

**BROOKLYN COMMUNITY BOARD 6**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**MAY 9, 2016**

**PRESENT:**

J. ARMER  
G. KELLY  
S. LONIAL  
T. MISKEL  
M. SILVERMAN

R. BASHNER  
A. KRASNOW  
R. LUFTGLASS  
M. RACIOPPO  
S. TURET

P. BLAKE  
R. LEVINE  
E. MCCLURE  
M. SHAMES

**EXCUSED:**

P. BELLENBAUM

P. FLEMING

R. UNDERWOOD

**\*\*\* M I N U T E S \*\*\***

**Internal briefing by CB6 representatives to the Brooklyn Bridge Park Development Corporation on park development matters.**

Brooklyn Bridge Park Summary. A lot of progress. Some concerns; some big concerns.

The biggest issue: Pier 6.

- City wants to push ahead on development.
- Distrust of Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation regarding their financing to claim need for Pier 6 housing.
- Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation is calming they need money up front on pier pilings to demonstrate need for additional income.
- Questions about the report, distrust between Advisory Council and Corporation.
- Every dialogue changes the projections of the budget needed. There is lack of trust.
- They have disclosed what they feel is required but not the underlying budgets.

Empire State Development Corporation has ruled that Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation must work with the community. Elected officials are against it.

Suggestion: Don't do the building until Brooklyn Bridge Park really needs the money. There is a percentage of park that was set aside for commercial use (non-park) use. It has not been built out. Could it be used for housing?

Pier 6 should be the grand entrance for Red Hook on the South Side of the park. Possibility to return to CB6 to discuss? Is there a milestone?

**Continued annual review of Brooklyn Community Board 6 committee structure.**

Community Development. It would be nice to have one committee to do outreach, if not this one.

Permits and Licenses should be on its own. Too much agenda to combine with Environmental Protection. Agreed it should be alone. Yes, it is overburdened and can stand alone.

Waterfront and Transportation? Ferry will come  
Suggestion: Transportation and Streets and Parks are similar in that they deal with public open space.

Public Safety and Transportation are closely linked - street safety.

Landmarks – do not want the committee to go back to preservation and Land Use Do not want the Committee to go back to preservation if it is broken away. Landmarks and Land Use together gives architects a better mix for Landmarks. Two sides together as it is now gives a better view and more informed decisions.

What are we addressing: More active Committees? Everything is related and Land Use is central. All Committees could be interrelated.

Social Services - Human services goes with Youth and Education. They go together.

Environmental Protection – together with Public Safety – quality of life of the community is not linked to Land Use. Consensus on leaving Permits and Licenses alone.

Environmental with Parks- What will the agenda be?

Landmarks - should be separated from Land Use. Landmarks fits well with Land Use - similar sets.

Environmental and Parks makes sense.

Waterfront and Parks? Transportation and Parks? - public space.

All combinations could make sense. Permits alone makes sense. Landmarks and Parks and Environmental - regulatory and design issues?

Landmarks and Land Use work well together, there is a good overlap of committee memberships.

**Goal of Restructuring:**

Issue: More engaged Board. More engaged community – outreach.

Resiliency should be fit with Environmental.  
Make the Board better known. How do we get people more interested?

Environmental Protection Resiliency Committee - new committee - change the By-laws.

Attendance: Community and Board Members must go to Committee. Having more Committees gives more chairs and more flexibility.

8:00 pm - Motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on April 11, 2016 was seconded.

Minutes approved.

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.