#### EAST SIDE COASTAL RESILIENCY PROJECT **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES** JULY 28,29,&30 + SEPT. 10, 2015

### **PROJECT AREA 1 SUMMARY REPORT** (from Montgomery St to E14th St)

#### **KEY STATISTICS:**

07/29 Community Engagement Workshop at Church of St. Brigid 90 sign-ins (counts exclude City & consultant team members but include media (1) and elected officials reps. (4))

07/30 Community Engagement Workshop at the Manny Cantor Center 131 sign-ins (counts exclude City & consultant team members but include media (1) and elected officials reps. (4))

09/10 Community Engagement Workshop at Henry Street Settlement 89 sign-ins (counts exclude City & consultant team members but include media (0) and elected officials reps. (3))

#### WORKSHOP FORMAT:

After the presentation, participants engaged in roundtable discussions where they collectively discussed the pros and cons of three conceptual design alternatives for each of the following access points to East River Park: Delancey St. bridge, Houston St. overpass, E6th St. bridge and E10th St. bridge. An additional table focusing on the Montgomery St. tie-back and Pier 42 area was introduced at the 09/10 workshop. Using illustrative physical models at a 1:200 scale, facilitators guided workshop participants through the workshop exercise. At the end of the session, one representative from each table reported their group's findings to the whole audience.





#### **KEY FINDINGS:**

#### 1. Conceptual design alternatives:

Delancey St. Bridge The Grand St. access point emerged as a polarizing issue but, overall, participants expressed support for the modest-impact bridge span in Alternative B where: - A new Delancey St. bridge would facilitate separate bike and pedestrian circulation and;

- An extensive berm would offer unprogrammed space in the park (Alt. B and C)

#### Houston St. Overpass

There was near universal support, amongst participants, for the Alternative C improvements where: - The "punchthrough" would offer gentle access to the waterfront and create new family-friendly spaces in the park

#### E6th St. Bridge

While fewer in number, participants showed support for elements of Alternatives B and C where: - Stair access, in addition to a ramp, would allow for quick entry into the park from the city (Alt. B) and; - Park-side ramps would bring visitors closer to the waterfront esplanade

E10th St. Bridge

Participants voiced strong support for the wide, landscape landing and span of Alternative C with: - Additional access from the FDR Service road and an extensive berm landscape



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

#### **MONTGOMERY STREET TIE-BACK AND PIER 42 MASTER PLAN:**

COMMUNITY COMMENTS

During the community engagement workshop on 09/10, ESCR team members and Pier 42 lead designers, Mathews Nielsen Landscape Architects, led a group discussion focused on the Pier 42 master plan and its integration with the ESCR project. Workshop participants were invited to share their concerns and queries in a small and inviting forum. The Pier 42 master plan, as represented below, was approved by CB3 Parks Committee and the Public Design Commission in January 2014.

Workshop participants inquired about the following items:

- Pier 42 Phase I timeline
- Access improvements at Pier 42 entrance •
- Removal date of existing shed •
- Use of additional LMDC funding to advance the Pier 42 master plan, if applicable •
- Governance, maintenance, and operation of the deployable flood gates at Montgomery Street •
- Nature of subsurface constraints at the Montgomery Street tie-back •
- Approximate location of future ferry terminal







#### SEPT. 10, 2015









COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

#### DELANCEY STREET BRIDGE SUMMARY



**DELANCEY ST. BRIDGE** ALTERNATIVE A: BASELINE FLOOD PROTECTION

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

•

Satisfies requirements for baseline flood control



**DELANCEY ST. BRIDGE** ALT. B: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - MEDIUM LEVEL

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

- Ability to fit into the neighborhood Ð
- Đ Grand St. access point
- Đ A wide but not excessive berm
- Ð Unprogrammed space on the berm
- Đ Sequence and progression of the pathways
- Ð Width of the bridge and landscaping additions
- Ð Cost-benefit value compared to Alternatives A&C

No le la companya de		

**DELANCEY ST. BRIDGE** 

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

<del>()</del>	Alte
Ð	Gene
Ð	Smo
Ð	Ease
Ð	Sepa

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- The width of the existing ramp and bridge
- Lack of safety improvements near Delancey St. and under the 8 Williamsburg bridge (lighting, parking lot hazard, etc.)
- Lack of open space improvements
- 8 Lack of alternative access point

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- Grand St. access ramp
- The length of both access ramps on the city side and their 8 potential to create undesirable spaces
- Visual impact of the Grand St. ramp for Coop residents
- Potential impact on circulation along the FDR Service Road

•	The l
•	Lack
•	Visua
0	Pote
6	Cost-



ALT. C: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGH LEVEL

- ernative B improvements, plus:
- erous width of the bridge and landscaping additions
- oth transition into the park
- e of access via the 1:20 and 1:30 ramps on the park side arate access ramps for bikes and pedestrians

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- length of the access ramps on the city side
- of staircases along the ramps
- al impact of the Grand St. ramp for Coop residents
- ential impact on circulation along the FDR Service Road
- -benefit value compared to Alternative A&B







COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

### HOUSTON STREET OVERPASS SUMMARY



**HOUSTON STREET OVERPASS** ALTERNATIVE A: BASELINE FLOOD PROTECTION

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

Ð

(no comments from workshop participants)



**HOUSTON STREET OVERPASS** ALT. B: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - MEDIUM LEVEL

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

Bleacher-type seating options close to the athletic fields Ð



#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

÷	Alte
÷	Quic
Ð	Gent
Ð	Fam
Ð	Eleva

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- Circuitous access to the heavily utilized athletic fields 8
- Length and trajectory of the existing ramps which bring visitors 8 to the back of the park, far from the waterfront
- Lack of access improvements

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- Ramps do not facilitate access to the athletic fields or waterfront
- Concerns about lighting and shade for the bleacher-type seating

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

ALT. C: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGH LEVEL

ernative B improvements, plus: ck, easy and safe access to the waterfront for all tle 1:20 slopes that criss-cross the "punchthrough" nily friendly terraces and potential picnic areas vated vantage point to enjoy views of the park

Concerns about lighting







**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES** 

### E6TH STREET BRIDGE OVERPASS SUMMARY



**E6TH STREET BRIDGE** ALTERNATIVE A: BASELINE FLOOD PROTECTION

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

Ð

(no comments from workshop participants)



**E6TH STREET BRIDGE** ALT. B: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - MEDIUM LEVEL

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

- Quantity and variety of access points (stairs or ramps) Đ
- Đ Shorter walkways mitigate safety concerns
- Đ Width of bridge facilitates access for physically impaired visitors
- Ð Bridging over the East River bikeway reduces the potential for bike and pedestrian collisions



**E6TH STREET BRIDGE** 

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

•	Alte
÷	The
•	The

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

Concerns about safety of proposed alternative led to a preference for existing conditions

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

A shared walkway may lead cyclists to speed

0	A s
0	Ler
0	Lac

# ALT. C: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGH LEVEL

ernative B improvements, plus: comfort of being dropped off near the waterfront nature walk

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

shared walkway may lead cyclists to speed ngth of access ramps ck of staircase options



**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES** 

# E10TH ST BRIDGE: ALTERNATIVE B WE LIKE THE IMPROVED ACCESS RAMP FROM E10TH ST! THE ACCESS RAMP SEEMS VERY **CLOSE TO THE RIIS BUILDINGS...** THE BRIDGE SPAN ISN'T WIDENED, THE EXISTING ONE IS TOO NARROW. MORE BERM! LESS WALL! WE LIKE THE IMPROVED PLAYGROUND AND BBQ AREA!





COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

### E10TH STREET BRIDGE OVERPASS SUMMARY



**E10TH STREET BRIDGE** ALTERNATIVE A: BASELINE FLOOD PROTECTION

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

Gentle 1:20 slope on the park-side access ramp



E10TH STREET BRIDGE ALT. B: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - MEDIUM LEVEL

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

- Gentle 1:20 access ramp on the city-side Ð
- Đ Increase in use of berm over wall for flood protection
- Ð Upgraded playground and BBQ area



E10TH STREET BRIDGE

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS LIKED:

Ð	Incre
÷	Upg
÷	Wid
	for s
+	High

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:



Ð

Reuse of the existing bridge span and city-side access ramp No upgrade to existing park facilities (playground and BBQ area)

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

- Reuse of the existing bridge span
- Impact of new city-side access ramp on Riis buildings 8

#### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS DISLIKED:

ALT. C: ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGH LEVEL

- ease in use of berm over wall for flood protection
- graded playground and BBQ area
- ler bridge and city-side access ramp could facilitate access seniors
- h visibility of bridge landing from E10th St.

Loss of street parking spaces along E10th St