

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

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

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed School Space in Site 5C Development

WHEREAS: The public elementary schools within this District, *i.e.*, the zoned schools, PS 89 and PS 234, and the District 2-zoned school, PS 150, are operating with student populations at or above their stated capacities, and

WHEREAS: PS 234 suffers from overcrowding, with the current school year's zoned Kindergartners taking all available student seats, and next year's projected zoned Kindergartners are expected to exceed the current year's numbers, and

WHEREAS: The residential population of this District continues to grow with the express support and encouragement of the City and State governments, and

WHEREAS: The planned new K-8 school on the East side of this District is projected only partially to satisfy the growth in school age population in this District, and is still in the planning stages, and

WHEREAS: The City has proposed the creation of additional Pre-K and K classrooms in the Site 5C building to address local overcrowding issues in our local schools, and

WHEREAS: On May 4, 2004, representatives of EDC and the Department of Education (DOE) met with Community Board 1 representatives and Councilmember Alan Gerson's staff to solicit community input regarding possible inclusion of classroom space in the development of Site 5C, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the creation of additional classroom space for pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten students intended primarily to address capacity issues at PS 234, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: This Board appreciates the steps taken by EDC and DOE to involve this Board and Councilmember Gerson in decisions regarding possible classroom space at Site 5C, and states its support for one option presented by EDC and DOE, to wit, the creation of a pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten "annex" to PS 234 at Site 5C, with the following provisos:

- EDC and DOE involve this Board, Councilmember Gerson, the principal of PS 234, its Parents Association and its School Leadership Team in the decisions regarding the specifics of such an annex;
- Such an annex is not a substitute for additional school space required in this District, including the proposed K-8 school on the East side of this district, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The only rational and effective solution to the existing overcrowding, and projected increased overcrowding, of the schools in this District is the building of new schools, both elementary and middle schools, with the proposed K-8 school on the East side of this District being but a first step, which will alleviate, but not solve, even as of the day it opens, the overcrowding in our schools, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon the City to enter into a binding written agreement with CB #1 and the City Council, compelling not only this administration but any incoming City administration as well, insuring the construction in the short term of a K-8 school on the East side to serve our district to be completed before construction concludes on Site 5B, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Immediate steps must be taken to alleviate the overcrowding that PS 234 will suffer this coming school year, with possible measures including the housing of pre-K classes in a nearby temporary site; and that any such alleviation steps should be made in consultation with the principal of PS 234, its Parents Association, its School Leadership Team and this Board, and, to the extent that any such measures affect any other school, in consultation with the principal, PA and SLT of that school or schools as well, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 also urges that steps be taken to limit admission to PS 234 and PS 89 to zoned students and to avoid the issuance of variances or to grant admission to children who reside outside the respective catchments areas of these schools.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Rebuilding Lower Manhattan vs a new West Side central business district

WHEREAS: The Wall Street Financial District is the nation's third largest commercial district, and

WHEREAS: A strong and resurgent commercial presence is vital to Lower Manhattan's future as well as New York City's future, and

WHEREAS: The Master Plan for rebuilding Lower Manhattan calls for restoring the commercial space that was destroyed at the World Trade Center site on 9/11, and

WHEREAS: The new 7 World Trade Center is under construction and ground will be broken for the Freedom Tower on July 4th of this year, and

WHEREAS: It appears that the remaining WTC towers will be rebuilt in response to market demand, and

WHEREAS: The proposed "Hudson Yards" central business district goes beyond a rezoning plan in that it requires the immediate creation of large office towers on Manhattan's Far West Side, and

WHEREAS: Starting in 2010 the proposed Far West Side central business district would require the proceeds from one million square feet of office space every year in order to pay off several billion dollars of City-sponsored bonds, and

WHEREAS: Since the City will be financially dependent on these new West Side commercial towers to pay off their bonds, it will be in their interest to see that these buildings are built and leased, possibly to the detriment of all the other commercial districts, and

WHEREAS: Important moral commitments have been made and should be kept to successfully rebuild Lower Manhattan following the September 11th attack so as to insure that it enjoys a proud and prosperous future, and

WHEREAS: The recent legal decisions with regard to Silverstein Properties' insurance proceeds has called into question the funding of the remaining office towers downtown, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has grave concerns that the Far West Side central business district would be in direct competition with the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: We recommend deferring implementation of the presently proposed Hudson Yards development plan until the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site is completed.

04res.may18

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 0 Opposed 2 Abstained 1 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 29 In Favor 0 Opposed 5 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 137-141 Duane Street, liquor license application for Rosanjin

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 7 tables with 16 seats,
and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 11:00AM until 9PM,
and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have quiet background music only as appropriate
for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-
proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a sidewalk café
license or a cabaret license, and

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

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for Rosanjin, at
137-141 Duane Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by
the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 0 Opposed 4 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 134 Reade Street, liquor license application for NYRU, Inc.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 26 tables with 70 seats and a bar with 10 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 9:00 AM until 3:30 AM Monday to Sunday but the applicant agreed to limit service at the outside tables to 10 PM Sunday to Thursday and midnight on Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have quiet background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a sidewalk café license or a cabaret license, and

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

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for NYRU, Inc. at 134 Reade Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 3 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: 25 Hudson Street, liquor license application for Shinobi, LLC dba Ninja.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 25 tables with 110 seats and a bar with 8 tables and 30 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 5:00 PM until 2 AM Monday to Sunday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have quiet background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a sidewalk café license or a cabaret license, and

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

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for Shinobi, LLC at 25 Hudson Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 228 West Broadway, sidewalk cafe application for 228 West Broadway Inc, dba The Bubble Lounge

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a sidewalk cafe license for 5 tables and 10 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be 4:30 PM until midnight Sunday through Thursday, and 4:30 PM until 1:00 AM, Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has not received any complaints of loud noise but did receive some opposition from the community particularly to tables located on the West Broadway side and the applicant agreed to remove those tables from the application, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not object to the sidewalk café license for 228 West Broadway Inc., dba the Bubble Lounge for a period of two years provided that the applicant agrees to post hours of operation in the window, and that no tables be located on West Broadway but on the North Moore side only.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: 51-53 Walker Street, application to construct a new nine-story building

WHEREAS: This proposal calls for the construction of a new nine-story residential building on the south side of Walker Street, just west of Broadway, on what is currently a parking lot in the Tribeca East Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The property's width is 50 linear feet, the same as the historic structure at 45 Walker Street, which was recently converted and renovated, and whose design this applicant's architect acknowledges in his renderings for 51-53 Walker Street. For example, the first floor would be 16½ feet tall, matching that of 45 Walker Street, and deep window penetrations, set back 16 inches from the façade, also echo 45 Walker, and

WHEREAS: Although the proposal calls for a new structure taller than most on the block, it is within the current C6-2A, F.A.R/ 6.02 zoning envelope, an 8½-foot setback would exist above the 7th floor, with a 17½-foot setback at the 85-foot height level, and a top setback of 30 feet, so the applicant claims the top two floors would be invisible from any street-level sightline, and

WHEREAS: Although members of the Landmarks Committee thought the described materials and color palette were interesting, the applicant did not bring samples, making it impossible to reach an informed recommendation, and

WHEREAS: Doubt was expressed about the as-drawn cornice, one member likening it to a series of pigeon coops, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Although much of this plan seems promising, the Landmarks Preservation Commission is urged to hold over this matter until the applicant returns to the Landmarks Committee of Community Board #1 Manhattan with color and materials samples, as the applicant has agreed to do.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 133 Beekman Street, application to replace rooftop mechanical equipment

WHEREAS: This proposal calls for the replacement of the building's three existing cooling towers with two new units, and

WHEREAS: The new units will be smaller in plan, but slightly taller than the existing units, and located in the same general location, and

WHEREAS: The applicant states that the new towers will be 4½ feet more visible than the old ones, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

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

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Battery Park Carousel

WHEREAS: Since 1994, The Battery Conservancy has served the Lower Manhattan community as an advocate for rebuilding and revitalizing the Battery, and

WHEREAS: The Conservancy honors and preserves the heritage of The Battery by rebuilding the park's landscape while mindful of its historic past, and

WHEREAS: The Conservancy is proposing the creation of The Battery Carousel, which is envisioned as a beacon, attracting people through movement, sound, light and fun, and

WHEREAS: The aquatic theme of the carousel and surrounding pavilion recalls New York's first Aquarium that was located in Castle Clinton from 1896 to 1941, and

WHEREAS: The carousel and pavilion are being designed by the architecture firm of Weisz and Yoes Studio, and

WHEREAS: The Conservancy held a public competition for artists, and with an advisory committee, selected artist Barbara Broughel of New York to create the 28 carousel marine figures, cast in resin representing a selection of marine life that was displayed in the original Aquarium, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 fully supports this amenity for children and the public in Lower Manhattan, and recognizes the positive influence it will provide for residents, tourists, and all visitors to The Battery.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Street fair, May 27th, Pearl Street

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the proposed May 27th street fair to be run by local merchant John Moran on behalf of the Sloan Kettering Children's Cancer Center to take place on Pearl Street between Wall Street and Hanover Square from noon until 9 PM.

04res.may18

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 60 Hudson Street, application to create a building-wide master plan for the installation of storefront and window louvers, and mechanical equipment at the building setbacks

WHEREAS: This application reveals the long-awaited proposed “master plan” for perpetually ongoing exterior alterations to 60 Hudson Street (*a/k/a* the Western Union Building), an individual New York City landmark comprising the square block of West Broadway and Worth, Hudson and Thomas Streets, and surrounded on three sides by the Tribeca West Historic District, and

WHEREAS: This new program would replace the confusing and untenable original master plan of 1997, and

WHEREAS: The present application arrives at the insistence of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, Community Board #1, and the residents of Tribeca, almost three years after it was promised, and after a decade of desecration not only to architect Ralph Walker’s Art Deco masterpiece, but, because of the nature of latter-day installations at 60 Hudson Street, to the neighborhood beyond its doors, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board has asked the applicant to provide a comprehensive written summary of the all the elements of the proposed “master plan.” The applicant agreed, and noted that the same was to be drawn up for the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: We recognize the quality of architect George Boyle’s initial ideas for restoration work, including the return of bronze “storefronts” (which really aren’t storefronts anymore, since, with one exception, all the stores have been eliminated); the removal of all street-level infill louvers on the Hudson Street façade; the specification of no additional louvers on Hudson Street above the first floor and the replacement of a strip of transom glass with a narrow band of interesting, undulating ziggurat-styled louvers, respecting a major theme of the building’s original design; the replacement of incorrect windows and a broken pier on the West Broadway side; and the removal of unnecessary doors and other, unspecified elements on the Worth Street frontage, and

WHEREAS: The central tenet of this proposal, namely, a so-called “open plan” for the placement of louvers anywhere on the West Broadway, Worth and Thomas Streets façades means that 60 Hudson Street’s operators would be able to install as many louvers for air circulation and other devices as desired, with the concomitant removal of windows, thereby annihilating the last traces of life emanating from the building. Despite the fig leaf of “fading” the louvers to match tenant shades, this cynical proposal is ineffably opposed by Community Board #1. One of the intentions of requiring a new master plan was to correct the problems created by the previous master plan, which enabled the installation of too many louvers and generators, leading in turn to the mess that exists at the building presently. The building management’s controversial but potentially ameliorative idea to centralize building cooling by placing a cooling tower on the roof does not appear in this application, and

WHEREAS: Another core proposal is to add as much exterior mechanical equipment on 60 Hudson Street’s many setbacks – already bulging with huge pieces of hardware -- as can be squeezed onto them, in effect expanding the building’s dimensions. Many neighborhood residents consider what is already in place as visual blight, and uncommonly noisy. Rather, existing equipment must be discarded, and the building’s contents must be contained within the building, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan will oppose vigorously the specific items above-mentioned, and otherwise urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission to hold over this application to allow further analysis and public discussion of this “master plan” after a thorough summary is received, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan strongly recommends that the overall aim of a new 60 Hudson Street “master plan” should be – in addition to restoration -- the removal of existing visible equipment on the building’s setbacks, and the reduction, not addition, of exterior pipes, vents, and louvers, even if that requires the further exploration of a central rooftop cooling tower.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 In Favor 1 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused (Text Amendment)

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused (Goldman Sachs building)

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 2 Recused

RE: Battery Park City – Site 26 Zoning Text Amendment & Goldman Sachs Proposed Development on Site 26

WHEREAS: Site 26 is located in northern Battery Park City and is bounded by Vesey St., Murray St., West St. and a pedestrian right-of-way. This site is just north of the World Financial Center and is currently occupied by a surface parking lot, and

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority is the applicant for these text amendments which would establish zoning for this site that had previously not been zoned and would place zoning on Site 26 that corresponds with an underlying C6-6 designation and would establish additional street wall and setback regulations, and

WHEREAS: The following amendments are sought:

- Extend the C zone currently situated to the west, across Site 26 in an easterly direction and establish two sub-zones (C-1 and C-2) within the C zone. C-1 would correspond to Site 25 (Embassy Suites & Cinema) and C-2 to Site 26
- Establish mandatory front building walls in sub-zone C-2 of not less than 60 feet and not more than 140 feet. An exception would be made for Murray Street where the front building wall may rise to the maximum height of 800 feet and the text would be amended to allow for no setbacks on Murray Street in sub-zone C-2
- Establishes a maximum height of 800 feet
- Permit 300 public parking spaces in sub-zone C-1 and C-2 combined
- Allow for the reduction in required loading berths by 50%
- Limit curb cuts in sub-zone C-2 to an aggregate of 60 feet
- Maps and plans in the Appendices would be modified to reflect the above text changes, and

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority seeks this text amendment based on their negotiations with Goldman Sachs, and

WHEREAS: Goldman Sachs desires to develop Site 26 as their headquarters and have retained Pei Cobb Freed as their architects. The building would be for their sole use and this site satisfies their needs for large floor plates supporting the high density of both sales and trading operations and allows Goldman Sachs to extend its commitment to Lower Manhattan where it has been located for over 130 years, and

WHEREAS: The northern side of Site 26 faces a neighborhood of residential buildings, Teardrop Park, schools and the BPC ballfields, with the right-of way between Sites 25 and 26 as the major pedestrian connection to the northern and southern sections of BPC, and

WHEREAS: While the Goldman Sachs building will bring over 8,000 employees and promote the mixed-use nature of our community, it will also add a 1.8 million gross square foot commercial building with extremely high security requirements and unlike most other commercial buildings in BPC will have very limited public amenities or access, and

WHEREAS: In an effort to spur the continued growth and well being of their Lower Manhattan community, Goldman Sachs has generously agreed to provide complete funding for the build-out of the Battery Park City New York Public Library branch to be built on site 16 along with a contribution of \$1 million for the community center to be built on Site 5C and operated by Manhattan Youth Recreation and Resources Inc., and

WHEREAS: The development of this building by Goldman Sachs provides an overall benefit to Lower Manhattan but presents genuine concerns and challenges for Battery Park City as a community. Examples, which must be addressed, include:

- Increase of black cars for Goldman employees
- Recognition and integration of a vibrant residential neighborhood to the north
- Increase in traffic flows on West Street, Vesey Street and Murray Street
- 800 foot building wall on Murray Street
- Storage of fuel for back-up power generation
- Construction staging and transportation/parking for contractors during that time
- Residents' & workers' use of the Vesey Street bridge, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the Battery Park City Authority application for a text amendment to the New York City Zoning Resolution, Section 84-30, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the development of Site 26 by Goldman Sachs based on Goldman's agreement to provide an amenity, as indicated above, that satisfies the community's needs in lieu of the original provisions of a 75,000 square foot amenity within Site 26, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1's approval requires that Goldman insure that no black cars lay over or idle in the residential neighborhood to the north and that Goldman implement an aggressive Black Car Management Plan with staging of cars off-street, use of Traffic Coordinators and Dispatchers on-site to execute the plan, and limited use of the West Street Lay-by for Black Cars. Additionally, the West Street Lay-by will have room for approximately 12 to 15 black cars, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 also requires adherence to the following conditions:

- Goldman Sachs present a construction plan to Community Board #1 covering how materials and workers will be transported and staged and how parking will be handled. We also request a mitigation plan to address the construction impacts on air quality and noise near our schools and ballfields by using low-sulphur diesel fuels and taking other appropriate measures.
- The 5,000 to 10,000 square feet of retail located in the new building and accessible via the right-of-way between Sites 25 and 26 be developed in a way that responds to residential needs. Several community groups, supported by survey data, can assist Goldman with this plan.
- While we are pleased with the prospect of 80 feet of public accessible open space on the western side of the building, Goldman must make every effort to keep the Bikeway/Walkway open during construction and afterwards.
- Provide that the pedestrian walkway between Sites 25 and 26 be accessible and maintained for residents and workers alike.
- Goldman Sachs will adhere to the "Leed Gold" guidelines established by the Federal Government in the development of this building and provide the community with a safety plan for the storage of fuel for power generation.
- Goldman will not create any more than 15 indoor parking spaces.
- Goldman will make every effort to allow some community use of their conference center subject to final design and their security requirements.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: WORLD TRADE CENTER MEMORIAL AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FINAL
GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WHEREAS: CB#1 strongly supports the redevelopment of the World Trade Center site and the creation of a World Trade Center Memorial, and

WHEREAS: The WTC site (Project Site) redevelopment project (Proposed Action) and other concurrent construction projects in Lower Manhattan will have a significant impact on residents, workers, visitors and businesses in the area, and

WHEREAS: Because the Proposed Action is the driving force for the economic revitalization of Lower Manhattan and the catalyst for development in areas beyond the boundaries of the WTC redevelopment site, a thorough assessment of the aggregate impact of all planned or anticipated construction in Lower Manhattan, including the construction of the new PATH station, the new Fulton Transit Center, the Second Avenue Subway line, the reconstruction of Route 9A, the proposed Goldman Sachs headquarters building on Site 26, the demolition of the Deutsche Bank building located at 130 Liberty Street and the reconstruction or replacement of Fiterman Hall, should be included as part of the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS), and

WHEREAS: The FGEIS does not adequately address or does not address at all many of the comments submitted by CB#1 in response to the DGEIS, which reflect significant issues facing the Lower Manhattan community, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 reiterates its concerns and its belief that these issues must be addressed by the LMDC, including:

- *Cumulative Impact.* The FGEIS does not adequately address or does not address at all the cumulative effects of the various redevelopment and reconstruction projects planned for Lower Manhattan, which are triggered by and will have a significant effect on the Proposed Action as well as surrounding neighborhoods. These include, the construction of the new PATH station, the new Fulton Transit Center, the Second Avenue Subway line, the reconstruction of Route 9A, the demolition of the Deutsche Bank building located at 130 Liberty Street, the Battery

Park City Goldman Sachs building the development of Sites 5B and 5C, the NYU Hospital Parking Lot Development, and the reconstruction or replacement of Fiterman Hall. For example, the FGEIS states that with respect to the proposed reconstruction of Route 9A, the LMDC will simply forward all comments on that project to NYSDOT. This is an inadequate response. At a minimum, we would expect the LMDC to address these issues, including the effects of the Proposed Action and other planned or anticipated construction projects in the area, in a coordinated Environmental Impact Study. A coordinated approach is essential to ensure adequate mitigation of construction and other short-term effects as well as the long-term effects of the Proposed Action and other planned or anticipated redevelopment projects in Lower Manhattan.

- *Lower Manhattan Construction Coordination Group.* The precise legal structure and enforcement powers of the Lower Manhattan Construction Coordination Group are unclear at this time and require clarification. Just as importantly, this group must include a full-time paid position as well as volunteer representatives of the community that will be directly affected, including participants from CB#1, downtown residents, community groups, and neighborhood businesses.
- *Community Facilities.* The increase of office space that will result from the Proposed Action will attract workers who will use community facilities in Lower Manhattan. For example, many workers will enroll their children in already overcrowded Lower Manhattan schools, many of which accept applicants who reside outside of the local community on the same basis as local residents while other schools in our area have historically admitted many commuter students through the standard variance process. The expected influx of additional students in schools from the Proposed Action will have a cascading effect on the other facilities that serve children, such as playgrounds, libraries, after school programs, as these facilities serve not only local resident children, but also the children who attend school in the area.
- *NYPD and FDNY.* The FGEIS indicates that the responsibility to ensure that the Project Site is adequately protected is the responsibility of the Port Authority police and the NYPD. Given the estimated 9 million annual visitors expected to the site as well as the unique significance of the site as a possible terrorist target, the potential threats and need for additional fire and police services will extend beyond the borders of the Project Site. NYPD and FDNY need to ensure that the area surrounding the Project Site will be adequately serviced.
- *Traffic.* The Proposed Action will result in unprecedented traffic volume and will present complex traffic flow issues, calling for careful planning and a dynamic mitigation strategy. Adverse effects of poor planning or inadequate mitigation measures will be

felt far outside the boundaries of the Project Site and well into the neighboring residential communities surrounding the Site. Of particular concern, the FGEIS contemplates the rerouting of traffic away from Route 9A but does not adequately address the impact of increased traffic on North/South arteries including Greenwich and West Broadway. It also contemplates reversing traffic flows on certain streets without adequately addressing the impact of such reversals on the flow of traffic on adjacent streets. In the absence of a coordinated environmental impact study of the entire area that will be affected by the Proposed Action and other planned or contemplated projects in Lower Manhattan, including the reconstruction of Route 9A, the FGEIS does not adequately address the effects of the traffic volume and traffic flow that will be induced by the Proposed Action.

- *Bus Depot.* The number of tour buses in Lower Manhattan will increase significantly once the Project Site and the Memorial are built. Planning must be done now to ensure that the impact these buses will have on the downtown community is minimal. The FGEIS does not adequately address the impact of bus traffic to, from, and through the Project Site. The FGEIS underestimates the number of tour buses that will be coming to the site and does not identify an enforceable plan for drop-offs, pick-ups and storage. Specifically, we would like to see further analysis of how the LMDC will implement its plan to have buses drop off and pick up passengers on Greenwich Street and route them into and out of the bus depot entrance on Liberty Street. We are further concerned that at peak times, the queue for the underground facilities could be backed up so severely that it would impact traffic patterns in the streets in and around the Project Site. The FGEIS should include a thorough analysis of these peak times that could create extreme conditions. Construction and improvements scheduled for Route 9A will also displace dozens of commuter buses which have for years laid over along this stretch. These and other buses need new and permanent places to go. The LMDC should work with CB#1 and other stakeholders to address issues relating to the location, construction and operation of a bus depot.
- *Open Space.* We remain troubled by the fact that open space calculations include sidewalks and other streetscape elements and believe that there is an inadequate amount of open space, given the huge number of visitors expected. In view of the extremely high density of commercial and retail building contemplated by the Proposed Action (particularly in view of recent reports that the actual size of the WTC is less than 16 acres), it is imperative that the limited open space available (including the 2.87 acres of Memorial “open space”) be designed and programmed to maximize the accessibility and usability and to facilitate pedestrian flows through and around the entire site. Additionally, CB#1 believes an alternative must be found to the wall along West Street that is part of the current design, which ideally should include a landscaped area.

- *Retail.* The FGEIS contemplates that half of the retail at the Project Site (approximately 200,000-300,000 square feet) will be located below grade. CB#1 urges the LMDC to relocate the maximum amount of retail space at or above grade to create active, vibrant street level retail and that street level retail development be phased in as early as possible in the redevelopment process.
- *Air Quality.* The FGEIS concludes that the Proposed Action “would have significant traffic impacts in both 2009 and 2015 ” but “is not predicted to cause any significant adverse air quality impacts in either 2009 or 2015. ” These statements are inconsistent and the FGEIS should address this inconsistency. The FGEIS also indicates that the highest impact assessment for Peak Total PM10 Emissions by Month “were usually from locations immediately adjacent to the construction on site boundary of the Proposed Action” and that “some of those results were predicted at residential locations immediately adjacent to the site.” On-going air monitoring around the Proposed Site (including not only on Church Street but also along the North and South sides of the Proposed Site) and the Fulton Street Transportation Station are essential to insure that proper steps can be taken to minimize mobile and stationary sources during the decade of ongoing construction, including the use of available mitigation measures such as electrification, advanced reduction technologies and newer engines. Air quality data should be posted on a website and frequently updated. The Lower Manhattan Construction Coordination Group should also take effective steps to ensure enforcement of laws to reduce air pollution such as the existing idling law, and

BE IT
 FURTHER
 RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 reaffirms and restates in its entirety its unanimous resolution dated February 17, 2004, and

BE IT
 FURTHER
 RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 requests that the LMDC and the Port Authority provide regular updates and submit for review and comment specific designs and proposals for mitigating potential adverse effects of the Proposed Action, including pollution controls, street closures and traffic management plans, quality of life issues, security barrier installations and all other design and construction elements that will affect the residents, workers, businesses and visitors to Lower Manhattan.