's not going to be a bike lane everywhere and so sometimes there are those situations and I think you're making a good point. If someone feels for their own safety that they need to get off the street I respect that. I think for an adult, unlike a kid, the law would of course be walk you bike don't ride it in that situation. That said, at 6:38 in the morning, I'm a little surprised that the officers did that and they obviously have discretion in these situations, one of the things we've emphasized really across all enforcement by NYPD, training officers to exercise discretion and look at each individual situation. So I think in a lot of cases officers might say okay this is one where, we're not going to – we're not going to sweat it but we do want to remind you don't do this regularly, but it may have been a busy sidewalk at that point or whatever else that may have been their judgement so they should give that. The bottom line is we need to create as many bike lanes as we can and when there isn't one, people have to make their own choices but if it looks like a situation where there might be any problem or danger for the people on the sidewalk than I would urge, you know, get off the bike and just walk for that stretch.

**Lehrer:** Megan thank you. I guess I have a bicycle question too about the new pedal-assist Citi Bikes that add some electric oomph as long as you're pedaling. As I'm sure you know, the advocates for the mostly low-income immigrant delivery people in the city are arguing that it's a double standard that you banned their fully electric bikes, that they said they need to make decent living but you're offering partial – partially electric bikes, not that different in their speeds, as a nice amenity to the general public. What would you say?

**Mayor:** I really respect the impulse of the advocates and I absolutely disagree with the reasoning and I find many times that advocates look at one piece of the puzzle without the other piece and I think it's not fair to the whole public. We of course want immigrant folks to have opportunity that's all of New York's history and we continue that, but the problem with the e-bikes as opposed to the pedal-assist: the e-bikes are faster, a lot of people did not use them appropriately, going the wrong way down the street, going against the traffic lights, driving recklessly, in ways that really endangered people and there was a particular sensitivity around seniors and children because some of them go very, very fast. And so I respect that working people, obviously, and

immigrants I want them to do well, but I also have to defend public safety. The pedal-assist are slower and they are legal for that reason among others; that's part of why there is a difference.

**Lehrer:** The delivery people say there's no data linking electric bikes to actual deaths or injuries so the backlash against them is based on impressions, not on science.

**Mayor:** Well it may be true there has not been a definitive study. But I will tell you having talked to people all over the city, I've been to 57 town hall meetings, and talked to police leaders in a number of precincts there is a very consistent view that they're too fast for what they are being used for. They are – look, if you're on a car, or even a motorcycle you have to obey all the traffic rules. If you don't you, you know, you're immediately dead to rights that you did not obey that law. I think with bikes, let's be blunt, with bikes there has been a lot more flexibility. Sometimes we need to be flexible, sometimes we need to be tougher on bikes of all kinds that drive recklessly, but with e-bikes that are fast, they're as fast as some other motorized vehicles, but people are using them like a bike. They're in many cases going the wrong way on the street, going right through lights, right through stop signs. I have enough evidence from everything I've seen and talked to people to say we did the right thing by cracking down and saying public safety first. Now there is a solution here which is to, in the next legislative session in Albany, come up with a new approach, because right now the other crucial point; they're illegal. I mean, on top of everything I've just said, the e-bikes as opposed to pedal-assist, are illegal under state law period. And of course the obligation of police is to enforce all state laws. So if we want to figure out a different approach we have an opportunity to but that approach has to come with some real limits because I'm not comfortable with someone treating a very fast electrified bike like they can do whatever they want with it.

**Lehrer:** One other thing on this, and I'll give a shoutout to our local news website Gothamist which has been all over this story: how about providing money, as some people have suggested, to all the delivery people to convert to pedal-assist because the recent crackdown has turned their business investments into contraband.

**Mayor:** It was illegal already. I'm not comfortable at first blush with that. The – you know, for somethings there are public sector solutions, for other things there are not and I just think – you have to recognize this was not legal to begin with. People went and got them and they made money with. Fine, that's in the past, but I am not comfortable at first blush with the notion of subsidizing people who did something that actually was not legal to begin with, and creates some real problems. I think there's a real possibility that this will be resolved in Albany. Again if someone owns an e-bike they can hold on to it pending the resolution of the legal situation. You're allowed to own it in New York City; you're not allowed to ride it in New York City under current law. But the notion that when you think of all the things that we need to invest in as a city and all the crying needs, this one, to me, doesn't not make sense.

**Lehrer:** Bobby in Flushing you're on WNYC with the Mayor de Blasio. Hello Bobby.

**Question:** Alright, good morning Mr. Mayor. I'm calling to update you about what – the gentrification here in Flushing. We spoke when you came to the town hall meeting. Well, in 132-30 Sanford Avenue, the building is totally empty. They now [inaudible] turn it into a condo. In 132-40, they're now turn it – [inaudible] to turn it into a condo. It was 11 vacant apartments now it's 21 out of the 94. In 133-17 Sanford Avenue, I – it goes on and on and on, they're kicking out

people here en masse. We have a stop order – work order on 132-40 and they’re working in every single apartment. They even – I don’t know how they did this. There’s a stop work order, there’s a class A violation, and they owe the city thousands of dollars after the city gave them a permit to be working in these buildings last month. As you hear I can’t even talk because of the dust. It’s crazy what’s going here.

**Mayor:** Bobby, I’m very glad you’re – I remember we talked at that town hall I’m glad you’re telling me this because I – this stuff’s not acceptable to me nor is it in many cases legal. So first of all give your information please to WNYC so we can follow up immediately—

**Question:** and Brian, why can’t you—

**Mayor:** but here’s the point—

**Question:** Brian, why can’t you send some reporters here, send them to Saint George’s Church, and we’ll show you and document what’s going on. The only people who covered this were the Gothamist and the Flushing papers. Nobody else wants to cover this. It’s crazy – we’re losing mad rent stabilized apartments here.

**Lehrer:** Well Gothamist is us. But I will make sure that the rest of our news team knows about your call today Bobby. It sounds horrible and it sounds just like the thing, Mr. Mayor, that you always say the city needs to prevent—

**Mayor:** Yes, and that’s—

**Lehrer:** in a time of gentrification.

**Mayor:** Yeah and this is – so let me just make the bigger point for everyone listening and because there are things that people can do in these situations and we need help to stop things like this. We don’t always – you know, it’s a huge city. The only way we catch a lot of these things is by everyday people reporting them and then it’s our job to act on them quickly. So first of all, Bobby, let’s get your information; let’s get folks following up with you today. We will get our folks out there immediately from the Mayor’s Office. Now second, on the bigger point. Anyone who believes a landlord is doing anything illegal: if they’re trying to force people out, if they’re doing any kind of work in the building that is meant to harass. There’s very strong laws now. The City Council, to their great credit, really toughened the anti-harassment laws. I signed those laws very happily because now we have a lot more tools to fight with.

Anything like that we need to get eyes on it and if we believe it is harassment there are very substantial penalties that can be brought, even in some cases criminal penalties if a landlord is doing something that might endanger people.

The other thing is legal support. Any tenants who are being forced out of their apartments illegally, we will provide a free lawyer to. And that’s in so many cases. We’ve seen the numbers of evictions start to go down rapidly. As we’ve done that we’ve seen the number of affordable units that are going off affordability and being lost to us, that number is also going down the more we provide legal support and the more we intervene in these cases.

So, the good news is as more intensive government intervention is occurring, it's actually reducing the number of evictions and reducing the number of affordable apartments that are being lost. But we need to know about them.

So anybody – and I'm asking everyone, just never hold back if you think it's happening. If you think it's happening pick up the phone and call 3-1-1 so that we can get people on-site and we can see if you need legal assistance.

**Lehrer:** Bobby hang on, we're going to take your contact information. A question related to housing about NYCHA and the intense money shortage for maintenance that you and everybody have talked so much about recently caused largely by federal cutbacks over many years.

An article on Politico New York describes a program that comes with federal funding for apartment renovation call Rental Assistance Demonstration which relies on what's described as a more stable source of funding and allows private building management of NYCHA properties.

But the article suggests that your ideological queasiness over any perception of privatizing public assets and your caution around pushback from residents and the housing workers union delayed the use of the program until NYCHA problems blew up as a big story. Is that a fair description of why you didn't take advantage of that funding source earlier?

**Mayor:** No, that really isn't. We – a couple of things have to be said here. When we came in, the assessment of the need in NYCHA was already really great and you're right, we basically have seen no serious increase in federal funding and in fact steady decreases over 30 years or more.

And that was supposed to be the backbone of NYCHA. NYCHA was created, chartered by the federal government and the State government, and they were both supposed to support it. That was the whole concept. The federal support has plummeted over decades. That's the essential problem. The State, by the way, in the entire time I've been Mayor, I think we've gotten about \$75 million total from the State of New York. I think it should be talked a lot more how the State has made many promises to provide money and has not delivered it.

And I'm stunned that is not looked at more. We're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars that was authorized as far back as 2015 that still has not come to NYCHA, and somehow the State gets a free pass on that.

That said on this question, the Next Generation NYCHA plan which was put together at the beginning of the administration, that required use of a variety of approaches including RAD and we did start using it and found it to be good but I think it was much more a case of we have to figure out how to make it work.

We also – the federal government did not offer limitless possibilities to use it. It was quite limited in the beginning. Interestingly in the last year, the federal government has now opened the door to a much higher level of use and we have requested the ability to now go to a much, much higher use of RAD because the door is open for it.

We can't do it without the federal government. I think that characterization is wrong also because once I became assured that this initiative could be – that RAD could be utilized while

protecting public housing meaning we maintain public control, we maintain public decision making, and rent levels are kept the same, I became comfortable with the approach. I've talked about it at town hall meetings over the last couple of years of why I'm comfortable with that approach because it conforms to keep it public. So, I think there's a lot of assumptions in that analysis that just aren't accurate.

**Lehrer:** Alexandra in Harlem, you're on WNYC with the Mayor. Hello, Alexandra.

**Question:** Hi, Mr. Mayor. My name is Alexandra. I'm 22 years old. I'm here with my roommate Andrea. We've been facing housing discrimination because of my assistance animal. My roommate and I are both qualified tenants and we've been approved on multiple occasions before disclosing the fact that I have an emotional support animal. And once we've revealed this information with thorough documentation from my psychiatrist, not only are we blocked from these signings or their rescinded, but the authenticity of my documentation has been questioned or my character questioned as dishonest.

I know the Mayor supports all the laws that provide help for people with depression and disabilities, and I know this is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act but I haven't found any effective way to communicate that to landlords or real estate agents, and what recourse do we have from the City of New York. Is there any way to get less ambiguous language on nyc.gov because we haven't been able to find any definitive guidance?

**Mayor:** Well, I really appreciate you raising this. I'm sorry you've gone through this but you're obviously pointing to a place where we have to get a clearer message out. What you said makes total sense to me that this would be a form of discrimination. And the place to turn is the Human Rights Commission of the city which in a case – broadly whenever there's been housing discrimination the Human Rights Commission, if they can document it, can then require a landlord to provide some kind of compensation or often in some cases even to provide the original apartment that was being sought.

So, if you'll stay on the line, we'll make sure folks talk to you and get you connected with the Human Rights Commission. We'll get on this quickly. But you also make the point about getting a clearer message out on our website about what someone should do if they have a [inaudible] support animal and what their rights are and how to document that upfront. I think that's a very fair point. We will make sure we do that.

**Lehrer:** Alexandra, I'm curious. Do you think it's the animal they don't want living there or do they then turn against you?

**Question:** I think. Well it's a little bit of both, right, because there's definitely – we've literally been ghosted by “pet-friendly apartments.” But realtors say we're going to start a terrible relationship with our landlord because the dog is big and be prepared for future problems down the road even if they let the dog on the property. And the thing is, should we be monetarily penalized to a pet-friendly apartment even though I have a disability that requires me to have an assistance animal. My dog is not an amenity. He's an important of treating a chronic illness. So, it's sort of rendered my roommates semi-homeless in the search for this [inaudible] housing situation.



**Lehrer:** So, we're going to take your contact information off the air and you're going to get a quicker pipeline into the City on this. Good luck. Paul in the Bronx, you're on WNYC with the Mayor. Hello, Paul.

**Question:** Hi, good morning, how are you?

**Lehrer:** Okay, thank you.

**Question:** Very good points this morning. I want to diverge just a bit and talk about some – a local problem that we have particularly here in the Bronx as I live here in the South Bronx. And that is – I'd like to ask the Mayor, as he spoke on television the other day, what is the reasoning behind the interdiction of the police to arrest, and DAs to prosecute for, public marijuana smoking from marijuana sales?

**Mayor:** Well, the – okay, fair question. Let's start at the beginning. There's a lot of confusion that needs to be addressed on the broader issue of marijuana and its legal status in the State of New York right now.

There's been a big discussion of legalization at the state level but it has not happened. So, marijuana is illegal in every way, shape, or form right now. What we've said is – originally a few years ago, we're not going to arrest, the NYPD will not arrest for low-level possession. More recently, we've said we're not going to arrest for smoking in public. We will provide a summons. There is a sanction, and that summons needs to be answered by the person involved in it, whether it's a fine or whatever it is. They have to fulfill their part of it or if not that could lead to more trouble with the law.

So, it's still not legal to have marijuana. It's still not legal to smoke marijuana. But I think with sales, you're talking now, obviously, higher up the scale in terms of legal issues. I'm not an expert on what the penalties are around sales but it is, by the same reasoning, it's illegal in all forms so the sale of it is an even higher offense.

And we still want to inhibit that. And obviously, people sometimes think of it you will low-level sales and don't think of it as something particularly problematic but there are – there's another reality which is very real which is unfortunately, criminal enterprises and gangs that so sales on a very high level.

And that's a huge problem and a lot of violence often associated with that. So, that's why at this point – I mean to give you a layman's answer because I'm not an expert on the nuances of the law but that's a broad answer as to why sales are still treated differently.

**Lehrer:** Thank you. We'll get one more in here. Back to Queens – Woodhaven for Tracy. You're on with the Mayor. Hello, Tracy.

**Question:** Hi, good morning gentlemen. Mr. Mayor, I wanted to ask you about a recent article in the New York Times about the removal of public garbage cans specifically in Harlem. I believe there were 233 cans removed from the street, and over 1,000 across the city.

As a Queens resident I have personally purchased and put a garbage can at the local bodega because there was none. But I don't understand if people have something to throw away they need a place to put it. So, can you explain why that was done?

**Mayor:** Well, I'm going to explain but I'm going to explain it with my own questions. So, I'm glad you're raising the question. By the way, thank you for putting that garbage can in front of the bodega. That's something – when people step and do something in your neighborhood, it helps a lot.

But the bigger question is – okay, well, why did it happen? Well, the Sanitation Department will say – and I respect them but I'm not sure I fully agree in this case – they'll say a lot of public trash cans, unfortunately, draw a lot of residential trash. So, in theory, I'm speaking as a homeowner or you're in an apartment or where ever you live, your trash is supposed to go to a particular site outside your building for pickup and not into a public trash can.

The public trash can is supposed to be for people walking by and throwing out a coffee cup or whatever it is. The fact is, unfortunately, a lot of New Yorkers put their own large-scale trash bags with a lot of stuff in them, in the public trash can, overflow it, and then it becomes a problem. It can't be picked up often enough when people do that. There's just too much trash for what the cans are meant for. It's not what they were originally meant for.

So, in places where that's happened on a large scale, the Sanitation Department says, okay, we're actually better off not having the trash can because then people won't do that, they'll put it in front of their building more likely, and that's an imperfect solution but better than what we had.

I think what we got to try and figure out is something better than both of those realities. We've got to figure out a way to have the public trash cans but really help ensure that people put their own residential trash where it's supposed to go. I don't know if that means more enforcement or more education. I'm not sure. I'm going to have that conversation with the Sanitation Commissioner.

I don't love the notion of taking away public trash cans but I do understand there is some actual evidence behind this that in some cases the public trash can creates a worse problem than was there already. And that's what we've got to [inaudible]. I think we need some solution we don't have yet that gets us to a better place.

**Lehrer:** Well, we're just about out of time. We got calls in from four of the five boroughs today. We happen not to have anybody on our ten lines from Staten Island this morning. So, let's end with a shout out to the Staten Island Little League team that was eliminated last night but got very deep into the Little League World Series this year.

**Mayor:** They were amazing. I was out [inaudible] a few years ago. The Mid Island – they're fantastic. I want to really commend all the coaches and the parents who make that such a great Little League, and the kids do an amazing job.

I mean, just imagine the intensity and the pressure – an international audience watching when you're that age. The kids did an amazing job and they almost got there but as New Yorkers, we

should be very, very proud of them, and we're looking forward to celebrating what they achieved because it was something really wonderful to watch.

**Lehrer:** Mr. Mayor, thanks as always. Talk to you next week.

**Mayor:** Thanks, Brian.

###