

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SOCIAL SERVICES**

BOARD VOTE:                    21 In Favor                    0 Opposed                    0 Abstained

RE:        **Proposed Criteria for the Location of City Facilities**

WHEREAS:        The Mayor and the City Planning Commission have proposed **Criteria for the Location of City Facilities** as required by Section 203, of the new **City Charter**, and

WHEREAS:        According to the Charter, the purpose of the criteria is to further the fair distribution among communities of the burdens and benefits associated with City facilities, and

WHEREAS:        The "fair share" criteria apply to siting decisions for facilities controlled by Mayoral agencies, whether the facility is owned or operated by the City or operated by an organization on the City's behalf through contract, and

WHEREAS:        The criteria incorporate several considerations including need for services, their cost, effective delivery of services, the fairness of their geographic distribution, and the impacts on surrounding communities, and

WHEREAS:        The proposal applies differing criteria to four categories: local and neighborhood facilities, where service is aimed primarily at one community; regional and citywide facilities, which serve a broader area than one community or service district; administrative offices and data processing facilities; and facility closings, and

WHEREAS:        Nonetheless, Community Board #1 is concerned that establishment of needed, albeit controversial, facilities: shelters for the homeless, congregate housing for persons with AIDS, corrections facilities, waste disposal and resource recovery plants, etc. not be unduly constrained or delayed by unjustified community opposition and regulations which might provide opportunities for litigation obstructing the placement of facilities, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:                    Community Board #1 endorses the Manhattan Borough President's draft response (September 8, 1990) to the proposed "fair share" criteria, as

summarized below:

1. Expanding the Definition of City Facility

- a. expanded and clarified to ensure that agencies will not contest "fair share" coverage of their plans and programs, and providing specific examples of types of facilities that are expected to be covered
- b. the "fairness" mandate itself should be called into play as a siting criterion any time the City plays a significant role in the ability of the facility to operate; it should also be triggered in any case where the City is otherwise required to approve the facility, e.g., granting a license, a zoning variance, etc.
- c. the definition of facility should be even more expansive for purposes of measuring existing levels of impact and concentration. Privately-run facilities, as well as state or federal ones, should be explicitly considered in evaluating the appropriateness of the siting of new City facilities.

2. Defining Significance

- a. there should be specific expansion/reduction levels for each general type of facility, based on the level of impacts that such a change would be likely to produce.
- b. two decreases in service within a three-year period that total more than a 15% reduction in capacity should be considered a "significant" reduction.

3. Amending the Definition of Expansion

- a. A facility which undergoes a major programmatic change, "retrofit", that adds a substantial number of years to its life, or which brings it into compliance with new laws or regulations, should be treated as a facility expansion for the purpose of the "fair share" criteria.

4. Specifying Cost Criteria

- a. Cost criteria for a facility should include a detailed analysis not only of initial land acquisition and capital costs for the site and any potential alternatives but also of projected differentials in long-term operating expenses at such alternative locations.
- b. The fair share rules should mandate a comparative analysis of the relative advantages of leasing, in lieu of acquisition and City

ownership.

5. Requiring Consistency and Fuller Consideration

- a. The rules should mandate that each agency sponsoring a proposed facility - whether local, regional or citywide - ensure that the site is fully consistent with any plans that have been made their way through the 197-a approval process. To the degree that approval is later sought for a site plan that departs from a plan approved by the City, the sponsoring agency should have to meet a very high threshold to justify the selection of such a site. In the event a community has identified an actual site for a local or regional facility, the agency should be required to give additional weight to this recommendation and justify any variance from the community's suggestion. In any case where the agency believes it must select a site that is not consistent with such plans, the agency should be required to supply written documentation explaining the rationale for the discrepancy.

6. Effective Consensus Building

- a. The consensus building process should have the authority to review the questions of need for a proposed facility, and of alternatives to or changes in a proposed facility's program, as well as a facility's location.

7. Enforcing Agency Facility Agreements

- a. Regular representation by the sponsoring agency of City facilities at more frequent committee meetings than the proposed minimum of once a year is essential, and the monitoring committee mechanism should be expanded to include "local facilities".
- b. The City Planning Commission should be required to issue a restrictive declaration or some other legally enforceable mechanism precluding the use of sites proposed as "temporary" for longer than two years without additional public review.

8. Assessing Cumulative Impact

- a. A true cumulative impact analysis must require an analysis of existing facilities that affect not only the adjacent residential areas, but all areas reasonably thought to be affected by the proposed facility's impacts.

9. Establishing Citywide Thresholds

1. Precise thresholds for designating community districts that have a high concentration of residential care, treatment and detention facilities must be established and need also to be made apply to non-residential citywide facilities such as transportation and waste management facilities, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends that the "fair share" criteria clearly state that there is a presumption in favor of the equitable distribution of the burdens of city facilities among all communities and that the burden of proof is imposed on any community to argue that there are overwhelming reasons of environmental impact or neighborhood saturation which would mitigate against a community bearing its share of citywide burdens.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	4 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	17 In Favor	7 Opposed	7 Abstained

**RE: At-grade crossing at Chambers and West Street**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has expressed its strong desire to develop a safe at-grade crossing at Chambers and West Street to accommodate the increasing number of pedestrians who will need to cross this busy intersection, and

WHEREAS: Insuring the safety of pedestrians who need to cross West Street is of paramount concern to the Community Board, and

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority, in an effort to address the Community Board's concerns regarding the proposed Stuyvesant High School pedestrian bridge, has employed traffic engineers from Vollmer Associates to design a safe at-grade crossing at this location, and

WHEREAS: A group of Community Board members along with representatives from the Battery Park City Authority, Vollmer Associates, the Manhattan Borough President's Office, Stuyvesant Coalition and the Board of Education have held a series of meetings in recent months in order to develop a mutually agreeable scheme for the at-grade crossing, and

WHEREAS: This group has brought forth two potential crossing plans to recommend to the Department of Transportation for implementation, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1, while not completely satisfied with either plan A or B, recommends that the Department of Transportation fully study plan B except that it include only a single left turn lane from West Street onto Chambers Street, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Department of Transportation meet with the Community Board following its review to discuss its finding and to receive additional recommendations from the Board prior to the implementation of any of at-grade crossing plan,

and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends that the Department of Transportation provide additional left turn lanes along southbound West St. to divert some eastbound traffic off Chambers St.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRANSPORTATION AND UNIFORMED SERVICES**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	16 In Favor	3 Opposed	0 Abstained

**RE: Two-way Traffic on N. Moore, Harrison and Hubert Streets**

WHEREAS: The Department of Transportation is now recommending that N. Moore Street, Harrison Street and Hubert Street between West and Greenwich Street be turned into two-way streets, and

WHEREAS: Hubert Street is felt to be insufficiently wide and contains too much commercial activity to allow for two-way traffic, and

WHEREAS: The IPN Tenants Association has expressed strong opposition to instituting two-way traffic on N. Moore St. due to safety considerations, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that Harrison Street between West and Greenwich Street be converted to a two-way street but that it only be done simultaneously with the installation of a traffic signal at this location, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends against converting Hubert Street and N. Moore St. to two-way streets.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	17 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Homeless PWA's** by Gran Fury

WHEREAS: Gran Fury's street sign project is planned to be part of Alternative Museum's annual "Dia De Los Muertos" (Day of the Dead) exhibition, this year commemorating those who have died due to conditions of homelessness, including persons with AIDS, and

WHEREAS: The collective proposes to install street signs mounted on street light poles, 2 each at 3 sites bounded by West Broadway, N. Moore Street, Church Street and Franklin Street and specifically from among proposed sites (subject to DOT authorization) at:

- Walker Street and Church Street
- Church Street and Franklin Street
- White Street and Church Street
- Walker Street and West Broadway
- N. Moore Street and West Broadway
- Franklin Street and West Broadway, and

WHEREAS: While it is not the policy of Community Board #1 to approve an art installation that has already been exhibited in the City, and particularly in Manhattan, Gran Fury's installation is supported as it is part of an exhibition that has been curated by a reputable local arts organization, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the NYC Department of Transportation approve the temporary installation (11/2/90-12/15/90) of **Homeless PWA's** by Gran Fury.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE**

BOARD VOTE:            30 In Favor            0 Opposed            0 Abstained

RE:     **Capital and Expense Budget Requests for FY 1992**

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:            Community Board #1 approves the budget requests for our district as prioritized on the attached hand-out.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	4 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	12 Opposed	1 Abstained

**RE: Grand Prix Auto Race**

WHEREAS: The NYC Sports Commission has requested the support of Community Board #1 to establish a new annual grand prix auto race known as the "New York 200", and

WHEREAS: The proposed race would traverse a course consisting of the four blocks around the World Trade Center complex (Liberty Street, Church Street, Vesey Street, West Street) as well as West Street from Chambers Street to Liberty Street, and

WHEREAS: The race will result in the closing of these streets for a three day period (Friday through Sunday) in mid-July, and

WHEREAS: The sponsor of the event, the International Management Group (IMG), has safely run similar events in other cities and will install temporary pedestrian bridges and safety apparatus to insure that people traveling to the World Trade Center and Battery Park City will be able to reach their destinations, and

WHEREAS: The proposed route will not directly impact any residential sections of our district, and

WHEREAS: The Sports Commission has agreed to fully include the Community Board in developing the detailed traffic and safety provisions to be employed during the race, and

WHEREAS: The auto race is projected by the Sports Commission to benefit the City by attracting over \$56 million in total direct and indirect spending, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board #1 district will also benefit due to an annual contribution by IMG of \$350,000 to be used by the Community Board for projects intended to address the needs of our local citizens, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 endorses, on a one year trial basis, the running of the

"New York 200" auto race on the course set forth by the NYC Sports Commission provided that:

1. The \$350,000 contribution to the community include a minimum of \$250,000 in cash with the balance to consist of in-kind contributions at wholesale value (projected to consist of athletic equipment) whose cash value will be documented
2. The cash earmarked for the Community Board be placed into a special Community Board #1 account prior to the race
3. The Executive Committee of Community Board #1, with the approval of the full Board, will be fully empowered to determine the community projects to be funded
4. IMG provide funds to hire (in addition to the \$350,000 cited above) an independent safety consultant to represent the interests of the Community Board in planning this event
5. The needs of residents and businesses impacted by the race will be addressed by the sponsors so that access into and out of all buildings and areas will be maintained

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Community Board #1 reserves the right to reconsider its support of this event each year and to re-negotiate the terms of this agreement as necessary.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	19 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

**RE: Cobblestones on Franklin Street**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has strongly endorsed the proposed creation of a Tribeca Historic District, and

WHEREAS: Franklin St., between Broadway and Church St., is within one of the historic districts calendared by the LPC, and

WHEREAS: The Department of Transportation also has a policy of preserving existing cobblestone streets wherever possible, and

WHEREAS: Due to a snafu, the DOT began removing the cobblestones and raising the manhole covers on Franklin Street between Broadway and Church St. and only stopped after receiving complaints from CB #1 and local residents, and

WHEREAS: An agreement has been reached with DOT to restore the cobblestones and lower the manhole covers on Franklin St., and

WHEREAS: The current condition of Franklin St. is of great concern to local businesses, residents and to CB #1, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly supports the policy of maintaining cobblestone streets wherever it is feasible and particularly in existing or proposed historic districts, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 commends DOT for agreeing to restore Franklin St. and urges that all repairs be completed as soon as possible and certainly no later than Nov. 15, 1990.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CIVIC CENTER**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

**RE: 29-33 Peck Slip**

**WHEREAS:** LPC granted in 1989 a Certificate of Appropriateness to the prior owner which allows for a two story addition with setbacks, and

**WHEREAS:** The current owner is requesting approval to:

- modify storefront doors for egress purposes
- eliminate non-historical fire escapes
- replace windows
- repaint, clean and repair building façade
- add 9 1/2 feet in height to accommodate elevator and stair bulkhead
- enlarge interior courtyard to increase light and air
- reallocate 100 square feet of bulk on the 7th floor, now

**THEREFORE**

**BE IT**

**RESOLVED**

**THAT:** CB #1 approves the plans put forth by the new owners of 29-33 Peck Slip to modify the existing Certificate of Appropriateness in order to convert the building to a hotel and restaurant.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT AND ENVIRONMENT**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

**RE: Westside Waterfront Panel**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has been presented with the overall plans for the Westside Waterfront Panel and in general we are pleased with the results of the panel recommendations, especially the concept of the walkway and bicycle path, public piers and the continuous esplanade and open areas for active and passive recreation, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the following:

That there should be an extension of the interim bikeway and walkway now planned for the Village area to include the Board #1 area to Battery Park City, and

During the construction period, there should be safe at-grade, level crosswalks provided so that the residential and business communities are able to cross the Westside highway or route 9A to make use of any interim uses of the Piers or other waterfront activities, and

We re-iterate our support of an ecological park for the Board #1 area from the northern edge of BPCA up to the northern edge of the CB #1 area, we would also like to see this park extended to Pier 40, depending on the support of CB #2, and

We continue to support a 100% pay back waiver and a scenic easement application by the WSWP which includes 100% of the area, and

We do not believe that residential units should be built on Pier 40, and we support the concept of an open-air park for Pier 40, so that there are some wide open spaces provided along the waterfront to allow for the playing of team sports. Such as softball, football, and other such sports, such areas are completely absent from the west side and this may be our only chance to get them, and

Any facilities built along the westside waterfront must not only provide lots of public open space, but we would like to see that many of these facilities be affordable rather than be so expensive that most residents of the City cannot use them, and

Any facilities must be environmentally sound so that if there are any marinas or other boating facilities, they must have adequate sewage and waste collection methods, and

We endorse the concept of a successor agency, as either a not-for-profit entity or agency which must be subject to all local and State laws, including ULURP, and the Community Boards along the right-of-way must continue to have input on the uses of this area. Such input should include the right to review leases, subleases and any other plans for this area, and we also support the proposal to provide funding to pay for consultants who would represent the affected Community Board, and

Finally, we support the eventual extension of the westside esplanade north to meet Riverside Park.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

OCTOBER 9, 1990

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT AND ENVIRONMENT**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	0 Opposed	2 Abstained

RE: **Pier 25**

WHEREAS: The State DOT desires to lease Pier 25 for a period of two years, and

WHEREAS: A presentation was made to the Community Board for this use, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 takes no position on the proposed use because many of the possible usages are still too indefinite, but makes the following recommendations:

The use must maximize the amount of public space, and

Parking of cars must be minimized and should only include those vehicles which are necessary for the service of the facility, and there should be no parking for customers/diners

If the lessor of the pier decides to rent out to either row, sailing or small motor boats, the facility must be as ecologically safe as possible, and

There should be no dumping of any type of sewage into the river and a pump house station must be provided for all boats, both those rented and those allowed to tie up to prevent the dumping of any sewage, and

No structures should be built which are so high that they intrude into the sightlines and block the view of the river from the community, and

Space must be provided for the small boating club, currently on Pier 26 and which the Community Board has previously supported, and

Space must also be provided for the "Tug" and the "Yankee", currently docked at Pier 25, and

Any music played in the proposed restaurant must not be too loud or disruptive

of the nearby residential community, however, no shell should be constructed since that would be too high, and

If the lessor subleases to any type of facility other than that presented to us in either size or usage, the Community Board must be given a chance to comment on that usage, and

Finally, there must be no usage which would in any way destroy our chances to get grants and funding of the ecological reserve park which this Community Board has already said it favors for this area.