



The Future of Tillary and Adams Streets Public Meeting #2 Summary

**Tuesday, June 23, 2009
6:30 – 8:00 PM**

Background

In anticipation of an upcoming Capital Reconstruction of Tillary and Adams Streets, the Brooklyn Borough Commissioner's Office and Pedestrian Projects Group of NYCDOT is engaged in a public outreach effort to guide the conceptual design process.

The planned reconstruction project currently encompasses the full length of Tillary Street (Cadman Plaza West to Navy Street) as well as several adjoining roadways, including the Adams Street service roads north of Tillary Street. The full width of Adams Street north to Red Cross Place and south to Johnson Street were included as an important part of the workshop discussion as well, given their relationship to the key intersection of Tillary Street and Adams Street. NYCDOT is pursuing additional funding so that this area can be included in the scope of the reconstruction as well.

NYCDOT used input received from a well-attended public workshop on January 27, 2009¹ to develop a conceptual design for the study area, which was presented at a follow-up meeting held on June 23, 2009. This document summarizes the input received at the June meeting.

Format and Agenda

Notification of the meeting took place well in advance. The Brooklyn Borough Commissioner's Office created a flyer that was included in the monthly Community Board 2 mailing, posted on the NYCDOT website, and provided for additional distribution to various stakeholders in Downtown Brooklyn. Thirty-five attendees, plus NYCDOT staff, were present at the second public meeting, held at Brooklyn Borough Hall. After an introduction to the project by Brooklyn Borough Commissioner's Office staff, DOT Pedestrian Project Group gave a power point overview of the conceptual design. This was followed by a public question and answer session, during which time

¹ A summary of the January public workshop is available on the NYCDOT website



NYCDOT staff took notes. Participants then broke up into multiple groups to view sets of conceptual plans and were encouraged to write comments on the plans. Feedback sheets were also distributed (see Appendix A). These sheets offered participants the opportunity to rank how well the conceptual plan addresses the issues and suggestions raised at the January 2009 workshop, and also provided a space for written comments. `

Conceptual Design

The conceptual design is responsive to many of the issues and suggestions raised in the January workshop. The most prevalent of these are described in detail in the January Public Workshop Summary, available at www.nyc.gov/dot and listed below:

Issues

1. "Highway" design creates barriers
2. Parking in Bicycle Lanes
3. Pedestrian Safety/Turning Conflicts
4. Wide Roadway/Long Crosswalks
5. Turning Conflicts
6. Cyclist Safety
7. Too Much Permit Parking

Suggestions

1. Widen Existing Medians
2. Enhance/Expand Protected Bicycle Lanes
3. Neckdowns
4. Additional Landscaping
5. Reduce Number of Lanes
6. Eliminate/Reduce Size of Service Roads
7. Add 2nd SB Adams Left-Turn Lane

Figure 1 shows the conceptual design. The key component is a widened and landscaped pedestrian and bicycle ramp connecting the Brooklyn Bridge to Downtown Brooklyn, creating a gateway worthy of this important location, and making Adams Street operate as a city street rather than a highway. On Tillary Street, lanes would be aligned to simplify traffic movement, and underused lanes would be eliminated, allowing for wider sidewalks, protected bike lanes and additional landscaping. All crossing lengths would be reduced to improve pedestrian safety. The separated bicycle path that now exists on the north side of Tillary Street between Cadman Plaza West and Adams Street would be built out in permanent materials and extended to Jay Street. The design also proposes a

Figure 1
Brooklyn Bridge Gateway Conceptual Design





public plaza space where Tillary Street terminates at Cadman Plaza West and Clinton Street. The plan will calm motorized traffic without reducing vehicular capacity, and achieve a better balance for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Public Meeting Input

As with the first public workshop, NYCDOT provided a number of opportunities for participants to provide their input, which in this case consisted of their reactions to the conceptual design. This section summarizes (1) the question and answer session following the power point presentation, (2) written comments on conceptual plans that were marked up by participants and on the comment sheets that were distributed and returned; and (3) rankings of how well the conceptual plan addresses the issues and suggestions identified during the January workshop. A full record of this input is included as Appendix B to this report.

Questions and Comments

Public input during the question and answer session can be summarized by the following categories:

- Expressions of Support
- Requests for Clarification/Specification
- Suggestions of Additional Features

Appendix B, section B1 documents the questions and comments that were received. A number of participants spoke out favorably on the proposal, specifically citing the improved options for bicyclists and the elimination of Adams Street service roads. As participants were being introduced to the conceptual design for the first time, there were several questions that were asked with the intent of gaining a full understanding of how the plan would work. Several participants suggested elements that were not included in the plan, such as a pedestrian bridge, a mid-block crosswalk on Adams Street north of Tillary Street, and the placement of pedestrian fencing at corners along with the offset pedestrian crossings.

Written Comments on Plans and Feedback Sheets

Written comments were received from participants who marked up multiple sets of plans provided for that purpose, as well as on the feedback sheets. These comments can be categorized into the following:

- Expressions of Support
- Identification of Current Issues



- Concerns about Conceptual Plans
 - Vehicle Capacity/Operations
 - Parking
 - Bicycle Travel
 - Pedestrian Safety
- Suggested Plan Refinements or Additional Elements
 - Plan Refinements
 - Additional Elements
- Other

Expressions of Support - There were a dozen statements of support. Some of these were directed towards the plan as a whole, but most pointed out specific elements that were favored. These individual elements included new and enhanced bike lanes and crossings, medians, and intersection treatments.

Identification of Current Issues – A few participants used the opportunity to indicate some issues or problems that exist now in the project area. As an example, someone pointed out the perceived danger of crossing the intersection of Tillary and Adams from the south side to the north side, which will be improved by the proposed median to median crossing.

Concerns about Conceptual Plans – Some participants did express concerns about the proposed plan. Most of these comments were about the perceived impact on traffic operations or capacity on southbound and northbound Adams Street. Other comments were related to loss of parking, illegal placard parking, and bike lane configurations.

Suggested Plan Refinements or Additional Elements –Participants also noted ideas for improving upon the plan or adding elements not now in the plan. These tended to focus on additional pedestrian and bicycle enhancements.

Other - Other individual written comments were received which cannot be easily categorized. These, along with all comments, are included in Appendix B, section B2 to this document.

Conceptual Plan Ratings

Fourteen participants provided feedback on how well the proposed conceptual plan addressed the most common issues and suggestions raised at the January workshop. Appendix A shows the form that was used for ranking. Participants were instructed to assign of a score between 1 and 5 for each of the seven main issues and seven main types of suggestion, with 1 meaning the plan addresses the item “very well” and 5 meaning the plan addresses the item “not well”. These scores were averaged for each item and the average scores are presented in Appendix B, section B3. .



In general, the plan scored very well by this means of measurement, with all items but one scoring lower (therefore better) than the middle rating of 3. The exception was Issue 7 – issues associated with the use and abuse of agency parking permits, which are difficult to address through physical design alone. That the remaining items scored well indicates that respondents believed the conceptual plan does a good job of addressing the issues and incorporating the suggestions. Items with the best scores were issue 6 – Cyclist Safety, Suggestion 3- Neckdowns, Suggestion 4 – Additional Landscaping, and Suggestion 7 – Add 2nd SB Adams Left-Turn Lane. All of these had scores lower than 2.

Next Steps

Just as the January public workshop assisted NYCDOT in developing its conceptual design for the Brooklyn Bridge Gateway, the June 20th workshop will help NYCDOT further refine its design as the project moves forward.

The design process is a dynamic one that may require additional targeted meetings with key stakeholders. On July 15th, 2009, NYCDOT met with Concord Village representatives to discuss specific access and parking issues that residents had, and intends to meet with the U.S. Postal Service to ensure that the conceptual design will be compatible with their loading operations on Adams Street.

The intent is to present a refined design to the Community Board 2 Transportation Committee. Community board meetings are open to the public and NYCDOT will notify previous public workshop participants once this is scheduled and work with Community Board 2 to encourage good attendance.

Once a conceptual design is finalized, the project will be turned over by NYCDOT to New York City Department of Design And Construction (NYCDDC), which is responsible for final design and construction. This project is currently programmed for Fiscal Year 2012, with \$14.4 million in city and federal funding available. NYCDOT is currently pursuing additional funding to ensure that the full scope of the conceptual design being contemplated can be constructed.



Appendix A – Feedback Form

Community Feedback from January 27, 2009 Public Workshop

<i>Issues:</i>	Plan Addresses:					Notes:
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. "Highway" Design Creates Barrier	1	2	3	4	5	
2. Pedestrian Safety	1	2	3	4	5	
3. Wide Roadway/Long Crosswalks	1	2	3	4	5	
4. Turning Conflicts	1	2	3	4	5	
5. Parking in Bicycle Lanes	1	2	3	4	5	
6. Cyclist Safety	1	2	3	4	5	
7. Too Much Permit Parking	1	2	3	4	5	

Suggestions:

1. Widen Existing Medians	1	2	3	4	5	
2. Enhance/Expand Protected Bike Paths	1	2	3	4	5	
3. Neckdowns	1	2	3	4	5	
4. Additional Landscaping	1	2	3	4	5	
5. Reduce Number of Lanes	1	2	3	4	5	
6. Eliminate/Reduce Size of Service Rds	1	2	3	4	5	
7. Add 2nd SB Adams Left-Turn Lane	1	2	3	4	5	

Comments and Ideas:



Appendix B – June Workshop Feedback

B1. Questions and Comments

Question #1 – What will happen with the Adams Street service roads under this plan?

Answer – Certain sections of the Adams Street service roads will be eliminated under this plan in order to make Adams Street more like a city street and less like a highway. This will also provide more room for pedestrians and bicycles and allow for landscaping in the median promenade.

Question #2 – How far will the Adams Street medians be raised above the street bed?

Answer – The exact treatment of the medians in this respect is to be determined; however, there will be physical separation between the median and the road.

Question #3 – What will be the impact of this plan on parking?

Answer – Twenty-four parking spaces would be eliminated.

Question #4 – How would the new Adams Street southbound service road adjacent to the Federal Courthouse terminate at Tillary Street?

Answer – This project would be coordinated with security installations planned for the federal courthouse and the city's Office of Emergency Management. A delta barrier at the end of the service road would be implemented, permitting access for authorized vehicles only.

Question #5 – Have you considered placing pedestrian fencing at the intersections and moving back the pedestrian crossings from the corners?

Answer – There have been issues with pedestrian fencing elsewhere in the city. It is not something we generally choose to implement if there are other acceptable alternatives.

Question #6 – How are you dealing with the conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists at the southern end of the Brooklyn Bridge Promenade (north side of Tillary and Adams)?

Answer – The plan creates much more additional area space at the end of the promenade for both cyclists and pedestrians entering the promenade or waiting to cross the intersection.

Question #7 – Why doesn't the plan include a mid-block crosswalk of Adams between Tillary Street and Red Cross Place?



Answer – The plan does not preclude a mid-block crosswalk. However, NYCDOT is concerned that a midblock crosswalk in this location would create vehicle safety issues caused by southbound vehicles queuing back north of Red Cross Place to the sharp curve in the Brooklyn Bridge approach.

Question #8 – Did you consider incorporating a pedestrian overpass into the plan?

Answer – Pedestrians have a tendency to cross at grade even when overpasses are present. In addition, overpasses are extremely expensive and would make it even more difficult to fund this capital project.

Comment #9 – The plan is great because it allows bicyclists to go in any direction they want.

Comment #10 – I like the elimination of the northbound Adams Street service road.

Question #11 - Does this plan create a problem for postal office access to loading docks by eliminating the southbound Adams Street service road south of Tillary Street?

Answer – We believe that vehicles would still be able to safely access these loading docks. However, we will meet with the Post Office to get their input.

Comment #12 – There is a need for a bicycle network connection between the Tillary Street bike lane and Clark Street via Cadman Plaza West.

Question #13 - Where will parking be eliminated?

Answer - Twenty-four parking spaces would be eliminated from Adams Street as a result of the partial elimination of the service road north of Tillary. However, curbside parking adjacent to Concord Village will remain. In addition, some new parking spaces will be created on the north side of Tillary Street west of Adams Street.

Question #14 – Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed medians?

Answer – NYCDOT would sign a maintenance agreement with a local partner to maintain the landscaping. We have had preliminary discussions with Downtown Brooklyn Partnership about the potential for them to serve as the local maintenance partner for this project, and they have expressed initial interest.

Question #15 - Why are no leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) included as part of the plan?

Answer – The feasibility of Leading Pedestrian Intervals was not investigated as part of this conceptual design development. This design does not preclude LPIs if they are shown to be feasible through a detailed signal study during project development



B2. Written Comments*

Expressions of Support

- “Like this” separated right turn lane from northbound Cadman Plaza West to eastbound Tillary and splitter island.
- “I like this” raised entrance to Cadman Plaza East
- “I like this bike lane” indicating median Adams Street bike lane south of Tillary”; “Me too” (indicates same bike lane)
- “I like this bike lane” indicating physically separated bike lane on Tillary Street east of Adams Street
- Indicating proposed ped and bike crossing between Adams median at south and north side of Adams/Tillary intersection - “These are great!”
- Indicating north approach to Tillary/Jay – “great – lane reduction”
- Indicating intersection of Adams Street and Tech Place – “This is great”
- Indicated extended median on north side of Tillary and Adams - “great”
- I like a lot of the changes
- Very happy about elimination of service road north of Tillary and preservation of the bike lane (as well as addition of one on median).
- I love it! I live in Concord Village and it will make it so much easier to walk and bike around. It seems 100X safer.
- Wonderful! Can you implement some of this short-term. Like the median connector?

Identification of Current Issues

- Indicating proposed ped and bike crossing between Adams median at south and north side of Adams/Tillary intersection - “These crossings are 100% crucial! Very dangerous now and will need to be addressed”
- Indicating Adams/Tillary intersection – “Eliminate the need for NYPD”; “traffic cop in morning can be eliminated with proper plan. Too noisy!! Yelling!!”
- Indicating Adams/Tillary intersection – “NOISE – too noisy at intersection. Horn honking; vendors selling things and slowing traffic”
- Indicating south curb of Tillary Street between Gold and Prince Streets – “Lots of parking placard abuse here – need solution”

**Written Comments include both comments marked on plans and on feedback form*



- On the bridge – after the pedestrian stairs up the bridge – those new flexible barriers between the entering bridge traffic and the bike lane on the bridge create a hazard. While walking here tonight I saw a runner zigzagging through the barriers into the narrow bike lane.

Concerns about Plans

-Vehicle Capacity/Operations

- Indicating southbound approach to Tillary/Adams – “Capacity Inadequate”
- Indicating Adams median north of Tillary Street (Brooklyn Bridge Promenade) – “Where is capacity to come from to widen median?”
- “Need sufficient turning radius” at Tillary Street entrance to Concord Village
- Does not address diversion of NB service road /Brooklyn Bridge to avoid entering same road
- Re: Partial elimination of divider between main roadway of NB Adams and service road: You plan to create a short, third BB-bound lane. Within a relatively short distance, three lanes are reduced to one lane (at 175 Adams), which is particularly problematic during morning rush hours.
- Left turn off Bridge might not provide enough lanes going straight
- Might be backlogged traffic onto Bridge b/c one lane
- Re proposed changes on SB Adams service road along the federal courthouse: In late afternoon, traffic on SB Adams begins to back up onto the Brooklyn Bridge. As soon as the federal agent, who controls the SB Adams service road at the "mid-block" curb cut leaves between 4:30-5 p.m., SB motorists routinely use the service road as an alternate lane, which acts as a relief valve, primarily for "through traffic." I have observed side-swipe accidents when a SB motorist turns from the main roadway into WB Tillary while a SB motorist on the SB service road proceeds across Tillary.

You propose to reduce the width of the SB service road to one lane, which will allow only turns into WB Tillary because of the extended Tillary median. If this is approved by the federal government and even if the service road were to remain available to the public "after hours," it could no longer serve as a relief lane for "through traffic." The brief length of the newly created straight/turning lane will provide space for only a few cars and queuing traffic will be even longer than it is now during late afternoon/evening rush hours.

- Will probably have a bottleneck, northbound in route to Brooklyn bridge; possible car breakdown

-Parking

- Indicating reconfigured northbound Adams Street north of Tillary Street: “Concerned – loss of bridge-side parking”; “potential – drivers treat it like a highway”



- Loss of many parking spaces on north side of Adams
- What do we do about double parking on Tillary Street?
- What design ideas are there to reduce permit double/triple parking ?

-Bicycle Travel

- Indicating northbound left turn for cyclists at Jay Street and Tillary Street – “how to bikes get to path?”

-Pedestrian Safety

- Two-way bicycle path creates danger for pedestrians b/c natural to look right when crossing

Suggested Plan Refinements or Additional Elements

- Plan Refinements

- General comment – “seating in medians?”
- Indicating Adams/Tillary intersection – “Placement of traffic lights to keep cars off crosswalk?”
- General comment – “Use green materials for everything”
- Indicating Adams Street north of Tillary - “Remove all parking along strip in front of Concord Village; more green space, etc”; “here, here. Eliminate parking-okay!”
- “Continue bike path to Navy Street bike lane”
- “Facilitate (northbound left) turn (for cyclists) at Jay Street and Tillary Street
- Indicating northwest corner of Tillary and Flatbush – “curb extension”; “bus bulb”
- Indicating median/pedestrian refuge of west side of Tillary/Flatbush – “bring further out” (i.e., move east into intersection)
- Indicating southwest corner of Tillary and Flatbush – “as big of a curb extension as possible”
- Indicating west crosswalk of Tillary and Flatbush – “LPI needed and designated car turn lane”(?)
- Indicating Tillary and Jay – “LPI at this intersection would be great”
- Indicating Tillary Street east of Jay Street – “take as many lanes of traffic away as possible”
- Indicating northeast corner of Flatbush and Tillary – “Curb Extension here – cars make right turn and sidewalk is small
- “Add curb extension “at Tillary and Gold Street, southwest and southeast corners.
- Lower “greenery” at intersections to increase visibility for everyone
-

- Additional Elements



- Indicating Tillary/Jay intersection – “signal timing = bad”; “designated turn signals needed for cars to reduce pedestrian – vehicle conflicts. Add LPI”
- “Add dedicated bus lane” to Tillary Street westbound between Flatbush Avenue and Jay Street.
- Indicating Tillary and Adams intersection – “put sign in for taxi stand at Marriot or somewhere outside of main intersection”; signage in Spanish and other languages
- “Consider eastbound bike access on Tech Place (from median of Adams to Jay Street)”
- Still would like to have pedestrian crossing across Adams closer to exit from Brooklyn Bridge
- Long bridge from bridge walkway near Watchtower gradually over to Adams service road for bikes and pedestrians.
- Midblock crossing, flyover, and pedestrian overpass
-

Other

- Indicating protected curb lane on north side of Tillary between Adams Street and Cadman Plaza east – “should be a drop-off/loading zone”
- Indicating buffered class 2 bike lane Adams Street service road north of Tillary Street – “bike lane should be buffered or protected. That’s a busy road for a class 3 lane” (Note: commenter may have misread this to be a Class 3 rather than Class 2 bike facility)
- Indicating north curb on Tillary Street just west of Jay Street – “Now a bus stop – B51; Deliveries made here – park in bus stop
- Indicating Adams Street north of Concord Village entrance - “school bus stop here?”
- Indicating southbound left turns at Adams and Tillary - “make sure this phase is exclusive”
- Please work to eliminate permit parking and bike lane parking
- Re Tillary between Adams and Jay - In view of the existing bus stop in front of the grocery store (270 Jay) and the need for deliveries to the store, the creation of a bicycle lane adjacent to the existing sidewalk and addition of a narrow curbed sidewalk to protect this bicycle lane from the westbound traffic lanes should be revisited.
- I’m concerned about lack of details and plans/beautification east of Jay Street on Tillary. Looks good otherwise.



B3. Written Comments

Issues

- 1 "Highway" design creates barriers
- 2 Pedestrian Safety
- 3 Wide Roadway/Long Crosswalks
- 4 Turning Conflicts
- 5 Parking in Bicycle lanes
- 6 Cyclist Safety
- 7 Too Much Permit Parking

Suggestions

- 1 Widen Existing Medians
- 2 Enhance/Expand Protected Bike Paths
- 3 Neckdowns
- 4 Additional Landscaping
- 5 Reduce Number of Lanes
- 6 Eliminate/Reduce Size of Service Roads
- 7 Add 2nd SB Adams Left-turn Lane

Respondent #	Issues						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
2	3	2	3	2	3	1	4
3	1	3	3	3	5	3	5
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6	3	1	2	4	3	1	NR
7	3	4	4	3	4	3	2
8	2	2	3	3	2	2	3
9	2	1	2	2	2	2	5
10	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
11	2	3	1	2	3	2	5
12	2	2	2	1	1	1	3
13	3	2	3	2	3	3	2
14	2	2	2	NR	1	2	NR
Ave score	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.5	1.9	3.3



Respondent #	Suggestions						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2
3	1	4	2	1	5	5	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6	3	1	2	1	4	3	2
7	4	4	NR	4	4	3	3
8	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
9	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	2	1	1	3	1
11	3	2	2	2	3	3	1
12	2	2	2	1	2	1	1
13	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
14	1	1	1	1	NR	NR	2
Ave score	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.4	2.5	2.3	1.5