1	COURT OF APPEALS						
2	STATE OF NEW YORK						
3							
4	LEND LEASE (US) CONSTRUCTION LMB INC.,						
5	Appellant,						
	-against-						
6	NO. 11 ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY,						
7	Respondent.						
8							
9	20 Eagle Street						
10	Albany, New York January 11, 2017						
11	Before: CHIEF JUDGE JANET DIFIORE						
12	ASSOCIATE JUDGE JENNY RIVERA ASSOCIATE JUDGE SHEILA ABDUS-SALAAM						
13	ASSOCIATE JUDGE LESLIE E. STEIN ASSOCIATE JUDGE EUGENE M. FAHEY						
	ASSOCIATE JUDGE MICHAEL J. GARCIA						
14	Appearances:						
15	MATTHEW J. LODGE, ESQ						
16	CARROLL MCNULTY & KULL LLC						
17	Attorney for Appellant Lend Lease 570 Lexington Avenue, 8th Floor						
18	New York, NY 10022						
19	RICHARD J. LAMBERT, ESQ GREENBERG, TRAGER & HERBST, LLP						
20	Attorney for Appellant Extell 767 Third Avenue, 12th Floor						
21	New York, NY 10017						
	PHILIP C. SILVERBERG, ESQ						
22	MOUND COTTON WOLLAN & GREENGRASS LLP Attorney for Respondent						
23	One New York Plaza, 44th Floor New York, NY 10004						
24	Sara Winkeljohn						
25	Official Court Transcriber						

CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: The next matter on this afternoon's calendar is appeal number 11, Lend Lease

Construction v. Zurich American Insurance Company.

Counsel.

MR. LODGE: Good afternoon. May it please the

2.0

MR. LODGE: Good afternoon. May it please the court, my name is Matt Lodge, and I'm counsel for one of the appellants, Lend Lease (US) Construction LMB Inc. As I only have five minutes, I'm going to jump right into it.

So I'm going to talk first about whether the tower crane is covered property, and covered property is - - is something that includes something called temporary works.

And so what we're going to do is jump to the definition of temporary works, and the definition of temporary works requires a couple things. It - - - from - - - from our perspective, we - - - we are seeking to prove that the tower crane is a temporary structure, and the - - - the specific definition of temporary works includes the phrase "temporary buildings or structures." And so we say the tower crane is - -

JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Counsel, could I just ask this before you get into that. As - - - assuming this is a temporary - - - the crane is a temporary structure, can it also be equipment or machinery?

MR. LODGE: We - - - we don't think it - - - it constitutes equipment or machinery for purposes of the

exclusion. I think that, from a colloquial standpoint, you could call it equipment. You could also call scaffolding equipment. You know, so for example, one of the - - - the specific items that's identified as a temporary work in the definition of temporary work is scaffolding. Scaffolding - - scaffolding is something that I think, you know, routinely is referred to as - - as "equipment." And so yes, it could be given that label. It would not be - - - I don't think it would be especially wrong to do so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

JUDGE FAHEY: Listen, you only got five minutes, the - - - the nub of this case, in my mind, is the - - the question of illusoriness, which - - - which gets us to the exclusion. And can you tell me or - - or point me to some place in the record that I should look at that shows that there is - - - that there is or is not remaining coverage on any activities that such that it would render the coverage either exclusion on the basis of the - - it's illusory on the basis of the operation exclusion or nearly illusory, as some of the case law has said? other words, where in the record can I go? Because it seems to me there's certain things left over, shoring, the formwork, scaffolding, there are some things that may or may not be left over, though I - - - I'm not sure about scaffolding. But tell me what's excluded? What's left after this exclusion operates?

1 MR. LODGE: So the - - -2 JUDGE FAHEY: Let's assume you're covered, okay. 3 Assume you're covered for now. Let's say - - - let's at least say it's a question of fact - - -4 5 MR. LODGE: Right. 6 JUDGE FAHEY: - - - as to whether or not you're 7 covered. Get to the exclusion. What is - - -8 MR. LODGE: What is - - - what is excluded by the 9 exclusion? 10 JUDGE FAHEY: What's your position on the 11 illusory nature of coverage that was in the dissent? 12 MR. LODGE: Okay. You're - - - so I'm not 13 entirely sure I understand your question. 14 JUDGE FAHEY: What I want to know is - - - is the 15 dissent said the coverage was illusory here in the 16 operation. And, okay, if it's illusory that means, in my 17 mind, that there is nothing left covered as a result of the operation of the exclusion. 18 19 MR. LODGE: Right. 2.0 JUDGE FAHEY: That's your position, right? 2.1 MR. LODGE: There - - - there's not nothing. 22 There's - - - there's a lot of things that are - - - that 23 are excluded by the exclusion for sure. JUDGE FAHEY: Um-hum, but there are some things 2.4

25

left.

1 MR. LODGE: And - - - and we're saying that the 2 tower - - - the tower crane is - - - is not one of those 3 things. 4 JUDGE FAHEY: I see. 5 MR. LODGE: And, you know, so a cement mixer, a 6 drill, a - - - a saw, you know, all the - - - the run-of-7 the-mill tools of - - - of contractors are - - - are things 8 that would be excluded. I mean this is something - - -9 JUDGE STEIN: Well, why aren't those tools as 10 opposed to equipment and machinery? I mean the - - - the -11 - - we have to assume that those phrases, that those terms 12 mean three different things. 13 MR. LODGE: I - - - I agree with completely. So 14 - - - so, I mean, one of the - - - one of the points and 15 one of - - - one of the things that I think illustrates our 16 position is the scaffolding. Scaffolding is one of the 17 things that's specifically mentioned as - - - as a 18 temporary work. Scaffolding can be equipment. 19 exclusion applies to equipment, tools and equipment. And, 2.0 you know, I - - - I believe that - - - that - - -21 JUDGE FAHEY: They - - - they argue in the brief 22 that scaffolding has - - - has never been excluded. 23 the way I read it.

MR. LODGE: The - - - I was just going to say

They - - - they agree to that. And what we're

2.4

25

that.

1 saying is we're in the same category as them. You know, 2 the - - - the tower crane, the vast majority of it, is 3 basically a very large scaffold. It's - - - it's massive. 4 That's the - - -5 JUDGE RIVERA: But - - - but isn't it - - - isn't 6 it referred to as heavy machinery in your contract with 7 Pinnacle? 8 MR. LODGE: But - -9 JUDGE RIVERA: I mean how is it - - - how is it 10 not fitting under this if you yourselves have signed off on 11 a contract that calls it machinery? 12 MR. LODGE: Because it also qualifies as a 13 temporary work, and the temporary works are not subject to the exclusion. 14 15 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Why - - -16 JUDGE FAHEY: The problem - - - oh, I'm sorry, 17 Judge. Go ahead. 18 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Why is it a temporary work? 19 MR. LODGE: It's - - - it's a temporary work 2.0 because it's - - - it checks all the boxes. So the - - -21 one of the things that - - - that it needs to be, at least from our perspective, our - - - our argument is that 22 23 because it's a temporary structure, that's one of the 2.4 things. It is included in the total project value.

JUDGE FAHEY: Okay. Let's - - - let's stop you

1 | there.

2.0

2.4

MR. LODGE: And it - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Isn't everything temporary that's not the building that you're trying to build? Isn't everything temporary that's not the building you're trying to build? So what - - - what would this provision apply to?

MR. LODGE: Well, it doesn't - - - it doesn't refer to the - - - like the things I mentioned before, the traditional tools. I mean this is - - - this is a structure integrated into the building. It's different than the things that typically - - -

JUDGE FAHEY: But - - - but to covered under temporary works it has be included within total project values.

MR. LODGE: Right.

JUDGE FAHEY: I understand that your argument is that it's included within the cost for superstructure concrete, I guess Pinnacle, and it's not - - - it's not a specific line item, right?

MR. LODGE: It's - - - it's under a contract.

It's under the Pinnacle contract and within the Pinnacle contract is the obligation to - - - to erect and operate the tower crane.

JUDGE FAHEY: Cut to the chase, though. It's not

1 listed crane, under - - - under temporary works at any 2 point, right? 3 MR. LODGE: Under the definition of temporary 4 works in the policy, no, it does not list crane. 5 JUDGE FAHEY: So and you say it's covered in the 6 cost to Pinnacle under the eight-nine million as a 7 superstructure concrete costs. So that's why I asked you. 8 Assuming that's - - - and maybe your co-counsel can - - -9 can raise this issue because it's the same issue to both of 10 When - - - it's include - - - if it's an - - - if you. 11 it's a question of fact as to whether or not that property 12 is covered, and that's why I say assuming it is, then we 13 get to the operation of the exclusion. And when we're 14 talking about the operation of the exclusion, my question 15 to everybody today is what's left after the exclusion 16 operates? What's covered under this policy? That's 17 that's where I was going with it. 18 MR. LODGE: Right. And the tower crane is 19 covered. 2.0 JUDGE FAHEY: I see. 21 MR. LODGE: Is not excluded. 22 JUDGE FAHEY: Well, I - - - I don't know if I 23 agree with the argument, but I see what you're saying. 2.4 Okay. Thank you.

MR. LODGE: Okay.

1 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Thank you, counsel. 2 Thank you. MR. LODGE: 3 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Mr. Lambert. MR. LAMBERT: Richard Lambert for Extell West 4 5 57th Street. Every single item in the temporary works 6 coverage provision can be deemed to be contractor's 7 equipment. Okay. 8 JUDGE GARCIA: Counsel, could I stop you on 9 there? Just to follow up on something Judge Fahey was 10 saying about the - - - the value. Would it be your 11 position if the crane was completely destroyed in this 12 storm that you would be covered for that cost? 13 MR. LAMBERT: That is correct. 14 JUDGE GARCIA: And where - - - and do you know an 15 approximate value of this crane? 16 MR. LAMBERT: Well, accord - - - see the value of 17 the crane - - - if it got totally destroyed, there's a 18 separate provision in the policy for valuation which states 19 that the amount of the loss will be determined at the time 2.0 and the place of the loss. Whereas the total project value 21 is determined prior to the issuance of the policy because 22 it's the estimated construction costs, in total.

25 And it's 700 million dollars, and that becomes the amount

three-page - - - three pages in the record of the estimated

construction costs, a laundry list of all of the items.

23

2.4

of the policy prior to the issuance.

2.0

2.4

JUDGE GARCIA: Right. But I think a key point here is the value - - obviously, is the value of this crane included in total project value. That is, obviously, a key question here. Because if it's in there, I think it has to be a temporary work because it doesn't fall under any of the other categories - - -

MR. LAMBERT: Right.

JUDGE GARCIA: - - - of total project value.

Wait. So what I'm wondering is your loss here is determine from the record what you're claiming. It seems some to the crane, some to the building. But total project value, to me, including the crane, which seemed to me to cover - - - and maybe this isn't relevant, but seemed to cover the loss of the use of the crane or getting it back into operation.

And how would you then cover - - let's say I don't know - - I have no idea how much this crane is worth to re - - to replace. But your view would be that that value, a replacement value for this crane, is covered in the total project value?

MR. LAMBERT: No. Total project value is the estimated construction costs for the project. So the value of the tower crane - - were the construction costs of the tower crane included in the total project value, the total project construction costs? And it is because the

construction costs for the crane, which involved the engineering design, the providing of all the parts and materials, the labor to erect it, and the labor to disassemble it, where all included in the eighty million dollar Pinnacle contract, which is a package deal.

2.0

2.4

JUDGE STEIN: But to follow up on Judge Garcia's question, then if there is - - if you're making a claim then why isn't that limited to loss of use versus if you had included the entire value of the claim - - of the crane itself, then if the crane itself was destroyed then you'd have coverage of the crane? Is - - -

MR. LAMBERT: No. There was no requirement to put the replacement value of the crane into - - -

JUDGE STEIN: Why would an insurance company have a policy in that way? So it - - - I mean I have no idea what this crane is worth.

MR. LAMBERT: It covers - - -

JUDGE STEIN: So let's say it's worth hundreds of millions of dollars, okay. Why would they cover its total loss if that wasn't included in the - - - in the - - -

MR. LAMBERT: It's included in the total project value which are the construction costs for the project.

The construct - - - for instance, the Pinnacle contract is an eighty million dollar contract. It includes all kinds of temporary works. It includes scaffolding, it includes

1 formwork, it includes two tower cranes. 2 JUDGE STEIN: But - - - but do you put in the - -3 - the value of the scaffolding or just the cost to erect it 4 and bring it there and - - - and take it down when you're 5 done? Which is it? That's the question. MR. LAMBERT: Well, all of that - - - all of 6 7 these temporary works are covered because the construction 8 costs for this work, scaffolding, formwork, tower crane, 9 were all included in the eighty million dollar - - -10 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Who owns the crane, counsel? 11 Is it Pinnacle or do you own the crane? Who owns the 12 crane? 13 MR. LAMBERT: The crane is owned by someone that 14 it was leased from. 15 JUDGE FAHEY: Yeah. I thought you leased it for 16 79,000 a month or something like that. 17 MR. LAMBERT: Well, that - - - that was, you 18 know, the tower crane, that was a part of the tower crane 19 that sits on the top. But the temporary works coverage 2.0 provision doesn't say rented scaffolding, owned 21 scaffolding, leased scaffolding. Okay. You - - - you are 22 reading that into the temporary works coverage provision. 23 Scaffolding is covered whether it's rented, owned, 2.4 borrowed, or stolen.

JUDGE FAHEY: My - - - my question to your co - -

- co-counsel, and just to follow up on the other - - other judges' questions is - - - is the same. Assuming that it's a question of fact as to whether or not the crane was covered property and included within the total project value, it is not explicit. You can argue - - - I think a reasonable argument could be made that it's a question of fact. So let's assume it is. So then we go to the question of the exclusion and is the - - - has the exclusion created an illusory contract by virtue of the fact that it would eliminate everything that's supposedly In other words, you would have no benefit of your covered? MR. LAMBERT: Right. JUDGE FAHEY: And it would - - - and your - - your response when you first came up was - - - was that everything there could be characterized as a tool, so therefore it's illusory.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LAMBERT: So the temporary works coverage provision would be illusory because the exclusion provision would swallow that entire temporary works coverage - - -

So your position is the formwork JUDGE FAHEY: wasn't covered? The shoring wasn't covered. None of the scaffolding costs or erection or anything was covered?

MR. LAMBERT: It's all covered in temporary works provision, and it's specifically covered in the temporary

1 works provision. 2 JUDGE FAHEY: I understand that. 3 MR. LAMBERT: And that specific - - -4 JUDGE FAHEY: That's not my question, though. Му 5 question is by operation of the exclusion, was that 6 coverage lost or were those things, in your mind, still 7 covered? 8 MR. LAMBERT: The exclusion provision does not 9 apply to those temporary works - - -10 JUDGE FAHEY: So they were still covered. 11 MR. LAMBERT: Yes. JUDGE FAHEY: Okay. 12 13 MR. LAMBERT: Because the exclusion provision, if 14 you apply it to all of those temporary works items, because 15 they are all - - - can be deemed contractor's equipment, 16 would render the temporary works provision of no force and 17 effect because all of them would excluded. And at page 49 18 of defendant insurer's brief they acknowledge the fact that 19 all of the items in the temporary works provision are not 2.0 subject to the exclusion provision except for temporary 21 structures which makes no sense. 22 JUDGE FAHEY: I see. Thank you. 23 Thank you, counsel. CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: 24 MR. LAMBERT: Thank you. 25 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Counsel.

1 MR. SILVERBERG: Thank you, Your Honors, Philip 2 Silverberg for the respondents. I'd like to just, 3 obviously, of course, address all of your questions. I'd 4 like to address a couple of comments that were made by - -5 6 JUDGE RIVERA: Is - - - is your position what he 7 just said that temporary structures are excluded? 8 MR. SILVERBERG: Well, let's look at the 9 provision temporary works. And the policy defines what's a 10 temporary works, and it talks about scaff - - -11 JUDGE RIVERA: Is the answer - - - is it yes or 12 no? And then you can - - -13 MR. SILVERBERG: The answer is "temporary 14 buildings or structures including office and job site 15 trailers, all incidental to the project." 16 JUDGE STEIN: But assuming that we - - - we were 17 to find that this crane fits within that coverage provision 18 or at least that there's a question of fact to that. 19 assume that for a moment. 2.0 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes. 21 JUDGE STEIN: Okay. Then - - - then tell us what 22 you think the exclusion provision does to that coverage 23 provision. 2.4 MR. SILVERBERG: The exclusion provision - - -

and - - - and this is basically, you know, fundamental

1 insurance and contract case law. The exclusion takes away, 2 it's an exclusion - - - takes away certain things that are 3 granted in the coverage. 4 JUDGE STEIN: Does it take away all of those 5 things listed in the temporary works, scaffolding and 6 fencing and all of those things? 7 MR. SILVERBERG: No. It does not. JUDGE FAHEY: Why? 8 9 MR. SILVERBERG: Provided that it meets the 10 criteria of what is a temporary works, and I recognize your 11 question is conditioned on my assuming - - -12 JUDGE STEIN: Yes. 13 MR. SILVERBERG: - - - that the crane, that this 750 foot crane - - -14 15 JUDGE FAHEY: And does it - - -16 JUDGE STEIN: We're - - - we're trying to 17 determine if there's any distinction between those items, 18 assuming they're all part of temporary works, and - - - and 19 if there's anything left to any of those after the 2.0 temporary works. 21 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes, there is. 22 JUDGE STEIN: After the exclusion. 23 MR. SILVERBERG: And - - - and you even heard it 2.4 in answer from counsel. He talked about cement mixers, he

talked about tools, he talked about all these other things.

1 JUDGE FAHEY: Yeah. But - - - but that's - - -2 of the items that were listed under the temporary works, is 3 anything left after the exclusion operates? 4 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes. 5 JUDGE FAHEY: What? 6 MR. SILVERBERG: Cement mixers, tools - - -7 JUDGE RIVERA: But - - - but - - -8 MR. SILVERBERG: - - - equipment. 9 JUDGE RIVERA: - - - the exclusion says tools. 10 MR. SILVERBERG: What? 11 JUDGE RIVERA: The exclusion says tools. 12 MR. SILVERBERG: No. He - - -13 JUDGE RIVERA: Why isn't a cement mixer machinery? 14 15 MR. SILVERBERG: I - - - I think - - -JUDGE RIVERA: Why isn't it equipment? 16 17 MR. SILVERBERG: I think it is machinery, but if 18 you go back to the temporary works provision, it enumerates 19 very specific things. It talks about scaffolding, it talks 2.0 about formwork, and then it talks about office and job site 21 trailers. And - - -22 JUDGE STEIN: I thought your argument was that 23 because scaffolding and those other things were 24 specifically listed - - -25 MR. SILVERBERG: That's exactly right.

JUDGE STEIN: - - - they don't fall within the 1 2 exclusion, but because that provision doesn't say crane 3 that does fall within the exclusion. MR. SILVERBERG: That - - - that's correct. 4 5 JUDGE STEIN: Is that your argument? 6 MR. SILVERBERG: And I'm sorry if I - - - if I 7 misstated it. What - - - and the only - - - the only 8 comment about temporary buildings and structures in the 9 temporary works definition says "including office and job 10 site trailers, all incidental." So the including - - -11 JUDGE RIVERA: So - - - I'm sorry. So then your 12 position is if something, let's just use the word thing 13 now, excuse me for the moment, is a temporary structure and 14 a - - - machinery, it's excluded? Is that a yes or a no? 15 That's all it takes here. 16 MR. SILVERBERG: I would say that's a yes. 17 JUDGE RIVERA: Okay. So then your position, though, is that there are other things that don't fit under 18 19 the exclusion that are temporary structures. That may not 2.0 already be listed, correct? 21 MR. SILVERBERG: That's correct. 22 JUDGE RIVERA: Okay. 23 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes. That's - - - that's 2.4 correct, and I believe that. At least I hope that's what 25 came - - - came across in our briefing.

1 JUDGE FAHEY: So - - - so we're not - - - we're 2 not leaving this point yet. So - - -3 MR. SILVERBERG: Sure. 4 JUDGE FAHEY: So - - - so scaffolding, shoring, 5 formwork, falsework those are all still covered under your 6 interpretation of the contract even after the exclusion 7 operates? 8 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes, Your Honor. 9 JUDGE FAHEY: Okay. 10 MR. SILVERBERG: Yes, they are. Provided that 11 they - -12 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So you disagree with your 13 adversary that that - - - those - - - all of those things 14 that are listed under temporary works could also be 15 considered equipment? 16 MR. SILVERBERG: I would - - - I don't think that 17 they would be considered equipment, but again, the point is 18 is that these are specifically enumerated in the temporary 19 works provision definition. It defines what is a temporary 2.0 work, which also includes office and job site trailers and 21 - - - and items of that ilk. This crane is something very, 22 very different, and there's a couple of points I'd like to 23 make. There are a lot of questions about the value of the 2.4 crane itself. And even the dissent, which - - - which went

out of its way to say, you know, they disagreed with - - -

with the insurers here, and we disagree with that part of the dissent.

2.0

But what the dissent did say is we would not grant summary judgment because we have know if the value of the crane itself was in the policy because as it says in the temporary works provision "total project value." We haven't gotten a straight answer. I - - - what I can say it the value of the crane itself is not listed. It's not part of the project value. Yes, there's a 77,000-dollar-amonth lease. Yes, there may have been labor costs to erect this crane. The value of the crane itself, it's owned by a third party. It's leased to a subcontractor who then works on the project.

JUDGE STEIN: If they're not - - - if they're not seeking a claim for the value of the crane itself, their claim is for the loss of use, maybe some damage that prevented it for using the crane for a period of time, delaying the project, all that. If that's their claim why wouldn't that be covered if those costs are included in the contract?

MR. SILVERBERG: Because this is the first-party property policy. We insure the property itself. This piece of property is not insured under this policy. It is insured under another policy. It's not insured under this policy.

JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: This piece of property being the crane?

2.0

2.4

MR. SILVERBERG: The crane is the piece of property that's not insured here. We say it's not insured. It's - - -

JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Or is it Pinnacle has insurance on the crane?

MR. SILVERBERG: Yes. Now also, I think it's worth noting and we mentioned in - - in our briefing that the insured, Extell, did have an opportunity to endorse onto this policy the tower crane. And that - - - that endorsement is record 825 - 826. It's blank. They didn't list it. If this was such an important part of the project that they wanted to insure, they - - - they could have chosen to insure it. They did not.

There was also, I think, a very early question about whether or not the tower crane - - - crane was equipment. And while we point it in our brief and just the record cite would be 602, the crane is referred to as equipment in the sublease itself. There's no question that this crane is a - - is a massive piece of equipment.

Going back, and I recognize that - - that some of the questions here today have asked me to assume that it is a temporary works, I don't think a fair reading of this entire contract gets you to find that this crane falls

1 within the definition of temporary works when you look at 2 what's listed and when you look at what modifies buildings 3 or structures, including office and job site trailers, this 4 crane is nothing like that. As - - - and it's - - - it's 5 well documented in the record and in the briefing. 6 750 feet. They had to build a platform for it. This is a 7 massive structure. This is not the type of item, short of 8 a separate endorsement, where it would be insured under the 9 - - - under this type of builder's risk policy. Also, one 10 of the things where I think was really - - -JUDGE RIVERA: Well, just to clarify. 11 12 MR. SILVERBERG: Sure. 13 JUDGE RIVERA: Are the - - - the items that are 14 specifically listed, scaffolding, so forth, excuse my

JUDGE RIVERA: Are the - - - the items that are specifically listed, scaffolding, so forth, excuse my ignorance, are any of them attached to the building you're trying to build or that they're trying to build?

MR. SILVERBERG: I - - - I believe temporarily they would be. Sure.

JUDGE RIVERA: Physically attached and could not work but for being attached, or would not be used but for being attached?

MR. SILVERBERG: I - - -

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

JUDGE RIVERA: Like the crane, right? The crane's got to be attached.

MR. SILVERBERG: Well, it - - - you know, it's

not - - - you know, I get - - - sure, someone wants to say attached in one form or another, and I'm not quite a construction expert, although I dabble in it a little bit in my - - in my legal life. For the most part, not - - - certainly not attached where this was built into the building at some point and then, of course, taken out and - - and unassembled. I'm talking about the crane itself. Whether or not scaffolding is physically attached for - - for a part of the time while the building's going up, it may be. I don't - - I don't specifically know the answer to that question.

2.0

2.4

But I will say in - - - in the dissent,
essentially, it - - - the phrase "all incidental to the
project," and we say that the crane is something very
different than scaffolding, very different than a job site
trailer or some - - - or any of these other items, it was
not just incidental. And I know that there is a lot of
back-and-forth between the majority and the dissent on
this. But to accept the dissent's treatment of that phrase
is essentially to - - - to wipe that phrase out because
essentially, everything that's temporary would - - would
not be incidental. They're - - they're reading that
phrase out of it and they - - and they basically create a
superfluous term here. That's not what the majority did,
and that's certainly black letter of contract instruction.

1 JUDGE RIVERA: You say incidental only applies to 2 the temporary buildings or structures? 3 MR. SILVERBERG: Right. And it would not apply -4 5 JUDGE RIVERA: So what's the point of the - - -6 MR. SILVERBERG: In other words, the crane is not 7 something incidental. 8 JUDGE RIVERA: Yes. What's the point of the word 9 "all" as opposed to saying which are, that are? 10 MR. SILVERBERG: I - - - because I believe it 11 modifies including office and job site trailers, all 12 incidental. 13 JUDGE RIVERA: I'm saying but why wouldn't it 14 have been clear to have said that are, which are? Doesn't 15 all suggest that perhaps it applies and modifies more than 16 what you say it does? 17 MR. SILVERBERG: But then - - - but then what 18 would - - - what would be the purpose of that phrase at all 19 if everything that's not a permanent part of the project 2.0 becomes a temporary work? Everything? And I - - - and 21 that would render that a superfluous term. And I - - - I 22 believe that was the point of the major - - - majority. I 23 know it's my point here, and I believe that's' where the 2.4 dissent got it wrong. I see - - -

JUDGE GARCIA: Thank you, counsel.

1	MR.	SII	LVEI	RBERG:	Thank	you
2	(Co	urt	is	adjour	ned)	
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

CERTIFICATION I, Sara Winkeljohn, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Court of Appeals of People v. Zurich American Insurance Company, No. 11 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Cucionia ood Signature: Agency Name: eScribers Address of Agency: 352 Seventh Avenue Suite 604 New York, NY 10001 Date: January 17, 2017 2.4