



Published by the Bronx Chapter AIA Publications Committee to highlight activities and information of interest to the Practicing Architect.

Newsletter

NOTICE: Unfortunately, due to the current pandemic corona virus since March and due to the work from home order in March 2020, subsequent newsletters will be abbreviated to include only the basic activities of the AIA Bronx Chapter until the health crisis is over.

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
I Welcome	
• Bronx Chapter welcomes New Members: Orghya Bhattacharjee, Assoc. Hoiting Chan, Assoc.	
II Current Activities:	2
Chapter Virtual Meeting January 28, 2021	
III Related Articles and Education Opportunities - Omitted	
IV AIA Activities: AIA National Grass Roots February 16-19, 2021 Washington, DC https://www.aia.org/events	
• Most National and State activities are virtual until the health crisis abates.	
• The AIA '21 National Convention has not been scheduled due to the COVID-19 outbreak.	
V Next Chapter Meeting is Virtual and on Thursday February 18, 2021 at 12:00pm.	6

I Current Activities



January 28, 2021
AIA BRONX CHAPTER MEETING MINUTES

Meeting began at 6:06pm

Attendees:

Ofe Clark
William E. Davis, Jr.
Sara Djazayeri
Bob Esnard
Antonio Freda
Ken H. Koons, Sr.
Ken A. Koons, Jr.
Robert Markisz
Josette Matthew
Soany K. Marquez
Julian Misiurski
Bryan Zelnik
Martin Zelnik

Guest

Ben Max, Christine Camilleri,
Manuela Powidayko and
Gregory Miller
NYC Department of Planning

Agenda / Discussion:

- Seminar:
The seminar reviewed the proposed Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency (ZCFR) of New York City's flood plain and waterfront areas. Manuela Powidayko coordinated the presentation for the Department of City Planning (DPC) with Ben Max and Gregory Miller as presenters of the seminar. Christine Camilleri, the Director of the Bronx Office of City Planning also attended and answered specific questions concerning the impact of the zoning proposal in the Bronx. The seminar outlined the goals of the proposed zoning ordinance which were to:
 - Encouraging Resiliency through the current and future flood plains.
 - Support long term resilient design of all building types
 - Allow for adaption over time through implemental retrofits.
 - Facilitate future recovery by reducing regulatory obstacles.

The presentation was introduced by describing the many sources of flooding that pose issues in New York City. Coastal storms present the most significant flood risk in terms of compromising human safety, property damage, and business disruptions. Approximately, a million New Yorkers live in the New York City flood zones that Hurricane Sandy awakened us to in 2012. Unfortunately, this risk will increase over time with sea levels rising, and will be exacerbated by more frequent and powerful coastal storms.

These zoning changes will require buildings to be built at a robust standard which will take into account potential flood risks. This zoning also tends to support resilient buildings that are accessible and fit in their existing neighborhoods and surroundings. As part of the regulations, existing buildings would be encouraged to be more resilient through partial retrofits. The regulations will support the recovery process after a disaster, including the ongoing Covid-19 Pandemic. In addition, buildings in the flood zones will be designed or retrofitted to reduce the damage from flood events and will ultimately save on insurance costs.

The regulations will make permanent some temporary zoning provisions which were adopted after Hurricane Sandy in 2013. They will improve the regulations to having the rules more consistent and encourage owners to reinvest or invest in protecting buildings in the flood zones. The proposal also provides flexibility for grading and shoreline design in waterfront areas mitigating flood risks and prohibiting the construction of nursing homes, hospitals and public facilities in high-risk areas considering the health and life safety consequences related to the evacuation of these facilities.

The formal approval process has started and included discussions with elected officials, community groups, and professional organizations such as our Chapter. At the seminar conclusion, Chapter members were encouraged to ask questions and to get more details on the project. Additionally, if members feel appropriate, they can make any comments by communicating with DCP in two ways:

First, submit our official form with comments to the City Planning Commission using a link [City Planning Commission Public Hearing Comments \(nyc.gov\)](#), and if comments are submitted by March 2, 2021, they will be included and considered in the DPS's record.

Additionally, the CPC is holding a virtual public hearing on ZCFR now scheduled for Wednesday, February 3, 2021 at 10:00am. Members sharing architectural experiences in working with property owners on floodplain issues with DCP could be helpful for the Commission's consideration.

The presentation included many slides and charts describing the proposal and was well received by Chapter members. Members were encouraged to contact the CPC staff directly if they are interested in some of the specifics of the proposal and should contact:

Manuela Powidayko
Project Manager, Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency
Senior Planner I Zoning Division
NYC Department of City Planning
Email: MPowidayko@planning.nyc.ov

2. Adoption of December minutes:

The Minutes of the December 17, 2020 were attached to December's meeting notice for members to review. Marty Zelnik made a motion to approve, the motion was seconded by Julian Misiurski, and the December minutes were unanimously accepted.

3. The next meetings again unfortunately, will be virtual meetings until the COVID virus allows us to have in-person meetings at our restaurant venue. The future dates are:

February 18, 2021	12:00pm
March 18, 2021	6:00pm
April 15, 2021	12:00pm
May 27, 2021	6:00pm
June 17, 2021	12:00pm

4. Additional Chapter Directors:

The State Organization and the Architects Counsel of New York City each formally requested that the Chapter appoint a member to represent the Chapter. Specifically, the New York State AIA had requested an additional Chapter member as our existing representative Ofe Clark has become an Officer of New York State AIA. The State AIA Bylaws require that officers cannot vote twice as both a Chapter representative and an officer. Therefore, the Chapter needed to choose two additional directors. The executive committee of the Chapter recommended Josette Matthew, to be the Bronx Chapter Representative for the State AIA, and as a Representative to the Architects Counsel of New York City, Tony Freda was selected. Both Josette Matthew and Tony Freda were unanimously approved as additional Bronx Chapter Directors.

5. NYS Continuing Education Update:

The New York State Education Department has extended the emergency COVID-19 continuing education regulations for Architects allowing 100% of the credits to be self-study or virtual education through January 1, 2022. The State extended the temporary regulations as an emergency last year at the sudden onset of the health crisis. From that time to this January all the Continuing Educations Credits could be done electronically and virtually. The New York State AIA notice about this announcement is attached as Appendix I.

6. NYC-DOB Electronic Filing/Bronx DOB Office:

Bob Esnard outlined the frustration that architects and engineers have had, working with the DOB NOW electronic only. The DOB has restricted in-person conferences and visiting their offices due to the COVID health crises, to minimize the spread of infection. Unfortunately, without “human” contact, issues and problems are very hard to resolve and has cost many time delays for construction. Staten Island, Queens and the Bronx AIA Chapter all requested meetings either in-person or virtually to review these “practical” issues. The response from the DOB was only to have training sessions and some online forums to get feedback. These sessions included many general issues but did not assist architects and engineers in specifically addressing their needs; working with the DOB borough offices, or resolving individual unique circumstances. The Queens and Staten Island Chapters sent lists of questions to DOB which are similar to many problems discussed in our previous Bronx meetings. After a Chapter discussion, this communication problem was summarized by Sara Djazayeri. She invited the members to write their specific questions/issues concerning processing through the DOB NOW system and suggested coordinating with Tony Freda, our Architect’s Counsel Representative to record these thoughts, perhaps on a “blog”. The hope was to allow Chapter members to learn from the experiences of others and/or possibly assist in resolving problems. She recommended sending a short note to Tony Freda at: fredadesign@hotmail.com. Appendix II outlines contains the Staten Island and Queens Chapter questions/issues.

7. Chapter Committees:

- Audit/Budget:

Ken Koons, Sr., of the Chapter Audit Committee discussed last year's quarterly report, from September to December 2020. The review of the finances started with an opening balance of \$44,859.00 and ended with a closing balance of \$49,250.00. The Covid-19 health emergencies has modified how our Chapter is currently operating. On one hand, we have had less expenses because our meetings have been virtual. However, we still have to pay fees for insurance, accounting, and registrations to professional organizations. Also, several companies who have sponsored meetings in the past, have been less likely to support virtual conferences and meetings, when they cannot meet in person and be able to demonstrate their products or construction expertise physically. However, the Chapter over this unusual time has been consistent in operating with a positive cash flow and within the projected budget guidelines approved by the Board for 2020. Our Treasurer Ken Koons, Jr., is expecting to present a proposed 2021 budget for the Board to consider at the February Chapter meeting to continue to operate as prudently and efficiently as possible.

- Education:

Sara Djazayeri briefly outlined the education activities which due to the Covid-19 limitations, changed the direction of the committee from meeting students in person to only virtual involvement. Sara and Ofé Clark have been working on a virtual event to take place sometime in March. As the program evolves it will be posted on our website and/or in the minutes.

- Cloud for Chapter Documents:

Josette Matthew reviewed her activities to implement an accessible "library" of our documents that members can access. Josette has many of the documents that she needs and will organize them so that they will be catalogued by subject. She has been receiving assistance from Valerie Brown, a key staff person of the Westchester Hudson Valley AIA Chapter who has always been helpful in dealing with administrative AIA issues. Tony Freda and Bob Esnard have given her many of the documents that were prepared by the Chapter in the past National AIA review of the Bronx Chapter activities. It was also requested that other members, who have paper documents that are in their files or garages, send them to Josette at j.matthew061@gmail.com for organizing and inclusion in the Cloud.

- Bronx Blueprint:

Bill Davis gave a summary of the committee's efforts. Unfortunately, over the holidays the committee was not able to have a meeting. The plan is at the February Chapter meeting, to outline some ideas concerning education and turning a mentoring program for young professionals/interns into reality.

8. New Business:

Ken Koons, Jr., suggested that the Chapter prepare two letters which were drafted, discussed, and approved to be sent. One letter was to wish Bronx DOB Deputy Commissioner Raymond Plumey R.A. well on his retirement and to thank him for his over a decade of public service work.

The second letter requested DOB Commissioner Melanie La Rocca, to consider William Singer, R.A., as a replacement for retiring Deputy Commissioner Plumey. The hope would be to have someone such as William in place, who can understand the Bronx and its' construction industry and that there would not be lost time on a learning curve. If he is chosen, there would be a smooth transition at the Bronx DOB office at this time of limited in-person activity and the current DOB NOW initiatives. Both letters were unanimously approved and are attached as Appendix III.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08pm.

IV. Next Meeting:

As the health crisis unfortunately continues and the meeting venue at Artie's Restaurant is only open for outdoor dining. The, the next meeting will again be a Virtual meeting on:

Thursday February 18, 2021 at 12:00PM

**Appendix I - AIA NYS
Continuing Education Opportunities**

**Appendix II - Industry Meeting with DOB Build Representatives.
Queens AIA
Staten Island AIA**

**Appendix III - Bronx AIA – Letters to:
Commissioner Melanie La Rocca
Deputy Commissioner Raymond Plumey, RA**

Appendix I

AIA NYS Continuing Education Opportunities



AIA
New York State

Continuing Education Update

In response to the evolving situation with the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19), the New York State Education Department has again extended the capability for architects to complete 100% of their continuing education requirement via self-study through January 1, 2022.

See the full announcement below.

Some regulations restrict licensees to a certain percentage of self-study for continuing education requirements. In response to the evolving situation with the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19), and for those licensees whose registrations are due to renew March 1, 2020 – January 1, 2022, the Department will grant an adjustment to all licensees to complete up to 100% of the continuing education as self-study, provided that it is taken from a Department-approved provider and is in an acceptable subject area for the specific profession.

Additionally, the Department will grant an adjustment to all licensees, regardless of registration renewal date, to utilize self-study for any coursework taken during the period from March 1, 2020 – January 1, 2022, provided that it is taken from a Department-approved provider and is in an acceptable subject area for the specific profession. Coursework taken outside that timeframe must meet the continuing education requirements in each individual profession's laws and regulations.

To view the announcement directly on the OP website, go to <http://www.op.nysed.gov/COVID-19.html#COED>.

SED is working closely with other New York State agencies and the Governor's Office to tackle issues relating to COVID-19. Please continue to monitor the Department's website for updated guidance.

AIA New York State | [Website](#)



Appendix II

Industry Meeting with DOB Build Representatives Queens AIA Staten Island AIA



SUBMITTED QUESTIONS For QUEENS INDUSTRY MEETING FOR DOB BUILD TEAM

Scheduled Thursday, January 21, 2021
2:20 PM – 3:00 PM

COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS FOR DOB BUILD TEAM

1. Rejections need to come with more detailed instructions as to what needs to be done to achieve the outcome.
2. DOB NOW Help says that you will receive a response within 3 days. It is often much longer and sometimes you never receive a response.
3. Response times are terrible, whether it is a Plan Exam, clerk accepting e-file documents, DOB NOW Help, response to PER11's and Project Advocate forms
4. Data entry errors are encountered on almost every application. Especially on PAA's and Schedule A corrections.
5. NYC Open Records Portal has 3 month wait for records.
6. Per 11 for DOB project advocates are ignored with no responses.
7. No clear direction on how to process an increase in the final cost of a PW-3 if the final construction cost is greater than the initial estimated cost, preventing a clerk to sign off a job application.
8. On many occasions DOB Inspectors are citing objections which are outside the scope of work being inspected and have no bearing on the application or life safety
9. The ability to communicate with a human through DOB NOW Help would be helpful.
10. There needs to be more consistency with clerks acceptance/rejections in e-file.

11. A DAILY DOB Help BLOG ...M-F 9-12, where questions can be addressed in real time by a "manned" person knowledgeable with the changes to DOB Now would be helpful. There are too many gray areas in the response to the ongoing DOB Now Update, and it is only going to get worse when CO's are added. Please consider this suggestion to assist the agency and profession. Thank you

QUESTIONS FOR DOB BUILD TEAM

1. Now as per the Service Memo : General Construction(Phase One) and Other Work Types to Launch in DOB NOW: Build page 3 of 3, "Alteration Type 1 (Alt1) jobs –file a "No Work" job and Schedule A in BIS, then file GC in DOB NOW", is Commissioner approval still required for No Work ALT I applications?
2. I have been trying to obtain NO WORK Permit in owner's name for A sign permit to resolve sign violation for almost 1 year. Although Approved by NYC DOB Deputy Commissioner, there seems to be no workable way IN DOB NOW to issue this Permit. I requested HELP for this at least three times under same Reference number with no success. Please advise.
3. How are fee exempt filings (NYC capital construction projects), handled in new DOB NOW-BUILD?
4. Can the on-going, BIS, C of O applications, be allowed to stay in BIS, to avoid being trapped in unknown processes on the new platform?
5. For fence permits (single family detached) the DOB NOW system makes you provide all information as if you are constructing a new house. Couldn't the questions be relevant to the fence only?
6. On 9/16/20 we took Equipment Use Permits and PW4 to the Queens Boro Office to submit and we were told by Jaime Maule to submit them online. We uploaded them thru e-file and they are still pending. What do we need to do to have them accepted?
7. What do we need to do/or submit when there is a "Final Elevator Sign off" in required items and there is no elevator in the building? We request a waiver with an AI-1 but they are ignored by the clerk processing the sign-off.
8. Can you file a subsequent application on a BIS self certified job?
9. Is there a proper channel for us to inquire about the SD1&2 application status? Since the covid we have been unable to track or to call for our application status. Without the SD1&2 approvals we cannot get our new building applications approved.



AIASI Meeting Presentation Questions
American Institute of Architects
Staten Island Chapter
January 26, 2021

1. How are fee exempt filings handled in DOB NOW: Build?
2. Under new DOB NOW: BUILD, can "no work" application generate "no work" permit, for the sole purpose of obtaining C of O?
3. We would like clarification on the ability to add and/or remove TR items. Currently, it has been our experience that the only way to remove a TR item is to email a request to DOB NOW technical support. It has been our experience that this request can take 3-4+ weeks. Can we be given the ability to remove TR items?
4. Currently it is our understanding that to combine work types ST + FO you also need to select GC. However, as an example, on an NB filing the ST and FO applicants are sometimes the same, but the GC filing is covered under the NB application. This is problematic as we would need to create a duplicate GC work type which is redundant and not necessary.
5. Like the above, it is our understanding that FO + SOE cannot be combined work types. It is not uncommon for the applicant to be the same for these as well and would be beneficial if they could be filed together.
6. It is our understanding that filing representatives do not have the ability to request a LOC. If true, why?
7. It is our understanding that Alt-1 applications currently must be fragmented into a No work Alt-1 filing through BIS and a "GC" application through DOB NOW. Will these applications be given to the same examiner? Will we have to coordinate between two separate sets of objections? This seems counterproductive and unnecessary. Additionally, it is our understanding that No work ALT-1 applications require commissioner approval. Is this still necessary given that this is now DOB procedure?
8. Why can't we resubmit a rejected L2? A new request must be submitted every time with a new examiner. This adds redundancy to the process and an increased timeline.
 - a. Same question as above but in-regard to Certificate of Corrections.
9. It was my understanding that the EN2 form was needed at time of sign off for projects with an energy code component, the form appears to indicate that the building conformed to the information on the plans regarding energy code items, the new "GC" filing via DOB NOW process has the EN2 required for every application (we've submitted thus far) to even submit for review, as a prior to submission item, I do not believe this is accurate.
10. Many interior alterations which do not affect the CO which are being filed via DOB NOW system require answers to Street Width, Street Status (mapped, unmapped, CCO) this info cannot be



AIA Staten Island

The American Institute of Architects
1000 South Avenue, Suite 104
Staten Island, NY 10314

- ascertained w/o architectural survey. Can these questions be removed from applications in which they are not applicable or, can "not applicable" be added as an option?
11. DOB NOW "GC" applications are asking about Foundation Earthwork. Can this be clarified? For example, is a deck with 4' footings triggering a Foundation and Earthwork separate application on a 1-2 family dwelling? Is an in-ground swimming pool footings triggering a Foundation and Earthwork separate application on a 1-2 family dwelling?
 12. Soil Class options are only 6 and 7, can this be clarified? Does this require further expansion to include additional soil classifications.
 13. Is it possible to provide more options for different types of payments? For example, we are still required to physically visit the local DOB for certain payments such Subdivisions, reinstatements, civil penalty fees, etc.
 14. When will requests for archives via the Record Room be implemented into a digital format which does not require a physical visit to the DOB? The DOB seems to have a list of every folder that is within off-site storage facility. If so, why must we be forced to visit the Record Room only to be told that the folder is off-site?
 15. Phase 1 implementation of DOB NOW requires that CO jobs be broken up into two separate filings. Filing #1 = ALT 1 application to be filed as "No Work" applications via E-filing. Filing #2 = "GC" work filed in DOB NOW BUILD. However, E-filing still does not recognize DOB NOW job numbers where it requests "related job". When will this be corrected?
 16. Is DOB NOW going to expand on allowing multiple work types for the same scope on one application? The RDP community now must file an application per work type for the same scope where we were once able to file one application with multiple work types. For example. A sprinkler application can be filed with both Sprinkler and Plumbing work types on the same application. Can the same logic be applied with Mechanical Systems and Plumbing? The installation of a unit heater involves one trade: a plumber. We understand the need for an MS work type, but they could be filed together like Plumbing and Sprinkler are filed together. Additionally, could it be possible for a Licensed Master Plumber to permit both Mechanical Systems and Plumbing work types on the same DOB NOW application? Currently a GC must be engaged to permit the MS work type. The entire installation of a unit heater is completed by just the Plumber.
 17. Can an option for "NOT APPLICABLE" be added to all fields for irrelevant information? The GC (OT) work type in DOB NOW requests irrelevant information for some applications. For example, an application for an interior legalization of a three-fixture bathroom requires the yards to be stated during the data entry process. The scope of any interior renovation would not require a survey. A survey would need to be prepared to accurately fill out the Yard Details portion of the Zoning Information. The RDP should not involuntarily be forced to create an inaccurate record of a yard. It is unnecessary to retain a surveyor for a scope that is just for interior work.
 18. Every DOB NOW application has a field for the square footage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION FLOOR AREA (TCFA) regardless of scope. It is understood that this area is the entire area of the



subject building. At times this number is disproportionate to the specific work. For example, filing for an interior fit out of a store at the Mall is insignificant in area when the square footage of the entire facility is considered. Why and how does the RDP even accurately calculate the square footage of large facilities where the information is irrelevant? Furthermore, Plan Examiners are using this number to consider how to calculate a Cost Estimate. Doing so creates a disproportionate fee. The RDP community must take a responsible approach to the estimated job cost and balance what is the reality verses what a Plan Examiner may accept. What is the purpose of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION FLOOR AREA on these applications where it is completely irrelevant? Can we expand this field to just show the area for the scope of work? How do we combat overzealous Plan Examiners that play "guess what number I am thinking of" with the estimated fee due to the TCFA?

19. Can the requirement for an ACP-5 and County Clerk recording Land Doc # be permanently required prior to permit or done so without Chief Plan Examiner approval?
The requirement of an asbestos investigation report (ACP-5) is required for most alterations to existing buildings. This requirement does not need to be met until a permit application is submitted. Deferring the ACP-5 requirement prior to permit currently requires approval from the Chief Plan Examiner (CPE). Recently the CPE have been denying this request and thereby holding up a review while lab analysis, reports and the County Clerk Land Doc #'s are generated. The denial is made without reason and the RDP cannot directly communicate with the CPE for explanation.
20. Why is the input of an ACP-5 report or Land Doc number input still required where a waiver or deferral is approved?
21. Can the field be modified to add a thermal efficiency rating (or AFUE) for the Certificate of Compliance on MS application?
When submitting an MS appliance for heat only the Certificate of Compliance field asks for a SEER, EER or COP rating but not thermal efficiency. COP, SEER and EER are all measures of air conditioning energy efficiencies. A gas fired unit heater can require a Certificate of Compliance but there is no field for thermal efficiency (or AFUE) and the field for a SEER, EER, or COP rating is required but not relevant.
22. Can the character count for responding to objections be increased by triple?
Responding to objections in the limited character count can create confusion and additional reviews to explain one objection in another objections response field. Most times, if not all instances, the character count limits the response.
23. Can a "NOT APPLICABLE" tab be added to the Plumbing Scope of Work where fixtures are listed where none are required and in fact being removed? The legalization of work without a permit may require a plumbing application to cut and cap gas fixtures that are not permitted. The Plumbing Scope of Work field permits noting what gas fixture needs to be removed and gas piping cut and capped. The same section cannot be completed without entering a fixture under the Appliance/Equipment tab.



24. Why are the selections for Special Progress and Energy Inspection limited during the data entry process? Can all the inspections be made available exactly as they are on the existing TR-1 and TR-8 forms for selection during the pre-filing stage? If not, why?
25. I started one application with just GC as the work type and the final inspection on the TR-1 was fine and not required to click on. After realizing that I needed to add foundation and structural work types, it is requiring that the Final Inspection on the TR-1 must be identified by and engineer or architect, not by DOB.
26. Based on the interpretation of DOB, it seems that DOB is requiring the Applicant to file independent and separate sets of drawings for each work type (GC, Foundation, & Structural). Perhaps on larger commercial and larger residential filings this is typical but, to impose this requirement on small retail projects and especially on 1, 2 and 3 family residences, is extremely onerous. The amount of time and effort that must be put into creating independent and separate sets of drawings is adding significant amounts of time to the project, which in turn, is driving up the fees that RDP's must charge their clients. The submission of a composite set of drawings which contains all phases of a 1, 2 and 3 family home has been the standard within the industry for decades. Why must it now change due to the DOB NOW filing system?
27. Like the last question, as per the PW3 it seems that they expect us to break down the cost for each work type. The DOB uses their software which for General Construction is \$198 per sq ft for an alteration of a building in which the foundation is included and \$188 per sq ft for an alteration of a building in which the foundation is not included. The \$198 per sq ft encompasses all the construction work including: General construction, plumbing, electrical, foundation, windows, doors, exterior siding... etc.... Is there a new way to calculate this for DOB NOW and are there concrete numbers that we should be using? for instance, when the examiner plugs in the total new construction floor area (into the DOB calculator program) it is multiplied by \$198 or \$188 depending on the project and they are given a number. In the new filing case, that number will have to be broken down into each work type. Do they want the applicant to be picking numbers for these or is there a standard?
28. Under the Additional Considerations section, if you click that "Yes" structural stability will be affected by the proposed work, a message pops up mandating that you must submit an Alteration job filing for Structural Stability affected by the proposed work in the E-filing system. Is this an error?
29. In the Yard Details section under the Zoning Information tab there is a dropdown menu for Rear Yard Equivalent that you must choose an answer for. This does not apply to most applications but is still a requirement. The only way to file the job is to pick a wrong answer. Can this be removed from the applications in which it is not applicable or, can an option for "not applicable" be added?
30. Why does the Applicant of Record/SIA receive so many emails every time a Special Inspection is identified? Is it necessary?



AIA **Staten Island**

The American Institute of Architects
1000 South Avenue, Suite 104
Staten Island, NY 10314

31. Why does the Applicant of Record receive email notifications that the job is under QA review or QA Failed after the Job has already been approved? Why are these emails coming so delayed?
32. On jobs that are filed in DOB NOW that sometimes give an error message to contact the Borough Office, why is it necessary to go to the Borough Office? Why can't the error or glitch be fixed online or via a phone call?
33. If a PAA is needed to submit revised plans, what is the correct way of uploading the plans? Do we need to upload only the revised sheets or, do we need to upload the entire set of plans that include both the original sheets that are not being amended together with the sheets that are revised? Once the PAA is approved and the amended plans override the initial filing, the original set of approved plans are gone. Is the original approved set saved somewhere in the DOB NOW system?
34. When you open a job, the system seems to Auto-Populate the TR inspections, the list doesn't seem accurate and, on some occasions, we believe that additional inspections are required (from 15 years of plan exam). Can the auto populate be dismantled and just give the RDP a list to check off like in the old days or, give the RDP the option to remove some inspection we believe are NOT part of our application.

Appendix III

Bronx AIA – Letters to Commissioner Melanie La Rocca Deputy Commissioner Raymond Plumey, RA



January 28, 2021

Melanie F. La Rocca, Commissioner
Department of Buildings
280 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10017

Dear Commissioner, La Rocca,

As Bronx DOB Deputy Commissioner Plumey is retiring on January 29, 2021, the Bronx Chapter AIA would hope that you would consider the current Bronx Chief Planning Examiner, William Singer, R.A. as his replacement.

William Singer has demonstrated a willingness to engage applicants in a most professional manner and is a knowledgeable hard-working government official, who makes a complicated system work as efficiently as possible. Chief Singer is now the longest serving member of the Bronx office professional staff. In addition, for the sake of continuity and efficiency he would be a wonderful asset for the agency and the Bronx construction industry.

The Bronx Chapter highly recommends William Singer, as he an effective problem solver and most of all a gentleman!

Respectfully submitted.

Sara Djazayeri, RA
President, Bronx AIA Chapter

Sent by Email and Mail

Studio 360 Inc.

2500 Johnson Avenue, Riverdale, New York 10463

info@studio360s.com



January 28, 2021

Raymond Plumey, R.A.,
Deputy Borough Commissioner
Department of Buildings
1932 Arthur Avenue, Fl. 5
Bronx, New York, 10457

Dear Deputy Commissioner Plumey,

As you are retiring at the end of this month, the Bronx AIA Chapter thanks you for over a decade of government service, as a regulator of the Bronx construction industry. You have been effective and an asset both to government and the industry professionals who have worked with you over the years. We as architects, have specifically trusted and respected you, who have always handled issues and problems as a gentleman!

The Bronx AIA Chapter wishes you well and many healthy, happy successful years of retirement.

Sincerely,

Sara Djazayeri, RA
President, Bronx AIA Chapter

Sent by Email and Mail

Studio 360 Inc.

2500 Johnson Avenue, Riverdale, New York 10463

info@studio360s.com

The End