



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

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:** November 19, 2018  
**CONTACT:** [pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov](mailto:pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov), (212) 788-2958

**TRANSCRIPT: MAYOR DE BLASIO ANNOUNCES 62,000 NYCHA APARTMENTS  
TO RECEIVE COMPREHENSIVE REPAIRS**

**Mayor Bill de Blasio:** Thank you, well done.

[Applause]

Well, Giselle, it is obvious why you are the president and the head of the Residents Association. And you speak with a real passion and real authority as to what is needed to make Betances Houses all it should be. So, I want to say I appreciate very much your commitment to all of your neighbors, your commitment to making things better. That's what leaders are supposed to do. Let's all give Giselle a big round of applause. Thank you.

[Applause]

And I want to say to everyone who is here, everybody from the Betances community – I would ask all New Yorkers to really focus on the good people who live in public housing. 400,000 New Yorkers who work hard every day, who care about their families and their neighbors, who want to make things better and are looking for NYCHA and the City to partner with them. Too often I feel that people who live in public housing are portrayed in a way that takes away some of their humanity, some of their strength. Sometimes they are portrayed, in my opinion, as victims. I don't think people here are victims. I think these are good people fighting for a good way of life, demanding more results. And these are the folks who are the backbone of New York City. These are the folks who make New York City work. Let's celebrate them. Let's celebrate them for all the good they do.

[Applause]

We are here today to begin a process of change. For months we have talked about the fact that we're going to have to do something very different with public housing in New York City. 400,000 people rely on it. It's time for big, systemic changes.

Today we're going to unveil a beginning. I've said publicly, this is just the beginning. By the end of the year, you will see a formal plan for the major, major changes that have to happen in public

housing that will help us to bring in the vast resources we need. I'm going to say upfront, and I'm sure I'll be saying in response to some of the questions from the media – \$31 billion is the level of need in public housing in New York City. We don't have \$31 billion today but we believe that the plans we're putting forward are going to help us to get a lot of those resources in and make a huge difference in the lives of residents.

I want to thank everyone who is here with us. You're going to hear from the Chair of NYCHA, Stan Brezenoff, in a moment but I also want to thank other members of my administration who played a crucial role in putting together this new vision that, again, begins to be unveiled today but will be formalized in the coming weeks. I want to thank our Deputy Mayor for Housing and Economic Development Alicia Glen, General Manager of NYCHA Vito Mustaciolo. Both of them have been working night and day on this new plan that I think is going to have a huge impact on people in public housing. I also want to thank some of the leaders of community organizations and faith leaders who are here with us and the organizations themselves that want to play a constructive role in rejuvenating public housing and helping people who live in our communities. I want to thank Monsignor Kevin Sullivan of Catholic Charities – a crucial partner in all we do. I want to thank Masjid Al Wadud, the Darou Salam Islamic Community, the Northwest Bronx Clergy Coalition, Community Board 1, and Mothers on the Move. Let's give them all a round of applause.

[Applause]

We all know the history. It's not a good history. In fact, today on the front page of the New York Times was a detailed look at decades of neglect suffered by the residents of public housing. This is not a good history. There are too many instances where the City, NYCHA, and other partners at the federal and state level did not do all that should have been done. Our job is of course to understand that history but to transcend it. We're not going to be lost in the mistakes of the past. We have to be the generation that fixes them.

I want that to be very, very clear. Any question about the past, I'll entertain but I'll always tell you the crucial question is where are we going from here. What happened in the past and examining that is important but it's not going to change the lives of the people standing behind me. What's going to change the lives of the people standing behind me is more resources used better to fix problems. That's why today we're going to focus on the investments we have to make.

To date this administration has committed \$3.7 billion in investments that were never made previously, that were not legally mandated. We believed they were the right thing to do. We started that with our first budget in the spring of 2014. We made a decision to agree to an additional investment in a consent decree with the federal government – \$1.2 billion minimum investment. As I'm sure many of you saw, last week the judge overseeing that case decided to reject the initial draft of the consent decree. I made clear instantly that the City of New York, regardless of the outcome with the consent decree, will stand by its commitment to invest an additional \$1.2 billion in NYCHA.

We believe in that commitment and when you combine that will \$3.7 billion that's already been spent, we're talking now a grand total since 2014 of \$5 billion in new resources for the people of public housing. We are going to stand by all those commitments.

Now, we cannot alone solve the problem. This is something I think everyone understands but it bears repeating. There's no way that with the resources of the housing authority itself and the City of New York – there's no way we could reach \$31 billion in the timeframe we need to. We must bring in outside resources. We must work with the federal government which is obviously the single biggest source of resources and the legal power to make the changes.

That's why we're going to focus now on the kind of public private partnerships that have worked. Everyone here knows about Section 8 and you know about Section-8 vouchers for individuals but the other piece of Section 8 is Project Section-8 which means when an entire housing development is covered by Section 8 and the subsidies that it provides. That is the essence of what we're doing through the RAD program. And we want to do it on a very big scale.

Section 8 on a development by development basis has worked. It's a proven methodology. What does it mean? It means that entire development is renovated up and down, public spaces and apartments. It means new kitchens. It means new bathrooms, new windows. It means upgrading the entire development to make it the kind of place Giselle was talking about, that has what people are really looking for.

Now, you can say, is that just a dream, is that something that sounds great but has never happened? Well, you're going to hear in a few minutes from Congressman Gregory Meeks who is one of the most senior members of our House delegation to fought hard to make sure that this type of approach would help residents in his community, and he can tell you from firsthand experience about the Ocean Bay development in his district and the change that this type of approach with RAD and Project Based Section 8 has made – the profound changes made in people's lives.

I've been in those buildings. I've been in those apartments. I've seen it with my own eyes as well. People who are living at Campos Plaza in Manhattan can tell you, one part of that development has gone through this approach, the other we've announced will get it soon. But they can tell you about the difference it's making in their lives. This is not a theoretical idea. This is an idea that works in practice right here in New York City.

So, at Ocean Bay, we've seen tremendous progress. At Campos Plaza, we've seen tremendous progress. I am here to announce that you will soon be seeing tremendous progress right here at Betances.

[Applause]

Giselle told me I had to say that –

[Laughter]

But it's true. This is the formal announcement that Betances will be one of the next developments to benefit from this extraordinary approach. Now, we had announced previously that we wanted to use this focus on Project Based Section 8 on a much bigger scale. We said our hope had been that 20,000 apartments would be renovated with this approach over the next eight years. We are now upping that goal substantially. We believe that this approach can work on a much bigger scale for the people of public housing here in New York City and we believe the federal government is receptive to going to a much bigger scale here in what is the biggest public housing authority in America.

So, our new goal will be 62,000 apartments that will be renovated over the next ten years. 62,000 apartments that we can make as good as they should be – the quality standard that the people of public housing deserve. What does that mean in reality? That is tripling the number of apartments that will benefit from this approach, and for human beings – I want you to hear how many people will be reached. 100,000 public housing residents will get their buildings and their apartments renovated. 100,000 people will benefit from this new approach including the people right here behind me.

We're very, very excited of what it's going to mean but we also have to make really clear what it is not because I have gotten this question – I think I've done 58 town hall meetings around the city. I think at almost everyone I've gotten a question about the future of public housing. So, what we're talking about today with Project Based Section 8, with RAD is a way to protect everything that we care about in terms of public housing. It's a way to make sure that the people that are in those apartments, stay in those apartments, that they have the tenancy rights they have right this minute, that they have the rent levels they have right this minute – 30 percent of income, the standard that's always been held in public housing continues – that the public sector, NYCHA and the City of New York, retain control over the land and the decisions.

So, this is a way to get a lot more resources in and protect all of the things that are the decisive factors in what makes public housing so important to New Yorkers. I want to tell you what this not. This is not privatization. We do not believe in privatization and we will not allow it. This is a way to get private dollars in to help us achieve a public good. We believe that public housing has been crucial to New York City's past, it's crucial to our present, and it's crucial to our future, and we're going to protect public housing in New York City.

To close, I just want to say very clearly – and then I'll say a few words in Spanish – I set a goal for this entire four-year term to make New York City the fairest big city in America, to make sure that New Yorkers felt their lives were getting more fair all the time whether it's in the relationship between police and community, whether it's in the experience that parents and grandparents have with their kids going to public school, or whether it's in the experience of people looking for affordable housing and getting affordable housing and quality affordable housing – these are the marks of a society that is fair to everyone. We have a long way to go but this is one of the building blocks. Turning public housing around in New York City is one of the ways to ensure that we become the fairest big city in America.

And it's going to take a lot of work and anyone who tries to suggest there are quick fixes or overnight solutions, I will stare them in the eye and say that's not the reality. The problems Giselle described did not happen overnight and they will not be fixed overnight, but we will rebuild NYCHA brick by brick. We will use these resources to fix building after building after building, apartment after apartment after apartment to give people a better life – that is what we're committed to.

A few words in Spanish –

[Mayor de Blasio speaks in Spanish]

With that, I want to turn to the man who I've charged with achieving really fundamental change in NYCHA. His mandate is to be bold and to do things that have not been done before and needed to be done, and that's a tall order, but the Chair of the Housing Authority has already seen a number of really tough missions in his career and he's seen them through to success. He's one of the people who brought New York City back from the brink of the fiscal crisis of the 70s and 80s, one of the people that turned around our Health and Hospitals Corporation. He knows how to make a difference. It's my pleasure to introduce Chair Stan Brezenoff.

[Applause]

**Interim Chair and CEO Stanley Brezenoff, NYCHA:** What can I say after that? Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and thank you Betances Houses residents, and particularly our gracious hostess. Thank you for hosting us. The Mayor has described what's going on here. I'm really proud to be here because this is an important day for the residents of Betances Houses, bringing Betances to the status of Project Based Section 8 promises significant improvements for the hundreds of families who live here. Even as important though, as it is an early step in an effort to bring Project Based Section 8 financing to many, many more units of housing within NYCHA. As the Mayor noted we seek to transform by the year 2028 62,000 units, better than a third of all of the units currently within NYCHA, and well over 100,000 residents. More than a third of NYCHA residents will see nearly \$13 billion over renovations and major repairs to their homes.

Project Based Section 8, the RAD program as the manifestation of that funding, is the kind of approach that offers the ability to go to scale in addressing the problems of NYCHA.

The Mayor noted that a recent needs analysis for NYCHA totaled \$32 billion. In thinking about how to attack that in a way that makes a dramatic difference for a substantial amount of the tenants, Project Based Section 8 is essentially the only big game in town and therefore the public private partnership has to be embraced by us as quickly and as effectively as we can.

There is another byproduct, though, of focusing on the RAD program and that is that it will free-up NYCHA and resources to focus on the remaining parts of NYCHA because while this is an ambitious program that has great, great promise for the people who live in NYCHA, we will not be, as the Mayor as has noted, forgetting that there are many problems and issues in the balance of NYCHA. And we will be using those resources in a more focused, in a more reliable, in a

more effective way over the coming months and years so that inroads can be made in the same kinds of problems while the RAD program unfolds in the 62,000 units.

**Mayor:** Alright, you got more or you're done?

**Interim Chair Brezenoff:** No, I'm done.

**Mayor:** Okay, thank you. Thank you.

**Interim Chair Brezenoff:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** Yes, I know. Thank you, Stan. Now, I mentioned before Congressman Greg Meeks, who has been a very, very strong voice for public housing defending the residents but also has recognized that we need the resources to make people's lives better and that the federal government has a crucial role to play. So, this is a voice of authority to me because he wants to strike that balance of protecting the rights and the needs of residents, protecting public housing long term but also getting real resources in without which we cannot make the right changes. He's been right in the middle of making sure that Ocean Bay was everything it was meant to be and Congressman, I want to say thank you for that. I want to say congratulations that you will now be in the majority, a great place to be –

[Applause]

And I look forward to calling you Chairman or whatever various titles you will be gaining now.

[Laughter]

But your leadership is going to be very good for the people of New York City and we want to commend you and thank you and please, help people understand what you were able to achieve with Ocean Bay and the difference it's making in people's lives.

[...]

**Mayor:** Thank you so much Assembly member and thank you both for your extraordinary support for the residents of public housing. We're going to take questions to begin on this announcement today. Let's see if there's questions on this?

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, I am sure many of these residents would love to get new kitchens and bathrooms, and things for their apartments. But when they call our newsrooms desperate for help [inaudible] major infrastructure – plumbing, boilers, leaking, no cleaning, no hot water. Does any of this money help with those concerns?

**Mayor:** All of those concerns.

**Congressman Gregory Meeks:** Absolutely.

**Mayor:** Well why don't you start since you're an eye witness, and then we'll let Stan or Vito can speak to it as well.

**Congressman Meeks:** I would tell you – you talk about new boilers, the guts of the building, absolutely from the ground up. It take covers all of that, and when you look at coming in for repairs, etcetera. There's no question about that. So it's not just the apartment itself, it's from the guts of the building on up. It concludes everything.

**Assemblywoman Carmen Arroyo:** From the base to the roof.

**Mayor:** There you go, want to add? I think that says it all, that says it all.

**Question:** [Inaudible] success at Ocean Bay what happened there. But in terms of getting through this winter – what my colleague just asked about – there are people right now at this moment who do not have heat or hot water in their apartment who have fixtures torn off the walls, holes in the walls who have rats. What can be done to at least ease the suffering for these residents as we go into the colder months?

**Mayor:** Look, we have to do both. We have to do everything we can to address people suffering right now while doing something much more fundamental for the future. If we just keep addressing problem, after problem, after problem but don't get to the root cause, we're not going to be helping anyone. So this is why this is so important today. We're talking about the resources to completely rehabilitate 62,000 apartments and all the rest of those buildings. That is trying to fix the problem once and for all. That's what we want to do. Now you're right. Right now we've got problems we have to address. So Vito, Stan can jump in, but what we've announced previously is we're trying to use a whole host of tools that honestly NYCHA didn't do enough of in the past – outside contractors, outside technical experts, mechanics, who can be applied more quickly to where the heat problems are – more mobile boilers. It is not going to be perfect. I think what – I've being saying \$31 billion, Stan's right, when you round it off its closer to \$32 billion. When you have a \$32 billion hold, there's going to be a lot of problems. But we do believe we can help people this winter to have a better experience than last winter. You want to add to it all?

**General Manager Vito Mustaciuolo, NYCHA:** So as the Mayor indicated, we've been in number of changes for the heat season. And this week I am going to be sharing with the Mayor some additional plans to make improvements to how we deliver services this heat season.

**Mayor:** And we also – just one other point – honestly, I have deep respect for the hard working people at NYCHA, but NYCHA has done a lousy job of communicating with the residents about their heat problems. One of the things in the announcement a few weeks ago was to say we're going to not only send out those teams, send out those mobile boilers, but then ask residents are you experiencing an improvement in your heat situation in your home, if you're not, we have to go back. Also, something that I have instructed both Stan and Vito to focus on, there's times when the heat has to be maintained and worked on in a building. It's true in a private building, its true in a public housing building. And what NYCHA has never done consistently is alert the residents in advance of when the heat will be down for maintenance reasons. Not because there

was a break down but because they are trying to avoid a break down by doing a normal maintenance they have to do. That's kind of 1-0-1 to tell people when something like that is needed and let them prepare for it hasn't been a strong suit. I think Stan, and Vito are going to put in place a variety of things quickly to allow people to have that information. Courtney?

**Question:** In the beginning of your remarks, you talked about [inaudible]. Can you talk to me about [inaudible] suggesting [inaudible]? You mentioned the state handling, your predecessor failing, federal government failing. However, you've been in office five years now. Do you accept some responsibility?

**Mayor:** Of course, of course, and we've covered this ground, but I'll cover it again. It's very painful to me that some of this clearly happened under our watch. The origins are not on our watch, and I think the story today points it out more clearly than ever. We were handed an already fundamentally broken situation and honestly we didn't even know some of these problems existed. We did not know, and I've said it before. We did not realize that the inspections had stopped years before. And some people made some very big mistakes, and those people are gone. The new leadership I think is doing a very commendable job under tough circumstances trying to fix to things once and for all so that never happens again. And obviously inspections are now happening regularly, remediation is happening regularly. But of course we have to take, I have to take responsibility, we all – of us up here have to take responsibility for the administration for what happened on watch. And we are pained that some of what is happening we didn't know because we would have fixed it. So, to the point about contesting the Health Department instructions several months ago, Stan, and Vito ordered that stopped. That, from that point on, when the Health Department said remediate now, NYCHA just remediates, period. So some of this is – Courtney it's – you could debate what's worse, knowing about something, and not acting on it, or not even knowing about it. What I think is the truth of what we've experienced these last few years, we didn't know about a number of these things when we found out about them, we acted. I didn't know those Health Department reports were being contested in that way. It was a no brainer to say we're not doing that. Once we understood that, we're not doing that. Please.

**Question:** I just have to [inaudible]. You said talk to – you're optimistic [inaudible].

**Mayor:** Yes.

**Question:** What does that mean specifically? [Inaudible] great idea, go for it [inaudible] every single development [inaudible].

**Mayor:** I'll turn to Alicia, Stan, and Vito. But just to say, one, it's a policy that has worked. So that's the first reason we're optimistic. It has worked in practice including right here in New York City. And HUD has encouraged public housing authorities to use this. Two, I think we've had very productive conversations with HUD that certainly leave us feeling like they want to see this be a crucial part of what we do going forward. But I'll leave it to my colleagues to fill it in.



**Deputy Mayor Alicia Glen:** So yes, we've had very collaborative conversations with HUD around how to get this effort underway and the fact that we're here today as a testament to the fact that we've been able to build some of those bridges and deal with some of the issues. Because NYCHA is a very complex and the largest authority by far and many of the programs were not designed necessarily to accommodate some of the issues that we have here, so we've been in extensive conversations with them and we've closed this transaction with HUD just last week as well as the Ocean Bay transaction, there are several more to close this year. Each time we convert something to section 8 we do have to get approval from HUD under something called section 18. So it's an ongoing relationship and I feel very good about where we are and we'll continue to work with them.

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Deputy Mayor Glen:** We have briefed them on the broad outlines of this effort, yes.

**Mayor:** Jillian.

**Congressman Meeks:** Just to make this –

**Mayor:** Go ahead, congressman.

**Congressman Meeks:** -- On the Congressional level we have been talking with HUD also previously and now that we're in charge of the house and there's going to be a number of members who I know, Emmanuel Cleaver for example, he may be, or Lacy Clay the chair of the Housing Committee on the Financial Service Committee. We are looking to having a meeting further with Secretary Carson and I can tell you that it's going to be very much on top of our agenda in regards to HUD, and the one thing that we've been agreed – been able to agree upon with them has been nothing much to be quite honest with you but one of the things that Carson has been promoting is RAD and wanting to invest and getting involved in RAD. I can tell you that's the only one thing that we've been talking about and we've been going at it head and head. But RAD has been that one area of which we seem to have some type of an agreement and we want to move forward on.

**Mayor:** Amen, Jillian?

**Question:** Mayor, just a quick follow up on Courtney's first question. You just said that you didn't know [inaudible] challenge. But [inaudible] public for a year at this point. [Inaudible]. How is this not something that would come up really in months?

**Mayor:** Again, I want to really make sure we understand this, because the question has been asked in a lot of ways and I feel like it's been answered so I am going to try again. Today's article points out the sheer totality of the problem. And how long the stakes were made, but also points out that for all of us coming in the door, we were focused on a host of other challenges in NYCHA. This is just plain fact. If you go back just look at the year 2014, look at the 2013 citywide debate that was the mayoral campaign, and look at the 2014, the issues of that year in public housing. In the campaign people were talking about what was going to happen on

development, how do you avoid privatization, a whole host of issues. In the first year, number one issue was crime in NYCHA developments, and a huge amount of energy went that year into reducing crime successfully. This issue was not on the radar and is just the honest truth. In fact it is part of the reality and I wish, I wish we had like perfect field vision. I wish we could see everything happening in the whole city at all times. It's just not the honest truth. We rely on a whole host of community groups, resident associations, elected officials, the media, etc. To bring issues forward in addition to everything we do all day. Once it started to be clear that there was something fundamentally wrong. Piece by piece we've tried to address the lead issue. So now we have a lead czar for the first time working to coordinate all citywide efforts under a Vision Zero strategy which the city never had, which says we're going to eradicate lead poisoning once and for all in New York City. We've come down 90 percent since 2005 which is stunning progress for the city. We're going to end it once and for all. We're going to make sure that any young people affected get the treatment they need. It's never been the approach; it will be the approach now. As each piece of the equation has been presented we're trying to fundamentally change things. So I am telling you a factual statement. If anyone had presented to me along the way that these reports from the Department of Health were being contested that would have been the day that we started the process of turning that around. It has now been ended once and for all.

**Question:** I guess my question though is why weren't we doing this in 2013? If this happened [inaudible] -

**Mayor:** Bless you.

**Question:** Why did this aspect of [inaudible] -

**Mayor:** Because I think honestly the problem had been - thank God - had gotten a lot better over the years, Arroyo said that, 90 percent reduction since 2005. There were a host other problems that were very urgent, you know, again I respect if anyone in the media or in any elected office says why were we not able to do everything at once, the honest truth is we have huge a number of things we're trying to do just when it comes to public housing, let alone everything else we do. We respond to both an agenda, we broaden that agenda what we want to do, try to help NYCHA starting with ending the payments to the police department, ending the fact that NYCHA had to pay taxes to the City of New York, turning that money back to repairs, if you said to me on the first day of my administration what were the central problems in HUD, I would have said safety, I would have said the repairs not being made on a timely basis, and I would have said NYCHA is still having to pay money to the City of New York instead of keeping that money to fix its own problems and needs. That's what we focused on.

The lead issue was not on the front of the discussion I think in part because a lot of progress had been made and in part because we didn't realize that some of the things that needed to be happening had stopped, like those inspections. I had no idea the inspections had stopped. Anyone in the right mind would have said they have to be, they're legally mandated, they have to happen. This is reality of how things work as were trying to make sense of a whole lot of complicated material. But again, what I think residents care about now, is what are we doing now? Now we have lead czar. Now we're using a Vision Zero approach to lead. Now we've invested between the previous investments and the new ones I mentioned almost \$5 billion that no other

administration invested. No we're trying to move 62,000 apartments to be finally the quality they deserve, that is the way forward for NYCHA. That's what we're focused on.

**Interim Chair Brezenhoff:** Might I add, the – we're going to be inspecting every apartment that was built before the key dates, 132,000 – [inaudible] – 132,000 apartments to establish what is a comprehensive baseline. So that we will have all the information we need, we will have corrective action plans –

**Mayor:** And this, I want to – he is pointing to Vito, because it was Vito's idea, and I want to commend him for the idea – in the article today there's a very important point in previous administrations they decided a certain number of buildings didn't have lead in them. They didn't have a whole lot of evidence of that fact. Vito said in a meeting not long after he was named at City Hall, he said we actually need to go back over everything that does not – that we're not a hundred percent confirmed doesn't have lead. And it's going to – I remember the meeting vividly - he says it's going to cost a whole lot of money and it's going to lead to a lot more work.

Again what do most people do in Government, they try to minimize exposure and minimize cost and minimize the amount of obligations. He looked me in the eye and suggested the exact opposite, he was 100 percent right. So now 140,000 apartments are going to be tested once and for all to determine if they have lead or not and then we act accordingly. Greg?

**Question:** I think you've used the term consent decree since we've been sitting here? And the situation is, as far as I can tell, is that you guys have signed up for this thing. You're married to it as is the Housing Authority. But the judge has a different plan, and specifically the judge has brought up a couple times now, receivership. My question is how do you feel about receivership, there is two kinds, [inaudible]. Where are you with that?

**Mayor:** I think it would be a huge mistake for the people of public housing in this city because it will take the decision making power someplace else, and we don't know what that will lead to. It's as simple as that. Now I want to contest you just a little, because I have read that decision over and over. I think the judge says he would like to see HUD play a more central role. We're going to go back to – I mean, again this is my interpretation having read it, read it, read it, he points out all the tools that HUD has, and he would like HUD to play a more central role in resolving this issue.

Now we have until the middle of December to go back. We're going to work with HUD, we're going to work the U.S. Attorney, NYCHA, the City, everyone together, to try and figure out a way forward that is productive. But I for one believe that there is a better chance of the problems being solved with the leadership we have now and the structure we have now rather than a receivership. Receivership is a great unknown. Now we are putting in place step by step a series of fundamental reforms, like what we're talking about today. We are absolutely committed to fixing these 62,000 apartments. We're going to put the resources we need to, we're going to do the work. I have confidence that will happen, so I'd rather stay with a plan that I know can be achieved rather than open up a whole another world.

**Question:** Are you against both administrative and judicial –

**Mayor:** I'm going to work with all the players but if you ask me my personal opinion, which you did, I believe that we have a better chance with solving the problems with the approach we have now than with, again, the great unknown. Yes, Monica?

**Question:** We're live on Facebook, I was supposed to be at the Murphy Houses today, they don't have [inaudible]. People are suffering all across the City. What do you tell them, they think, the City is too little, too late. They think [inaudible] asking about [inaudible]. How can we trust you now that will [inaudible] and what is moving forward, what is the plan? What is the plan for this [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** Let's – let's – the Congressman can speak to this in personal experience, the work that was done in Ocean Bay was done while keeping the residents in their homes. Clearly we believe in public housing and serving the people right now in public housing. Don't want to see anyone pushed out. Another reason to Greg's question, that I am concerned when I see ideas like receivership is the history of, in a lot of places, of other parts of government coming in doesn't always that the people who are in public housing benefit. I worry a lot about some of the bad history in this country of developments being torn down and there never being a place for people. Here, at Ocean Bay, and Congressman if you'd describe it, it's fixed in place with the residents right there – hold on, hold on, you go ahead.

**Congressman Meeks:** Let me tell you, I think that you should go, because I want to bring out the Congressional delegation to get out, come visit, and see it. But – and we've got tenants here too, from Ocean Bay, they will tell you now, what happens is that people are still living there. And what they did was there times because when you are renovating an apartment there is inconveniences, no question, but there where lounges that were put in place for folks to go while people were still working in their house, so that they have a nice place to rest and they were making sure they were able to eat because it's a major renovation that was being done. But nobody was put out or had to go someplace else, it was all done while folks continued to live there and they saw their apartments were going on and you had those – as it would take place, you know, you've got to try to have timing and things of that nature, but they were working with the residents and I think overall if you talked to the people that lived there and went through the process, they will tell you that they were more than satisfied with how it was done.

**Mayor:** Can I ask – hold on – who's here from Ocean Bay, anyone? Just for colleagues in the media take a look at the hands that are up. Put your hands up one more time Ocean Bay people, if you want to talk to any of the folks who actually went through it and have actually have benefited, have you benefitted?

**Unknown:** [Inaudible].

**Mayor:** Have you benefited?

**Unknown:** Yes I did –

**Mayor:** Alright it worked. Who else is here, Ocean Bay? What are your names?

**Unknown:** Iris [inaudible]

**Unknown:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** Alright, very good, anyone else on this side? Okay, talk to those folks after.

**Question:** Mayor, [inaudible] visited NYCHA –

**Mayor:** I have visited NYCHA for years and years, I'm going to visit NYCHA. I'm not playing by your rules, I'm playing by what is right for people of New York City, I'm going to visit NYCHA on a regular basis as I've always had.

**Question:** [Inaudible] see you –

**Mayor:** I would like to see them, and I have for years and years, and I will back again, and I am right now at NYCHA. But the point is, how do you know people are serious? Because we put \$5 billion into doing this and no other administration did that because we brought in leaders who are clearly proven at fixing problems because we have shown a path forward and we're going to be showing a lot more by the end of the year. Who else? Go ahead?

**Question:** Who are the managers – managing companies?

**Mayor:** Louder?

**Question:** Who are the managing companies that will be running these developments?

**Mayor:** I know in the case of Ocean Bay, what's the – I'm forgetting –

**Congressman Meeks:** Ocean Bay. It's MDG and Wavecrest.

**Mayor:** MDG and Wavecrest in that case, but could someone among the three of you describe how those companies and organizations and non-profits are recruited?

**Question:** Are they both non-profits or [inaudible]?

**Deputy Mayor Glen:** It's a combination. So actually today also we have Susan from Wavecrest, wave – oh, wave, Wavecrest, who is a terrific manager who manages a lot of affordable housing around the City. All of the folks who wind up managing and operating the Section 8 developments are chosen through a competitive process and we put out solicitations at various times across the year and teams respond. They often respond with a construction manager, an operating company, a non-profit, and so here today this is a good example of the kind partnership you would have. You would have a contractor, Wavecrest, a couple of social service providers, including Catholic Charities and Bronx Works, so that residents are also getting services as part of the package. So it's done on a competitive basis and we'll be rolling those out, quarterly every half year, to solicit more folks so that we could have wider participation across the boroughs.

**Question:** [Inaudible].

**Deputy Mayor Glen:** Yes – you get – it’s all – yes, you must have had experience in sort of the relative size and scale of the development that we would like you to be participating in, right? So depending on the size of the bundles as we call them, various groups will be matched with projects as we roll them out.

**Mayor:** Okay, way back.

**Question:** What kind of relationship –

**Mayor:** Louder.

**Question:** What kind of relationship will NYCHA have with these tenants after the renovations are made? [Inaudible] call NYCHA if they have problems with their apartment, do they call 3-1-1, or do they call construction and management [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** So again, Greg anytime you want to jump in what the day to day as in Ocean Bay to give people live experience, the question was when people need a repair or have a problem, who do they turn to?

**Congressman Meeks:** They turn to in this case to Wavecrest who is running the facilities and they go in and they, you know, have their mechanisms for repairs. We also have there is that there is a community person that from the development that are working in, so they help expedite it also. They are talking to their tenants on a day to day basis to try to make sure where there is some repair work that needs to be done, that that conversations is happening so that it is done in a very timely fashion. So it’s a – it is a – they turn directly to the individuals at Wavecrest who is the managing agent.

**Mayor:** Back, way back, yes?

**Question:** Mayor, the question I asked is, outside management [inaudible] do the job better then what NYCHA was doing and we see that here [inaudible] doesn’t that kind of beg the question then why not give everything over to other folks to manage if NYCHA is doing such a horrible job?

**Mayor:** So I appreciate the spirit of the question and I want to tell you the world is whole lot more complex than yet. And again you guys are trying to boil it down, I get that. We have an obligation, all of us here to serve 400,000 people and we have to be really precise about how we do it. If the current structure of NYCHA could achieve everything we need it to achieve, could suddenly receive \$32 billion and we could make all the other reforms we want to make, we would stick with that structure. We don’t have another way to get the money in on a level we need without going to this RAD/Project based Section-8 approach which is a public private partnership. It’s the only way we get the money, it also brings in management companies, you know for profit, nonprofit that are really good at what they do so it ends up being a division of

labor. Wherever we can get that to work, we do that, we focus the rest of our energies on the traditional structure and trying to continually improve that.

And I do think there have been serious improvements over the years in that traditional structure. We have a lot more to do to make it work better but it began by giving back the money to NYCHA to make repairs for example which was something that was not happening for a long time. So I think the honest answer is we need to do both. We don't have a magic wand that turns everything into project based section-8, just that's not conceivable today, but we can turn a lot into it and focus the rest of our energies on the existing stuff. Yes?

**Question:** Mayor, some of the folks who were briefed on your plan said that there's consideration being given to more [inaudible] greater share of market rate houses [inaudible] development [inaudible] ratio to of market rate to affordable. I know that that's not being [inaudible] I was just wondering if maybe you could talk about [inaudible] jobs in the plan?

**Mayor:** I will, I will speak to that when we come back with the next piece, I mean we definitely, the development issue is going to be part of this plan and we need development to achieve the most we can for the residents of the immediate area. So what you will see, I can just say it in a very broad stroke, is much greater focus on any new development benefiting the surrounding houses in the maximum way. But we will come back on what that's going to look like. Another thing we will certainly talk about is air rights that's been out there previously. That is a piece of the plan, it's not a huge piece but it's a helpful piece. We are going to get our hands on everything we can, we haven't come up with a grand name for this 2.0 concept but it's basically taking the Next Generation plan which did have some really strong elements and building upon them and we'll come back with a formal plan by the end of the year. Yes?

**Question:** Okay first of all, thank you Congressman [inaudible] because I grew up in [inaudible].

**Mayor:** No, no that's his predecessor. Congressman Meeks here.

**Question:** Alright [inaudible] and Borough President Diaz recently visited the Paxton Houses in the Bronx, money was allocated in 2011 for boilers but upon their visit they see another temporary boiler being put in. Why is that? And [inaudible] said that the City gets \$2.5 million for NYCHA from the federal government. Will that improve now that Democrats are in control?

**Mayor:** Okay I will just make a comment on the second one, I think on the first one, Vito is the best person to speak to it. I think Greg Meeks is going to have a lot to say on that question. Democrats are in control of the House, that's a huge difference maker. Senator Schumer is the Democratic leaders in the Senate. He's already shown even from the minority he could move some resources that were helpful to public housing. I'm very hopeful about how all of this comes together. I don't think anything bluntly, will achieve as much as we need until we have Democratic control of the House, Senate, and the Presidency, but I think we have a great opportunity at least to take a step forward. Congressman, what would you say?

**Congressman Meeks:** Yes, I think that we still – we've got one third, we need to have a two thirds. But we are going to look to see what we can do collectively, where we can agree upon. I

talked about [inaudible] costs and that. We don't agree on much. One area that I found that we did agree upon was RAD. So we are going to try to work with them on RAD and try to see what we can do to get those resources there so that for public housing. But it is difficult. We are going to be able now in the House to stop some of the horrendous things because the President won't have a blank check to just do what he wants to do and get it approved by the Republicans in the House. We can no block that. We can also now send some decent bills to the Senate and see if in fact some of the Republicans there would want to work with us so that we can pass something on a bipartisan basis.

**Mayor:** Yes and on that one there are senators who happen t be Republican but who still have a whole lot of public housing in their states so there's a real chance for some bipartisanship there. On the question of that specific boiler – Vito?

**General Manager Mustaciuolo:** So I'm sorry you said Patterson, correct? Right so the replacement of the heating plant at Patterson is underway but what we have done is we've taken out the old, inefficient, oil fired mobile unit. Under the contract for the replacement of the heating plant and we are putting in a new gas fired mobile unit. That's only going to be in place until the reconstruction of the heating plant is conducted. Excuse me?

**Question:** What does that mean?

**General Manager Mustaciuolo:** So it's underway now. It just started and we anticipate that we will have it done in about a year, full replacement.

**Mayor:** Okay, he'll follow up on any details. Few more on NYCHA and then we are going to go to other topics. Yes?

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, could you give us an idea of any of the developments that are part of these 62,000 apartments?

**Mayor:** So it's one, I'll start and then turn to these folks – its, the list continues to be developed, and that is an interactive process with HUD to determine which of the final ones can be but anything else you all want to sat to that?

**Interim Chair Brezenoff:** It's also interactive with the tenants and tenant leadership so we will be working on developing that –

**Mayor:** Stay close to this.

**Interim Chair Brezenoff:** We will be working on developing that list in the coming months. We have several that are slated for, between now and the early part of next year and then we will get on our regular time table but there is a consultative process, including especially tenants and tenant leadership.

**Mayor:** Can I urge and I don't know if this has already been though of by people at NYCHA and at City Hall but I think it would be very smart organize a formal media visit to Ocean Bay,



that the Congressman could be at for any members of the media who want to see it, obviously you can on your own time too but I think it would helpful to organize something like a formal tour with the management companies, etcetera, so people can hear about how it works. Last call yes?

**Question:** Just a follow up, [inaudible] the selection of developments, will that be based on need, the ones that are most dilapidated?

**Interim Chair Brezenoff:** There are criteria of which dilapidation is a key part. We are interested in doing some of the projects that are sort of removed on outlier, so that we can sort of take them out of the sphere of day to day management by NYCHA. And the criteria starts with the condition of the developments and 62,000 units is close to a third of what we've got so there will be quite a few that meet that criteria.

**Mayor:** And I want to emphasize as we bring out the bigger plans later on in the year we are going to be talking about the things that we have to do for some developments that have a lot of need but would not make sense for RAD because that's another part of the plan. Okay, last call on NYCHA, yes?

**Question:** What are the specific renovations that are starting right now? And when will they start?

**Mayor:** What's the timeline of Betances? And, I mean, I'm just going to say as you heard about Ocean Bay, it's everything. I mean –

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** No, no it progresses and we'll get you – I think we should get you the history of Ocean Bay and [inaudible] so you understand how it works but it's ultimately everything. It is done in a way that does not displace the tenants, the residents. But –

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** Say again?

**Question:** Do you know what they are doing first, what they are starting on first?

**Mayor:** Couldn't hear that?

**Question:** Do you know what they are working on first?

**Mayor:** We can get you that but does anyone know when the timeline is? Wait someone is trying to hand you a paper –

**Unknown:** We are starting in January.

**Mayor:** January.

**Unknown:** [Inaudible] And we are starting in January.

**Mayor:** January, I like that kind of answer.

**Unknown:** Two year, time frame in total of all construction.

**Mayor:** I feel like a ventriloquist.

[Laughter]

Starts in January, two year time frame, let's get you sense of what happens when but again I think the previous ones will be very instructive about how it progresses.

**Question:** So Mr. Mayor, is the federal government picking up the whole tax for the [inaudible] renovations?

**Mayor:** It's public-private.

**Question:** What does that mean? What percentage –

**Mayor:** So Alicia, you want to try and break down how that works? Simple, simple, she knows too much.

**Deputy Mayor Glen:** I'm going to be very simple.

**Mayor:** Simple.

**Deputy mayor Glen:** Under public housing you get a certain amount of money per unit to operate. Under Section 8 you get more money. So we use the money per unit, partially to operate the building, Wavecrest will be operating these buildings. And then the balance of the money, we can go out and borrow money in order to fix up the buildings. So the difference between converting from Section 9 to Section 8 is that is just gives the Authority more resources, some of which go into running the buildings, and the balance go to support the loan which is what these guys will use to fix up the buildings.

**Mayor:** I am going to try and make that even simpler and I want to ask our friends in communications for NYCHA and City Hall, you need a fact sheet badly to explain how this piece works because it took me several times to get the nuance. The federal government has the authority to give you the additional resources, the additional resources allow you working with the private sector to bring in private financing. So it's a multi-step process but what it results in is cash money you can use to fix buildings that you would not have if you were just relying on the regular direct subsidies for public housing. But let's get the step by step to show how that process works.

**Question:** So with the case of Wavecrest, is Wavecrest employees now that are doing the repairs and responding and then where does that leave –

**Mayor:** Yes.

**Question:** So then where does that leave the NYCHA employees?

**Mayor:** The NYCHA employees, I've said publically and I'll reiterate it, all current NYCHA employees, we need them, we have a lot of work to do. They are all going to have work to do in the NYCHA system. They might move to a different development to do some of that work but they are going to be working for NYCHA.

**Question:** Just to follow up on that question, do you expect any [inaudible]?

**Mayor:** I think there will be concerns but I think the most central thing any union is concerned about is everyone who has got a job going to be able to keep their job and the answer is yes.

**Question:** I have a question about NYCHA and the DOI, do you want to do that now or?

**Mayor:** If it is NYCHA go for it.

**Question:** In the report or the letter that the DOI Commissioner sent today, he said that he got a call from your First Deputy Mayor, Tony Shorris, on the day of your reelection in fact November 7th, telling him not come forward with that report and without that report we talked about earlier about not knowing things and [inaudible] it really was that report that started you know bringing a lot of public attention onto of all of the failings that happen at NYCHA. Now why would it be that a member of your administration would try and withhold or get him to withhold a report on that?

**Mayor:** Look I don't accept the Commissioner's interpretation of what happened in many instances. We've consistently cooperated with DOI over five years on a whole host of investigations. We'll continue to going forward. Margaret Garnett, I'm convinced is going to be a great DOI Commissioner, she has extraordinary background so the bottom line is we constantly cooperated, this line where you remember the US Attorney, had already been deeply engaged and I think that was one of the nuisances there of respecting the US Attorney's work and being mindful of that. But I want to be crystal clear, anything they were doing they would continue to. But let me hold you on your follow up for a second, because I think we have left the pure NYCHA, you are very good about trying to define the line there, I appreciate that. So I want to give the good people behind us who have been patiently standing a chance to get to someplace else and thank you all and wish you all a very happy Thanksgiving.

[Applause]

Happy Thanksgiving, everybody. Happy Thanksgiving.

[...]

**Mayor:** You want to leave, it's your chance. Thank you Pat, I appreciate that.

[Laughter]

Back to David, okay continue David.

**Question:** I wanted to ask a quick follow up on that second question. The follow up is just – so you are saying essentially that your interaction–

**Mayor:** Hold on, hold on. Can everyone keep it down we are trying to listen to the question. Go ahead.

**Question:** The interaction that you had with Peters, this summer obviously, you are saying actually part of that had to do with First Deputy Mayor Shorris saying maybe, you know, there is this federal investigation going on, and so that's the reason not to come forward –

**Mayor:** One, I wasn't part of that conversation best I remember. And I don't remember it being reported to me. Two, in every instance with DOI, we respected the DOI had a job to do, in fact if you look at the record we provided a lot of resources to DOI for additional inspectors and more investigations, and additional investigators I should say, and more investigations. So it was very clear that all of us understood DOI has a job to do, they are going to do it independently. In the instance that you referred to, I'm only giving you a background point, which was the real origination of a lot of the information that was the US Attorney investigation that started over two years ago, and we tend to be very respectful of federal investigations and allowing them to achieve what they need to achieve. So that's only just for background on that case.

**Question:** Now I just want to ask you in general, is it ever appropriate for you or a member of your administration to request the DOI, that they pull or not make public a report that was meant for –

**Mayor:** It's absolutely – let me define it because I want to put in my own words, to debate what to do about findings is 100 percent appropriate. To understand if the findings are accurate, to ask tough questions, to understand what the recommendations are, not every recommendation is going to be perfect, some are accepted instantly, some are debated, that's normal. To talk about how to make sure the report is complete, how to make sure the agency had a chance to respond, these are all pertinent parts of the process, but what's a 100 percent clear is whatever investigations DOI has initiated, they were always respected. They were seen through to completion, any existing investigations that they choose to continue, we will absolutely respect their right to do so. And the new commissioner who has an outstanding record at the Southern District, which is the gold standard in law enforcement and prosecution and at the Attorney General's office – is going to have the independence to follow through, not only on existing investigations, but any new ones that she deems fit. Yes?

**Question:** Yes, just to [inaudible] including, [inaudible] Mayor and meeting calls which I was pressured to not issue certain reports, including the report exposing lead paint safety hazards at NYCHA, suggested attempt to punish and intimidate the DOI for its past work. Did you call –

**Mayor:** False, it's just false. I am sure I had conversations with Mr. Peters, and I'm sure I had disagreements but that characterization is false. Yes?

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, when [inaudible] that you gave [inaudible] ACS, to Corrections, to NYCHA lead, the NYPD where he says members of your administration or you yourself asked him not to release the investigations and in effect [inaudible].

**Mayor:** False.

**Question:** Your response?

**Mayor:** False. Look unfortunately this is an individual who did some very inappropriate things, there was an independent investigation by a respected investigator who he handpicked and found that he had done inappropriate things. I am exercising my authority under the charter to make sure that there's a change in that office and we bring in someone new and independent and strong. But those characterizations are not fair and not accurate.

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, if I could just follow up. So the piece says these [inaudible].

**Mayor:** I can only say I am not here to interpret his words. I know what he's saying there is not accurate and there are times when there is real professional discussion about specific issues and specific agencies. That's normal but never an attempt in any way to undermine an investigation.

**Question:** [Inaudible] reports over the past year, I think the New York Post and maybe the Daily News and other places [inaudible] and some of those reports [inaudible] his takeover of the [inaudible]. Can you speak to that [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** I'm not going to go into the personnel process and the details. I will only say this – there continue to be questions about other actions he took. I believe there are still some of those being looked at. The – what's in the McGovern report that you've seen is one set of concerns but you're also right that at one point a document was leaked that did accurately portray other concerns that had been brought to us by employees.

So, what's in the McGovern report to date is not the only set of complaints that we received and that's really, to my mind, unusual to have that kind of level of concern about a DOI commissioner in terms of acting appropriately. But the McGovern report having provided an objective outside assessment, to me, was the straw that broke the camel's back. And as I described the other day, the last step in the process was finding a suitable replacement and we found one.

**Question:** So, in Mr. Peters' letter, to sort of paraphrase that, he told Zachary Carter and Team Fuleihan his intent to [inaudible]. What's your interpretation?

**Mayor:** I interpret it the same way the McGovern report interprets it. He gave some kind of summary. He didn't, from everything – I mean, that report is quite exhaustive – did not make clear the full ramification in the midst of a long agenda with other things on it, didn't ask support or assent. When they went and tried to get some assent from the Department of Education, they didn't get it. No, this was not the right way to do things. On something of that magnitude, it should have been presented with all the pros and cons, the real legal questions. And as I said the other day Anastasia Colman was asking a central legal question – is what he was trying to do legal? And the answer was no.

**Question:** Video surfaced last week showing a bomb detection dog at the Staten Island Ferry alerting its handler of what may have been a potential explosive device. Instead of immediately securing the area, the bag, the bag owner, etcetera [inaudible] bag was left to sit there for minutes as commuters and children were passing right by it. And people in the video can also be seen – security personnel [inaudible] can be seen talking on their cell phones over the bag which security experts say [inaudible] device had it been inside of the bag. Have you seen the video and you know what are your thoughts? And do you think that security at the Staten Island Ferry need to be retrained in how to respond [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** So, two part answer. One – in terms of stopping terrorism, the track record of the NYPD has been exceptional. So, I have tremendous faith in the NYPD and particularly in the counter-terror units that we have created and built up in recent years. That said, any instance where an individual might have done what they should have done, we have to look into it. I haven't seen the video. I will look at it but more important I will talk to Commissioner O'Neill about it directly. And if something different has to be done with that officer or those officers or with the overall approach to the Staten Island Ferry Terminal, we will do it because we take this stuff very, very seriously.

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** No, over here. I'm going to Yoav then to you.

**Question:** [Inaudible] letter, he wrote about the January 2017 report on ACS [inaudible] focusing on its 24-hour call center. It was kind of critical of ACS. And he wrote that, this January 2017, he wrote, "I received a call from the Mayor in which he asked me not to release this ACS report."

**Mayor:** Again, false. I will only say broadly, there have been conversations about reports about accuracy, about specific recommendations, all sorts of things but never a conversation where there was an effort to inhibit the actions of DOI on a specific report. It's not just right.

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** That's all I have to say. Go ahead.

**Question:** [Inaudible] false [inaudible] alleging he's lying –

**Mayor:** I'm not going to characterize. I'm saying that statement is false.

**Question:** Mayor, do you have any idea why he would [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** I am not going to get inside his head.

**Question:** [Inaudible] you calling a city watchdog [inaudible] –

**Mayor:** No, not in the least because look at the reports that were released consistently even when we debated specific concerns within them report after report after report, look at all of the extra resources that were provided to DOI to do more reports on more topics. Not at all –

**Question:** The Governor was on Brian Lehrer this morning and he says he's against any fare increase by the MTA, and he also said he thinks that there's an inequitable system of some bridges having tolls and some not having tolls, and he wants to review that – he thinks there should be tolls on bridges as part of congestion pricing –

**Mayor:** I want to see what he said specifically because I haven't seen that or heard that yet. I've made clear that the Governor's commission, which I think came up with an important breakthrough, which was to see congestion pricing separate from the status of East River Bridges. I thought that was a really important breakthrough. So, again, this sounds different but I don't want to characterize it until I've heard it.

**Question:** [Inaudible] charging tolls on –

**Mayor:** No, I've been very, very clear. I haven't been in favor of the previous versions of congestion pricing. I've started to open my mind because they got away from the bridges. So, you know, let's – I'll take a look at it. But the more important point is, the only way we could proceed with any vision like that is by addressing the issues of fairness to the outer boroughs and addressing issues of fairness to individual New Yorkers. That's conceivable to do but that's going to be a long discussion with the legislature as well.

**Question:** The Peters' letter describes Anthony Shorris calling him up and telling – asking him, hold off [inaudible] NYCHA lead paint [inaudible]. [Inaudible] there have been conversations about [inaudible] maybe [inaudible] things like that. So, what were the conversations preceding that [inaudible]?

**Mayor:** I can't review that for you – just can't tell you –

**Question:** [Inaudible]

**Mayor:** My friend, you can speak in a sonorous voice all you want. I can't recall to you exactly what happened that night – and one thing or another – just not going to even pretend.

Back there?

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, Chancellor Carranza and I met in June and I asked him why Bronx public schools are not performing as the rest of the City. His answer was, the Mayor and I know that Bronx public schools are not performing as they should [inaudible] I saw the teacher's contract [inaudible]. Do you think that's going to work [inaudible] tried 10 years ago, and it didn't work, and I spoke –

**Mayor:** No, no, no – wait, it was not tried 10 years ago. What we're talking about in this thing, this new contract with the UFT has never been tried.

**Question:** They tried to take –

**Mayor:** Excuse me, I've been over this history. We can agree to disagree, if you like, but it's never been tried on the level we're talking about before of a huge number of schools, and a systematic approach to provide extra incentives in the subject matters where we have a lack of teachers and the places where we have a lack of teachers. It's never been tried on this scale, it's never been tried with the agreement of the union contractually. So, this is something that people tried to achieve for years – we're the ones to achieve it. I think it's going to have a huge positive impact on the Bronx. The Bronx schools that have suffered could never have turned the corner until they could get enough quality teachers in the subject matter that they had lacking – that's just a true statement. It's not the only statement, it's not the only factor, but that's part of it.

Okay, we'll do a few more. David?

**Question:** Another element of this letter – there's some ongoing investigations that Mark Peters raised the issue of how [inaudible] be affected – a chilling effect – which brings up an inquiry into [inaudible] sexual assault and other kind of sex crimes were being investigated in the NYPD. He says that the head of the Special Victims Division was removed on the same day that he, himself was fired, and he alleges that, that was done because of information that given to his investigators by that same head of SVD.

**Mayor:** That's false. And I'm sorry he has delusions of grandeur, thinking everything revolves around him, but the fact is we had told you for months there was a major leadership change at the NYPD when Dermot Shea became Chief of Detectives. We said at that time there was a full review being done of the SVU. In fact, not only the DOI report, but a number of other advocates have raised real concerns about the personnel levels at SVU and whether a change was needed to be made. I think a lot of you have watched the work of Dermot Shea for a long time, he's an outstanding public servant. He undertook a very objective review, came to the conclusion that a number of changes had to be made, that discussion had been going on internally for a while. It was announced when it was announced, it had nothing to do with the other matters, and I believe it was the right thing to do to move that unit forward.

Two more –

**Question:** So, Mr. Mayor, as far as you know [inaudible] have the information, no one in your administration has ever requested of the DOI commissioner to suppress [inaudible] report, right?



**Mayor:** You can talk about specifics in a report and never, ever suppress it, or want to suppress it, or believe it should be suppressed. Every report that was started was followed through on, and that was how it worked.

**Question:** Were you ever concerned enough about Mr. Peters to tape a conversation you were having with him –

**Mayor:** Me? Personally? No.

Okay, last one – back there –

**Question:** Mr. Mayor, in his letter, Mr. Peters says the Mr. McGovern never recommended that he be fired, he recommended the discipline be the letter [inaudible] file. So, why did you go [inaudible]?

**Mayor:** Because I looked at what was in that report and I found it unbecoming of a public servant, particularly one who is supposed to hold the highest standards of integrity. The job is the integrity job. And where those fundamental problems were being portrayed objectively, again, by and investigator he handpicked. When I saw the fullness of that, I said this is just not an acceptable situation, it can't go on. We need someone more objective, more independent, more effective, and we have that person in Margaret Garnett.

Thanks, everyone.

###