

March 8, 2004

Paul Januszewski
NYC Economic Development Corporation
110 William Street
New York, NY 10038

Dear Mr Januszewski:

Thank you for your presentation regarding the Economic Development Corporation's present and future plans for the passenger ship terminals in Manhattan, which are located within the boundaries of Manhattan Community District No. 4, as well as your potential plans for developing a second PST in Brooklyn.

As you stated, and as we all know, cruise liners are getting bigger and are carrying more passengers. The new Queen Mary II will extend beyond her berth at the Passenger Ship Terminal by 180' and will carry 800 more passengers than her predecessor, Queen Elizabeth II. Other new cruise ships are taller and bulkier, with much higher passenger capacities than we have experienced in the past. And the trend continues - as does the forecast for the growth of this industry.

Let us start by saying that Manhattan Community Board No. 4 believes the cruise ship industry is vital and important both to our city and to our neighborhood. This industry, which is an evolution of the passenger ship industry, has historically been located on the west side of Manhattan. It is also an economic engine with significant impacts on employment and locally-provided services, as well as on the tourist industry in general. Therefore, we believe that efforts to retain this industry at its present location, even as alternatives for additional facilities in New York City are explored, are important and, quite frankly, overdue.

In addition, at one time in the Concept Plan for Hudson River Park, the Passenger Ship Terminal was considered to be part of the park, adding to the park experience even as it generated income for the park. In about 1996, to the great dismay of Manhattan Community Board No. 4, the three Passenger Ship Terminal piers (88, 90 and 92) along with Pier 94 were removed from the park's jurisdiction. Subsequently, and with the support of Manhattan Community Board No. 4, the Hudson River Park Act was passed, which, while it did not restore the PST to the park plan, did call for 20% of the income from the Passenger Ship Terminal to be allocated toward park maintenance.

Thus, Manhattan Community Board No. 4's Waterfront and Parks committee will continue to take an active interest in the future of the Passenger Ship Terminal, especially as it relates to the ongoing development of Hudson River Park, currently under construction in the Clinton area. And while our view about the future of this industry at the Passenger Ship Terminal is generally positive, we do have some concerns and desires that we hope will be considered seriously as planners begin to think about a new or redesigned Passenger Ship Terminal.

One of the concept plans that you showed indicated the possible use, or shared use, of Pier 92 as an extension of the trade show activity that currently takes place on Pier 94, the UnConvention Center. Our position has been that a trade show use at Pier 94 is one of the least ideal uses of a west side pier in the context of Hudson River Park, our approval of the ENK/EDC ULURP notwithstanding. By extension, the use of Pier 92 to expand this undesirable activity would be a waste of a precious waterfront resource, which should be reserved, in so far as possible, for a water-dependent use. In the event, however, of part or all of Pier 92's being devoted to the UnConvention Center, the use of Pier 94 in whole or part for this use must be reconsidered, with the view of returning to the original intention that Pier 94, or at the very least the northern wing of its headhouse, should be incorporated in the Hudson River Park. The original concept of the UnConvention Center was for a space far smaller than the combination of Piers 92 and 94 shown in this plan. We also note that in the long run the expansion of the Javits Center, in whatever form it may eventually take, is likely to diminish considerably the demand for the UnConvention Center.

Traffic

As much as we like the ships, we dislike the massive traffic jams that occur regularly on Route 9A as a result of this activity, especially southbound north of the Passenger Ship Terminal, but also northbound. The short term solutions that you outlined, including new taxi stops on the east side of 9A and new baggage handling access direct to the rooftop parking, thus eliminating duplication of traffic patterns, will help alleviate this problem. And your plan as presented, which includes reducing the Manhattan PST to three wider slips with a maximum daily capacity of 12,000, along with a new two to three slip PST in Brooklyn, will also help in the longer term. However, we believe that more drastic solutions will ultimately be required. We encourage EDC to make traffic reduction a prime objective of the design of the new Manhattan PST.

Pedestrian Access

It used to be possible for pedestrians to walk directly along the bulkhead between the Passenger Ship Terminal piers, but that changed after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and today access is blocked by chain link fences, which is totally contrary to the new vision of an accessible waterfront embraced by Hudson River Park, as well as the city as a whole. There is no reason for these ugly barriers, they don't add to security, and they should be removed. These barriers also interfere with the pedestrian esplanade planned by the New York State Department of Transportation in front of the PST. We must note that cars are free to drive into the PST with virtually no security checks; why then should pedestrians be restricted?

For the sake of park users and the community as well as PST customers, we urge EDC to work closely with NYS DOT, the Hudson River Park Trust, the United States Coast Guard and the Department of Homeland Security to devise a way to provide a pedestrian esplanade or other form of access in front of the redesigned PST in the best possible way

consistent with realistic security concerns, as was done very well in the case of the new Pier 79 ferry terminal just a few blocks south. Further, no physical changes should be made that would preclude the possibility of restoring an esplanade along the water's edge in the eventuality of a long-term alteration in the national security situation or reuse of the piers in a way that would

P. Januszewski

March 4, 2004

Page 3 of 3

render such a walkway feasible. Finally, pursuant to law, EDC must honor the requirements of waterfront zoning as much as possible if major changes are made to the facility.

Integration with Hudson River Park

As mentioned earlier, the Passenger Ship Terminal was once part of the concept for Hudson River Park. Now it lies surrounded by the park both to the north and the south, creating a massive and unsightly interruption. This does not have to be the case. Even as plans for a Passenger Ship Terminal capable of handling larger ships are being entertained, now is the time to consider the creation of a truly magnificent facility that accomplishes many goals at once, one being its reintegration with the park experience. Once again, this will be appreciated not only by residents and park users, but also by the very cruise ships that use these facilities. We ask that the plans for the PST, as they go forward, consider the aesthetic as well as the practical. Creative design or treatment of the ramps along the highway would go a long way towards making the PST a more attractive neighbor. In this regard, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's Triple Bridge project at the Port Authority Bus Terminal in Manhattan, might be a worthwhile model to explore.

There was a time when the arrival and departure of passenger ships was an important and wonderful experience for New Yorkers of all kinds - the passengers, their families and well-wishers, vendors, nearby restaurants, hotels and shops, and neighborhood residents and visitors who would simply flock to the water to watch the grand vessels arrive and depart. It was even possible for non-passengers to board the ships prior to departure, sip some free champagne and join in pre-departure festivities before the ship's loudspeaker asked all visitors to please depart.

Today, with heightened security, that scenario is no longer possible. But a Passenger Ship Terminal that not only allows for larger vessels, but also combines better traffic flow with a festive atmosphere for everyone, within a dynamic urban waterfront park, is possible. Manhattan Community Board No. 4 urges EDC to work towards just that.

Sincerely,



Walter Mankoff

Chair

Manhattan Community Board No. 4



John Doswell

Co-Chair

Waterfront & Parks Committee

Pam Frederick

Co-Chair

Waterfront & Parks Committee

cc: Kate Ascher, Exec VP, EDC
Congressman Jerry Nadler
Councilmember David Yasky (chair NYC Council Waterfront Committee)
Al Butzel, Friends of Hudson River Park
P&O (operator of PST)
Local elected officials