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Written Comments Received on the DEIS
January 16, 2013

Recommendation on
ULURP Application Nos. C 130100 ZMM, C 130101 ZSM, C 130102 ZSM,
C 130103 ZSM, and N 130104 ZCM
by Hudson River Park Trust and Hudson Eagle LLC

PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Hudson River Park Trust and Hudson Eagle LLC\(^1\) (collectively, “the applicants”) propose a number of land use actions to facilitate the redevelopment and rehabilitation of Pier 57 (Block 662, Lot 3, and part of Marginal Street Wharf or Place). The project site is located west of Route 9A between West 14\(^{th}\) and 16\(^{th}\) streets within the Hudson River Park in Manhattan Community District 4. The proposed actions allow certain commercial and community facility uses, and waive height and bulk requirements for an existing legal non-complying building on Pier 57. Specifically, the applicants seek:

1. A Zoning Map Amendment (C 130100 ZMM) to rezone the project site’s M2-3 to an M1-5 zoning district. The existing M2-3 zoning district allows a maximum allowable 2.0 FAR. Approval of the amendment would permit enlargements to the existing pier building to the proposed 2.23 FAR. The rezoning would also permit the development of some community facility uses (Use Group 4) that currently are not allowed.

2. A Special Permit (C 130101 ZSM) pursuant to § 62-834 (Developments on piers or platforms) of the Zoning Resolution (“ZR”) to modify use regulations (§ 62-241), waterfront

\(^{1}\) Hudson Eagle, LLC is a primarily represented by Young Woo and Associates.
yard regulations (§ 62-332), height and setback requirements (§ 62-342), waterfront public access requirements (§ 62-57), and visual corridor requirements (§62-513).

Approval of this special permit would allow the development of non-water dependent uses, and allow Use Groups 6A, 6C, 9A and 10 uses to occupy more than 20,000 SF of floor area. The existing building on the Pier is a legal non-complying structure, and many of the height and bulk waivers are necessary to bring the building into compliance with zoning regulations as it would be rehabilitated, reused, and enlarged in the proposed development program. The proposed additions on portions of the rooftop require a maximum height waiver of up to 57 feet 3 inches. Additionally, a waiver of approximately 522 feet is required for the existing length of the building.

The proposed project also seeks a waiver for planned enlargements that would encroach on the required visual corridor along the waterfront. The applicants seek this special permit to waive the minimum 20 percent of lot area required for a waterfront public access area. The proposal would add approximately 30,022 SF (17.7 percent of lot area) of public access area on the site.

In granting these modifications, the City Planning Commission (“CPC”) must find that the (1) facility is designed to significantly enhance public use and enjoyment of the waterfront; (2) accessory parking or loading facilities provided are arranged and designed to not adversely impact public access areas; (3) the proposed development does not violate bulk provisions of § 62-341 (Developments on land and platforms); (4) the ratio of floor area on the pier to water coverage of the pier does not exceed the maximum floor area ratio for the use as set forth in the district regulations; (5) such bulk modifications would not obstruct the light and air or waterfront views of neighboring properties; and (6) such modifications would not adversely affect the essential character, use or future growth of the waterfront and the surrounding area.

In granting modifications of the waterfront public access area and visual corridor, CPC must find that the (1) proposed development would result in better achievement of the goals set forth in § 62-00 than would otherwise be possible by strict adherence to the regulations of § 62-50 (General requirements for visual corridors and waterfront public access areas) and § 62-60 (Design requirements for waterfront public access areas); and (2) alternative waterfront public access area and visual corridors on the zoning lot, or off-site on a public property adjacent to the zoning lot, are provided and that are substantially equal in area to that required and by their location and design, provide equivalent public use and enjoyment of the waterfront and views to the water from upland streets and other public areas.

3. A Special Permit (C 130102 ZSM) pursuant to § 74-922 (Certain large retail establishments) to modify regulations to allow retail establishments (Use Groups 6 and 10A uses) greater than 10,000 SF. Approval of this special permit approval would allow the development of a 100,000 SF urban public market on Pier 57. The market would include large retail establishments and a range of small stores.

---

2 Maximum height permitted on piers is 30 feet for developments without any setback.
3 Buildings on piers cannot be greater than 200 feet in length.
4 The existing lot area is 170,069 SF. 20 percent is approximately 34,014 SF).
In granting a special permit for such large retail establishment, CPC must find that (a) the principal vehicular access for such use is not located on a local narrow street; (b) that such use is so located to draw minimum vehicular traffic to and through local streets; (c) that adequate reservoir space at the vehicular entrance, and sufficient vehicular entrances and exits, are provided to prevent congestion; (d) that vehicular entrances and exits are provided for such uses and are located not less than 100 feet apart; (e) that in selecting the site, consideration has been given to the proximity and adequacy of bus and rapid transit facilities; (f) that such use is so located as not to impair the essential character or the future use of or development of the surrounding area; and (g) that such use will not produce any adverse effects which interfere with the appropriate use of land in the district or in any adjacent district.

4. A Special Permit (C 130103 ZSM) pursuant to § 13-561 (Accessory off-street parking spaces) to allow an enclosed accessory parking garage in the cellar level with 74 spaces. Current parking regulations apply only to new community facility, commercial or manufacturing developments (ZR § 13-133), and therefore would only apply to approximately 138,000 SF of the enlarged portions of the building. Approximately 35 parking spaces are permitted on the site, but the proposed project would require a waiver to allow an additional 39 accessory parking spaces.

In granting the special permit for accessory off-street parking spaces, CPC must find that (a) such parking spaces are needed for, and will be used by, the occupants, visitors, customers or employees of the use to which they are accessory; (b) within the vicinity of the site, there are insufficient parking spaces available; (c) the facility will not create or contribute to serious traffic congestion nor will inhibit vehicular and pedestrian movement; (d) the facility is so located as to draw minimum vehicular traffic to and through local residential streets; and (e) adequate reservoir space is provided at the vehicular entrance to accommodate vehicles equivalent to 20 percent of the total number of parking spaces, up to 50 parking spaces.

5. A Certification (N 130104 ZCM) from the Chairperson of CPC indicating that the submitted site plan, with approvals to the requested waivers and modifications, is in compliance with the Department of Buildings or Department of Small Businesses.

The approval of the proposed actions would facilitate the development of Pier 57 as a commercial, cultural and recreational destination to complement the active and passive recreational activities along Hudson River Park.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicants seek a number of actions to facilitate the redevelopment and rehabilitation of Pier 57 (“the Pier”) and the Pier’s existing building, located within the Hudson River Park (“the Park”) on the west side of Manhattan. The Pier is roughly situated between West 14th and 16th streets, just west of Route 9A and a protected bicycle path. The site, approximately 170,069 SF, consists of a vacant headhouse and “finger” building that contain approximately 242,230 SF of floor area. The applicant proposes to repurpose the Pier’s existing structure for commercial and retail uses, cultural and educational programs, and new public open space. The proposed redevelopment is intended to better incorporate and activate the Pier with the rest of Hudson River Park.

The Pier is located in and around three west side neighborhoods: Chelsea in Community District
4, and the Meatpacking and West Village neighborhoods in Community District 2. These areas contain a mix of warehouses and low- to medium-density residential buildings. The development of the elevated High Line Park, located roughly one block east of the Pier, has coincided with the growth of creative industries and new residential developments in recent years. A mix of restaurants, high-end retail shops, art galleries and offices also characterize the immediate area east of the Pier.

Similar to other waterfront piers, Pier 57 is zoned M2-3 reflecting its uses prior to the establishment of the Hudson River Park. M2-3 zoning districts allow for heavier industrial uses than M1 zoning districts, and have lower performance standards on smoke, noise and vibration. An M2-3 zoning district has a maximum allowable FAR of 2.0, and permit only commercial and manufacturing uses. Community facility uses are not permitted as of right. With the approval of a text amendment in 1998, park uses were allowed on M2 and M3 zoning districts that are located within the Park.

History and Policy

The existing Pier was built between 1950 and 1954 as an ocean liner pier for Grace Line Cruises. The buoyancy from three hollow caissons supports much of the Pier’s weight, and its significance in engineering history has placed the Pier on the list of State and National Registers of Historic Places. Following Grace Line Cruises, the Pier was used as a garage and maintenance facility for buses until 2007, and has remained vacant since.

Similar to much of New York City’s waterfront, Manhattan’s Lower West Side, at one time, was an active manufacturing and commercial site. With its access to the water, and the freight railway, the area transported production of goods and food imports to other parts of the city. Subsequently, New York’s general decline in manufacturing, shipping and freight industries changed the Pier’s surrounding uses and character. Industries began to leave the city, and the factories and warehouses were vacated for an extended period until art studios and galleries started to move into the old manufacturing buildings. Over time, the immediate area around the Pier appealed to other commercial, residential and retail tenants.

The Hudson River Park Act (‘the Act’) was a response to the shifting needs along the waterfront, and established the 550-acre Hudson River Park in 1998. The waterfront park spans along the west side from Battery Place at the tip of Lower Manhattan to West 59th Street. It was created, in part, to re-activate an underutilized waterfront, and to better serve existing and projected residential growth along its stretch. Additionally, the Act created the Hudson River Park Trust (‘the Trust”) as the entity to design, build and operate the Park, and to integrate the underutilized piers to the rest of the Park.

Proposed Development Program

The proposed redevelopment of Pier 57 is part of the Trust’s continued efforts to improve and expand recreational activities along the Hudson River Park. The applicants seek a number of proposed actions to facilitate the development of a public market within an existing pier structure. The approved project would also include the development of educational and cultural uses, new and improved public open space, and accessory parking that would help reactivate the vacant pier.
Commercial and Cultural Uses

A mix of retail and commercial uses, containing approximately 260,000 SF, are proposed for the interior of the Pier building. The interior of the Pier building would be divided by stacked shipping containers. The building’s interior would consist of four levels: the first floor, first floor mezzanine, second floor, and the second floor mezzanine. The stacked containers would also create customizable food-related “work/sell” spaces and stores that range between 160 and 640 SF in floor area. Rotating food markets would be part of the retail program to promote foods from visiting chefs and food purveyors. Additionally, the current plan lists at least one sit-down eating establishment to be located on the Pier’s western edge. Retail tenants are also expected to fill the headhouse of the building. While large retail establishments are permitted under the proposed M1-5 zoning district, the Trust would prohibit big-box developments on this site. These restrictions are defined in the Pier’s lease with the developer.

In addition to the proposed retail uses within the building, public community spaces would also be available. Approval of this application would permit cultural uses including a technical arts school (approximately 33,000 SF) and theater (11,000 SF).

Public Open Space and Marina

The Pier’s redevelopment program includes improvements and expansions to the public open space areas on and surrounding the Pier, adding approximately 2.5 acres of open space to the Park. The perimeter walkway would be repaired and extended to connect with the Park’s esplanade, and to provide additional public seating and viewing areas. Additionally, approximately 73,000 SF\(^5\) of rooftop open space would also be created. The rooftop space is designed with shaded seating areas, space for art installations, as well as a pavilion for seasonal performances and events.

A marina with up to 141 slips would be located on the north and south sides of the Pier. Several slips would be reserved for historic shipping vessels, as well as non-motorized boats. Additionally, a water-taxi landing may be located on the Pier’s northeast corner.

Pier Access and Circulation

The proposed project includes a plan for vehicular flow into and around the project site. A circulation road, fronting the Pier building, would separate the Pier from the protected bicycle path. In the future, vehicles would access the Pier through a dedicated right turn lane along Route 9A at the West 16\(^{th}\) Street intersection\(^6\), and the West 17\(^{th}\) Street intersection for vehicles coming from the south.

The proposed 74-space accessory parking garage would be located on the caisson level. Vehicles would access and enter the garage on the Pier’s southeast corner, and exit on its

---

\(^5\) The rooftop open space would accommodate approximately 2,500 people. The number of people attending special events on the roof, however, would not exceed 1,500.

\(^6\) A new traffic light would be installed at that intersection to regulate vehicles coming into the Pier at West 16\(^{th}\) Street.
northeast corner.

The project would install a taxi stand directly across from the Pier located on the east side of Route 9A, and south of West 15th Street. The designated taxi stand will include space for loading and unloading of passengers, and will not interfere with the accessory vehicles entering and exiting the Pier.

The applicants propose multiple pedestrian access points along the side of the Pier building that fronts the Hudson River Park esplanade. The redevelopment plan includes a public walkway surrounding the Pier’s southern, western and northern sides. Additionally, the sidewalk along the Pier’s frontage would be widened to prevent potential pedestrian spillover onto the bicycle path. The upper floors and rooftop would be accessed through an existing ramp from the eastern entrance. Finally, the Pier would be accessed by the upland through several pedestrian crosswalks across the West Side Highway.\(^7\)

**Anticipated Development under the Reasonable Worst Case Scenario Development**

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") indicates that the proposed actions would lead to a number of transportation- and noise-related impacts under the *With-Action Scenario*. Other than the unavoidable noise impacts on the surrounding areas in the Park, the transportation impacts will be mitigated.

The *DEIS* found five locations to experience significant impacts during one or more analyzed peak periods.\(^8\) Additionally, three pedestrian crosswalks would experience significant adverse impacts from the proposed project. In consultation with the New York City Department of Transportation, mitigations of impacts include changing signalizations and the widening of crosswalks.

**COMMUNITY BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

At a Full Board meeting on December 5, 2012, Community Board 4 ("CB4") approved the proposed project with conditions by a vote of 36 in favor and 0 in opposition.

While generally satisfied with the plans to redevelop Pier 57, CB4 made recommendations to ensure the project remains within the scope of the Pier’s long-term development. CB4 voted to limit the Pier’s FAR to 2.23, as currently proposed, which is below the maximum allowable 6.5 FAR under an M1-5 zoning district. The community board also recommended further restrictions to exclude hotel uses and big-box retailers on the Pier. CB4 also requested that the proposed accessory parking garage prohibit transient parking as to reduce pedestrian and vehicular conflicts. Lastly, to better improve pedestrian safety, CB4 recommended a split phase signal at the intersection of Tenth Avenue and West 15th Street.

**BOROUGH PRESIDENT’S COMMENTS**

\(^7\) There are five nearby crosswalks across Route 9A: the south side of West 17th Street, south side of West 16th Street, north and south sides of West 15th Street and the south side of West 14th Street.

\(^8\) The five locations are: Route 9A and West 17th Street, Route 9A and West 15th Street, Tenth Avenue and West 14th Street, Eighth Avenue and West 17th Street, and Eighth Avenue and West 14th Street.
The development of Hudson River Park has transformed the west side waterfront into a regional New York City attraction. Located in communities where quality open space is often difficult to find, the Park has become an enormous public amenity providing much-needed green space to its surrounding communities. Redevelopment of Pier 57 is part of a larger plan to complete the Hudson River Park as it will add open space, and re-connect the vacant pier to the rest of the greenway. Further, the Pier will be reactivated with retail uses and revenue-generating opportunities that are beneficial to the Park’s maintenance and continued success.

The proposed project supports sound city policies, incorporates community input and promotes goals defined in the Hudson River Park Trust Act. It will expand recreational opportunities, and increase public access to the waterfront, which are important citywide goals. The project also employs sustainable principles as it will reclaim and restore an existing historic structure, and use repurposed shipping containers to partition spaces within the building. Further, the proposed project is the culmination of a community engagement process that informed the final project design and development program. The proposed actions are necessary to meet these notable project objectives.

**Bulk and Uses**

The applicants seek a new zoning district to permit certain commercial and community facility uses, and greater density that are currently not allowed under an M2-3 zoning district. The proposed 2.23 FAR slightly exceeds the 2.0 FAR currently permitted on the site. The additional FAR will accommodate the four levels of proposed development program which includes commercial, retail, cultural and educational uses.

Without the rezoning, proposed eating establishments and a potential technical school are not permitted on the project site. In addition, without an M1-5 zoning designation, the site does not qualify for a special permit that allows retail establishments exceeding 10,000 SF. This special permit is necessary to develop the proposed public marketplace of approximately 100,000 SF, which will be divided into smaller individual stalls.

The current plan for a public marketplace is a highly appropriate use in the repurposed building. There are also clear benefits to housing small retail and food tenants on the Pier. First, small food retail stores and eateries will be complementary to the Park’s passive recreational uses, as the Pier will be one of the few areas along the Park with food and shopping options. Second, businesses will benefit from lower overhead costs in the shared space and resources, which also incubates growth and discourages high turnover. Third, the collective industry experience and knowledge across related food and design specialties fosters innovative ideas. Lastly, the public marketplace model enables greater flexibility in accommodating needs of various retail spaces.

The other proposed uses on the site are also highly appropriate and carry significant public benefits. The addition and improvement of park space around the perimeter and on the roof of the Pier create accessible community spaces for public events and performances, as well as passive recreation and enjoyment of scenic views of the waterfront.

The proposed uses are fitting, reflect the uses nearby, and do not overwhelm the passive recreational activities along the Park. The proposed marketplace will be a unique public space
that will contribute to the growth of small businesses and to the Park’s overall attraction. The M1-5 rezoning, therefore, is appropriate as it supports the efforts in transforming the vacant pier into a vibrant and unique public amenity.

The proposed bulk waivers will legalize the building’s existing non-complying height and bulk. These waivers are necessary to preserve and repurpose the historic structure, and to enlarge portions of the building that would enhance the overall project. The project seeks to waive a waterfront yard requirement, intended to provide recreational space, and light and air along the waterfront. However, the proposed plan will add nearly 109,000 SF of open space on the roof and along the Pier’s perimeter which fully satisfies the regulation’s intent.

The existing building also needs to waive obstructions of the waterfront visual corridor, and a slight encroachment on the public access area. Theses waivers would also permit minor enlargements to portions of the building, while bringing the majority of the building into compliance with zoning.

These waivers and special permits will facilitate the development of the project’s thoughtful design of the rooftop open space, and improvements to the public access areas.

Density and Use Restrictions

While the Community Board was generally pleased with the project’s design and the “work/sell” store concept, members expressed some concerns regarding the allowable density and uses in the proposed zoning district. The proposed M1-5 zoning district will increase the project site’s maximum allowable density from a 2.0 to a 6.5 FAR, which equates to a potential 765,311 SF of floor area that could be developed on the site. The new zoning designation and special permit approvals would also allow Use Group 5 hotel uses, and Use Group 10A big-box retail uses greater than 20,000 SF that are currently not allowed under the site’s M2-3 zoning.

If realized, those uses at such a significant density would greatly detract from the waterfront park’s open space and recreation purposes, and should be discouraged. However, the redevelopment of Pier 57 will be governed by regulatory safeguards, which will prevent the Pier from being developed other than what is currently proposed.

While zoning generally dictates the uses on a site, allowable uses on the Pier are also governed by the Hudson River Park Trust Act. Among one of the prohibited uses listed in the Act is hotel use.9 The Trust will further include restrictions on big-box retailers, trade show and ballroom operators, and nightclubs and cabarets in its lease with the developer.10

The Pier is listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places, and requires oversight and evaluation from the State Historic Preservation Office on any changes to the Pier’s physical form. Further, any alteration to the current design or the proposed program would also be reviewed by the Trust, which has a set of its own regulatory processes that include public hearings on the Park’s developments.

---

9 Other prohibited uses are residential, manufacturing, warehousing, incompatible government uses and casinos.
10 Prohibitive uses found in a draft lease provided by the applicants.
Accessory Parking

The proposed 74-space accessory parking facility, with 10 reservoir spaces at the garage’s entrance, will be located on the Pier’s caisson level to accommodate the occupants, visitors, customers and employees at the project site. A special permit is required to increase the number of as-of-right parking spaces at this location. Applicants of this special permit are generally entitled to a favorable consideration if they meet the findings.

Currently, approximately 35 parking spaces are allowed on the project site.\textsuperscript{11} The DEIS finds no significant adverse impact, even with the additional 39 spaces requested by the applicants, suggesting there will be no resulting traffic congestion as defined under the City’s Environmental Quality Review. Currently, there is a lack of available parking within the project site’s vicinity. As studied in the DEIS, on-street parking within a quarter mile of the Pier is generally near 100 percent utilization rate. In addition, there are eight parking facilities, with a combined capacity of 2,046 spaces, located in the area with an average 81 percent utilization rate. According to the DEIS, the proposed project is expected to generate additional parking demand in the area, bringing in 187 additional vehicles during the weekday midday peak hour, and 293 during the weekend midday peak hour.\textsuperscript{12} The results from the study imply that the surrounding facilities would be close to full capacity when accommodating an increased parking demand from the project, and the proposed additional spaces at the project site will help ease congestion in the surrounding area.

The proposed 74-space facility will increase available spaces in the area to accommodate the additional demand. The addition of this garage will also prevent vehicles from circling the neighborhood in search of parking, curbing the amount of driving on local residential streets.

CB4 expressed concerns about potential transient parking that may take place in the proposed garage. In preventing non-accessory parking at the project site, the applicants have agreed to install a sign that will be prominently displayed at the garage’s entrance to discourage public parking. The sign will indicate parking is reserved only for the owners, occupants, employees, customers, or visitors of the Pier.

Traffic and Vehicular Flow

The proposed vehicular access plan will improve flow of traffic and increase safety in and around the Pier. Proposed speed tables, lights and a new pedestrian walkway will increase efficiency and help reduce potential conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. Locating the taxi stand in a separate area than the Pier’s frontage further adds to the circulation efficiency and safety around the project site.

The community expressed concerns about traffic conditions at the intersection of 10\textsuperscript{th} Avenue and West 15\textsuperscript{th} Street. In its resolution, CB4 identified the intersection to be dangerous, especially for pedestrians crossing West 15\textsuperscript{th} Street on the west side of 10\textsuperscript{th} Avenue. The DEIS

\textsuperscript{11} Enlarged portions of the Pier equal to approximately 138,000 SF. Under § 13-1333 of the Zoning Resolution, the maximum number of accessory off-street parking spaces permitted for each enlargement should not exceed one space per 4,000 SF of floor area, or 100 spaces, whichever is less.

\textsuperscript{12} Tables 14-26 and 14-27 in the \textit{DEIS}. 
studied this intersection and identified no significant adverse impacts as a result of the proposed project. The applicants, however, have reached out to and continue to work with the Department of Transportation in identifying ways to mitigate the community’s concerns with this intersection.

BOROUGH PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The rezoning will facilitate the rehabilitation of a historic pier in Hudson River Park, and will allow the appropriate commercial and community facility uses. This project meets city policies and the findings for waterfront zoning and purposes, enhances waterfront access, and adds to a great public benefit.

Therefore, the Manhattan Borough President recommends approval of ULURP Application Nos. C 1300100 ZMM, C 130101 ZSM, C 130102 ZSM, C 130103 ZSM, and N 130104 ZCM.

Scott M. Stringer
Manhattan Borough President
Comments of
ASSEMBLY MEMBER RICHARD N. GOTTFRIED
ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT and
ULURP Applications Nos. 130100ZMM, 130101ZSM, 130102ZSM, N130103ZSM and
130104ZCM
SUPPORTING THE PIER 57 REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL
before New York City Department of City Planning
Public Hearing
Spector Hall, 22 Reade Street
Wednesday, January 23, 2013

As the Assembly Member representing the site of the proposed redevelopment project at Pier 57, as a member of the Pier 57 Working Group and as the Assembly author of the NYS law that created the Hudson River Park, I thank the City Planning Commission for the opportunity to present comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and proposed ULURP actions and thank the Hudson River Park Trust (HRPT) and Hudson Eagle for creating a valuable and significant project.

The proposal by Young Woo and Associates to convert Pier 57 into a new and noteworthy cultural and commercial destination will be a benefit to the Hudson River Park and its communities not just for the income it will bring to the Park, but also for the addition of 110,000 square feet of beautiful roof-top public open space, the perimeter walkway, a marina, exciting programming and a variety of restaurants. This proposal was not only the choice of the Hudson River Park Trust, but had the support of the Pier 57 Working Group, comprised of the local elected officials, the three “Hudson River” Community Boards (1, 2 and 4), and other stakeholders. It is the product of many meetings and consultations to maximize public input and will be a welcome improvement to the long vacant historic structure. I wholeheartedly support the plan.

I share many of the concerns expressed by Community Board 4 and the Manhattan Borough President, but will focus only on two: parking and traffic mitigation. I am satisfied with the Trust’s promise to not allow a big box store, which will be achieved via the lease with Young Woo/Hudson Eagle. I am also gratified that only “accessory” parking will be allowed, since, under the Hudson River Park Act, only “incidental” parking is allowed. I understand the Trust has guaranteed advisory signage to ensure that there only be accessory parking, but clarification would be gained by defining “accessory parking” in the formality of the lease.
While I trust that Young Woo and Hudson River Park Trust have worked diligently to ensure traffic flow on 9A and allow for maximum safety and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists, I am aware of Chelsea Piers’ apprehensions concerning the Traffic Management Plan, the potential backup of southbound traffic at 17th Street, especially during an event at Pier 57, as this is both the area of egress for cars leaving Chelsea Piers and the entrance for Pier 57. I urge the Trust and its very able traffic consultants to continue to work with Chelsea Piers and NYS and NYC DOT as appropriate, to circumvent to the extent possible a backup of traffic within Chelsea Piers due to vehicles entering Pier 57. This might be accomplished with the adjustment of the traffic lights as well as an addition of traffic enforcement agents to ensure traffic departure from Chelsea Piers during events. The Traffic Management Plan needs further detail and examination as per the “Potential Actions to Mitigate Traffic Impacts From Pier 57 On Chelsea Piers Egress” contained in Chelsea Piers’ letter of December 11, 2012 “Pier 57 DEIS Traffic Analysis Review Comments” in the EIS.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments and look forward to continuing work with the Hudson River Park Trust, the Pier 57 Working Group, Young Woo and Associates, and the community to advance the project.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.
December 18, 2012

Amanda M. Burden, Chair
City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street
New York, NY 10007

Re: ULURP Applications Nos. 130100ZMM, 130101ZSM, 130102ZSM, N130103ZSM and 130104ZCM - Pier 57

Dear Chair Burden:

At its regularly scheduled Full Board Meeting on December 5, 2012, Manhattan Community Board 4, on the recommendation of its Chelsea Land Use, Waterfront, Parks and Environment and Transportation Planning Committees, and following a duly noticed public hearing, voted by roll call 36 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining and 2 present not eligible to recommend approval of the Applications if the conditions presented below are fulfilled.

Background

Pier 57 is located west of Route 9A at the ends of 16th and 17th Streets, within Hudson River Park. To the north are Piers 59 through 62, the Chelsea Piers complex, and to the south is Pier 54, planned to be developed as an open public park pier, and Gansevoort Peninsula, planned to be developed as public park land. Among the Hudson River piers, Pier 57 is unique in that it was built on three giant concrete caissons that were constructed up-river and floated into position. The pier is listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places and is currently vacant.

Proposed Development

The current proposal is the result of an RFP issued by the Hudson River Park Trust (HRPT) four years ago. It was selected from three respondents following review by HRPT as well as The HRPT Advisory Council, which includes members from Community Boards 1, 2 and 4. The proposed redevelopment, renovation, reuse and enlargement of Pier 57 would be consistent with and further the goals of the Hudson River Park Act in that it involves the reuse of the historic pier for uses beneficial to the public.

The proposed project would rehabilitate and redevelop the vacant Pier 57 site with a major new public open space and a perimeter walkway, and provide new retail, restaurant and other...
commercial uses, as well as educational, cultural, boating and rooftop open space uses, and accessory parking. The proposed development program is expected to include the following major land uses:

- 260,000 SF of retail and restaurant space;
- 11,000 SF of cultural use (i.e., 300-seat theatre);
- 33,000 SF technical arts school;
- 40,000 SF of art gallery/exhibit space (at the caisson level);
- 73,000 SF rooftop space (for open space use and programmed events);
- 141-slip marina;
- Accessory parking for a maximum of 74 vehicles; and
- Water taxi landing.

The primary retail use proposed for the project site would be designed as a planned public marketplace modeled on several existing year-round markets located in London, England and on one recently implemented on a temporary basis as the DeKalb Market in Brooklyn. At Pier 57, this public marketplace concept draws specific inspiration from existing businesses in West Chelsea and the Meatpacking District in the realms of fashion, design, art, and food.

Repurposed shipping containers would be stacked to create four market levels (first floor, first-floor mezzanine, second floor, and second-floor mezzanine). In combination with some traditional walled enclosures, these containers would create multiple “work/sell” retail stores and showrooms expected to range in size between approximately 160 and 640 SF. These retail uses would be oriented primarily toward a collection of independent designers and food purveyors. The work/sell marketplace would be an incubator for new retail businesses, designers, and food-related businesses as well as a community gathering place. Towards the western end of the pier shed, the design would open to a large double-height space with views of the water to the north and south. This end of the pier shed would include open, public “piazza” spaces to be used for occasional entertainment or small-format displays, and would be designed to accommodate rotating food markets and “bazaars,” with the idea of providing lively surroundings for resident and visiting chefs and food purveyors to exhibit and promote their food products.

In addition, the proposed project would add the following new public open space elements:

- **Waterfront Public Access Areas** - The existing perimeter walkway extending around most of the pier would be repaired and extended to connect with the Hudson River Park waterfront esplanade to the east of the pier, consistent with existing permits previously received by HRPT. The walkway would include approximately 800 linear feet of seating. In addition, new public walkways parallel to the existing bulkhead, previously approved and permitted, would extend to the north and south, extending the currently limited public circulation space along the headhouse. Treatments would be compatible with existing designs for areas bordering the river within Hudson River Park.

- **Rooftop open space** - Approximately 1.6 acres of open space would be created on the pier’s finger building. The roof would be divided into open areas on the eastern and western portions of the rooftop with a pavilion in the center. The open areas on the eastern and western
portions of the rooftop would mostly provide flexible space for seating, relaxation, and views of the river, with a capacity for approximately 2,500 persons. These areas could include wooden decking, hardscape, paving, and small lawn areas. The center of the rooftop would contain a pavilion with a public observation deck on the roof and wide stairs on the east that would function as seating areas during events. It is also expected that portions of the headhouse rooftop would be accessible to the public and function primarily as open space, but may be programmed for events, e.g., the Tribeca Film Festival.

Requested Actions

Hudson River Park Trust and Hudson Eagle, LLC, an affiliate of Youngwoo & Associates, LLC, the developer, are co-applicants for the requested actions.

i. **130100ZMM** - Application for a Zoning Map Change to rezone Pier 57 to M1-5 from M2-3. The applicants seek this amendment in order to:

   - Develop Pier 57 to an FAR of approximately 2.23; the maximum permitted FAR is 2.0 under M2-3 and 5.0 under M1-5;
   - Permit certain uses prohibited under M2-3, including those in Use Group 6C (e.g., eating or drinking establishment with entertainment, but not dancing, with a capacity of 200 persons or less, sporting stores, gift shops);
   - Make the project site eligible for a Special Permit under ZR 74-922 to allow large retail stores; and
   - Make the project site eligible for a Special Permit under ZR 74-921 relating to certain community facility uses in Use Groups 3A and 4A.

ii. **130101ZSM** - Application for two Special Permits under ZR Sections 62-834(b) and 62-834(c).

   - The applicants seek a Special Permit under ZR 62-834(b) in order to:
     - Modify ZR 62-342 to allow a building that exceeds the maximum permitted height of 30 feet by approximately 25 feet and 57 feet, and to allow a building that exceeds the maximum permitted length of 200 feet, and thus comply with ZR 62-241(c) permitting the change, enlargement and extension of uses on the existing pier.
     - Modify ZR 62-332 to allow further vertical encroachment into the required waterfront yard.
   - The applicants seek a Special Permit under ZR 62-834(c) in order to:
     - Modify ZR 62-57 to allow 30,022 sq. ft. of waterfront public access area instead of the required 34,014 sq. ft.
- Modify ZR 62-513 to waive required visual corridors that would be encroached by the proposed development.

iii. 130102ZSM - Application for a Special Permit under ZR 74-922 seeking the modification of the use regulations of ZR 42-10 to allow large retail establishments.

- The applicants seek a Special Permit under ZR 74-922 to modify the use regulations of ZR 42-10 to allow an urban public marketplace of approximately 100,000 sq. ft. and other larger retail establishments.

iv. 130103ZSM - Application for a Special Permit under ZR 13-561 seeking the modification of the parking regulations of ZR 13-133.

- The applicants seeks a Special Permit under ZR 13-562 to modify the requirements of ZR 13-133 to permit an accessory garage with a maximum capacity of 74 parking spaces.

v. 130104ZCM - Application for Certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission under ZR 62-811 that the proposed project complies with minimum waterfront public access area requirements under ZR 62-57 and ZR 62-58 as modified by the requested approvals.

- The applicants seek a Certification that the proposed plan, as modified by the requested approvals, complies with the minimum waterfront public access area requirements under ZR 62-52(b), ZR 62-57 and ZR 62-58.

Community Board 4 Recommendations

The Board strongly supports the redevelopment of Pier 57 and believes that the proposed project would be an excellent addition to Hudson River Park and to the community. We believe, however, that there are elements of the proposal that should be reconsidered in order to protect the interests of the community.

- 130100ZMM - Zoning Map Change. While we understand the applicants' desire for the proposed M1-5 zoning designation, the change potentially opens the door to future as-of-right bulk, height and uses that CB4 believes are undesirable. We normally would request a restrictive declaration of the applicant, but since Pier 57 is owned by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation we suspect that another mechanism will be required. We have asked Senator Tom Duane and Assemblyman Richard Gottfried for help in devising appropriate means to fulfill the conditions listed below and request that the Department of City Planning also help in whatever way they can.

- CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to limit the FAR to the 2.23 the applicants are requesting for the proposed development. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.
- CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude hotel uses. We understand that the current proposal does not include a hotel and that the Hudson River Park Act currently does not permit hotels, but since the proposed M1-5 zoning permits hotels as-of-right we would greatly prefer one more safeguard against this use that the community strongly opposes on piers in Hudson River Park. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.

- CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude "big box" retailers or discounters. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction. (See discussion under 130102ZSM - Special Permit under ZR 74-922, below.)

- CB4 recommends that the application for these special permits be approved. CB4 notes that the existing structure is non-compliant and that the proposed redevelopment would increase this non-compliance. We believe, however, that the proposed increase in height and length of the development will not detract from the waterfront experience, including the required visual corridors. We also note that including the waterfront public access area that will be provided immediately adjacent to Pier 57 will result in more than the required 30,022 sq. ft.

- CB4 recommends that this special permit be approved. The proposed development provides for an urban public market space consisting of multiple small retailers, along with larger retail establishments, totaling approximately 100,000 sq. ft. In the aggregate this retail space requires a special permit allowing large retail establishments, but HRPT has shared with the Board excerpts of its Memorandum of Understanding with the developer in which the developer agrees that "big box" retailers or discounters will be prohibited on Pier 57. HRPT has told the Board that the ultimate lease with the developer will be based on this MOU.

- CB4 recommends that approval be contingent on HRPT agreeing that the ultimate lease with the developer specifically prohibit transient parking, uses the term "ancillary parking" as it is used in the Zoning Resolution and mandates that any operator of the parking facility be required to apply for a variance to post a sign stating, "No transient parking permitted, accessory use only" (as provided in Administrative Code, Title 6, Subchapter Q, paragraph 2-161).

- Traffic and Pedestrian Safety. The traffic issues associated with the redevelopment of Pier 57 have been among the most difficult to resolve and led to community opposition to earlier proposals. CB4 believes that the current proposal successfully addresses the community's
concerns and is grateful for the applicants’ diligent attention to these issues. Our one remaining concern is the intersection of Tenth Avenue and West 15th Street, a dangerous intersection that exposes pedestrians crossing West 15th Street on the west side of Tenth Avenue to cars arriving at high speed from the West Side Highway.

- CB4 recommends that approval be contingent on the equipping of the west bound turning movements from Tenth Avenue onto West 15th Street with a split phase signal.

- **130104ZCM - Certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission under ZR 62-811.**

- CB4 recommends that the Chairperson issue the requested Certification if the conditions listed above are met.

In addition to agreeing to the conditions listed above, Hudson Eagle, LLC has agreed to work with CB4 to make Pier 57 and its tenants an integral part of the community. Specifically, Hudson Eagle, LLC has agreed to:

- Support the CB4 Community Jobs Project for Pier 57 and to work with CB4 in its implementation. Hudson Eagle, LLC has agreed to post Pier 57 job openings on the CB4 website as they become available; to hold periodic job fairs in coordination with CB4; and to work with its current and future tenants, on a best efforts basis, to identify and hire employees from within Community Board 4.

- Provide the opportunity for contacts and collaboration between arts-related uses and tenants on Pier 57 and Chelsea schools, including PS 11, PS 33 and the Museum School.

- Consider the opportunity to provide discounted tuitions to community residents for food-related programs.

The redevelopment of Pier 57 is a crucial element in the ongoing revitalization of Hudson River Park. We believe that the proposed project is an appropriate use of the waterfront and would be an excellent addition to the park.

Subject to the conditions set forth for the individual requested actions, Community Board strongly supports the applications and recommends their approval.

Sincerely,

Corey Johnson, Chair
Manhattan Community Board 4
J. Lee Compton, Co-Chair
Chelsea Preservation & Planning

Brett Firfer, Co-Chair
Chelsea Preservation and Planning

John Doswell, Co-Chair
Waterfront, Parks and Environment Committee

Maarten de Kadt, Co-Chair
Waterfront, Parks and Environment Committee

Christine Berthet, Co-chair
Transportation Planning Committee

Jay Marcus, Co-chair
Transportation Planning Committee

cc : Madelyn Wils, Noreen Doyle, Laurie Silberfeld – Hudson River Park Trust
Ross F. Moskowitz, Esq. – Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
Edith Hsu-Chen, Karolina Grebowiec-Hall – Department of City Planning
Melanie LaRocca, Michaela Miller - NYC Council Speaker Christine Quinn’s Office
Brian Cook, Lin Zeng – Manhattan Borough President’s Office
NYS Assemblyman Richard Gottfried
NYS Senator Thomas Duane
U.S. Congressman – Jerrold Nadler
A.J. Pietrantone – Friends of Hudson River Park
December 18, 2012

Director Amanda M. Burden
Department of City Planning
22 Reade Street
New York, New York 10007

Re: ULURP Applications Nos. 130100ZMM, 130101ZSM, 130102ZSM, N130103ZSM and 130104ZCM - Pier 57

Dear Chair Burden:

Manhattan Community Board 4 is pleased to provide the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the project commonly known as Pier 57.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Pier 57 is located west of Route 9A at the ends of 16th and 17th Streets, within Hudson River Park. To the north are Piers 59 through 62, the Chelsea Piers complex, and to the south is Pier 54, planned to be developed as an open public park pier, and Gansevoort Peninsula, planned to be developed as public park land. Among the Hudson River piers, Pier 57 is unique in that it was built on three giant concrete caissons that were constructed up-river and floated into position. The pier is listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places and is currently vacant.

The current proposal is the result of an RFP issued by the Hudson River Park Trust (HRPT) four years ago. It was selected from three respondents following review by HRPT as well as The HRPT Advisory Council, which includes members from Community Boards 1, 2 and 4. The proposed redevelopment, renovation, reuse and enlargement of Pier 57 would be consistent with and further the goals of the Hudson River Park Act in that it involves the reuse of the historic pier for uses beneficial to the public.

The proposed project would rehabilitate and redevelop the vacant Pier 57 site with a major new public open space and a perimeter walkway, and provide new retail, restaurant and other commercial uses, as well as educational, cultural, boating and rooftop open space uses, and accessory parking. The proposed development program is expected to include the following major land uses:
- 260,000 SF of retail and restaurant space;
- 11,000 SF of cultural use (i.e., 300-seat theatre);
- 33,000 SF technical arts school;
- 40,000 SF of art gallery/exhibit space (at the caisson level);
- 73,000 SF rooftop space (for open space use and programmed events);
- 141-slip marina;
- Accessory parking for a maximum of 74 vehicles; and
- Water taxi landing.

The primary retail use proposed for the project site would be designed as a planned public marketplace modeled on several existing year-round markets located in London, England and on one recently implemented on a temporary basis as the DeKalb Market in Brooklyn. At Pier 57, this public marketplace concept draws specific inspiration from existing businesses in West Chelsea and the Meatpacking District in the realms of fashion, design, art, and food.

Repurposed shipping containers would be stacked to create four market levels (first floor, first-floor mezzanine, second floor, and second-floor mezzanine). In combination with some traditional walled enclosures, these containers would create multiple “work/sell” retail stores and showrooms expected to range in size between approximately 160 and 640 SF. These retail uses would be oriented primarily toward a collection of independent designers and food purveyors. The work/sell marketplace would be an incubator for new retail businesses, designers, and food-related businesses as well as a community gathering place. Towards the western end of the pier shed, the design would open to a large double-height space with views of the water to the north and south. This end of the pier shed would include open, public “piazza” spaces to be used for occasional entertainment or small-format displays, and would be designed to accommodate rotating food markets and “bazaars,” with the idea of providing lively surroundings for resident and visiting chefs and food purveyors to exhibit and promote their food products.

In addition, the proposed project would add the following new public open space elements:

- **Waterfront Public Access Areas** - The existing perimeter walkway extending around most of the pier would be repaired and extended to connect with the Hudson River Park waterfront esplanade to the east of the pier, consistent with existing permits previously received by HRPT. The walkway would include approximately 800 linear feet of seating. In addition, new public walkways parallel to the existing bulkhead, previously approved and permitted, would extend to the north and south, extending the currently limited public circulation space along the headhouse. Treatments would be compatible with existing designs for areas bordering the river within Hudson River Park.

- **Rooftop open space** - Approximately 1.6 acres of open space would be created on the pier’s finger building. The roof would be divided into open areas on the eastern and western portions of the rooftop with a pavilion in the center. The open areas on the eastern and western portions of the rooftop would mostly provide flexible space for seating, relaxation, and views of the river, with a capacity for approximately 2,500 persons. These areas could include wooden decking, hardscape, paving, and small lawn areas. The center of the rooftop would contain a pavilion with a public observation deck on the roof and wide stairs on the east that would
function as seating areas during events. It is also expected that portions of the headhouse rooftop would be accessible to the public and function primarily as open space, but may be programmed for events, e.g., the Tribeca Film Festival.

THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The following are specific comments on several of the individual sections discussed in the DEIS.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

The Board strongly supports the redevelopment of Pier 57 and believes that the proposed project would be an excellent addition to Hudson River Park and to the community. We believe, however, that there are elements of the proposal that should be reconsidered in order to protect the interests of the community.

While we understand the applicants' desire for the proposed M1-5 zoning designation, the change potentially opens the door to future as-of-right bulk, height and uses that CB4 believes are undesirable.

a. CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to limit the FAR to the 2.23 the applicants are requesting for the proposed development. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.

b. CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude hotel uses. We understand that the current proposal does not include a hotel and that the Hudson River Park Act currently does not permit hotels, but since the proposed M1-5 zoning permits hotels as-of-right we would greatly prefer one more safeguard against this use that the community strongly opposes on piers in Hudson River Park. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.

c. CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude "big box" retailers or discounters. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Business

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. Pier 57 would join neighboring Western Beef and Chelsea Market (also slated for an expansion by 2017) along with the areas distinct concentrations of shoppers’ goods stores, including concentrations of art galleries in Chelsea and high-end boutiques in the Meatpacking District. In the end, it will have limited impact on any market displacement and rent increases.
However, it does provide an opportunity for local residents with a place to look for when job hunting. We asked that the applicant agree to support a Jobs Program for Chelsea Market and to work with CB4 in its implementation. They agreed to place a link to job openings on the CB4 website, to hold periodic job fairs in coordination with CB4 and to work with its future tenants on a best efforts basis to identify and hire employees from within Community District 4.

Residents
The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct or indirect residential displacement. The proposed project would redevelop a vacant building, and therefore would not directly displace any residents.

Community Facilities and Services
No comments.

Open Space
No comments.

Shadows
No comments.

Historic Resources and Urban Design and Visual Resources
We recognize that the proposed changes to the physical structure and visual resources of Pier 57 will have significant impacts on the historic character of the pier and the visual resources it represents, but believes they should be accepted as a whole as forming the most feasible proposal for both the reuse of the structure as an active feature of the Hudson River Park and as a necessary source of income for the park under the original scheme for supporting the park.

The proposals for the pier include provisions for restoration and reuse of the greater part of the exterior of the pier and of many of the interior elements. The extensive rooftop changes elsewhere on the pier shed will make possible an elaborate park program at this location. The interior changes just below at both head house and pier shed will enable an elaborate retail proposal that will contribute major funding to the park in accordance with the function of this pier in the park master plan. In mitigation, maritime and other park-related uses will occupy much of the original lower levels to the south and west of the retail and in the adjoining water.

This proposal largely maintains the historic levels on the interior. Besides maintaining this important feature of the original structure and use, this feature enables retention of the largely intact features of the route taken inside the pier by passengers and light luggage departing by steamer, a now rare relic of the historic port that the applicant has recently announced his intention to restore. The Board regards this laudable action as significant partial mitigation for the alterations elsewhere and accepts the changes above and on the outside of the pier shed and
within the portion of the head house directly in front of the shed and behind the restored front as regrettable necessities in accordance with the basic provisions for park funding.

We are concerned, however, that the head house roof is to be raised over the north wing and that the existing light structure there, clearly visible from highway and the park walkway to the north, is to be replaced by a banal modern one. We believe this is an unnecessary loss. The roof location would only provide a minor contribution to the extensive retail level below. The light structure is significant in that it is the only remaining feature that recalls that the pier did not stand alone but was part of a group of major passenger and freight piers, especially the present Chelsea Piers to the north. Indeed its purpose was to provide a connection with the rooftop of the now demolished pier just to the north. Its partial glass enclosure within a light metal framework is also attractive in itself, and would also reflect the constant changes constantly taking place on this active waterfront, even on this most monumental group of piers. It could provide a sheltered location for users of the rooftop to enjoy shade and views to the city to the east, and perhaps even be a spot for refreshments for visitors to this portion of the roof.

**Natural Resources**

No comments.

**Hazardous Material**

No comments.

**Water and Sewer Infrastructure**

This DEIS tells us the project’s effect on the city’s water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste management services, and energy use “would be minimal and would not significantly impact existing infrastructure.”¹

Nowhere is there any indication that the project will use state-of-the-art management techniques in these areas. If not, the project misses an opportunity to educate the public about the importance of managing these areas.

We are pleased to note that the project will send storm water directly to the Hudson River. Other projects in our area should manage uncontaminated water in the same way. However, nowhere is there an indication that some amount of the storm water would be captured for use in HVAC equipment, gardening and for cleaning. We believe that some amount of storm water capture retention should occur in this project as that would diminish the project’s 132,603 gallons per day reliance on the city’s drinking water supply.

¹DEIS, Chapter 11-1
**Solid Waste**

The DEIS states that “it is expected that all solid waste generated by the proposed project would be handled by private carters.”² Nowhere does it say anything about recycling within the project or specific areas in which collected recyclable materials could be stored before picked up. Nor is there mention of composting surely for garden materials and possibly for food. We believe that missing here is an opportunity to reduce the amount of solid waste and to educate the public visiting the site about municipal solid waste issues.

**Energy**

The DEIS states that “the proposed project would generate an incremental increase in energy demand that would be negligible when compared to the overall demand within Con Edison’s New York City and Westchester County service area.”³ Further, the DEIS indicates Energy Star and other efficient electrical equipment will be used.

The Board is pleased with those statements but would also like to see the project study the possibility of installing solar voltaic collection devices on the roof possibly instead of the wisteria clad trellises currently in the design shown to the Waterfront and Parks Committee and thus reduce the projected demand for 93,004 million BTUs of energy needed per year. This would both be an energy producer and a public educational opportunity.

**Transportation**

The traffic issues associated with the redevelopment of Pier 57 have been among the most difficult to resolve and led to community opposition to earlier proposals. CB4 believes that the current proposal successfully addresses the community’s concerns and is grateful for the applicants’ diligent attention to these issues. Our one remaining concern is the intersection of Tenth Avenue and West 15th Street, a dangerous intersection that exposes pedestrians crossing West 15th Street on the west side of Tenth Avenue to cars arriving at high speed from the West Side Highway.

We recommend that the intersection of Tenth Avenue and W. 15th Street, a dangerous intersection that exposes pedestrians crossing W. 15th Street on the west side of Tenth Avenue to cars arriving at high speed from the West Side Highway, be addressed by the equipping of the west bound turning movements from Tenth Avenue onto W. 15th Street with a split phase signal.

**Air Quality**

No comments.

---

² DEIS, Chapter 12-2
³ DEIS, Chapter 13-1
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Given the advent of Hurricane Sandy in October 2012 and damage done to the Hudson River Park area, we hope that the applicant and the HRPT will continue giving sufficient consideration of the impact of rising sea levels on this project.

Noise

No comments.

Neighborhood Character

Please see our comments in the “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy” section.

Construction Impact

The sheer scope of the project will have an unavoidable impact on local residents, businesses as well as students and visitors to the Hudson River Park. In addition the project is being constructed on a major traffic artery affecting traffic and congestion in the area.

Many of the impacts were found to be within acceptable CEQR guidelines vis-à-vis the permitted development. However, in that the developer is benefitting from the zoning change, there should be some benefit to the community during the extended construction period, perhaps mitigation and enhancement of pathways around the site, and limiting of construction take-over of lanes on major traffic artery.

Public Health

No comments.

Alternatives

No comments.

Mitigation

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to limit the FAR to the 2.23 the applicants are requesting for the proposed development.

CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude hotel uses. We understand that the current proposal does not include a hotel and that the Hudson River Park Act currently does not permit hotels, but since the proposed M1-5 zoning permits hotels as-of-right we would greatly
prefer one more safeguard against this use that the community strongly opposes on piers in Hudson River Park.

CB4 recommends that the application for a Zoning Map Change be approved only if a deed restriction or similar device be placed on Pier 57 to preclude "big box" retailers or discounters. The applicants have indicated that they would support such a restriction.

_Transportation_
We recommend that the intersection of Tenth Avenue and W. 15th Street, a dangerous intersection that exposes pedestrians crossing W. 15th Street on the west side of Tenth Avenue to cars arriving at high speed from the West Side Highway, be addressed by the equipping of the west bound turning movements from Tenth Avenue onto W. 15th Street with a split phase signal.

_Construction._
We recommend that a construction task force be established, with representatives of all stakeholders, which will meet at least monthly throughout the constructions phase of the project and must be in place prior to the commencement of demolition.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

No comments.

**Growth-Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Actions**

No comments.

**Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources**

No comments.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Corey Johnson, Chair
Manhattan Community Board 4

J. Lee Compton, Co-Chair
Chelsea Preservation & Planning

Brett Firfer, Co-Chair
Chelsea Preservation and Planning
John Doswell, Co-Chair  
Waterfront, Parks and Environment Committee  

Maarten de Kadt, Co-Chair  
Waterfront, Parks and Environment Committee  

Christine Berthet, Co-chair  
Transportation Planning Committee  

Jay Marcus, Co-chair  
Transportation Planning Committee  

cc: Madelyn Wils, Noreen Doyle, Laurie Silberfeld – Hudson River Park Trust  
Ross F. Moskowitz, Esq. – Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP  
Celeste Evans, Edith Hsu-Chen, Karolina Grebowiec-Hall – Department of City Planning  
Melanie LaRocca, Michaela Miller - NYC Council Speaker Christine Quinn’s Office  
Brian Cook, Lin Zeng – Manhattan Borough President’s Office  
NYS Assemblyman Richard Gottfried  
NYS Senator Thomas Duane  
U.S. Congressman – Jerold Nadler  
A.J. Pietrantone – Friends of Hudson River Park
January 31, 2013

Mr. David Tewksbury
Executive Vice President
Chelsea Piers Management
62 Chelsea Piers, Room 300
New York, NY 1011

Re: Pier 57 DEIS Traffic Analysis Review Comments Update

Dear Mr. Tewksbury:

Please find the results of our review of the Pier 57 DEIS traffic analysis that includes an update of the December 11, 2012 letter and attachments and reflects our review of HRPT’s January 18, 2013 letter and attachments.

Based on the January 18, 2013 letter from HRPT, we understand the Pier 57 DEIS preparers will not be providing the information (beyond the traffic analysis information included with the January 18th letter) requested in our December 11, 2012 letter. We are therefore concluding the preparation of our comments and submitting them to meet the February 4, 2013 deadline for written comments.

The primary concerns are that traffic volumes in the Pier 57 DEIS may be an underestimation of the volumes that could actually result from the intended operations and that, when there is a major weekday event, there are key intersections that are projected to operate with little or no capacity available to handle any additional traffic. Therefore, additional volume above the DEIS projections would result in traffic operational failures of elements of the roadway network to a significantly greater extent than documented in the DEIS.

A principal overriding issue is that any failure of the Pier 57 access plan would cause gridlock at Route 9A and West 17th Street, blocking Chelsea Piers egress and Pier 57 entry.

The following five bullet point topics highlight the primary areas of concern based on our reviews, and the attachments to this letter provide more details regarding each of the five topics.

1. Traffic Projections Used In Pier 57 DEIS Need Clarification and Appear Low

For specific activities and land uses, the DEIS does not clearly define the intended operations at Pier 57 or the related trip generation. The concern is that the traffic volumes in the DEIS may be an underestimation of the volumes that could actually result from the intended operations. This would result in the DEIS projecting better operations than could be reasonably expected. In addition, the number and type of activities proposed on the circulation road curb frontage and the associated vehicle stacking needs may also be underestimated.

The following is an example of a possible, significant under estimation of the Pier 57 traffic volume relates to the "rooftop event" (such as the Tribeca Film Festival) during the weekday evening pre-event peak hour:
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The DEIS projects a rooftop event would generate 1,717 person trips. Applying modal split and other assumptions, the DEIS projects this type of event would generate only 79 vehicle trips, representing less than 5 percent of the estimated person trips. Furthermore, it appears that of the 79 vehicle trips, only an estimated 45 vehicle trips were assigned in the DEIS to Pier 57 entry/egress locations (or circulation road). The remaining 24 vehicle trips (79 - 45) were routed directly to off-site parking without accounting for site drop-offs and pick-ups.

Implications of higher actual traffic volumes than those estimated in the DEIS include worse operational and safety conditions than indicated in the DEIS, including at the Pier 57 entry and egress points.

It is important to recognize that at the two entry points to Pier 57 – Route 9A at West 16th Street and at West 17th Street – the traffic analysis results indicate there is little to no margin of error for handling increased traffic. These two locations are briefly discussed below and in more detail in Attachment 1. Attachment 2 provides more information related to the activities and land uses listed above.

An implication of higher actual volumes is the possibility that the storage length along the proposed Pier 57 circulation roadway proposed in the DEIS may be inadequate to accommodate queuing vehicles and the multi-lane curbside vehicle activities described in the DEIS without the queue extending into the Pier 57 entry/Chelsea Pier egress/West 17th Street intersection.

The activities and land uses that are not clearly defined and therefore trip generation not clearly identified include:

1. Traffic Assignment related to Drop-Off and Pick-Up Activities
2. Potential Taxi Activity and Distribution of Taxi Trips
3. Potential Bus Activity on the Circulation Roadway
4. Marina Trip Generation and "Historic Vessels"
5. Water Taxi
6. Food Counter Trip Generation

In addition, the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual – the methodology used in the DEIS for traffic analysis – indicates that “when delay is already high, and demand is near or over capacity..., the delay may increase rapidly with small changes in demand.” This would apply to intersections in the study area, including Route 9A at West 17th Street and the Chelsea Piers egress and Pier 57 entry.

2. West 17th Street at Route 9A Projected in DEIS to Fail (at the Chelsea Piers sole egress and Pier 57 entry)

Failing traffic operations conditions are projected for the westbound West 17th Street approach to Route 9A. Long delays on the westbound West 17th Street approach (almost 2 minutes per vehicle for the through and left-turn movements during the weekday pre-event peak hour) could adversely affect safety and operations on Route 9A and the bikeway and constrain the egress movement from Chelsea Piers and the entry movement to Pier 57. See Figures 1 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details.
3. Southbound Right-Turn Lane at West 16th Street on Route 9A Projected in DEIS to Operate Near Capacity (Pier 57 entry)

The short storage length of the signal-controlled southbound Route 9A right-turn lane could result in vehicle backups that block traffic on Route 9A, West 17th Street, the Chelsea Piers egress, and the Pier 57 entry. See Figures 2 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details. The analysis results from the DEIS indicate that, during the weekday evening pre-event peak hour, the 95th percentile queue of this right-turn movement to Pier 57 would allow for little or no available capacity to handle additional traffic entering Pier 57. Queuing beyond the storage length would negatively impact Route 9A, Chelsea Piers, and Pier 57.

4. Pier 57 “Circulation Road” Modeling and Analyses Results Not included in DEIS

The projected operation of the two-lane circulation road is not addressed in the DEIS. With the right lane needed for curbside activities, the circulation road would operate as a single lane much of the time with disruptions relating to the vehicles entering/exiting the curbside lane. There are multiple activities along the circulation road that may be underestimated in the DEIS as noted in Item 1 above. The concern relates to whether there is sufficient storage available to avoid vehicle backups that block Route 9A and the bikeway and that impede Chelsea Piers egress and emergency vehicle access. See Figures 1, 2 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details.

5. Traffic Management Plan Critical Elements not Defined in the DEIS

It appears from a review of the DEIS that the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be critical for the proposed access arrangement to operate safely and efficiently. It will need to be implemented “particularly during large events” to manage conflicting movements on the circulation road, crosswalks, and bikeway. Managing these types of conflicts at Chelsea Piers currently involves more than 30 full-time staff. However the DEIS provides only a very brief and general description of the plan. The full extent of the TMP needs to be documented and the means for commitment to implement it formalized. See Attachment 1 for further details.

See Attachment 3 for the list of additional information that had been requested based on the review of the Pier 57 DEIS.

Based on the above, we’ve prepared a list of potential mitigation actions that are included in Attachment 4. These actions would need to be further investigated as additional information is available.

Please advise if you’d like to meet and discuss these materials or if you have any comments or questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry Gluck, PE, PTOE
Principal Traffic Engineer
AECOM

cc: File 60276516
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FIGURE 1: Illustration of Potential Traffic Back-Up from Westbound W 17th Street into Chelsea Piers Egress Route
FIGURE 2: Illustration of Potential Traffic Back-Up from Southbound W 16th Street Right Turn Into Chelsea Piers Egress Route
FIGURE 3: Illustration of Potential Combined Traffic Back-Up from Westbound W 17th Street and Southbound W 16th Street Right Turn into Chelsea Piers Egress Route

Appendix A: Results of AECOM's review of Pier 57 Transportation Planning Assumptions for all Land Uses.
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SUMMARY OF ISSUES RELATED TO THE PIER 57 ACCESS ARRANGEMENT IN THE DEIS

1. W 17th Street and Route 9A Projected in DEIS to Fail (at the Chelsea Piers sole egress and Pier 57 entry) (see Figures 1 and 3)

Failing conditions are projected for the westbound W 17th Street approach to Route 9A. The DEIS states, concerning the weekday evening pre-event peak hour: "Even with the project improvement to restrripe the westbound approach to two travel lanes, the operations under the With Action condition would degrade to an average delay of 131.9 seconds (Level of Service F) for the westbound shared left/through lane change and 81.1 seconds (LOS F) for the exclusive right-turn lane....". Therefore, the DEIS recommends mitigating this impact by also reallocating traffic signal time (1 second) from Route 9A to W 17th Street.

Long delays on the westbound W 17th Street approach could result in drivers entering the intersection at the end of the yellow phase and proceeding across Route 9A even when storage space in the circulation road does not allow. As a result, there is the real potential for backups in the entrance to the circulation road that could block traffic on Route 9A and Chelsea Piers egress.

It is important to note a statement in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual — the methodology used in the DEIS for traffic analysis. It indicates that “when delay is already high, and demand is near or over capacity,... the delay may increase rapidly with small changes in demand." This applies to this intersection and confirms that any underestimation of Pier 57 traffic volumes could result in a significant worsening of projected traffic conditions that would affect Route 9A, W 17th Street, Chelsea Piers egress, and Pier 57 entry.

2. Southbound Right-Turn Lane at W 16th Street on Route 9A Projected in DEIS to Operate Near Capacity (Pier 57 entry) (see Figures 2 and 3)

The 140-foot storage length of the southbound Route 9A right-turn lane may be insufficient to accommodate the traffic demand. There are potential operational problems that will limit the throughput of the southbound right-turn lane, including the conflicting movements and transportation modes, traffic control, design (e.g. geometry and speed table), proximity to the Pier 57 garage egress, and loading zone. Therefore, the proposed arrangement could result in vehicle backups that exceed the storage capacity of the signal-controlled, right-turn lane. This could block traffic on Route 9A, W 17th Street, and Chelsea Piers egress.

A review of the analysis results from the DEIS indicates that, during the weekday evening pre-event peak hour, the 95th percentile queue of this right-turn movement to Pier 57 would be between 5 and 6 vehicles. This would allow for little or no available capacity to handle additional traffic entering Pier 57. These results confirm that any underestimation of Pier 57 traffic volumes could result in a significant worsening of projected traffic conditions and queuing that would impact Route 9A, Chelsea Piers, and Pier 57.
3. Pier 57 “Circulation Road” Modeling and Analyses Results Not Included in the DEIS

There are no traffic analysis results provided for the operation of the two-lane circulation road in the DEIS. With the right lane identified in the DEIS as being used for multiple curbside activities, the circulation road would operate as a single lane much of the time with disruptions relating to the vehicles entering/exiting the curbside lane. Also, the DEIS identifies: large volumes of pedestrians crossing the circulation road at STOP-sign controlled crossings, a traffic signal on the circulation road at the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street, and truck loading and unloading operations at the north end of the Pier 57 building. Whether there is sufficient capacity available along the circulation road to avoid backups that extend across W 17th Street and impede Route 9A and Chelsea Piers egress has not been addressed in the DEIS. The DEIS [page S-8] notes the potential usage of the circulation road for a stop on the M14 bus route and for loading and unloading tour buses. The potential number of buses is not identified and the location of the bus stop, as shown north of the Pier 57 building, could result in traffic blocking Route 9A and the Chelsea Piers egress at W 17th Street.

4. Traffic Management Plan Critical Elements Not Defined in the DEIS

The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be critical to the proposed Pier 57 access arrangement operating safely and efficiently, “particularly during large events” and to avoid impacts to Route 9A and Chelsea Piers egress. The plan will need to address how to avoid queuing from the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street and along the circulation road as well as to “control and manage crowds and conflict points along the bikeway”. The DEIS, however, only has a paragraph that provides a very general description of the TMP.

The DEIS recommends dealing with the “intermittent condition” adverse impact on pedestrian operations in the north crosswalk at Route 9A and W 15th Street by using traffic enforcement agents. This should be detailed in the TMP along with additional conditions, such as blockage of Chelsea Piers egress that would trigger its implementation. The commitment of Pier 57 to implement the TMP would need to be formalized. It is important to recognize that Chelsea Piers employs more than 30 full-time staff to manage vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic and conflicts.
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PIER 57 ACTIVITIES AND LAND USES WITH SITE TRAFFIC PROJECTIONS THAT NEED CLARIFICATION AND APPEAR LOW

The focus of our review was on the person-trip generation rates and the modal split estimates used in the Pier 57 DEIS. The person-trip generation rates form the fundamental basis for determining the magnitude of site-generated trips and the modal split determines the allocation of those trips among the available modes of travel. The vehicle occupancies, temporal distributions, and linked-trip credits—important components of the trip generation rate—also were reviewed.

For some land uses and activities, as noted below, further clarifications should be obtained to better understand the intended operations at Pier 57 to assess whether the traffic projections in the DEIS are reasonable and if modifications to the DEIS should be considered.

- Traffic Assignment related to Drop-off and Pick-Up Activities:

  One of the issues we identified in the December 11\textsuperscript{th} document is the lack of information in the Pier 57 DEIS regarding the usage and operation of the Pier 57 circulation road. One of the missing items is the projected number of drop-offs related to both private vehicles and taxis for each of the analysis hours. This issue has ramifications on the projected traffic volumes at the Pier 57 egress and exit points as well as stacking needs on the circulation roadway.

  Based on the information in the DEIS, a comparison was done of the Pier 57 vehicle trip projections with the actual traffic volumes assigned to the Pier 57 circulation roadway entry and egress locations. The comparison showed that the volumes entering and exiting the Pier 57 site during a peak hour do not match the vehicular trip generation for that peak hour. This is unexplained in the DEIS, but may be related to the assignment of site generated traffic directly to/from external parking facilities without a drop-off or pick-up at Pier 57. In Appendix C-2 of the DEIS there is a brief description of “Auto Trip Assignment Assumptions – Parking Off-Site”. However, there is no explanation presented regarding passenger drop-offs or pick-ups at Pier 57.

  The question is what proportion of the vehicle trips assigned to off-site parking were estimated in the DEIS to first stop at Pier 57 to discharge passengers before parking externally. A similar situation could exist after a visit/event when a driver who was parked at an external facility would return to Pier 57 to pick-up passengers. This is a very relevant question because the vehicle occupancy for all but one or two land uses was between two and three occupants per vehicle. This occupancy means that, on average, a vehicle traveling to the site is likely to have at least one passenger—and potentially as many as two passengers (or more)—in addition to the driver. Under these circumstances, it seems likely that a significant proportion of drivers of inbound vehicles would travel directly to the site to drop-off the passengers before seeking parking elsewhere in the area and similarly for a
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proportion of the outbound vehicles to travel to the site after an event to pick-up passengers. This would affect not only the nearby intersections, but also the stacking along the circulation road as well Route 9A and the Chelsea Piers egress.

Since it is reasonable to expect there would be at least some drop-offs at Pier 57 before parking externally, vehicles dropping-off passengers should have been estimated and assigned to Pier 57 access/egress points. The DEIS preparers need to identify what proportion, if any, of the vehicles parking externally was assigned to Pier 57 for drop-offs and what proportion was assigned directly to the external parking facilities. The latter vehicles were not assigned to Pier 57 and are not reflected in the volumes at the W 16th and W 17 Street entrances (nor W 14th Street egress). This concern, accounting for drop-offs by vehicles that are parking externally, also has ramifications for the assignment of vehicles to account for post-event pick-ups involving vehicles parked in the external parking facilities.

As an example, during the weekday evening pre-event peak hour, the inbound volumes at the W 16th and W 17th Street entrances to Pier 57 account for only about 56 percent of the total inbound vehicle trips projected to be generated by the project. Similarly, the volume at the W 14th Street egress accounts for only 58 percent of the total outbound vehicle trips projected to be generated by the project during that same peak hour.

As a result of how the vehicles destined to external parking facilities were assigned to the roadway network, the traffic analysis may underestimate the operational impacts of project-generated vehicle-trips at intersections in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site including Route 9A at W 16th Street and at W 17th Street — two intersections already noted as being potentially problematic.

- Potential Taxi Activity and Distribution of Taxi Trips:

The DEIS does not indicate the assumption used for allocating the taxi movements among the three possible locations identified in the DEIS: along the Pier 57 circulation road, at a designated off-site taxi stand located on northbound Route 9A between W 14th and W 15th Streets, or on the north side of W 15th Street between Tenth Avenue and Route 9A (also off-site). There are concerns that many of the taxi movements assumed in the DEIS to use an external (i.e., off-site) location would actually end up on the Pier 57 circulation road. Both external locations would require taxi users to walk a longer distance and cross Route 9A traffic. During evening hours and poor weather conditions this would appear to be unlikely. As a result, the turning volumes at the nearby intersections could be under-reported in the DEIS. In addition, there would be greater need for stacking along the circulation road to accommodate the additional taxis.
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- Potential Bus Activity on the Circulation Roadway:

Regarding circulation road usage and projected volumes at intersections near Pier 57, there is also a concern related to bus usage and stops (both MTA NYCT and tour buses). The DEIS indicates there is the possibility of “providing an on-site bus stop for the NYCT M14 bus route” on the circulation roadway north of the Pier 57 building. The DEIS also indicates the “potential for tour bus activity to be generated by the proposed project...” on the circulation roadway. Although the DEIS states that “... the access plan would accommodate such activities, if needed” the bus volumes are not projected and are not reflected in any of the analyses.

- Marina Trip Generation:

The trip generation for Pier 57 estimate cites two sources for the Marina trip rates: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). While the higher rate of 6.23 trips/SLIP from the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS is used to estimate the weekday trips (as compared to 5.9 trips/SLIP in the Hudson River Park FEIS), the lower rate of 12.8 trips/SLIP from the Hudson River Park FEIS is used to estimate the Saturday trips (as compared to the 13.47 trips/SLIP rate from the Brooklyn Bridge FEIS). Therefore, the trip generation for Pier 57 for Saturday may be underestimated. A broader question is the intended operation of the marina — would it be used by private or charter boats? The trip generation for charter boats would be expected to have significantly higher trip generation rates.

- Marina “Historic Vessels”:

As stated on page 1-4 of the DEIS, the Marina includes “slips for one or more historic vessels”. Presumably, historic vessels—whether they remain docked or actively sail—could operate as visitor attractions at Pier 57, and therefore potentially generate additional pedestrian/vehicle trips to Pier 57. The trip generation rates for this activity are not reflected in the trip generation rates for the Marina land use cited in the source documents referenced in the DEIS: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005).

- Water Taxi:

The DEIS indicates that a new water taxi landing at Pier 57 potentially would serve as a possible alternative mode of travel that could replace other modes of travel to and from the Pier 57 site. As a result, the water taxi landing is not reflected in the trip generation estimate in the DEIS with respect to its potential to introduce additional pedestrian trips through the study area that are not originating from, or destined to, Pier 57. The inclusion of the water taxi landing suggests a potential for attracting/generating higher volumes of
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pedestrian (walk) trips that are not destined to Pier 57, but rather pass by the proposed site on their way to and from other locations. Additional pedestrian trips have implications on both the pedestrian capacity analyses and the vehicular capacity analyses (i.e., conflicting pedestrian volumes for vehicle turning movements).

- Food Counter:

The weekday and Saturday person-trip generation rates for the Food Counter land use are the same as those for the Quality Restaurant land use. Typically, high-turnover restaurants, such as those envisioned as part of the Food Counter use, have higher trip generation rates than Quality Restaurants. This conclusion is supported by data in the ITE Trip Generation manual which indicates that average daily trip rates for a High-Turnover Restaurant (Land Use Code 932) are 41 percent higher than those for a Quality Restaurant (Land Use Code 931) on a weekday, and 68 percent higher on a Saturday.

Appendix A provides discussion on the review findings for all land uses included in the Pier 57 development plan.
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INFORMATION REQUESTED RELATED TO THE DEIS ANALYSIS OF THE PIER 57 ACCESS ARRANGEMENT

1. We have been provided the intersection capacity analysis reports for the intersection of W 16th Street and Route 9A (related to the southbound Route 9A right-turn lane to Pier 57). However, further discussion is needed regarding how well the traffic analysis reflects the dynamics at that location, including the speed table, conflicts with bikeway users, alignment of the turn onto the circulation road, etc. Further information is needed regarding the intersection of the right-turn lane and the two-lane circulation (frontage) road that could operate as only one lane under many conditions that are identified in the DEIS.

2. Analysis results for how the circulation road is projected to operate and the vehicle queue lengths for the proposed conditions. This includes projected traffic (vehicles and pedestrians) volumes/flow maps for the circulation road. Vehicular volumes should distinguish between cars, vans, taxis, buses, and trucks. The volumes should reflect all the activities along the circulation road, including vehicle traffic, truck deliveries, passenger loading/unloading, turns at the driveways, taxis, buses, etc. and pedestrian volumes crossing the circulation road.

3. The actions that would be implemented as part of the Traffic Management Plan to avoid queuing from the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street and along the circulation road (to prevent congestion that blocks Route 9A and Chelsea Piers egress) as well as to “control and manage crowds and conflict points along the bikeway”. This could include preventing vehicles from stopping in both lanes to pick or discharge passengers or goods and limiting the duration that vehicles are allowed to remain on the circulation road.
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POTENTIAL ACTIONS TO MITIGATE TRAFFIC IMPACTS FROM PIER 57 ON CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS

Pending the receipt and review of the additional information identified in Attachment 3, the list below presents potential mitigation actions that could be further investigated to minimize adverse impacts from Pier 57 on Chelsea Piers egress. However, a fundamental question is whether the projected volumes in the Pier 57 DEIS are a reasonable estimate of the anticipated site-generated traffic.

1. Increase green time at the Route 9A and W 16th Street traffic signal only for the southbound right-turn movement into Pier 57 at W 16th Street beyond what is allowed for the southbound left-turn movement. However, this would reduce the green signal time for the bikeway.

2. Provide manual traffic control at the intersection of the southbound right-turn lane/ circulation road/bikeway at W 16th Street to manage conflicts and prevent queues from the right-turn lane extending onto Route 9A and blocking Chelsea Piers egress and Pier 57 entry.

3. Provide manual traffic control along Route 9A at the intersection of W 17th Street/Chelsea Piers egress/circulation road to manage conflicts and prevent queues from the circulation road extending onto Route 9A and blocking Chelsea Piers egress and Pier 57 ingress.

4. Relocate the potential bus stop shown in the DEIS from north of W 16th Street to a location near W 15th Street to help maintain two lanes on the circulation road between W 16th and W 17th Streets.

5. Implement provisions to minimize taxi drop offs/pick-ups along the circulation road and enforce usage of the taxi zone on the east side of Route 9A between W 14th and W 15th Streets and along the north side of W 15th Street between Route 9A and Tenth Avenue.

6. Prohibit curbside activities on the circulation road between W 16th and W 17th Streets, redirecting them further south, and enforce these prohibitions, providing manual control, if needed.

7. If there is a charter boat operation envisioned as part of the marina plan, then limit the charter operations size and times to help manage traffic volumes and conditions along the circulation road and at nearby intersections.

8. Minimize curbside activities on the circulation road in the vicinity of the W 16th Street entry during peak periods of activity, particularly when there is an event in order to help maintain traffic flow.

9. Detail the provisions relating to Pier 57 traffic operations in the Traffic Management Plan and establish as a major objective the prevention of congestion on the circulation road and southbound right-turn lane (at W 16th Street) that could impede Route 9A and the Chelsea Piers egress route.

10. Develop a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan to include provisions on how to avoid queuing from the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street and along the circulation road as well as to "control and manage crowds and conflict points along the bikeway". The Traffic Management Plan
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should be refined and reevaluated during the first year of Pier 57 operations and then reviewed and updated in regular five-year intervals.

11. Include the requirement for implementation of the above actions in a binding document (such as the lease).
PHA ROADWAY PLAN – ILLUSTRATION OF POTENTIAL TRAFFIC BACK-UP FROM SOUTHBOUND W. 16TH ST. RIGHT TURN INTO CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS ROUTE
PHA ROADSIDE PLAN – ILLUSTRATION OF POTENTIAL TRAFFIC BACK-UP FROM WESTBOUND W. 17th ST. INTO CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS ROUTE
PHA ROADWAY PLAN – ILLUSTRATION OF POTENTIAL COMBINED TRAFFIC BACK-UP FROM WESTBOUND W. 17th & SOUTHBOUND W. 16th RIGHT TURN INTO CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS ROUTE
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Appendix A

Review of Pier 57 Transportation Planning Assumptions for All Pier 57 Land Uses

The DEIS-proposed Pier 57 project consists of a unique mix of land uses including retail, various restaurant types, a marina, museum/exhibit space, a technical school, and theatre/special event space. The types and mix of land uses—as well as the location of the proposed site along the Manhattan waterfront—make finding comparable data sources for this particular project challenging, because valid trip generation studies of comparable sites in New York City are comparatively limited in relation to more common and well-documented land uses such as residential, retail, and office. Data for similar land uses can sometimes, but not always, be found online in approved and published Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). In other instances, data must be obtained via transportation surveys conducted at other similar land uses already in operation.

The following is a summary of our findings relative to the trip generation estimate for each proposed Pier 57 land use. The focus of our review was on the person-trip generation rates and the modal split estimates. The person-trip generation rates form the fundamental basis for determining the magnitude of site-generated trips and the modal split determines the allocation of those trips among the available modes of travel. The vehicle occupancies, temporal distributions, and linked-trip credits—also important components of the trip generation estimate—also were reviewed. (A more detailed summary of the data sources for each of the trip generation parameters applied in the Pier 57 traffic study is provided in Table 1. A summary of projected person- and vehicle-trip generation is presented in Table 2.)

- **Destination Retail**
  - The DEIS person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard rates for destination retail uses in the CEQR Technical Manual.
  
  - The mode splits for weekday and Saturday conditions are based on a 2011 survey conducted at the Chelsea Market in 2011 by Sam Schwartz Engineering (SSE), which are compared to those reported for Restaurant/Retail uses as part of the South Street Seaport project below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Destination Retail Weekday</th>
<th>Pier 57: Destination Retail Saturday</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail Weekday Midday/PM</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail Pre-Event</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail Saturday Midday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi/Black Car</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Other</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Quality Restaurant**
  - The person-trip generation rate used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard references by Pushkarev & Zupan and the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation manual. The weekday person-trip generation rate for the proposed Quality Restaurant matches the person-trip generation rate used for the Restaurant use in the Flushing Commons FEIS. The Saturday person-trip generation rate was developed by applying the ratio of Saturday-to-weekday trip-rates given in the ITE Trip Generation manual to the weekday trip rate.
Appendix A

- The mode splits for weekday and Saturday are based on assumptions developed jointly by SSE and NYCDOT staff, and are compared to those developed for the Restaurant/Retail uses for the South Street Seaport and the Specialized Retail uses in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS below. As shown below, the Pier 57 mode splits show higher auto and taxi mode splits, which would result in higher numbers of projected auto and taxi trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Quality Restaurant</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail</th>
<th>Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS: Specialized Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday &amp; Saturday</td>
<td>Weekday Midday/PM</td>
<td>Pre-Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Food Counter
  - The weekday and Saturday person-trip generation rates for the Food Counter land use are the same as those for the Quality Restaurant land use. Typically, high-turnover restaurants, such as those envisioned as part of the Food Counter use, have higher trip generation rates than Quality Restaurants. This conclusion is supported by data in the ITE Trip Generation manual which indicates that average daily trip rates for a High-Turnover Restaurant (Land Use Code 932) are 41 percent higher than those for a Quality Restaurant (Land Use Code 931) on a weekday, and 68 percent higher on a Saturday. The DEIS justifies the rates used by stating: "...It is expected that patrons of these food counters will also be shopping at the retail pods and, as such, are expected to have similar trip generation characteristics as the destination retail. However, to be conservative, the total daily trip generation rates were based on daily trip rates calculated for Quality Restaurant, which provides higher rates than for destination retail."

- The mode splits for weekday and Saturday are based on assumptions developed jointly by SSE and New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) staff, and are compared to those reported for Restaurant/Retail uses as part of the South Street Seaport project and the Specialized Retail uses in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS below:
### Theatre and Rooftop Events
- The daily person-trip rate for both theatre and rooftop events is the same for both weekdays and Saturdays. This rate matches the daily person-trip rate used for events in the 2005 *Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS*, and were based on transportation surveys conducted at Lincoln Center in 2000.
- The modal split for the theatre and rooftop events very closely approximates that reported as part of the South Street Seaport project. The mode splits for both studies appear to be based on a transportation survey conducted by AKRF at a Pier 54 movie event in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Food Counter</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail</th>
<th>Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS: Specialized Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday &amp; Saturday</td>
<td>Weekday Midday/PM</td>
<td>Pre-Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike/Other</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Theatre and Rooftop Events</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Event Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday &amp; Saturday</td>
<td>Weekday Midday/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike/Other</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Museum/Exhibit Space and Rooftop Exhibit Space
- The person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard rates for museum uses in the CEQR Technical Manual.
- The mode splits for the museum/exhibit space are based on transportation surveys conducted by Philip Habib Associates (PHA) in 2005 of a temporary art exhibit at Pier 54.

### Technical Arts School
- The person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday were estimated based on vehicle-trip rates for a Junior/Community College in the ITE Trip Generation manual, with an adjustment to reflect a projected auto occupancy of 1.11 as cited in the 2009 *Fordham University/Lincoln Center Master Plan FEIS* for day-time/full-time graduate students.
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- The mode split was based on the mode split projections cited in the 2009 Fordham University/Lincoln Center Master Plan FEIS for day-time/full-time graduate students which generally reflected the highest combined auto plus taxi mode share. Slight refinements to the modal split were made to reflect a reallocation of the Fordham University site's "dorm-based trips" and "shuttle trips" to the available modes at Pier 57.

- Marina
  - As stated on page 1-4 of the DEIS, the Marina includes "slips for one or more historic vessels". Presumably, historic vessels—whether they remain docked or actively sail—could operate as visitor attractions at Pier 57, and therefore potentially generate additional trips. The trip generation rates for such activities are not reflected in the trip generation rates for the Marina land use cited in the source documents: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). The proposed operation of the historic vessels should be further clarified.

- The trip generation estimate cites two sources for the Marina trip rates: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). While the higher rate of 6.23 trips/slip from the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS is used to estimate the weekday trips (as compared to 5.9 trips/slip in the Hudson River Park FEIS), the lower rate of 12.8 trips/slip from the Hudson River Park FEIS is used to estimate the Saturday trips (as compared to the 13.47 trips/slip rate from the Brooklyn Bridge FEIS). Therefore, the trip generation for Saturday may be underestimated. A broader question is the intended operation of the marina – would it be used by private or charter boats. The trip generation for charter boats would be expected to potentially have significantly higher trip generation rates.

- The modal split for the marina at Pier 57 was based on the modal split for the marina cited in the 1998 Hudson River Park FEIS.

- Rooftop Open Space
  - The rooftop is expected to be a multi-use area, accommodating events, exhibits and an "open space" recreational area. The trip generation estimate assumes all three uses operating at once, albeit with rooftop events occurring only during evening hours on weekdays and Saturdays.

  - The person-trip generation rates for Rooftop Events and Rooftop Exhibits are as noted above (see Theatre and Rooftop Events and Museum/Exhibit Space and Rooftop Exhibit Space). The person-trip generation rates for the Rooftop Open Space are based on standard person-trip generation rates for Active Park Space in the CEQR Technical Manual.

  - The mode split for Rooftop Open Space is based on the mode split for the High Line Open Space in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS.
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- **Potential Water Taxi**
  - The existing Hudson River water taxi route operates along Manhattan’s west side at headways ranging from 45 and 90 minutes between 9:00 AM and 6:15 PM. The water taxi currently stops at Pier 84 at West 44th Street, Pier 45 at Christopher Street, Battery Park, the South Street Seaport, and the Fulton Ferry Landing in Brooklyn (source: [http://www.nywatertaxi.com/](http://www.nywatertaxi.com/))
  
  - We recognize that, as noted in the DEIS, the (potential) water taxi landing would serve as a possible alternative mode of travel that could replace other modes of travel to and from the Pier 57 site. As a result, the water taxi is not reflected in the trip generation estimate in the DEIS with respect to its potential to introduce additional pedestrian trips through the study area not originating from, or destined to, Pier 57. The inclusion of the water taxi suggests a potential for attracting/generating higher volumes of pedestrian (walk) trips that are not destined to Pier 57, but rather pass by the proposed site on their way to and from other locations. Additional pedestrian trips have implications on both the pedestrian capacity analyses and the vehicular capacity analyses (i.e., conflicting pedestrian volumes for vehicle turning movements).
February 4, 2013

HAND DELIVERY
Ms. Noreen Doyle
Hudson River Park Trust
353 West Street
Pier 40, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10014

Re: Pier 57 Redevelopment project

Dear Ms. Doyle,

Attached please find comments of Chelsea Piers made by the firm of AECOM, professional engineering consultants, regarding the Pier 57 Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS"), HRPT’s January 18, 2013 letter to Chelsea Piers and testimony made at the January 23, 2013 joint public hearing on the DEIS and the Land Use Review Application before the City Planning Commission.

Chelsea Piers supports the development of Pier 57. However, the scope of the project has still not been adequately defined to assess the potential adverse impacts. Will there be banquets, special events, large passenger or charter boats? Unlike the prohibition on big box stores, there is no lease restriction being proposed to prevent such uses, which are potentially significant traffic generators. Will there be a bus stop serving MTA buses or tour buses? Even without these uses being considered, the traffic and circulation analyses describes a project that will disrupt the traffic on Route 9A and likely cause gridlock at the West 17th Street and Route 9A intersection, which is the sole egress point for Chelsea Piers. Currently classified as an area of
failing traffic intersections at times, the DEIS reflects low estimates of vehicular traffic accessing Pier 57 and using its circulation road (including private vehicles and taxis) due to some of the assumptions regarding trip generation, modal split and traffic assignments. For example, the low estimates for Pier 57 vehicular traffic reflect assumptions related to taxi drop-offs/pick-ups and to Pier 57 customers parking at off-site facilities. The majority of taxis destined for Pier 57 were assumed to use the drop-off location on the east side of Route 9A. In addition, no portion of Pier 57 traffic that is assigned to off-site parking facilities was assigned to Pier 57 entry/egress. Are these reasonable assumptions on a cold stormy night? Assuming the traffic plan is accepted as proposed, it is therefore critical that the uses be clearly delineated and that a one year post-opening study be performed in consultation with NYCDOT and NYSDOT.

Chelsea Piers has been a significant presence in the area for over 18 years. Their traffic and parking management plan has evolved over time and currently involves more than 30 full-time staff. As proposed herein, there is no active management of the Pier 57 circulation road. We urge HRPT and the developer to reassess the traffic models using traffic inputs from Chelsea Piers and to provide a more robust commitment to manage the circulation road.

Notwithstanding, AECOM has prepared a list of potential mitigation measures that can be further investigated to minimize adverse impacts from Pier 57 on Chelsea Piers egress based on the information currently provided in the DEIS (See, AECOM Attachment 4). We urge HRPT and the developer to include these measures in a binding recorded document and to take other actions to minimize adverse traffic impacts.

Finally, we urge you to consider the alternative access plans Chelsea Piers has provided to HRPT and its' consultants to help reduce the need for complicated, high volume access driveways and park-side circulation roadways.¹ A safe and successful environment will serve all in the area.

¹ The preliminary plan represents an alternative approach to handling large volumes of traffic. It need not be adopted wholesale and elements, such as the location of the bikeway, can be re-configured. The important point is that the plan has an access configuration that is stream-lined and less likely to break down.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Karen Binder

Cc:  
The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor of New York State  
The Honorable Michael R. Bloomberg  
Patricia E. Harris, First Deputy Mayor  
Councilwoman Christine Quinn  
Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer  
Congressman Jerald Nadler  
New York State Assemblyman Richard Gottfried  
New York State Senator Brad Hoylman  
New York State Assemblymember Deborah J. Glick  
New York State Assemblymember Daniel Squadron  
Chair Amanda M. Burden, New York City Planning Commission (and Commissioners)  
Commissioner Janette Sadik-Khan, New York City Department of Transportation  
Borough Commissioner Margaret Forgione, New York City Department of Transportation  
Naim Rasheed, Director of Environmental Review, New York City Department of Transportation  
Corey Johnson, Chair of Community Board #4  
Mr. Robert J. Benfatto, District Manager of Community Board #4  
Jay Marcus, Co-Chair of the Transportation Planning Committee, Community Board #4  
Christine Berthet, Co-Chair of the Transportation Planning Committee, Community Board #4  
Chairwoman Diana L. Taylor, Hudson River Park Trust  
Joseph Martens, Hudson River Park Trust  
Paul A. Ullman, Hudson River Park Trust  
Michael E. Novogratz, Hudson River Park Trust  
Vice Chairman Robert K. Steel, Hudson River Park Trust  
Veronica M. White, Hudson River Park Trust  
Joseph B. Rose, Hudson River Park Trust  
Henry J. Stern, Hudson River Park Trust  
Jeffrey Kaplan, Hudson River Park Trust  
Lawrence B. Goldberg, Esq., Hudson River Park Trust  
Franz S. Leichter, Esq., Hudson River Park Trust  
Pamela Frederick, Hudson River Park Trust  
Debra L. Kustka, Assistant Vice President of Operations, Hudson River Park Trust  
Colonel Paul Owen, Commander, New York District Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Commissioner Joseph Martens, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Commissioner Joan McDonald, New York State Department of Transportation
Commissioner Rose Harvey, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation
Cesar A. Perales, Secretary of State
Robert Kuijikowski, Director of New York City Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination
David Karnovsky, General Counsel, New York City Department of City Planning
Robert B. Tierney, Chair, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission
Commissioner Veronica M. White, New York City Department of Parks and Recreation
Douglas Blonsky, President & CEO, The Central Park Conservancy
Commissioner Carter Strickland, New York City Department of Environmental Protection
Noah S. Budnick, Deputy Director of Transportation Alternatives
Lauren Danziger, Meatpacking District Improvement Association
Matt Bronfman, Jamestown Properties
Barry Diller, Chairman, IAC
Miguel Acevedo, President of Fulton Houses Tenants Association
Terri Cude, Chair, Manhattan Community Board #2
Shirley Secunda, Traffic and Transportation Committee Chair, Community Board #2
Catherine McVay Hughes, Chair, Manhattan Community Board #1
Justin Sadrian, Acting Chair, Friends of Hudson River Park
Ronald Lewis, President & CEO, Chelsea Waterside Park Association
William Borock, President, Council of Chelsea Block Associations
Peggy Navarre, President, Hudson River Watertrail Association
Hon. Patricia A. Dillon
David Howe
Dana Hudes
John Sherratt
Board of Directors of The Chelsea-Village Partnership
Chelsea Cultural Partnership
100 West 15th Street Block Association
200 West 15th Street Block Association
Pier 57 Working Group, Hudson River Park Trust Advisory Council
Clean Air NY
December 11, 2012

Mr. David Tewksbury  
Executive Vice President  
Chelsea Piers Management  
62 Chelsea Piers, Room 300  
New York, NY 1011

Re: Pier 57 DEIS Traffic Analysis Review Comments

Dear David:

Please find the results of our review of the Pier 57 DEIS traffic analysis as discussed at our November 14, 2012 meeting. The following five bullet point topics highlight areas of concern based on the review, and the attachments to this letter provide more detail regarding each of the five topics.

1. West 17th Street and Route 9A (at Chelsea Piers sole egress point)  
Failing traffic operations conditions are projected for the westbound W 17th Street approach to Route 9A. Long delays on the westbound W 17th Street approach could adversely affect safety and constrain the egress movement from Chelsea Piers. See Figures 1 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details.

2. West 16th Street and Route 9A (related to southbound Route 9A right-turn lane to Pier 57)  
The short storage length of the signal-controlled southbound Route 9A right-turn lane could result in vehicle backups that block traffic on Route 9A, W 17th Street, and the Chelsea Piers egress. See Figures 2 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details.

3. Pier 57 “Circulation Road”  
The projected operation of the two-lane circulation road is not addressed in the DEIS. With the right lane needed for curbside activities, the circulation road would operate as a single lane much of the time with disruptions relating to the vehicles entering/exiting the curbside lane. The concern relates to whether there is sufficient storage available to avoid vehicle backups that impede Chelsea Piers egress. See Figures 1, 2 and 3 and Attachment 1 for further details.

4. Traffic Management Plan  
It appears that the Traffic Management Plan will be critical to the proposed access arrangement operating safely and efficiently, but the DEIS only has about one paragraph that provides a very general description of the TMP. The full extent of the TMP needs to be documented and the means for commitment to implement formalized. See Attachment 1 for further details.
Mr. David Tewksbury  
December 11, 2012  
Page 2 of 2

5. Review of Traffic Projections/Analyses Used in Pier 57 DEIS
For specific land uses and activities, the traffic projections and traffic analysis/mitigation require further clarifications and/or additional information to understand the intended operations and projected traffic conditions. These include:
1. Food Counter
2. Marina “Historic Vessels”
3. Marina Trip Generation
4. Water Taxi
5. Potential Bus Activity

See Attachment 2 for further details and Attachment 3 for the list of additional information required.

Based on the above, we’ve prepared a list of potential mitigation actions that are included in Attachment 4. These actions would need to be further investigated once the additional information is obtained and reviewed.

Please advise if you’d like to meet and discuss these materials or if you have any comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Jerry Gluck, PE, PTOE  
Principal Traffic Engineer  
AECOM

cc: File 60276516

Attachments:

ATTACHMENT 1: Summary of Issues Related to the Pier 57 Access Arrangement in the DEIS  
ATTACHMENT 2: Pier 57 Land Uses and Activities with Site Traffic Volumes that Require Further Information  
ATTACHMENT 3: Information Needed Related to the DEIS Analysis of the Pier 57 Access Arrangement  
ATTACHMENT 4: Potential Actions to Mitigate Traffic Impacts from Pier 57 on Chelsea Piers Egress

FIGURE 1: Illustration of Potential Traffic Back-Up from Westbound W 17th Street into Chelsea Piers Egress Route
FIGURE 2: Illustration of Potential Traffic Back-Up from Southbound W 16th Street Right Turn Into Chelsea Piers Egress Route
FIGURE 3: Illustration of Potential Combined Traffic Back-Up from Westbound W 17th Street and Southbound W 16th Street Right Turn Into Chelsea Piers Egress Route

Appendix A: Results of AECOM’s review of Pier 57 Transportation Planning Assumptions for all Land Uses.
ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RELATED TO THE PIER 57 ACCESS ARRANGEMENT IN THE DEIS

1. W 17th Street and Route 9A (at Chelsea Piers sole egress point) (see Figures 1 and 3)

Failing conditions are projected for the westbound W 17th Street approach to Route 9A. (DEIS states concerning the weekday evening pre-event peak hour: “Even with the project improvement to restrripe the westbound approach to two travel lanes, the operations under the With Action condition would degrade to an average delay of 131.9 seconds (Level of Service F) for the westbound shared left/through lane change and 81.1 seconds (LOS F) for the exclusive right-turn lane....”)

Long delays on the westbound W 17th Street approach could result in drivers entering the intersection at the end of the yellow phase and proceeding across Route 9A even when storage space in the circulation road does not allow. As a result, there is the real potential for backups in the entrance to the circulation road that could block traffic on Route 9A and Chelsea Piers egress.

2. W 16th Street and Route 9A (related to southbound Route 9A right-turn lane to Pier 57) (see Figures 2 and 3)

The 140-foot storage length of the southbound Route 9A right-turn lane may be insufficient to accommodate the traffic demand. There are potential operational problems that will limit the throughput of the southbound right-turn lane, including the conflicting movements and transportation modes, traffic control, design (e.g. geometry and speed table), proximity to the Pier 57 garage egress, and loading zone. Therefore, the proposed arrangement could result in vehicle backups that exceed the storage capacity of the signal-controlled, right-turn lane. This could block traffic on Route 9A, W 17th Street, and Chelsea Piers egress.

3. Pier 57 “Circulation Road”

There are no traffic analysis results provided for the operation of the two-lane circulation road in the DEIS. With the right lane identified in the DEIS being used for multiple curbside activities, the circulation road would operate as a single lane much of the time with disruptions relating to the vehicles entering/exiting the curbside lane. Also, the DEIS identifies: large volumes of pedestrians crossing the circulation road at STOP-sign controlled crossings, a traffic signal on the circulation road at the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street, and truck loading and unloading operations at the north end of the Pier 57 building. Whether there is sufficient capacity available along the circulation road to avoid backups that extend across W 17th Street and impede Chelsea Piers egress has not been addressed in the DEIS. The DEIS [page 5-8] notes the potential usage of the circulation road for a stop on the M14 bus route and for loading and unloading tour buses. The potential number of buses is not identified and the location of the bus stop, as shown north of the Pier 57 building, could result in traffic blocking the Chelsea Piers egress at W 17th Street and Route 9A.
ATTACHMENT 1 (continued)

4. Traffic Management Plan

The Traffic Management Plan will be critical to the proposed Pier 57 access arrangement operating safely and efficiently, “particularly during large events” and to avoid impacts to Chelsea Piers egress. The plan will need to address how to avoid queuing from the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street and along the circulation road as well as to “control and manage crowds and conflict points along the bikeway”. The DEIS, however, only has a paragraph that provides a very general description of the TMP.

The DEIS recommends dealing with the “intermittent condition” adverse impact on pedestrian operations in the north crosswalk at Route 9A and W 15th Street by using traffic enforcement agents. This should be detailed in the Traffic Management Plan along with additional conditions, such as blockage of Chelsea Piers egress, that would trigger its implementation. The commitment of Pier 57 to implement the TMP would need to be formalized.

Other Access-Related Issues:

Taxi Loading/Unloading:

The DEIS notes that “Taxis would load/unload along a frontage road... or at a designated taxi stand located on northbound Route 9A between W 14th and W 15th Streets. Taxis were also assumed to load and unload on the north side of W 15th Street between Tenth Avenue and Route 9A”. The DEIS does not identify the assumption used for allocating the taxi movements among the three locations. There are concerns that many of the taxi movements assumed in the DEIS to use an external location would actually end up on the Pier 57 circulation road. Both external locations would require taxi users to walk a longer distance and cross Route 9A traffic. During evening hours and poor weather conditions this would appear to be unlikely. In addition, the potential for taxi loading/unloading on the north side of W 15th Street, between Tenth Avenue and Route 9A is limited because W 15th Street accommodates on-street parking (closer to Tenth Avenue) and an active driveway (closer to Route 9A).

W 14th Street and Route 9A

The volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio shown for the southbound left-turn movement from Route 9A to W 14th Street ranges as high as 1.99 for existing conditions. For NYCDOT, the existing v/c ratio should not exceed 1.05. Such a high v/c ratio for this movement raises questions about how well the analysis reflects existing conditions at this location and along southbound Route 9A.
ATTACHMENT 2

PIER 57 LAND USES AND ACTIVITIES WITH SITE TRAFFIC VOLUMES THAT REQUIRE FURTHER INFORMATION

The focus of our review was on the person-trip generation rates and the modal split estimates used in the Pier 57 DEIS. The person-trip generation rates form the fundamental basis for determining the magnitude of site-generated trips and the modal split determines the allocation of those trips among the available modes of travel. The vehicle occupancies, temporal distributions, and linked-trip credits—important components of the trip generation rate—also were reviewed.

For some land uses and activities, as noted below, further clarifications should be obtained to better understand the intended operations at Pier 57 to assess whether the traffic projections in the DEIS are reasonable and if modifications to the DEIS should be considered.

- **Food Counter**: The weekday and Saturday person-trip generation rates for the Food Counter land use are the same as those for the Quality Restaurant land use. Typically, high-turnover restaurants, such as those envisioned as part of the Food Counter use, have higher trip generation rates than Quality Restaurants. This conclusion is supported by data in the ITE *Trip Generation* manual which indicates that average daily trip rates for a High-Turnover Restaurant (Land Use Code 932) are 41 percent higher than those for a Quality Restaurant (Land Use Code 931) on a weekday, and 68 percent higher on a Saturday.

- **Marina “Historic Vessels”**: As stated on page 1-4 of the DEIS, the Marina includes “slips for one or more historic vessels”. Presumably, historic vessels—whether they remain docked or actively sail—could operate as visitor attractions at Pier 57, and therefore potentially generate additional pedestrian/vehicle trips to Pier 57. The trip generation rates for this activity are not reflected in the trip generation rates for the Marina land use cited in the source documents referenced in the DEIS: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005).

- **Marina Trip Generation**: The trip generation for Pier 57 estimate cites two sources for the Marina trip rates: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). While the higher rate of 6.23 trips/slip from the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS is used to estimate the weekday trips (as compared to 5.9 trips/slip in the Hudson River Park FEIS), the lower rate of 12.8 trips/slip from the Hudson River Park FEIS is used to estimate the Saturday trips (as compared to the 13.47 trips/slip rate from the Brooklyn Bridge FEIS). Therefore, the trip generation for Pier 57 for Saturday may be underestimated. A broader question is the intended operation of the marina — would it be used by private or charter boats? The trip generation for charter boats would be expected to have significantly higher trip generation rates.
ATTACHMENT 3

INFORMATION NEEDED RELATED TO THE DEIS ANALYSIS OF THE PIER 57 ACCESS ARRANGEMENT

1. The complete intersection capacity analysis reports for the intersection of W 17th Street and Route 9A (at Chelsea Piers sole egress point), including the input data, adjustment factors used, and corresponding output are necessary to conduct a thorough review. Of particular interest are the traffic analyses, including the traffic signal phasing/timing, and details of the traffic mitigation (e.g. storage length of the additional lane on westbound W 17th Street).

2. The complete intersection capacity analysis reports for the intersection of W 16th Street and Route 9A (related to the southbound Route 9A right-turn lane to Pier 57), including the input data, adjustment factors used, and corresponding output are necessary to conduct a thorough review. Of particular interest are traffic analysis to identify how it reflects the dynamics at that location, including the speed table, conflicts with bikeway users, alignment of the turn onto the circulation road, etc. and the estimated queue length for the signal-controlled right turn lane at W. 16th Street that crosses the bikeway, or for the signal-controlled and stop bar controlled two-lane circulation (frontage) road that could operate as only one lane under many conditions that are identified in the DEIS. For example, the DEIS proposed “speed tables” at the W 16th Street ingress point and the W 14th Street egress point would likely reduce the saturation flow rate for vehicles entering and leaving via those access points because of the change in the vertical profile of the roadway at these access points. It is unclear if this is reflected in the capacity analysis for the respective intersections.

3. Analysis results for how the circulation road is projected to operate and the vehicle queue lengths for the proposed conditions. This includes projected traffic (vehicles and pedestrians) volumes/flow maps for the circulation road. Vehicular volumes should distinguish between cars, vans, taxis, buses, and trucks. The volumes should reflect all the activities along the circulation road, including vehicle traffic, truck deliveries, passenger loading/unloading, turns at the driveways, taxis, etc. and pedestrian volumes crossing the circulation road.

4. The actions that would be implemented as part of the Traffic Management Plan to avoid queuing from the southbound right-turn lane at W 16th Street and along the circulation road (to prevent congestion that blocks Chelsea Piers egress) as well as to “control and manage crowds and conflict points along the bikeway”.

5. Information as to why the high v/c ratios were retained for existing conditions and how this may affect the analysis results for the intersection of Route 9A and W 14th Street.
ATTACHMENT 4

POTENTIAL ACTIONS TO MITIGATE TRAFFIC IMPACTS FROM PIER 57 ON CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS

Pending the receipt and review of the additional information identified in Attachment 3, the list below presents potential mitigation actions that could be further investigated to minimize adverse impacts from Pier 57 on Chelsea Piers egress. However, a fundamental question is whether the projected volumes in the Pier 57 DEIS are a reasonable estimate of the anticipated site-generated traffic.

1. Increase green time at the Route 9A and W 16th Street traffic signal only for the southbound right-turn movement into Pier 57 at W 16th Street beyond what is allowed for the southbound left-turn movement.

2. Provide manual traffic control at the intersection of the southbound right-turn lane/circulation road/bikeway to manage conflicts and prevent queues from the right-turn lane extending onto southbound Route 9A and blocking Chelsea Piers egress.

3. Provide manual traffic control along Route 9A at the intersection of W 17th Street/Chelsea Piers egress/circulation road to manage conflicts and prevent queues from the circulation road extending into Chelsea Piers egress.

4. Relocate the potential bus stop shown in the DEIS from north of W 16th Street to a location near W 15th Street to help maintain two lanes on the circulation road between W 16th and W 17th Streets.

5. Enforce provisions to minimize taxi drop offs/pick-ups along the circulation road and encourage usage of the taxi zone on the east side of Route 9A between W 14th and W 15th Streets.

6. Prohibit curbside activities on the circulation road between W 16th and W 17th Streets and enforce these prohibitions, providing manual control, if needed.

7. If there is a charter boat operation envisioned as part of the marina plan, then limit the charter operations to off-peak hours to help manage traffic volumes and conditions along the circulation road.

8. Minimize curbside activities south of W 16th Street during peak period of activity, particularly when there is an event.

9. Detail the provisions relating to Pier 57 traffic operations in the Traffic Management Plan and establish as a major objective the prevention of congestion on the circulation road and southbound right-turn lane (at W 16th Street) that could impede the Chelsea Piers egress route.

10. Include the requirement for implementation of the above actions in a binding document (such as the lease).
PHA ROADWAY PLAN – ILLUSTRATION OF POTENTIAL COMBINED TRAFFIC BACK-UP FROM WESTBOUND W. 17th & SOUTHBOUND W. 16th RIGHT TURN INTO CHELSEA PIERS EGRESS ROUTE
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Review of Pier 57 Transportation Planning Assumptions for All Pier 57 Land Uses

The DEIS-proposed Pier 57 project consists of a unique mix of land uses including retail, various restaurant types, a marina, museum/exhibit space, a technical school, and theatre/special event space. The types and mix of land uses—as well as the location of the proposed site along the Manhattan waterfront—make finding comparable data sources for this particular project challenging, because valid trip generation studies of comparable sites in New York City are comparatively limited in relation to more common and well-documented land uses such as residential, retail, and office. Data for similar land uses can sometimes, but not always, be found online in approved and published Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). In other instances, data must be obtained via transportation surveys conducted at other similar land uses already in operation.

The following is a summary of our findings relative to the trip generation estimate for each proposed Pier 57 land use. The focus of our review was on the person-trip generation rates and the modal split estimates. The person-trip generation rates form the fundamental basis for determining the magnitude of site-generated trips and the modal split determines the allocation of those trips among the available modes of travel. The vehicle occupancies, temporal distributions, and linked-trip credits—also important components of the trip generation estimate—also were reviewed. (A more detailed summary of the data sources for each of the trip generation parameters applied in the Pier 57 traffic study is provided in Table 1. A summary of projected person- and vehicle-trip generation is presented in Table 2.)

- **Destination Retail**
  - The DEIS person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard rates for destination retail uses in the CEQR Technical Manual.
  - The mode splits for weekday and Saturday conditions are based on a 2011 survey conducted at the Chelsea Market in 2011 by Sam Schwartz Engineering (SSE), which are compared to those reported for Restaurant/Retail uses as part of the South Street Seaport project below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Destination Retail</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi/Black Car</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Other</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Quality Restaurant**
  - The person-trip generation rate used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard references by Pushkarev & Zupan and the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation manual. The weekday person-trip generation rate for the proposed Quality Restaurant matches the person-trip generation rate used for the Restaurant use in the Flushing Commons FEIS. The Saturday person-trip generation rate was developed by applying the ratio of Saturday-to-weekday trip-rates given in the ITE Trip Generation manual to the weekday trip rate.
Appendix A

- The mode splits for weekday and Saturday are based on assumptions developed jointly by SSE and NYCDOT staff, and are compared to those developed for the Restaurant/Retail uses for the South Street Seaport and the Specialized Retail uses in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS below. As shown below, the Pier 57 mode splits show higher auto and taxi mode splits, which would result in higher numbers of projected auto and taxi trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pier 57: Quality Restaurant</th>
<th>South Street Seaport: Restaurant/Retail</th>
<th>Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS: Specialized Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday &amp; Saturday</td>
<td>Weekday Midday/PM</td>
<td>Pre-Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Food Counter**
  - The weekday and Saturday person-trip generation rates for the Food Counter land use are the same as those for the Quality Restaurant land use. Typically, high-turnover restaurants, such as those envisioned as part of the Food Counter use, have higher trip generation rates than Quality Restaurants. This conclusion is supported by data in the ITE Trip Generation manual which indicates that average daily trip rates for a High-Turnover Restaurant (Land Use Code 932) are 41 percent higher than those for a Quality Restaurant (Land Use Code 931) on a weekday, and 68 percent higher on a Saturday. The DEIS justifies the rates used by stating: "... It is expected that patrons of these food counters will also be shopping at the retail pods and, as such, are expected to have similar trip generation characteristics as the destination retail. However, to be conservative, the total daily trip generation rates were based on daily trip rates calculated for Quality Restaurant, which provides higher rates than for destination retail."

- The mode splits for weekday and Saturday are based on assumptions developed jointly by SSE and New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) staff, and are compared to those reported for Restaurant/Retail uses as part of the South Street Seaport project and the Specialized Retail uses in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS below:
### Theatre and Rooftop Events
- The daily person-trip rate for both theatre and rooftop events is the same for both weekdays and Saturdays. This rate matches the daily person-trip rate used for events in the 2005 *Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS*, and were based on transportation surveys conducted at Lincoln Center in 2000.

- The modal split for the theatre and rooftop events very closely approximates that reported as part of the South Street Seaport project. The mode splits for both studies appear to be based on a transportation survey conducted by AKRF at a Pier 54 movie event in 2009.

### Museum/Exhibit Space and Rooftop Exhibit Space
- The person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday are based on standard rates for museum uses in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

- The mode splits for the museum/exhibit space are based on transportation surveys conducted by Philip Habib Associates (PHA) in 2005 of a temporary art exhibit at Pier 54.

### Technical Arts School
- The person-trip generation rates used for weekday and Saturday were estimated based on vehicle-trip rates for a Junior/Community College in the ITE *Trip Generation* manual, with an adjustment to reflect a projected auto occupancy of 1.11 as cited in the 2009 *Fordham University/Lincoln Center Master Plan FEIS* for day-time/full-time graduate students.
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- The mode split was based on the mode split projections cited in the 2009 Fordham University/Lincoln Center Master Plan FEIS for day-time/full-time graduate students which generally reflected the highest combined auto plus taxi mode share. Slight refinements to the modal split were made to reflect a reallocation of the Fordham University site's "dorm-based trips" and "shuttle trips" to the available modes at Pier 57.

- Marina
  - As stated on page 1-4 of the DEIS, the Marina includes "slips for one or more historic vessels". Presumably, historic vessels—whether they remain docked or actively sail—could operate as visitor attractions at Pier 57, and therefore potentially generate additional trips. The trip generation rates for such activities are not reflected in the trip generation rates for the Marina land use cited in the source documents: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). The proposed operation of the historic vessels should be further clarified.
  - The trip generation estimate cites two sources for the Marina trip rates: the Hudson River Park FEIS (1998) and the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS (2005). While the higher rate of 6.23 trips/slip from the Brooklyn Bridge Park FEIS is used to estimate the weekday trips (as compared to 5.9 trips/slip in the Hudson River Park FEIS), the lower rate of 12.8 trips/slip from the Hudson River Park FEIS is used to estimate the Saturday trips (as compared to the 13.47 trips/slip rate from the Brooklyn Bridge FEIS). Therefore, the trip generation for Saturday may be underestimated. A broader question is the intended operation of the marina—would it be used by private or charter boats. The trip generation for charter boats would be expected to potentially have significantly higher trip generation rates.
  - The modal split for the marina at Pier 57 was based on the modal split for the marina cited in the 1998 Hudson River Park FEIS.

- Rooftop Open Space
  - The rooftop is expected to be a multi-use area, accommodating events, exhibits and an "open space" recreational area. The trip generation estimate assumes all three uses operating at once, albeit with rooftop events occurring only during evening hours on weekdays and Saturdays.
  - The person-trip generation rates for Rooftop Events and Rooftop Exhibits are as noted above (see Theatre and Rooftop Events and Museum/Exhibit Space and Rooftop Exhibit Space). The person-trip generation rates for the Rooftop Open Space are based on standard person-trip generation rates for Active Park Space in the CEQR Technical Manual.
  - The mode split for Rooftop Open Space is based on the mode split for the High Line Open Space in the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space EIS.
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- **Potential Water Taxi**
  - The existing Hudson River water taxi route operates along Manhattan's west side at headways ranging from 45 and 90 minutes between 9:00 AM and 6:15 PM. The water taxi currently stops at Pier 84 at West 44th Street, Pier 45 at Christopher Street, Battery Park, the South Street Seaport, and the Fulton Ferry Landing in Brooklyn (source: [http://www.nywatertaxi.com/](http://www.nywatertaxi.com/))
  
  - We recognize that, as noted in the DEIS, the (potential) water taxi landing would serve as a possible alternative mode of travel that could replace other modes of travel to and from the Pier 57 site. As a result, the water taxi is not reflected in the trip generation estimate in the DEIS with respect to its potential to introduce additional pedestrian trips through the study area not originating from, or destined to, Pier 57. The inclusion of the water taxi suggests a potential for attracting/generating higher volumes of pedestrian (walk) trips that are not destined to Pier 57, but rather pass by the proposed site on their way to and from other locations. Additional pedestrian trips have implications on both the pedestrian capacity analyses and the vehicular capacity analyses (i.e., conflicting pedestrian volumes for vehicle turning movements).
January 8, 2013

FEDERAL EXPRESS
Madelyn Wils, President and CEO
Hudson River Park Trust
353 West Street
Pier 40, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10014

Re: Pier 57 Redevelopment project

Dear Ms. Wils,

This firm represents the Chelsea Piers Management Company, which operates and maintains the Chelsea Piers recreational facility on Piers 59, 60, 61, and 62 between 17th Street and 23rd Street adjacent to Pier 57. Chelsea Piers supports the development of Pier 57 and hopes to work together with the Trust to ensure a safe environment for all who reside, visit and work in the area. However, as discussed in our earlier meeting with the Trust, the proposed design for Pier 57 will cause new and additional traffic impacts that could adversely affect safety and significantly constrain the egress movement from Chelsea Piers. In a worst case scenario, the problems with traffic flow at Pier 57 could significantly disrupt traffic on Route 9A.

Chelsea Piers has retained the firm of AECOM, professional engineer consultants with significant experience regarding Route 9A traffic and circulation, to review the Pier 57 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”). In short, their review reveals that Pier 57’s traffic and circulation plan could worsen and block traffic on Route 9A and W17th Street (at Chelsea Piers sole egress point). In addition, the DEIS lacks important analyses concerning intended operations that could further inflate these adverse impacts particularly in regard to the Pier 57 “Circulation Road” and the Traffic Management Plan. Notwithstanding, AECOM has prepared a list of potential mitigation measures that can be implemented to minimize adverse impacts from Pier 57 on Chelsea Piers egress based on the information currently provided in the DEIS.

We urge the Trust to immediately request the additional information described in the AECOM submittal so it is available prior to the hearing on January 23, 2013. Without these analyses the Trust cannot adequately take a “hard look” at the potential environmental consequences that are potentially likely to result from the Pier 57 Redevelopment Project. In
addition, in order to minimize the adverse impacts that are currently anticipated in the DEIS the Trust should require that the mitigation measures proposed by AECOM be implemented.

Further, we urge you to consider alternative access plans that reduce the need for complicated, high volume access driveways and park-side circulation roadways.

Thank you for your consideration and we are available at your convenience should you wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Karen Binder

Cc:  The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor of New York State
     The Honorable Michael R. Bloomberg
     Patricia E. Harris, First Deputy Mayor
     Councilwoman Christine Quinn
     Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer
     Congressman Jerry Nadler
     New York State Assemblyman Richard Gottfried
     New York State Senator Brad Hoylman
     New York State Assemblymember Deborah J. Glick
     New York State Assemblymember Daniel Squadron
     Chair Amanda M. Burden, New York City Planning Commission
     Commissioner Janette Sadik-Khan, New York City Department of Transportation
     Borough Commissioner Margaret Forgione, New York City Department of Transportation
     Naim Rasheed, Director of Environmental Review, New York City Department of Transportation
     Corey Johnson, Chair of Community Board 4 Manhattan
     Mr. Robert J. Benfatto, District Manager of Community Board 4 Manhattan
     Chairwoman Diana L. Taylor, Hudson River Park Trust
     Joseph Martens, Hudson River Park Trust
     Paul A. Ullman, Hudson River Park Trust
     Michael E. Novogratz, Hudson River Park Trust
     Vice Chairman Robert K. Steel, Hudson River Park Trust
     Veronica M. White, Hudson River Park Trust
     Joseph B. Rose, Hudson River Park Trust
     Henry J. Stern, Hudson River Park Trust
     Jeffrey Kaplan, Hudson River Park Trust
Lawrence B. Goldberg, Esq., Hudson River Park Trust
Franz S. Leichter, Esq., Hudson River Park Trust
Pamela Frederick, Hudson River Park Trust
Debra L. Kustka, Assistant Vice President of Operations, Hudson River Park Trust
Colonel Paul Owen, Commander, New York District Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Commissioner Joseph Martens, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Commissioner Joan McDonald, New York State Department of Transportation
Commissioner Rose Harvey, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation
Cesar A. Perales, Secretary of State
Robert Kulikowski, Director of New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination
David Karnovsky, General Counsel, New York City Department of City Planning
Robert B. Tierney, Chair, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission
Commissioner Veronica M. White, New York City Department of Parks and Recreation
Douglas Bionsky, President & CEO, The Central Park Conservancy
Commissioner Carter Strickland, New York City Department of Environmental Protection
Noreen Doyle, Executive Vice President, Hudson River Park Trust
Noah S. Budnick, Deputy Director of Transportation Alternatives
Lauren Danziger, Meatpacking District Improvement Association
Matt Bronfman, Jamestown Properties
Barry Diller, Chairman, IAC
Miguel Acevedo, President of Fulton Houses Tenants Association
Terri Cude, Chair, Manhattan Community Board #2
Catherine McVay Hughes, Chair, Manhattan Community Board #1
Justin Sadrian, Acting Chair, Friends of Hudson River Park
Ronald Lewis, President & CEO, Chelsea Waterside Park Association
William Borock, President, Council of Chelsea Block Associations
Peggy Navarre, President, Hudson River Watertrail Association
Jim Lane, Committee Chair, Sierra Club, Hudson River Estuary Committee
Hon. Patricia A. Dillon
David Howe
Dana Hudes
John Sherratt
Board of Directors of The Chelsea-Village Partnership
Chelsea Cultural Partnership
100 West 15th Street Block Association
200 West 15th Street Block Association
Pier 57 Working Group, Hudson River Park Trust Advisory Council
Clean Air NY
Re: Support for Pier 57 Rezoning

Dear Chair Burden,

On behalf of Friends of the High Line, I am writing to express our enthusiastic support of the plans by Young Woo & Associates, LLC and the Hudson River Park Trust to develop Pier 57 into a new, mixed-use facility.

Friends of the High Line is a non-profit organization whose mission is to build and maintain an extraordinary public park on the High Line, which sits one block east of Pier 57 on West 15th Street. Like Manhattan Community Board 4, we believe that the redevelopment of Pier 57 is a crucial element in the ongoing revitalization of the Hudson River Park and is an appropriate and excellent addition to the park and the community.

Further, we believe that the uses proposed at Pier 57 – cultural, food, recreation and small and mid-sized retail – are complimentary to the High Line, and will only enhance the experience of those visitors to the High Line, Hudson River Park, and Manhattan’s West Side.

We commend the efforts of Young Woo, the Hudson River Park Trust, Manhattan Community Board 4 and all of the stakeholders who played a role in this impressive proposal. It is our hope that the City Planning Commission will quickly vote to approve the project and bring it one step closer to realization.

Sincerely,

Robert Hammond
Co-Founder
Friends of the High Line
February 4, 2013

Hon. Amanda Burden, FAICP
Chair
City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Burden,

Thank you for considering the information presented by Chelsea Piers and its traffic consultant Aecom at the January 23, 2013 Public Hearing on the Pier 57 DEIS. Aecom will also make a formal written submission.

Chelsea Piers has been running its waterfront sports and entertainment complex, between 17th and 23rd Streets, for almost 20 years. Over 2,000 people work at Chelsea Piers and it is one of the most visited places in New York City, with over 4 million annual visits. We generate tens of millions of dollars annually for the city and state through rents, business taxes, payroll taxes, etc. If Chelsea Piers’ accessibility is impaired due to Pier 57 traffic issues, the repercussions will be significant.

As you are aware, Chelsea Piers is extremely concerned about the 17th Street intersection, which is the sole exit from Chelsea Piers and is the proposed principal entry for Pier 57. It should be noted that the existing 17th Street intersection gets an “F” service rating. Despite the claims of the HRPT traffic engineer, adding Pier 57 traffic to this intersection is not going to improve the level of service for the Pier 57 development.

In summary, we highlight the following issues for your consideration:

1. Traffic generation information for Pier 57 is understated and incomplete.
   - Modal splits (car/taxi vs other modes) are artificially low.
The projections that most car/taxis will drop off or park east of Route 9A is not realistic.

The traffic plans describe bus transportation but no buses seem to be factored into actual traffic counts and operations.

2. The proposed service road and Route 9A access points will fail under increases in traffic volumes above the stated DEIS traffic levels (17th Street is already an "F" level of service).

Any conflicts (bike-car, pedestrian-taxi, etc.) at either Pier 57 entrance will not only block the sole exit to the Chelsea Piers, but will cause immediate back up on Route 9A.

Problems on Pier 57 access driveway (like a bus, van or car that stops to unload away from curb), will quickly jam up driveway and restrict entrance from 9A – thus more back ups onto 9A.

We believe it is imperative for NYC DOT to require further study of Pier 57 traffic issues, including exploring alternatives that do not use 17th Street as the primary project entrance.

We are supportive of YWA's efforts to redevelop Pier 57, but having operated a business on Route 9A for the last 20 years, we are keenly aware of the issues associated with cars, taxis and buses. The plan for access to Pier 57 must be viable and sustainable for the long term. Otherwise, all will suffer.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

David A. Tewksbury

cc: Hon. Kenneth J. Knuckles, Esq., Vice Chairman, City Planning Commission
Hon. Angela M. Battaglia, City Planning Commission
Hon. Rayann Besser, City Planning Commission
Hon. Irwin G. Cantor, P.E., City Planning Commission
Hon. Alfred C. Cerullo, III, City Planning Commission
Hon. Betty Y. Chen, City Planning Commission
Hon. Michelle de la Uz, City Planning Commission
Hon. Maria M. Del Toro, City Planning Commission
Hon. Joseph Douek, City Planning Commission
Hon. Richard W. Eaddy, City Planning Commission
Hon. Anna Hayes Levin, City Planning Commission
Hon. Orlando Marin, City Planning Commission
Edith Hsu-Chen, Director, Manhattan Office, Dept. of City Planning
Adam Wolff, Deputy Director, Manhattan Office, Dept. of City Planning
Karolina Grebowiec-Hall, City Planner, Manhattan office, Dept. of City Planning

Madelyn Wils, President, HRPT
Dear Hudson River Trust:

I am a daily user of the Greenway. I use it to commute to work by bicycle. I also walk regularly along its pedestrian paths and park areas. I think it is one of the best things about the city. This is why it makes me so disappointed to learn about your traffic plan for Pier 57.

With your plan, the area by the river, now used by people to walk, run, and sit will be degraded to a driveway that will be lined with vehicles. Pedestrians will be pushed onto a sidewalk. Runners will go onto the bikeway, increasing conflict with bicyclists. Sitters will have to go elsewhere. I assume the picnic tables currently there will be removed – no room anymore.

Those using the bikeway will now endure horn honking and exhaust fumes on both sides; more traffic lights hindering their trip; and more risk of getting injured or killed by motorists crossing the path. (Go up to the Circle Line, NY Waterways, or impound lot areas and see how well right turn lanes work at slowing down motorists, or how the “do not enter” signs work at keeping motorists from turning into exits. In my experience, the answer “is not very well.”)

Additionally, pedestrians trying to cross 11th and 12th avenues at 14th Street now have “turn thru” crosswalks to deal with, created by vehicles exiting your driveway.

I understand the need for deliveries to the pier. The “movable gate” mentioned in your plan seems logical. Actually, over the summer this strategy worked well when there were events at Pier 57. A few guards would stop traffic on the Greenway when a delivery vehicle needed to cross.

However, I do not understand the logic of building a driveway and crossing points to accommodate all motorists at the expense of Greenway users, like you are planning to do. A “pull in” area that did not cross the Greenway, such as at the Intrepid, seems like a preferable idea.

Incidentally, a few months ago I was entering the Greenway at 135th Street. As I was doing so, a park ranger sped out of the Department’s office parking lot and onto the road in her personal vehicle. She was being reckless so I waved to her: “slow down.” She didn’t. Instead, she sped by me and gave me the finger. Nice, huh? Unfortunately, your plan seems to do about the same thing to Greenway users.

I am an average citizen so there is nothing I can do to stop your reconstruction. However, your plan makes me think less of the Hudson River Trust and I really wish your foundation would hold stronger to the mission of the Greenway and the lives of its users over the desires of developers.

Sincerely,

Sean Kelliher
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PROCEEDINGS

MS. GRUEL: This is a public hearing pursuant to Manhattan calendar numbers 13 through 16. Calendar number 13, CD4 C130100ZMM. Calendar number 14, C130101ZSM. Calendar number 15, C130102ZSM. Calendar number 16, C130103ZSM. A public hearing in the matter of applications for an amendment of the zoning map and for the grant of special permits concerning Pier 57.

Notice, in addition to considering the ULURP applications before you, today's hearing is being conducted as a joint hearing with the Hudson Park River Trust, the lead agency on the environmental review for the Pier 57 redevelopment. As noted in today's calendar, the DEIS Notice of Completion and the DEIS for the project were issued by the Trust for public review and comment on October 25th, 2012. And the full text of both documents are available for review on the Trust's Web site or at their Pier 40 offices. Copies of the Trust's public notice are available at the sign-in desk if anyone needs a copy.

Please be advised that comments
received at today's hearing are being transcribed
by the Trust's stenographer, and will receive the
same consideration as any written comments that
are submitted during the public comment period.
Those wishing to submit lengthy or complex
testimony are urged to do so in writing.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Madam
Secretary. I would also like to acknowledge the
Trust's board member, Pam Frederick, who is seated
in the front row, and is serving as the Trust's
hearing officer for today's joint hearing.

MS. FREDERICK: Thanks.

THE CHAIR: Thank you for being
here.

MS. FREDERICK: I'm happy to be
here.

THE CHAIR: As is our normal custom,
we will hear speakers in favor for one half hour,
for thirty minutes, and then we will switch to
speakers in opposition. We will begin today with
Noreen Doyle.

MS. DOYLE: Good morning. My name
is Noreen Doyle, and I am the executive vice
president at the Hudson River Park Trust. In
addition to our hearing officer and board member Pam Frederick, I'm joined by the general counsel, Laurie Silberfeld. Madelyn Wils, our president, sends her regrets for missing this very important hearing, but she's been summoned to jury duty and could not be excused.

Before I begin the presentation I would like to extend our appreciation to Chair Burden and the other Commissioners for agreeing to host this joint hearing. We also appreciate the assistance of the department staff for helping us with the additional logistics required to accommodate us.

Pier 57 is an approximately 375,000 square foot structure located at 15th Street and Hudson River Park. 15th Street is there. It was used for about three decades as a municipal bus garage. It is now vacant, and is one of the very few sites within the overall Hudson River Park where certain commercial uses are permitted. Because Hudson River Park does not receive any government operating funds, Pier 57 is an important component of the park's overall financial plan, as well as a key missing link in...
the physical park.

In July 2008 the Trust issued a request for proposals for Pier 57. Among our stated goals were:

Creating a quality park enhancement development for a combination of cultural, educational, recreational, maritime and other uses allowed by the Hudson River Park Act;

Providing an opportunity for park and water enhancing activities to expand the public's enjoyment of the waterfront, and for restaurant, retail and other commercial uses in a new and exciting setting, and respecting the historic structure.

In July 2009, with the unanimous support of our advisory council and Pier 57 community working group, HRPT's board of directors conditionally designated Young Woo & Associates as the developer for Pier 57. The Trust has been working with Young Woo since that time to advance the planning and environmental review process for Pier 57. We have worked particularly hard on planning high quality public open space, ensuring that any water construction respects the Hudson
River habitat, and of course addressing traffic. In this regard we have sought to balance the competing demands of pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles, those that will be attracted to Pier 57, and those that are already in the park, including at Chelsea Piers, Pier 57's northern neighbor. We were gratified to hear Community Board 4's strong support for the effort we put into this planning.

The EIS process is a critical part of the Trust's continuing project review, and affords opportunities for elected officials, the working group, the public and agencies to comment on relevant areas of concern. The complete DEIS is posted on the home page of our Web site, Hudson River Park dot-org, and comments on it may be submitted to us until February 4th. Information on how to do so is on our Web site and on the fliers in the back of the room.

(Bell rung)

MS. DOYLE: Today Young Woo & Associates will provide an overview of the project program, and some of the other project team members will also present. We have other members of the project team here to answer questions. We
were at the review session and noted some of the commissions have questions.

Thank you again on behalf of the Trust.

THE CHAIR: Thanks, Noreen. Let me see if there are any questions for you.

MS. DOYLE: Sure.

THE CHAIR: I'm assuming there are.

Noreen represents the Trust, so I would encourage you to direct questions to her. Anna.

COMM. LEVIN: Yes.

Hi, Noreen, nice to see you again.

MS. DOYLE: Good to see you.

COMM. LEVIN: The Community Board raised a number of concerns about the floor area ratio, a larger ratio would be permitted by the rezoning, the proposal is for something significantly less than that, and about preventing unintended consequences of this rezoning, namely hotels and big box retail. As was laid out in the borough president's letter, this project is also subject to some additional regulatory controls that I think you have a handle on.

Could you address for us the
reassurances that will be available in the
arrangements between the Trust and the developer
on the points that concern the community board?

MS. DOYLE: Sure. For starters, I think it's important that the commissioners
understand that none of the property in Hudson
River Park, including Pier 57, is actually owned
by the Hudson River Park Trust. In this case, the
underlying property is owned by the State Parks
Department. So they are our partner in terms of
understanding the requests for some of the
additional restrictions requested by Community
Board 4.

But before we kind of get to that
point, we had a good discussion with Community
Board 4 throughout the process with respect to the
concern about hotels. Hotels are not a
permissible use under the Hudson River Park Act.
Some of you may know that we are actually in a
discussion about trying to amend the Hudson River
Park Act to allow for a greater spectrum of
commercial uses. But we have no intention, nor
does the applicant have any interest in adding
hotels to Pier 57. It is not a sensible site for
that use, in part because of the historic structure. We offered to Community Board 4 that we would send them a letter and agree to add that as a lease condition as part of the future lease.

With respect to big box, that's actually that something that Hudson River Park Trust thought about a long time ago when we were working out the MOU that we are currently in with Young Woo. We actually preclude big box as part of the MOU. The language to that effect has been sent to Community Board 4 and the borough president and to some of your staff. We tried to define big box even to the extent that we really didn't want it to turn into something that's not intended.

The Pier, as you heard, is a historic structure. It's on the state and National Registers of Historic Places. And in addition to the normal state Historic Preservation Office review process that would restrict greatly what can be put on the building in terms of height, the applicant is also going to be seeking historic tax credits, which are an important financial incentive for them. They're subject to
an even more strict standard for review by the National Parks Service. And we think that there's realistically no chance that anything approaching the maximum limits of M1-5 or even far below it could ever, ever happen.

However, we are not trying to increase beyond the M -- the 2.23 I think that we are at. We'd like to preserve a little bit of flexibility in the event that mechanical equipment needed to be a foot taller than what's anticipated or something like that. But we really have no intention of going beyond that.

And I think that those were the three main questions.

COMM. LEVIN: Thank you.

MS. DOYLE: Sure.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions?

Michelle?

COMM. DE LA UZ: She answered mine.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for being here.

MS. DOYLE: You're welcome.

THE CHAIR: Okay, the next speaker is Greg Carney.
MR. CARNEY: Thanks, Noreen, and good morning, everyone. I'm Greg Carney. I'm with Young Woo & Associates. And I'm joined by my colleague and project manager, Norm Roumanous, this morning to take you through our program at the pier. We really are honored to be part of this unique development in partnership with the Trust. And before I go on, I want to extend thanks on behalf of the entire team to the board, the Trust, and to Ann Green and her staff in particular for all their efforts to get us to this point.

Our collective goal for Pier 57 is to transform the property into a creative urban marketplace, focused on food, fashion, film, and art. In developing our concepts and plans for the sort of cultural hub that we envision, our firm had worked hard to understand the Pier itself, the property, the surrounding park to our north and south, and the neighborhoods to our east, where we ourselves have quite a history, having owned and developed a number of significant projects in west Chelsea.

So our plans for the pier reflect
the following objectives.

First, community oriented design. Our intended use is to incorporate significant input from the community, as dozens of meetings and input sessions were held throughout the planning process, not to mention the countless discussions with the Trust.

Secondly, reactivation of a vacant property into a vibrant gathering place in a true community in and of itself. As Noreen mentioned, Pier 57 has been unused since 2004. Our program will look to activate and energize this historic property in a respectable and what we think is a very creative way. Generating new business and community activity, and opening up a portion of the waterfront and new open space for area residents, workers and visitors.

Thirdly, sustainable development. Incorporating a number of green initiatives to ensure energy efficiency and also responsible design, construction, and operation going forward. Next, very important, historic preservation. Not only because of the historic tax credits, but we really wanted to preserve and
maintain this very unique, historic character. The very industrial, extraordinary double height spaces, large column free spaces that we want to preserve.

Next, job creation and economic development. The project will create thousands of new construction and long term jobs, and generate new tax revenue for the city and state of New York.

Sixth, a related goal, support for small business. Our planned public marketplace, which you will hear more about, is a proven business model that provides entrepreneurs, small merchants and artisans a platform to start or expand their businesses, sell their goods and to incubate their growth within Manhattan with low barriers to entry, and in this case a prime location.

Next, education and engagement. Many of the targeted uses are meant to encourage not just sales and consumption but interaction, whether between merchants and visitors, chefs and guests, or artists and the public. All with the idea of creating an experience, rather than just
making a purchase, having a meal, et cetera.

And last but certainly not least, to generate funding for Hudson River Park. As part of our MOU with the Trust, which will ultimately convert to a long term lease agreement, the project will generate substantial new revenue that will be dedicated towards the operation and maintenance of the Hudson River Park we have all come to know and love.

(Bell rung)

MR. CARNEY: Beyond that we believe that together with the Trust we will be able to make a meaningful contribution the city's West Side, and continue all the great progress that's been made along the waterfront to the north and south. And with that I'll turn it over to Norm with more details on the program. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Maybe if you just wait.

MR. CARNEY: Sure.

THE CHAIR: For two seconds, there may be questions for you.

There are not. Thank you. I'm sorry, yes, Michelle.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you for the
presentation and outlining a few key points. Maybe you're the appropriate person or someone else is, maybe you can talk a little bit about how you intend to actually lease the commercial spaces to the small businesses.

MR. CARNEY: Yes. Actually in partnership with our operator, Urban Space Management, there are sort of several tiers of engagement with the market. One is a more traditional channel through leasing agents, some of the larger tenants or more established tenants. A lot of the merchants and smaller vendors, as you might imagine, are more direct. That comes from both the existing network within our relationships and Urban Space's relationships in the market, and Urban Spaces appear in the Union Square Holiday Market, Columbus Circle, Madison Square Park, so that roster of tenants will also be directly contacted. And then we have also talked about actually making a container space that will be described later on, available online and in more of a reservation almost like an airplane, a flight reservation system, where people can pick and choose their locations, so we make it as easy as
possible for people to find entry into the pier.

THE CHAIR: Thanks very much for being here.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: The next speaker is Norm Roumanous.

MR. ROUMANOUS: That's it.

THE CHAIR: Hi.

MR. ROUMANOUS: Hi. My name is Norm Roumanous. I'm the project manager for Young Woo & Associates.

As Greg mentioned, Pier 57 will be creating an urban marketplace focusing on food, fashion, film, art. Young Woo & Associates, we have commenced our marketing and leasing program as much as we can. We are out in the market discussing the space with a number of excited tenants, including restaurateurs, creative entrepreneurs, and small business groups. As part of our agreement with the Hudson River Park Trust, Noreen Doyle mentioned it earlier, we were required to provide a substantial amount of what we call CEE, or cultural, education and entertainment uses. Those uses include things
like cooking classes, art and technical classes, rooftop farming, art exhibits, community kayaking, open air cinema and water activities.

One thing I'd like to touch on which sort of sums up our whole programming. In 2011 Young Woo & Associates in conjunction with Urban Space Management created DeKalb Markets in Brooklyn. It was a great success for us, it was an incubator test for us. For Pier 57, we have over 60 local merchants and entrepreneurs. DeKalb was a great success and created a vibrant marketplace in the community.

DeKalb Market, as part of our incubator test, also was housed in refurbed shipping containers, and was a great addition to the community, creating jobs and providing amenity. And so as part of that we do have some images of the refurbed shipping containers in the market. And we also had a farm, a community farm which was, you know, school groups and community groups were able to utilize for free.

So as far as our program goes, Greg did touch on, you know, restaurants, some open area spaces for the community. And then obviously
we have the Tribeca Film Festival as our key tenant or our key user for the roof. They are required to provide free programming throughout the year and open space management with regard to our market.

With regards to the marina, as you can see on the first rendering, on the north and south side of Pier 57 we have assessed 141 marine slips, which will consist of small boats, recreational boats and some historic ships. Since we are not dredging or doing any type of dredging in the river, we are limited to the types of boats we can use because, you know, the depths range from seven feet all the way up closer to the tip to around twenty feet. So it does restrict us to the types of boats we can have in the pier.

And that's it.

THE CHAIR: Thanks very much. As I was looking through the speakers in opposition, most of them represent Chelsea Piers. Since we can't call you back again, maybe you can talk about what you anticipate their concerns are. I think there's a concern about the vehicular flow of the cars that are coming to Chelsea piers and
how they drop off. But if there are other things that you might like to talk about in anticipation of what they might say, that would be helpful.

MR. ROUMANOUS: Well, with regards to the circulation of the traffic, I think it would be best if we wait for our traffic engineers.

THE CHAIR: Okay, that's fine. So you think that's what it's all about?

MR. ROUMANOUS: Yeah.

THE CHAIR: Let me see if there are any questions for you from Commissioners.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: No, there are not.

Great, thank you for being here.

The next speaker is Gary Handel.

MR. HANDEL: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, it's a pleasure to be here. My name is Gary Handel, and I'm here for the applicant.

Pier 57 is an extraordinary structure that was designed by an extraordinary engineer. Admiral Prager, when he was the head of the Naval's Bureau of Design, designed this series
of concrete breakwaters that were used in Operation Phoenix in the Normandy Landing, you know, in World War 2. This innovative technique was used again at Pier 57. Admiral Prager constructed a series of three enormous caissons over 360 feet long and 80 feet wide up north on the Hudson River. They were floated downriver, positioned precisely in place, and now remain the foundations for Pier 57. And that's why the project was listed on the National Register because of its unique construction. Our goal is to restore this amazing structure to its former glory and infuse it with new uses.

So the headhouse structure, which you can see in the photographs before me, the brickwork will be repointed and repaired. The cast stone wall will be put back in place. The existing steel windows will be restored and replaced in kind where necessary.

There's 128 amazing four panel sequentially geared doors that form the north and south facades of the building. Each and every one of them will be put back into service.

At the western end of the pier
there's a beautiful sign for the marine and aviation terminal. This will be repaired, as will all of the balance of, you know, of the Pier. And then, you know, it will be infused with new life.

The pier will also make a significant contribution to public space along the pier. The existing walkway, the perimeter walkway will be put back into public service and opened up to the public. And there be will be extensions that connect that perimeter walkway eastward to link into the extraordinary experience which is the Hudson River Park. In addition, there will be extensions on the north and south which increase the dimensions of the public walkway in order to alleviate some of the concerns that have been raised, you know, by those in opposition.

In total, there will be over 35,000 square feet of public space on the ground floor. And in addition to that, there will be over an acre and a half of publicly accessible open space on the roof. So we think it will be an amazing addition to Hudson River Park.

One of the concerns that was raised in several of our meetings was, you know, this is
obviously an exposed structure, you know, on the waterfront, and so basically all of the mechanical systems of the building have been lifted off of the ground floor and placed into a well directly behind the headhouse in between the Pier fingers.

(Bell rung)

MR. HANDEL: So they are invisible to view, but well protected. And, in addition, we're working on creating a series of six foot tall floodgates that will protect the structure in case of any additional storms.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thanks Gary. Don't go away yet, let me see if there are questions. Yes, Michelle.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Could you actually discuss or describe those floodgates a little bit more?

MR. HANDEL: Sure. So floodgate technology, right now basically the easiest way to adaptively fit a historic structure is actually to create or there are little sleeves that can go into concrete footings that basically then can take vertical stanchions. And then there's a
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series of panels that come in and sequentially interlock. And so basically all of those and so every bit of the facade will have to be protected with these stanchions. And then basically when you remove them they're just flush, they look like what you would have, I don't know if you've seen where people have, you know, awnings and canopies and there's little inserts into the concrete in the sidewalk. All of those barriers will be stored down in the caissons. Fortunately we usually know when storms are coming, so there's adequate time to evacuate if you have to evacuate the building and to erect the floodgates.

THE CHAIR: So they're assembled manually or electronically?

MR. HANDEL: Yeah. Yeah. So basically they're -- it would be possible I think to design something that would be -- but given the historic nature of the structure, it would be hard to reconcile.


Any other questions? Yes, Anna.

COMM. LEVIN: Yes, thank you.
I have actually, I guess I have two questions. One is about signage, it's a hot topic around here these days. And renderings suggest that the only signage is to restore the existing identifications of the --

MR. HANDEL: Yes. So we definitely will be, you know, the signing, you know, at the western end is glorious. So yes, that would be brought into service. And I think there is an idea of having some modest signage at the entrance to the, but nothing major. Not part of this application.

COMM. LEVIN: Okay. Is that signage that's been included in the application or -- I guess it would be interesting to know what signage is proposed.

MR. HANDEL: There is no signage that is part of this application.

COMM. LEVIN: Okay. Is there signage that's intended, planned? Anyway, if you could provide us details about that.

MR. HANDEL: Yes, sure.

COMM. LEVIN: I think it might be good.
My second question is about, I think it's great that the perimeter walkway is being made so robust, but will there be points -- could you describe how -- will there be access to the walkway from within the pier?

MR. HANDEL: Yes.

COMM. LEVIN: Or do you have to start at the headhouse and go all the way out to the end?

MR. HANDEL: Ada Tolla will go through some of the plans. And there are a lot -- the idea really is to be able through this market concept and with those four panel doors that basically it's an incredibly flexible system. So there are points that will always be available for fixed access, so people will have access to the perimeter walkway and, you know, there's a wonderful space at the west end terminus of the pier. So there will be places that will always be accessible from inside to the perimeter walkway.

And then there's also the idea that the, you know, that the access could change over time. You know, that basically that with these, with all of these doors that you can see here, and
the flexibility that Greg and Norm talked about, and basically the pier is an open market and the idea is that it will evolve over time. And so that the exact relationship of inside and out will actually be able to vary from year to year as tenants take hold of the building.

COMM. LEVIN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Other questions for Gary?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thanks a lot, Gary.

The next speaker is, check my time, it's okay, Ada Tolla.

MS. TOLLA: Good morning. My name is Ada Tolla. I'm one of the principals at LOT-EK, and I've been working on the pier from the onset, from the beginning of the RFP. We worked very closely with Young Woo and the Trust to try to really understand the structure. And, as was stated before, the intention was to sort of really appreciate and glorify the existing structure of the pier, which is a fantastic industrial, two level building. And therefore to think about the new use as something that could be inserted within
the building, that would also have a very defined difference from the condition of the building itself.

We worked with the idea of creating this market that is a much finer grain of the retail, with the smaller units that are obviously modular and that are these incubators that the speakers before talked about. And the market is completely made with shipping containers. They are, it's a practice that our office has been working with for a long time. It's of course an upcycling practice. We also thought that for this particular project the shipping containers made a lot of sense because they connect to the history of the port and the history of what the pier used to be.

The containers are an organizer that enters the space and basically fits each one of the two levels with a level and a mezzanine, and a level and a mezzanine. It's sort of like an organizer that form ground level reconnects the building to 15th Street. We always saw the building as an extension of 15th Street. Allowing people to go through these series of services and
experiences that are within.

I'm going to quickly just guide you through the building. So the ground level, when one enters the building to the existing doors on the headhouse, as Greg and Gary were saying before, we have retained the existing ramp. There was the access ways that the bus department used when they were using the building, and it is actually a pretty interesting architectural feature of the building. So one has the option to enter in the gate or go up on the ramp. Of course we're talking about pedestrian access.

And as we go along, you have opportunities to both see the water and also come outside. And you're constantly flanked either by the smaller grain of the container market or by the larger, which is shown in blue here in the plans, the either larger retail or what we have been calling flex spaces, which are spaces where basically a different kind of retail experience can open, like the night markets in Hong Kong or something again of a finer grain.

(Bell rung)

MS. TOLLA: So -- okay. I'm just
going to say very quickly that this is repeated throughout the four levels. And then at the very top we come out inside the roof pavilion and onto the roof part, which is a very important feature of the building. Basically the entire top floor is a park that will be open to the public, occasionally operated by Tribeca Film Festival with outdoor movies, but otherwise be connected to the Hudson River Park.

THE CHAIR: Great. Let me see if there are any questions for you, thank you so much. I think there was a question about whether you could from the very -- you didn't have to go back to the headhouse to get onto the perimeter. So if you're at the end of the pier, how do you get onto the public space?

MS. TOLLA: There is a stair.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MS. TOLLA: That crosses the entire building. And basically one can come in. And this is an open stair, it's not an egress stair. It's an actual public open stair that crosses the entire building and ends in the roof pavilion.

There is this vertical cross circulation that
allows penetration throughout.

THE CHAIR: And you actually think the top of the pier can support the amount of plantings that you showed, because it's very beautiful.

MS. TOLLA: Actually, interestingly, one of the comments that we had early on from SHPO was that they didn't want to see trees on the roof because the nature of the building originally was not of that kind. So the design was actually developed by Malk Landscape Architects, plans to use mainly the surface. And then there is this idea of working with the concept of the gantries, the existing gantries and therefore thinking of a sort of shading that comes more from the industrial quality of the building.

THE CHAIR: Great. Any other questions? Yes Angela.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: You mentioned the stair that goes across the building. Could you speak to features for handicapped and disabled persons?

MS. TOLLA: Right. Well, the building luckily was already fitted with this very
large elevator. So we are using the shafts, but we are retrofitting, of course, the elevators. And they will unload at every single level. So there are elevators that are centrally located exactly in the same area. So the main, what we call the main public plaza has both the stairs as well as the existing elevators. So it will be an equivalent experience.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Great. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

COMM. CANTOR: Just one question.

THE CHAIR: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

Irwin, go ahead.

COMM. CANTOR: With regard to the question about the capacity of the roof, I assume you've had engineers review it?

MS. TOLLA: Yes. Yeah, we reviewed it both from multiple perspectives. One is structural, two is also egress of course, and three is fire. So the capacity is connected to all of those.

COMM. CANTOR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Great, thanks a lot.
We will now switch to speakers in opposition. And the first is Jesse Masyr, who will be followed by Noatl Budnick.

MR. MASYR: Good morning. My name is Jesse Masyr. I'm with the firm of Wachtel, Masyr & Missry, and we represent Chelsea Piers, as we have done so before this Commission for the past twenty years. Chelsea Piers, as you know, is located on Piers 59 through 61, and for more than eighteen years has operated. Located on 28 acres, it's a busy, active facility operating nearly 24 hours, seven days a week.

Our concern, and we do support the revitalization of Pier 57, but our concern is with the proposed impacts from Pier 57 are not being adequately studied, and its potential to create significant adverse impacts, particularly as it relates to traffic, have been underestimated and will severely affect the operation of both Chelsea Pier and Route 9A.

First, it's unclear to us what is actually being proposed. The project description outlines a 428,000 square feet mid-use facility with 141 slip marina and 75 car accessory parking.
The cornerstone of any submission to environmental review is to adequately define the project's characteristics, so that decision makers can make reasonable assessments about the project's likely affects. So while the DEIS states there's 141 slip marina, it totally fails to describe the intended operation of the marina. Will it only be used for private boats, will there be charter boats. Will there be dinner boats.

These details are critical, since the attraction can bring up to a thousand passengers within one peak hour to the pier. Without a reasonable level of detail, it's impossible to evaluate the legally required worst case scenario. This is particularly surprising given that the Trust and the developer will execute a lease with the pier, and the uses permitted and prohibited will undoubtedly be specified, although not shared at present with all of us.

This brings me to the next point, the access plan being proposed. The operations of Chelsea Piers now relies exclusively at the egress of the 17th Street approach. As proposed, the
developer intends to use the 17th Street approach as its principal entrance to Pier 57. The intersection is already operating at a failed level of service, and even with the project improvements the traffic flow still fails. Imagine, just imagine the traffic meltdown that will result if the development generates more than 20 percent of its current estimates.

Despite the potential conflicts with the shared 17th Street approach, in the past 18 months the Trust has never contacted Chelsea Piers. When they finally did agree to meet with us, they refused to provide any traffic details, making Chelsea Piers wait until the DEIS was released. At that meeting we finally had with the Trust, we brought our traffic engineer, who is here to testify, and we agreed that we would draft an alternate traffic plan. Such a plan was submitted and was summarily dismissed.

My final point of focus is on the public purpose of the project. The development and reuse of Pier 57 certainly is a worthy goal. However, Pier 58, the upland area which lies between Chelsea Piers and Pier 57, was designated
as a passive park in the Hudson River Park Act itself.

(Bell rung)

MR. MASYR: The park area -- I will sum up -- is now being slated for use as an access road leading to the circulation road in front of Pier 57. This land, located between two commercial uses, could be a beautiful green park space; instead, it's a two lane asphalt roadway. We believe there's still time to correct this traffic problem, and we will have our traffic engineer testify.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MR. MASYR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Okay, Jesse, wait, let me see if there are questions for you. Will the traffic engineer actually have a plan drawn just to show where Chelsea Piers --

MR. MASYR: Yes.


COMM. CANTOR: Just one question.

THE CHAIR: Yes. Irwin.

COMM. CANTOR: Good morning, Jesse.
MR. MASYR: Good morning.

COMM. CANTOR: Listening to you I gather the primary issue is traffic?

MR. MASYR: Yes.

COMM. CANTOR: Thank you.

(Laughter)

MR. MASYR: Subtlety was always my big point.

THE CHAIR: A question about the marina too. Okay, Jesse, thanks a lot.

Noatl Budnick, he's next, and then Mike Braito.

MR. BUDNICK: Good morning. My name is Noatl Budnick. I am the deputy director of Transportation Alternatives. And despite having checked off opposed this project I want to just state for the record that Transportation Alternatives doesn't have a position on the development, but in order to stand here today I had to check off a box.

So, Dr. Carl Henry Nacht and Eric Ing, I want to tell you about these two people. Dr. Nacht was born in Brooklyn, raised there, father of two, family physician. Saw his patients
by calling by all over the city. Eric Ing had graduated from NYU, was an artist and an activist. They were both killed on the greenway by drivers crossing the path.

Any addition of driveways, any addition of parking that will pull people, drivers across the greenway presents a hazard to the tens of thousands of people that enjoy Hudson River Park every day. And that is our main concern at Transportation Alternatives. There are already some 29 crossings on the path, and I think surely we can think about how to use those to serve the needs of this proposed development. Yes, people do need to drive to access the many uses on the water side of the park. But this has to be done in as safe a way as possible, and really protect the most vulnerable people who are using the park.

Chelsea Piers has put a full time traffic agent at the 22nd Street entrance to Chelsea Piers. And thankfully, and kudos to them, it has really helped to mitigate the dangers and conflicts between drivers and bicycles and pedestrians on the path. Our own staff have been out on the path and had to sway drivers who were
about to drive down the greenway and turn them from driving down the bike path. So any additional driveways crossing the path, any additional traffic crossing the path is going to open up more danger to park users.

The City's own research, I have a report from the Department of Transportation and police departments, on bicyclists' fatality and another report from the Department of Transportation on pedestrian fatalities found that most crashes occur at intersections. Some 90 percent of bike deaths and serious injuries happen at intersections, 75 percent of pedestrian deaths and serious injuries happen at intersections. So adding more intersections along the path just invites more danger.

This is the busiest bicycle path in the U.S. It connects some of the densest residential neighborhoods to the biggest business districts in the country. It's enjoyed by thousands of bike commuters every day, and it's a great bike path network. Transportation Alternatives wants to see it continue to be the busiest bike path in the country but also the
safest.

(Bell rung)

THE CHAIR: Okay. Let me see if there are questions for you. Yes, Richard Eaddy.

COMM. EADDY: Thank you for your testimony. Do you have or have you brought with you any specific proposals of how you would design this or what changes you would make in order to avoid some of the problems you outlined?

MR. BUDNICK: Off the cuff I would say that not adding the proposed three driveways across the path is a starting point, and looking at the driveways that already exist off the path and how to make those work. You know, we have concerns about adding parking, which is just a magnet to invite more people to drive to this destination as well, so you may want to eliminate that as well.

COMM. EADDY: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions from the Commission? Yes, Rayann.

COMM. BESSER: I actually had the same question as Commissioner Eaddy, but I was unable to clearly hear your response, so would you
mind repeating it?

MR. BUDNICK: Sure. So the current proposal puts forward adding three driveways across the path, and there's already a number of driveways going across the greenway. So we would say the first thing to do is to look at how to make the best use of those without adding more crossings. And then our other concern is the addition of 75 parking spaces, which is just a magnet for more traffic to cross the path. So to reduce or eliminate the parking.

COMM. BESSER: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Was there another question over here?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thanks so much for coming, we appreciate it.

Mike Braito. Is Mike Braito here?

Okay, fine, I'm sorry. And then so I called the names before, and then Jerome Gluck and then Paul Gallieu or Gallen, something like that.

MR. BRAITO: Madam Chair, Commission members, good morning. My name is Mike Braito. I'm the senior vice president and director of all
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site operations at Chelsea Piers. I have been in this position at Chelsea Piers since 1995.

Over the years I've worked with representatives of the state Department of Transportation, city Department of Transportation, the MTA, the Community Board, and Hudson River Park Trust in an effort to make sure all visitors to Chelsea Piers arrive safely, arrive and leave safely. No matter what their mode of transportation, we work very hard making sure people can get safely into and leave Chelsea Piers, along with ensuring quick access and egress for the FDNY, NYPD and EMS services.

Motor vehicles have always been the most problematic. Traffic issues arise when the volume of traffic exceeds the physical and operational capacity of the roadway and the parking system. Chelsea Piers has 18 years experience handling large volumes of traffic. We have approximately 500 parking spaces and one mile of double wide on-site queuing and circulation roadway.

Even with this large on-site capacity, we struggle at times. Why? Exiting
capacity. When we worked out the design of Chelsea Piers access during the mid nineties, maintaining a continuous bikeway was very important. The result was we have one entrance at 23rd Street and one exit at 17th Street. This allows for continuous traffic flow on-site with minimum bikeway conflicts.

However, the single exit at 17th Street basically operates at full capacity. We depend on the smooth and continuous operating capacity of this 17th Street exit. If there is gridlock at 17th Street, Chelsea Piers is effectively shut down.

Two, high volume activities. Events and dinner boats regularly generate hundreds of vehicles per event or cruise. One event and two dinner cruises could attract over 2,000 people on-site within a sixty minute arrival window. This could mean more than 500 to a thousand more vehicles, both parking and dropping off, than is suggested in the DEIS.

We are concerned about the proposed Pier 57 traffic plan. It is too complex and there are multiple ways it can fail. If it fails, the
only exit from Chelsea Piers will be blocked, and consequently the only entrance to Chelsea Piers will be blocked by the backup on 9A. Traffic problems are going to have a huge negative impact on our businesses, and directly impact critical response time for the FDNY, EMS, to respond to Chelsea Piers and Chelsea Cove Park.

(Bell rung)

THE CHAIR: You could conclude, do you want to wrap up?

MR. BRAITO: Sure.

Furthermore, it's been brought to our attention last week that we were advised by a senior executive of Chelsea Piers of Spirit Cruises that Spirit is in discussions with Pier 57 to relocate Spirit's four dinner cruises to Pier 57. These four vessels have a total capacity of 1,700 guests. One of these vehicles or large charter boats could generate five to ten times the peak marina volume claimed in the DEIS.

I'll sum up now. Please know that Chelsea Piers supports the redevelopment of Pier 57 and the completion of the Hudson River Park. However, we urge the city and state to require a
full and honest evaluation of traffic plans and the real impact before allowing this to proceed.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Did you bring with you, because I know that after speakers in opposition Philip Habib will be speaking, do you have a plan showing Chelsea Piers in relationship to Pier 57?

MR. BRAITO: We do. We have our consultant here.

THE CHAIR: Can you just put a board up so we can talk about it, because everyone is talking about it but some commissioners are familiar with Chelsea Piers, maybe all of them, but I think that's --

COMM. CANTOR: Madam Chair, it's also in the packet.

THE CHAIR: I just would like it up. I would like it up there so other speakers could talk to it if necessary to answer questions.

So if you would just note for the Commissioners where Chelsea Piers is and what connects it, and where Pier 57 is. And I think it's the 17th Street exit and entry that people are talking about, just so it's easier to see the
additional, okay.

MR. BRAINTO: Sure. This is 17th Street, which is westbound. This is 9A, both the north and southbound lanes. And this is the egress path leaving Chelsea Piers, which is southbound only. And currently there four are phases at this intersection, which is north and southbound traffic from 9A. There is a left and right turn phase off 17th Street. There is pedestrian crossing and then there's also vehicles exiting Chelsea Piers that can go north or south.

THE CHAIR: And the yellow represents pedestrian crossing there, the yellow east-west? Right next to 17th Street.

MR. BRAINTO: Yes. I'd rather let the gentleman who prepared the board answer that.

THE CHAIR: Anything else that you -- are there any questions? Yes, Irwin and then Michelle.

COMM. CANTOR: Sir, the references to the quote "struggle", correct me if I'm wrong because I probably am, but isn't your heaviest activity at night?

MR. BRAINTO: Well, our heaviest
activity at the piers is usually event based driven, whether we have an event in one of our catering halls, dinner boats, our tenants have various events. So those create two traffic pulses. The arrival phase, which typically occurs between six and seven-thirty p.m. at night, it could be weeknights. That corresponds with the commuter sort of pulse that's on the West Side Highway. The second pulse we have is usually when these events are leaving, which is later in the evenings.

COMM. CANTOR: But presumably the impact of the applicant's project, which I'll say is throughout the day, I don't know what degree in the evening versus what degree prior to the evening, I don't know their working hours, so it's not a full daily impact. I'm not suggesting there's no impact. I'm very concerned about it. But just as you were talking about a pulse, is there room between your pulse and their pulse in the course of the day?

MR. BRAITO: Well, I think one of the reasons we're all here today is we're trying to figure out what their pulse really is. And
that's the whole point here. We don't, you know, the DEIS says one thing and, you know, a few days ago we hear they're now considering dinner boats. So in order for all of us to make sort of an accurate assessment of what's going to happen to our property, to their property and to the West Side Highway, I think we have to get all the facts correct, which is I think exactly what you are alluding to.

COMM. CANTOR: When you are at peak at night, are you full?

MR. BRAITO: Yes.

COMM. CANTOR: So you couldn't accommodate any vehicular, any vehicles that wanted to come to the market?

MR. BRAITO: We turn vehicles away frequently throughout the year on our peak nights, where we'll have many of our tenants having events, the dinner cruises. And we actually provide a little card at our exit booth showing guests where the other available parking facilities are in the neighborhood.

COMM. CANTOR: Is it fair to assume that prior to events you have some vacant parking
stalls?

MR. BRAITO: Yes, we do. We have a transient parking system. That's why I said it's sort of, our peak parking issues, both egress, entry and capacity is usually event based driven.

COMM. CANTOR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Michelle.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you for your testimony. And I appreciate that the main emphasis that you're making is the need to have full information about the traffic. But I'm wondering if you believe, and it might be an unfair question, whether you believe just limiting the leasing of the marina to individuals as opposed to more leases that attract a great number of people might address the significant, you know, the concerns that you're primarily raising.

And the second question I have is just to learn more about the traffic agent that you have in place, the hours that they're there, and, you know, at what point in Chelsea Piers' operations did the decision come to actually put that in place.
MR. BRAITO: Okay. To answer your first question, I think we need to learn more about the uses. Yes, the marina business is absolutely an impact, particularly if you have large dinner boats. We have pretty large capacity at the piers, and we are constantly getting inquiries from other tenants to come and bring more, which we say no, we can't. And they subsequently go to other piers in the Hudson and on the East River.

The decision, so I think we need to find out what other uses, if there are potential events that can take place, public or private. I mean it's, you know, even when we do public and private events it's always an impact.

The second question is we decided very early on that we needed a traffic guard at the 22nd Street intersection. And we looked very hard to find a person that had the right skill set. He's actually an ex-military MP. And I think he's done a fantastic job. Not to say that he's militant because he's extremely friendly I think everybody loves him. But it's very, very important because there's a lot of people,
especially children that cross at that
tersection, and kids tend to run from parents.
So he's very, very with it and on top of it.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: On 17th Street, because it's a very small scale drawing, is the exit the exact location, the Chelsea Piers exit the exact location where Pier 57 is planning their egress, planning their entry?

MR. BRAITO: Yes.

THE CHAIR: And how many lanes is that, is it just two lines, how does it work?

MR. BRAITO: Right now we have the ability to queue three vehicles. A dedicated lane that can turn to the north on Route 9A, a dedicated lane that can turn south, and a center lane that has a choice to go either way because obviously you can't go eastbound on 17th Street.

THE CHAIR: And which of those and how many lanes do they have to enter going west and then going to their roadways?

MR. BRAITO: I believe they're creating two lanes coming in. But again, my
traffic consultant can speak to more of that.

THE CHAIR: Okay. And also Phil Habib will speak it later.

MR. BRAITO: Yes.

THE CHAIR: But personal I'd like to see a blow up of that intersection to understand the cars, Chelsea Piers cars, Pier 57 cars, bicycles, and pedestrians, because until it's blown up I have a hard time unraveling the yard.

MR. BRAITO: I would add to that we also need to see true vehicle counts going in each direction.

THE CHAIR: Yes. I think actually the vehicle counts, the pedestrian counts, bicycle counts and yes.

Let me is there are other questions.

Yes.

COMM. DOUEK: Question. Where is Spirit Cruises located now?

MR. BRAITO: Spirit Cruises are a tenant of ours on Pier 61, and their lease is up for renewal. And if they were to leave us, obviously we would look to replace those dinner boats with other cruises around the harbor that
frequently come to us and ask to lease space.

COMM. DOUEK: So right now their idea is to shift downward to Pier 57.

MR. BRAITO: Correct.

THE CHAIR: Let me see if there are other questions from the Commission? Yes, Rayann Besser.

COMM. BESSER: Thank you.

Have you had any direct communications with the applicant as far as your concerns and suggestions?

THE CHAIR: Make sure to speak into the microphone because I know if somebody is listening to the recording, they can't hear it.

MR. BRAITO: I have not, but I believe our consultant, Jesse Masyr's firm, has tried to have correspondence. And I believe he testified before that we really sort of didn't receive any information until, and we were told to wait for the DEIS.

COMM. BESSER: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Other questions?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thank you for coming.
MR. BRAITO: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: The next speaker is Jerome Gluck. And then Paul Gallen.

MR. GLUCK: Hi. My name is Jerome Gluck. I am the senior traffic engineer with AECOM. AECOM is a consulting engineering firm familiar with Route 9A. Chelsea Piers has retained AECOM to review the Pier 57 DEIS to identify potential traffic impacts on Chelsea Piers and on Route 9A. This testimony is a summary of the findings of the review.

I will now briefly describe some of the principal concerns identified in the review, and which are more detailed in the handout.

One. At the intersection of West 17th Street and Route 9A, as was noted earlier, this is the location of the only egress from Chelsea Piers. The DEIS projects failing traffic operations for the westbound West 17th Street approach to Route 9A. More than two minutes on average of delay for traffic on westbound 17th Street.

Oversaturated traffic conditions on West 17th Street could adversely affect safety.
along Route 9A and the bikeway and constrain the egress movement from Chelsea Piers. This is the real potential for queues extending beyond the entrance to the circulation road that could block traffic on Route 9A and the Chelsea Piers egress.

Two. At the intersection of West 16th Street and Route 9A, the DEIS protects the short storage lanes for the signal controlled southbound Route 9A right turn lane. This and other operational constraints at this location could result in vehicle queues exceeding the storage capacity, which is only about 140 feet, and blocking traffic on Route 9A, West 17th Street and the Chelsea Piers egress.

Three. For the Pier 57 circulation road, that's the two lane roadway that runs down by Pier 57, the DEIS does not address projected traffic operations. The circulation road is two lanes, with the right lane needed for various curbside activities. As identified in the DEIS, the circulation road would operate as a single lane much of the time, with disruptions relating to the vehicles entering and exiting the curbside lane. The concern relates to whether there is
sufficient storage available on the circulation road to avoid vehicle queues that would block Route 9A and Chelsea Piers, as well as impede emergency vehicle access.

Fourth. The DEIS identifies there will be a traffic management plan implemented, particularly during large events, to manage conflicting movements on the circulation road, crosswalks and bikeway. Managing these types of conflicts at Chelsea Piers involves more than thirty full time staff. However, the DEIS provides only a very brief and general description of the plan. A detailed and binding plan that includes specific implementation criteria and management procedures will be critical.

Five. The review of the traffic projections and analysis used in the DEIS indicated the DEIS does not clearly define the intended operations at Pier 57 for a number of land uses and activities. The concern is that the traffic volumes in the DEIS may be an underestimation of the volumes that could actually result from the intended operations. This would result in the DEIS projecting better traffic.
operations than could be reasonably expected.

(Bell rung)

MR. GLUCK: The primary activities and land uses of concern are:

The marina trip generation;
A realistic multiple events scenario;
Potential taxi activity, potential bus activity, water activity; as well as,
The food counter.

Our handout contains further details relating to these concerns. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Let me see if there are questions for you. Yes, Irwin.

COMM. CANTOR: Does your handout, Mr. Gluck, does your handout include traffic studies as of today as well as the projected traffic studies?

MR. GLUCK: Well, what our handout includes is an overview of what we found from reviewing the traffic section in the DEIS, and some shortfalls that we have identified in terms of questions that we feel need to be answered, as
well as other clarifications that are needed to
gain a better understanding of how the roadway
system would operate.

COMM. CANTOR: But it does not
include any actual studies of traffic flow.

MR. GLUCK: We were responding to
the DEIS.

COMM. CANTOR: No, I'm just asking
what you did, that's all.

MR. GLUCK: Yes. We didn't do
anything independent in terms of going out and
doing traffic counts, traffic analysis or anything
like that.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Has the Hudson River
Park Trust and their consultants seen that
handout?

MR. GLUCK: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So that -- yes,
Maria.

COMM. DEL TORO: Thank you for your
testimony.

Just to get sort of a clearer view
of what's going on, you did mention the entrance,
the 22nd Street. That's where you have a traffic person, right?

MR. GLUCK: Yeah, that was noted earlier.

COMM. DEL TORO: Yes. And then you talked about the 17th egress.

MR. GLUCK: Egress, correct.

COMM. DEL TORO: Egress. But it would be good if we could understand the different, the ways, the patterns of coming in, the different streets because you were just talking about 17th and 22nd. Is that the only way, is there another way to get into Chelsea Piers, other ways of leaving Chelsea Piers, so we'll have a sense of how the proposed pattern impacts on Chelsea.

MR. GLUCK: Well, the real overlap occurs at West 17th Street, because that's the sole egress from Chelsea Piers. It's also the route into Pier 57 for the traffic that's coming from the south and the traffic coming from the east. In the DEIS that traffic is routed across 17th Street, and in -- via 17th Street, by the 17th Street entrance. For the southbound traffic...
on Route 9A there is a second entrance which is at West 16th Street which is a right turn lane.

But one of the points I had made was there's a very short storage lane for that right turn lane. It's probably sufficient for only five or six vehicles, as well as it's compounded by the difficulty of the dynamics of the turn coming in. There's a speed table to slow the traffic down because that's a point where it conflicts with the bikeway. So we question whether there's sufficient storage in that right turn lane and how this could work. Because if it doesn't work properly, the traffic would back up, spill across 17th Street, block the traffic from coming in from westbound 17th Street, as well as block the traffic trying to exit from Chelsea Piers.

Now, on top of that, the other concern we have which I alluded to was this approach on West 17th Street westbound. With the mitigation that's identified in the DEIS, the average delay during one of the peak hours is more than two minutes. It's about 234 seconds of delay for the traffic that's trying to get out of there.
That volume is being increased by the Pier 57 development. But drivers know, drivers experience the fact that once they have waited so long they don't necessarily abide by all the traffic rules.

So the operational analysis is really a theoretical analysis and really doesn't fully reflect the safety implications of this type of situation. So the bottom line is the dynamics here with the potential for the traffic backing up from 16th Street, the traffic coming in from 17th Street, and the egress from Chelsea Piers, presents a problem.

THE CHAIR: Other questions from the Commission?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

MR. GLUCK: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Paul Gallen. Followed by Catrina Reid.

MR. GALLEN: Good afternoon. My name is Paul Gallen. I am the general manager of Pier 60 & The Lighthouse View event space located at Chelsea Piers, and operated by the Abigail Kirsch Catering Company.
Our business was founded in 1998 when we made a significant investment to open these venues, and over time is now considered a premier event location. We now employ almost 300 people, and our business is very established. We cater approximately 500 events per year, ranging from small weddings to large charity fundraising galas of up to 1,200 people.

As general manager of these facilities, I've become familiar with how parking challenges can impact the experience of our guests. And it's for this reason we are extremely concerned about the potential impact of the proposed Pier 57 access plan on both our business and reputation.

We regularly handle 200 plus cars arriving for one of our events, while another three to four hundred cars arrive for boat cruises. It takes management a significant amount of manpower to sufficiently deal with this volume of cars while impacting the traffic flow to Chelsea Piers. One of the keys to our efficiency is the access to the existing one mile of circulation roadways within Chelsea Piers to stage
the parked cars, as well as almost thirty Chelsea Piers attendants who assist parking and moving the cars around. However, we still struggle at times to handle very high volume.

Once we valet park the arriving cars, our challenge is to quickly return the cars to their owners at the conclusion of the event. Once the car is returned, it is critical that our guests are able to rapidly exit the site at 17th Street. The reasons are two fold. Any delay in having cars leave the site creates a traffic jam within Chelsea Piers, causing a delay in returning marina cars to their owners, and, two, it means guests who just attended an event now have a final negative experience to ponder during the drive home.

We believe that based on the proposed access plan for Pier 57, the potential exists for gridlock at 17th Street on a consistent basis. If that were to happen, the impact on our reputation and our business will be extremely damaging. We firmly believe our customers, already sensitive to Route 9A traffic challenges, will seek out alternative locations for their
events, and our business will suffer irrevocable harm.

Please know that Chelsea Piers and Abigail Kirsch Catering support the redevelopment of Pier 60 and the completion of Hudson River Park. However, we respectfully request a full and honest evaluation of the traffic volumes and the real impacts before allowing this project to proceed.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thanks. Let me see if there are questions.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: There are not. Thank you for being here.

MR. GALLEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: The next speaker is Catrina Reid. All right, Catrina. And then we are going to switch to speakers in favor after Ms. Reid.

MS. REID: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Catrina Reid. I'm representing 300 New York. We're tenants of Chelsea Piers. I personally have been with the
company for over fourteen years. And 300 New York, we have been tenants of Chelsea Piers for over sixteen years. We are located in between Pier 59 and Pier 60, which a lot of our traffic is coming along 18th Street. We host a numerous amount of day events. We open up at nine a.m. We host fundraisers, children's birthday parties, a lot of school groups, corporate events. So I feel as though we will be affected by the trafficking in 2015. And I don't know, that's it.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MS. REID: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Let me see if there are any questions for you.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: There are not, but we really appreciate your coming.

MS. REID: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Okay, back to speakers in favor. The first is Philip Habib. And then Ross Moskowitz.

You can take that down, gosh, that tiny photograph.

COMM. CANTOR: Time's up.
(Laughter)

THE CHAIR: Phil, keep going to three minutes, but then I'll ask you to continue because I think --

MR. HABIB: All right. I'll quickly go through because I do believe that a fairly detailed presentation of the plan is appropriate.

My name is Philip Habib, and I assisted in preparing a site access plan. And what I'd like to do is sort of quickly go through the pieces, but I'd like to point to the beginning, which is the baseline condition.

At 15th Street where right now basically we have a vehicular entry into the site. And in the future all of 9A south of 17th Street to 14th Street will actually change for both pedestrians and bicyclists and access. So what I'd like to do is to begin at the north end, the famous 17th Street entrance.

Presently Chelsea Piers exits on 17th Street, they have their own green signal.

17th Street comes across on its own green signal, and 9A goes north-south on its own green signal.

There will be a service road constructed from 17th
Street to 14th Street along the pier. The access point, one of the two access points at 17th Street allows vehicles which already exit 17th Street on their green to not only go left or right, but to come into the service road. So it's just capitalizing on an existing street and on an existing green signal. No changes to that. And no changes to the reduction of any green time or capacity to the exit at 17th Street. It's just capitalizing on an existing street.

As we move south, this 15th Street is gone. This is predominantly a vehicular crossing. In the future it's all pedestrian.

One of the issues as you can see here at 15th Street there is a right turn lane. Whenever there is a right turn lane on 9A, there cannot be a service road. There is no room between the highway and the pier.

So the second entrance to the site then is a right turn lane being relocated from 15th Street up to 16th Street. And so if you're coming south on 9A and you wish to enter the site, on 9A, for those who are not aware, you really cannot make a right turn on the through
lane on 9A, it's too fast. So the highway requires a right turn lane, just as there is one here, Pier 40, everywhere else. So the right turn lane then stores vehicles, and the signal, right turn signal comes up to allow the right turn to cross the bike path and the bike path signal turns red.

(Bell rings)

MR. HABIB: As we move quickly south, the bikeway is no longer zig-zagging, it is continuous, it's a continuous bikeway to 14th Street. No interruptions at all, except the pedestrians who cross at 15th Street.

The service road is two lanes, 22 feet along this edge. In two places where the service road is created, the greenway esplanade/pedestrian space is expanded over the water. This particular pedestrian space is the range of 20 or 21 feet. This one about 25 feet in width. So the pedestrian system is continuous. The bikeway system is continuous. This existing intersection already exists as a breakup of the bikeway. This breakup of the bikeway is converted to that breakup of the bikeway.
As we move south, the service road permits an additional lane for bus storage or for other vehicular storage, and then exits at 14th Street, which is this part of the plan. There are other parts of the plan, Community Board and DOT, as you know, have been very involved. Right now, right here at 14th Street that crossing is about a hundred feet in length. The park is being extended and the crossings on both sides are being modified, actually cut in half in terms of its width. So the pedestrian system north-south along 14th Street to the site of 9A, and approximately to the site, is being reduced in size.

And, in addition to that as often occurs, like it's a major generators, taxis do penetrate into the site. We are trying to reduce that. Therefore, the project also includes a creation of a taxi widening lane along here which does not exist, so that vehicles coming up 9A in a taxi vehicle coming up 9A can drop off here and the pedestrian system used to access directly into the pier versus trying to meander around and come in from the north.

So the transportation plan has many
components, the pedestrian plan, bicycle plan, taxi plan, off-site plan and the circulation system. Which has been extensively reviewed by state DOT, which has jurisdiction over this, and city DOT, normal review process for traffic.

And that is how we got here today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I'm sure there are lots of questions for you, but could you just point out the number of traffic signals just on the drawing on the left?

MR. HABIB: Okay. I didn't really get down into the details but you asked. There is an existing signal here, existing.

THE CHAIR: That's the four phase?

MR. HABIB: That's not four phase. That's two phase.

THE CHAIR: I thought you said four phase.

MR. HABIB: It's three phase. It's okay.

It's exit from Chelsea Piers, exit on 17th Street, and north-south 9A. Those are the three phases. We have currently a signal at 16th.
Street, which I know it's hard to see, is right there. And allows pedestrian crossing. It also allows a left turn onto 16th Street. We are introducing a right turn here and we are eliminating the signal for the southbound.

THE CHAIR: So there will be no signal at that right turn?

MR. HABIB: There will be a signal for the right turn and a signal for the left turn. But if you are heading south from 17th, your next stop is 15th.

THE CHAIR: I just want to get a number, an indication of the number of signals.

MR. HABIB: Okay.

THE CHAIR: So you're going to add a signal right there at 16th Street for the right turn lane?

MR. HABIB: Yes. So you're at 16th Street, you pull into the lane, you will get a right turn arrow. At the same time, this one comes up as a left turn arrow. And if you happen to be going through, it's a through movement with uncontrolled. So there will be, well, the block becomes this lane for through vehicles, which is a
predominant flow.

At 15th Street we are narrowing, eliminating flows and all the movements are turning onto 9A. Right now it's crazy.

At 14th Street, the existing signal remains at 14th Street. What happens at 14th Street, and this is a nuance, is that the signal for the left turn is timed for pedestrians to cross 9A. So what happens if you go out there and look, you will see that this is empty and it's still red, because pedestrian time has not been exhausted. So we are using some of that unused time to egress from the site at 14th Street. Not a lot of time, we don't have a lot of traffic on our service road, but it is available. So we are using it to egress and we are taking that time from the left turn movement.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MR. HABIB: And so those are the signals. We are making them a little simpler, not reducing them, not necessarily increasing them.

THE CHAIR: So I think what I would probably like to see, the Commissioners as well, my questions didn't help me at all, is to actually
have a blow up of the 17th Street intersection because you haven't shown any -- you don't have a graphic showing that Chelsea Piers is exiting there. We really have to understand the number of lanes, in which direction they're going to go in, and some indication, a way to indicate the traffic lights. But even more important, there's a conventional device that traffic experts use for the peak volumes, and what they are. Because I can't, just a little pink line, it's not going to show me the number of lanes and where they're going and what you expect for peak use. And I think that there are several -- and the same thing goes for the right lane. I really don't understand, I thought the speaker was very compelling about the danger to bicyclists. We really want to understand that.

I think we have had universal enthusiasm, we've heard for the reuse of Pier 57, I think everybody is very excited about that. I think the biggest questions have to do with just access to the site, safety of pedestrians, safety for bicyclists. And the ability to accommodate, you have two, you know, heavy, heavy users of 9A
at perpendicular, you know, cross grain connections. And we have to make sure it's smooth.

So I'm sure the other Commissioners will have questions, but we have to resolve that issue to make sure everybody wins here.

Irwin, then Angela and Michelle.

COMM. CANTOR: Good morning, Phil.

MR. HABIB: Hi.

COMM. CANTOR: Afternoon, Phil.

Three questions.

Number one, the chair alluded to the traffic study. Have you done it?

MR. HABIB: The traffic consultant has done a very extensive traffic study required for the Environmental Impact Statement, as you are probably aware. Very thick. There has been review by state agencies, city agencies of this. And that is how we have been certified into the ULURP process.

So there's been a lot of review of the traffic. The traffic has asked, as an example, to analyze the worst case conditions,
which I think they are doing, which is the occupancy of the film festival, which is the heaviest typical condition. All of that is already documented in the EIS.

COMM. CANTOR: When you say they, have you not participated?

MR. HABIB: Well, I'm the physical planner, and so I understand transportation, but the actual number crunching is being done by the Schwartz Company. And I give them my two cents and they give me what they can do and so forth.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. You are talking about southbound traffic, you are going to create an off lane.

MR. HABIB: Right turn lane.

COMM. CANTOR: Right there. What's the reservoir on that right lane?

MR. HABIB: It's about seven.

COMM. CANTOR: At the turn, in other words, the right.

MR. HABIB: Yeah, this one right here.

COMM. CANTOR: Yeah.

MR. HABIB: Well, this is a city
block, as you can visualize.

COMM. CANTOR: So it's 200 feet.

MR. HABIB: It's a little less. It's probably around 150 to 160 because there are transitions right there.

COMM. CANTOR: So perhaps six to seven cars?

MR. HABIB: In that range. For south.

COMM. CANTOR: Per what?

MR. HABIB: Every time that green comes up it stores about six cars.

COMM. CANTOR: Yeah, but the maximum storage you'd have is six to seven cars?

MR. HABIB: Six to seven cars, correct.

COMM. CANTOR: All coming southbound.

Now, you referenced 17th Street as a street that you intend to use.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. CANTOR: But I didn't hear you speak to the fact that you're adding to what is apparently, no, not what is apparently, what I
know is a congested street. You didn't address that.

MR. HABIB: No. Well, the EIS allows -- it's projecting, adding. It's currently one lane there, as you are aware, it is a bus stop. The EIS projects to expand that to two travel lanes, as you can see, and allow that to operate better, and this is EIS lingo, better than it would do without the project. However, I just want to continue, a part of that is vehicles coming up 9A and penetrating around into the site. We are attempting to eliminate the taxi or the for-hire component of that move by having a taxi drop off here so pedestrians walk right into the site.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. But Mr. Gluck, if I understood him correctly, suggested there were three lanes there, one turning left, one turning right and one going straight on 17th Street. Did I understand him incorrectly?

MR. HABIB: Yeah, I think he was talking -- I don't know what he was talking about. But I think someone said that Chelsea Piers has three lanes exiting at their site.
COMM. CANTOR: Okay, so I misunderstood that. Thank you.

MR. HABIB: So this is just 17th Street, it's a cross street. So you are correct. That is to say, you know, is it reasonable that all the vehicles from the south and all the vehicles from the west would end up in this one street, and we said no. Introduce at least a combination of for-hire vehicles to have them have a lane on 9A to drop off or direct access into the site for those coming from the site.

COMM. CANTOR: Now, how does a northbound vehicle get to the site?

MR. HABIB: Well, if it's a taxi, if you want to actually get to the site, you get off right here and you come on up to 17th Street.

COMM. CANTOR: On 10th Avenue?

MR. HABIB: Yes, Tenth Avenue, I'm sorry, Tenth Avenue. And you come into the site directly as the extension of the service road that actually exists up here extending south.

COMM. CANTOR: So we have now created a situation at, is it 15th Street or 16th Street where they turn north, where they turn
east?

MR. HABIB: At First Avenue -- tenth Avenue and 17th Street, which is right here.

COMM. CANTOR: No, you're coming from the south.

MR. HABIB: Yeah, you're turning right.

COMM. CANTOR: Where do you make your right turn?

MR. HABIB: Yeah, this right, it's a double right. It's a fairly big --

COMM. CANTOR: Make a right onto Tenth, oh, okay, yeah, Tenth Avenue springs in, okay. So they come around to Tenth Avenue and then they hang up and they make a left on 17th Street.

MR. HABIB: Yeah, to 17th Street, exactly. And they come straight into the site directly that way.

And what we have tried to do, and I think successfully with the traffic study, is break up the demand into the site as much as possible. Seventy-four parking spaces. By the time the employees are there, they may be publicly...
exited. There's very few parking spaces on the site compared to the numbers.

COMM. CANTOR: Yeah, but there are a lot of drop offs.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. CANTOR: The issue isn't the 74 cars.

MR. HABIB: Well, there will be a lot of -- a fair number of taxis, that is correct. So we are anticipating the ones at least coming from the south to drop off a fair number of them here.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. But the self driver will be looking up to Tenth Avenue past the park, going up to 17th Street and coming down.

MR. HABIB: Yes. Yes. So there are three ways, three vehicular ways and numerous pedestrian ways. And I don't want to -- I know vehicles have been the subject, but we are --

COMM. CANTOR: Right.

MR. HABIB: -- aware of 10th Avenue.

COMM. CANTOR: So now you are adding traffic on the corner of 17th and Tenth, which now has to make a left while you've got traffic coming
from the east.

MR. HABIB: No, not at the same time.

COMM. CANTOR: Well, there is traffic coming from the east.

MR. HABIB: This guy?

COMM. CANTOR: That's coming down 17 in order to get to your site.

MR. HABIB: Yeah.

COMM. CANTOR: You're loading up 17th Street.

MR. HABIB: Yeah. 17th Street is an existing street that is being utilized exactly, just capitalizing on an existing street to access one of the two vehicular entrances.

COMM. CANTOR: Now, in the absence of seeing a traffic study, on 17th, I don't know what the traffic light situation is going to be, but you're going to have cars queuing north to make a left, and you're going to have cars coming from the east to continue straight onto the highway, to the site. Correct?

MR. HABIB: We're still talking about 17th?
COMM. CANTOR: Yeah. I'm talking about --

MR. HABIB: I actually -- I'm sorry.

COMM. DE LA UZ: You can't turn left.

COMM. LEVIN: Why not?

COMM. CANTOR: You're going to Tenth Street, to Tenth Avenue.

THE CHAIR: Can't they make a left if they're heading north?

(Inaudible)

COMM. CANTOR: No, no, no, I'm not talking about a left there. A guy coming from the south.

MR. HABIB: Coming from the south.

COMM. CANTOR: Going up Tenth Avenue.

MR. HABIB: Going up.

COMM. CANTOR: He's coming to 17th Street where he intends to make a left.

MR. HABIB: Make a left.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. Now, that corner will now have a guy coming from the left and a guy coming from the east coming across.
MR. HABIB: Tenth Avenue.

COMM. CANTOR: And there is not going to be any conflict?

MR. HABIB: Well, there is an existing traffic signal between Tenth Avenue and 17th Street.

COMM. CANTOR: Yeah, I understand that.

MR. HABIB: And so some of our traffic is going to come up and just turn left on 17th on the green time that is allocated to Tenth Avenue.

COMM. CANTOR: Have you done, has --

MR. HABIB: That is also included in the analysis.

COMM. CANTOR: Have you included that in the analysis?

MR. HABIB: That is also included in the analysis.

THE CHAIR: Okay, so we'll get more of a traffic report on that, but let's let other commissioners speak.

MR. HABIB: Go ahead, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR: Angela and then
Michelle.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: It's very concerning, the traffic is concerning, the pedestrian is concerning, the bicycle safety is concerning.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: We know there will be a multitude of vehicles once this is open. It's a wonderful project, so we need to have some assurance that there be safety features and this will not be an absolute traffic nightmare, which it sounds that it can be. So two things. What compels a taxi to drop their passengers off there as opposed to going all the way around?

MR. HABIB: I think it's a five block distance. Because of the movement that is alternative to this.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: That I understand, but you have a tourist in a cab that wants to be dropped off right in front.

MR. HABIB: Then they will do that.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Right. Especially on a day like today in high heels.

(Laughter)
COMM. BATTAGLIA: No, these are things that we must consider.

MR. HABIB: Actually, Commissioner, I've actually been out there, what I've actually seen periodically is that they stop right here anyway on 9A, and it's crazy, bad. So I think that with a little bit of -- yeah, the tourists, you're correct. But with a little bit of general knowledge by the cab industry, I think that may actually become a little bit more logical.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: And the other question I had, you are creating a employee service road, for lack of a better terminology.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: That will -- brand new, from 17th down to 14th along --

MR. HABIB: It's sort of haphazard, but yeah, you are correct.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: And you contend that that's what will make the difference?

MR. HABIB: Well, it connects the project to the access system. I mean that's basically what it does. Right now, if we wanted to stay with what we had, we would have a right
turn right into the property. There's no way that's going to happen, right.

So because of all of these, whether it be Chelsea Piers or the ship terminals or sort of any of the other projects that actually end up with access and egress, you end up having to create this longitudinal space which then takes up space. And is then where we can't find that because it's the landmark building and this is actually pretty close to the -- requires the expansion of the esplanade over water. And this is already approved in the Hudson River Park Act, I think they can up go to 50 feet.

But this is, these extensions come with the service road, 16 foot bikeway, a buffer to Route 9A. All these pieces come together. The narrowest we have for pedestrian space here is around 18 feet to about 15 feet. The pier is not perfectly aligned to 9A, it kind of kinks a little bit. So we are trying to maintain a decent sized frontage for the pedestrian along 9A, along the service road as well. So it's a long answer to your question.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Madam Chair, if I
may.

THE CHAIR: You have to be quick, only one.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Very quickly, if I could.

THE CHAIR: The other Commissioners may have questions too.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Okay.

I was surprised that the Community Board was satisfied with the information provided on traffic and pedestrian safety, with the exception of intersection of Tenth and 15th. Can you address that? They were asking for a split signal on these matters.

MR. HABIB: They -- yes. And what happened, it actually happened in a couple of different places, is that the main 14th Street, actually it happens also on 23rd, ends and the demand for traffic comes up 14th Street and Tenth Avenue and makes a left. So it's kind of a through movement that was turned into a left turn when this part, this thing was built.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Thank you.

MR. HABIB: And that is the purpose
of the Community Board's -- I think it's been
going on for a while actually. It's not just our
project.

COMM. BATTAGLIA: Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR: Michelle and then Betty.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Mr. Habib, thanks
for your detailed comments, and thank you for I'm
sure all of the conversations that you've already
had. I just want to ask a couple of questions
about whether or not a couple of scenarios might
have already been examined.

I'm wondering if you at all examined
making the right turn moving it farther south to
16th Street rather than 15th Street, because that
might answer some of the questions about --

MR. HABIB: I'm sorry.

COMM. DE LA UZ: -- the queuing, the
right turn into the service road.

MR. HABIB: Well, the right turn
actually is at 16th Street. See, right now the
right turn lane exists at 15th, and we are pushing
it up to 16th Street.

COMM. DE LA UZ: I'm sorry -- okay.
MR. HABIB: So why didn't we go to 17th Street, that was your question?

COMM. DE LA UZ: Right.

MR. HABIB: There was no room.

Chelsea Piers has -- I love Chelsea Piers.
Chelsea Piers has a very narrow sidewalk in front of their building, and they have a very large service road, and what is left is essentially a bikeway with a small buffer, like this. To create a right turn lane there would then push the service road off Chelsea Piers or reduce its size because we would end up taking up service road space with Chelsea Piers. So that was not envisioned to be, you know, realistic.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Was that even discussed with Chelsea Piers?

MR. HABIB: I think that no one wanted to actually go into Chelsea Piers and reduce their service road. They have all their activity, there is actually I think a gate there.

COMM. DE LA UZ: There is.

MR. HABIB: An exit gate for parking and stuff like that. So that was basically one of our givens, not to really address or deal with the
adjacent property.

And, you know, we also thought about, you know, could we make a quick right here. But that is when, you know, we could not egress 9A at a high speed in conflict with the bikeway. You have to have a right turn lane to slow down. You can't turn from a moving lane and it does -- and nowhere on 9A is that permitted, for that reason.

COMM. DE LA UZ: And did you at all examine shifting the bike lane perhaps into the esplanade, that eliminates one conflict, creates others.

MR. HABIB: Yes, we looked at that too. And that is the question. Here we have defined, well, this one exists already, a defined crossing, a signalized crossing where if you can visualize a typical left turn lane, it doesn't get that much green time. And so in this particular case the left turn and the right turn get the same green time. So my guess is that the bikeway will have the free flow 85 percent of the time because the conflict move is a turning line, not a major improvement. And so that is a better conflict that taking the bikeway and pushing it against the
Goldman Sachs building, if you will, that's how it's done, and having all the taxis drop off from the service road on that side and randomly cross the bikeway. All the goods that are being delivered, randomly crossing the bikeway. And so to trade that off against one crossing was not -- didn't work.

COMM. DE LA UZ: And I just ask, you know, I think the Chair's request for the blown up map for the detail is absolutely necessary.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. DE LA UZ: And I think clearly indicating where you're promoting the pedestrian uses would be especially helpful for us to understand.

MR. HABIB: That's fine.

THE CHAIR: Betty.

COMM. CHEN: Thank you.

Comm. CHEN: Two questions about the 17th Street intersection.

MR. HABIB: Go ahead.

COMM. CHEN: The first is if someone is driving southbound and they're approaching the...
complex, when they get to 17th Street, and just to
the right you have a more generous entrance for
the people turning off of 17th?

MR. HABIB: Coming down 9A.

COMM. CHEN: But further ahead is
the actual right hand --

MR. HABIB: Yes. There will have to
be signage for no right turn, signage typical --

COMM. CHEN: So I'm just wondering
if people would be confused as they're approaching
that.

MR. HABIB: Well, that doesn't
really --

COMM. CHEN: If you look to the
right and it looks like you could just drive right
in instead of going a block further.

MR. HABIB: It does, yeah. Maybe a
bigger graphic might be appropriate. Because
actually this, it's not as evident that you can
actually do this. First of all, it's hard to see
the intersection because of how it's configured,
there is a greenway along it. But this was also
reviewed with DOT, the state DOT, to either
prohibit right turn with a separate sign, or put
only. But it was not anticipated that this would
be, how I would say logical but it wouldn't be --

COMM. CHEN: I'm just thinking if
it's not intuitive or obvious they would get back
ended when they get to that intersection and
hesitate, you know, how to --

MR. HABIB: And we will be doing
signage to reinforce that. And whether the
signing says exit at 16th Street or not, it was
not anticipated to be as big a deal as this guy
right here, where there was going to be a raised
speed hump at the crossing, and that's actually
been more of sort of a design thing than the
driver there.

COMM. CHEN: And the second question
just has to do with that capacity of six to seven
cars as you're about to make that right hand turn.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. CHEN: And I know you said
there's a reasonable worst case scenario in the
DEIS. So are you saying that that's six to seven
cars, forty feet --

MR. HABIB: This is going to
handle --
COMM. CHEN: -- is accurate for a reasonable worst case?

MR. HABIB: The short answer is yes. The long answer is --

COMM. CHEN: But that was keyed towards the Tribeca Film Festival.

MR. HABIB: Yes.

COMM. CHEN: Did that address the dinner boat cruise kind of peak that the other testimony talked about?

MR. HABIB: I think the next speaker is going to talk about cruises. But for what was analyzed just so that generally, we anticipate about 60 percent of the demand using 17th Street, and about 40 percent of the demand using the right turn. That is how the -- because the right turn services just the southbound movement on 9A, whereas 17th Street sort of deals with Midtown as well as some of the southbound who are doing a reverse move back into the site.

So the analysis has been done that shows that this movement can easily be handled. I think the numbers that I saw, and I'm just sort of trying to remember now, about 60 percent of the
cars per hour making that right turn. This signal comes up every two minutes. Which means that it comes up 30 times per hour-ish. At 60 to 70 vehicles per hour, the average flow in the right turn is two to two and a half cars every time it turns green.

COMM. CHEN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Other questions this side of the table?

COMM. CANTOR: May I?

THE CHAIR: I'm sorry, Irwin.

COMM. CANTOR: Do you know how many drop offs there are on the pier?

MR. HABIB: In the future?

COMM. CANTOR: Yes.

MR. HABIB: The EIS has it, and I could --

COMM. CANTOR: Excuse me, how many entrances I should ask.

MR. HABIB: Along these entrances?

COMM. CANTOR: Yeah.

MR. HABIB: I think it may be, if I'm not wrong, it's 100 to 200 drop offs per hour, in that range.
COMM. CANTOR: Okay. But there are, how many entrances are there to the pier, the headhouse?
MR. HABIB: Okay. So that's where these guys come in.
COMM. CANTOR: I'll tell you where I'm going.
MR. HABIB: Okay, go ahead.
COMM. CANTOR: I'll tell you where I'm going. I now finally came south and I made my right turn and I'm now going to go into the area where I did the drop off.
MR. HABIB: Right.
COMM. CANTOR: At the same time that I did, guys that are coming from 17th Street have gone into the drop off. And you've only got a two lane road here, okay. And has your analyses included the time of dropping off --
MR. HABIB: Drop offs, exactly.
COMM. CANTOR: -- people getting out of the car.
MR. HABIB: Getting into the car, paying the fare, yes.
THE CHAIR: Yes, okay. No, no, I'm
assuming it's not a taxi, I'm assuming it's a private car.

MR. HABIB: Okay.

COMM. CANTOR: Because once again I would ask, it seems to me there's going to be a queue right here on Pier 57 which could back up very easily to the highway. And I'm just asking that you have a --

MR. HABIB: We will do the arithmetic and submit that to you in more detail, yes, that's fine.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions for Phil?

COMM. DOUEK: Just a question.

THE CHAIR: Joseph.

COMM. DOUEK: Do you think taking a cue from Chelsea Piers and having a dedicated traffic agent on the 17th Street entrances would be something the applicant would look to do?

MR. HABIB: I'm thinking about the start of the question, but I would say that yes, I think that a traffic management plan needs to be implemented. I'm not a hundred percent sure it has to be here.
ROSS MOSKOWITZ: Madam Chair, I’m Ross Moskowitz, counsel to Young Woo. Thank you very much. A couple of observations and I will walk you through the actions.

One, first of all, I’d like to thank City Planning staff for their technical assistance on a very complicated project. As you know, waterfront properties are complicated enough, but the technical assistance was greatly appreciated by the staff.

Two, contrary to Mr. Habib, I am not a dinner cruise expert, I’m just a lawyer. Having said that, I’d like to suggest that any further discussion on the Spirit Cruise, we will respond in writing but I will give you the preview. We have not had any conversations. It’s ironic that Chelsea Piers is citing their own tenant thinking.
of competition with us. We have no desire for
dinner cruises. We will put in writing many of
the things you have asked for today obviously will
be responded in writing. But perhaps we can not
have any more conversation on that.

Third, again we will put in
writing, it makes it seem like we just started
talking to Chelsea Piers. We have been talking to
them for a while. Our landlord is their landlord
too. They have been talking to them for a while.
And just because they don't like what they're
hearing doesn't mean we haven't been speaking with
them. So we'll respond to that in writing as
well.

So it's great that everyone is
supportive of the project. It seems to be a
traffic discussion, and Commissioner Cantor, we
will of course address that.

COMM. CANTOR: Thank you.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: And I think
Commissioner Burden's suggestion of the blow ups
is good for a lot of reasons, and we will be happy
to provide that.

I'm here to discuss one of the
actions, the rezoning of the M1-5 district, just
two highlights for the Commission on that.

One is that gives us a lot of
flexibility, as you could expect. This is
multi-tenanted type of facility and we are still
trying to determine that mix. You have heard a
little bit about what that mix will look like, but
the M1-5 uses that flexibility.

And second leads us to the second
action, which we have talked about as well, this
zoning allows us to apply for the special permit,
for the 74.922. You've heard the discussion on
that, that we are not intending to do the big box.
But because of the relationship with Urban Space
Management as a tenant, we would have to lease
more than 100,000 square feet. That of course
would run afoul of the 10,000 square foot
limitation, which is one of our actions.

The third bucket is special permits
with regard to the waterfront. As you know, it's
waterfront, we're non compliant as we speak. So
anything that we are doing here, whether it's the
visual corridor and the like, requires a special
permit through the Commission.
The fourth bucket we also briefly discussed, which is the accessory parking garage. We are permitted 35 accessory spaces. We'd like a modest increase to 74 spaces. We believe those, unlike, this is not like Chelsea Piers, which is transient, this will be purely accessory for the visitors and tenants of this establishment.

And the last, which is I know near and dear to the chairperson, is the waterfront regulations, which is, you know, under section 62(A)(1)(1), which is really a balancing test which is to show how we comply with the waterfront, not exactly to the T of the regulations, but overall the balance, the open space and the like that we are providing, which we think ultimately meets the intent and the challenge of the resolution and the regulations on the waterfront.

(Bell rung)

THE CHAIR: Wow, pretty good.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: That's pretty good I'd say.

THE CHAIR: Let me see if there any questions for you.
MR. MOSKOWITZ: Sure.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: No, thanks a lot.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Lin Zeng.

MS. ZENG: Hello again. Good afternoon. My name is Lin Zeng, from Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer's office. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

The borough president supports the redevelopment project at Pier 57. The proposed actions will facilitate the renovation of the pier, it will facilitate the development of a new public marketplace, and improve open space areas for a growing residential community along Manhattan's West Side. Approval of this project will reactivate and connect Pier 57 to the rest of the Hudson River Park.

The proposed public marketplace is an appropriate use for the refurbished pier building. While the marketplace will occupy approximately 100,000 square feet of floor area, it will be divided into individual work sale stalls for independent designers and food
purveyors. This business model not only provides a suitable location and conditions for small businesses to grow, it also creates a unique public space that benefits the community at large. The bulk modifications are necessary to bring the existing building into compliance to allow for open space improvements on the pier's perimeter, and for additions on the rooftop.

After completion, this project will add approximately two and a half acres of open space to existing park for passive recreation, public events and performances throughout the year. The applicants also seek additional accessory parking spaces at the pier to accommodate prospective new users at the site. The proposed facility will be reserved only for the owners, occupants, employees, customers, and visitors of the Pier and not as a public parking garage.

The community has expressed concerns on the allowable maximum density and potential big box and hotel uses that are permitted under the proposed M1-5 zoning district. If those uses and greater density are realized,
then they would certainly detract from the park's open space and recreation purposes, and should be discouraged.

Pier 57 fortunately is governed by several regulatory safeguards that will prevent any significant changes to what is currently being proposed. Pier 57 is listed under the National Registers of Historic places, and requires state oversight on any changes to the pier's physical form.

In addition to zoning regulations, allowable uses are also governed by the Hudson River Park Trust Act, which currently prohibits hotel use in the park. The Trust will also include restrictions on big box retail stores in its lease with the developer. These proposed uses are appropriate, they complement the passive recreational activities in the park, and they generally reflect nearby uses east of the pier.

Further, the proposed project will reactivate a historic structure, enhance waterfront access, and contribute to great public benefit. Therefore, the Manhattan Borough President gives his full support of the Pier 57
redevelopment project.

THE CHAIR: Thank you so much for coming on behalf of the borough president, we appreciate it.

MS. ZENG: Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIR: Thanks.

The next speaker is AJ Pietrantone. And then Pamela Wasserstein.

MR. PIETRANTONE: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, the Commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. My name is AJ Pietrantone. I'm the executive director of the Friends of Hudson River Park, a designated fundraising partner with Hudson River Park Trust. Our mission is to secure resources for the completion, repair and enhancement of Hudson River Park. We create opportunities for public contributions too, participation in the park's operations and growth, to guarantee its future for generations of New Yorkers and visitors from around the world.

I'm also a member of the Pier 57 Working Group of the Hudson River Park Trust's advisory council, and a primary component of the
I'm here this morning to urge your approval of this project, perhaps taking it up to a higher level to remind us why it has been proposed. The redevelopment of Pier 57 is the first significant new commercial development since the passage of the Hudson River Park Act of 1998. As such, it will not only enhance and increase the public open space within Hudson River Park, but also provide desperately needed revenue to the Trust for its operations and maintenance. As the Park receives no government funds for its operations and maintenance, the designated commercial development areas within the park are critical for its long term financial stability and opportunities to make this historic waterfront accessible to the public.

Equally important is the need to renovate legacy assets such as Pier 57 so that the reuse and ongoing maintenance can become more efficient and their space made available for the public for its enjoyment and appreciation as the park act intended. We anxiously await completion
of this project that will provide an uninterrupted stretch of park from 14th to 29th Street.

In addition to the financial and open space benefits this project will provide the Trust and public, it will help to knit together the park with the surrounding neighborhoods, adding variety to existing recreational opportunities and amenities, and providing additional opportunities for the many employees and residents centered in this West Chelsea neighborhood, as well as the outlet for the additional visitors it currently draws.

The planning and community involvement on this project has been extraordinary since the RFP process began in 2008. Along with the details that require close examination, analysis of impacts and other information provided, we believe that the due diligence of the applicant has resulted in an attractive environmental amenity and reasonable resolution of the estimated results, while addressing the primary community concerns. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that moving forward the Hudson River Park Trust will not continue to
analyze and examine the actual patterns of use and continue to enhance the experience of park users and the community in conjunction with all its stakeholders. We have seen this implemented in other areas of the park in concert with both community boards and public officials with a high degree of success.

We look forward to that dialogue. We will continue to make Hudson River Park the amazing resource it is for us today.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, thanks so much. Let me see if there are questions for you.

Yes, Michelle.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Just one brief question, and I'm not sure you're the person to ask, but since you had raised money you probably know the answer. The 1.6 acre open space, who's going to be paying for the ongoing maintenance of that along the esplanade?

MR. PIETRANTONE: I believe that the developer is paying for the open space on the pier, but the esplanade open space will be the responsibility of the Trust.
COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thank you for coming.

Pamela Wasserstein is the next speaker, to be followed by Eldon Scott.

MS. WASSERSTEIN: Hi, good afternoon. I'm Pam Wasserstein. I'm director of corporate development at Tribeca Enterprises, which is the parent company of the Tribeca Film Festival.

We are very honored that since the start of Pier 57 planning we have partnered with Young Woo to offer a public cultural element in the redevelopment plan. The Pier's two and a half acres of open space include 1.8 acres on the rooftop. We intend to provide free cultural programming there, including an outdoor home for the Tribeca Film Festival, and a summer film screening series, as well as public art, live performance and special events.

We are very proud to support the Pier 57 redevelopment project, and we look forward to participating in the establishment of what we
believe will be an important cultural hub for the neighborhood and for New York.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'll see if there are any questions for you. There are not. Thanks for being -- oh, I'm sorry, Anna. I didn't see your hand.

COMM. LEVIN: Actually I did have a question. And that is, how big a crowd do you think your most successful event will draw?

MS. WASSERSTEIN: So the maximum capacity, and, you know, the developers can speak to this as well, the maximum capacity for the larger area that could seat a screening, for example, is currently planning for I think a thousand people. I expect that that wouldn't be very frequent, but that would kind of be the maximum there. And obviously the capacity for the complete roof is a bit higher than that.

COMM. LEVIN: And you also have plans to use other space for, you know, fundraisers, parties, special event kind of things?

MS. WASSERSTEIN: We may. You mean
interior spaces?

COMM. LEVIN: Yeah.

MS. WASSERSTEIN: Yeah, we absolutely may. There's not a set plan right now, but we have a close working relationship with Young Woo. And, you know, we're excited about what's going on in the interior as well. And we think that our partners and sponsors will be excited about this too.

COMM. LEVIN: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions for Ms. Wasserstein?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thank you for being here.

MS. WASSERSTEIN: Thanks.

THE CHAIR: The next speaker will be Eldon Scott, to be followed by Jared Chausow.

MR. SCOTT: Hi. My name is Eldon Scott and I'm the president of the Urban Space Management, USA. Urban Space is the proposed tenant of the public market component of Pier 57, which incorporates approximately 300 shipping containers on four market levels. The market
incubates small businesses in the creative industries, what we call the creative industry sector, which includes retail, art, fashion and food.

Urban Space is a well-known creator of both permanent and seasonable public markets, most notably Camden Locks and Spitalfields in London, and the holiday markets in Union Square and in Grand Central terminal in New York City. We also co-developed the DeKalb Market with Young Woo, which consisted of approximately 60 reused shipping containers in downtown Brooklyn. And this project was named one of the top ten architectural projects of 2011 by the New York Observer, and best retail project of 2011 by the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

I can talk a little bit more, but we're mostly a daytime activity, at DeKalb we're primarily a daytime activity.

We enthusiastically support this project and look forward to the opportunity to create and facilitate a retail community marketplace for small business owners and entrepreneurs to thrive in Manhattan.
THE CHAIR: Great. Let me see if there are questions for you.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: There aren't, but thank you for being here.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Jared Chausow. And then Jeff Smithline and then Edward Applebome.

MR. CHAUSOW: You actually got that right.

My name is Jared Chausow. I'm here on behalf of Senator Hoylman, and I'll be summarizing his testimony.

(Reading:) My name is Brad Hoylman and I represent New York State's 27th Senate District, which includes Pier 57 as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding the ULURP applications regarding the proposed redevelopment of Pier 57 submitted by HRPT and Hudson Eagle LLC.

As a longtime supporter of Hudson River Park, I urge the New York City Planning Commission to approve these applications, subject to the conditions set forth in Manhattan Community
Board 4's December 18th, 2012 letter to the Commission. The plan will transform Pier 57 from a vacant pier into an innovative cultural and commercial destination, while restoring and preserving its historical architectural character. I am especially pleased by the proposed redevelopment's creation of 2.5 acres of new public open space. Its restoration of an historic landmark that is listed on the state and National Registers of Historic Places, and its activation of a long underutilized part of our waterfront. All programming on the rooftop open space, which constitutes the bulk of the proposal's total open space would be free and open to the public. I also appreciate that the developer has committed to fostering dynamic retail and restaurant uses, partnering with the Urban Space Management to create a public marketplace modeled on existing year-round markets in London, in four levels of repurposed shipping containers retrofitted with ADA compliant access. Crucially, according to the draft DEIS, "big box" retail would be prohibited under Hudson Eagle's proposed lease with HRPT.
In addition, the applicant is seeking federal tax credits from the US Department of the Interior, which would require the developer to adhere to the secretary's standards for rehabilitation of historic properties, thereby helping to ensure its contextual appropriateness. That said, I share CB 4's concerns that the development envelope and uses that would be permitted if the discretionary actions were approved, would enable as-of-right development perhaps by a future developer that would have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding community. For example, while the applicant's proposal includes a floor area ratio of just 2.23, the requested zoning map amendment to M1-5 would permit a maximum FAR of 5.0, which is far too high for this historic property in Hudson River Park.

It is also of grave concern that M1-5 zones allow hotel and "big box" retail uses. And while the Hudson River Park Act does not currently allow such uses, I echo CB 4's stated desire for an additional measure of protection from such uses in the future. Likewise, while the aforementioned restriction on "big box" retailers
included in the lease is a positive step, there
must be an additional restriction on this use that
is not predicated on occupancy of the site by the
applicant.

Certainly I hope and anticipate
that the proposed development will endure through
and perhaps beyond the term of its lease. But its
longevity cannot be guaranteed. The zoning map
amendment under consideration today has no
expiration date. And therefore, CPC must account
for all of the possibilities it would engender.
However, it is my understanding that the City
cannot use a restrictive declaration on the site
because it is state owned parkland. To ensure
that non contextual or otherwise undesirable
development is not permitted on Pier 57, I request
that CPC work with me, HRPT, CB 4 and other
elected officials and government agencies to craft
a set of binding restrictions for the site that
reflect the vision of this application. My office
has already had preliminary discussions to explore
the feasibility of such restrictions with liaisons
at the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation
and Historic Preservation.
(Bell rung)

MR. CHAUSOW: CPC and HRPT. And I'll end here. Notwithstanding these concerns, I strongly support the proposed Pier 57 redevelopment, and again urge CPC to approve these applications subject to the conditions sought by CB 4.

THE CHAIR: Thanks for coming on behalf of the senator, we appreciate it. The next speaker is Jeff Smithline. And then Edward Applebome.

MR. SMITHLINE: Hi. My name is Jeff Smithline, I'm from Sam Schwartz Engineering. We did the transportation analysis and all the work that went into the draft EIS.

So, you know, just to go through that real quick. We looked at five peak hours, including two peak hours that cover the event. We did a weekly event peak and a Saturday event peak. We also looked at 16 intersections, I think with 90 locations that included sidewalks, corners and crosswalks. So we really did study this. It's a 92 page chapter and it's full of information. So all the traffic volumes are there.
The trip generation we had, I think it was eight different land uses. For each of these land uses we broke it down into different assumptions. Trip rates, modal splits, they all got vetted with City DOT. They'd like to err on the conservative side so that conservativeness is laid into all eight land uses, and when they're all combined, believe me, it becomes a very conservative analysis.

We did identify significant impacts. There were five intersections that had them. The mitigation chapter does propose signal timing changes to bring all those impacts back to the same or better level of service as what would be in the no action condition.

There were questions that came up about the 16th Street right turn. The right turn is 140 feet long, that's the length of the data that's being provided. The ECS analysis, that's the software that we're required to use by City DOT for the EIS does give us the queue lengths for that right turn. The right turn during any peak does not exceed a hundred feet. So that's about five vehicles. So it would be five vehicles.
Philip went through and explained, you know, sort of the arithmetic behind that. But the analysis software also does confirm that it ranges from two to five vehicles during, you know, any of those five peak hours.

You know, one of the benefits that I also want to point out is, well, first just going to 17th Street, that is, you know, one of the access point locations. We are not proposing any signal timing changes for the Chelsea Piers exit. We will still have the same amount of green time that it has today. So there will be no negative impact on their level of service for their exit.

And just from being out there and actually watching the exit, one of the things that I did notice is that because the block of 16th to 17th Street on Route 9A southbound is so short, it's actually one of the shortest blocks along 9A, sometimes at the signal at 16th when southbound traffic is stopped, it does queue back and extend to 17th Street. So when the Chelsea Piers exit, when they get a green light, sometimes there's nowhere for them to go, and that does cause some
impacts along the Chelsea Piers frontage.

Now, one of the big benefits of this project is that it's eliminating the through signal at 16th Street.

(Bell rung)

MR. SMITHLINE: So now traffic when it starts to queue up will be able to pull all the way down to 15th Street and start to queue there.

So that when Chelsea Piers and when 17th Street gets a green light, there will be a space to move into, which will help alleviate a lot of the existing problems that they have today at Chelsea piers.

THE CHAIR: Great, thanks. Let me see if there are questions for you. Yes, Irwin.

COMM. CANTOR: On that last comment, you have now said that you can probably queue five cars. Therefore, anything beyond five -- and I think that Philip said it's a two minute light.

MR. SMITHLINE: Yeah, well, it's actually 140 feet long, which queues up about seven cars.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. Anything beyond that backs up onto Route 9A.
MR. SMITHLINE: Yes, it would.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay. And I think you said or he said certainly on 17th Street he said it was a two minute light. What's the right turn light?

MR. SMITHLINE: Well, the whole cycle there is two minutes. So some portion of that two minutes would be for 9A.

COMM. CANTOR: So you've got to hope that there's only six cars in the queue.

MR. SMITHLINE: Right. And that's what the analysis does bear out, that it's no more than five during any peak hour.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay.

MR. SMITHLINE: And I mean some of the reason why that happens is really two-fold. One, there's not a lot of parking on the site, so the auto modal split is low. Two is that it is a long phase. Even though it's just a right turn, you know, it also satisfies the left turn, but that's also when the pedestrians will cross at 16th. So it has to be long enough to get pedestrians across the entire highway. And that's why that right turn phase is long.
COMM. CANTOR: That's wider than Queens Boulevard.

MR. SMITHLINE: Wider than some portions of Queens Boulevard.

COMM. CANTOR: Yes.

Does the software include the overlap of people and cars which have a tendency to run a yellow and people which have a tendency to be halfway through?

MR. SMITHLINE: It does account for some running of the yellow, yes. But it's not a traffic simulation, so it doesn't show it graphically. It's based on empirical data and empirical equations, so it's a mathematical equation.

COMM. CANTOR: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Michelle, you have a question.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Can you just comment on whether or not the worst case scenario in terms of peak traffic times accounts for the potential for dinner cruises or any use that would be high demand like that?

MR. SMITHLINE: The analysis that we
did for our site did not include any dinner
cruises because at the time, and I think that's
still the case, there are no dinner cruise use as
part of this development.

COMM. DE LA UZ: How about water
taxi?

MR. SMITHLINE: Water taxi is
discussed in the EIS, it's not included in the
traffic analysis. What we actually explain in the
EIS is that there's somewhat of an offset between
a water taxi. And we use this logic on other
sites as well. Where it's going to attract some
new trips, you know, I think most of it will be on
foot or by transit. But it will also take trips
away from what the site would generate. So it's
somewhat of an offset.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions for
Mr. Smithline? Yes, Anna.

COMM. LEVIN: Just following up on
Michelle's question. We heard comments from
Messrs. Masyr and Gluck that there was inadequate
information about the marina scenario and the
multiple event scenario. I think you partially
addressed the dinner cruise issue. What assumptions are you making about use of the marina and the generation there, and what assumptions are you making about special events?

MR. SMITHLINE: All right. Well, for special events we assume a 2,500 person event on the rooftop, which is what the limit size for the events would be, a maximum limit. The majority of those events would not be 2,500 people, but that was the reasonable worst case we looked at.

COMM. LEVIN: Okay. And is the rooftop the only special event space?

MR. SMITHLINE: I believe it is.

COMM. LEVIN: Does any of the restaurant space have capacity for special events?

MR. SMITHLINE: I'm not aware of -- I don't know if they've all been laid out in that kind of detail yet.

COMM. LEVIN: Okay. But anyway, not that you know of?

MR. SMITHLINE: But for a special event happening at the restaurant, the restaurant wouldn't be open for regular patrons. So, you
know, there would be an offset there as well.

COMM. LEVIN: And what assumptions did you make about marina use that was not dinner cruises?

MR. SMITHLINE: We just counted the number of slips that are proposed and we used the generally accepted rates for, you know, that's been approved in other EIS's. So it's a standard trip rate for a marina.

COMM. LEVIN: So it's mostly assuming private --

MR. SMITHLINE: Well, it's based on sample counts that were done at other marinas. So it's sort of an average marina type use.

COMM. LEVIN: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions for Mr. Smithline?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thanks for coming, thank you for your testimony.

Edward Applebome.

MR. APPLEBOME: Good afternoon. My name is Edward Applebome. I'm the president of AKRF. We were the lead firm for the preparation
of the Environmental Impact Statement. I just
wanted to follow up and clarify a few points that
were made.

In terms of the program that was
analyzed for the project, there is a very specific
reasonable worst case program. It reflects the
maximum amount of development conservatively that
we expect to occur on the site. So there's not
sort of a wishy-washy gray area there. We have
accounted for the maximum amount of development
that's expected to occur under the approvals.

In terms of the marina, the marina
operation is not expected to include charter or
dinner cruises, so we don't account for them.
It's not designed for them, the water depth
doesn't support it, so it's not part of the
analysis of the project.

The transportation studies, as with
the other studies, are consistent with the SEQRA
manual. They're very detailed. We look at
traffic, we look at pedestrians, we look at
pedestrian safety, we look at parking, we look at
public transportation. It's a long chapter. It
carries all of those analyses forward, consistent
with EIS's from major projects. So you should all
be reviewing those pieces.

The travel demand estimates are
done consistent with the SEQRA manual, consistent
with other analyses of waterfront projects. They
were reviewed by City DOT, they were reviewed by
State DOT. The treatment of the marina is
consistent with how we have analyzed marinas for
other waterfront projects, including Hudson River
Park, Brooklyn Bridge Park, and probably other
marina projects in the city.

Marinas, in fact, are actually very
low generators because, if you're familiar with
boat slips, a lot of times it's just a boat
sitting at a slip and they don't generate the
kinds of activities that you would from some other
uses.

And in terms of the banquet
operations, the project does not anticipate
banquet operations and so that's not accounted for
as part of the EIS.

THE CHAIR: Thanks. Let me see if
there are questions for you.

(No response)
THE CHAIR: There are not. Thank you, thanks for coming, we appreciate your testimony.

The next speaker is Laurie Silberfeld.

MS. SILBERFELD: Good afternoon, Chair and Commissioners. I'm the general counsel for Hudson River Park. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I just wanted to make one short clarification with respect to special events I believe one of the questions were asked. The MOU that we have entered into with the developer and will be converted to a lease once it's done, specifically does not allow for special events, so banquets, the sort of use that you see up at Chelsea Piers.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Maybe there are other questions for you, wait one second.

Michelle has a question.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Maybe you can speak to this. I'm glad that Mr. Applebome talked about the water depth not supporting the boats that could have dinner cruises. But do you know why we
heard that the Park was in -- the Trust was in
conversation with Spirit Cruises?

MS. SILBERFELD: The Trust has
not been in conversations with Spirit Cruises.

And as has been previously explained by
Mr. Moskowitz, neither has Young Woo. So I'm not
certain. Perhaps, you know, it's one of those
rumors that doesn't --

COMM. DE LA UZ: Is there any
intention to bring dinner cruises to the marina in
any way?

MS. SILBERFELD: There is no
intention.

COMM. DE LA UZ: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Thanks for coming,
thanks for answering the question.

MS. SILBERFELD: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Is there anyone who has
not spoken on this item who would like to do so?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Okay. In addition to
accepting comments into today's hearing, written
comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement may be submitted to the Trust as indicated in their public notice and on their Web site. Written comments on the DEIS following today's public hearing will be accepted until five p.m. on February 4, 2013.

Thank you all so much. This hearing is closed.

(Time noted: 1:20 p.m.)
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