From: Raul Rothblatt [redacted]
Sent time: 05/27/2026 09:25:40 AM
To: esd.sm.AYCDCBdMtg <AYCDCBdMtg@esd.ny.gov>
Subject: Thank for announcing the meeting so late

[redacted]

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Dear Empire State Development,

Thank you so much for your recent announcement about the May 28, 2026 meeting. You have done a remarkable job showing, yet again, that the ESD is not interested in real community input. With hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money at stake, you have done a tireless job of removing democratic oversight. This has led to the astounding level of mediocrity in terms of public planning, long-term financial stability, architecture, and sustainability.

If you ever are interested in achieving a successful plan, my block association is more than willing to help. We care about our community and we're ready to do the hard work. Thank you yet again for displaying your disregard for our expertise and commitment to transparency.

Again, bravo on your astounding accomplishment!

Yours in a love of Prospect Heights,
Raul Rothblatt
President, Prospect Place Block Association (Flatbush to Underhill)

From: Robert Puca [redacted]
Sent time: 05/27/2026 10:25:37 AM
To: esd.sm.AYCDCBdMtg <AYCDCBdMtg@esd.ny.gov>
Subject: AYCDC 5/28

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Here are a few questions I'd hope could be answered in public:

- ·Regarding the Community Engagement exercise, why not allow follow-up questions in real time and for attendees to report back to the group at large?
- ·If, according to the engagement report, a top priority is maximizing affordable units "particularly for moderate and middle incomes," is that truly reflective of community sentiment or just the subset of relatively well-off people who answered the survey?
- ·It's been reported that the state is ready to provide $175 million in subsidies, rather than $350 million as previously discussed, to build the platform over the Vanderbilt Yard. Is that a cut in proposed subsidies or just a new sequence? Either way, do the funds cover the first of two railyard blocks, or both? How much might be sought, in total?
- ·How can New York State assess the request for public assistance, including subsidies, tax breaks, and more, without understanding how much it cost the developers to enter the project—remember, Joseph McDonnell of Cirrus called it a "no-brainer"—and their profit expectations? Regarding the latter, what's reasonable?
- ·Why should New York State commit to subsidies before understanding—and publicizing—the scale and timetable of the project the developers propose? Why have no renderings of the contemplated project been released ?

why should New York State commit to subsidies before an accountability structure—with meaningful guarantees is established?

An executive session regards "Negotiations with the Project Developer Regarding Memorandum of Understanding and Development of Property/Project."

the justification for the executive session is Public Officers Law Section 105(h), which states:

> A public body may conduct an executive session for the below enumerated purposes only:
>
> ...
>
> h. the proposed acquisition, sale or lease of real property or the proposed acquisition of securities, or sale or exchange of securities held by such public body, but only when publicity would substantially affect the value thereof.

So another question

- ·How do negotiations involving subsidies and tax breaks for a real estate project fall under “acquisition, sale or lease of real property”?

Robert Puca

From: VINCE BRUNS [redacted]
Sent time: 05/27/2026 12:03:09 PM
To: esd.sm.AYCDCBdMtg <AYCDCBdMtg@esd.ny.gov>
Subject: This meeting

[redacted]

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

It is a disgrace that this meeting is being held with inadequate notice.
Top priority should be for deeply affordable units no matter what your suspicious figures show.
This project is far behind on real affordability from the original agreement (and it has been a real long time, as we know) and now many more total units are proposed. There are lots of market rate homes being built in this area.
The city's need for real affordability must be prioritized if public money is on the table.
We should have reliable information on developer's costs and potential profits and have real guarantees that the project will be built, and on what reliable timeframe, to assess whether and how much public money should be allotted.
Vince Bruns