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DIAMOND REPORTING (718) 624-7200 info@diamonddreporting.com
MS. MYER: Welcome to Brooklyn Bridge Park's Committee on Alternatives to Housing Public Hearing. This is the second in two scheduled hearings.

Tonight I want to welcome State Senator Daniel Squadron, and if you'd like to make some remarks now it be would be wonderful. Thanks.

SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very much, Regina. Sorry, I know -- I suggest no one else do that. I know you have a long agenda, so I'll let you get to it. I just wanted to come by. This is the second one of these listening sessions that the Committee on Alternatives to Housing is doing. I was also able to be at the first, and we had a great turnout tonight, and I know more people are coming, and we had a great turnout at the first one, too.

This is an incredibly important part of the process of getting
Brooklyn Bridge Park built and making sure that it really is everything that it could possibly be and really reaches every bit of its potential.

I think, as many of you know, there was a transition in the governance to sort of a stricter governance under the City with some other appointees, and that part of that agreement was a serious consideration of alternatives to housing as the funding stream. And just to be clear about it, that consideration of alternatives to housing is very serious. This is the process. This is an incredibly important part of the process. It doesn't end here tonight. And Regina, when others will describe that to you, we've hired -- the Committee on Alternatives to Housing has hired a consultant to look at this. The consultant is being paid with funds that we were able to secure for this,
and the ideas that come up tonight are really going to form the basis of the future of this Park and this Plan.

And this Park is not just a great, great park in our backyard, though it is, it's also a great, great park for our Borough and for our City. It's going to be a worldwide draw, and it's a piece of an overall harbor park, the Central Park for the center of our City.

So, what you're doing tonight by participating, and many of you participate in a lot of different contexts and a lot of different ways, and it's always important, but what you're doing tonight by participating in this really is helping to shape one of the great public works for the 21st century in New York. And that's a very, very important role, it's a monumental role, and I thank you for taking the time to participate in
that, and really help all of us ensure that Brooklyn Bridge Park, the Harbor Park, New York City, and our State can reach the absolute outer limit of our potential.

So, it's going to be, I know, a long and interesting meeting. There's going to be a lot of good ideas. My appointee and a lot of others are here. I look forward to it, and I'm really glad you came tonight. Thank you very much.

MS. MYER: Thank you.

I'm Regina Myer, President of Brooklyn Bridge Park. I'd like to introduce a few members and representatives of the Committee on Alternatives to Housing tonight.

So, starting with you, Kyle.

MR. KIMBALL: Kyle Kimball -- sorry. Kyle Kimball, sitting in for Deputy Mayor Steel.

MR. PINSKY: Hi, I'm Seth Pinsky. I'm the President of the New
York City, no Economic Development Corporation.

MR. RASKIN: I'm John Raskin. I'm Senator Squadron's chief of staff and appointee to the Committee.

MR. NELSON: I'm Paul Nelson. I'm Assemblywoman Joan Millman's chief of staff, and her appointee to the Board Corporation and to this Committee.

MR. GOLEM: And I'm Ron Golem with Bay Area Economics, or BAE, consultants to the Committee to Alternatives on Housing.

MS. MYER: In 2002 the City and the State of New York entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which outlined the conditions for the creation and operation of the Park.

The MOU required that the Park be financially self-sufficient with annual operation and maintenance expenses funded by revenue generated from within the Project.
In addition, the MOU stipulated that development parcels were not allowed to exceed 20 percent of the Project area. The 2005 General Project Plan affirmed this requirement and identified five sites within the Project footprint, occupying less than 10 percent of the Project area that may be developed to provide revenue for the maintenance and operation of the Park.

The GPP also described the height limits and allowable uses for those sites. A map of those sites and a chart describing the allowable uses can be found on the table outside.

In 2010, the City of New York took over control of the Project, and under this agreement we're moving ahead. Over 20 new acres of new parkland was opened this year at Piers 1 and 6.

In March 2010 as well, the City of New York entered into a Memorandum
of Understanding with Assembly Member Joan Millman and State Senator Daniel Squadron. This MOU outlined a series of steps to be undertaken to study park financing alternatives in regards to the Pier 6 and John Street development sites.

In accordance with this MOU, which is posted on our Web site and available tonight as well at the sign-in table, Brooklyn Bridge Park has retained a consultant, Bay Area Economics, to conduct a park financing alternative study under the direction of the Corporation's Committee on Alternatives to Housing.

The MOU stipulates that these hearings are allowed to -- for public input regarding alternative sources of financing.

Ron Golem of Bay Area Economics will serve as our hearing chair and review the format and ground rules for tonight's hearing.
We've retained a Stenographer for both hearings so that we will have a complete and accurate record of the proceedings.

The purpose of tonight's session is to collect recommendations and ideas from the public on alternative sources of financing to replace revenue from the Pier 6 and John Street Development Sites. Bay Area Economics and the Committee on Alternatives to Housing will be taking the testimony here tonight, at last week's hearing, and submit it in writing for consideration for the draft report that's expected to be released in mid-February in accordance with the time frames identified in the MOU.

After the draft report is released it will be posted on our Web site, and a public hearing will be scheduled to solicit feedback on the report and its recommendation.
Bay Area Economics will be accepting written testimony until Monday, December 13 at 5:00 P.M. Spoken and written statements are weighted equally. You may E-mail your testimony to BBPtestimony@BAE1.com. And this information is available as a handout at the desk outside as well.

In closing, I would like to thank St. Francis College for hosting these proceedings, they were incredibly generous, and I'd also like to thank you for attending tonight, and I'll turn the hearing over to Ron.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you, Regina. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. As I said, my name is Ron Golem, and I'm a principal of Bay Area Economics, or BAE. We're a private consulting firm with offices in New York, Washington, D.C. and California. I'm also here tonight
with my colleague Kei Hayashi, sitting at the end of the table to my right, you may recall from the previous meeting if you were here.

We have been selected by the Brooklyn Bridge Park's Committee on Alternatives to Housing to prepare a study on alternatives to housing for the funding of Brooklyn Bridge Park operations. I've been asked by the committee members to serve as the independent hearing officer for tonight's public hearing, which is being held pursuant to the March 8, 2010 Memorandum of Understanding, or MOU.

My purpose tonight is to run the hearing in a fair and impartial manner, to make sure that everybody who wishes to speak has an adequate opportunity to be heard, and in a means conducted in a fair and respectful manner.

This hearing will consider
alternative funding sources to replace revenue from the Pier 6 and John Street development sites within Brooklyn Bridge Park.

Pursuant to the March 8, 2010 MOU, the purpose of the hearing is to allow public input regarding alternative funding sources before issuing a draft report that describes any alternative sources that are projected to meet some parameters that I will discuss in a minute.

In the MOU there are two threshold parameters for alternative funding sources that have been established. These thresholds require that an alternative will not be considered unless it's concluded that first, that the source is not in any way displacing revenue to which the City is otherwise entitled, and, secondly, the timing of and level of risk associated with the revenue projected to be generated by such
alternative source is consistent with
the projected timing and level of
risk associated with the revenue that
is projected to be generated by the
John Street and Pier 6 sites.

Copies of the March 6 -- March
8, 2010 MOU are available at the
table outside. This document
describes the Park financing
alternatives process in more detail.
It's also on the Park's Web site.
Also on the table outside is a
description of the Park's current
finance plan as was set forth in the
September 23, 2010 Request For
Proposals For Consulting Services.

I'd like to emphasize that
tonight is not intended to be a
question-and-answer session. Instead,
it is an opportunity for you as
attendees and participants to present
to the Committee here your views so
that as a consultant and as the
Committee as a whole can consider
them in the Committee's final
determinations.

Written comments on the
alternative sources of funding, which
is the subject of this hearing, are
very much requested and appreciated
and will continue to be received and
considered by BAE and by the
Committee after the conclusion of
tonight's hearing. As Regina said,
the deadline for those comments is
5:00 P.M. Monday, December 13.

Please note that written
comments, if any, should be sent by
E-mail to us, and again I'll read the
address, and it's on slips of paper
that are outside at the table, that
is the address is BBPtestimony@BAE
and the numeral 1 dot-com. And again
we have that information on the
table.

Please note that all comments
that are presented at this hearing
and during the comment period and
through the E-mail will be reviewed by us in our consideration to alternative funding sources pursuant to the MOU. Draft report will be issued in mid-February, which is approximately 120 days after our work commenced. After the release of the draft report, which will also be on the BBP Web site, there will be a six-day comment period, during which time testimony, response, may be submitted by the public. During this time period there will be at least one public hearing to allow for public input and at least one public meeting of the committee members, and it is possible that hearing and meeting may be combined, the purpose of which is to provide feedback on the draft report.

So with that background, I'd now like to begin the public comment portion of the hearing. Just to reiterate the ground rules, the
procedures we're going to follow are
first, to testify tonight individuals
do need to sign up at the table
outside, and those cards are being
forwarded to me. Second of all, as a
courtesy, we have allowed public
officials to speak as soon as
possible after their arrival. I'm not
sure if we're expecting more? Okay.

When a speaker is called I will
also announce the subsequent speaker,
and that is so that the subsequent
speaker can be ready to make their
comments as soon as the previous
speaker concludes, which allow more
people to speak during the meeting
time.

All speakers will be given a
maximum of five minutes to speak.
After four minutes there will be a
one-minute warning that is given to
conclude remarks. Speakers who run
longer than the allotted five-minute
time will be given the opportunity to
conclude their remarks after all
other speakers have commented, if
there is remaining time at the end of
the meeting.

I shall also say that speakers
at the December 9 hearing who have
not previously testified will be
given preference over those who have
already spoken at the November 30th
hearing. We'll try to do that to the
extent possible.

Please do keep in mind that
either as an addition to, or in lieu
of, an oral presentation you are also
able to submit written comments of
any length at tonight's hearing to
the box that's on the table outside,
or by E-mail to the address that
we've given you. I'm sorry, the box
is here, I'm told. It's here at the
end of the stage.

In order to ensure an accurate
transcript and to make sure that
we've covered everything that is said
tonight, a transcript is being prepared by the Stenographer you see at the end of the table. So in order that we do have complete information I'm going to ask that each speaker, when they're called, come to the microphone in the front of the room and give their name and their address. And furthermore, if you're appearing as a representative of an organization or a governmental entity please identify that organization or entity and state its address so that we have that for our information.

Finally, I want to remind everyone that the purpose of this hearing is to afford all here tonight an opportunity to make statements and comments about alternative sources of funding in regards to the Pier 6 and John Street Development Sites. Again, I'd like to stress that there are no limitations on your submissions of your statements, comments, or
materials at tonight's hearing, or at
any time prior to the close of the
comment period on December 13.

And I guess one thing I would
like to add, too, is that my goal is
that we do this in a fair and
respectful manner, and so I would ask
folks to withhold applause or
comments in a respectful manner
regardless of what view you have on
of the various issues here.

So with that, I'd like to ask
our first speaker to approach the
front of the room, that is Sue Wolfe.
And I will apologize in advance for
any names that I butcher in this
process.

Again, Ms. Wolfe, if you could
state your name, address, and if
you're a representative of an
organization.

The second speaker will be Sue
Novick Wasko.

MS. WOLFE: My name is Sue
Wolfe. I live at 448 Atlantic Avenue. I'm representing Atlantic Avenue LGC, which is located at 494 Atlantic Avenue. I'm a past president of the Boerum Hill Association. For the six years that I was president of this association our board advocated for this park.

Boerum Hill has very little park space, and this park is very important to our neighborhood. I've also been a board member of the Atlantic Avenue LDC Corporation for many years, and a resident of Atlantic Avenue since 1975.

The western end of Atlantic Avenue has already seen positive retail traffic from the beautiful playgrounds there.

I support the current financing plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park and urge the Committee on Alternatives to retain this plan going forward to ensure the completion of the Park.
without delay. The BBP financing plan was the subject of serious examination and thoughtful deliberation following the creation of the Park Master Plan.

The current financing plan minimizes the footprint of development in the Park, 8 percent of the total project area. Housing and limited hotel use is most appropriate and compatible land use for a public park. These uses are land-efficient and provide "eyes on the park" as well as ancillary uses, like meeting space, restrooms and restaurants that will serve the Park users.

There is no evidence that housing in close proximity to parks serves to privatize public park. This is a false criticism. Many examples all over New York City illustrate this, including Riverside South and Central Park in Manhattan.

The current financing plan is
not subject to unpredictable budget
cycles and ensures the Brooklyn
Bridge Park will be well maintained
in perpetuity.

Maintenance costs were
evaluated by the NYC Department of
Parks and Recreation and found to be
consistent with operating costs for
large waterfront parks.

The Park's financial plan is
already in action with maintenance
funds coming from One Brooklyn Bridge
Park, a preexisting building within
the project boundaries that was
adaptively reused for residential use
and completed in 2008.

Brooklyn needs a world class
park. Let's celebrate it, not
denigrate it. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Great, thank you.

At this point I'd like to allow
one of our Committee Members to
introduce himself.

MR. DAVIDSON: Good evening.
I'm Peter Davidson, Executive Director of the Empire State Development Corp. and a Board Member of Brooklyn Bridge Park.

MR. GOLEM: Thanks.

Our next speaker is Sue Novick Wasko, and the following speaker will be Doreen Gallo.

MS. NOVICK WASKO: Good evening, everybody. I'm Sue Novick Wasko. I'm very honored to follow Miss Wolfe. I can't be as articulate as she, I don't think, but everything she said is extremely important and really on point.

I just want to say that I'm a longtime Brooklyn -- I'm not too good with this. I'm a longtime Brooklyn Heights resident -- excuse me for not facing you, but you won't hear me if I don't face this. Okay.

I'm a longtime Brooklyn Heights resident. I'm very committed to my community. I've been involved in
various local initiatives, and I just
really love this neighborhood and
this Borough. Marty Markowitz is
right. It's the center of the Earth.

I've been a consistent Park
supporter from really from close to
the beginning -- certainly for the
last eleven years -- participating in
fundraisers, participating in every
new activity that came upon the
scene, and enjoying every minute of
it. It's just such a wonderful thing
for the public and for the local
public as well as the greater public,
which includes all the foreigners we
see on the Brooklyn Bridge on a daily
basis, which is amazing.

I just want to say that we've
enjoyed opening Piers 1 and 6 and
look forward to so many new things
happening with the continued
construction of the Park.

I have to say that I would be
extremely disturbed if there would be
anything that would delay or halt the continuing of park construction, of the momentum that has occurred in the recent past is just amazing, and anything that would delay it be would awful.

I'm really -- I really want to urge the Committee on Alternatives to Housing to recognize that any financial alternatives to sustaining the Park's maintenance and operations be (1) limited to the 8.2 acres already in the Plan, because we want the most in that park and the least amount of space used for the development to pay for; and (2) the alternative construction must fully fund the revenue plan for the Park.

Considering the ongoing very high cost of operation, including the maintenance of the pilings, the overall nature of the waterfront site, and the safety and security of everybody who uses the Park, the
costs are very high, and if we don't have the money available on a regular basis with a regular payment, it's just not going to survive, the Park.

So, just not to be too repetitious, I just want to say that if alternatives can't be found that meet these criteria I urge you to support the Park's current General Project Plan, and again I would defer to Miss Wolfe's more specific detailing thereof.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

The next speaker is Doreen Gallo, followed by Mary Goodman.

MS. GALLO: On behalf of the DUMBO neighborhood -- oh, I'm Doreen Gallo. I'm representing the DUMBO Neighborhood Alliance. Our address is 45 Washington Street, number 123, Brooklyn, New York 11201.

On behalf of DNA, I would like
to thank Daniel Squadron -- Senator Daniel Squadron, Assembly Member Joan Millman, Council Member Steven Levin, for delivering funding for the City.

The parameters of having to come up with the same budget that includes housing and all the amenities needed is impossible, particularly in the funding stream that has to come from only within the Park.

Public parkland should be created with public non-profit or donated funds. The planning and implementation has been purposefully segmented by the Bloomberg administration, rather than focussing on an overall park development plan, chipping away at the principles the community has advocated for over so many, very many years.

The General Project Plan should be reviewed immediately. This is due to the fact that, for example, where
historic buildings such as the Purchase and Cold Storage buildings could have had immediate adaptive reuses, creating revenue, they're instead destroyed. At the same time, the great pedestrian entrance under the Manhattan Bridge is cluttered with the Department of Transportation lot, including its cinderblock building jutting out several feet in front of the Manhattan Bridge, blocking the view corridors to the water and overall occupation under the public spaces of the bridge.

Why not have park concessions with paying tenants instead, or perhaps actual public open space? Preserving this walkway would reconnect preexisting public transportation and would connect to the neighborhoods of Metro Tech Park all the way to Williamsburg.

The Jehovah's Witnesses, the original developer in DUMBO so many
decades ago, are planning to sell all of their holdings. A combination of using preexisting buildings on the edge of the Park for a hotel conference center and/or residential housing should be seriously considered, particularly since there is so much property to consider and can include a mix of affordable and luxury housing as well as recreational uses.

The contract with the River Cafe should reflect real revenue as part of the Park where it has that their rent is less than that of a studio apartment in DUMBO. If this is so, it should be made public and there should be a new contract that stipulates market rent for this site.

Senator Squadron's PIRP plan should also be reconsidered. The developers fought against landmarking and fought for the up zoning of DUMBO. There should be some
monetary contribution back to DUMBO that would actually benefit the public spaces of our neighborhood.

Year-round recreation came out of the Park when housing came in. The argument that housing is a minimum footprint for maximum return is not addressing the fact that a lot of the acreage of the Park is on artificial land and piers, as well as all the development is on precious existing waterfront land. But as the Empire Fulton Ferry State Park has a great concentration of historic buildings, George Washington's historic Battle of Brooklyn was in Fulton Ferry, there certainly should be money to be made for such an important piece of history. Developing the Empire Stores to include space for a museum.

There should be a Stop Work Order on Jane Walentas's Carousel in the Park under the Brooklyn Bridge.
A more suitable location within the Park should be found. We should look to Prospect Park and Central Park for their place of their carousels.

The Tobacco Warehouse can generate income. Several years ago the Conservancy marketed renting out the public space with their tent inside for 7,000 per event. There can be flexible recreational uses for the Tobacco Warehouse, skating, or theater companies; however, we believe that transforming it into a permanent theater, creating a dark space, which is now contained open space, in order to ultimately benefit a private non-profit and developers is unacceptable.

Tennis, boating, and many concessions businesses can take place in the piers; that there have been complaints from film location managers that BBPC will charge as
much as --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MS. GALLO: -- okay, one
thousand a day to shoot in the Park.

DNA does not agree with the fee
amount, but filming in the Park is
another source of revenue.

In conclusion, we must further
public benefits of the park, although
a few suggestions, preserve the green
space of Empire Fulton Ferry State
Park and expand it into the adjacent
shoreline properties as the John
Street lot, which has the most
amazing views of the Manhattan and
Brooklyn Bridge. Consider the
Con Edison property in Vinegar Hill
and the imminent closing of that
power plant that was referred to in
DNA's comprehensive zoning plan.

I'm probably up for time,
right?

MR. GOLEM: Twenty seconds.

MS. GALLO: Oh. Conserve the
shoreline of Manhattan and manage it for maximum health and function and develop real public access to the water in modes that conform to community and environmental needs. That's it.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Mary Goodman, followed by Samira Deandrade.

MS. GOODMAN: Hi, everyone. I'm Mary Goodman. I'm a resident of Brooklyn Heights in excess of 20 years, a tenure member of the CB2 Parks Committee, eight-year member of Community Board 2 in Brooklyn, and a five-year member as a director of the Willow Time Association.

So, the question is how to pay for Brooklyn Bridge Park? Oh, but I am speaking right now as member of the Brooklyn Board of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Defense Found, the most important qualification.

How to pay for Brooklyn Bridge
Park? It's very simple. First cut out the fat and lower the budget. Take the 72 acres, not the overinflated water acreage of 85 acres, multiply it by $150,000 per acre, which is 10 times what the City pays for upkeep of regular parks, and your budget is 10.8 million, more than sufficient to run this park.

We almost live within our means in today's economy and so must Brooklyn Bridge Park.

Two. Build a for-pay recreational center and charge for use. The Mayor gave the real state industry over 10 billion in tax subsidies over his first 8 years in office. What has that resulted in? Except a lot of subsidies for residential real estate that is now under water. Over 600 buildings in New York lie vacant and unfinished.

Why not invest in the people of New York? We need recreational
facilities, and these facilities can make money for the Park. They do so for Hudson River Park, they do for other parks across the nation.

Our children are obese. They suffer from asthma at a rate unequaled in the nation. It's time we invested in our children. Provide the tax incentive to draw a world class reaction center, operate to build facilities that the community advocated for when they came up with the idea of the Park in the first place. This will make money.

Look no further than the Dodge Y, three blocks down the street from the Park. Within the first month of operation this Y was fully subscribed with a membership of 3,000 families paying over $1,000 per year. This number has grown to over 7,000 families paying more than 1,200 per year. That is 8.4 million per year for a 40-thousand-square-foot
facility. And the Y offers reduced and free memberships to families unable to pay as well. Their mission is not about money. Their mission is about building strong children and families and communities.

Maybe it is time the Park focuses on what is important to Brooklynites, not thinking about world-class park, but what is important to Brooklynites. The money will follow just as it has for the Y.

Third, capture all the money from in-park concessions. The five new concessions already inside the Park should at least pay rent. Some do not, according to Regina Myer at the first CAH meeting. Not one concession today is paying money into the Park, not one. The Wine Bar and Popup Park in 2009 paid $500,000 for one short season. The Shake Shack in Madison Square Park has a revenue sharing program with the park with
the formula contributed to the park -- take a breath -- is still smaller than it should be because certain special events are exempt from the revenue-sharing model. The River Cafe as been said just recently should contribute into the Park for the two acres of parkland they occupy for parking and a city park. They currently pay $28,000 per year for renting two acres of public parkland. Not one dime goes into park maintenance. That is a scandal. That's $2,333 a month. A walkup in Jersey City, I think that would be.

No free passes for any business at the Park borders, and that includes parking facilities.

The ESDC has already taking parking revenue off the table. The 3 Furman Street building, a significant revenue loss for the Park operations budget, because most parks that do contribute to their overhead use of
parking as a big source of parking funding. So the balance of the space planned for the Park must go to park operations.

Fourth, capture money from in-park activities that the Park attracts. The Brooklyn Bridge is the backdrop of feature films, television shoots, advertising shoots, fashion shoots. All these funds should go back to support the Park. Again, if the Park must pay itself, then all funds it generates must be kept for the Park. After all, it costs the City nothing because Brooklyn Bridge Park has its own armed police force and a maintenance crew, so the Park should keep all its revenue. It's not costing the City money to clean up after it. Think of the free advertising it brings to the Park, an added benefit for tourism to the Park, bringing even more visitors.

One fashion designer and a
1 religious group rented Pier 1 over
2 the past four years for a one-day
3 private event.
4 MR. GOLEM: One minute.
5 MS. GOODMAN: Thank you. It is
6 unknown what they pay for these
7 privileges, except BBP. We could use
8 a crystal ball perhaps. What is
9 known is other big events that occur
10 in Central Park and Bryant Park and
11 in other parks throughout the City
12 pay good money to rent public lands.
13 This park should be no different,
14 only a bigger and better venue.
15 Fifth, capture funds from
16 businesses that profit from the Park.
17 There's a line often around the block
18 at Patsy's Pizza everyday and night,
19 even on a cold night like this. Like
20 Bryant Park, we can create a Park
21 Improvement District of businesses
22 along the Park's corridors who now
23 have patrons because of the Park.
24 Since it's only a gazing look-
around park, people like Michele Obama spend less than 20 minutes inside it and then go outside to eat in local establishments. Let's move indeed. There's no magic for a park-funding solution. No one size or idea short of taxing proposals that have already been put on the table and rejected by the Mayor. These include Senator Squadron's PIRP plan, the Brooklyn Bridge Park Defense Fund's, Park Improvement Optional Tax modeled on that of Polk County, Florida, or the historic trust real estate transaction theme used in East Hampton or putting --

(A bell timer sounded.)

MR. GOLEM: Your time is up --

MR. GOODMAN -- or the Jehovah's Witnesses project. Thank you for your time, bye.

MR. GOLEM: Again, I have to ask you to hold your applause so that everyone has a chance to present
their comments.

The next speaker is Samira Deandrade, and followed by Gregory Mellon.

Go ahead.

MS. DEANDRADE: Hi. So, I'm here representing the youth of Brooklyn. I am the youth leader at a church in Downtown Brooklyn, and I'm here just to basically express their feelings towards the Park. And for me, they were very excited about the plan and, you know, the projects. And one thing they did say is they're tired of having to go to Prospect Park or having for me to take them to Central Park for them to enjoy, you know, nice trees, or other amenities when they could have one right behind their backyard.

So, I don't -- I'm not here to talk about numbers, or where we can create revenue, but I am here to just talk about the youth, who are our
future, and it's sometimes it's
positive to think about, you know,
what can help them. Because
sometimes we're here talking about
revenue, sometimes we're talking
about what we want. But what happens
ten years from now? When we're all
older, and our youth have nowhere to
go, and they feel they have to move
outside the Borough of Brooklyn to
have what kids in Manhattan do.

I personally live in the Upper
West Side, and I was telling a friend
of mine I am dying to move to
Brooklyn because I feel like it gives
other people -- it gives us Manhattan
people what Brooklyn -- what
Manhattan can't give us, which is a
type of piece of mind.

So, I just want you and
everyone in the Panel to just sit
here and think about what is good for
our youths. Not only the youths that
live in Downtown Brooklyn but that
live in Canarsie, or East New York, or wherever that you can, you know, want to take a train and say, you know, "I can step outside of my four walls of East New York and go to Downtown Brooklyn and enjoy, you know, nice scenery."

So, that's all I really have to say. I don't have any numbers. I don't have any fancy words to say. But it's just more about let's pause and think about the youths, the future. And just think about what we can give them, to educate them, and to want to stay in Brooklyn and not, you know, want to leave because they feel, like, Brooklyn is not investing in them, in their future, so that's all I have to say.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.

Next is Gregory Mellon, followed by David Kramer.

MR. MELLON: Hi. My name is Gregory Mellon. I live at 750
Lefferts Avenue, apartment B2. It's Crown Heights. I -- I own and operate a luxury car service. It's called Doran Luxury, Incorporated (phonetic), and one of the reasons why I'm here is because I'm really speaking on behalf of not only all of the TLC drivers in New York City, but also a lot of the families that I serve.

One of the things that I often hear in my vehicle, and this is, of course, while I'm trying to save my life while I'm in traffic, you know, either in traffic between the Midtown Tunnel, Grand Central, you know, the Holland Tunnel, you name it, I'm on a daily basis I'm trying to save my life from passengers that are very angry.

I think that I represent -- a lot of the families that I represent are very elite families that I drive for, Wall Street clients, a lot of
entertainment people, and a lot of what they say is really the same thing while I'm driving. They'll always ask me a question. That question always falls along the line of "where can I go in Brooklyn?"

Outside of Prospect Park, which is a beautiful park, and outside of the Brooklyn Museum, which was a great reconstruction there, I think that a lot of my clients and a lot of what my people are looking for is a balance, because Brooklyn brings a balance that Manhattan doesn't give. It gives a level of comfort, a level of appreciation.

I would like to see more housing. I and the people that I work for, the people that I serve, would love to see more housing. Most of my clients, if not all, who are above, I would say, the $600 range -- $600,000 range, would love more housing, would love to come back to
Brooklyn. A lot of the clients that I drive that are frequent, you know, airport clients that fly in on Sunday night, come to work on Wall Street, or they come to work on 34th Street, they are looking for hotels, and I'd love to see more hotels in the downtown area.

I think that Brooklyn can give them something. I think this is a great way we can bring more revenue. And I think that they will be more comfortable in the environment that Brooklyn can provide. That's all.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Again, I'd ask you to hold your applause, please.

Next speaker is David Kramer, and followed by Kate Collignon.

MR. KRAMER: Good evening, everybody. Alright. It's time for a joke. I got a cute E-mail today. It's a Peanuts Cartoon, and Lucy is complaining to Charlie. She says:
"I never get what I want for Christmas." And Charlie says:

"Well, what do you want for Christmas?" And Lucy sighs and says:

Real Estate." So. I'm glad the Stenographer got that.

So in the spirit of avoiding Lucy's fate, David Kramer, 171 Clinton Street. I'm here as an individual as well as chair for the Brooklyn Bridge Park Conservancy. So I rarely get to say the following statement ever in life, but here goes. I come here to offer lavish praise for the status quo. We are unquestionably in an age of limited resources at the city and state levels, and if I had to personally recreate a park finance plan that didn't poach from the City's current and future revenues, I would probably arrive at a plan nearly identical to the approved DIS Park Plan, which I had nothing to do with. A few small
development parcels at the perimeter of the Park providing disproportionate revenue, given their small imprint and impact on the Park, revenue that would sustain the Park for generations.

I specify funds that don't poach from the City because that's the language of the MOU. And all the alternatives I've heard to date from PERP's to takeover of the Witness buildings are mostly unrealistic, but they're all undeniably poaching from City revenue. And by the way, as a quick rebuttal to the woman from the Park Defense Fund. You know, I can say, first of all, that, you know, a lot of commercial uses you specified are literally pennies on the dollar, drops in the bucket, towards the revenue we're seeking. You know, specifically you mentioned the YMCA and how if 7,000 people are paying X dollars and $7 million. I can tell
you from experience if somebody was considerate enough to build a YMCA at the Park perimeter it would be 10,000-square-feet. The YMC could barely afford $30 a square foot. That would be $300,000 in rental income for that building, and that building would barely break even. Which is why the people who created EIS financing plan went the direction that they did.

By way of introduction, I'm the father of three kids, who has spent countless hours with them in the park over the past 12 years, starting with Fulton Ferry Park and the Main Street playground, then the floating pool, then Piers 1 and 6, and now that I have a puppy, long walks along the entirety of the future Park from Atlantic Avenue to John Street. Not for a second would I support anything that compromises the experience in the Park. And when I
first started exploring the Park economics 5 years ago, I assumed that the governmental analysis would be riddled with inaccuracies, silly assumptions and bad mouth.

My background is both as a parks organizer whose first job after college was starting People For Parks in Los Angeles, and my day job for the past 20 years, which has been in real estate. And by the way, given my advocacy at the Conservancy, I long ago recuse myself from any role in the housing developments. But instead, what I discovered when I looked at the EIS plan was thorough financial analysis and reasonable assumptions in an effort to underwrite $15 million of revenue without materially impacting the Park experience. The assumptions of about ground rent in taxes were pretty much what I would have suggested.

The housing at the perimeter
doesn't bother me one bit. I would have already noticed that from the several the hundred people already living at One Brooklyn Bridge Park. They don't bothered me, and, in fact, to the extent they'll help populate the Park when it's cold and dreary, that's a good thing. I don't feel the good folks at One Brooklyn have any priority interest in the Park, nor do I feel that way about the residents of One Main Street negatively impacting their adjacent playground. If I think about what type of change truly has a material impact on daily life I would say the addition of Trader Joe's is so much more relevant by a factor of 100 than the prospective addition of two apartment buildings at the end of Atlantic Avenue.

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. KRAMER: I've heard people argue that you can't have housing in
the Park, but I don't think of it that way. The boundaries of the Park may include the development parcels for legal and financial reasons, but when I walk by One Brooklyn I don't think it's a building in a park. I think it's a building adjacent to a park separated by a street and parked cars and then the Park begins. One Brooklyn is as much in our park as the Gramercy Park buildings are in their park.

So let's talk alternatives. You don't have to look very far to come up with an alternative, and I turn to the controlling language of the EIS. The EIS says: "The development program is based on analysis from 2004; however, the actual development will emerge as a result of competitive developer selection process, and, therefore, the development may be smaller if market conditions permit it because
of the value of the land and other
factors may well be different from
those assumed in this analysis."

So, here's the alternative.

Let's start the RFP process, see how
the revenue response materialize,
leave the Pier 6 development for
last --

MR. GOLEM: Your time is up.

MR. KRAMER: -- and go from
there. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

I'd like to remind everyone
that there is not a need to either
comment or debate suggestions made by
folks on either side of the issue.
This process is intended for everyone
to submit their ideas, their
alternatives to funding. And the
process is that we as the consultants
working with the Committee will
evaluate these pursuant to parameters
and considerations. So again, what
we're looking for are comments about
alternatives.

With that, the next speaker is Kate Collignon and followed by Alex Taylor.

MS. COLLIGNON: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Kate Collignon. I'm a member at large of the Community Advisory Committee. I'm a 15-year resident of Prospect Heights and frequent visitor to Pier 6, Pier 1 and Main Street -- the former Main Street Park with my son, who is greatly enjoying the new recreation facilities there.

I'm also proud to have worked with the City's Economic Development Corporation from 2000 through 2007, working very closely on the original agreement to -- for the City and the State to engage in creation of Brooklyn Bridge Park and for the Brooklyn Bridge Park Plan being created.

Arguments have been made about
whether there's an alternative to
housing for the Park. And the
assumption there is that housing is
in some way going to be detrimental
to park activities. I want to argue
that housing is actually a tremendous
asset to the park. Not only does it provide "eyes on the street" in terms
of increasing a sense of safety, it
has the potential to create even
greater levels of activity and use
within the Park. And if you think
about the great parks within the
City -- Central Park, Bryant Park was
already mentioned and Prospect
Park -- these are surrounded by
residential uses and part of their
fundamental character.

I think the fact that the
assumption that residential is going
to be bad is starting off in the
wrong place. Even before you get to
that, though, I and many different
agencies, consultants and community
members who have examined this for
over a decade have yet to see an
alternative revenue-generator that
can sustain an amenity of the scale
that we're talking about here.

First, on a market basis,
clearly there's no market for
commercial development at the
location or nearby the Park. There is
a market for hotel development, but
if you're going to do anything of
this scale that would be necessary to
generate revenue you're talking about
a theme park effectively. That's not
really what we're looking for here.
Other uses that there may be a market
for such as retail and big box are
not compatible with the Park. The
footprints for those are going to
take up so much space as to really
minimize the amount of park space
left over, and the amount of traffic
they're likely to generate is not
going to be compatible with park
uses.

I've heard a lot of very creative ideas about other revenue-generators that could be identified within the Park boundaries, and certainly to the extent that concessions can generate revenue to support the Park, I strongly support that and applaud that.

I don't think that's ever going to reach the level necessary to make this Park self-staining, which was what the expectation was from Day One. And if you look at any parks across the country you're not going to find that from concessions in those cases either.

Other opportunities that have been talked about have included indoor recreation space, and, in fact, there have been suggestions that housing has taken the place of indoor recreation space. In fact, there has even been historically
locations preserved for indoor recreation space on Pier 5. There's just not sufficient revenue to support that. And the expectation is that that's not only not going to be revenue-generator, it's probably not going to be self-staining, which has generally been the case for the vast majority of indoor recreation spaces. If a not-for-profit facility like the Y breaks even people are very, very happy about that.

In closing, we have an incredible opportunity to create an incomparable resource for local residents, Brooklyn residents, or residents citywide. The existing financing plan ensures that this Park, unlike Hudson Park, unlike so many other parks across the City, will not have to face very real, very fundamental operating funding shortfalls in the near future. I think the need for this funding
security is likely to become all the more stark in upcoming years as the impact of the recession becomes apparent on the public rolls and their ability to finance public services. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

The next speaker is Alex Taylor, followed by Robert Elmes.

MS. TAYLOR: Hi, Alex Taylor, 33 Willow Street, Brooklyn Heights, New York. My name is Alex Taylor and I live with my two children and husband in Brooklyn Heights.

We've anticipated this park for 18 years and have lived in Brooklyn and pleased with parks that have opened. We can now get down to the water and view the harbors are magnificent.

We are very disturbed by the recreational facilities long promised but have not materialized in the park. We're pleased that Senator
Squadron, an advocate for a
year-round recreational facility that
we can play soccer in cold months, or
an ice rink, or for a floating pool.
These recreational features will make
this Park useable for my family
because right now, really, there's
not much to do down there except look
at the terrific views like the view
from the Promenade.

We're concerned that the Park
is scheduled to have 5 more luxury
condo towers built on what should be
land dedicated to the Park.

I think the Park should pay for
itself with things appropriate for a
public park. Like all other parks,
if you collected rent from food
concessions inside the Park,
collected money from events that
occur in the Park, from parking fees
and retail that is planned for Empire
Stores be a long way for paying for
the Park without more housing.
My family would also be glad to pay to swim there, to ice-skate, for indoor gym sports. We would pay to have children's parties events there, park recreation facilities, too. And trust me, I paid a lot of money for parties in Brooklyn Heights. At Plymouth Church, Christ Church, Kids Club, Gym -- on and on. On and on. On Atlantic. It's good money here.

There's no -- there's such a need for year-round recreation in Brooklyn right now. My kids play soccer and in the winter the soccer is in private schools. If you have kids in different age groups you have to go from school to school in order to have your friends, your kids, play. I know that there's soccer fields planned for the Park. Last spring, because of work at Prospect Park playgrounds, they had 36 kids playing six different soccer games at any one time on a piece of land that
was the size of a baseball field, including their parents, other kids on the team, grandparents, all watching. I think it was a fire hazard for all of us to be cramped in that space. And there were 5 sets of games on any one day.

Prospect Park is redoing -- sorry, to get back -- Prospect Park is redoing their ice rink this year and there's no place to go. One mother told me that was their Saturday morning activity in the winter. They're not sure what they're going to do. Even when it is open, if you don't get there first thing, it's so overcrowded you can't even skate.

Again, we live in small apartments. Our houses are little. There are no backyards. With two young boys we're always looking for a place for them to run around and get, get out. The winter months gets
harder to get them their exercise
they need. Football living room is
not so much fun. A year-round sports
facility would do wonders and be good
money for the Park.

But housing inside the Park is
a slippery slope that has divided our
community and has gotten us away from
what we all seek, a wonderful park
that Brooklyn Heights can use
throughout the year. I hope you find
better ways for a long way to park
and private housing.

A friend of mine once said when
playing one of those games where you
have to shift one square to make room
for another square, "Right now we
have some open squares. Let's not
fill them with buildings but use them
for things we can really all enjoy."

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Again I'd
like to ask folks to hold their
applause.
The next speaker is Robert Elmes or El-Mes.

MR. ELMES: Elmes.

MR. GOLEM: Thanks.

Followed by John Alshuler.

MR. ELMES: My name is Robert Elmes, I'm the director of Galapagos Art Space. Also, we do DUMBO Kite Flying Society for Kids on the first Saturday of every month in Brooklyn Bridge Park.

We have thought a lot about the John Street location, and we think that in its little nook in the east end of the Park that it provides important "eyes on the park," creates use and comfort, it sort of surrounds the Park similar to what we feel occurs for the Kite Flying Society and just for the Brooklyn Bridge Park in general. It extends the nighttime comfort to the John Street area, which I think is sort of lacking up and around that nook, and creates
bathroom and social amenities that we think is a good idea.

    Self-funding creates independence for a self-funded performance space. If this is a park that wants to think independently, this is a good way to start. And we support the current financing plan. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

The next speaker is John Alshuler, followed by Christina Soto.

MR. ALSHULER: I'm John Alshuler. I'm the chairman of HR&A Advisors. We are a consultancy firm. We've done park financing plans for a very wide range of cities: Boston, Washington, D.C., Seattle, St. Louis, and about 15 others.

The very legitimate and complicated problem you're addressing tonight is one of major national significance. Building a park is only half the financial problem. The
present value of operating parks is roughly equal to the cost of construction, so the job of making a wonderful, great Brooklyn Bridge Park is only half done with the capital budget as provided.

I also deal with this issue in my personal and voluntary life. I chair the Board of the Friends of High Line, and I take the personal responsibility for raising $5 million a year in order to maintain that public space.

I'm strongly supportive of the existing plan. I'm strongly supportive for the following reasons:

1) The cost structure is entirely exorbitant. We've reviewed the cost, as I say, in at least 15 comparable locations. When you're building pier structures over water, when you're dealing with a park of regional significance, this park and its maintenance plan is fair, it's
reasonable, it's cost effective, you should be proud of it.

Secondly, as my colleague and friend Kate Collignon mentioned, housing in the Park is a tremendous asset for the Park. It will increase the hours in which it's used. It will make the Park safer, it will make the Park livelier.

Great parks are a function of the space of the park and the frame of what's around the park. This park is isolated from the rest of Brooklyn by a major interstate freeway and a substantial grade change. The introduction of life and energy into the spaces on the other side of the BQE are profoundly in the best interests in the children and the citizens of Brooklyn and will contribute mightily to making this a great park.

Finally, this is the appropriate revenue source. It's not
very complicated to figure out what
the all alternatives are. It's clear
that a concession strategy within the
Park is wholly unrealistic. There's
not a park of any size and scale in
the United States that can finance
this obligation off small-scale
concessions. That's an illusion.

You could tap the General Fund
to the City. Were you to do that you
would take money away from other
parks. You would take money away from
schools or police or fire. I don't
believe that's a viable option.

You could adopt a tax increment
financing scheme. That's simply
attacking the General Fund by some
other means. All a tax increment
is, is taking additional tax revenue
that we need for our Police
Departments, our Parks Department,
our children, our healthcare system.
So, while all a tax increment is, a
backdoor way of taking money away
from other important public uses.

You could adopt a BID, and you could transfer the obligation on to other abutting property owners.

This is a highly appropriate scheme when you have very large-scale commercial densities such as you have around Bryant Park, or you have around Union Square. I believe it would be highly inappropriate to the kind of character of development which abuts Brooklyn Bridge Park. It also is highly inappropriate to place the obligation for financing a park of regional significance upon a neighborhood that already carries too many burdens for transportation and infrastructure for our city.

So, the final choice you would have would be to raise the money privately. As somebody, who as I say, does this in far too many hours of my day and night, this is a major obligation. I believe it is very
difficult to try and raise that source of money out of one --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. ALSHULER: -- community.

To get the $5 million a year we need for Friends of the High Line out of the Manhattan community, in our business community, is an enormous challenge. So, I believe the solution that you have in place today will help create and sustain a great Brooklyn Bridge Park. It's fair, it's equitable. All the other alternatives are either unrealistic or profoundly unfair economically.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

The next speaker is Cristina Soto, followed by Ray Levin.

MS. SOTO: Hi, I'm Cristina Soto, 360 Furman Street, mother of two PS8 kids who enjoy staying fit at Pier 6.
I look forward to the Committee's findings on their investigation into alternative sources of funding for the Park. I hope that they will favor options that (a) don't take up more than the currently proposed 8 acres of development; (b) ensure that the Park will be fully funded and self-sustaining; (c) do not delay the creation of the Park in any way.

In lieu of such an alternative, I support the current project plan. Back to point A, taking up more than the currently proposed 8 acres of development, a Chelsea Piers-type model would be a very large footprint, if it was to be to the scale that it would need to be to generate enough funding. It also would employ a "pay to play" model, which is not what I consider a public use of land, and leaves out a large portion of the population. And when
you compare it to, say, for example, the footprint of the buildings at Pier 6, which could hardly yield one ball field, it doesn't seem like the more available option.

Point B, ensure that the Park will be fully funded and self-sustaining, this is something that is very, very important to me. Having grown up in New York City during a time when I could not step foot in under penalty of death by my parents into Union Square Park, Tompkins Square Park, Washington Square Park, Central Park most times of the day, Prospect Park, Bryant Park, I mean, you couldn't go in them. So, I think we need to make a park that not only gets created but is properly funded into the future forever. Otherwise, it can be a disaster.

To that point, housing in the Park could actually serve the added
purpose of "eyes on the park". The more people that have a vested interest in the Park, I think, the better. I also think that this is the far more likely byproduct of housing in the Park than the dreaded privatization and everybody keeping people out of their part of the Park. I've heard it compared -- I mean, that would be like saying, you know, Central Park is for people that live on Fifth Avenue, and I've heard it compared to Gramercy Park, but Gramercy Park is actually a private park. This would not be, and I don't think it would ever become that, with housing.

Point C was do not delay the creation of the Park. If the Board doesn't come to an agreement on the plan soon we will lose funding for part of the Park for Piers 2 and 3 and the Con Edison lot, and, in my opinion, that would just be a
tragedy.

So, if the Committee does come up with a solution, maybe having other buildings pay PILOTS will work. If that satisfies the criteria, then that would be great. But in conclusion, I'm for a great world class park for Brooklyn, for New York City, fully funded, self-sustaining and sooner rather than later.

MR. GOLEM: Okay. Thank you.

Next is Ray Levin followed by Sara Doar.

MR. LEVIN: Good evening. My name Raymond Levin. I live at One Main Street. I've lived there for the last almost 12 years. I've seen the parking lot at the foot of Main Street become a city park. And now it's part of the Brooklyn Bridge Park. It's a terrific park. I've seen the shipping piers also be converted into parkland, and I hope to see the completion of the piers
and the inclusion of the Con Edison
lot and Jay Street entrance also
become part of the Park.

I've been following the debate
on maintenance funding. I personally
believe the City should maintain its
parks and not place the burden on
sources outside the City budget, but
that's not to be. I also believe that
acquiring more land in order to --
such as the Watch Tower property, or
other land to develop and provide
income, is not in the cards.

To create tax increment
financing, which has never been done
in New York City, without opening the
floodgates throughout the City is not
a politically palatable way to
proceed. So, acquiring land, raising
taxes, will not see the light of day.

The use of a small portion of
already publicly-owned land, which is
the remnants of piers and warehouses
and other industrial non-park uses to
generate income to maintain this magnificent park is doable, practical, reasonable. Those who say this will privatize the Park have not walked on the Promenade, gone to Battery Park City, seen City Planning Commission's requirements that public waterfront open space be provided in all private developments.

All this being said, I endorse the General Project Plan and urge you to adopt it. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Great, thank you. Next is Sara Doar, followed by Gale Bartholomew.

MS. DOAR: Hi, I'm Sara Doar. I live at 143 Willow Street, Brooklyn, New York.

I am a mother of four kids. They all play lots of soccer and baseball, so I'm a really avid user of New York City parks.

I came tonight because I am concerned that some of the
alternative park funding plans recently discussed have significant shortcomings and may delay construction: 1. Restaurants and other concessions may produce some revenue, but I hate to see what the Park would look like if you needed to earn $16 million annually. Are we thinking Coney Island, Chelsea Piers or South Street Seaport?

The Jehovah property presents interesting options, but there are too many unknowns at this point. Please consider only proposals that do not affect more than the 8 acres currently slated for building. Fully fund the Park's operation and maintenance in a way that is not tied to City budget cycles. And most important, allow park construction to continue according to schedule.

Remember that the Housing in the Park Plan was subject to intense review by several parties. The
cluster approach has been widely used in other settings, and, in this case, places housing on relatively marginal land. I'm down there a lot, and the footprint of the buildings in question isn't really big enough to accommodate a full-size baseball or soccer field.

You must also remember the qualitative benefits of housing in the Park. It provides a community of people who will work to keep this world class facility safe, clean and functioning for all of New York City to enjoy. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Gale Bartholomew, followed by Kevin McCall.

MS. BARTHOLOMEW: Good evening. My name is Gale Bartholomew. I reside at 170 East 51st Street. I work at Build Brooklyn Organization, which is not-for-profit organization, and from work I just heard about this
meeting today. But I must say I know about Brooklyn Bridge Project. And I have a five-year-old daughter, and when I discovered the Park was being built three years ago we enjoy going there, because there was hardly anywhere for us to go. We would have to travel into Manhattan all the time. And in my community it's totally -- where I live it's totally different, so I really enjoy that Park. And I am looking forward with my five-year-old daughter, and I also take many kids from our community there to play. So, I really do hope we provide more recreation for the children of Brooklyn, the future, so they will have somewhere to go, because I go to support the Brooklyn Museums a lot, I travel into Central Park, Chelsea Piers, also Stuyvesant Town, everywhere with my daughter. And sometimes I do not have the time to travel that far. So, I really
hope that you guys consider more recreation along with housing for the Brooklyn Project, and that's what I came here today to say.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Kevin McCall followed by Linda Derosa.

MR. McCALL: Good evening, everyone. My name is Kevin McCall. I'm representing the people of East New York-Brownsville. I'm here today in support of this project because people on the other side, man, we don't have things like you all have to look at, to visit, to come to, to see the -- you know, Brooklyn Bridge Park is like something that is a world that we never, really never had. And, you know, yes, we got the Prospect Park. Yes, we got other parks in Brooklyn. But when this is completely built with the housing and all the things that is being put
together now, it's going to be fantastic.

And we need people that is going -- we need people like Regina and everybody else to really to support this and put this on the forefront of their agenda because, you know, the economy is going up and down, and, you know, with the housing that's being created, that's creating jobs, and, you know, we need a lot of jobs. You know, the unemployment rate went up. A lot of people has been laid off. So with this housing, part of the Park, it will be a great atmosphere for the people of Brooklyn because Brooklyn is just a borough in itself. No disrespect to other boroughs. I'm with Marty Markowitz. I'm the cheerleader for Brooklyn, because we really need something for us to go to because there's nothing else. We shouldn't have to pay, you know, we're going to have to pay more
next year. We shouldn't have to pay $5 just to go to the city. Why don't we just stay here and pay $2.50 to stay right here in Brooklyn and support the Brooklyn Park and we go to the park. And these kids, they ride their skateboards. Now they can go in the Park and ride the skateboards and see, you know, the different attributes of New York City and what New York City has to offer. Because we just need that, and I'm just here to support those efforts and to really be a champion and speak for those young people, those seniors, and also the youth that really cannot speak for themselves.

I'm here today to support the Park fully. A hundred percent. And I'm here also today to tell whoever that is against it you have to think about the brighter side, not just today, but also 5 years from now when you have children? You have your --
1
2    the children's children. You have to
3    think about the future, because
4    tomorrow is not promising no one.
5    Thank you.
6    MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.
7    Next is Linda Derosa, and
8    following will be Marron Doherty.
9    MS. DEROSA: Yes. Hi. I'm
10    Linda Derosa and I'm the Vice
11    President of the Willow Town
12    Association. Our address is 26
13    Willow Place. And I am also a member
14    of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Defense
15    Fund Board. And as Willow Town
16    president Ben Banks (phonetic) said
17    in his statement last week at these
18    hearings, Willow Town Board Piers 5
19    and 6 in Brooklyn Bridge Park is
20    greatly impacted by whatever happens
21    at these piers and really the entire
22    Park. And so we're going to watch
23    with great interest what develops,
24    and especially Pier 5, which is
25    scheduled to open in 2012.
In 2005 Willow Town Association adopted a 7-point platform program entitled "Fighting For Public Treasures on the Brooklyn Water Front." The points of that plan were a park in keeping with the 13 original guiding principles that were adapted in 1992: Creation of an affordable waterfront park that can become a real public treasure; no new residential housing in the Park; income-producing uses other than housing; greater access to the park via public transportation and foot traffic availability through additional roadways, and an affordable maintenance budget. Oh, one more, respect for the surrounding neighborhoods and the residents of the neighborhoods.

This Park is well along in becoming the public treasure that we called for, and the way that Pier 1 and 6 have been panning out is great
witness to what can be happening in
the Park in the future.

Also, last March Willow Town
Association President, along with
representatives of other neighborhood
groups, met with a century-old
independent advocacy group in New
York called New Yorkers for Parks.
Interestingly, that organization did
a study in 2008 on the very subject
of this hearing. The result is a
report called "Supporting Our Parks:
A Guide to Alternative Revenue
Strategies."

And so we recommend to this
Board and Bay Area Economics that
they take a look at this study, which
is really almost the same focus of
what you're here today to review. It
calls for a self-sustaining mandate
and the difficulty that would be
created in such a park especially in
poor economic times.

And here are a few suggestions
that study came up with.
Leveraging concessions to support
maintenance and operations of the
Park. Create conservancies and our
friend groups to create private
support. Generate income-free --
generate income from for-fee
attendance uses such as for
filmmakers and other such film shoots
and sort of, you know, photo shoots
for magazines and such. Seek a tenant
for the Empire Stores in the Park
that will lift the history of what
the Empire Stores is all about. And
as mentioned before, this part of the
Empire Stores was where George
Washington once crossed the East
River. Establish a Park Improvement
District, a PED [sic], sort of like a
Business Improvement District.

So there are ways to pay for
the Park without privatization, or
put housing in the Park, which
essentially in some instances would
privatize it by having people live there.

The community has offered many, options over the years, and at last week's meeting and at tonight's meeting. And if this is a real process then we have to listen to all of these options. And if these options don't come to be then we want to really urge Senator Squadron and Councilwoman Millman to end the pain and simply veto the housing that's now focused on being developed for the Park, and hopefully we can get back to a real park with no housing.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Marron Doherty, followed by David Flemming.

MR. DOHERTY: Thank you. Good evening, everybody. Is it cold in here? My fingers are starting to turn blue.

My name is Marron Doherty. I
live at 236 Baltic Street, and I'm a lifelong resident of New York and a 15-year resident of Brooklyn.

I recently joined the Junior Committee of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Conservancy, and I'm here to fully support the current development plan.

I'm hearing a lot of talk about concessions and soaking the people, who -- the businesses that make up that neighborhood and make DUMBO so vibrant, and, in essence, imposing upon them an unfair cost for a park that's not going to be used only by Brooklynites but by people from every borough and potentially every country in the world.

Now, I don't think it's viable to have an institution like Chelsea Piers, or South Street Seaport, the latter of which is actually going bankrupt as we speak. And not only would those institutions not be self-staining, they might actually cost
the Park money in the long run.

The footprint that we're talking about is, objectively speaking, very small. It's 8 percent of the total land that would be devoted to the Park. And it's in a location that isn't going to obstruct the usage of the Park.

I'm in favor, of course, of recreation for children. I'm in favor of adding more recreation to the park. But in terms of the financial density necessary to support this Park, what we really need is the kind of high-end housing that the current development project calls for.

You know, a lot of people have come up here and have said that, you know, such-and-such makes money, makes "good money," you know. What is "good money"? It's going to cost $16 million a year to maintain this Park once it's fully built out. I
don't think that that money can be raised from concessions. The New York Parks Department doesn't think that that money can be raised from concessions. So, even though my resume may not be as impressive as some of the other folks who stepped up here to talk tonight, I strongly believe, and I'm actually, I'm speaking for people who have a lot more knowledge of this than I have, I'm just reading their words, I strongly believe the current development proposal should be followed, and that any other proposal, if adopted, ought to take into consideration the size of the Park, the size of the footprint that's currently planned to be utilized for the in-park financing. And the fact that we don't want this to turn into a kind of -- I think someone said "pay for play" earlier, where we're charging people
for movies and ice skating and, you
know, with the current plan these are
all recreations that could eventually
be added to the Park at no cost to
the public. And I don't think that
privatizes the Park. I think that
makes it more accessible and more
enjoyable to the public. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next
speaker is David Flemming, followed
by Gary Vanderputten.

MR. FLEMMING: Good evening.
My name David Flemming. I live on
264 Court Street, and I rise in
emotional, personal and nontechnical
support of the apartment financing
plan we have had, and we currently
have, on the table.

It did occur to me just a
second ago I was trying to wonder, a
thought crossed my mind: What makes
the people who live on the foot of
Joralemon Street, live in the Park.
Any less or more than the people who
would live in the towers on the

corner of -- at the foot of Atlantic

Avenue? It occurred to me just this

very second.

I grew up down by Columbia

Place during some of the Brooklyn

glory days, when all the kids were

outside and everywhere, which I'm

sure many or at least some of you --

here can appreciate. At the bottom of

the street was always the black hole.

The black hole, the barely working

and then closed and totally

inaccessible waterfront piers. We

couldn't, and didn't, even think

about the waterfront, let alone the

waterside, except on the Promenade.

It didn't exist. It didn't -- and

even as we were just a hundred yards

from it.

I spent just under 40 years of

my 52 years in the two neighborhoods

of the Heights of the Cobble

Hill-Carol Gardens area, 16 years in
Cobble Hill, and the last 11 years we've lived on the border in Carol Gardens on Court Street. I've not traveled far, clearly.

Open green space was always what western Brooklyn was dearly missing, so this new park is a literal dream come true. And so I think it be would for all of us here and throughout the extended communities all throughout Brooklyn. Thus, when I first stepped onto the new Pier 1 space last spring I literally had tears in my eyes. I still well up almost every time. It's a wonderful start, but it's not enough, not yet.

As a Cobble Hill resident and as a lifetime New York City Brooklyn blood native, I want that kind of inspired space and beauty all the way down to the foot of Atlantic Avenue, period. Then this Park will be a worldwide reckoned-with park with
which to be proud and awed. One that can take our breath away every time we visit. It will also, as designed, be one that we could all use heavily, ball fields galore right under the skyline, running and riding past access to the actual water, literally on the water; places to wander up and down, trees to sit under, places to cuddle, stroll, scramble, and take your whole families and your dates. It will be our Central Park, Riverside Park, Prospect Park, on waterfront skyline steroids right under and beside our Brooklyn Bridge. That's the park I want.

The one I see in design and has now been promised, the one that has already been started and committed to, that's our park. And this park stands a chance to live among the great ones of them all. A city jewel and treasure, a chance to literally alter the dynamic and character not
only of western Brooklyn but all of
New York City. A chance to stand
with San Fran's Golden State Park,
Vancouver's Stanley Park, even our
nation's Grand Canyon. Seriously,
that's how dramatic our skyline
harbor and waterfront is. And that is
this Park's potential and future, I
truly believe, as designed.

Now, as far as I'm concerned,
beyond the two towers package and its
8.2-acre minimal footprint, the plans
already have plenty enough buildings
of commercial facilities scattered
throughout. No more. Please. The
last thing this park should be is
another South Street Seaport or
Chelsea Piers. Nor even, forgive me,
western, Manhattan Westsider, Hudson
River Park. That would be a blown
and missed opportunity for us all,
and a tragedy as far as I'm
concerned. And if all it takes to
get the kind of green, open, rolling,
sloping beauty promised and agreed to in the design that I've been seeing, and not one foot less, that kind of urban yet natural breathtaking splendor, that kind of unique opportunity and setting, if all it takes now to get this built, finished and financially exist are essentially those two pencil thin apartment buildings where they are currently slated to be, then glory be, let's keep it moving. Given everything that I've seen, that's a pill easily worth swallowing.

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. FLEMMING: We should not settle for one drop less of open green and landscape and parkland that's already been designed, presented and promised to us. If by some sort of accounting and political miracle we can achieve every bit of that same park no less via some deal with the Jehovah buildings, or some
other tax deal that would not harm or
take away from the interests of the
City or Borough, well, then, we
should be all leaders. But it had
better be ready and on the table now.
The City better be amenable and ready
to agree now. And it must add up,
because this Park, as envisioned,
started and now promised to us all,
has got to be built and delivered as
fast as humanly possible before our
slivers of hope and financing
promised, and to come, actually dry
up or get yanked away from us by the
whims of economy or misfortune. We
all know what's financially going on
around us --

MR. GOLEM: Your time is up.

MR. FLEMMING: Thank you very
much.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is
Gary Vanderputten followed by Andrew
Reynolds.

MR. VANDERPUTTEN: Hi. I'm
Gary Vanderputten, 28 Old Fulton Street. I am currently on the Brooklyn Park Conservancy, also go back to the original coalition. I've been on the Parks Community Council and all its iterations since it existed. I'm a past president of Fulton Ferry Landing.

I'm speaking on behalf of myself, though. And first of all, I want to thank you for the Park. Every day I look at it. I get up in the morning, I look at it, and there it is. It's just fabulous, so thanks for that so far.

I would welcome any plan you guys can come up with that can meet the current financial requirements and hopefully reduce even the size of some of these buildings that you may have to build. However, if no such alternatives are found then I would support the current plan.

I do want to make two points,
though. One is about housing and the other is about capital maintenance.

During my 10 years of active involvement with the Park prior to 2005 I mean, there was really no mention of housing. It was never talked about. In 2003 your predecessor Jim Moogan (phonetic) came to Fulton Ferry Landing, gave a presentation about what was probably going to happen on Pier 1. Now, we've always been told that we would get a hotel-like structure, so he presented what was then in 2003 the concept for Pier 1, which was this big hotel.

During the Q&A someone from the audience -- there may have been maybe 20 people there, which was a good meeting for Fulton Ferry Landing -- said, "Why do we have to have a hotel? Why can't we have residential?" Now, this really stopped all discussion. Everybody was really stunned. And so they
started talking about it. And the points they were making were "well, it extends our residential community to the footprint, the doorstep of the Park. It would put 'eyes on the park'"; an expression we've heard all night. There would be people there in the winter, and most important, which is an important thing for Fulton Ferry Landing, is the vehicular traffic is really what we're most afraid of in the Park, is that all these commercial traffic that would support a hotel is really a big problem. Less vehicular traffic for residents.

They further said that there would be more pro-housing than any other commercial, you know, like, especially a Chelsea Piers. That would just kill our neighborhood with thousands of cars.

It was interesting. They did a vote and it was unanimous among the
people there. Now, I don't know how Fulton Ferry feels today. They're here, they can tell you themselves. It was very interesting for me. So I never -- it never occurred to me that this would be a real viable alternative. So, in 2005 there was. It was not quite a surprise.

Also, I worked for years around Battery Park in various buildings there. I was at that park almost every day. You know, surrounded by, it's a fabulous park. I go to Long Island City. I have friends there. They say it's fabulous. They live in one of those buildings. There's park -- no one seems to have this problem with housing, I mean, so if it comes down to apartment housing or no park, I vote for the Park with housing.

The other point, this is an echo from someone who was from Hudson River Park, it's about capital
maintenance. But myself, I lived near Central Park for years in the '60s and '70s. I don't know if anybody was up there at that point in time, but it was a really amazing place to be, with be-ins, and you really just watched it deteriorate in a 10-year period, just really awful. The Sheep Meadow was like, was hard scape. Same thing at the Great Lawn in Prospect Park. I mean, they were all at the mercy of these declining --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. VANDERPUTTEN: -- declining budgets.

The point was that people still went to these parks. As crappy as they got, people went to the parks. This is not so with a waterfront park. With a waterfront park, when they get crappy they get dangerous, they fall in the water. East River Park. And then you have to wait for some sort of what's the -- earmark to
come along and bail it out. I really -- I've looked at the Marine Maintenance Plan you guys have come up here. I believe that's the only way to go. I've heard talk "why don't you take that out of the plan?" You can't. You have to have a maintenance plan. So I'm done.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Andrew Reynolds followed by Jane McGroarty.

MR. REYNOLDS: My name is Andrew Reynolds. I've lived at 37 Joralemon Street for the last 25 years. I'm on the Willow Town Association Board, currently its treasurer.

I just don't understand how these PILOTs payments move taxes work. They're totally mysterious to me. If you want something which doesn't deprive the City of revenue it's already entitled to, it certainly can't be chosen. What
you're doing is it's no new revenue stream; rather, a tax rate of lower the normal real estate taxes it's charged, and the proceeds are directed solely towards park maintenance. But where does the money come from to pay for all the City services which would be required for the new housing, the policemen, the firemen, the sanitation, the road maintenance, schools, water and sewer services? Why, it comes from the general revenues generated by the General Revenue Fund. So either the existing such services are diluted to cover the needs of the new luxury condos and everyone suffers from a reduction of city services, or additional funds from the general revenues are required to pay for additional services. That is, additional taxes paid for by those who did not buy these multimillion-dollar condos. The only possible
beneficiary to this scheme are those who can afford luxury housing. I think we've already had more than enough tax benefits for the very wealthy.

Since the City Parks Department designed and built the northern end of the DUMBO Park in DUMBO, finished it in 2006 for $7 million, there was an incredible rise in real estate taxes in the DUMBO community. The DUMBO taxes alone should be sufficient justification for this park has more than paid for itself. It doesn't need to pay one more thin dime to this system. Let it enjoy the revenue stream it has already created. And if we are to have private housing inside our parks, this is a huge public policy decision. New York State forbids housing in state parks.

Where is the public debate? It has been by proxy to our votes. We
have successfully gotten rid of the politicians who advocated for this policy, but with the current Mayor at the helm maybe this isn't enough. Maybe we need a referendum on the next ballot to prevent this from happening, or to allow it for other parks. But right now, today, we have the opportunity to simply say "no" to housing. Find another way to pay for this Park. But do not alienate the parklands forever with private housing. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Jane McGroarty followed by Sandra Sanchez.

MS. STANTON: (Phonetic) I'm Judy Stanton speaking for Jane McGroarty of the Brooklyn Heights Association on whose behalf I am testifying.

The Brooklyn Heights Association strongly supports the General Project Plan for the Brooklyn Heights Association.
Bridge Park and the fiscally sound and reliable revenue-generating mechanisms it relies upon to ensure the Park's financial self-sustainability.

We commend the Committee on Alternatives to Housing on its efforts to explore other options for generating the revenue needed to fund the Park's maintenance and operations, and we look forward to reviewing its findings.

As the Committee carries out its mission we urge you to consider only those funding alternatives that meet the following criteria. The development footprint required must not exceed the approximately 8 acres of parkland presently reserved for revenue in the general --

MR. GOLEM: I'm sorry.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Microphone.

MS. STANTON: Thank you.

The development footprint
required must not exceed the proposed
8 acres of parkland.

(Unidentified voices from the
audience.)

MS. STANTON: Is that okay? I've
got a loud voice. I really shouldn't
need a mike.

MR. GOLEM: Is the microphone
on? I know these mikes are turned on
pretty high.

MS. STANTON: The development
footprint required must not exceed
the approximately 8 acres of the
parkland presently reserved for
revenue generation in the General
Project Plan. The revenue stream
produced must guarantee that the Park
operations and capital maintenance
are fully funded and allow the Park
to be self-sustaining.

The revenue stream generated
must be guaranteed and should be
insulated as much as possible against
the vicissitudes of a complex
economy. The funding alternative proposal must not cause any delay in the building of the Park. The proposals should be compatible with surrounding park and neighborhood uses and must maintain the protected view corridor for the Brooklyn Heights Promenade. Concentrate development on the upland side of the Park and at the Park's three entrances to help create vital active urban junctions.

On a separate note, for those of us who regularly experience the Park, it is clear the residence of One Brooklyn Bridge Park Condominium have not coopted the Park and claimed it as their private backyard. Rather, our good neighbor's presence has enriched and enlivened the Park. We do not fear the presence of additional neighbors living adjacent to this magnificent park. They will merely join the tens of thousands of
us who every day are in awe by the wonders of this magical place.

We thank you for your commitment to hastening the building of our magnificent Brooklyn Bridge Park.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.

Next is Sandra Sanchez followed by Sarah Butler.

MS. SANCHEZ: Good evening. My name is Sandra Sanchez, and I am a lifelong member of the Brooklyn community and represent the Seventh Day Adventist community as well as an urban planning major at NYU. I've studied extensively the beauty of the City as an urban sprawl and mostly we focused onto Manhattan. And I always thought to myself, as someone raised in Brooklyn, What about Brooklyn?

The Brooklyn Bridge Park and its continued development is a magnet that is vital and essential to the harmonious urbanization in the age
where obesity is as -- is our common

cold. The importance of community

and community public space cannot be

measured nor neglected. Parks

provide a space to enjoy a leisure

walk and a bike ride.

Furthermore, it is a willing
testament of the beauty of Brooklyn,

not the beauty of Manhattan, but the

beauty of Brooklyn.

As communities continue to

flourish, harmony among the spacial,

social and environmental aspects of

the City, and between their

inhabitants become a paramount of

importance. Harmony hinges on two

key pillars, which are equity and

sustainability. This is exactly what

the Brooklyn Bridge has done and can

continue to do in the future.

Housing has the ability to advance

the prosperity of its inhabitants

while achieving equitable social

outcomes and fostering sustainable
use of resources.

   It is for this reason I support the current self-sustaining financial plan that will help guarantee the completion of the Park in an efficient and effective manner.

   The Brooklyn Bridge Park is located in a dynamic waterfront area, and for this reason it perpetuates the illusion that maintenance is more expensive. But in reality, the Brooklyn Bridge Park is consistent with the operating costs of most waterfront parks.

   The preeminent way to help fund the expenses of the Park would be to have a practical and perpetual source of funding. Housing is an asset and would be the most logical way to provide land-efficient use.

   Studies have shown that housing in close proximity to parks will not compromise the prosperity of the neighborhood and community in which
it is located. In fact, parks along
with housing serve as a point of
social integration. Parks
especially are the people who
inhabit and frequent them.

I urge the community to move
forward with the sustainable
financial plan for the Brooklyn
Bridge Park. It is a perfect balance
of spatial and territorial
development particularly through the
investments in the urban and
interurban infrastructure and
services. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is
Sarah Butler followed by Jerry
Foister (phonetic).

MS. BUTLER: Hello. I'm Sarah
Butler. I'm a resident of 78
Congress Street in Columbia, which is
just south of the Pier 6, Brooklyn
Bridge Park. I want to thank you for
this opportunity to address Brooklyn
Park's financial plan and possible
alternatives.

I do support the current financial plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park and the committee on alternatives to retain this plan going forward to ensure the completion of the Park, including Piers 2, 3 and the Con Ed lot in DUMBO without delay.

The current financing plan, which allows 8 acres of development to support 70 acres of public park is self-staining and, therefore, not subject to unpredictable budget cycles. This plan fully provides a steady source of income to park maintenance and ensures that Brooklyn Bridge Park will be well maintained in the foreseeable future.

As a resident of the Columbia Water Street District just south of the Pier 6, I find the opposition's assumption that housing would serve to privatize the Park to be
unfounded. The generous expansions of Piers 1 through 6 is now serving an entirely new set of Brooklyn and New York City as a whole as it reaches across six piers. I personally use the Park daily as a runner and by no means see further development as damaging to the Park's original focus as a community park as well as a public gathering place.

The Brooklyn Bridge Park Development Corporation General Project Plan as released in 2005 was the subject of serious examination and thoughtful deliberation following the creation of the Park Master Plan. In addition, the current plan only uses 10 percent of the Park footprint, not the 20 percent initially contemplated. Devoting 8 acres of the Park's footprint to development, including housing, and unlimited hotel use to support over 70 acres of the Park simply makes
sense. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Jerry Foister followed by William Ringler.

Do we have -- Jerry Foister's not here.

William Ringler? And if I could ask just so everyone knows, we're probably a little bit less than half the speakers I have cards for here, so as I call folks, if you're the second one up if you could come to the front and be ready to go, it will help us get to all the speakers sooner and have their chance to offer their perspectives.

MR. RINGLER: My name is William Ringler. I live in Willow Town.

The question is do the current condo owners at 360 Furman Street know you're planning to build two towers next to them? Where are you going to reimburse them? Where are
you going to get the money to
reimburse them of the
losses (inaudible)? Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.

Next is Juliana Dubovsky followed by
Robert Pirani.

MS. DUBOVSKY: Hi. Again,
Juliana Dubovsky speaking on behalf
of New Yorkers for Parks, 355
Lexington Avenue.

New Yorkers for Parks is a
citywide independent organization
dedicated to ensuring that all New
Yorkers enjoy a world class park
system. New Yorkers For Parks
achieves its purpose through an
integrated framework of advocacy,
research and a coalition of parks,
open space through advocacy and
civics organizations.

We would like to thank the
Brooklyn Bridge Park Subcommittee on
Alternatives to Housing, with the
assistance of Bay Area Economics
consulting, for their efforts to solicit public input on alternative funding opportunities for the Park. We also commend the many local community members and advocacy groups who continue to contribute to the public discussion on the future of the Park.

Long-term budget planning for the maintenance and operations of city parks is hampered by chronic funding volatility, much of which is attributable to fluctuating economic cycles.

While New York City has undertaken an enormous citywide park-building campaign, current maintenance funding for the Parks Department, when adjusted for inflation, is less than it was in 1986. This budget reality is not unique to New York City, and it has led a growing number of communities across the country to look toward
revenue-generating alternatives that
can supplement fluctuating government
funds.

The 2002 Memorandum of
Understanding between the City and
State of New York requires the Park
to be self-sustaining. It is now the
tasks of the Park's governing body to
develop a strategy that would provide
adequate long-term funding that will
address the rising costs of
maintenance and operations faced in
today's parks.

NY4P has been advocating for
New York City's parks for over a
hundred years, and time after time
our experience has shown us that a
community will only realize benefits
from parks if the parks themselves
are in good condition. In other
words, despite physical challenges
parks must be kept in good condition
if they are to bestow any benefits on
the surrounding community.
In addition, the rising costs, overall, the character of Brooklyn Bridge Park, presents additional challenges to maintenance. First, its unique location, with unmatched use of Manhattan and the Brooklyn Bridge, and its sophisticated design courtesy of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates, who tracked a high rate of the visitor-ship. This will put greater demands on the physical structures of the Park and the characteristics of the Park that adds to maintenance challenges and costs of its proximity to the water and reliance on multiple pier structures.

Waterfront parks are far more costly than inland parks due to their infrastructure, and the faster pace of deterioration due to salty air.

In April of this year, New Yorkers For Parks Published "Supporting Our Parks: A Guide to Alternative in Revenue Strategies,"
which I'll leave on the desk for you, guys. This report presents a wide range of strategies that have been used to generate revenue for city, state, and federal parks across the country. A mix of commercial, residential and cultural revenue programs to generate funding for parks. Their report also explores a variety of tax structures that can help finance parks. Unfortunately, there is no silver bullet solution. And each park in its generating-revenue model is as unique as the community it is located in.

In many cases, if not most, the finance solutions were a product of community negotiations and compromises, and the final revenue-generating model was a unique balance that met the needs of the Park, the community, and the marketplace.

One example of a
self-supporting park is the Presidio, San Francisco. In 1994 this former military installation was to be sold to developers at market rate, but the outcry in the Bay Area was so great the government relented and a compromise was struck. The Presidio Trust was created in 1996 with the mandate to be self-sufficient by 2012. They achieved that in 2005 to accomplish this trust sold (inaudible) former military houses at market rate, leased hundreds of thousands of square feet of commercial space, allowed (inaudible) film to construct a new corporate campus, and is currently reviewing a plan to build a new art museum which would pay market rate ground leases. Even with all this market activity, however, it must still supplement its leasing revenues for the long-term fundraising and endowment campaign that will raise fifty to a hundred
million additional dollars.

New Yorkers for Parks urges the Committee to continue its efforts to identify a flexible funding strategy that will provide dependable revenue for this world class park, minimize any non-park uses of the Park --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MS. DUBOVSKY -- be respectful of the character of the surrounding community. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Robert Pirani followed by Paul Thompson.

MR. PIRANI: Good evening. My name is Rob Pirani. I'm the Vice President For Environmental Programs at Regional Plan Association. RPA is a non-profit research planning and advocacy organization that operates in the New York Metropolitan area.

Thanks so much for this opportunity to address the Panel and share our thoughts on the financing
plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park. We share with the Panel, the many people in the room, a great desire to see this Park move forward and believe it will be a terrific addition to the number of waterfront parks now being constructed all over New York City.

The financing plan, of course, the need for such plan, really there's no doubt. The stewardship of the City's waterfront parks that are being created is very expensive, and I think everyone recognizes that the large amounts of hard scape and furnishing the heavy usage, the linear nature of waterfront parks, most of all, of course, their location in the coastal zone with piers and platforms and other maritime infrastructure makes them very, very expensive.

Several years ago we surveyed the costs of operating waterfront parks, both large and small, in New
York City, no and found an average of about $135,000 an acre was the cost. The proposed budget for Brooklyn Bridge Park is somewhat higher, but I think it's accurate in the sense that it reflects the fact that Brooklyn Bridge Park has many, many more pilings and piers to take care of than, let's say, Battery Park or many of the other waterfront parks in the City, so it's certainly a reasonable cost.

I would note that we join New Yorkers for Parks in believing that the funding currently allocated to maintain and program New York City's parkland is inadequate in terms of the General Operating Fund, and for that reason the Memorandum of Understanding that was created in 2002 mandated that Brooklyn Bridge Park be self-sustaining. It's unfortunate, but until we as a people and our elected representatives
change that allocation of the General Operating Fund this is the world we live in.

Given this reality, we do support the current financing plan and believe that the use of residential and limited hotel uses as a primary source of income is both appropriate and really the only option that's available to the Park in many ways. It poses many advantages. Many other speakers have noted the fact that it will be adding more "eyes to the park"; the fact that the residential uses can create a base population that helps sustain other services that we all enjoy in the Park, whether it's ferry uses, or restaurants and cafes; and also they're very land-efficient, they're very viable in terms of the amount of funding that would be generated.

The only other use that we would note would be big box retail
that can possibly generate the same amount of money, and we think that would be inappropriate for the Park.

We believe that concerns over privatization of the Park can be addressed both by design and programming. The plan does a good job of separating the housing from the Park through streets and other public spaces. We also support the use of restaurants, cafes, other local retail on the first floor of the proposed development to add to the public quality of those streets and again minimize the idea of these being private enclaves.

We would also suggest that the operation funding being discussed for the Park include the use for to create substantial public programming that can be used to track people not just for the immediate neighborhood but from all over Brooklyn, and ensure that in fact the Park does
belong to all the people in Brooklyn and the City as a whole.

We do remain concerned over the scale of some of the proposed towers. The gateways to the Park at Atlantic Avenue and Fulton Ferry Landing as well as John Street must be beautiful iconic arrival points. And we don't believe the Park should be dominated by the tall towers currently envisioned by the park plan. And while that may be necessary to generate the income needed, we would suggest that the consultant also assess the possibility of creating a Park Improvement District. Several years ago we did a study for Friends of Hudson River Park --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. PIRANI: -- that looked at the value created by the Park in a two-block area of Greenwich Village. We found that 20 percent of the value of that real estate was attributable
to the Park. And the fact that that park was beautiful and well maintained, as we know this Park will be, generated over $200 million according to local property owners. And we feel it might be appropriate to think about how other property owners enjoying the Park might through a Business Improvement District or Park Improvement District help contribute, not replace, the plan currently that exists but perhaps to defray some of its costs.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Paul Thompson followed by John Watts.

MR. THOMPSON: Good evening. My name is Paul Thompson. I'm the Principal of the Urban Assembly School of Music and Art. We are a public high school servicing about 400 students. We are located at 49 Flatbush Extension.

All of our students pretty much
are from Brooklyn. About 80 percent receive free or reduced lunch. Being that we are literally uphill from the Park, it has become a real extension of our classroom. So we encourage, really, any development of the Park so that we can continue to use it in the state that it has been in and what it will grow to be.

I would say that I am certainly no expert in these funding plans, but I am unfortunately becoming an expert in managing budgets that are subject to unprecedented budget cycles. So I would just encourage you to please seek a grounded and reasonable funding solution so that we can continue to enjoy the Park and use it as inspiration for our students.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM:  Great. Thank you.

The next speaker is John Watts followed by David Glick.

MR. WATTS:  I'd rather not turn
my back to you --

MR. GOLEM: Excuse me. If you turn your microphone around so that we all can hear you.

MR. WATTS: This thing makes a lot of noise when you mess with it.

Anyway, my name is John Watts. I live on Pierrepont Place, which is one house next to the playground up near the Promenade, and I've worked on this park project since late -- since the '70s, about 30 years. And I think it's just wonderful, and I think I agree with just about everything that's been said.

I think we have a good plan. We've had fantastic leadership in Regina, and I see some of the folks who, like Gary and Sue, Ben Crane and others, that have worked on it for years and years.

I just want to make a comment about housing. I'm quite much in the camp of those who say having people
in the Park is really important. Not only for the positives, but if you look at the parks around the world -- I'm kind of a park nut and I've been in parks from Istanbul to Seattle -- if there's a highway, of active highway alongside of a waterfront park, you can see it right here in the East River Park, you can see it up on the East River further, you can see it around part of the park that is the approach to La Guardia from JFK, with a big highway, even a very nice park with water on the other side, is very likely used. I saw that every day with the worst ferry traffic from my house to where I could take it everyday to my office. So, I think it prevents any kind of vacant park.

We did start out, the 13 principles someone mentioned, were written by John Bengat (phonetic) and by me, but it was what everybody had
in mind at that time. And we then thought that the City would bear the replacement cost of the pilings. We then found that the real deal in the political realm was that the capital costs, capital maintenance, as well as the ongoing park maintenance was necessary. And if you look at your, just a point I'd like to make, if you look at that little picture that's on the back of your sheet, you can see that what we were then working with was the buildings in Pier 1 and 2 and Empire Stores, which were there. We didn't know that One Brooklyn Bridge Park would be -- dedicated its revenues, its tax revenues would be dedicated to the Park, which was a great thing. But at that time we thought those buildings would carry because it was going to be people there in the hotel, and in the Stores, and we thought that they would carry the maintenance. When we
began to really understand how expensive it was to replace those pilings, we realized that something was needed. As it turned out, it's quite clear, as everybody said, that even One Brooklyn Bridge Park, which is really lucky to get it because it's just frankly a fig leaf [sic] for taking city money that would otherwise have gone to the City, it's a payment in lieu of taxes, taxes would have gone to the City. But that still wasn't enough, so it was needed, more housing, and it is a fact that many years ago we -- the early plans considered having brownstones all along the -- underneath the Promenade to block the noise and also to generate more revenue, but they couldn't be very high because of the height restriction. So, a lot of people who have really gotten angry about housing in the Park I think are wrong
because it's my feeling, as many people have said, the housing bounding the Park makes it a lot better.

But the last, the last point I'd like to make is that this plan and this Committee and the way it's worked out, if it turns out that the market supports the size of the budget we need, we can cut down the height of the towers. But if you look also again just to get a feel of the economics, you don't have to be a fancy consultant, look at the --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. WATTS: -- two tall towers now, how tiny that footprint is, and yet they have the same financial production as One Brooklyn Bridge Park, which is huge. And so if we try to have the low-rise to make up for them it would just pave over the Park, so I'm very happy to see it being built.
I was a youngster when we started on it. My grand kids, believe it or not, my grand kids play there, and I must congratulate everybody working on it. I'm very happy to see it go and I think we ought -- the design of this magnificent plan that this designer has given us and just as it is. Thanks.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. I'm told David Glick has left, so the next speaker is Andrew Hollweck, and after Andrew Hollweck would be Dick Dadey.

MR. HOLLWECK: Good evening. My name is Andrew Hollweck. I'm here on behalf of the New York Building Congress.

The City and State have committed hundreds of millions of dollars to create a new public amenity that is truly a jewel of the Park system out of underutilized industrial space that separates from Brooklyn from its waterfront.
At a moment of extreme fiscal austerity, the Bloomberg administration, Brooklyn Bridge Park, and numerous private donors continue to pour money to fund the construction and programming of this once-in-a-generation project. It is, therefore, incumbent upon government and the public to find realistic ways to protect this investment.

Brooklyn Bridge Park again in close partnership with the City and State, have scrutinized realistic revenue-generating options that would provide the funds necessary to maintain 85 acres of new parkland, protecting a considerable infrastructure and supports it.

The City has generously agreed to divert, in addition to those capital funds, to divert new property taxes on new development sites to keep the upkeep of this park. The Building Congress has been monitoring...
infrastructure investment closely this year, and we pay particular attention to the model of public-private partnerships at which Brooklyn Bridge Park is but one example. We believe the residential development model proposed by the Park is the most sensible solution to the question of how to adequately and reliably fund the upkeep of Brooklyn Bridge Park.

We urge the team reviewing funding options to provide objective recommendations. Do not jeopardize the long-term viability of this project without verifiable revenue figures demonstrating the viable alternative. There should be no change to the Park's proposed maintenance program. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Dick Dadey followed by Patti Hagan.

MR. DADEY: Good evening. My
name is Dick Dadey. I'm a member of the Board of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Conservancy, having served on that Board for 12 years now, and a long-time resident of Brooklyn Heights, having lived here for 20 years. I also professionally serve as the Executive Director of Citizens Union, a citywide good government group that serves as a watchdog in the City and State government. And I do have to say I commend all of us, the Development Corporation, the Conservancy, and many of the neighborhood groups and individuals which have stepped forward over the last 25, 30 years, people like Ben Crane, John Watts, to really provide the leadership necessary to create this magnificent urban park that's going to be the envy of not just New York, or New York State, or of the country, but of the world.

Already, when we've gone down
and enjoyed the first full summer of this Park, we have seen and heard the languages of so many different people from so many different countries enjoying this. But also, we've had the joy of seeing the diversity of the Park users.

I was down there one day on a Saturday afternoon -- or Sunday afternoon, wanting to go over to Governors Island and seeing the, you know, the Hasidic families playing with other families, and of all different colors, of all different ages, of all different races. It really made me feel very proud of the role that we've all played in creating this magnificent democratic space of where all New Yorkers and people from all over the country come together to enjoy a vista and a view and an assembly of people unlike anything else that takes place.

If you go to Hudson River Park,
it's a very long park and there's not really much gathering going on, and the piers are much narrower, and people seem to come in and leave. Here, Brooklyn Bridge Park, they come in and stay and use it.

I want to point out that in looking at other parks throughout the country, one of the most successful park systems is the Chicago Park District. And why is that? Because they have a guaranteed funding. The Chicago Park District is not subject to the vagaries and the ebbs and flows of city budgets. There's a guaranteed funding flow. And that's why they are able to build the park and maintain and operate the park system as they do. And as we all know, it's a great park system because they know they can count on the money that is guaranteed to them. And it's not subject to city fiscal challenges.
We look at New York City's own fiscal and budget challenges of the 1980s and 1990s and the devastation that was reaped upon our city parks as a result of decisions by our public officials and elected officials -- tough decisions that they had to make -- to cut back funding for city parks, and look how long it took us to get back to a point where we could once again enjoy our city parks like many of us are doing now. But that came at an enormous cost. The debt that we've had to incur in order to rebuild those parks we're paying for today. The City budget has grown nearly 80 percent over the last 10 years. Much of that is debt service for the infrastructure and capital improvements that we've made to the City, not only to our parks, but to the other infrastructure project; roads, bridges schools. Also the
labor costs, and the pension costs, and the Medicaid costs, and the labor costs, and the education costs, and the medical costs.

We have got tremendous obligations in this City and State. And we know what is happening. Budget cuts are going to come. In the next year or two they're going to be more severe than we've seen in the last couple years and more than we've seen in the last 30 years.

We cannot subject Brooklyn Bridge Park to the ebbs and flows of City and State budget decisions. We need to be responsible New Yorkers and follow through with the commitments that we made a couple years ago to fully fund this park along the lines outlined in the General Project Plan.

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. DADEY: So, I think that what we need to do is be responsible
and continue to support the General Project Plan as outlined and continue the guaranteed funding plan for the purpose the Park. You've heard all the reasons why we should do it. I will lend my voice to the many of them that have been spoken tonight.

I just wanted to say that we are building a 21st century park. We should not fall back on 20th century funding models of relying upon City taxpayer dollars to fund it. We've got a guaranteed funding stream, that's something unique, that's rare and special, that will ensure the long-term use and vitality of this Park, and we should not walk away from that obligation. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Patti Hagan followed by Joan Zimmerman.

MS. HAGAN: Good evening, Committee on Alternatives to Housing in Brooklyn Bridge Park. I am Patti
Hagan. I live at 117 St. Marks Avenue in Prospect Heights. I'm with the Prospect Heights Action Coalition.

I have to say it's really fitting that we should be gathered here again to mark the sixth anniversary of the December 2004 Brooklyn Bridge Park Coup de 'park when Mayor Bloomberg and governor Pataki kicked aside the Brooklyn Bridge Park community-developed Park Plan, costing 3 to $5 million a year to maintain, which was made over 20 years in more than 70 public meetings, and placed -- and replaced it -- and placed the Park Plan in the authoritarian hands of the Empire State Development Corporation. Whereupon, the Empire immediately hired a world class, extremely pricey, landscape architect, Michael Van Valkenburgh, from Boston. And the budget for this
world class park went to 16.1 million. That is sort of typical Empire State Development Corporation cost creep. And that is when the artificially jacking up of the cost to build and maintain this Park began six years ago.

As a life-long gardener and a long-time garden writer for the Wall Street Journal, where you might remember I wrote the article that caused Governor Cuomo to kill Jennifer Bartlett's horticulturally insane South Gardens Project for Battery Park City, I was shocked earlier this year while attending a metro horti-group meeting at the Arsenal in Manhattan, a lecture on Brooklyn Bridge Park by Michael Van Valkenburgh associate, Matthew Urbanski, he said, "A lot of what we try to do is create a complexity, intricacy in the landscape."

Everyone's spending so much
money on it, it better be complex. A waterfront park, make it as complex as possible: Beaches, tidal pools, salt marshes, water gardens, exposed piles; fields, meadows, wave attenuator.

We want linear gardens of intricacy in the Park. All the landscaped types incorporated into the Park are far more than would be there naturally. We have managed a succession of lawn, meadow, shrub bands, a very contrived meadow, water gardens that are very complex. The idea being more complexity is better. Little lawns with different microclimates, a perched wetland perched on a pier.

Anyway, this is where Battery Park -- Battery -- Brooklyn Bridge Park budget could really cut the budget in half.

While I have no doubt that a Van Valkenized Brooklyn Bridge Park
landscape would be a wonder to behold in its world class botanical complexity, world class cost to build and maintain as a public park, not a privatized apartment garden for plutocrats, the genius low side dictates all that's needed is something simple that does not distract from this simply splendid Brooklyn Bridge Park site.

People don't come to this park to examine a perched --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MS. HAGAN -- wetland, a contrived meadow, a very complex wet garden. They don't come for Michael Van Valkenburgh's botanical and topographical complexity. The place is enough as it is. It's absolutely wonderful.

The obvious alternative to housing in the Park is simple: No housing in the Park and no sophisticated Michael Van Valkenburgh
landscape design. Go back to the grassroots affordable 3 to $5 million community Brooklyn Bridge Park Plan developed pre the December 2004 Coup d' park.

This City and this State cannot afford and do not need this souped-up Van Valkenized luxury condo-ized $16.1 million park. I suggest we get back to Brooklyn Bridge Park basics, say, something we could afford, something within our means, place to recreate in and enjoy.

(A bell timer rang.)

MS. HAGAN: I think that I shall --

MR. GOLEM: I'm --

Ms. HAGAN: -- housing in the Park, lovely as a tree.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. The next speaker is Joan Zimmerman followed by Jane Kojima.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: I'll try not to wake you up again.
MR. GOLEM: It's cold enough.
We're awake.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Here we go.

Joan Zimmerman. First, want to thank you all of --

MR. GOLEM: Angle it down towards you to --

(Instructions to Ms. Zimmerman from an audience member.)

MS. ZIMMERMAN: I was being given instructions by the gentleman on the right.

Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're welcome.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you all.
At least I didn't set it off.

Joan Zimmerman, Fulton Ferry Landing Association, 28 Old Fulton Street. I will first ask your forbearance. I do not have a written statement, so I will speak -- be speaking off-the-cuff, and I will try not to be too redundant nor
inarticulate.

Fulton Ferry Landing Association, as you may have heard from my predecessor and young associate back there with the white hair, has been involved in the conception of Brooklyn Bridge Park literally since the beginning, along with John Watts, who has since left, and we are all living adjacent to the Park. We have to say that in spite of our qualms about some aspects of it, we have been incredibly happy, and it has really added immeasurably to peoples lives in the Park -- you know, in the area, but also added to the enormous number of outsiders who come to our gateway.

We want to thank you for considering alternatives. We think that it is an important function. We would ask two things if you are going -- or three things if you are going to ask or to consider
alternatives. The first is, quite frankly, we are somewhat surprised that in considering alternatives for housing the housing element at Pier 1 is not within that -- within consideration.

We would ask that if you are going to look at housing you should look at three developments, the two sites on the north and the south, and also the site on Pier 1. At least a hundred -- the hotel is a hotel-condo development. We have asked that the condo side of it be considered just as the other developments be considered.

We would also ask that if you are going to find viable alternatives to housing, like others, we would strongly urge you to ensure that it not exceed the 8 acres currently dedicated to development, housing development.

In addition, should you find
viable alternatives, we would ask to reduce, at least a portion of the development, the housing development, we would ask that that portion be attributed equally to the three development sites. You can apportion it on a percentage basis or whatever else.

We do encourage that you consider the Jehovah Witnesses buildings. Whether or not they will be a viable alternative we cannot tell you. If they turn out to mitigate some of the cost that would be a positive, in our opinion.

I would also have to say that I'm going to put forth one possible mitigating cost that has -- or one possible mitigating source that has not been mentioned heretofore, and that is naming rights. We have enormous numbers of large corporations in Brooklyn, or who have come to Brooklyn, and I myself, for
instance, have absolutely no objection to Fairway Fields. I don't mind Home Depot Hoops, and given the amount that the real state developers are going to make, and have made, from the Park as it develops, I have no qualms about Boy Mel Green Basketball, Ratner's Rink --

(Hissing from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Hold the comments, please.

MS. ZIMMERNAN: If the Mets and every other -- in fact, we can simply look across the river to see Verizon Fields to recognize that this is not out of the question, at least as an alternative.

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MS. ZIMMERNAN: I thank you for your time, for your patience, and we will submit real written comments at a later stage.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Jane Kojima followed by Chris Tepper.
MS. KOJIMA: Good evening. My name is Jane Kojima. I'm a resident of Brooklyn Heights, 80 Cranberry Street. I'm Director of Communications and Marketing for the DUMBO Improvement District, a Business Improvement District organized to support the business community, property owners and residents of DUMBO, Brooklyn.

As a resident, I love spending my time in Brooklyn Bridge Park and was thrilled with the opening of Piers 1 and 6 this year. I look forward to the continued progress of construction and support the existing General Project Plan.

In my role in the DUMBO BID, I work closely with the neighborhood retail and cultural community to support their businesses and organizations throughout marketing and promotion for programming, all to drive foot traffic to DUMBO.
As a neighborhood, DUMBO still has a very small residential population, a population too small to adequately support the retail community.

Housing in Brooklyn Bridge Park would add to our population, making the neighborhood a more vibrant place. Residents of these buildings would not only be "eyes on the park," as other people have said, but also on our streets for public safety, a benefit to the community, and all of its visitors.

Thank you for the opportunity to express myself.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Chris Tepper followed by Matt Hopkins.

MR. TEPPER: Hi, my name is Christopher Tepper. I live in Park Slope at 496 13th Street. I'm a supporter of the current financing plan. I think the scope of the
Committee is to explore alternatives, and I think to the current financing plan, and I think we've heard all the very few alternatives that work.

The only alternatives I've heard tonight are the current financing plan, big box retail, concessions, using money from the General Fund, which I don't think is acceptable, and especially during the fiscal condition the City is in now, and then we just heard naming rights.

I think when Bay Area Economics puts pencil to paper and looks at trying to fund the Park with concessions they'll find that it does not work and it's too small and volatile of a revenue stream to support long-term capital maintenance. I think that the current financing plan again is the only one that we've heard tonight that can actually provide a stable financing source for the Park, and that also
does so in a really efficient and
good urban design that respects good
urban design. Thank you. That's all.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.
Next is Matt Hopkins followed by Tom
Montvel-Cohen.

MR. HOPKINS: Hi, good evening.
I'm not saying anything that probably
hasn't already been said tonight. My
name is Matt Hopkins. I'm here to
speak in support of the current
financing plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park, and I urge the Committee
on Alternatives to move forward to
ensure the Park is completed without
delay.

I'm a lifelong Brooklynite,
born and raised in Park Slope, and
went to school a few blocks away from
here, so I spent a good portion of my
life both enjoying and being
disappointed in aspects in Prospect
and Cadman Plaza Park. Because of
this, I'm acutely aware of the need for great public paces like Brooklyn Bridge Park, which enhance the lives of Brooklyn residents and provide opportunities for recreation, exercise and relaxation.

In terms of the financing plan, which is the issue of the evening, as a development professional with the experience in both the public and private sectors, I'm well aware that the plan has undergone intense scrutiny in the course of the project's environmental review phase and in the creation of the Park Master Plan.

The current plan is aimed at minimizing the development footprint within the Park while simultaneously recognizing that waterfront parks are expensive to maintain and cannot be operated without some alternative source of capital.

The proposed housing and
limited hotel uses on-site are compatible with the Park and create complementary spaces. While others argue that the plan is a push to overly privatize the Park really has no basis in this example based upon the minimal size of the development footprint as well as the fact that the plan is already in some respect successfully in action with the maintenance and upkeep of funds that are contributed from One Brooklyn Bridge Park, which is within the Park's boundaries.

My final point is simply the current financial plan is not subject to unforeseen government budget shortfalls and ensure the Park will be adequately maintained and continue to offer the fantastic amenities that make it a real gem of the Brooklyn waterfront.

Finally, Brooklyn Bridge Park's financing plan is one of the
countless examples of great public projects that have leveraged some private investment, to create jobs, attract tourists and enhance the overall environment for New York City residents. This is the type of plan that Brooklyn should stand behind.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Tom Montvel-Cohen followed by Clint Padgett (phonetic).

MR. MONTVEL-COHEN: Hi, my name is Tom Montvel-Cohen. I reside at 130 Maple Street in Brooklyn, and I am presently the chairman of the DUMBO Business Improvement District. However, I have been involved in some aspect of the development of Brooklyn Bridge Park since 1986, when I was senior advisor to the Deputy Mayor for Finance and Economic Development during the Koch administration. One of my first jobs there was to respond to the Port Authority's original Battery Park City-like concept for
Piers 1 through 5. Really, that scheme was one of the things that catalyzed and encouraged the development of the Brooklyn Bridge Park plan, and really going back to the Brooklyn Heights Association's commissioning the study of the future of the Brooklyn piers, which was done by Buckhurst Fish in the '80s, this was the first document that basically said (a) the City's budget can't absorb at least the capital and maintenance costs and (b) that the only way to provide a reasonable stable and reliable on-site revenue stream was through housing.

This was in the mid '80s. Here we are 25 years later, we're still agonizing over this. People have very strong feelings about it. This is very understandable, but the fact of the matter is that there are no reasonable large-scale, on-site revenues available to support the
maintenance and operation. It's just a fact.

So, I view, even though I don't particularly support the idea of a PIRP or a TIF, I do see the notion of a PIRP or TIF as acceptance of reality, and I think facing reality is a good thing in life. You know? I mean, when the TIF and the PIRP mean yes, there isn't money available on-site, we have to find another place to get it.

Now, as a citizen, I'm very leery of invading the City's general revenue, especially at a time like this, and I think the MOU sort of captures that concern, and basically it's really not for -- you guys have to decide whether that's a good idea at the City level whether that slippery slope of carving off pieces of the property tax revenue is an appropriate thing to support, you know, projects around the City. It's
a very, very difficult type of position to make, and there's a certain arbitrariness to it, and I think that is what causes certainly the people at OMB, at EDC and at City Hall a great deal of concern about how does one come up with a reasonable justification for doing these things and in what circumstances you could do that.

So, to me, because of the difficulty of that, and because the Park plan uses so little of the footprint, so little of the footprint of the 85 acres, that it just seems to be a very, very reasonable and worthwhile compromise to be able to control your own financial destiny on a very, very small portion of the land at the very edges of the park.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Clint Padgett followed by Katrin Adams.
(No response from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Mr. Padgett is not here.
Katrin Adams.

MS. ADAM: I'm here. It's Adam.

MR. GOLEM: Adam. I'm sorry.

MS. ADAM: It's alright.
I'm Katrin Adam and a board member of the Fulton Ferry Landing Association. It's almost 40 years that I've been involved in the rebirth of this now residential historic neighborhood. I moved to Fulton Ferry in 1972. I and others in our neighborhood have been involved in the creation of a park in the underutilized pier land from the beginning, and we are delighted that some of it has been finally realized for all of us to enjoy.

The planning has been long and has gone through many mutations,
adjusted -- adjusting to the realities of the various then-present situations. Unfortunately, economic development in the Park for the funding of maintaining and operating costs for the Brooklyn Bridge Park has grown exponentially with each step of the Park planning. And the proposed development of Pier 1 and to Pier 2 is now overwhelmingly expansive. This can be easily -- I mean, seeing now that it's luckily getting very green on this huge development site. And it -- but it also -- this -- it diminished not only the leftover parkland, this huge site, which has been growing, growing -- has been growing over the years, but it also hinders the entrance to what we hope to become a world class park.

We have been very pleased that money was found for the CAH study, but we -- I want to reiterate what
Joan had said. We don't understand why Pier 1 and Pier 2 was not included and for alternative funding.

We urge that they -- that it is indeed included in the study, and we have expressed that many, several times before.

Should the development in the Park have been necessary, we request the development be equally distributed over all proposed development sites, also something which Joan had mentioned.

As to the Park operational financing -- operation financing plan, we hope and request that all other possibilities for funding be considered, including the Witness building, and to diminish all of the development sites. And again I want to say, as others have said here before, I think the areas in the Park which are the most successful, in a way, living very close to the
site, are -- is the Big Meadow. Indeed, this is where everyone comes together and stays together and plays together. And it is -- if we could have more of that it be would wonderful. And I hope that we don't miss an opportunity for a really fantastic park in an extraordinary place. And once these big housing developments are in the Park there is no turning back.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.

I didn't call the next speaker. I am told that Councilman Speaker Steve Levin will be here imminently. But meanwhile, he is not here. If Mark Agar (phonetic) is here, and the speaker after Mark Agar will be Joann Nicholas.

Mr. Agar?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: No.

Alright. Joanne Nicholas? And following her will be Dash Henley.
MS. NICHOLAS: Hi. Thank you for giving me this opportunity. My name is Joann Nicholas. I'm a member of the Cobble Hill Association, and in 1988 I was the only Cobble Hill member of the Brooklyn Heights Association Recreation Subcommittee, which was one of the early inklings that we could have a park there rather than housing. And we did a survey of all the educational institutions from LIU, P.S. 8, all the private school, public school, all the way to P.S. 29, where I live in Cobble Hill, and they all said they didn't have enough recreation. And so we worked together, Roy Sloane who is sitting here, and I, we were doing outreach and public affairs, and Roy came up with the idea of Brooklyn Bridge Park because as someone else mentioned, it was just Piers 1 through 5. But he thought: How are you going to get people
excited about it? So, it became
Brooklyn Bridge Park, or that was our
idea. And one of the things we did
in 1989 was we had a boat ride for
elected officials because nobody had
been down on the site. And the
children and in my son's kindergarten
class all wore their little soccer
uniforms and baseball uniforms and
they held up a little plant saying
"We Want a Park." Not one child
brought Lego's that said "We Want a
Hotel or Housing Here."

Kids need recreation. We look
to the area across the East River,
where there are parks there, where
people are playing ball there night
and day. There are teams there from
Con Edison, Show League if they can't
get a place in Central Park, Zog
Sports since 9/11 has become huge.

Why can't we have recreation
like that in Brooklyn Bridge Park?
And the reason we can't have it is
because a tremendous amount of money has been spent to design the Park, and the 2004 change of the whole idea, the concept we had for the Park, because it became a real estate giveaway by the State before any of them could imagine that the bubble was going to burst.

Well, when you're talking about how you can't depend on anything but real estate to fund the Park, Brooklyn has the highest number of stopped construction sites in the City because you've been overbuilding and overselling it, and there's just not enough people who want to live here, especially with almost 9 percent unemployment. And so housing is not necessarily the panacea. But nobody would look at anything beyond that until this teeny little sap that they've thrown to us, "Okay, we'll hire a consultant." And I appreciate you looking into it, but I'm sure
that, you know, HR&A, who was hired to say that the public wants this was, you know, much larger funding. And no one has asked through an RFP: What would the private sector do? Don't ask me. I do public affairs for a hospital. Ask someone who wants to put their money where their mouth is. And when I spoke to someone at the New York City EDC, and I notice the gentleman has left, but this was before he was in charge, I said: "Look at what's going on in Red Hook. Look at Fairway. It's so successful. "Oh, it's only been open for three weeks and that's why people are going there, it's a novelty." Look at Ikea, look at Fairway. I'm not saying I want the stores there --

MR. GOLEM: One minute --

MS. NICHOLAS: Okay. But I'm telling you that there are
things that -- who would have thought of the Galapagos Space? You need to give the public sector a chance to look at something besides housing, and you need to reduce the costs of the Park so that we don't have such high expenses. We want Ikea cabinets for the Park. We have don't need luxury. We just want recreation.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

At this time I would like to invite Counsel Member Steve Levin.

Le-vin, I'm sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you very much. I testified at the last hearing, but I kind of avoided making any specific suggestions and then, you know, thought afterwards that I might come back and just throw my two cents in a couple of suggestions and make sure I'm on the record of support.

So, a few ideas that I would be
supportive and endorse in terms of non-housing-related funding streams, I believe that we do need to take a serious look at capturing taxes generated from the potential sale of the Jehovah Witnesses' properties, as Mannheim and others have mentioned.

I realize that the City is going to be tempted to bring any tax revenue from transfer to a non-tax-exempt entity to the General Fund of the City, and that may be okay for a good portion of it, but there should be a majority, at least, set aside for park maintenance.

I realize that this sale, which I've heard many indications, is a strong and likely possibility, maybe a few years off, but any housing potential or any potential housing development is most likely a few years off as well.

We are still in a recession-like climate when it comes
to luxury housing development in New York City and in Brooklyn, so again I think that the responsible thing to do is to look at these alternatives.

I would like to see this Committee truly explore a revenue-generating athletic center which pays an assessment to the Park. There are several benefits to this idea. First, obviously, is that it has a great potential to generate revenue. Secondly, it adds active uses to the Park, which I believe the Park could use more of. Thirdly, it will attract more people to the Park for a greater diversity of uses, and that is a good thing.

I believe that Senator Squadron's PIRP plan is something we should be looking into again. I think that we missed an opportunity in the last DUMBO rezoning to get that in, so we'll have to look at another way, or another form of
implementing it, obviously, but I've never heard a thorough and compelling reason why we're not fully exploring the idea. It's not taking money that is currently going to the General Fund. What we're talking about is capping that amount that -- and directing that increase and any assessment back to the source of the increase, which is the Park, and I think that's something that is appropriate to do if this Park is going to increase the values of nearby property.

Explore additional concessions and reexamine concessions in the park now. The original 13 guiding principles served (inaudible) "Specialized commercial uses, for example, executive conference center, a destination resort, restaurants, maritime center, shall be encouraged; residential and office uses shall be discouraged." That was part of the
original 13 guiding principles going back 16 years ago. I believe there's still time to adhere to this and that's what we should be looking to do.

I believe that it's important to look at alternatives not just because I'm a fan -- I'm not a fan of housing in the Park, and I'm not a fan of housing in the Park. I believe it's important because the way that -- the way that the luxury real estate market has been behaving will show you that luxury housing demand isn't all there right now, and nobody really knows when it's coming back, and that that's the market forces at work.

We have a very different economy than what was predicted to be at this time in 2004, when many, when many of these ideas were conceived, and I think that it's time that those things be reevaluated.
Thank you very much.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Dash Henley followed by Richard Lloyd.

MR. HENLEY: Good evening. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of Roland Lewis from Metropolitan Waterfront Alliance, our president.

MWA is a coalition of over 400 organizations working together to --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Speak up, please.

MR. HENLEY: MWA is an organization of over 400 organizations working together to transform New York and New Jersey Harbor and its waterways into a world class resource for work, play, transit and education.

We're pleased that in March of 2010 the City of New York took over control of Brooklyn Bridge Park, and Pier 1 was reclaimed for public use.

The effect it will have on New York
is immeasurable.

Brooklyn Bridge Park already offers great amenities for visitors, including the 85 acres of waterfront park, huge recreational (inaudible) at Pier 1, gentle, sloped hills and currently a rare opportunity to directly access the water, something we strongly support.

With that in mind, we enthusiastically support the current financing plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park and urge the Committee on Alternatives to Housing to retain this plan going forward to ensure delay-free construction of the Park.

Waterfront parks, by nature, are expensive to maintain. We must budget for maritime infrastructure and capital reserve to adequately sustain the Park. The annual maintenance for the Park's full build-out is expected to be $16 million, including thousands of
pilings on Piers 2, 3, 5 and 6. Neglect of these pier structures alone would lead to rapid deterioration.

Housing and limited hotel use is the most appropriate (inaudible) solution.

The current financing plan calls for the Park operator to control development sites and limits the development of footprint to 8 percent of the total project area. This plan is already in action with maintenance funds, as we said before, coming from One Brooklyn Bridge Park, preexisting building within the project's boundaries.

In addition to revenue, these developments bring meeting space, restaurants, restrooms and collective "eyes on the park" as was also said before. Construction of Brooklyn Bridge Park will be an enormous achievement, and assuming that other
harbor parks go forward, the project as a whole will radically alter the character of the City not only by making the waterfront more accessible to all citizens, but also by reorienting it toward the life of the harbor.

We urge the Committee to support the current financing plan so that the Park's construction can continue without delay. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Richard Lloyd followed by Robin Shaymus (phonetic)?

Is Mr. Lloyd here? (No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Not.

Robin Shaymus? (No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: I think we're starting to lose folks here a little bit.

Is Patrick Telfort here? And after Patrick Telfort is Theirry
Nicolas.

MR. TELFORT: Good evening. My name is Patrick Telfort, and I live at 2 Tiffany Place in Red Hook, and I've been in the area for over 10 years.

I currently work for the New York City Department of Environmental Protection as a Senior Stationary Engineer, and from that perspective I wanted to offer that the pilings that they've put in the Brooklyn Bridge Park right now as we speak has taken a beating, and it costs money to run this. And currently, a concession stand in the winter nobody would really attend, nobody would come and generate funds. It wouldn't be able to generate funds to keep with the pilings and things of that nature.

I support the public housing that the committee has proposed because there's no other viable solution for that. And until that's
been presented, then that's why I'll have no choice but to go with it, and thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Theirry Nicolas and following is Chris Owens.

MR. NICOLAS: Good evening. My name is Theirry Nicolas. I work in Brooklyn Heights for about 5 years as a real estate agent.

I support the plan and I also support the housing, the housing portion of it because I recently I had a lot of interest in --

THE COURT REPORTER: He'll have to speak up.

MR. GOLEM: Sorry, speak up a little bit. The Stenographer can't hear you. It seems likes the mike's been turned down. So if you're afraid the mike's going to be louder, they're a little quieter now, so you're going to have to speak over it a little more in the mike.
MR. NICOLAS: I work in Brooklyn Heights for 5 years as a real estate agent. And recently I have taken a lot of interest in energy, in the energy business. And soon I'll be a Certified Legal Associate. As a Legal Associate, what we do is educate, you know, new construction, building housing, you know, to make their, you know, really more energy efficient. So I think (inaudible) considered in building these new projects to make sure it's energy efficient, create new jobs who -- for people who are interested in going into these fields. You know. And that's it.

MR. GOLEM: Great. Thank you.

Chris Owens.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's gone.

MR. GOLEM: He's gone? Okay.

Leslie Schultz? Leslie, okay.

Following Leslie will be Carl Hum.
MS. SCHULTZ: How's that?

MR. GOLEM: Honestly, these are not booby trapped.

MS. SCHULTZ: Actually, I've never testified like this in my life before.

My name is Leslie Schultz. I live at 246 Henry Street in Brooklyn Heights, and I moved here in 1999 after 12 years in Lefferts Gardens, which is near Flatbush and near Prospect Park.

I've been considering the debates over the Brooklyn Bridge Park ever since we moved here, and I think I was actually a swing voter on a number of issues over the years. But with parts of the Park now built, I have actually come to a point of view on a lot of things, including the question of whether housing in the Park is appropriate and what its impact will be.

I'm grateful for the
opportunity to express that point of view now. The hard -- and I come from the emotional side of things, I guess. The hardest thing about moving here in 1999 was coming to a neighborhood that had no park. Prospect Park, which was close to our old house, was an amazing refuge from the intensity of life and wandering around that park, being surrounded by greenery and relaxing alongside fellow park users of unmatched diversity, was a great pleasure of our lives.

My younger daughter was six when we moved, and I told her that some people predicted a new park would open near our house by the time she finished high school, and, amazingly, the night before her SAT's in spring 2010 she and I were able to leave our Henry Street house, take a walk down to Pier 1, and lay on the grass looking out on water and the
bridges, and quietly talk, taking off
the edge off junior year testing.
Our adoptive neighborhood now had a
refuge, too.

I've been to Brooklyn Bridge
Parks dozens of times since, at all
times of day, and every time it has
taken my breath away. A public
amenity of this monumental scale is
an incredible thing, and I'm amazed
and awed that it has been created out
of whole cloth. I am also really
grateful, and it's wonderful to see
my neighborhood enlivened by the
hundreds, if not thousands of people,
who come to enjoy Pier 6 playground,
or take the ferry to Governors
Island, another great space, or bike
from Pier 6 to Pier 1, or lie in the
grass at Pier 1.

There was a massive public
investment to build this public park,
and it will take a lot to keep it in
good repair, keep it safe, and keep
it clean. Building 750 addition units of luxury housing as a source of revenue to pay these ongoing costs seems like a very reasonable plan and one that will in no way change the very evident truth that the Park belongs to the public. It seems like the structures are being placed at the edges of the Park, which strikes me as a good thing.

When my daughters were little we used to head over the Brooklyn Bridge regularly to see the wondrous playgrounds at Battery Park City. It never crossed our minds that we were not at home in those playgrounds, or while running along the waterfront. Indeed, we used to bump into our Brooklyn neighbors all the time when we were over there. Those playgrounds and that waterfront belong to us as New Yorkers just as Brooklyn Bridge Park will, even if wealthy people live in buildings.
carefully placed on the edges of the Park. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next is Carl Hum followed by Nat Rubin.

MR. HUM: Good evening. My name is Carl Hum, and I am President-CEO of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, a 92-year-old membership organization dedicated to serving our membership and promoting a healthy business environment in Brooklyn.

The Chamber has a long history with the development of Brooklyn Bridge Park, being one of the first advocates to build a park along our once robust working waterfront.

The Chamber recognizes the commercial and economic development opportunities offered in the build-out of Brooklyn's first major park in a lifetime. We were further encouraged by the steady development of the Park over the past few years. And on a personal note, as a
life-long Brooklynite, 25 years ago, when I was riding in to high school over the Manhattan Bridge, I would often see the land between the bridges and just wonder about how you get down there and what it would be to be among the waterfront. And congratulations to Regina, to Seth, and everyone else on this Panel in regards to opening up that space and at least satisfying the curiosity of this Brooklyn boy and many others.

So back to the script. I'm here tonight to voice the Chamber's support for the current financing plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park and urge the Committee on Alternatives to Housing to retain this plan going forward to ensure the completion of the Park without any further delay.

The financing plan was the subject of a series of examinations, thoughtful deliberation, following the creation of the Park Master Plan,
and moreover, the current financing plan was studied in the course of the project's environmental review as a (inaudible) to the project plan, General Project Plan to reopen the financing plan, after such careful deliberation and thought, will only cause unnecessarily delay, undue burdens to a complex building process.

One of the key features of the Park is its self-sustaining nature from its ecological build-out to financing. And the current financing plan allows for maximum revenue while preserving the maximum amount of acreage to be devoted to public use.

Under the current plan, only 8 percent of the total project area will be used for development in revenue-generating purposes. This plan is a long way towards fulfilling an important provision in the original MOU between the State and
the City in creating the Park that provision demands that no less than 80 percent of the project area be reserved as open space and dedicated as parkland. One would be hard pressed to create an alternative financing plan with a physical footprint less than 8 percent of the total project area and can generate $16 million annually. Furthermore, the proposed housing and hotel use are most compatible uses among parkland and will help build a burgeoning neighborhood and bring business opportunity to the Borough's overall economic growth. It also provides a built-in population to ensure the continued use and security of the Park. Again, the Chamber wholeheartedly supports the current financing plan and respectfully requests that it is implemented so the world class park that Brooklyn Bridge Park is to be, be completed
without delay. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next speaker is Nat Rubin.

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Nat is not here.

Next speaker is Joanne Simon.

And following Joanne will be Josh Scaller (phonetic).

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He left.

MR. GOLEM: I'm told Josh has left, so following Joanne will be Ursula Hahn.

MS. SIMON: Well, thank you. I'm not going to take up too much time. I think I'm just going to say a few things.

Like a lot of people who were involved in this process, when the Park Development Corporation came out with a new plan, that sort of holiday un-gift, that I think a lot of people felt very much that the rug had been pulled out from under them. And that set up a whole series of
consequences, and this has been a very emotional issue, as you know, for a lot of people. And people have, I think, addressed this from a perspective of various levels of trying to make lemonade out of the lemons that they feel they were handed. So, I think if there are three observations that I listened to people tonight, I listened to people at the last hearing, there are a couple of things that I think this body needs to consider going forward.

One is people. Because of what happened six years ago, people don't have much faith in the powers that be in terms of planning this park. And so I would urge you to do whatever you do with great transparency and accountability to the public, because people really feel like they don't trust the analysis that's been made, and they don't trust, therefore, the results. And whether the analysis is
the best in the world or not, people
don't have faith in it.

Secondarily, I think that like
many people, and I think that very
few people probably really actively
want housing in the Park, I don't
want housing in the Park, but I think
that we need to find some
alternatives that are going to make
up the difference. And right now just
cost-cutting isn't going to make up
the difference. And I don't think
we've adequately explored either the
PIRP plan or the Jehovah Witness plan
either. I think that if you do that,
and you do that with transparency and
accountability, people will be better
able to accept whatever that result
is. And I think we may be able to
find sufficient alternatives to make
a real difference in the way this
Park is going.

The economy has changed the
nature of the housing market. It's
changed the nature of the real estate market dramatically. Some of the assumptions that underlie the plan that had come out in 2004 are no longer assumptions that I think we can make, and so I really encourage everybody to do this by leaving no stone unturned; and also by making sure that you really effectively communicate this with the public.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next is Ursula Hahn, and following her is Michael D.D. White.

MS. HAHN: My name is Ursula Hahn. I live at 175 Adams Street. I was present at a meeting of Community Board 2 almost 25 years ago at which the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey presented its plan to sell Piers 1 to 5 for residential development. Under the leadership of Tony Mannheim, Tom Fawkes and Maria Fafuzzi the public was quickly
mobilized to demand a pardon. And I have supported a waterfront park ever since.

In the Brooklyn Bridge Park Coalition and its successor, the Conservancy, the first Community Advisory Committee, as well as the current committee, and in the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Committee, yet another group which fought unsuccessfully to keep the Tobacco Warehouse out of the hands of one or more developers.

During all these years and during these efforts I've representative Concorde Village Owners, a cooperative with a population of approximately 1,600 residents in Downtown Brooklyn. It has been public knowledge since the Memorandum of Understanding was issued by the governor and the Mayor, that neither New York State nor New York City will provide funds for park
maintenance and operations. We learned years ago that pier maintenance will absorb an extraordinary part of the annual budgets. The consultants showed convincingly that the only steady source of the millions of dollars needed would be some residential and/or commercial development, and that the waterfront's desirability and thus real estate values would help minimize the footprint of such development parcels. Obviously, neither construction nor maintenance costs have shrunk ever since. But if legal intervention by development opponents had not delayed park construction, the public may by now enjoy more park than exists, although I'm very grateful to have that, thank you.

To date, no realistic alternative funding sources have been put on the table which would satisfy
the maintenance and operational requirements of this park. Even if 5 low-rise, four Michelin star restaurants and 50 food carts were to operate in Brooklyn Bridge Park the income would not suffice to maintain it. I for one am probably the majority who are here tonight know nothing about how to raise funds on the scale necessary to ensure the needed income. Therefore, I hope that the Committee's expert consultants will recommend realistic schemes that require the least possible amount of parkland while maximizing income.

Last but not least, I urge those who assert that park maintenance doesn't cost millions to visit the Main Street Park in DUMBO next year if they didn't do so this past summer. If they have eyes to see, I hope they will acknowledge the difference in the maintenance of a park serviced by a cash strapped NYC
department and offer park service by
the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation.

Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

The next speaker is Michael
D.D. White followed by Penny
Christofrow (phonetic).

MR. WHITE: Michael White,
Noticing New York.

The idea that a city park
should finance itself is howlingly
inane. I think this has been
sufficiently addressed at this point
and thoroughly debunked. I'll give
you my prior testimony from April
together with this testimony.

Any park worth its salt is
worthwhile because it provides
exogenous, or external, benefits to
the surrounding community; that the
City administration should still be
trying to frame its discussion in
terms of a discredited argument
indicates just how uncomfortable it
is with discussing in truly pertinent terms what needs to be discussed:

How much park should there be? How much development should there be?

Which land, if any, should be set aside for development? Should land that could be some of the quietest park space, if it were so used, be developed instead?

These are valid questions for civic governance discussions. They are not the province of developmental spreadsheets or arcane calculations with a technocrat's slide rule. If the City and ESDC and its subsidiaries are not willing to have the civic governance discussions honestly and out in the open then the motivations of our government officials must be suspect.

Saying that everything must be resolved by reference to obscure development equations make us suspect what many of us believe is fairly
obvious, that the continuing effort
to frame the discussions in terms of
a discredited theory is cover for a
city administration bias in favor of
finding excuses to justify
development.

Did the administration find
members of the real state community
to come forward and speak in favor of
development of these acres that could
be parkland? That only goes to prove
the theory that what is hosted here
is a bias towards development. Under
the circumstances, if statements of
support for development from the
development community are not viewed
as indicia of such bias, they should
be set apart and quarantined so as
not to contaminate the rest of the
hearing's record.

With the City administration
displaying such bias, how are we to
believe that it will properly
evaluate and entertain alternative
proposals that would not result in
the development it wants? For
instance, the key proposition to this
park, like any other in the City,
should be paid for by the surrounding
city that the Park benefits. I remind
you again of Nicolai Arosso's
(phonetic) assessment that the
positive effect of the Park will have
on New York is immeasurable. Equating
it with Frederick Law Olmstead and
Calvert Vaux (inaudible) for Central
Park.

The Park can be expected to
have substantial external benefits
far beyond its borders, which means
the idea that it should pay itself
within its borders is way off base.
Payment should obviously come from
beyond its borders.

I live in Brooklyn Heights. I
think I can therefor say with some
reasonable weight that adjacent
Brooklyn Heights is one of the
neighborhoods that should pay more taxes because it has benefited from this Park's creation. If the City's administration's bias is to preclude the very normal, very sensible approach of going outside its Borders to pay for the Park, why should we believe that the administration will look seriously at other suggestions such as cutting out the fat and lowering the Park's costs? Skeptics wondering about these costs, whether these costs were artificially inflated. Remember the fleet of 31 tioga --

MR. GOLEM: One minute, please.

MR. WHITE -- dune buggies.

Let's set aside the notion the Park should pay for itself. It doesn't even make sense on its face because acres that are developed are simply development. They aren't park, whatever you refer to them as. Let's have the discussions we ought
to be having: Where do we want park? Where do we want development? And if we decide there are acres where we want development let's have a discussion about how much development we want there. Hinging everything together on the relationship doesn't make sense to these calculations because there is a non-relationship.

The calculations with respect to each, how much the Park costs or how much it should -- can be made from development continually shift independently. We abandon the necessary -- before we abandon the necessary civic governance discussions and leave everything to the preposterous proposition that a technocrat's slide rule can magically determine how much development --

(A bell timer rang.)

MR. GOLEM: Your time is up.

MR. WHITE: -- let's remember the technocrat's slide rule is
working for a mayor, who particularly
with respect --

MR. GOLEM: Wrap up your
comments, please --

MR. WITE -- and the Governors
Island has been given extreme
unchecked power. Is it a good thing
or a bad thing when the Mayor is
now making speeches --

MR. GOLEM: In all fairness,
please conclude.

MR. WHITE: -- presidential
campaign.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next speaker is Penny
Christofrow followed by Anna Towly
Legend (phonetic).

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Penny's no
longer here.

MR. GOLEM: Penny's not here.

Is Anna Towly here?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Anna Towly is not
here.
The next speaker is Christie Barker?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: And after Christie Barker is Luke Fikthorn (phonetic).

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: I'm sorry, neither one of them here.

I'll keep going through cards.

Is Franklin Stone here? And following Franklin will be Andrew Lastowecky.

MS. STONE: Does this sound right? The first time I testified about Brooklyn Bridge Park I did not need reading glasses. My name is Franklin Stone. I've lived in Cobble Hill for more than 25 years. I've served two terms as president of the Cobble Hill Association and nearly 15 years on its executive board. I served as Cobble Hill's representative on the Brooklyn Bridge Park Coalition Board, which really
dates me, and I served as Assemblywoman Joan Millman's representative on the Brooklyn Bridge Park LDC, which developed the Master Plan that generated state and city financial support for the Park.

As we saw this past summer at Piers 1 and 6, the decades of work to secure a park on the waterfront has begun to pay off. Brooklyn Bridge Park is already an extraordinary open space and recreational resource. The residents of Cobble Hill are thrilled. They are using the Park, all parts of it, in great numbers. There is no question that many, if not most residents of Cobble Hill, want work on the park to continue without delay so that there will be additional facilities, particularly for recreation, as soon as possible.

As you've heard here tonight, many residents believe that housing is a small price to pay for an
adjacent world class park.

During the past 15 years I have steadily opposed housing and have urged other means to support the Park's maintenance. Both the sale of the Watch Tower buildings and Senator Squadron's Park Increment Recapture Proposal seem like excellent opportunities, as does the introduction of year-round indoor recreation to the Park. The latter seems especially important on several levels. From my own observations and from listening to the voices of my Brooklyn friends and neighbors, I know that this Borough, and particularly this section of our Borough, is desperately short of recreational opportunities. Our existing facilities for skating hockey, basketball, indoor soccer, bowling, tennis and track are either nonexistent or severely overburdened. The upland of Pier 6 is an ideal
location for indoor recreation. And in our master planning process a decade ago we were assured by our urban planners that if some of the Park's capital money was spent on infrastructure, recreational operations could contribute significant revenue to the Park while also meeting the needs of the community. Quite simply, it would be wrong for Brooklyn residents to have to put up with an additional waterfront housing and not get a park that includes year-round recreation.

I urge the members of this committee to fully investigate these alternative sources of revenue. Individually and collectively they could serve to mitigate or reduce the impact of housing if some housing is found to be necessary.

I and my neighbors look forward to the results of a thorough, credible investigation of the options...
for park funding. We agree that it is important to devote as little parkland as possible to revenue generation, and to make sure there is sufficient revenue to sustain the Park. We hope that these goals can be met without housing especially in the amounts currently contemplated. But most of all, we want our park to be completed without undue delay. We are already looking forward to next summer. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Next speaker is Andrew Lastowecky. I'm sorry if I mispronounced your name.

MR. LASTOWECKY: That's quite alright.

Good evening. My name is Andrew Lastowecky. I'm a member of Community Board 2 and also the current chair of the Park's Committee. Our Community Board 2, nor the Park's Committee, took any kind of a vote to come before you and
present some kind of alternative plans because that is not the role that we played. On the contrary, we would like to eventually listen to some of the proposals you might have; however, many of us individually, collectively, working with the Park, some of us, not so much as the 20 or 30 years that other people have contributed to their -- to this cause, we have all been very deeply concerned with the goings and with the progress of the Park.

We strongly support the Park in the direction that it is now going. We would wish that the Park could be completed as quickly as possible for our youth and for the benefit of the residents of all of Brooklyn, not just the surrounding immediate neighborhood, as well as the citizens of the entire city and all the tourists that come to visit this beautiful Borough.
We would welcome a plan that would not take away an inch of parkland from the Park if possible. If any viable objective proposal can be put forward to eliminate commercial development entirely, or reduce it by any number of stories or units of housing in the Park to support the maintenance, so be it. We welcome it so long as it does not take away the percentage of the Park as has been conceived by the current planners, which we have been hearing is no longer the 20 percent, or the 10, it is now like 8 percent and going down to what I've heard recently being almost 4 percent. But at the same time, if this is not to be, then let the powers that be proceed in developing the Park with the plans proposed so far and proceed in constructing the Park as soon as possibly economically feasible and with consideration given
to positive community input to the RFP's that will be needed to seek out the appropriate developers if at all possible.

In the end, the finished product must be fully -- must fully support the Park and in no way detract from the experience but better enhance the Park experience for all visitors of Brooklyn. And just on a little further note, I wanted to just add something else.

Every comment that has been proposed to you I'm sure you're going to objectively go into it; eye it up and down, forwards, backwards, left to right. The objectiveness and the transparency is tantamount, as you've heard from previous speakers. However, I would also like to caution or present to some, and this is from a personal note, from a lot of speakers speaking here that this is a park not just for the surrounding
community of Brooklyn Heights, Boerum Hill or Carol Gardens. This has to be a park for the entire park --
Brooklyn, it's a regional park, and I want to emphasize that because the rest of Brooklyn is looking at this and wondering what the heck is going on that it's taking so long. Our youth is missing a park.

The other point is why don't we for once stop saying "development in the Park" and take a look and say "it's on the periphery of the Park" just as all the high-rises are around Central Park and around Prospect Park, wherever. Although we don't have high-rises at Prospect Park.

It's a necessity that's there.

The other thing is that if you walk into that park at the uplands of Pier 6, if you don't have something there to block out that sound from the BQE you're fooling yourself. And that little footprint is not all that
much. That towers, how big it is and you could actually -- I heard you, one minute -- you could reduce it in your final alternatives, maybe that would be the solution, but it would also be a solution for the noise problem that's in the Park. I thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Next speaker is Natasha Schwartz and following Natasha is James E. Caldwell.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I am pro housing, and as it is the best bang for the buck, it meets the projected financial needs. It includes a capital maintenance component, and it has the least vehicular impact on Fulton Ferry Landing, which I think is really important.

And if anyone has been to Battery Park City they will find that the hysteria about privatizing the Park is really a lot of nonsense. The
contingent against housing would rather give up more parkland than end up with a smaller park and have housing, and I'm absolutely against giving up any more parkland than the maximum 10 percent agreed to for housing. And what I find really ironic is the largest footprint on the Park is the hotel-condo on Pier 1. Why was there no uproar about that?

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

James Caldwell?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Mr. Caldwell is not here.

That concludes the list of folks who did not speak at the previous meeting. As we said at the beginning, once the people who have not spoken before had a chance we would call those who had spoken at the previous meeting.

I will now call as individuals,
at the same time in the light of the hour, I would make a request that those who speak if you could know that we do have your testimony from before in the record, so we have all the suggestions and comments from before, and so I would encourage you to the extent your other comments, if you can try to either add new ideas or not repeat the comments offered before. And again, as a courtesy, I want to hear if we could sort of try to make the comments closer to a minute or two rather than a full 5 minutes. I think that would be helpful.

So, the first person I would like to call is Judi Francis.

MS. FRANCIS: I've spoken before, so I'm not going to speak again.

MR. GOLEM: Okay.

MS. FRANCIS: My testimony is there. I'll just say this is about a
park. You've heard a lot of basic canards tonight about big box stores and "oh, the Park won't get built. We don't build housing." And that might be true because we put so much of our dollars into ground for housing and all the plans for it. I would just like to say that we're trying to get a park here, and for someone who has lived here for 30 years and been active in this in almost all of those years, I think we're getting close, but there's still miles to go.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

MS. FRANCIS: Thank you for listening.

The next speaker is Roy Sloane. And following Mr. Sloane will be Nancy Webster.

MR. SLOANE: Thank you very much. I'm going to -- I wanted to continue my talk about my proposals for a more active Pier 6 and to...
explain why it was important. I have written it out in detail, and I will be happy to submit it.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

MR. SLOANE: My main concern as somebody who has fought from the very beginning, and as people have mentioned, I actually coined the term Brooklyn Bridge Park, so I guess I've been involved longer than anybody. I can call Tony until a couple hours later. So, I've been fighting for something that is important to my community to try to make a livable city. I believe that the thing we want is what the Mayor wants. It is to make reasons for people who live here to make reasons for people to want to go to the Park.

On that ferry tour that somebody referred to, there were only two people. We visited every single waterfront park in New York City in late, either late winter or early
spring, however you want to look at it, there were two people in those parks. There was one roller blader going up. There was, like, park. We want a park that is truly part of our lives. The people that we want to be the "eyes on the park" are our children and our residents. We want the Park to have the benefit that Michael White talked about, to benefit our community.

We have commercial streets, Atlantic Avenue most particularly, Columbia Street, that need to be activated by the park. That is truly money that is -- that will be lost if we allow a park that is empty. I took San Pierre, the Mayor's representative, down there on October 20th, and we counted 5 people in the world class playground. I took him up to the Henry Street parks and there were 35 people in those parks. We need the Park to be usable and 12
months a year to activate it economically.

I also just want to briefly address the notion of privatization. The notion that somehow building housing in the Park and creating a roadway mitigates privatization is one of the more illogical and absurd things I ever heard in my life. If you take green space and build houses on it and put a road in front of it that parkland is lost forever. That is not land that any child will play on. There will be no ball games. There will be no concerts. We will never get to use that land. It will be devoted to private housing. More, you know, more activity is what is required for all of the people of Brooklyn.

We've heard urban planners talk about a comfortable quarter mile walking distance. The entrance of the Park is a quarter of a mile from the
nearest residence in South Brooklyn, in Community Board 6, Boerum Hill, rest of Brooklyn.

Experts have told us that 80 percent of the all of the people in Brooklyn will enter through Atlantic Avenue. We know that all of the residents of Community Board 6 in Boerum Hill will enter through Atlantic Avenue. We talk about the small amount of space that's given up, but if you look south, at Pier 5, and you count One Brooklyn Bridge Park, the roads and the commercial developments that's there, plus the perched wetland, which is actually waist water storage from the hard scape to prevent pollution into the harbor, most of the Park is actually -- most of the Park that we had, that we started with, is given up. I'd say it's much more like 80 percent of the parkland south of Atlantic Avenue. Most residents of Brooklyn,
if you believe that a quarter mile is a comfortable walking distance, that puts you only up to Pier 4. So, most residents of Brooklyn will have their park experience harmed or seriously deprived.

I also think we've heard so much about the public-private partnership, if you believe in the public-private --

MR. GOLEM: One minute.

MR. SLOANE -- if you believe in the public-private partnership, environmental justice is important. Those who are so keen on housing, and in their own Web site they say, "Without us this unique site may have been become luxury housing forever closed to the public," it seems like a double standard. I think it really is a double standard.

We in South Brooklyn have a giant Phoenix Beverage Truck Depot that has 30,000 truck trips. We've a
working waterfront. We do have big
box stores on our waterfront. I think
South Brooklyn is paying its fair
share, and I think that we need to
have an active part to activate our
residents to make life better in our
communities for our residents, and to
activate our retail strips. And I
count downtown Brooklyn in this. I
count the BAM cultural district --

(A timer bell rang.)
MR. GOLEM: Thank you.
MR. SLOANE -- Atlantic Yards.
Thank you. I also want to show you
what I think failure will look like.
MR. GOLEM: Thank you.
MR. SLOANE: I already gave you
one.
MR. GOLEM: Thank you.
Nancy Webster followed by Glenn
Kelly.
MS. WEBSTER: Thank you,
committee members, thank you for your
patience late into the evening.
My name is Nancy Webster. I'm the Executive Director of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Conservancy, and I'd like to take just a minute this evening to answer some of the concerns about the Park's revenue plan that we heard at the November 30 public hearing, and some of the concerns that we've heard tonight.

Some have said Brooklyn Bridge Park is not capturing concession revenue. While it is true that the River Cafe and the Brooklyn Ice Cream Factory operate under long-term leases which predate the Park, the Park expects to earn about $200,000 per year from the Pier 1 concessions and will earn concession revenue from the Pier 6 restaurant as well. All told, according to estimates, concessions will contribute about half a million dollars to the Park's operating budget. Further, the Park has already earned money from film
shoots within its borders, and it's hoped and anticipated that the Park will earn around $75,000 over 2011 in revenue from film and photo shoots and from other events and permits.

Some have also questioned Brooklyn Bridge Park's commitment to recreation. Brooklyn Bridge Park offers multiple recreation activities. Pier 5 will offer three outdoor multipurpose recreation fields to play soccer, lacrosse, cricket, rugby, football. These artificial turf fields will be available for play day or night.

Pier 2, at 5 acres, will feature active recreational courts for basketball, handball and bocci, as well as a full inline skating rink, swings, picnic tables, a concession. And these are all in addition to the bicycling path and the connection to the Brooklyn Greenway. The bus lane, playgrounds
at Pier 6, the boathouse and water
access for kayaking and canoeing.
The contemplation of the seasonal ice
rink at Brooklyn Bridge Park Plaza,
and, above all, on Pier 5, plus the
hope that the Department of
Environmental --

MR. GOLEM: I'm sorry, Nancy
I've been asked to point out to folks
when they've reached two minutes.

MS. WEBSTER: Okay.

That the Department of
Environmental Conservation will
permit a new floating pool.

Some have questioned the Park's
proposed maintenance and operations
budget, and we would note that the
Park's budget has been reviewed and
vetted by City Parks, and it's
roughly in line with other waterfront
parks. The Park's cost per acre is
slightly more than Hudson River Park,
which contains more hard scape and
less than Battery Park City parks.
Some have characterized the Park as simply a backyard for condo developments. And we would like to say that Brooklyn Bridge Park draws a wide range of visitors and communities. Visitors surveys over this past season have shown that folks from 175 different zip codes, towns and countries visited Brooklyn Bridge Park during its opening season. Educational classes and workshops brought over 5,000 children and adults from every Brooklyn zip code and from over 70 educational institutions and free City —

MR. GOLEM: Three minutes, Nancy. If I could ask you to wrap up.

MS. WEBSTER: Okay. Some have insisted that indoor recreation is sufficient to pay for the Park's maintenance. We would note that Chelsea Piers and Hudson River Park occupies a huge footprint with 1.2 million-square-feet. It stretches
across three piers and uplands all the way from 17th to 22nd Street. As such, it generates 3.2 million in rent. Notably, if we converted all of Piers 2, 3 and 5 into a private, expensive "pay to play" recreation space we still wouldn't have enough to cover Brooklyn Bridge Park's maintenance and operations budget. And that's why the Conservancy has consistently supported the current plan. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Again, I'd like to remind folks who have spoken before that in addition to your comments we both will take written testimony, and if you have more detailed information we do have the E-mail address, and we'll take it through that format through December 13.

I take it you're Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I'm Mr. Kelly.

MR. GOLEM: Okay. And again, in
view of the time, you know, we
originally said that we --

MR. KELLY: You're taking up
too much time. I'm going to be
brief.

MR. GOLEM: I'm done.

And after you is Sandy Balboza.

Okay.

MR. KELLY: My name is Glenn
Kelly. I reside at 257 Carol Street
in Carol Gardens. I am a 20-year park
volunteer and founder of the
Community to Improve Carol Park
[sic]. I am a member of Community
Board 6. I serve on the Parks and
Recreation Committee and (inaudible)
land use.

But tonight I'm here to speak
on behalf of the Carol Gardens
Neighborhood Association. We are
very excited in Carol Gardens about
our new park and are interested in
making sure that we get the biggest
and best park. We've noticed that
increasingly housing development is offered as a solution to any problem. In fact, we have been through a tremendous development boom and presently have more housing than we need. We have not increased the amount of parks or infrastructure to serve our growing population. And we -- that's our priority, is to make sure that we've got as much park as we can.

I've heard many good ideas and plans for alternative sources of revenue, and we urge you to explore those and select any and all of them if that's what it takes to avoid putting housing in the Park. Buildings in the Park just take away park. And we need park. And I'll close by saying what needs repeating, and that is that parks already pay for themselves. As Mr. White said before, parks, they promote tourism, they promote economic vitality,
people shop on the way to and from, they already pay for themselves. They just don't get credit for it. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you, thank you for keeping that under two minutes.

Sandy Balboza, followed by Barbara Chartin (phonetic).

MS. BALBOZA: Okay, I'm going to -- Sandy Balboza, 321 Atlantic Avenue. I'm president of the Atlantic Avenue Betterment Association. And is Patti still here? Yeah, okay. I think Patti Hagan hit the nail on the head. Hopefully, the budget will be looked into. I think her testimony is very relevant. We need to reduce, or look at reducing, the cost of the Park, less expensive, less complex design, affordable. Those words were said by other people.

And I'm shortening my testimony --
MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

MS. BALBOZA -- but I have some photographs of what Pier 6 looks like, and I don't call it a park. And a lot of people who are against the housing say that "what we want is a park." So, if you look at these photographs, and I followed the path that Mr. Van Valkenburgh made, and I see roads. I don't see people. There is a very expensive, fancy playground, which you can't see, and the only way you can go in is if you have a toddler, so I haven't been there. I've been to the dog run because I have a dog. And all I see are roads, and I hope everybody -- I don't know if everybody here has been to Pier 6, or what you think it is, but it's not a park.

And the people who say that housing is only a small footprint, they're not accurate because we're talking about towers, we're talking
about roads to service the towers, we're talking about now tour buses coming in past the children's playground. So, to me this is not a park. And I think the pictures will show that, and you'll see that there aren't any people here. There are very few people. There are more parked cars than people. And also, I think Patti mentioned --

MR. GOLEM: You're two minutes.

MS. BALBOZA: Okay. The perched wetlands, I have a picture of that, which won't contribute anything to financing the Park, or even an active use of the Park. It's desolate. It doesn't belong on Pier 6. So -- alright.

MR. GOLEM: If you'd like to leave the pictures with us we'll be happy to look at them.

MS. BALBOZA: I'm going to stop even though I'd like to go on. I hope people will look at this.
MR. GOLEM: Yes.

MS. BALBOZA: If you have not seen -- has everybody been down to Pier 6?

MR. GOLEM: This -- if you leave the pictures we'll look at them.

MS. BALBOZA: Okay. And this is that (handing).

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Barbara Charten? Is she here?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: No.

Barbara Brookheart? And following Barbara is Dorothy Siegel. And following Dorothy Siegel is Bronson Binger, and that's the last card I have.

MS. BROOKHEART: I'm Barbara Brookheart, 121 First Place in Carol Gardens, and I'm also a member of the -- I'm a founding member of the Carol Gardens Neighborhood Association. Again, I want to thank our elected's and the BBPC for
stepping back to relook at new and additional ways to finance the Park without using luxury high-rise housing. We also think that a 7-to 10-story hotel-condo will dominate at the Fulton Ferry entrance to the Park. My fear is that every inch of the Park has been so meticulously planned that there can be few alternative ways to finance the Park, and that this study will prove their point so they can claim "well, we did a study and only luxury co-ops can finance the Park," because we have experienced a lack of transparency in the process, and so we distrust anything that the corporations tells us, because we ask them this and they do that, and always "isn't it just great" and with a big smile on their face. And so we have tend not to trust whatever they say.

And when people think of the self-financing they think of a sports
facility, hotel, restaurant, a big
box store that pays rent, and a
percentage fee or PILOTS. But there
are soft money that can be generated
by the Park from commercial events
that can also pay for ongoing
operations that has little impact on
the Park, or does not inconvenience
the public, and the public can have
fun participating in these events.

I had a conversation with our
Borough President's person at the
public hearing last week, and for the
last 5 years she keeps saying that --
I work for Bryant Park, by the way,
and she kept saying, "Well --"

MR. GOLEM:  You're two minutes.

MS. BROOKHEART:  "-- that the
Brooklyn Bridge Park isn't Bryant
Park." But any group with just a
little savvy can create value out of
branding the name, especially one as
good and grand as the Brooklyn
Bridge. This is why these kind of
soft money funding must be factored in self-financing equations and on an escalating basis. It took Bryant Park many years to do this, but it will take Brooklyn Bridge Park only half that time to do that because it's a much more dramatic site. And the Park won't get commercial events that meet high pedestrian traffic, but it will get top fees for many commercial events, opportunities. Also, I see a major problem with having three top heavy organizations living off the proceeds of the financing of the Park. I think that only one organization should do cultural and programming in the Park. I think that there will be conflict with St. Ann's doing cultural events in Brooklyn Bridge Park --

MR. GOLEM: Three minutes.

MS. BROOKHEART: -- doing Park programming as both our organizations
will be begging to the same

corporations to sponsor their events

and programs. St. Ann's will make

substantial fees from private events

such as parties and commercial events

such as fashion shows in the Tobacco

Warehouse, and a percentage of these

fees will go back to the Park

Corporations to run for ongoing

operations, and my voice just ran

out.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Dorothy Siegel, and the last

speaker card I have is Bronson

Binger.

MS. SIEGEL: Hi to those of you

who are on the panel, I'm sorry, I

came a little late I didn't hear -- I

didn't hear the introduction, so

could I just find out who is a

representative and who is a member of

the --

MR. GOLEM: I'm sorry, this is

not a question and answer. I just
ask for your comments and then we
have to -- (inaudible).

MS. SIEGEL: Okay. Well, it was
relevant, but I guess you wouldn't
think so anyway.

This is what I would call
political theater. We're all sort of
playing out our, you know, in a
Kabuki audience. Some of us write to
each other and have little
conversations while the public is
giving you testimony that you're not
listening to. Some of you have
text-ing or playing on your
BlackBerries. I hope that your --
the people that you represent,
whether whoever it was who appointed
your boss, is getting good value.
Looking at your watches. I know, it
gets kind of late --

MR. GOLEM: If I could just ask
you, really, the subject is the
alternatives for the financing of the
Park --
MS. SIEGEL: Yes.

MR. GOLEM -- so if you could --

MS. SIEGEL: Yes.

MR. GOLEM: -- offer your comment.

MS. SIEGEL: My comment is a cynical comment that I don't believe, with two exceptions, that the people are in fact considering alternatives to housing. If you consider the fact that this proposal that is on the floor would put new housing up and that new housing will not be paying for the services that it uses, but instead imposing that burden on the rest of us, then you would say, "Well it's easy to match that funding."

It's not happening. The housing in the Park, if it paid for itself by paying taxes and paid something additional, then I could see that you would have to come up with an alternative. But as it stands right now, this is a fraud. And some of you
know that and some of you don't --

MR. GOLEM: See, now you're at
two minutes.

MS. SIEGEL: Thank you so much.
You're encouraging me to stay longer,
so thank you.

We all know that it's a fraud.
We all know that there is no funding
mechanism for the Park that is not
stealing money from the City. As it
is, this Park, as other people have
said, is generating money for the
City. There are many ways that it
could be funded if you actually were
looking for alternatives to housing.
We know that the Mayor controls the
majority of votes. So, we know that
you will all be voting with the
Mayor, with two exceptions, because
those two people were put there by
the people who voted overwhelmingly
against housing in the Park.

Now, if you were honest you
would recognize that the current
funding mechanism is not a funding mechanism. It's transferring funds from schools and other services to the Park to pay for the Park. And what I would say is that instead, you should take from the revenues that are being generated by the Park, which would be a Park Improvement District, or something of that nature. So I do hope that you will somehow transcend, you or your -- the people you represent, transcend the fact that you are beholden to the Mayor for your position here and actually look for alternatives to housing. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you.

Last speaker I have is Bronson Binger.

MR. BINGER: I thank you for listening to me, in some cases a second time, because I was at the last hearing. Is it alright if I speak for a minute?
MR. GOLEM: Yes, please. I think we're asking folks if they are going to, obviously it's late --

MR. BINGER: I worked on capital projects in the park for seven years ending in 1985. In that seven years I never put a single park in except one new one. All the rest, we couldn't afford to build parks back then. That one was in Fox Street in the Bronx. I don't believe that you could get very many people to build a high-rise building near it to support it. Nevertheless, we built it with taxpayer money, and it is supported with taxpayer money.

I'm interested to know when one of these high-rises catch fire and they're not paying taxes to support the Fire Department, are they going to let it burn? When they are not paying taxes to support the public schools are they not allowed to send their kids to public school? When
they are not paying taxes to support the police are we not allowed to call the police? So, I believe that as the last speaker said, this is a substitution of something else for the other services they're getting.

I also would like to point out that my father, who built the FDR Drive and the East River Drive as Assistant Commissioner as Deputy -- I can't think of his title, Assistant to the Borough President, Chief of the Borough President's office in 1939, when he left, starting about '33, when he started, they built more parks on the other side of the river than you will see in all of East River on this side from one end of the other all the way into Queens. Not one of those was done with private housing in it. And there was a much worse recession then than it is now, so I think we're falling back --
MR. GOLEM: You're two minutes.

MR. BINGER: Sorry. So, I will leave at that and say that I think. Housing does not belong in a park, we never built any in my time there, and I believe that this is entirely the wrong way to do it. And I'm sorry to say that because you've been very patient for many days now. And thank you for that.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Thank you all for your comments. Before we close the hearing is there anybody else here that would like to make a statement?

(Ms. Hagan addressed the panel.)

MR. GOLEM: If you want, I could ask you to come to the microphone, to the lectern, again, I'm sorry, I've been told the rules --

MR. PINSKY: We'll happy to have people submit --
MS. HAGAN: It's a really good idea. It just came to me while --

MR. GOLEM: I'll be happy to talk to you after the official meeting is over.

Yes, sir. Could you please identify yourself?

MR. KLEIMAN: Sure. Louis Kleiman, I work with one of the waterfront groups. I'm talking for myself. I live in Manhattan, in fact.

You've got to keep the recognition of the fact that a waterfront park is different than any other kind of park. A waterfront park in the 21st century should be for more than just having a good time and allowing children to do what they want to do, adults to have a recreation. It should be for storm water management, which is going to become very, very important. It should be for mitigation of steam
rises, which means soft shell embankments. And what I personally want to see is the ability not for people to get to the water but to get into the water and out of the water. And as Nancy once said, kayaking and human power boating, and things of that nature, I think is very, very essential. And I think that a good waterfront park means a benefit to the entire New York City area, not just for Brooklyn. Thank you.

MR. GOLEM: Thank you. Again, I'll ask before I close the hearing is there anyone else here that would like to make a statement?

(No reply from the audience.)

MR. GOLEM: Let the record reflect that no one has answered to that question. The time is now 9:35 P.M. and this hearing is now closed. However, please note as I stated earlier, that written comments are requested. I will fully review them
and we will receive and consider them after conclusion of the hearing on Monday at 5:00 P.M., on the 13th.

Thanks, everyone, for your comments. Thank to everyone for being here.

(Whereupon, at 9:35 P.M., the above matter concluded.)
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