

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 22 In Favor 6 Opposed 5 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: **Fulton Transit Hub**

WHEREAS: The MTA/NYC Transit is in the process of conceptual design work for the Fulton Transit Hub, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is already on record supporting the need to improve this most busy, complex, but poorly designed station complex at Fulton Street, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has also indicated that this very centrally located site would be a most desirable location for the planned 92nd Street Y which is currently searching for potential downtown sites, and

WHEREAS: This project also offers us the opportunity to improve many of the secondary subway entrances to the Fulton complex located in private buildings which are often dark, dirty and poorly identified, and to bring additional ground level retail services to the area, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 thanks the MTA/NYC Transit for its policy of reaching out to the community, via CB #1, in order to share changes to the Fulton Transit Hub and to seek our comments and input, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly urges that the MTA/NYC Transit seek to create a site for the new downtown 92nd Street Y within or above the hub while preserving the goal of bringing light into the station, and examine potential locations which extend beyond the very narrow Corbin Building, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The MTA/NYC Transit insure that the rebuilding of the Fulton Transit Hub includes the creation of additional, visible entrances east of Broadway, particularly on Nassau Street, as well as the re-opening and upgrading of secondary station entrances on William Street, John Street, Fulton Street etc. and also puts into place improved and reliable maintenance agreements for these important entrances.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Proposed interim park uses on Pier 40**

WHEREAS: The proposed interim uses on Pier 40 represents an opportunity to provide outdoor recreational space sorely needed for the community, and

WHEREAS: The Hudson River Park Trust did not accept any of the designs submitted in response to the recent Request for Expression of Interest, and

WHEREAS: The plan as proposed by the HRPT for interim use meets the requirement in the Hudson River Park Act for fifty percent open space and will provide outstanding recreational amenities improving the quality of life in the community, and

WHEREAS: The plan responds to the long-expressed community request for the need for athletic fields for youth; and the need for quiet enjoyment of the river, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 joins with CB #2 in expressing our support of the plan as set forth by the Hudson River Park Trust for the interim use of Pier 40 and requests that the HRPT work to complete the construction as expeditiously as possible.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
WITHDRAWN

RE: **302 Canal Street, application to legalize storefront constructed
without LPC approval**

WHEREAS: This building's façade was redone, and not very successfully, without
Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's architect represented that the owner is now willing to
rebuild the facade following legal procedures and with Landmarks
Preservation Commission guidance, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board recommends that the Landmarks Preservation
Commission reject this application, and work with the applicant's architect
to develop an appropriate facade.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Wall Street, Exchange Place, New Street and Broad Street,
application for a master plan governing the future installation of
security devices and streetscape improvements**

WHEREAS: The City Planning Commission, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, the New York City Police Department, the Alliance for Downtown New York and other parties have developed a multi-phased, comprehensive plan to significantly improve security in the heart of the Financial District, while vastly diminishing the “post-9/11” circulatory and aesthetic chaos that exists currently in the area, and

WHEREAS: The streetscape redesign and security rationalization will reduce actual physical material currently clotting the streets around the New York Stock Exchange to less than 25 percent, enabling Financial District residents and retailers to exist in a way that has not been possible for over two years, and

WHEREAS: Seven security sectors will be formed in the strategic plan, and they roughly demarcate the outer boundaries of the core district, as follows: Broadway at Wall Street; Nassau Street at Pine Street; Williams Street at Wall Street; Williams Street at Exchange Place; Broad Street at Beaver Street; New Street at Beaver Street, and Broadway at Exchange Place, and

WHEREAS: At the entrance to each sector, the portal will be embedded with double sets of high-security devices, including bollards and clamshell barriers, as well as sale-port devices (retractable vehicle barriers, such as can be seen at the driveways in front of City Hall), and

WHEREAS: What concerns the Landmarks Committee is that related to the area’s official historic designation: the so-called New Amsterdam Streetscape. This is the only place in New York City where the street layouts and curb cuts themselves comprise the designation. Their narrowness and configuration date back to original Dutch settlements. So what is beyond the curb is technically not in our purview here, and

WHEREAS: The redesign of the streetscape will include fixed furniture of bronze and limestone around Wall and Broad Streets, as well as some moveable furniture for cafes, and the streets themselves will be repaved in “Euro-Cobble,” quarried square Italian stones pre-cemented at their bases into sets of four, and grouted on-site, and

WHEREAS: The architectural firm of Rogers Marvel has designed clever cast-bronze sculptures fronting the security barriers, giving these typically oppressive-looking devices some aesthetic presence and coherence. While these devices are considered temporary, it might be advantageous to engage an established sculptor to consult on these elements, and

WHEREAS: The adjoining security control booths, on the sidewalks and so not specifically within our review, are largely specified by security issues. Nevertheless, they are big, square and ugly, and efforts should be taken to make THEM less threatening, perhaps with the use of more glass, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The overall scheme should be a great improvement to the quality of life in the Financial District. Community Board #1 endorses the plan in general, but asks the Landmarks Preservation Commission to examine carefully the shape and color of the proposed “Euro-Cobble,” and to influence to the extent possible the final design of the security control booths, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: As future phases of this project are initiated, Community Board #1 wants to be notified in a timely way, in order to thoroughly review them.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 2 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 1 Opposed 2 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **374 Greenwich St., restaurant wine license for Hana Sushi America**

WHEREAS: The applicant will operate a restaurant for 74 people with 19 tables, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 11:30 AM until 10:30 PM on Monday through Friday and noon until 10:30 PM on Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to properly manage the recorded music and have adequate soundproofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license or a sidewalk cafe license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 does not oppose the new restaurant wine license application for Hana Sushi America at 374 Greenwich Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 2 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 1 Opposed 2 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **385 Greenwich Street, liquor license application for Ivy's Bistro**

WHEREAS: The applicant will operate a restaurant for 74 people with 14 tables and 40 seats and a bar area with 6 seats, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be noon until 11:00 PM on Sunday through Thursday and noon until 12:00 midnight on Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to properly manage the recorded music and have adequate soundproofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to keep the planters for the sidewalk cafe 8 feet from the curb on Greenwich Street and to have no seating on N. Moore Street, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 does not oppose the transfer of the liquor license for Ivy's Bistro at 385 Greenwich Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 22 In Favor 6 Opposed 5 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan

WHEREAS: The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) has prepared a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan (Proposed Action), and

WHEREAS: The DGEIS analyzes a broad range of alternatives in terms of their potential effects on land use, neighborhood character, open space, traffic, air quality, noise, shadows, historic and archaeological resources, natural resources and other areas of socioeconomic and environmental concern, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 strongly supports the redevelopment of the World Trade Center and the creation of the World Trade Center Memorial, and

WHEREAS: The construction of this massive project, along with many other pending reconstruction projects in the area, will significantly affect Lower Manhattan and adequate steps must be taken to properly mitigate the anticipated impact of these projects on this community, and

WHEREAS: The completion of the WTC Redevelopment and Memorial will likewise have a significant impact upon Lower Manhattan and these impacts also need to be properly planned for and mitigated during this phase of the project, and

WHEREAS: The extremely lengthy duration of this reconstruction project will put tremendous strain upon a still unsettled Lower Manhattan economy and will greatly affect the lives of residents, workers and visitors to this vitally important district, and

WHEREAS: It is essential that all the parties involved in the Proposed Action take the necessary steps to minimize the adverse effects of this massive reconstruction project to insure that each phase of the Proposed Action is successful and serves as a springboard for the continued growth and revitalization of Lower Manhattan, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 offers the following comments and recommendations on the DGEIS:

Introductory

- We note that the DGEIS makes certain analytic assumptions without adequate explanation of the relevant underlying factual basis for such assumptions. No later than March 10, 2004, we request a meeting with the LMDC and its consultants to answer specific questions that Community Board #1 has regarding the analysis process and underlying assumptions used in the DGEIS.
- We also note the DGEIS does not appropriately consider either the individual impact of certain elements of the Proposed Action or the cumulative impact of the Proposed Action when considered with other projects expected to proceed concurrently with the Proposed Action, including the construction of the new PATH station, the new Fulton Transit Center, the Second Avenue Subway line or the reconstruction of Route 9A. The final EIS should consider all potential effects of the Proposed Action on the community, both on an individual basis and in the context of these and other concurrent projects, as well as the effects of anticipated population growth in Lower Manhattan for the purposes of planning and determining the impacts and appropriate mitigation.

Environmental

- We note the DGEIS indicates that particulate matter emitted from diesel engines will be “substantially higher” than New York City’s interim guidance threshold and will “substantially exceed” the EPA’s air quality standards. Therefore, we request that appropriate measures be taken to protect the air quality of Lower Manhattan, including, but not limited to the following:
 - **Incorporate the provisions of the 191-A law (which requires that city construction contracts use ultra low sulfur diesel and best available pollution control technology on heavy diesel construction machinery) into all contracts related to the World Trade Center Redevelopment, and extend the law to include contracts with the MTA, Port Authority, Con Edison, Verizon and other telecommunications utilities and provide for appropriate enforcement mechanisms;**
 - **Immediately extend the 191-A law to include all moving vehicles used in all Lower Manhattan construction projects – not just those that are part of the Proposed Action;**
 - **Modify appendix A, SEQ-5 (which does not go as far as 191-A since it refers to only non-road construction equipment of 60 hp or greater) to include diesel retrofit technology;**
 - **Enforce New York City’s three consecutive minute idling law for trucks and buses with diesel engines and manage construction scheduling to avoid idling;**
 - **Implement the LMDC’s suggestion of “reducing the exposure of people to PM (particulate matter) by installation of HEPA filters at fresh air inlets in hotels, office buildings and residential buildings, and the purchase of air conditioning units with HEPA filters for**

residences with operable windows, in the immediate vicinity of the project site;”

- **Develop an air monitoring program along the perimeter of the entire World Trade Center site (including 130 Liberty Street and 30 West Broadway) and the Fulton Street Station to track cumulative impact of the numerous construction projects on the adjacent residential and commercial areas and post monitoring data on the LMDC’s website;**
- **Include a detailed analysis of the impact of trucking slurry powder to the site and any resulting air quality impacts in the DGEIS;**
- **Require the use of Sustainable Design Guidelines that meet or exceed the existing Battery Park City Authority Green Guidelines that mandate increased energy efficiency by 20% and use of ultra low sulfur diesel for all construction vehicles;**
- **Monitor the soil for compliance with all applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations in accordance with the Health and Safety Soil Management Plans and post monitoring data on the LMDC’s website;**
- **Utilize all appropriate measures to clean and secure trucks and other vehicles leaving the WTC site to ensure that they do not bring contaminants to other areas of the neighborhood including, for example, spraying water and installing metal grates to clean tires of exiting vehicles and contain debris within the site; and**
- **Require that all MTA and tourist buses use low sulfur fuel and be designed or retrofitted to use current low emission technologies.**

Construction

- We support the establishment of the Lower Manhattan Construction Command Center (LMCCC) to coordinate the construction projects and ensure that schedules are arranged to minimize adverse noise, traffic, pedestrian and other adverse impacts and we request that it include representatives of the Buildings Department and Community Board #1 as well as residents and businesses most directly affected by the Proposed Action.
- The LMCCC should be responsible for community outreach and should coordinate with DOT’s Lower Manhattan Task Force and other local community organizations.
- A representative of the LMCCC should be available on-site 24 hours per day during construction and be reachable directly via a phone number that is widely available to the public. A LMCCC Project Coordinator should be appointed to oversee the work of the LMCCC and to respond to public comments and questions regarding the project.

- The LMCCC should produce a weekly traffic and construction map, reflecting all significant construction projects (including residential conversions and interior commercial office space rebuilds) south of Canal Street in order to enable efficient mitigation of the effects of such projects.
- The DGEIS does not appear to appropriately address the day-to-day issues that will inevitably arise during the construction process; to mitigate this problem, we suggest that an appropriate grievance and response mechanism be established to promptly and thoroughly address all issues as they arise.
- We recommend that consideration be given to limiting or changing the hours of construction on weekends and in the evenings as well as providing for “flex” hours and consulting with Community Board #1 to coordinate hours of operation in response to the needs of the community, recognizing however the importance of achieving an appropriate balance between the legitimate concerns of the community and the need to expeditiously complete construction, to coordinate overall scheduling requirements, and to properly address noise, air quality and other environmental concerns and other issues.
- Given that there are residential units in close proximity to the site of the Proposed Action and that the DGEIS notes that construction activities may result in “annoyance” to nearby residents, mitigation should include soundproof windows being provided to all residential buildings adjacent to the site. As indicated below under the heading “*Noise*,” we urge the LMDC to develop a monitoring program to track noise levels and post monitoring data on the LMDC’s website.
- The DGEIS assumes that the Sustainable Design Guidelines are in place. However, Appendix A notes that the Guidelines are still in draft form. Either the LMDC and Port Authority need to adopt the Guidelines or the DGEIS needs to be reevaluated in the context of the actual requirements that will be in place during construction.
- All mitigation measures listed in section 22-21 and SEQ-5 should be adopted, including but not limited to the following:
 - **Acoustic barriers and walled enclosures around certain construction activities;**
 - **Placement of construction equipment in shielded locations, such as below grade;**
 - **Installation of silencers on jackhammers and other equipment;**
 - **Use of electrically operated rather than combustion equipment;**
 - **Use of soil beds, exterior rubber lining on truck body and other methods to reduce rock impact noise during loading and unloading; and**
 - **Placement of most loading/unloading inside the bathtub.**

Noise

- While Community Board #1 supports the concept of wind generated energy on the Freedom Tower, the DGEIS does not provide the results of any studies that may have been done regarding the effects of wind turbines in close proximity to residential housing or address recent studies in the British press that suggest that low frequency sounds emitted by wind turbines can cause health problems, including headaches and depression in people living a mile away (*Telegraph*, 1/25/04). These studies should be assessed before the plan for wind turbines atop the Freedom Tower proceeds.
- The LMDC and its project partners must ensure that sound receptor stations are established at various locations throughout and near the site and regularly monitored to ensure that agencies and contractors adhere to sound level guidelines. We urge the LMDC to develop a monitoring program to track noise levels and post monitoring data on the LMDC's website.
- Other than noise generated by construction equipment, the DGEIS does not adequately address the potential impact of noise and estimates of projected noise impacts from mobile sources, *i.e.* projected noise from traffic and pedestrians, seem very low throughout the document. The LMDC should explain how these estimates were reached. While the community supports the restoration of a commercial center on this site, the noise impacts to be expected from the development of a hub that will be active day and night and all weekend (unlike the WTC which was mostly 9-5 M-F) must be acknowledged and mitigated as much as possible.
- The DGEIS should recognize and take into account that the NYC Noise Code is being revised and consider whether the Proposed Action would comply with the revised code and, if not, what actions can be taken to ensure compliance.
- The DGEIS notes that allowable maximum noise levels are exceeded throughout the site. Every effort should be made to meet HUD Site Acceptability Standards of 65 dBA for the Memorial. Ideally, the site, when fully built, exceed the current NYC Noise Code ambient noise quality criteria for noise quality zones N-3 of Leq-70 dBA measured for any one hour (subchapter 6, Section 24-243.) We oppose any wall or other physical barrier along West Street, however, as inconsistent with the overall Master Plan goal to integrate the WTC site with Battery Park City and the waterfront.
- Consideration should be given to how new and evolving technologies might eliminate or at least partially mitigate the noise levels created by the Proposed Action, including but not limited to the following:
 - **Reducing the amount of vehicular traffic (see traffic recommendations).**
 - **Setting guidelines for stationary noise sources, similar to the Sustainable Design Guidelines, that meet or exceed – not just comply with – all existing and pending codes and regulations. This would include setting standards for the type, size, quality, and placement of**

HVAC systems, generators, and mechanical equipment. For example, because the flow of air as well as HVAC equipment itself can create significant noise, maximum face velocity should be limited to 1000 fpm at discharge louvers and HVAC equipment should have a minimum of 7 feet of 2" thick, 3 lb. density duct liner from the unit to the louver face on the exterior of the building and high-quality sound traps.

- Exterior condensing units should be eliminated as much as possible and all condensing units should be treated with high-quality sound absorbing panels to reduce reflection of sound to adjacent buildings.
- Emergency generators should be hospital grade or better with acoustically treated radiator discharge, intake, and exhaust pipe. This treatment should include 3 ft. sound traps for the radiator intake/discharge and a critical-grade muffler for the exhaust.

Traffic, Parking, Transit and Pedestrian

- Because traffic, parking, transit and pedestrian impact conclusions are highly sensitive to assumptions regarding trip generation and fully populated numbers, these assumptions should account for how all projected workers and visitors will come to and leave the site. For example:
 - Vehicle trip generation is based on a rate per square office foot, which may be an appropriate method, but unless all workers and visitors are accounted for, it is not possible to test the reasonableness of the trip numbers so estimated.
 - Similarly, the transit trip generation numbers do not appear to be based on any estimate of total workers or visitors.
 - The projected 5% Proposed Action vehicular traffic increase over pre-9/11 scenario is counter-intuitive.
- The DGEIS appears to conclude that even without the Proposed Action, traffic congestion at studied intersections will be at “unacceptable” levels, and that therefore, much of the “unacceptable” traffic congestion projected from the Proposed Action need not be mitigated. This is a consequence of the DGEIS cumulative impact approach, addressed in the Introductory section, above.
- The DGEIS does not appropriately differentiate among types of traffic – buses, trucks, black cars, taxis, etc. Navigating a street clogged with trucks and buses is far different from navigating that same street with a similar number of automobiles. For example,
 - Delivery truck impact on the residential neighborhoods south of the WTC site and Greenwich Street is not adequately addressed.
 - The large number of anticipated “black cars” is not addressed. An underground staging of these vehicles is essential to avoid significant adverse effects throughout the area.

The effect of delivery truck, commuter bus and tour bus traffic on Route 9A, including any differences in such effects under the alternative at-grade and by-pass scenarios, is not adequately addressed. We are concerned that proposed truck and bus routing would take most truck and bus traffic to at-grade lanes on Route 9A, causing unacceptable congestion adjacent to the site.

- The effect of locating a ramp for delivery trucks on Liberty Street on traffic on Cedar Street and adjacent residential neighborhoods is not addressed and we are particularly concerned the truck ramp and pedestrian traffic accessing the Memorial on Liberty Street will impede access to Battery Park City by Ladder Company 10. Alternative truck ramps should be considered as well as strategies for truck staging on Greenwich Street and other locations.
- The DGEIS ignores the fact that, pre-9/11, the “service road” adjacent to the WTC along Church and Liberty Street and along a portion of West Street, functioned as a buffer area, absorbing certain traffic impacts, such as black cars and buses, and that the different geography of the Proposed Action will divert such traffic onto local streets absent adequate accommodation and planning for such traffic. Thus, even if the DGEIS estimate of only an overall 5% increase in traffic in comparison to the pre-9/11 scenario were correct, the DGEIS does not properly account for the fact that much of the pre-9/11 scenario high-impact traffic would be diverted onto neighboring streets under the Proposed Action.
- Key assumptions underlying the analyses are not stated and therefore not testable.
 - Assumptions regarding the basis of transit trip generation are not stated.
 - The background rate of trip increase is larger for transit (0.5%) than for vehicles (0.25%), even though the source appears to call for using a 0.5% rate for both.
 - The DGIS assumes 2/3 of Route 9A traffic would choose tunnel lanes (if the by-pass alternative were built) without explanation. Any underestimate of Proposed Action-generated traffic presumably understates the proportion of Route 9A traffic that would remain at-grade under the by-pass alternative.
 - The requested meeting with the LMDC and its consultants, referred to in the Introductory section, above, should include an explanation of methods and assumptions in order for Community Board #1 to properly address the issues raised by the DGEIS.
- The DGEIS should consider negative impacts of through traffic on Greenwich Street and West Broadway on areas north and south of WTC and the implications of using Greenwich Street as the proposed “drop off” for tour buses and of using the Greenwich Street-Albany Street-West Street routing for delivery trucks. Residents of Tribeca and students and teachers at PS-234, BMCC, PS/IS-89, Stuyvesant High School, as well as users of Washington Market Park, will be adversely affected if Greenwich Street and West Broadway become alternatives to

Broadway and West Street. Poorly planned truck and bus routing will also adversely affect the residential community south of the WTC.

- Community Board #1 believes that we need to reduce vehicular traffic in Lower Manhattan rather than accept the increase of traffic to intolerable levels as inevitable. This need will only become more critical as a result of the Proposed Action and other development projects such as the new PATH station, the new Fulton Transit Center, the Second Avenue Subway line and as the population of residents, workers and visitors in Lower Manhattan experiences significant expected growth. We strongly support the adoption of traffic management systems and other mitigation measures to discourage vehicular traffic in Lower Manhattan and manage inevitable traffic increases, including the adoption of “intelligent transportation systems” (ITS), the promotion of public transit modes to divert would-be drivers out of their cars and into PATH (including improvement of associated park and ride facilities), subways, buses, and ferry services and the development of a “one-stop” ride to regional airports. The members of Community Board #1 have differences of opinion regarding the use of pricing strategies, however, and urge that this issue be studied further.
- It is unacceptable to suggest “the anticipated saturation of Route 9A with traffic destined to the Project Site and its immediate environs could be better distributed to other streets with available capacity” (p. 22-3). Route 9A was designed to mitigate overburdened city streets; redirecting traffic through residential neighborhoods is not a wise or viable alternative.
- A separate EIS process is necessary to adequately address the alternative proposals for Route 9A.
- Tour and commuter bus parking are not adequately addressed. Adequate plans for underground parking of tour buses under the WTC site, the site of the Deutsche Bank building or Site 26 is essential to avoid significant adverse effects throughout the area. We note, at the same time, that the DGEIS indicates that the underground tenant parking will be underutilized even after the Proposed Action is completed in 2015.
- Construction worker personal vehicle impact is understated and the effects of construction worker and other commuter vehicle traffic and parking requirements are not adequately addressed. Informal surveys of local construction projects show that construction worker personal vehicles tend to be larger truck vehicles. Consideration should be given to banning personal vehicles from the site as well as strategies for facilitating construction worker and other commuter access to the site, such as establishing “Park and Ride” lots in areas outside of Lower Manhattan, shuttle bus services and incentives to use public transportation.

Neighborhood Character

- We note the DGEIS asserts that “the Proposed Action would have substantial positive effects on neighborhood character throughout the study area and all of Lower Manhattan” (p. 10-25), while at the same time acknowledging that there will be “substantial pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion” and “thousands of tourists filling the streets, sidewalks, and subway stations on weekdays and weekends” – all of which will have a significant impact on the overall character of

each adjacent neighborhood as well as the entire study area. Many who currently live in these neighborhoods may disagree that “neighborhood character throughout the study area would be both enhanced and improved by the Proposed Action, and no significant adverse impacts would occur” (p. 10-16). To fully understand the potential impacts and how they might be mitigated, the DGEIS should provide a thorough analysis of the unique character of each of the surrounding neighborhoods and a detailed study of the potential impact of the Proposed Action on neighborhood character, including:

- Potential to increase commercial rents and drive out businesses and amenities that cater to residents rather than tourists.
 - Anticipated impact on small businesses, including street closings, signage changes, restricted pedestrian access, construction barriers and other similar factors.
 - Potential to change property values.
 - Anticipated increase of noise and traffic – especially at nights and on weekends – in neighborhoods that are now relatively quiet after working hours.
 - Potential threats to safety and health, including impact of increased traffic and potential for increased crime.
 - Implications for the thousands of students who go to PS-234, BMCC, PS/IS-89, Stuyvesant High School, and other downtown schools.
 - Potential to change residential demographics and the corresponding impact of such changes.
- Analysis of possible mitigating factors, including tax rebates and other financial incentives for small business owners and residents who are adversely affected by the construction phase of the Proposed Action and other appropriate forms of assistance.

Community Facilities

- The DGEIS states that the NYPD and NYFD are adequately prepared to handle any situation, yet given the enormous influx of visitors, workers and new residents, we urge the LMDC to ensure that the NYPD and NYFD be staffed according to planned growth of the area and that communications between the NYPD, the NYFD and the Port Authority Police be fully integrated so as to avoid problems that have occurred in the past when the departments failed to communicate with each other.
- The potential impact on existing schools, libraries, and day care centers, open spaces, recreational facilities and hospitals and the need for new facilities to serve the anticipated increase in the population of residents, workers and tourists in Lower Manhattan should be covered by the final EIS. It is not accurate to conclude that, simply because the Proposed Action does not include residential development that there will be no impact on the community facilities that

typically serve residential populations, such as schools, day-care centers and recreational facilities. In fact, the Community Board #1 district has historically experienced significant load on such facilities from commuting workers who choose to have their children attend schools and day care facilities near the commuters' place of work.

Radio Frequency Electronic Fields

- The LMDC and the Port Authority indicate that any Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields (RFEMF) will be within or below all guidelines and standards for RFEMF radiation. We urge the LMDC to make this a mandatory requirement and that inspection and enforcement procedures be implemented.
- We urge the LMDC and the Port Authority to require that only fully tested, state-of-the-art antennas or transmission devices be used on the Freedom Tower and other tall buildings at the site in order to benefit from any improvements since the antenna was originally installed on the North Tower of the WTC, with regard to any potential health effects as well as adverse radio and television reception impacts near the site.
- Since the Freedom Tower will have both the observation deck and the broadcast antenna, we urge that proper shielding be in place to protect visitors and workers. We urge the LMDC to develop a monitoring program to track RFEMF and post monitoring data on the LMDC's website.

Wind

- The DGEIS indicates that the Proposed Action would result in "comparable" pedestrian-level wind conditions, but then later notes at some times wind conditions "may produce difficult walking conditions and pose potential safety problems..." unless measures are taken to reduce and mitigate undesirable wind effects. We urge that appropriate mitigation measures be taken to reduce any deleterious effects of wind.

Open Space

- We urge the LMDC to verify and explain a number of assumptions with regard to open space. For example, the DGEIS indicates that "open spaces include sidewalks and streetscape" (page 2-4, Table 2-1) and therefore we ask for a recalculation of purely "park" space and the verification of overall open space and confirmation that the amount of usable open space in Lower Manhattan will not in fact decline as a result of the Proposed Action instead of increasing to improve the quality of life and account for significantly increased populations.

Other Issues

- A new location needs to be determined for the Greenmarket that reopened in June 2003 at Liberty Plaza which has since subsequently closed due to Plaza renovations.
- A recent residential housing survey conducted by Community Board #1 estimates that by 2005 more than 13,000 new residential units would increase the

population from 35,000 to 60,000. By the year 2015, when we expect the Proposed Action to be completed, the population of Lower Manhattan can be expected to have increased even more significantly. The DGEIS does not adequately address the impact of such increased population and the related demands on services, community facilities, traffic or other concerns.

THEREFORE

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

Community Board #1 expects that the LMDC and the Port Authority will provide regular updates and submit for review and comment specific designs and proposals for mitigating adverse impacts of the Proposed Action, including without limitation traffic management, security barrier installation and all other design elements that will affect the residents, workers, businesses and visitors to Lower Manhattan.