

Brad Hoylman, *Chair*  
Bo Riccobono, *First Vice Chair*  
Alison Greenberg, *Second Vice Chair*  
Bob Gormley, *District Manager*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*  
Susan Kent, *Secretary*  
Keen Berger, *Assistant Secretary*

## COMMUNITY BOARD No. 2, MANHATTAN

3 WASHINGTON SQUARE VILLAGE

NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

[www.cb2manhattan.org](http://www.cb2manhattan.org)

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: [info@cb2manhattan.org](mailto:info@cb2manhattan.org)

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

January 31, 2012

Alicia D. Hurley  
Vice President  
University Relations and Public Affairs  
New York University  
70 Washington Square South, 1207  
New York, NY 10012

### **Re: NYU Core Proposal**

Dear Alicia:

Attached please find a list of questions compiled by Community Board No. 2, Manhattan (CB 2), during our preliminary review of the ULURP application by NYU for the 2031 campus expansion plan.

We hope these questions can provide a framework for the conversations between the relevant CB 2 committees and NYU during our February public hearings on this project. You will notice that some of these questions have been asked before, including several months ago in the CB 2 response to NYU's Draft Scope of Work, but remain unanswered.

We ask that you be prepared to respond to each committee's questions at the respective meetings. We understand that this is a long list of questions, but the enormity and

complexity of the NYU 2031 Plan has generated many questions from the community and it is, of course, CB 2's responsibility to seek answers in order to respond appropriately to the proposal.

Sincerely,



Brad Hoylman  
Chair  
Community Board No. 2  
Manhattan

cc: Hon. Scott M. Stringer, Manhattan Borough President  
Hon. Margaret Chin, NYC Council Member  
Hon. Jerrold L. Nadler, Member, U.S. House of Representatives  
Hon. Thomas K. Duane, Member, NY State Senate  
Hon. Deborah J. Glick, Member, NY State Assembly  
Hon. Christine C. Quinn, NYC Council Speaker  
Hon. Daniel J. Squadron, Member, NY State Senate  
Ms. Hannah Fischer-Baum, NYC Dept. of City Planning  
Land Use Review Unit, NYC Dept. of City Planning

## **LAND USE & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT**

1. Please provide a detailed analysis of what each year from the beginning of construction through the end would look like, including a drawing for each year of what buildings would remain, what would be gone, how any ongoing construction will be phased and where the different elements such as playgrounds and open space would be.
2. How many square feet of built space would exist beneath each of the city-owned strips on both superblocks?
3. Why does the north block need to be included in the current plan?
4. Why does NYU need to create a six-block overlay if the worst case scenario is new retail in six buildings?
5. Would NYU considered an incremental approach? (e.g., would NYU consider withdrawing its 20-year plan in exchange for a smaller vision of building at the Zipper Building site with the public school site to be included in that structure and waiting to build at the Morton Williams site until it becomes as of right and putting off for now the discussion of the north block?)
6. The new zoning would allow existing non-conforming uses to expand, with the potential to drive out neighborhood stores in favor of destination retail that requires larger units. Did NYU evaluate the possible change in the character of local retail and its impact on the residential neighbors?
7. There is currently only one retail store on the perimeter of Washington Square Park, a coffee shop on the corner of East Forth and WSP East. The character of that store is determined by its isolation from a larger retail district and by structure that cannot be modified under the current zoning. If all the ground floors opposite the park is zoned for retail, is there a possibility that large stores could be developed, changing the character of the park?
8. Why can't NYU propose an overlay just for a small area where they expect to convert the uses?
9. What are the specific requirements to retain UAA designation? How many NYU teams require gym use, how long is each season, and how many hours per day are these courts required? If UAA designation is forfeit, can the University reapply when adequate facilities become available?
10. Please provide a shadow study taking all buildings and open spaces into account throughout the course of a day - a cumulative analysis over time is needed in addition to the studies of specific buildings.

## **TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION**

### Analysis Times

1. Community input, based on long-time familiarity with day-to-day traffic patterns and conditions, indicates that there is currently considerable vehicular activity in the study area during night-time/late night hours Thursday through Sunday and hours all through the weekend, which would be expected to increase with increased student, faculty, resident and visiting populations. Yet the only late-day analysis done was on weekdays at what is called the PM Peak Hours, from 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m., and the only weekend analysis was on a Saturday afternoon at midday.
  - a. In view of the frequency of current activities making use of motor vehicles on these days and times that are beyond the habitually assigned peak times, and the prospect that this vehicular activity at these other times will increase, why weren't these extended days and times of day studied?
  - b. Can analysis of these vehicular activities during night-time/late night hours Thursday through Sunday and all through the weekend be added for study in the Final EIS?
2. Concerning transit and pedestrians, similarly, study of subway station elements and pedestrian activities was limited to only the weekday AM, midday and PM peak hours, although current night-time/late night hours Thursday through Sunday and hours all through the weekend were identified by the community as times of heavy use.
  - a. Given the nature of increased student, residential and visiting populations expected to be active at these night-time/late night and weekend hours, both on transit and in pedestrian activities, can consideration be given to including these additional days and times for study in the Final EIS?
3. There are certain "peak" usage moments that the study needs to take into account, e.g., the volume and effects of foot traffic during class change or the exacerbation of vehicular and foot traffic at specific times of year, such as at the beginning and end of the school year, when significant numbers of students move in and out. Has any of this been looked at, and if not, can it be studied in the Final EIS?

### Parking

1. The current 670-space below-grade parking garage (that includes public parking) is proposed to be replaced by a 389-space below-grade accessory parking facility, resulting in a loss of roughly 110 to 135 parking spaces to accommodate the public. NYU indicates there are 21 public parking facilities in the area with nearly 3,000 parking spaces. However, some of these facilities will be gone by 2031 (146-150 Wooster and NW corner of Lafayette & Bond are two sites planned for new buildings), while others will no doubt join them along the way. Can NYU study this situation in more depth and give a more detailed and realistic assessment of what (and how many) parking facilities are expected to be available with how many spaces?

2. Please describe the new access and egress patterns for the proposed new underground accessory parking garage. With proposed access only from W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (whereas currently it is from both W. 3<sup>rd</sup> and Bleecker Streets), wouldn't this add more traffic and congestion to W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street?
3. A resident conducted an informal survey in the area of the Super Blocks of the number of free day on-street parking spaces on Mercer, West 3<sup>rd</sup> and Bleecker Streets and the number of metered day parking spaces on LaGuardia Place and found there are close to 200 of these spaces at present. The survey didn't include overnight spaces (which include additional spots). This day parking for community residents, NYU faculty, staff, and students, and visitors or those who have business in the area will be adversely affected by closing of traffic lanes, establishment of construction staging areas, sidewalk sheds, delivery of construction equipment and materials, and construction dumpsters.
  - a. Can NYU assess how much of this on-street parking would be lost during construction and then, permanently and identify where this would happen?
  - b. What impact would the loss of on-street parking and resulting cruising and circling for spaces have on pedestrian safety and access, traffic congestion and emissions?
  - c. What does the University plan to do to mitigate the effects of this loss to the community?

#### Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Traffic

1. Why is Bleecker Street considered adequate to handle project-generated traffic when it is narrow (only one traffic lane) and overwhelmed now? The suggested mitigations at Bleecker & Mercer ("eliminate 4-5 alternate side parking spaces on the south side of Bleecker St. on the EB approach, install No Standing Anytime sign approx. 100 ft. from the intersection, paint transitional striping on the pavement") (thereby widening the moving lane in this area from 11 ft. to effectively 16 ft.) will only invite more traffic on an already overburdened corridor, facilitate speeding (and further reduce safety) on a vulnerable residential block, and take away from the character of this residential environment. Where would the removed parking be alternatively provided?
  - a. Shouldn't, instead, efforts be made to alleviate current conditions that would further be exacerbated by the proposed actions, and approaches be explored (e.g., re-routing the many oversize tour buses currently using this street) as a way to mitigate those proposed actions by establishing a foundation that lessens already- intense traffic impacts?
2. Similarly, how can Mercer Street, an even more narrow one-lane corridor, accommodate additional vehicular traffic, especially with anticipated Zipper Building loading docks, a hotel entrance, a mega-grocery and a student dorm, all also adding substantial new vehicular, bicycle and foot traffic?
3. Where would loading and unloading zones (and for what?) and garbage pickup facilities be located? How would they be accessed, e.g. how would 40-ft. trailers and

delivery trucks move in and out of the area? What would be their route(s)? How would their activities be managed?

4. What arrangements have been made with the FDNY, NYPD and other emergency service entities to provide emergency vehicle access and ensure adequate emergency response time?
5. What access and accommodation would be provided for visiting sports team buses and what measures would be taken to minimize their impact on congestion, cruising, street safety and air quality? Where would buses for the proposed public school go and how would they impact traffic?
6. The DEIS claims that current traffic conditions at the analyzed intersections are Level Of Service D for the most part, which it describes as "acceptable" and "satisfactory." Since LOS D is usually considered much less than desirable, how was the conclusion reached that LOS D is "satisfactory?" If conditions for the most part are LOS D at present, what hope is there for future traffic conditions with the proposed project?
7. What exactly would restriping the second moving lane from the median on the westbound approach from 14 ft. to 13 ft. and restriping the third moving lane from the median on the westbound approach from 11 ft. to 12 ft. on W. Houston St. & 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. do to improve vehicular conditions there?
8. What mechanisms would be put in place to accurately and continuously monitor changes to foot traffic and road traffic now, and through 2031?
9. Since there is no guarantee offered that foot and road traffic would not worsen and no absolute commitment to remediate "worst case" expectations should known mitigation approaches be infeasible, could there be a continuous mode of surveillance that allows for quick mitigational responses to changing situations at different times, especially during construction?

#### Transit

1. Has consideration been given to reopening any entrances have been closed previously at all the subway stations in the study area (as is being considered at the Cable Building location) as well as to restoring token booths and on-site service personnel to help mitigate the adverse impacts that are anticipated?
2. The DEIS states that potential mitigation measures for transit impacts will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS. Please describe these potential measures and explain what they would do.
  - a. The DEIS also states that other subway system elements will be explored in the FEIS. What elements would these be?
3. It is also stated that proposed mitigation measures will be explored and implementation coordinated with MTA/NYCT. Since these have yet to be looked at, when would the

results of these explorations and discussions be available to present to the community?  
Can the community/CB2 be apprised of such decisions on an ongoing basis?

4. Has consideration been given to the new MTA interconnected "super-station" at Broadway/Houston/Lafayette/Bleecker and what its potential for both positive and negative impacts might be? If not, please do so.
5. The DEIS states that there is a possibility that subway station mitigation measures may be infeasible. If so, the impacts would be unmitigated. Could mechanisms be put in place for observing conditions as the project progresses and to address them immediately with incremental adjustments before these transit impacts (e.g. during construction) get out of hand?

## **ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH & PUBLIC SAFETY**

1. NYU current enrollment is 55,000. Concerns include:
  - a. What is the projected enrollment after each phase of construction? How many additional classroom seats will there be? How many faculty-housing units will be constructed? How many hotel rooms? There is a lack of clarity and details on what the population impact will be; we need more specific numbers.
2. Noise mitigation efforts include barriers, caulking, storm windows, new A/C units and interior covers, however there were multiple concerns that these will not be enough protection against dust and pollutants and in some cases no mitigation will be done. What specific materials will be provided and to whom?
  - a. Barriers merely redirect noise. Where will noise barriers send the sound? Noise is not just a matter of decibels but must also take into consideration magnitude and duration. How is this factored into the DEIS?
3. Two nursery schools are located on the super blocks. There have been no specifics addressed regarding these schools. How does NYU intend to deal with the specific hazards and issues that will be raised for these children through the ongoing construction? The point was repeatedly made that community children will spend their entire childhoods and adolescence in a construction site, can NYU provide the board with a peer-reviewed study on how children in urban areas are affected by construction?
4. How many of NYU's expansion staff and contractors live in the community that will be affected for 20 years?
5. Under what conditions would construction crews have to resort to blasting?
6. Does pedestrian assessment include elderly, disabled, strollers, children? There is general disbelief that there will be no impact during process and minimal enduring impact.

7. Asbestos and other airborne pollutants are a significant concern, please explain in layman's terms how the construction crews will handle these hazards.
8. Exactly why can't this expansion take place in the financial district area where the community would be pleased to welcome the University and are offering financial incentives?
9. How will NYU enforce or control mitigations? Answer: mitigations will be contained in restrictive declaration. Since NYU has a history of vacating and voiding their previous restrictive declarations, how can community rely on NYU? There were multiple concerns regarding NYU history of not being honest with community and not supplying answers re pollutants - e.g. pollutants from chemistry building and recent oil spill.
10. Can the construction schedule be modified to minimize inconvenience and construction impacts to community? Currently the plans include spreading out the construction over a large period of time, what possibilities are there to compress the timeframe by building concurrently instead of spreading the building phases out? In particular: Phase II Mercer Building has construction schedule of 7 years.
11. Concerns and questions about underground water include:
  - a. What will be the impacts of constructing deep bathtubs within the water table and where will the displaced water go?
  - b. Is NYU working from updated maps regarding the location of underground water including underground springs, tributaries, etc.?
  - c. What guarantees can NYU provide that water will not be shifted or redirected and cause damage to surrounding foundations?
  - d. Does NYU intend to de-water?
  - e. What will be the impact on surrounding structures?
12. Multiple concerns regarding the existing gardens including both the corner garden and the Sasaki Garden such as: Why can't NYU design a building with a smaller profile or push the building envelope to the east so not to destroy the corner garden? Questions were also raised regarding the staging of the Bleecker LaGuardia building so the choice of staging will not impact the garden.
13. What assurances do we have that the proposed attenuation methods will be effective?
14. How can NYU assume that the noise of the activities of 20,000 additional people in the area will not be significant?
15. As student hours vary greatly from those of families or mature, working people, how will NYU control nighttime noise from such a large increase in students?
16. Emissions from retail operations vary greatly. Will NYU take into consideration that certain establishments produce more disturbances than others, and how will they deal with this fact?

## **PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE**

1. The DEIS does not clearly present the data for the stated net increase of 3.13 acres of publicly accessible open space. For example, it is unclear what space is included in the Philosophy Garden (listed at 104,000 sf) which seems to occupy the only part of the area previously occupied by the Sasaki Garden, aka "Elevated Garden" (listed at 60,445 sf and also at 58).
  - a. Please provide a list of all public and publicly accessible open spaces included in the calculations for the no-build alternative, 2021, and 2031, including the size of each.
  - b. Please explain why each of the following resources listed in the DEIS list of public and private resources is not included in the quantitative analysis:
    - Resource C - The Sasaki Garden (While hidden, it appears to be publicly accessible and to include seating.)
    - Resource D - The residents of a catchment area are entitled to access to Washington Square Village Playground, not just the residents of Washington Square Village as stated on the chart. This catchment, extending from Grand Street to 8<sup>th</sup> Street and from The Bowery to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, is typical of the ten minute walk area that naturally defines the majority of users of most neighborhood playgrounds.
    - Resource O - This area includes a long seating wall that is publicly accessible. While tall fences have been added on two sides, access to the area is unrestricted and not limited to residents.
    - Resource P - This is an unfenced publicly accessible lawn area large enough for recreational use, parts of which are often used for active recreation by neighborhood children.
    - Resources Q and Z - While not used for recreation, these are public accessible portions of an institutional campus.
    - Resource U - This is an un-gated publicly accessible seating area and access is not limited to residents.
    - Resource Y - As part of the 1979 amendment to the Washington Square Southeast Urban Renewal Plan, portions of the Coles Gym roof were designated as publicly accessible open space.
2. The DEIS includes a list of public and private resources in the development area. The list includes three city-owned properties that are not considered to be open space because they do not provide usable recreational areas and includes these three city-owned areas (Resources A, I, & L) in an "Alternative Quantified Assessment". Why are the other city-owned areas not included in the alternative analysis? (Resources G, J, M, R, & X)
3. The public trust doctrine protecting New York State parks is an important public policy element. The CB2 response to the Draft Scope requested that NYU evaluate whether the proposed actions would be consistent with the public trust doctrine with respect to the DOT strips to the extent that they function and/or are officially intended to function as public open space based on long standing stated public policy and prior government action.
  - a. Why was this analysis not included in the DEIS?

- b. Mercer Playground was built and is operated by the Parks Department using public funds. Did NYU analyze whether underground and access easements and temporary closings constitute alienation of parkland?
  - c. Similarly, did NYU analyze whether underground and access easement and temporary closings constitute alienation of parkland at LaGuardia Plaza and the planned Adrienne's Garden?
  - d. The portion of Mercer Street next to Coles was first developed for recreational use more than a half century ago. This use was officially confirmed in Washington Square Southeast Urban Renewal Plan, and most recently in the 1979 amendment allowing the construction of Coles. Did NYU analyze whether use of this land for construction of the Zipper building constitutes alienation of parkland?
  - e. Finally, did NYU analyze whether the temporary use of the LaGuardia Corner Garden for construction staging constitutes alienation of parkland.
4. Construction of the Zipper Building as proposed will extend the street wall of the new building beyond the street walls of the buildings on the west side of Mercer Street to the north. The negative impact of this is clearly seen on the north end of LaGuardia Place where the Bobst Library was built on what had been part of the widened street. Typical publicly accessible space on NYU property such as Gould and Schwartz Plazas provide much less benefit than the openness provided by wide streets. Why was this impact of the loss of this public open space not discussed in the qualitative analysis of the impacts of eliminating the public open space there?
5. NYU proposes remapping of two strips as public parks. On LaGuardia Place, the public park, with the exception of a small playground, appears to function entirely for access to the buildings and the campus. On Mercer Street, the entire park functions for building and campus access except that the Tricycle Garden shares a small part of the access with pedestrians.
- a. These actions are not responsive to long-standing community requests, opposed by NYU, for these city-owned areas to be mapped as parkland because the areas will nevertheless be substantially incorporated into the campus. Why is NYU now supporting mapping these areas as public parks?
  - b. What is the purpose of the plaza north of the LaGuardia Play Garden and of the LaGuardia Building portal leading directly onto this plaza?
  - c. Similarly, what is the purpose of the plaza on public land to the south of the Tricycle Garden and what is the function of the doors of the Mercer Building leading directly onto this plaza?
  - d. Why is a "filter" access point to the campus needed to the south of the LaGuardia Play Garden?
  - e. What is the reason for allowing access into the campus through this portion of the public park?
  - f. The entry plazas at the northwest and southeast corners of the superblock will be built on parkland, but the design appears to encourage their use only for campus and building entry, discouraging pedestrians from cutting across as they walk around the corner. What is the intent of these unusual path configurations in a public park?
  - g. What is the expected student and employee pedestrian volume through the public parks during class changes? If so much parkland is required for building and

- campus access, did NYU assess the attractiveness of the parkland for public use taking into consideration the experience of the failure of Gould Plaza?
- h. Given the strong connection between these public parks and the campus and its buildings, how will the areas “read” as public space instead of as part of a private university?
  - i. Will NYU support the design of the public parks to be done through a public process led by the Parks Department?
  - j. The areas to be mapped as public parks and maintained by the Parks Department are contiguous with privately held and maintained areas to be maintained by NYU. How will that work?
6. Why does NYU anticipate that the Greene St. Walk will be used by many people other than students accessing the Mercer St. buildings from the rear when spaces like these are rarely preferred by pedestrians over ordinary streets? Why is this space likely to be any more public in character than Gould Plaza, for example?
  7. The proposed location of the temporary gym appears to extend the duration of direct impacts on the Key Park and Mercer Playground by a decade. As much as 20 years could pass before permanent replacement parks are built, or more if any part of the entire project is delayed, which is not improbable.
    - a. Did NYU investigate and evaluate alternatives inside and/or outside the development area? If so, please list and briefly explain why they were not chosen.
    - b. What is the maximum acceptable travel time from Coles to a temporary facility?
    - c. Were any of the following evaluated? The LaGuardia retail strip, Pier 40, Governors Island, court rentals from one or more other schools or facilities such as Basketball City, lease of publicly or privately owned vacant land.
  8. In evaluating shadow impacts, did the DEIS consider the impact of shadows from existing and new buildings resulting from relocation of parks and open space?
    - a. What will be the shadow impacts on the proposed temporary and permanent playground locations compared to the Key Park?
    - b. To what extent would increased shadows in the replacement playgrounds be mitigated if the Washington Square Village Play Garden were expanded to the north?
    - c. What will be the shadow impacts on the public and private portions of the Tricycle Park compared to Mercer Playground currently?
    - d. What will be the shadow impacts on the relocated dog run compared to the existing location?
    - e. What will be the shadow impacts on the open space between the Mercer Building and the LaGuardia Building compared to the Sasaki Garden?
  9. The plans and images provided for the proposed temporary and permanent replacement playgrounds show small play areas separated by attractive planting areas with flowering trees and shrubs that may not thrive given the location of the area close to so many tall buildings. Visibility from area to area appears to be substandard and not in conformance with the needs of caretakers and design standards for New York City playgrounds, especially for younger children. Also, the apparent attractiveness of the

proposed playground area for adult seating may cause use conflicts given the large number of daytime users of the development.

- a. Has NYU reviewed these playground designs with the Parks Department?
  - b. How will the community and the Parks Department be involved in playground design.
10. The DEIS presents data only for passive open space for the non-residential study area because “non-residents typically use passive spaces.” But students are not “typical” non-residents such as workers because they are likely remain nearby for extended periods when they are not indoors, and they are of the age group needing more active open space.
- a. How will NYU prevent continuation of damage from increased active use by NYU students on restored Washington Square lawns intended for passive use?
  - b. How will NYU mitigate the impact of increased competition for very limited large play areas such as Passanante Park?
11. The new publicly accessible open spaces between the Mercer and LaGuardia buildings are included in quantitative and qualitative analyses as public open space, but its success usefulness to the non-NYU community depends on its design, use, and management.
- a. How many students and NYU employees does NYU expect will use the new open space on a daily basis, and what will be the capacity of the area?
  - b. Did NYU evaluate the use levels on an hourly basis and its impact on desirability of the space for neighborhood residents?
  - c. What is the ratio for the number of added daytime users to the acres of added public open space?
  - d. Did NYU consider a plan that created more separation between campus uses and community uses, particularly those involving elderly people and small children?
  - e. Will NYU allow public access to the Mercer and LaGuardia buildings to encourage public use of the open space including, for example, restrooms and cafes?
  - f. Did NYU take into account that in-facing open space, built above and surrounded by large campus structures may not be attractive for neighborhood residents, and were alternatives considered that placed structures in a manner that allowed open space to be directly accessible from Mercer Street and LaGuardia Place?
  - g. Will NYU commit to the same public process used for design of the Cogen plant to design these spaces to assure a design that encourages public use?
  - h. What rules will apply in the publicly accessible open space and will these differ from the Parks Department rules that will apply in the contiguous public parks?
  - i. What will be the hours of operation?
12. Why did NYU decide to replace Mercer Playground with the “Tricycle Garden” serving a younger group of children? When will NYU commit to a final design for this area and will NYU commit to a public process to design the area and make a final determination of the age group to be served?
13. The “Tricycle Garden” doubles as a “filter” access point to the campus. What will prevent the pedestrian access use from overwhelming and displacing the children’s play

use? Has NYU consulted with the Parks Department regarding appropriateness of the use of a playground as a campus entrance?

14. NYU has met privately with stakeholders from existing open spaces on the superblocks. What is the status of negotiations and have alternatives other than the plans in the application been discussed? Have changes to the current uses of city-owned areas been discussed?
15. The project will cause the loss of many mature trees in the project area, especially in the north block.
  - a. How many trees more than 15 years old will be removed and what is the average age of those trees?
  - b. How many years after 2031 will it be before the same number of trees have matured to the same average age?
  - c. Did NYU evaluate the possibility of excavating under the proposed public parks instead of from above so that the mature trees can be preserved?
16. There is only one retail store facing Washington Square Park and its impact on the park is lessened by its isolation from a retail district and by zoning that prevents its enlargement or structural modification.
  - a. What impacts to open space and neighborhood character would be caused by allowing a commercial district to develop to the east of the park including retail stores facing the park?
  - b. NYU proposes to rezone six blocks to include a commercial overlay with the intent of modifying the use of only six buildings used as the basis for the worst case scenario, but why would this area not trend toward full commercial development with rents providing needed income for NYU for the highest allowed use including large retail stores facing the park?
17. The DEIS failed to identify mitigation for shadowing of LaGuardia Corner Gardens which would eliminate its current use. The alternative of not building the Bleeker Building, or greatly reducing its height, is rejected because it would not allow the location of a 100,000 sf public school at the site and would not allow the development of the site for a dormitory. The DEIS states the site is best for the school because it will be developed before the north block buildings and because a separate entrance is possible on Bleeker Street. It further states this mitigation is not available because a "purpose and need of the Proposed Actions is to develop NYU dormitories so that more undergraduate students would have opportunity to live in student housing within the core campus to create a strong academic community and to become better acclimated to the City."
  - a. Did NYU evaluate locating the public school in the Zipper Building which will be built before the Bleeker Building and which will also allow for a Bleeker Street entrance?
  - b. Given the LaGuardia Corner Gardens represents a long-standing and well-loved use on city-owned land, representing one of the most vibrant downtown examples of the important tradition of public gardening and serving not just its gardeners but providing a strong sense of community to the neighborhood as a whole, does the DEIS conclude, through its qualitative analysis, that for the sake of acclimatizing its freshman, most of whom have chosen NYU because they want to go to school in

- Greenwich Village, it is an inarguable given that the elimination of this treasure and the pain it will cause to the people who have given so much love, is for the public good?
- c. In general, what criteria does NYU employ to evaluate the competing values and needs of the university community vis a vis the values and needs of the community as a whole?

## **SOCIAL SERVICES & EDUCATION**

1. Re: the proposed Bleecker School:
  - a. What was NYU's legal commitment towards building a school in 1963 and/or other years? What school promises were made to the community?
  - b. What will NYU do to guarantee that SCA will open a public school? Please provide proof including months/dates/years that NYU was in dialogue with the SCA/DOE re the Bleecker public school site, and details.
  - c. On what basis does NYU assume that the current severe overcrowding of schools will not be addressed over the next 10 years?
  - d. Please define/clarify what NYU means by "donating" the land to the DOE/SCA. Does NYU get tax or other benefits? If so, please disclose.
  - e. On what date does the land designated for a public school revert back to NYU if DOE/SCA doesn't construct?
  - f. Will NYU donate not only the land for the public school but also money to the SCA/DOE for construction (core & shell) of the school?
  - g. If CB2 does not approve all or most of the rezoning, de-mapping and other ULURP requests, will NYU still donate the land for the public school?
  - h. Will the proposed Bleecker school have access to the underground auditorium and rehearsal space?
  - i. What is the breakdown of the number of bedrooms among the proposed dwelling units, and if no hotel, of bedrooms for 260 additional dwelling units? Please provide CB2 with a true analysis of how many additional children are coming into the neighborhood from the new dwellings.
  - j. How did NYU determine that a rooftop playground was safer, more accessible, less windy/shadowed/noisy than one at ground level?
  - k. Why is it necessary to build a dorm on the Morton Williams site rather than having the entire site be a public school with a playground on street level which the community can utilize after school hours?
  - l. Please be specific about how deliveries are going to be made for the dorm and school with limited delivery space for trucks and buses.
  - m. How many NYU students/staff will use the underground academic space?
2. Please tell us the number of affordable housing units still available to the general public in buildings owned by NYU in the Core area. What is the plan for these remaining units of publicly-available affordable housing? Is there any plan to replace or increase the stock of affordable housing units controlled by NYU for income eligible families, seniors or the differently-abled?
3. What are NYU's current access rules and rates for community membership to Coles? What will these be for the temporary, and then the permanent gym? What are the

current NYU library membership costs and lending privileges for community members?  
What will these be going forward?

4. How will seniors in 505 LaGuardia as well as SoHo and the Central Village, for whom Morton Williams is the closest supermarket, get food independently, and how will the social aspects of the seating areas be replaced? What is NYU willing to contribute to the senior community?