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MS. GLEN: Good afternoon,
everybody. A meeting of the Board of
Directors of the Brooklyn Bridge Park
Corporation is hereby called to
Order.

I ask that Suma Mandel the
Secretary of the corporation, to
confirm we have a quorum for today's
meeting.

MS. MANDEL: We have a quorum.

MS. GLEN: Prior to addressing
all the voting items on today's
agenda, I would like to welcome all
the Board members -- I believe I met
all of you the last one -- and
various State and City officials, of
course, acknowledge Regina Myer and
her staff and everyone else in
attendance. And I would also like to
thank the members of the public for
joining us today. I would like to
get on with the voting items for
today's meeting. And I want to
remind everybody that as is our
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practice, I ask that if any members
of the public have any questions or
comments, during this Board meeting
please hold them and will I ask you
for your comments at the end of the
meeting. When formulating your
comments please note our policy is to
limit speakers to a two-minute turn
per speaker. I would appreciate
people being respectful of that
limit. This meeting should end at
5:00 p.m. and I want to make sure
everyone has an opportunity to speak
who wants to speak. I appreciate
people being respectful of our time
limit. Thank you.

We will move through our agenda
now. The first item on the agenda
for today is the approval of the
minutes of the April 1st, 2014
meeting of the Directors. A draft of
the proposed minutes have been
circulated to the Directors prior to
today's meeting along with other
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items and materials to be considered
by the Directors. Do any of the
Directors have any changes or
corrections or questions to the
proposed minutes? If not, I request
a motion to approve the minutes of
the April 1st, 2014 Board of
Directors meeting?

MR. CONNOR: So moved.

MR. GUTMAN: Second.

MS. GLEN: All in favor. So
moved.

The second item on today's
agenda is the authorization to
approve the capital budget for fiscal
2015. Pat Kirschner, the Park's vice
president of capital planning and
construction will now present this
item.

MS. KIRSCHNER: The proposed FY
2015 capital budget is sixty-five
million, seven hundred and eighty
thousand dollars.

The budget provides funding for
both construction and designs
services. The projects included both
hard bricks and mortar and soft
design and survey capital costs. The
total estimated cost for the design,
engineering and construction of the
project is two million five hundred
seventeen thousand five hundred and
forty-five dollars. The remaining
soft costs are one million, two
hundred sixty-two thousand, four
hundred fifty-five dollars to
complete the cost for BBP's owner
representative environmental
consultation as well as small
contingency for unforeseen survey
related work. Support and revenue
for the proposed 2015 capital grants
from New York City allocated in
fiscal years in 2014 and 2015. The
Directors are hereby requested to
authorize FY 2015 capital budget of
sixty-five million, seven hundred and
eighty thousand dollars.
MEETING - JUNE 5, 2014

MS. GLEN: Do any of the Directors have any questions or wish to discuss any items with respect to the capital budget get for 2015.

MS. HANDY: Is this part of the overall capital plan?

MS. GLEN: This is part of the implement plan since 2008 and has been proceeding with construction as capital fund available. Any other questions?

MR. RASKIN: Can you be more specific first on Pier 3? Is it a capital tag expenditure? Can you give more details on the plan for Pier 3 facing the timing and what will be there and what is so costly.

MS. KIRSCHNER: First the budget has to be approved, the City budget. This is assuming it does. It is our last on final pier build-out. It is will be landscaping consisting of lawns, plantings, using the BBP standard fixtures and design
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elements. A lot of it is maritime repairs, the piles underneath. It is very expensive work to bring the pier up to code.

MR. RASKIN: Was that a contracted expenditure, part of capital expenditures on pier.

MS. KIRCHNER: Right now we are doing emergency repair work to stabilize the pier. Additional work has to be done to bring the pier up to the load of the construction.

MS. GLEN: Can I have a motion to approve? Motion is approved.

The third item on today's agenda is the authorization to approve the operating budget for 2015. I would like Cedric Gaddy the financial officer to proceed with this item.

MR. GADDY: The BBP staff is proceeding an FY 2015 support and revenue budget of thirty-two point eight million dollars. An increase
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from physical year from 2014 due
largely to the successful
negotiations Empire Stores, John
Street and Pier One Real Estate and
Development Site. That will result
in base rent payments of real estate
taxes, sale taxes and mortgage
recording taxes revenue for BBP.
The FY 2015 of maintain and
operation budget of twenty-one point
one million increases over this
fiscal year largely as a result of
the need to use operating funds to
strengthen the piles under Pier
Three.

The remaining increases for FY
2015 the Parks maintain an operation
budget include the necessary and
organization of maintenance operation
staff to support the additions added
to the Park in fiscal year 2014
including Pier Three, Pier Two, Pier
Four, as well as addressing the
increased visitor usage of the Park.
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Other increases include utilities, supplies and equipment.

Along with these increases, BBP will incur costs for contract renewals for security provide by PEP and Park's maintenance.

The FY 2015 management administration budget consists of two point six million includes salary and benefits for staff, renewals with ADP total source for payroll and benefits services. IT support provided by New York City and other professional services provided for administrative support.

The total FY 2014 support revenue budget exceeds the operating expense budget of twenty-three point seven million dollars by nine point two million dollars.

Once this FY 2014 surplus is combined with the prior year FY 2014 estimated reserve of thirty-nine point five million dollars. BBP is
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projecting a forty-eight point six
million dollar operating reserve.

In discussions with both BBP'S
audit finance and budget and
operations committee BBP has begun a
new process of separating its
operating reserve into three separate
categories to allow BBP to better
plan for and meet future funding
requirements.

The capital maintenance reserve
with an initial funding of one point
five million is intended to support
the appropriate assets life cycle for
capital assets such as buildings,
structures, park landscaping, fixture
and equipment.

The Maritime reserve with an
initial funding amount of forty
million is intended to provide funds
specifically to meet the needs to
maintain the BBP's maritime
structures including pilings and
bulkheads.
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And the final operating reserve with an initial funding of seven point two is intended to provided funds for unforeseen circumstances such as uninsured losses, one time un-budgeted expenses for unanticipated losses.

The Directors are hereby requested to approve the attached BBP FY 2015 operating budget in the amount of twenty-six point seven million and authorize BBP staff to undertake the task of the incurred expenditures as identified in the approved budget.

MS. GLEN: Questions?

MS. WITTY: I would like to point Cedric mentioned as budget item PEP officers. Just to clarify a statement made earlier. We employed PEP officers in this park as part of your operation.

MS. GLEN: Any other questions about the operating budget?
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MS. HANDY: So Pier Three with respect to straightening the piles in Pier Three so the expenditure was unexpected and was an emergency expenditure?

MS. MYER: As Pat eluded to, there are emergency repairs, unfortunately they are not unexpected. This pier has not been repaired since the 1950s. We need to undertake pile repair in order to maintain the five acre pier for our park. As discussed, those piles repairs are paid for out of your operating budget.

MS. HANDY: Why are they capitalized?

MS. MYER: Waterfront infrastructure is paid for out of your operating budget.

MR. RASKIN: Putting aside of whether they should be paid for out of our operating budget, it is an old question. I want to ask about
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communicating the financials

specifically, and I don't mean that

you are doing this intentionally, the

way the financials end up looking is
difficult to understand for the

layperson because you have a lot of

one time revenues, one time payments,
you have emergency repairs, you have

the piers which is an ongoing expense

but we are putting in every few years

for a lot of money at once. I want
to ask it here; is it possible to put
together both a budget for the year

that shows what is kind of really the

annual ongoing operations and what is
either the annualized version of the

one time or just a different color on

a graft what is the one time so it is
clear. And then what I think would

be helpful, a projection of the

future of multiple years at a time a

five, ten-year projection of revenue

and expenses. Because what it looks

like now is the Park has forty-eight
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million dollar sitting around but
there is a plan that will be absorbed
over time. I want to make sure
people are to understand it. It was
explained to in more detail because I
was asking these questions. But for
members of public it will be helpful
for the corporation to do.

MS. MYER: I think in the
October financial discussion we did
talk about that over time. I think
what we could do is take the
information we used in October and
apply it to the actual and it will
become very clear that you can see we
are on projection in terms of our
actual Park operation. Our Park
operation budget is around seven or
eight million. It is on budget. The
remainder of the expenditures are in
the maritime infrastructure. We can
apply that to the October
presentation.

MR. RASKIN: It would be
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helpful to do that in an ongoing way. I think it is important over time and also somethings that came from the October presentation, for example, revenue from Pier Six which is something that was clear in October there was no changes that would be made plan for Pier Six and now there is a new plan for Pier Six.

MS. MYER: Honestly, we have been careful not putting funds in the budget that has not been received.

MR. RASKIN: I am saying the October presentation now seems to be out-of-date based not on this sheet of paper but on the broader discussions we are having about Pier Six.

MS. GLEN: The question and I think it is a fair question, our point would be on a quarterly basis we have our 2014 plan. And how we are doing on actuals and where there are variances over the quarters,
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which would not be atypical and in
addition a five-year forecast so you
can see we have the reserve. People
understand we need those reserved in
order to spend down what we know to
be out-year expenses. That should be
simply enough for them to track the
quarterly plan.

MR. RASKIN: That is fine.

MS. GLEN: Let's recommend that
we develop a prototype of what that
report would look like, and if that
is a more accessible financial.
Circulate it to a couple of people on
the Board to see if that answers your
question with respect to how the
information is being conveyed.

MR. RASKIN: Thank you.

MS. GLEN: Other questions
about the budget? I would like a
motion to approve the request.

MS. WITTY: I so move.

MR. OFFENSE: Second.

MS. GLEN: All in favor.
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(The Board collectively aye.)

MS. GLEN: We are going to have
to do something about the door
opening. It is going to get hot in
here.

The fourth item on today's
agenda is the approval of the
financial report pursuant to the
Public Authorities Accountability
Act. Mr. Gaddy, will you present
this item.

MR. GADDY: Pursuant to the
Public Authorities Accountability Act
of 2005 requires Brooklyn Bridge Park
to submit to New York State
Authorities budget Office budget
information on operations and capital
construction setting forth estimated
receipts and expenditures for fiscal
physical years 2015 and 2015. And
the actual receipts for expenditures
for fiscal year 2013.

The proposed financial report
is attached hereto as Attachment B.
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The sixth column in the spreadsheet can be summarized as follows:

The FY 2013 actuals are derived directly from our approved audit of fiscal year 2013 that was submitted to the Board on October 21, 2013.

FY 2014 are estimated. BBP will not have financial allowances until the conclusion of its audit performed by Mark Paners scheduled to begin in early August 2014.

The FY 2015 expenditures and operating revenue budget request submitted to the Board today at this meeting.

Fiscal year 2016 through 2018 represents estimates of spending requesting approved capital construction projects and required costs to maintain and operate suggested new park openings. The revenue estimates are based on improved development sites,

concession agreements and historical
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return revenue.

Because the State's budget office restricts the form and types of information presented this report does not provide a useful picture of the Corporation's finances as the annual audit of financials that are approved each fall for the annual budget that was submitted today for approval.

Please note BBP's capital funds are included in the report as other not operating revenues but do not appear as expenditures due to accounting characterization of capital assets.

The Directors are hereby requested to authorize the adoption of the financial report in the form attached hereto and authorize the president to take any related actions.

MS. GLEN: Any questions.

MS. KIMBALL: We reviewed and
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approve.

MS. GLEN: Anything other
questions from Directors?

Motion to approve this request?

MR. GUTMAN: So moved.

MR. OFFENSEN: Second.

MS. GLEN: All in favor. The
fifth agenda item is the
authorization to enter into the
Thirteenth Amendment of the Funding
Agreement with the City of New York.
Miss Kirschner will present this
item.

MS. KIRSCHNER: City funding of
the Twelfth Amendment totalled two
hundred eighty-one million nine
hundred and sixty-one thousand
dollars. The Thirteenth Amendment
will add a hundred and fifty thousand
dollars in new capital funds
allocated by the borough president to
BBP projects at Montague Street to
improve vehicle turnaround and access
to the Park.
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The borough president's office has also redirected two hundred and fifty thousand previously allocated to BBP for event equipment to the Montague Street project. This brings the total funding commitment to BBP of funds contributed by the City to two hundred eighty-two million one hundred eleven thousand dollars. The Directors are hereby requested to authorize the additional hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the agreement.

MS. GLEN: Any questions about this amendment? Motion to accept the amendment?

MS. WITTY: Motion.

MS. KIMBALL: Second.

MS. GLEN: All in favor. The sixth agenda item is the authorization to enter into a contract for architect services for the Pier Five maintenance and operation facilities. Miss Kirschner
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will present this at this time.

MS. KIRSCHNER: The proposed contract is with an architectural research office is for architectural and related services to design and build a maintenance and operations facility and a boathouse. The facility will provide public restrooms, a public boathouse and M&L facilities for BBP users that include storage, garage, workshop, administrative spaces, and a trash operation. Associated outdoor uses included composting and a yard space. ARO was selected by a competitive process, and was selected because they scored highest in terms of experience of a similar scope, quality of respondent, quality of concept proposal, WMBE composition of team and subcontractors, financial obligation and fee offer. The proposal not to exceed contract price is one million one hundred nine
thousand three hundred and seventeen dollars. BBP's owner allowance of thirty-five thousand dollars and a contingency of one hundred twelve thousand three hundred sixty-one dollars for a total contract price authorization of one million two hundred and fifty-six thousand six hundred and seventy-eight dollars.

The funding for this project will come from BBP capital budget. The Directors are hereby requested to authorize BBP to enter into this contract.

MS. GLEN: Any questions from Directors?

MS. HANDY: So this is a certified MWBE.

MS. KIRSCHNER: The architects themselves are not but their subcontractors are the consultants, the lighting designers, the electrical engineer. Thirty-nine percent are WMBE.
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MS. HANDY: In the competitive process how many were certified MWBE?

MS. KIRCHNER: There were three certified.

MS. GLEN: I ask for a motion to approve.

MS. WITTY: So moved.

MS. HYMAN: Seconded.

MS. GLEN: All in favor.

Motion approved. The seventh item is to approval of the recommendation of the parks community advisory council to designate a replacement organization representative. Belinda Kaye, the park's vice president of strategic partnerships, will present this item.

MS. KAYE: At our April 1st, 2014 financial meeting the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council voted to approve the designation or Carolyn Zigler to replace Jane McGarrity as the organization representative of the
MEETING - JUNE 5, 2014

Brooklyn Heights Association. The CAC's approval of an appointment representative is subject to the approval of BBP's Board of Directors.

Miss Zigler's biography is provided to all. Therefore the Directors are hereby requested to approve the recommended replacement of the CAC and authorized the taking of related actions.

MS. GLEN: Any questions? I would like a motion to approve.

MR. GUTMAN: Motion to approve.

MR. OFFENSEND: Second.

MS. GLEN: Motion is approved.

The eighth item on the agenda consists of an administrative matter. The bylaws of the corporation require that the Board of Directors designate a time and place for the annual, in which the annual report and the annual audit report are presented.

At this time I request a motion to designate the board meeting for
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October 1st, 2014. As same maybe
reschedule by BBP staff as the annual
meeting of the Board of Directors.
All in favor?
(The Board collectively aye.)

MS. GLEN: The nine agenda item
were just added today. So I don't
think I have materials. Is a
discussion presented of the CAC
resolution dated May 27th, 2014. And
a recommendation for the next step.
Miss Myer will speak to this item.
It looks like we are having a visual.

MS. MYER: No, we are not.
There are two letters. You have a
letter at your desk and I will speak
to this item. My thank, Chair Glen.

I want to bring you up to date
on an item that came from the
community advisory counsel at their
May 27th meeting. The CAC passed a
resolution which has been distributed
to your seat.

Two days ago we received a
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letter from State Senator Squadron,
Assemblywoman Millman and Councilman
Levine asking in consideration of the
CAC's resolution be added to the
Board's agenda today. I want to
first emphasize the Park's general
project plan which was adopted in
2005 and modified in 2006 is the
result of many years of planning and
design was fully reviewed during this
process. There is not in our view a
basis for additional review of the
GPP.

The completion of the
environmental review does not mean we
will continue work community and with
all our Park constituents to address
traffic concerns.

For some time BBP staff has
been monitoring the traffic near Pier
6. We have observed there have been
some times particularly during summer
weekends and spring and fall as well
where there is traffic congestion on
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the Park loop road. We intend to

take the following actions in an

attempt to alleviate this issue:

First, we believe one of the major

causes of the congestion is the poor

operation and management of the 360

Furman public parking garage. We

have been working with the public

parking garage operator to resolve

this issue. BBP has certain

contractual rights we plan to

aggressively enforce which we hope

will alleviate the congestion

including the ability to require the

parking garage add necessary signage,

and be staffed with sufficient

employees to insure safe and

expeditious flow of traffic and

experienced and qualified supervisory

personnel to oversee this operation.

Two, BBP will be installing paid

parking meters at the parking spaces

along the loop road this summer. If

some of you remembered from the car
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processes, this was a direct
recommendation of the car analysis we
did three years ago. Third, BBP is
always working with our Park
enforcement patrol to enforce the
double-parking vehicles along the
loop road. Four, BBP is willing to
engage a traffic consultant to
perform a study of these traffic
patterns in the Pier 6 area to
understand what other steps can be
taken to further alleviate the
problem. In summary it is my
recommendation we continue to work
through these issues and monitor the
traffic situation based on these four
items that we are undertaking right
away.

MS. GLEN: Thank you. That
sounds like a lot of good sense.

Good planning. Are there folks who
have questions about this?

MR. RASKIN: So I want to speak
in favor of our considering and
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adopting the community advisory
counsel's request that we look at the
general project plan specifically
about Pier 6 on its substance, for
instance, it is not only about
traffic. The general project plan
and all these considerations are also
the infrastructures, schools,
transportation, right, this is from
ten years ago we last looked at this.
The world has changed. Not the least
we are not, we're only talking about
Long Island College Hospital and the
enormous drain on the infrastructure
from the proposed plan there. I
think it is worth ten years later
looking back. But putting aside the
substance of it, you know, the
community advisory council is not a
radical organization. This is the
basic advisory committee we set up to
give input to us and to park
leadership on what to do. And have
since requested this review. I know
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Community Board 6 may be considering it. Just this basic structure we have in place at the most community level to give us input and are asking us to review this so I think even putting the substance aside, I think for progress reasons the community is asking for it in a very broad based and a consensus based way, I would ask us to adopt a resolution to look at it, and specifically if we could do it before the selection of a Pier 6 developer.

MS. GLEN: Peter, do you have something to say?

MR. ASCHKENSAY: I think we should probably speak to Regina's recommendation about traffic as a prerequisite to anything else. I think her suggestion make sense. I would propose the Board adopt those suggestions. Because after all that is work we can do in the immediate future.
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MR. GUTMAN: I would second that. I think that Regina's suggestion concerning traffic and studying it make a lot of sense. I would just point out that some years ago a Congressman Velazquez secured a million dollars for the LDC to do the study of transportation to access the Park. That produced some useful results a number of which have already been implemented and one of which we voted to accept the money to do today the business around Montague Street for pickup and drop-off. I urge we do what Regina proposed.

MS. GLEN: Any other Directors?

MS. HANDY: What are we voting on? Are we voting on adopting the resolution of the CAC or Regina's suggestions?

MS. GLEN: Regina's specific suggestion, the study they want to undertake as well as the Park's recommendation.
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MR. RASKIN: Sorry, I think I misinterpreted. I was looking for the Board to vote on whether or not to do that review, sorry, not the smaller traffic study but a board based environmental review. Is a yes vote a vote to adopt that review or is a yes vote to adopt the smaller traffic study?

MS. GLEN: Correct.

MR. RASKIN: I would like to make a request the Board also vote on the actual resolution that the CAC wanted for us to do. This board-based review is not limited to traffic, although they do identify traffic, but also the impact it will have on housing, and all sorts of things, schools being prominent.

So is that possible to then ask you to consider separately this review the CAC asked for coming that is coming from the community.

MR. OFFENSEND: I have a
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question and suggestion procedurally
which is that I don't know that there
is actually a motion on the floor,
but I think there are two issues
here. One is Regina's suggestion to
do this traffic study, which I think
is a very good one. I think we get a
motion on that and vote. But I think
subsequently it makes sense to have a
discussion about it and maybe we can
separate them. Does that make sense.

MS. GLEN: I think that is
appropriate procedure given what has
been added to the agenda for today's
meeting. The larger question is
whether or not we want to have a
broader discussion around the
environmental impact I would like to
table it and put it on the agenda for
October.

MR. RASKIN: I would be fine
with doing that if that is before the
selection of the developer of Pier 6.
I don't want to start the Pier 6
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project and say oh we should have
considered this a while ago. It is
that timeline that is more important.
Ideally we can vote on it today, I
think we have as much information
about the proposal as we have about
the proposed traffic study. I don't
see why we are only considering the
traffic study and not the broader
issue of the Pier 6 development.

MS. GLEN: The current motion
with respect to what we are being
asked to approve today is limited in
scope to these particular parking
issues. It is not a motion to reopen
the environmental review and add a
discussion around the broader
amendment of the GPP. That is not
what is on the table today, nor is
the recommendation to have that
conversation today. That was not
part of agenda item and if it would
be something we like to have a lot
more material on prior to asking the
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Board to vote on it.

MS. HANDY: I thought what was added to the agenda was this letter.

MS. MYER: This letter was placed there for your information because I referred to it in my discussions.

MS. HANDY: Pursuant to that there is now a motion to do as you are suggesting.

MS. MYER: For BBP staff to proceed with the four items relative to traffic at Pier 6.

MS. HANDY: So why do we have this letter?

MS. GLEN: For information purposes. The motion is to adopt the recommendations that have now been incorporated into the board of materials which have been given to all of you today with respect to a subset of issues which the president and myself are recommending we adopt and take immediate action on.
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MS. KIMBALL: So moved.

MR. ASCHKENASY: Second.

MS. HANDY: I am not ready.

MS. GLEN: You can abstain.

MS. HANDY: I appreciate that.

I am confused. I am sure we don't want to run over this.

MS. WITTY: I think the motion actually takes some positive steps to deal with some of the issues that have been raised specifically around traffic so. So it is not, I mean --

MS. HANDY: This is the first I am seeing this letter. I got a call this letter was being added and we are not talking about the letter. We are talking about a traffic study. So I am just trying to understand the process.

MS. GLEN: We have a motion on the table to adopt this set of recommendations and as I understand, we have just voted to approve that motion.
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MR. RASKIN: We have not voted yet.

MR. CONNOR: The ayes voted.

Under the rules of order you cannot interrupt a vote in the middle of a vote.

MS. GLEN: The motion passed.

MR. RASKIN: I vote no.

MS. GLEN: One no. One abstention. Councilman Levine?

MR. LEVIN: I vote no.

MR. RASKIN: I would like to make a new motion to consider the actual request of the Advisor Council as echoed in the letter from our elected officials and to adopt a broader review not only of traffic but including that but schools and our infrastructure and to do that and complete before selecting the developer for Pier 6.

MS. HANDY: I second that.

MR. MERKEL I have a question whether such a review which is
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contemplated by this proposed
resolution is in budget and whether
the staff recommends it.

MS. MYER: In terms of
reviewing the GPP and the
environmental review we are very
comfortable with moving forward with
the GPP. We talked about RFP at our
last meeting which we will talk about
later in the agenda has been
released. The issues that John has
raised with regard to schools and
other services are ones that we are
in constant contact with other
agencies on.

MS. HANDY: I think you are out
of order to have a discussion in the
middle of a motion. He moved. I
seconded.

MR. CONNOR: Right, and now you
have a discussion.

MS. GLEN: I believe your
question is do we have the budget and
were we prepared to undertake a
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discussion today around what kind of
review that would entail. And the
answer to that is no. So that is
clearly --

MR. MERKEL: All the other
resolutions we had have been at the
recommendation of staff. Now we have
a specification recommendations one
of which was with respect to this is
much boarded and out of the budget
proposal.

MS. MYER: My recommendation is
we do the traffic work I outlined.
We believe that traffic work is
warranted.

MR. CONNOR: With respect to
this resolution on which the motion
has been made, I think it is pretty
significant, and it is the kind of
thing that I appreciate more than a
couple of hours' notice on. Every
other item we voted on we received
the agenda, we received the
resolutions a couple of days ago.
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And so I don't think that the Chair's suggestions that it be considered for inclusion under our next meetings of this Board is unreasonable.

MS. LEVINE: I think that it is appropriate to consider these items now in this stage of the process because as John had mentioned previously, you know, we don't have a Board meeting in the summer. It is my understanding the next Board meeting is in October. That is a long time off. And if we are going to be incorporating sound planning principles into the Pier 6 RFP, then those ought to be looked at at this stage of the game and not six months from now.

In particular the issues of school overcrowding, elementary school overcrowding, is an issue with an unmitigated impact right now on all the developments we are seeing.

We are in District 13. It is an
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overcrowded school. We are running
out of space. There is no
opportunity to have Pre-K in P.S.8
because it is overcrowded right now.

There is Pier 1. There is John
Street. There is Dock Street, those
are all new buildings in addition to
Pier 6 that is all going to have an
impact on P.S. 8's school zone.

Unless we are going to redraw the
zone that is an impact on that school
and on that school's capacity which
is already at this point overcrowded.

So I think it is appropriate at this
time in addition to other impacts
ought be examined in line with what
we do in the city council all the
time. So I think it is appropriate
at this time to adopt the CAC's
recommendation and incorporate sound
planning principles.

MS. GLEN: This is a brief
discussion on the motion that was
made as to whether or not we should
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examine all of the impacts with
respect to potential projects
pursuant to, I guess, I am not sure
exactly, but let's stay on point and
vote on whether or not we want to do
that. We already voted to adopt
Regina's recommendation in the
materials.

I would recommend the
following: We can either vote on the
motion that is on the table and
second it and/or I understand we are
having a meeting in August. I didn't
realize there was a meeting in
October. I didn't realize we also
meet in August. We can withdraw that
the motion and set an agenda item for
an August meeting where we can have
more meaningful discussions based on
a set of materials that is much more
exhaustive than a one-paragraph
letter handed a few hours before a
meeting. I would recommend that you
withdraw your motion and we have an
MEETING - JUNE 5, 2014

agenda item in August to have a full
discussion around that. But
obviously, there is a motion on the
table and we can proceed with the
vote or we can have a discussion on
it.

MR. RASKIN: What is the timing
on the decision on Pier 6?

MS. MYER: The RFP is due July
21st. We anticipate we will spend
several months reviewing the
financial proposals and obviously we
will show the community the designs
and get feedback on that. We
anticipate the division wouldn't be
until fall.

MS. GLEN: So there is no hard
deadline for the decision to -- with
respect to get back from the RFP. I
strongly suggest we table this
conversation until August when there
have been enough materials presented
to people prior to the meeting so we
can have a more fulsome and educated
MEETING - JUNE 5, 2014

discussion around what undertaking
that would entail or no.

MR. RASKIN: I want us to have
a meaningful discussion about it. I
think that is valuable. The concern
raised by the advisory council and
the elected officials that the Pier 6
RFP not move forward before we are
able to have this discussion. I will
warn everybody, if we delay the
consideration of this and decide to
adopt a review it can further delay
any resolution of Pier 6. With that
said, both because what we are
talking about will happen long before
any documentation of Pier 6 and to be
frank I think we will hear from more
community members. This is not only
coming from the Advisory Council but
Community Board 6. For that reason I
think it is wise to revisit this in
August if you agree to put on the
board meeting agenda for August
specifically an adoption of the
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Community Advisory Council and you put that on ahead of time so we are all able to review the material ahead of time and can vote on it at August Board meeting. If BBP is willing to agree to that, I will withdraw the motion.

MS. GLEN: I am trying to understand what you are asking us to agree to. This does not agree to put this on the agenda.

MR. RASKIN: I am asking for the Park to guarantee consideration at the August Board meeting of the CAC's recommendation of what they requested from us. Which I think is fuller than the traffic study we just adopted. I'm asking a guarantee that would be on our August Board meeting agenda for discussion. I understand that I may well be out voted on the question whether to adopt the study. I want that question and a vote on the August Board meeting when we all...
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have the materials to review and we
have it ahead of time and so there is
no question about being given
something right there. Two months
before August is plenty of time to
review. If you are willing to put
that question on the August Board
meeting and guarantee that there is
no movement on the Pier 6 RFP or any
decision adopted before that time
that is totally reasonable to me and
I will withdraw the motion.

MS. GLEN: So I believe based
on my conversation with the president
we have no problem with agreeing to
put a discussion on the board meeting
for the August agenda and given the
time frame that president outlined
with respect to when the proposals
are due and the deliberation period
which has no end date, I think those
two things could work perfectly well
together.

MR. RASKIN: A discussion and a
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vote to be clear.

MS. GLEN: We can't agree to have a vote on something we don't know what it is we are voting on yet. We can have a discussion about it and if there is a particular motion you want to present in advance of that meeting. You can circulate those materials for the Board's consideration. So we can have a discussion and a vote. We don't know what it is we are voting on. So I can't put it on the agenda now.

MR. RASKIN: I will work with the guys on the CAC's to construct exactly what we are voting on. I withdraw this motion.

MS. GLEN: So the prior vote stands with respect to agenda number nine and Regina will go forth and do that good work in real time. Thank very much.

MR. MYER: Now, I am showing the slides. I just wanted to bring
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the Board up to date on the few other
items as part of my president's
report.

As many of you know, we opened
Pier Two and Four two weeks ago.
This represents a major milestone in
the arch of BBP construction and from
all reports both areas are being used
fantastically by the City at large
and we added a tremendous amount of
new recreation. I will show you some
sides of Pier Two. This is the Pier
Four Beach we opened two weeks ago.

In terms of programing, summer
programing is well underway. The
Celebrate Brooklyn dance parties were
successful, they were held in May.
We did suffer from cool or rainy
weather.

The public art fund exhibit of
Vanhdo's work, who is a Vietnamese
conceptual artist, opened as well,
demonstrating the ability of art to
enrich the landscape at the Pier
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Three Greenway.

Last weekend the World's
Science Festival brought it excellent
programing to the Park.

At your desks are the
programing calendars for the
remainder of the summer. I would
like to thank the Conservancy for
printing the beautiful calendar and
for tremendous amount of work they
contribute in the Park all summer
long.

Last week also we installed
historical signage throughout the
Park. This was a partnership with
the Brooklyn Historical Society. We
introduced the first phase of this
partnership with the signage system
which was designed by our parks
graphic designer and these signs and
the accompanying website add a great
new layer to the Park experience. We
will continue this signage program
north of the Brooklyn Bridge as the
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Main and John Street portions of the Park are completed.

A couple of updates on concessions. All of our concessions we have been discussing are in operation and here is a slide showing you them. Initial reports are they have all been successful. And the food and beverage amenities for our visitors have been well received.

This is an image of the signs.

A few other items, I don’t have slides on July 4th; as you may have read, Macy’s will be presenting the fireworks on the East River this year. Our operations team is working closely with the police department, City Hall’s special events and the parks department on how to best handle the great crowds we anticipate on July 4th.

In terms of ongoing park construction, construction is well under way in three sections right...
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now; Main Street, John Street, and
the outboard of Pier Six. And as you
heard earlier, we are scheduled to
begin the design process for the Pier
Five uplands immediately. Thank you
for your support on that.

In terms of ongoing development
with onsite construction, a few
updates. The Pier One and hotel is
ongoing. The superstructure for the
hotel is in process and the
residential building foundation work
is under way. Empire Stores, the
foundation work and emergency
stabilization work is nearly complete
and they are now finalizing the
design. And we hope to begin work on
the remainder of the building this
summer. At John Street site the
developer is wrapping up the design
phase and hopes to begin sales and
construction this summer. They
anticipate a 2016 completion date.

I would also like to note a
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temporary art installation developed
in collaboration with Smack Melon, a
gallery in Dumbo opened this week
titled the "John Street Pasture."

At St. Ann's the tobacco
warehouse work is proceeding with
foundation work completed and
superstructure beginning this summer.

Lastly, I did want to bring you
up to date on the RFP but I believe
the questions I answered just now
take care of most of my update. As I
mentioned we proceeded with the Pier
Six RFP to provide revenue to
continue with the ongoing maintenance
of the Park and funding for our
infrastructure. The RFP for Pier Six
development sites was released May
13th. And we held a site tour for
potential bidders on this past
Monday. Responses are due July 21st.
Thereafter, our selection team will
meet and the schedule we just
discussed is our schedule.
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As is our practice we anticipate discussing the design of the responses with the community in the early fall.

I also want to add following the April discussions on the RFP to both the CAC and Community Board Two, we received feedback on the design guidelines and the goals of the RFP.

So that concludes my report.

MS. GLEN: Are there any other matters that any Directors would like to discuss at this time? If there is anyone from the public who wishes to make a statement, as I mentioned at the beginning of this meeting, I would want everyone to keep their comments to two minutes so everyone has an opportunity to speak. Be respectful of your fellow citizens.

Oh, Nancy's here first. I apologize. Our elected officials first.

MS. WEBSTER: Nancy Webster,
Executive Director of the Brooklyn Conservancy. I wanted to take a moment, if I could, to speak to the Pier Six RFPs, and particularly to speak to that as I see, you know, many friends and supporters of the Conservancy here. And I would like to explain to you why the Conservancy supports these developments to fund infrastructure and maintenance of Brooklyn Bridge Park. Just to sort of be clear who we are, the Conservancy works closely with Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation in support of the Park. BBP builds and operates the Park and is responsible for the commercial development that funds these operations. And the Conservancy helps plan and support all of the Parks many green programs and activities.

The Conservancy's history is grounded in the citizen's movement to help build Brooklyn Bridge Park. We
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the initiative to build the Park.
And over the years have expanded our
missions to provide free public
activities that enliven and enrich
the Park.

As part of our advocacy the
Conservancy has long supported, ever
since 2005, the financial model we
currently have to sustain the Park
through limited commercial
development onsite. The revenue
generated by these residential
development parcels will be used to
cover the Park's maintenance and
operations and to repair and replace
the Park's marine infrastructure, the
thousands of wood pilings that hold
up the piers, the wood pilings.

Looking back, the City's
initial discussion and promise to the
community was no more than twenty
percent of the Park's footprint would
be used for commercial development.
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The Conservancy is certainly pleased
that the current plan does even
better limited revenue generating
development to less than ten percent
of the Park's footprint. And even
more we are especially pleased that
the financial model that was approved
by the City and the State of New York
over ten years ago is working. And
that this park is going to be
beautiful and safe for years to come.

Simply put, and I will
conclude, we have long supported
these parcels; we believe they are
necessary to sustain and support this
beloved, popular amazing park into
the future. Thank you.

MS. GLEN: Best thing would be
to stand up and create an order. I
will try to do it as you came.

LAURIE SCHOMP: I find it
fascinating we are looking at nine-
and ten-year-old environmental
studies. I spent some time last
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night looking through the documents.

And as you know it also takes time to
get data beforehand, so most of the
data on the environment impact
statement that was published in 2006
is 2004, 2005 type data.

A couple of things struck my
attention. The first one was I think
the Park has said it has sixty
thousand visitors now every weekend.
The original estimates were for
twenty-seven thousand visitors on a
Sunday and sixty-eight percent on a
Saturday. So accordingly the
visitors per week visiting the Park
are thirty-two percent above the
projection done at that time. And
mind you the hotel is not open, and
Pier House does not have people
living there yet. So you can
anticipate that member will continue
to grow higher.

The other thing that struck my
attention as a resident of southern
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Brooklyn Heights is the survey that occurred at that time only looked at people entering the park from north Brooklyn Heights. They never looked at the State Street entrance. They never looked at the Park entrance through Atlantic. I think you can tell by looking at the traffic on Atlantic that situation has changed.

The other thing I thought was interesting about the statement was it projected, and I think, I got this right that the Brooklyn population growth was at one percent per year. And I was looking at the Census Bureau and Brooklyn grew three and a half percent between 2010 and 2012. So I think you can really tell this area has changed. I don't think anyone, I have worked as a public financial analysis we would never pass a bond based on data from ten years ago. I think getting new information here would help us make a
better decision. The Park is tiny.
You are talking about adding maybe
two people for apartments, four
hundred and thirty units in addition
to Brooklyn Bridge Park. You are
looking at two thousand people living
on Pier Six. I don't think a traffic
study is going to capture what a
change that is for that spot.

MR. VIVIAN MORGAN: I am a
mother, a community organizer, and a
laborer. I have a community group,
Friends of Wingate Park. I would
really appreciate if the Board could
think about irresponsible development
group that is working on the project
Starwood Groups. They are hiring
non-union workers. They have union
workers out there that can be
responsible to do a good job and safe
practices. We want you guys to
consider the irresponsible work being
done by Starwood Group. Now, again,
we want union workers on this project
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because they are safe and they want
to provide jobs and they want to
provide good wages for their
families. Now, again, the group that
you have working here they have
people falling out of scaffolds on
the last project. And we would
really appreciate it if you would
think about the irresponsible work
being done on this project. Thank
you.

CHARLES BILLOCK: I am a part
of Build-Up NYC. I am also a union
carpenter. I have been part of the
Union for nine years. We are an
alliance of two thousand hard-working
men and women in the construction
field. We advocate for safe,
responsible development practices to
strengthen our community.

I would like to speak to you
about the proposed residential
development at Pier Six. We are
pleased Pier Six's RFP includes a
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requirement that developer show a
proven track record of labor and
harmony on their previous projects.
But what does that mean? Developers
needed to prove their past record and
show good safe jobs to our community.
This includes a history of paying,
prevailing of wages and training in
our apprenticeship program. I was
part of a four-year apprenticeship
that provided training on and off the
work site. It is important when we
do have these projects we can
incorporate having the workers being
trained properly. So they can have
safe job sites so people won't be in
danger. It is very important that we
have these opportunities available
for the community also. Since this
project provides employment for
people in the community and for
people that have military experience,
they have an easy way to get into the
union so they can a job that, you
know, that helps you live in New York City.

Construction is dangerous, just work. According to recent OSHA reports, seventy-five percent of NYC workplace fatalities in 2012 were construction related. Seventy-two percent of construction fatalities in NYC occurred on job sites where workers did not participate in safety approved apprenticeship programs.

REN RICHMAN: Building new buildings is a serious undertaking. That is why I like looking at financial models. And more disclosure would be helpful to let the community know we really need the money. Fixing the piers over fifty years, if you look back at the October financial study, you’ve got one line item for the budget. In the past more information has been provided; for instance, the BAE study where you have a bunch of line items.
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Just having simple disclosure where
we are now and where we are going.
And then the big changes that could
happen in the future like pilot tax
abatement coming on-line. So you
could look through and see we really
do need the buildings to be built now
to fund the park. To help the
community to understand what we are
trying to accomplish. Thank you.

ANDREW KERN: I am a local
resident here, a father, fourth
generation New Yorker. Have been
part of this community for a long
time.

I really want this Board to
focus on two things. First, is
population growth. And the second,
services, including schools and
hospitals.

Since this plan was put in
place, the population of Brooklyn has
exploded. In the last three years
close to three percent. Last ten
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years close to ten percent. There is no way the plan originally generated account for this population. Let's be truthful, most of that population growth has come into this part of Brooklyn. That is generally waterfront areas and generally south Brooklyn. Not generally going to Midwood, Coney Island, et cetera. All the growth has been concentrated here. At the same time while buildings have been going up, the services from the City have not kept pace. Schools have not been coming up, hospitals are not coming up. In fact, the opposite has been happening.

So I find it hard to believe the Board can sit here and look terribly pained by this man's presentation of slowing things down. As well as the Council says P.S. 8 is completely overcrowded. We are going to add four hundred apartments.
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Where are the kids going to go school? What happens when they get sick? A kid falls down in our park calls an ambulance. Where is he going to go? Everyone heard the news of what happened in Red Hook. A man died. Call an ambulance over in Red Hook not far from here mind you. Maybe one mile as the crow flies. Waited too long for an ambulance. Of course, they are not accepting ambulances in LICH, nor will they in the future.

GLEN KELLY: I service as a representative for Carroll Gardens Neighborhood Association on the CAC and I am the Chair for Community Board Six Park's and Recreation Committee. Both organizations have had long opposition to housing in this park.

I think we if we pursue this we are going down a dangerous path.

Think about it. I mean what other
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City amenity is required to show a profit or pay for itself. Do you expect the police department or the sanitation department to pay for itself.

Why have we swallowed this concept that Park's have to pay for themselves. I think it is ludicrous. I think we are making a mistake by doing this. We are setting a dangerous example. If we allow this to happen here then why wouldn't we have further encroachment of other Park's and the public trust. So I ask you reconsider.

PHYLLIS ELLIOTT: Hi, I am Brooklyn born and raised. I live in One Brooklyn Bridge now. I want to thank you, John Raskin and Mr. Levine for your positions you have taken here today. It seems to me everyone else, unless you join with what they are saying and do a review that brings us up to date you are living
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in lolly land. I would imagine that
very few of you, if any of you, with
the exception of one or two live here
and come here every day, and drive
down, and walk down, and send your
kids through the streets of this
neighborhood. Besides being a
resident, I am on the streets all day
long. Forget that I am a realtor,
this is a nightmare. This is a
problem in your vision that if you
don't stop you will pay the price is
such a significant way you cannot
imagine. To say that you are going
to do a traffic study all you need to
do is stand with the Sabret man on
the weekend and you will see about
traffic. You don't have to spend a
nickel for a survey. That you can
try to pass that along and not say
yes to the review of 2014 is to take
us and put us into a big box and move
the box along as though we have
nothing to say about it. We have
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everything to say about it.

JAMES MORGAN: Longtime
resident and neighbor, I want to make
an observation that when some of the
members of the Board hold up a letter
and dismissively wave it back and
forth that has been signed by so many
of our elected representatives and
treat it in such a very dismissive,
valueless manner you are insulting
every neighborhood, taxpayer and
voter.

JOHN DOCKERY: I am a
Brooklyn-born guy. The pulse of the
community, I think I am part of the
pulse of the community. What I am
saying if you build these projects as
they are currently designed with the
volume of apartments and people, as
the traffic is already overly
congested and schools are overcrowded
and there just, it is just
overburdening the neighborhood. It
is at a scale -- if you want to get
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esthetically it just doesn't fit the
that skyscraper will be in a park
like this on the water. So I am not
saying, and I understand
sustainability and I stand financial
responsibility. But I also
understand compromise. I think there
is a whole ground-swell coming in our
direction. But I think there is a
compromise that you can build it and
have sustainability. I don't know
all the numbers, but I think there is
a compromise and that has something
to do with the height of the
building, scale of the building,
number of apartments.

DOUGLAS EISENSTEIN: I am the
President of the Board of One
Brooklyn Bridge Park. Our position
is a little bit different. But at
the end of the day we support the
call for a further review of the Pier
Six development.

While the environmental impact
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study maybe still be legally valid,
the current realities and
circumstances of Pier Six should and
could not be ignored. There are
safety concerns. There is vehicle
congestion. There are school
concerns. There are many concerns
that go beyond just parking and
traffic. The infrastructure of Pier
Six cannot support building of this
size. Additional time to review and
public input can only result in a
better plan for Pier Six.

There are also very real and
reasonable concerns about whether
additional housing is necessary to
fund the Park. Therefore, whether
precious park land can be returned to
the community or on the other side
whether budget projections truly do
support a thirty percent reduction in
revenue for those parcels to afford
affordable housing. There is not
enough information on both sides of
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the coin. We need to get enough
information so either course can be
supported fully by the community.

There are very many laudable goals at
issue here. They should be given
time to be vetted. Whether the
building size can be reduced in
scope, whether affordable housing can
be supported, whether the housing can
be eliminated. They are all viable
options. They all needed to be
considered. More time needs to be
put into examining the full and fair
development plan for Pier Six in
light of current circumstances and
not circumstances that were developed
ten years ago. There is only one
opportunity to do this. Once a
course of action has been laid out
and set it is that course of action
that will be done. The buildings go
up, that's where they are going to
be. The consequences will follow
from that. If affordable housing
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go in and that revenue piece gets
unplugged, it is permanently
unplugged.

MS. GLEN: I want to let
everyone know the stated time for the
meeting for the Directors who have so
graciously given of their time to
serve on this Board was supposed to
be five o'clock. I will end the
meeting at 5:30 to be respectful of
people's time.

NATHANIEL RUBEN: I am part of
Brooklyn Bridge Park CAC. I own
Moxie's Spot.

My concerns about the Pier Six
RFP are different than some of them
that have been stated. My concern
has to do with the design of the RFP.
The other developments are beautiful.
The designs are integrated with the
Park. There is public and private
interaction. There is Park and city
interaction. There is leisure
activity. They are what great design
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to me represents. This layout and
site plan, I was not there in 2006, I
don't know who was. I wish I had
spoken up, then I didn't. But I
think that more could be done to make
this integrated with the Park. The
way it stands now when this building
goes up everything around will be
pretty for the buildings. No one
will sit in the plaza in front of
site A. They will not cross two
streets. There is more that can be
done design-wise to back this
development, reach the world class
quality as the rest of the Park. I
think the energy coming into the Park
from Atlantic Avenue should be
increased by redesigning it, and
looking at it. I know there are
transportation concerns. Those need
to be looked at too. I have all my
crazy little ideas and big ideas.
But I think it does need to be looked
at. I don't think it was really
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looked to be integrated with the Park like all the other developments. I think it would be a benefit for the residents in the building and it would be a benefit for the park-goers coming into the park.

ARTHUR CORD: I have a question about the financial budgeting and plans for the coming two years is that information available to the public.

MS. MYER: Call my office, I will show it to you.

SANDRA BELLBOSA: I am a member of CAC. I initiated the resolution for the CAC meeting. I got help. I am just going to say there is a need for park land and not more towers downtown in this area. It was expressed very well by everybody. We don't need more housing. We have a problem here. It is not just a traffic problem, there are more issues than that. This Board should
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consider resolution to have an
environmental review of everything.
There are lots of things that have
not been brought up yet that are
concerns. The CAC comes out every
other month. A lot people in the
community have been working in the
Park before this new plan in 2004,
which is now changed. And we should
have some say in this. That RFP
should be on hold until we get this
resolved. There are a lot of people
not here because they work. There
should be a review that the community
has a say about. It would be very
sad if this Board just bulldozed this
resolution.

ELLIOT ROTHMAN: I am an
architect, city planner and urban
designer. I just want to say I agree
very much with the guy from Moxie's
Spot. I think his comments are
germane. They are thoughtful. And I
think a major review has to be made
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of the solutions. Thirty-three percent of One Brooklyn Bridge Park where I live will be obscured from the sun with the new buildings that are proposed and the northern part of that building will not ever see the Brooklyn Bridge.

MS. GLEN: It is now 5:25. I want to thank everybody for their time today. I ask for a motion to be adjourned.

MR. CONNOR: So moved.

MR. OFFENSEND: Second.

(Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 P.M.)

I, ELIZABETH FORERO, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify that the above is a correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

______________________________
ELIZABETH FORERO