

CB 9M Manhattanville Rezoning Task Force Meeting  
January 24, 2005  
Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 P.M. by George Goodwill, Co-chair of the Task Force.

P. Jones provided the following update on the 197-A Plan:

- Meeting scheduled for February 18<sup>th</sup> with City Planning to discuss threshold review comments
- DCP comments will be reviewed with Task Force at the next meeting

Columbia University did not attend the meeting, however they provided the following status:

- CU is process of preparing written responses to open questions posed at previous Task Force meetings (many responses should be available by late February)
- CU will share details of its plan prior to the initiation of the public review process (probably in late winter/early spring), including:
  - EAS
  - Draft scope of EIS
  - Draft zoning text, maps and diagrams
- In response to CB 9's request, CU will hold multiple public meetings prior to the formal EIS scoping hearing to review the above documents

Co-chairs of the Task Force were asked to give CU deadlines for their responses to open questions most of which have been outstanding for many months.

It was noted that tours of infrastructure and labs where CU received fined have still not been conducted.

In response to a question, C. Shandra from DCP indicated that their current review of CU's plan and EIS scoping documents is technical in nature. A timeframe for completion of this review could not be estimated.

Update on CU Employment Center was requested for a future CB 9 General Board meeting.

#### City Planning Presentation

Betty Mackintosh, DCP, reviewed the process for the review of 197-A plans and compared it to the ULURP schedule. Generally, after threshold review comments have been satisfied,

- Plan goes to City Planning Commission for threshold determination;
- Environmental review is performed and paid for by DCP;
-

- Plan is distributed to CB and Borough President for comments, public hearings, and recommendations;
- City Planning Commission performs substantive review (policy issues) and holds public hearings;
- City Planning Commission votes on plan;
- City Council holds public hearings and votes on plan

In response to questions, DCP noted that the 197-A process noted above could take over a year. DCP further cited several 197-A plans where recommendations have been successfully implemented. There was discussion about 197-A's and 197-C's running parallel and whether one can be stopped in deference to the other and further comments be made to DCP on a 197-A plan without the community board's knowledge; no definitive answer could be given as this has not happened in B. Mackintosh's tenure at DCP.

DCP noted that research facilities are permitted in areas zoned for industrial, residential and community facility activity. Numerous concerns were raised about potential hazards associated with research activity. It was noted that all of these concerns need to be raised at CU's scoping meeting for the EIS.

DCP was asked to clarify a portion of the 197-A plan timeline relating to the Commission's ability to stop the environmental review in order to consider other plans.

#### Coalition to Preserve Community (CPC) Presentation

Tom DeMott, Tom Kappner, Nellie Bailey, and Cynthia Doty discussed the following issues:

- Need for community groups to participate in the Task Force and present their issues and concerns
- Listing of questions previously asked of Columbia was distributed; any additions or modifications can be sent to
- Cynthia Doty stated that Columbia's track record causes CPC to be skeptical (Audubon Ballroom was cited as specific example)
  - Audubon Ballroom was an active cultural center and historic site, but it could not be preserved
  - CU proposed a bio-tech center (which required rezoning) with many promises over a decade ago
  - For example, CU stated that the center would be a major advancement in bio-tech industry, important enterprise to the community and would transform Northern Manhattan and include local contractors, suppliers and vendors and provide employment, as well as preservation of the building
  - CU's promises were not binding and most were not kept
  - This situation underscores the need for a legally binding CBA with Columbia

- Tom Kappner reviewed important components of a Community Benefit Agreement with CU. The CBA should be developed in an open forum with much discussion, should not be dictated to the community and should incorporate five core areas:
  - Affordable housing must be preserved and created
  - Economic development (protecting existing local businesses, zoning must continue to allow manufacturing)
  - Community facilities for well being of CB 9 residents (e.g., senior centers, youth centers)
  - Historical and architectural integrity of existing buildings must be preserved and new buildings must be in context with existing structures
  - Ongoing activities/practices of CU must result in healthy, safe environment for CB 9 residents (w.r.t. bio-tech activities, CU must commit to comprehensive oversight mechanism by independent outside entities)
- Nellie Bailey added the following CBA components:
  - Job creation with living wage jobs
  - Affordable housing
    - Median income of specific community should be used and not the median income of the city
    - Housing or land trust fund should be sought in order to develop permanent affordable housing over the long term
  - Written commitment that CU will not operate any Level 4 labs

It was noted that monitoring of CBA's is equally important, along with reporting of progress, particularly given the length of CU's development project.

It was further noted that the community needs independent expertise around the core elements of any CBA to ensure that we have the best information and access to appropriate resources to make the best decisions.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 28, 2005 at 6:30 P.M.