



Monday, June 24, 2002 8:30 AM  
Salmagundi Club  
47 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
New York City

### Minutes

1. Bob Yaro opened the meeting and gave an overview of the agenda which included discussing the “Action Agenda” of the Civic Alliance and hearing from select working groups on revisions to their planning framework chapter. In the next coming weeks we plan to finalize the planning framework and use it as a platform for advocacy on a short list of issues that the Civic Alliance should champion.
2. Petra Todorovich gave a report on comments received to the Draft Planning Framework. This summary reflected written comments received only and not comments submitted directly to working groups or comments voiced in meetings. A summary of these comments is available.
3. Jeff Zupan gave an update on the ESTA Core Group/ Civic Alliance Transportation working group summary of “big pops.” He noted that this was a short list of advocacy priorities, not the revised chapter of the Planning Framework. The group chose to highlight items that are particularly important and items that demand immediate advocacy. They chose to shift items that fall under the purview of other working groups, such as urban design, and drop issues that already have broad support.
  - 3.1. The report outlined 6 “keepers” including:
    - 3.1.1. Creating a new transportation hub, underground walkway and PATH station at Church Street.
    - 3.1.2. Street management plan and pricing system
    - 3.1.3. Plan for hi-speed buses, and storage space
    - 3.1.4. Plan for moving goods & refuse in and out of Lower Manhattan
    - 3.1.5. Other issues included West Street, and how to pay for all of these transportation needs.
  - 3.2. This document will be available online shortly.
  - 3.3. Questions and comments:
    - 3.3.1. On the subject of the underground concourse, will it take life away from the street? Should the Civic Alliance take a stance on this?
    - 3.3.2. The document deals with commuter rail but does not take into account rail freight.
    - 3.3.3. Jeff: We need to deal with goods movement. So far, the Port Authority has not reacted favorably to carting trash in PATH trains.

- 3.3.4. The PA has agreed to evaluate options for rail removal of waste, including using PATH and barges.
- 3.3.5. They are taking this issue seriously, yet they have some concerns.
- 3.3.6. I don't mind if issues drop but it seems there should be some cross-reference to the different chapters. For example, the transportation hub: The LMDC blueprint did call for this to be a landmark structure, etc. We shouldn't back away from what we've already achieved. Also: I advise you to not define transportation so narrowly.
- 3.3.7. The intent is not to undercut what we've already gotten agreement on. Instead, let's focus our advocacy on issues that are still in contention.
- 3.3.8. On the issue of solid waste: The Chief architect of the Port Authority knew nothing about this issue about 10 days ago. This is not just a transportation issues but an environmental and social justice issue as well.
- 3.3.9. We sent the letter recently, so he should be aware by now.
- 3.3.10. What is the status on the short term and long term stations of PATH downtown?
- 3.3.11. The interim station is currently being rebuilt in its old location. I have recently heard that they could possibly make the interim station a permanent station – turning wall board into marble—it you will.
- 3.3.12. \$150 Million is being spent by the PA on an interim station – it would be cheaper to keep it where it is than to move it to Church Street. However if you move it to Church street you shorten walking times to points Eastwards and you bring it closer to the transportation hub at Fulton Street. Also if the station is built at Church street, it can accommodate 10 cars, which will increase capacity by 25%. LMDC has been pushing to extend the station to Broadway but there are serious costs associated with this proposal. To do this a new tunnel reaching outside of the bathtub would need to be built. The Civic Alliance needs to be a vocal advocate for replacing the station at Church Street.
- 3.3.13. Would it be possible to have two new stations in Lower Manhattan?
- 3.3.14. This has not been met with a positive evaluation. It also increases costs significantly.
- 3.3.15. I don't see the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue subway prominently featured among these “big pops.” Can we actually say that there has been genuine progress on this proposal? Members of the Alliance criticized LMDC for not featuring this prominently in their blueprint, and now we too are giving it second banana status.
- 3.3.16. Jeff: I guess we need to renew and reinforce our commitment to this committed-to project. Also, I meant to note earlier: if any new commuter rail to Lower Manhattan considered, it should not reduce existing subway service.
- 3.3.17. This needs to be a bold point. The danger is that no one is talking about it. The Second Avenue subway would serve up to 1 Million passengers a day. A portion of the \$20 billion should be allocated to building the Lower Manhattan portion of the Second Avenue subway.

- 3.3.18. Buses, and especially clean fuel buses should be used as much as possible. The language in here is not strong enough. We need to recommend that using clean fuel buses should be written into contracts, and that Lower Manhattan should be a “clean fuel” zone. I will suggest language for you to incorporate.
- 3.3.19. Also—you mentioned that there would be a link to Metro North at the 125<sup>th</sup> Street station in the MetroLink proposal. Should you stress this detail because there is such an interest in commuter rail to Lower Manhattan?
- 3.3.20. We had stated earlier that we recommend Light Rail in Lower Manhattan. I notice that it has disappeared from this document. Perhaps we should reinsert it in the context of bus traffic and as a way to move tourist traffic around.
- 3.3.21. Zupan: ESTA is concerned about the deluge of tourist buses, and is open to surface substitutes such as light rail.
- 3.3.22. Bob Yaro: We need to highlight the following points: bus access, and a street management plan or circulation system.
- 3.3.23. Light rail can be integrated with cars.
- 3.3.24. Waste movement often affects other communities. What are we going to do about the “other end” of waste management?
- 3.3.25. From the viewpoint of the local community, increased commuter buses, torn-up streets and construction will be very disruptive and chaotic.
- 3.3.26. It is clear that in order to increase subway capacity, a new tunnel under the East River will need to be built.
- 3.3.27. I am concerned about the fact that the Second Avenue subway is a likely 50 years from completion. It’s true that the completed project will address regional inequities in transportation and mobility, but until then, what are we to tell commuters in the South Bronx? Let’s promote LIRR connections to NY Waterway, which can be done in the short term. Also, let us reopen Metro North stops in the South Bronx to serve low-income communities.
4. Marian Imperatore, Co-chair of the Memorials Committee next gave a presentation on the revised platform of this group.
  - 4.1. Although it hasn’t been officially stated, the Memorial process has begun.
    - 4.1.1. LMDC has started meeting with its family advisory groups, and specific language in the RFP for consultant services referred to the memorial.
  - 4.2. We recommend that a team of consultants should be hired by LMDC to consult on the memorial process.
  - 4.3. The current advisory committee structure is ineffective. We recommend two panels: a professional committee made up of design professionals, a Park Service representative and others, and a Steering Committee, involving family members.
  - 4.4. We also recommend that a simple time frame that coordinates with the consultant process be set up.
  - 4.5. LMDC should set up a website, which is underway.
  - 4.6. There should be a world-class competition both invited and open, for the design of the memorial.
  - 4.7. Questions and Comments:

- 4.7.1. Are we concerned that the planning process being undertaken by Beyer Blinder Belle is too far gone to recommend slowing down at this point?
  - 4.7.1.1. Marian: We took a more pragmatic stance considering that the chance of slowing down the process over the next 7 months is slim. We are recommending the integration of the memorial process with the consultant's planning work that is underway.
  - 4.7.1.2. Bob Yaro: We've expressed concerns about the pace of the process. We need to either slow down the planning process or speed up the memorial process.
  - 4.7.1.3. On the subject of coordinating the schedules of the master plan and the memorial, I think we should talk about initiating the memorial process, but not speeding it up. Our hope is that after the gubernatorial election, the pressure for the planning process to move quickly may be lessened.
- 4.7.2. A community liaison design professional should be included on one of the memorial advisory committees.
- 4.7.3. Why can't we make a statement about how the time frame has been too politicized and that rushing doesn't make any sense at all. How can we even think about the design of the memorial until we have the space defined?
- 4.7.4. We need to put forth a consistent message that the planning process is moving too fast and that a rational process is needed. Furthermore, the memorial should not be separated from the rest of the site. The entire 16 acres should be integrated.
- 4.7.5. We have expressed our concerns about the pace both privately and publicly: this question should be part of the agenda a Listening to the City.
5. Chris Jones, Director of Economic Programs at RPA next gave a presentation on the progress of the Economic Development working group.
  - 5.1. The economic development working group of the Civic Alliance met on June 13. We considered several questions including: How can the rebuilding process produce a more equitable economy?
  - 5.2. We do not advocate "betting on" certain sectors of the economy, but recommend setting up the framework to support the growth of various industries.
  - 5.3. Questions and Comments:
    - 5.3.1. I am concerned that there is no jobs program mentioned here. That was a big focus of LCAN and the Community Services Society. I suggest that we include a manufacturing retention strategy, "Buy New York" campaign, and regional purchasing strategy. This has positive environmental implications.
      - 5.3.1.1. I dissent on advocating a regional purchasing strategy without having specifics on the return on this investment.
      - 5.3.1.2. To achieve a "carbon neutral area" for environmental sustainability reasons, buying locally makes sense. It also creates jobs in the region. This has both long and short term benefits.
    - 5.3.2. The history of this city demonstrates enormous diversification. However, we have long struggled with the enormous polarization of our region. We need a diversified and balanced economy.

- 5.3.3. It seems there is a tension between economic development and social justice proposals.
    - 5.3.3.1. I still maintain that a regional purchasing strategy leads to a more vibrant local economy and cuts down on shipping and transportation costs.
  - 5.3.4. On the subject of tourism, we can design Lower Manhattan to be a model of creative and sustainable redevelopment for the world. It will be a sort of urban eco-tourism in Lower Manhattan.
  - 5.3.5. I have concerns about the recommendations for Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) in the draft chapter and recommend we eliminate that recommendation.
  - 5.3.6. I take exception to eliminating any recommendations about zoning. Using zoning incentives can be an effective measure to create sub-market housing in a financially austere time. Let's sharpen the recommendations rather than eliminate them.
  - 5.3.7. I recommend that we incorporate principles of *permaculture* into all of our principles for redevelopment so that resources can be fed back into the city.
6. Amy Chester, of M&R gave an update on outreach for Listening to the City. On Monday there were over 756 people registered for the event. We continue to urge Civic Alliance members to reach out to their organizations and encourage them to attend the event.
  7. It was decided that in the summer months we will hold Civic Alliance meetings on Wednesday mornings. The next meeting will take place Wednesday, July 31.