CITY OF NEW YORK
Community Board No. 2
350 JAY STREET - 8TH FL.
BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201
(718) 596-5410 FAX (718) 852-1461
cb2k@nyc.rr.com

ERIC ADAMS
Borough President

SHIRLEY A. McRAE
Chairperson

ROBERT PERRIS
District Manager

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 18, 2017, 6:00PM
BROOKLYN HOSPITAL, FIRST FLOOR DINING ROOM
MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Members Present: Andrew Lastowecky, Vice Chairperson; Darryl Chang; Carolyn Hubbard-Kamunanwire, Irene Janner, Jennifer Melby; Julian Macrone, Secretary; Dwight Smith, Celeste Staton; Suzanne Quint,

Staff: Carol-Ann Church, Crystal Jalloh

Members Excused: Barbara Zahler-Gringer, Chairperson

AL Called the meeting to order at 6:10 with Introductions.

1. Introduction

2. Approval of Agenda and Invitation for Public Comment on Agenda Items

Mr. Lastowecky moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Hubbard seconded and unanimously approved.

3. Proposal for Plus POOL (Environmentally-friendly floating pool) Presentation by Play Lab

Kara Meyer (Friends of Plus Pool, nonprofit for the project, working independently and with the City of New York). Explained project concept, as a city surrounded by water and formerly of coastal bath houses (inspiration). Plus-shaped pool that will filter riverwater (6,000 gallons per day) and discharge a similar amount into the river. Pool to be divided into multiple cross sections (Kids, Sports, Laps, Lounge) that will accommodate different uses as well as open up to an Olympic sized swimming pool. Objective is to get New Yorkers in the river, have them understand the potential of the river, help to clean the estuary.

Time Magazine claimed: Kickstarter-funded concept experiment was floated out of Brooklyn Bridge Park and Pier 40 and tested. Stakeholders include Arup, McLaren, and Columbia, Joshua David (High Line). Partnered with Google to present the water quality data to the city, started the nonprofit in 2015. Some public events are ongoing, and include programs that teach kids how to swim (NYCHA), in school presentation.

Mr. Smith asks if the group is only looking at Brooklyn and Queens? M. Meyer states that they are talking to City Hall directly, now looking at a site on the Hudson, as well as other technically feasible sites.

Mr. Smith followed up asking where they are with locations and siting? Wasn't there a competition? Where are they planning on going with the project, where is the $20M fundraising coming from? Isn't there strong BK Local Elected interest in the project (borough President) KM: No competition, actually. At the mercy of the sites, some private, some public. Open to anyone who will allow them to integrate into the site. Need communities to vye for it. Would shoot for an MOU, which would facilitate $2M design phase and permitting application process.

When they get an interested party on the other side, when they come to the MOU, do they come to the table with the $20M Capital as well as maintenance/operating expense? KM: They have supporters interested in the project who will commit funds, hoping to find public investment that would spur private investment. Long-term business model is to generate revenue based on the recently-patented filtration technology.

Ms. Melby asks what other sites are under consideration. Ms. Meyer responds: Greenpoint, Noble Street. BBP between Piers 1 and 2; Red Hook.

Crystal: Describe the filtration system. Where does the waste go? Ms. Meyer explains that the system deploys a triple-layer filter, using no chemicals, no chlorine. Currently researching waste disposal of filtered materials. Adaptable system based on geography and local aquatic environment. Will create water quality criteria for the water because the City does not currently have any laws governing similar circumstances.

Ms. Hubbard-Kamunanwire asks why a plus, and is the shape adaptable? Ms. Meyer responds that the layout is more an aesthetic choice, and that the form is not governed by the filtration technology.

Ms. Church asks, will there be a cost? Ms. Meyer says that yes, the pool would be free, open to the public, ideally. Lots of business models to explore in order to integrate in to existing infrastructure.

Mr Macrone asks how the pool would be secured to the location. Ms. Meyer explains that the pool would be tethered to the river bed. Will rise and fall, engineered like a boat. Not sure if there needs to be pilings.

Ms. Janner asks about the ecological impacts of the project—will there be Army Corps obstacles, or similar problems to BBPC's barge pool? Ms. Meyer explains the situation is "water dependent," working on a way to minimize the shadows cast on the riverbed.

Mr. Lastowecy points out that this Committee has always advocated for a pool. Are the water and currents suitable?

Ms. Meyer explains yes, that's why Brooklyn Bridge Park has been selected as a site. Variances will have to be filed because of the novelty of the project, but the BBP site is actually exceptional by most metrics/criteria. "Our engineers are the ones who fixed the Squibb Park Bridge." They have discussed the proposal with the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation.

Ms. Quint asks what have the talks with BBPC consisted of? Ms. Meyer explains that they are speaking with Alicia Glen's office. Ms. Quint responds: But the Park hasn't committed yet, correct, and haven't even committed to the pool as part of the master plan?

Mr. Lastowecky states that BBPC will fall into place if the political will asks for it

Ms. Meyer points out that it is ultimately the decision of the Mayor's Office, more than anything else. Reliant on them to change the definition of a swimming pool.

Mr. Lastowecky asks: is the corporation a suitable model? Who's finding the funding for all of this?

Ms. Meyer states that this is a true public-private partnership; people are interested in Brooklyn Bridge Park.

Mr. Smith is attracted to a couple of things. Asks if the patent is owned by the not-for-profit organization? We've got a Goldilocks situation, don't we? KM: Yes, the patent is owned by Plus Pool, and thought that there would be a negotiation in place a long time ago.

AL: Capacity? KM: 400 in pool, 1,000 on deck.

Ms. Quint asks: if it doesn't work because of the design, will the design change? Timeline? Ms. Meyer responds that they would lean towards a site that fits the pool as-designed. Once a site is selected, timeline would include six months of design-engineering, two year allocation for permitting, possible simultaneous fabrication, then a year of construction. Three years in total.

Mr. Macrone asks if there are any for-profit entities associated with the ventures? Ms. Meyer replies no.

Mr. Smith asks if Ms. Meyer can explain the Heineken connection? Ms. Meyer: Heineken is a funder, programming partner, helping to generate petition signatures (public challenge) that's attached to further funding and goal-setting.

Mr. Lastowecky asks that if the park is built [in New York], shouldn't the preponderance of funding responsibility be placed on Plus Pool because of the potential benefit for scaling around the world?

Ms. Meyer notes that they are talking directly with BBPC, they want to operate and control the pool.

Ms. Quint, on behalf of Love our Pool, states that they want a pool in BBP, and appreciate the fastest way of obtaining one. Not going to commit to any one solution, LOP is going to remain agnostic.

Mr. Lastowecky asks if there are other entities vying for pool real estate in BBP? Ms. Meyer responds that she is not in a position to say. Ms. Quint explains that not to her knowledge.

Ms. Church asks if the system can be used in smaller applications? Ms. Meyer responds that yes, they're trying to scale the technology.

Mr. Smith proposes that we have to push our elected officials to let them know that we want a pool [in Brooklyn Bridge Park], and that the proposal should be pushed this through the executive committee.

4. Looking Ahead Fiscal Year 2018

C-A: Joint meeting with Youth and Education Cultural Affairs committee about NYPD interaction with youth in Brooklyn Bridge Park. Did receive new contact information about reaching Friends Groups. We got a much shorter list than previously. Friends groups should come out in March and tell us what they need.
SQ: Back at Brooklyn BP-organized meeting, there were lots of people.
AL: Need to get people excited about Commodore Barry Park—the way that happens is through charrettes. We've already taken care of the scoping of phases of park reconstruction.

C-A: Aside, because Suzanne needs to leave: Commissioner Maher has offered to tour the district's parks—interest? It would be helpful in setting funding priorities for the District.

Dwight: Reads off list: we've got six out of ten projects knocked out

AL: Council Member, Brooklyn Delegation, and Borough President should be held to funding the playfields at Commodore Barry, because of the extent to which the field is a citywide public asset. date.

JM: Describes remaining phases of FGP Capital plan.

AL + Irene: Yes, Fort Greene Park needs to remain at the top of our priorities list.

AL: Commodore Barry needs all the attention it can get. Needs funding for all parts of the masterplan other than the permitted field.

Dwight: clarified that there was a suggestion to remove

CA noted that if the item was removed it is no longer a priority.

AL: Said it should then be a separate sentence. Remove permitted field from our statement of needs.

AL: Brooklyn War, money has been allocated for ADA compliance, and we've seen the plan for elevator. The interior of the building is still unusable, though.
Irene: We should now include interior renovations to create a usable space.

AL: Cadman Plaza, northern into a passive park with irrigation, for seniors and children

AL: McLaughlin, Phase III, bathroom and clubhouse could use renovation

AL: Washington Hall Playground; lights and bathrooms are the biggest issue,

AL: BAM Park, done, funded, no longer needs to be included in the needs report

AL: Park formation in Boerum Hill, Eastern Clinton Hill. Talk to Levin about options

Dwight: We want the parking lot at the corner of Bond and Schermerhorn. Pitched that to Alloy bit the idea did not gain their support.

AL: Tennis courts in Fort Greene Park? Do they need full renovation? JM: Resurfaced in 2010, will eventually need renovation, but renovation isn't high on capital needs list. Bathrooms are higher priority.

C-A: There should be annual tours of Parks and facilities.

Mr. Lastowecky requests a motion to take the priorities as covered in the meeting. Mr. Smith

Motions, and Ms. Janner Seconds, unanimously approved, Mr. Macrone recuses.

5. Approval of Minutes (June 19, 2017).
Mr. Smith motioned, Ms.Staton seconded, unanimously approved

6. Chairperson's Report
No report

7. Other Business - None

8. Community Forum (non-committee members only) – No one wished to speak
AL motions to adjourn the meeting, 6 in favor, none opposed. Minutes from June Meeting were not approved