

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CITY SERVICES

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: Verrazano Bridge, One-Way Toll

WHEREAS: Verrazano Bridge was planned and built to provide relief to Downtown Manhattan by diverting traffic away from this part of the City through Queens and Brooklyn on existing roadways and away from the local streets of Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: The Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority's (TBTA) preliminary "Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement" (DSEIS) - July 1992, demonstrates dramatically that Lower Manhattan has become more congested and more polluted, and that the Metropolitan Transit Authority loses \$7.8 million annually in revenues as the result of the now six-year-long one-way toll collection system at the Verrazano Bridge, and

WHEREAS: Conversely, the preliminary DSEIS shows unequivocally that a return to two-way toll collections would result in a net reduction of traffic along Canal St. and the Brooklyn - Queens Expressway (BQE), and

WHEREAS: The DSEIS fails to assess the physical - and resultant monetary - costs of the undermining of the infrastructure under and about these roadways due to their continued overuse (costs that by even the most conservative of estimates must be extraordinary), and

WHEREAS: Senator Alphonse D'Amato's successful effort - via an amendment to a transportation appropriations bill in the U.S. Congress - to extend through September 1993 the collection of tolls one-way, defies logic and circumvented local decision making, and

WHEREAS: It is likewise illogical and detrimental to Lower Manhattan for the TBTA to have raised from \$5.00 to \$6.00 the toll for the Verrazano Bridge crossing* because:

- the Authority currently has excess funds in the amount of \$440 million which are being split among the Metro North and Long Island Railroads and the Metropolitan Transit Authority, and
- the toll increase is certain to encourage even more motorists to use the Holland tunnel as an unacceptable alternative to the Verrazano Bridge, and

WHEREAS: The TBTA issued the DSEIS in July 1992, and at that time indicated that public hearings would be held in each of three affected boroughs in the fall, however, these hearings were never conducted, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1

1. Reiterates its demand for the immediate reinstatement of two-way toll collections at the Verrazano Bridge.
2. Calls upon the U.S. Congress to reject any maneuver designed to again extend the collection of tolls, one-way at the Bridge.
3. Calls upon the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority to immediately rescind the approved \$1.00 fare increase for Verrazano Bridge crossings.
4. Calls upon TBTA to immediately schedule and hold public hearings on the "Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement".
5. Urges all relevant public entities and elected officials to redouble their efforts to see the immediate return of two-way toll collections at the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge; and to explore measures which have apparently not yet been considered, such as prohibiting through (truck) traffic on Canal St.

*Increase approved by TBTA Board on 12/18/92; scheduled to take effect at midnight 1/31/93.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	32 In Favor	1 Opposed	4 Abstained

RE: Washington St., (Vesey St. to Barclay St.) Designation of as a Restricted Use Street (ULURP #C910578 MMM)

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the City Planning Commission approve the application by the NYC Economic Development Corporation for an amendment to the City Map which would designate Washington Street from Vesey Street to Barclay St. as a "Restricted Use Street".

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: 152 Franklin Street, application for Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A),
Docket #93-1358

WHEREAS: The drawings shown to CB #1 representing the proposed changes to this residential building appear to represent an appropriate conversion of its facade, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has committed to maintaining the continuity of the loading platform (bulkhead) with the buildings on either side, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the above referenced application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	11 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: CB #1 Comment on the Citywide Statement of Needs FYs 1994-95

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 endorses the following as its response to the Citywide Statement of Needs - FYs 1994-95:

I. Response to Proposed City Facilities:

1. **HRA - Replacement of the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) Central Office** (p. 32)

Although no specific location is identified, CB #1 supports (in concept) the siting of this office in CB #1. This office, primarily administrative, has traditionally been located near the Manhattan Family Court in the Civic Center.

2. **HRA - New Family Preservation Office** (p. 34)

Although no specific site is identified, CB #1 opposes (in concept) the siting of the office in the district. This proposed siting of a New Family Preservation Office fails to meet one of the HRA siting criteria specifically: "located near/within residential area". Further, the program description ("public purpose") states: "Sites will be developed based on the number of out-of-home placements in a community board". CB #1 arguably does not have sufficient numbers of such placements to warrant the siting of a Family Preservation Office within its boundaries.

3. **DEP - Seven Shaft Facilities for City Water Tunnel #3** (p. 44)

A. Shaft 30-B, 250 Water St.

CB #1 reiterates its strong support for the designation of 250 Water St. as the site for DEP water tunnel Shaft 30-B and its subsequent conversion into an urgently needed park for the east side of our district. DEP engineers have consistently identified 250 Water St., a vacant parking lot, as the preferred site and agency spokesman Ian Michaels has said that "It's empty land, and its great geology, nice solid rock rather than soft landfill. Using an

alternative site could easily cost an extra \$10 million". In spite of this, the City at the request of a Deputy Mayor, continues to unsuccessfully seek out alternative sites which promise to be more costly and which cannot be converted into the badly needed park for our community. The DEP budget is sufficient to obtain this site and build the park on it when completed. The City's tentative plans to support the conversion of nearby office buildings into residences would also be enhanced by this park. The City should, therefore, take immediate steps to obtain the 250 Water St. site for these vital municipal purposes.

Note: *Siting of Shaft 30-B at 250 Water St. was previously supported in CB #1 responses to SONs, FY 1992-93 and FY 93-94. Also refer to CB #1 Capital Budget request for FY '94.*

B. Shaft 29-B, 3-9 Hubert St. (S/E/C Collister St.)

The location of the proposed shaft appears to have shifted from that identified in the two prior SONs, i.e. "Hubert St., Hudson St. and Ericsson Pl., Holland Tunnel Exit". Despite the apparent change in location, CB #1 continues to support the siting. While there is some concern that during construction more Tribeca residents will be inconvenienced at the current site than at that previously identified, CB #1 believes that when construction is completed the fixtures remaining, a 5 ft. x 3 ft. hatchway and a 14 in. diameter air vent, will have minimal impact on the site itself and the surrounding neighborhood.

4. DOS - Three New Material Recovery Facilities (MRF) (p. 53)

CB #1 concurs with the recommendation of the Manhattan Borough President (letter to Emily Lloyd of 12/22/92) that 3 potential sites for MRFs in CB #1 be deleted from DOS's preliminary site listing, namely:

- o 22 Ericsson Place
- o 34 West Street
- o 17 Varick Street

As the Borough President stated in her letter: "In some cases, the proposed sites would seem to have undue impact on traffic, and in other cases the sites are already targeted and well-underway for other proposals". The building at 22 Ericsson Pl., for example, is now owned by and will soon become the new home of the New York Blood Center.

5. DOT - Replacement of Enforcement Command Facility (p. 59)

CB #1 supports the Enforcement Command's relocation from 80 Lafayette St. to 2 Lafayette St. only if off street parking for the Command's vehicles is guaranteed. Currently City agencies routinely leave city-owned vehicles -particularly disabled ones - parked on streets within CB #1 for periods up to several days. Because these vehicles are obviously not subject to the same ticketing and towing activities as privately owned vehicles, they remain on the streets. Their presence regularly prevents the DOS's cleaning of streets with mechanical brooms in these "designated" agency and metered street parking

areas.

6. **DGS - Four New Court Facilities** (p. 76)

CB #1 supports the renovation of 530,000 sq. ft. at 80 Centre St. to house the New Manhattan Supreme Court Criminal Term.

7. **PROB - Five Replacement Adult Supervision Facilities** (p. 90)

CB #1 supports the restructuring to consolidate investigative functions at 100 Centre St. and supervision of probationers at 346 Broadway. Here too, we insist that the Department of Probations utilize off-street parking facilities for its vehicles and not park them on our congested streets. (Refer to #5. **DOT - Replacement of Enforcement Command Facility**, above).

8. **LPC - Replacement of Office Headquarters** (p. 106)

CB #1 supports LPC's move to 100 Old Slip, the landmark Old NYPD 1st Pct. building.

9. **LAW - Two Replacement Field Offices for Family Court Division** (p. 108)

Although no specific site is identified, CB #1 supports (in concept) the siting of this office in the district. Siting criteria call for its location in "close proximity to the Family Court Building". This office, currently at 60 Lafayette St., has traditionally been located in the Civic Center.

II. Facilities Requested by CB #1:

1. **BOE - New Elementary School**

PS 234 moved to its newly constructed facility in September 1988. When planned it was expected to accommodate the elementary education needs of the growing population in Lower Manhattan well into the next century. This year, however, the school is already at capacity. The Tribeca community continues to grow, the opening of residential buildings in Battery Park City is ongoing; the population there is projected to reach 22,200 by the year 2009. Parents from the east side of our district as well as many workers also send their children to PS 234. Similarly our only other elementary school, the Early Childhood Center, is now at capacity.

Lower Manhattan, therefore, is already in need of a new elementary school, and with each succeeding year the demand increases. This need is uniformly recognized by the community, its leaders, local educators, parents, and Community School Board #2.

Interested parties have organized to identify space to lease for a school in the short term. There are millions of square feet of vacant space in Lower Manhattan. The long term goal is to realize construction of a free - standing school. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '94.)

2. **BOE - Intermediate School**

There is no intermediate school within Board #1. Upon graduation all CB #1 students are forced to commute to intermediate schools elsewhere in Community School District #2. Given CB #1's current very large population of pre-school and elementary school students, there will be a vastly increased demand for intermediate school seats in the near future. Accordingly, the construction of an intermediate school within Community Board #1 is critically needed. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '94, Tracking Code: 3019006A.)

3. **DOT - Construct Lower Manhattan Bus Distribution Facility**

The number of commuter and tour buses and commuter vans entering and parking in Lower Manhattan continues to grow tremendously, exacerbating already extremely serious pollution and congestion problems. The city pays very little attention to this problem and has not addressed the short and long term parking issues associated with these vehicles. According to a report, **Lower Manhattan Bus Distribution Facilities Study** published by NYC DOT in May 1988, 725 express buses enter Lower Manhattan daily. The study projects up to 925 buses by 1995 and 1165 by 2005. In addition, hundreds of tour buses enter the district every day. These buses already contribute significantly to traffic pollution and congestion and pose pedestrian hazards. Many of these buses currently lay over along West St. When the reconstruction of West St. (Route 9A) begins, this area will no longer be available for this purpose. The Community Board is heartened that the Department of City Planning and others involved in the "Plan for Lower Manhattan" have agreed to seriously consider this proposal. Meanwhile, Community Board #1 strongly endorses the conclusion of the DOT report which recommends creation of a passenger terminal with bus storage facilities at the current Battery Parking Garage site. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '94, Tracking Code: 3018803A.)

4. **Office of Homeless Facilities and Service Development (OHFSD) and/or HRA - Transitional Housing for Homeless Adults**

It has become immediately evident to CB #1, John Heuss House, drop-in-center for the homeless, and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) - the two major providers of services for the homeless in Lower Manhattan - that there is desperate need for a facility in CB #1 to provide transitional housing for homeless persons in the district. Representatives of large and small business groups in Downtown Manhattan have

likewise expressed early interest in the creation of a transitional housing facility.

CB #1 is interested in exploring possible sites within its boundaries. CB #1 is desirous of entering into preliminary discussions about the development of such a facility, under these conditions:

- That potential sites be identified jointly by CB #1 and OHFSD and/or HRA;
- That the facility would serve exclusively/primarily homeless persons referred by John Heuss House and the PANYNJ funded Volunteers of America Outreach Program at the World Trade Center, and other homeless known to reside in CB #1;
- That the facility would include the essential array of physical and mental health services, social services and job readiness and referral services;
- That the facility would be of appropriate, manageable size and scale for this community;
- This facility would be operated only by a not-for-profit organization.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	4 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Draft "Fair Share Working Group Report"

WHEREAS: The Department of City Planning is required to submit a report evaluating the effectiveness of the Fair Share Rules within 24 months of their adoption/enactment, and

WHEREAS: The Manhattan Borough Board's Land Use Committee established a Working Group to determine Manhattan community boards' experience with the rules to date, and

WHEREAS: The series of Working Group meetings was well attended and included participation by nearly all Manhattan community boards, elected officials, city agencies bound by the Fair Share Rules and non-profit organizations, i.e. potential contractors to operate "contract/private facilities", and

WHEREAS: The Fair Share Working Group Report addresses and makes recommendations on four main and broad-based areas of concern, namely:

- the siting and disclosure processes followed by sponsoring agencies in regard to facilities owned or leased by public agencies;
- the way in which publicly funded or contracted programs with private agencies are sited;
- the need for incentives to focus on the siting of what are typically considered more "desirable" facilities, as well as to prevent unfair closings or service reductions in facilities needed by the communities;
- the need to include more thorough consideration of other programmatic issues, such as the impact of size and service levels, in decisions on siting, and

WHEREAS: The draft report is intended to be a "consensus" document, i.e. issues identified, specific examples used and recommendations which are presented therein apply to several, if not all Manhattan community boards, and

WHEREAS: Specific concerns of a single board were intentionally left out of the report, however, boards with such concerns are encouraged to present them at the time of the two scheduled public hearings of the Borough Board's Land Use Committee, and

WHEREAS: It is the hope of the Fair Share Working Group that Manhattan community boards will vote up/down on the draft text as presented, i.e. without amending it, so that it can continue to be a "consensus" document, reflective of the experience of all or the majority of Manhattan boards, and

WHEREAS: Again, community boards are encouraged to identify and present at the public hearings issues and concerns specific to their board areas, and

WHEREAS: All issues raised and recommendations made at the time of the public hearings, whether common to all or several board or specific to even a single community board will be appended to the final "Fair Share Working Group Report", and the Report and the addendum will constitute the Manhattan Borough Board's submission to the Department of City Planning, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 endorses the Manhattan Borough Board's Land Use Committee's Fair Share Working Group Report, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 submits the following comments to be incorporated into/appended to the final "Fair Share Working Group Report" prior to its submission to the Department of City Planning:

I. Programmatic Issues and Siting:

- While the size and location of a proposed facility are important in evaluating the impact of a facility, so is the building design. Many new facilities are sited in existing buildings. How a facility - particularly a less desirable one - interfaces physically with a neighborhood should also be among criteria used in evaluating potential sites i.e., the width of the street, physical buffers; like street trees, buildings setbacks, etc. These all affect privacy and determine impact and compatibility with the neighborhood.

- The definition of what constitutes a "small" facility depends on that facility's context. The size of a facility should not be related to the overall community district size but examined on a block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood basis, as overall population density and distribution can vary greatly within districts.
- Revision of the criteria should include: cost effectiveness, not only of program but also cost effectiveness related to acquisition of site, and construction.

II. More Effective Fair Share Analysis

- Besides including hospitals, ambulatory care facilities and prison beds, "dormitory beds" should also be included in the "indices of city facilities".

III. Notifying Communities of the Closing of "Desirable Facilities"

- Besides the examples of city facilities listed, health centers should also be listed, as well as those service centers run by not-for-profits receiving public funds.

IV. Improvements in the Statement of Needs Process...

- Change word (or) to (and) in the following: "...publicly displayed signs... public services announcements in the media (and) the distribution of fliers..." All of these together can effectively best accomplish the goal of notification.