

Alida Camp
Chair

Will Brightbill
District Manager



505 Park Avenue, Suite 620
New York, NY 10022
(212) 758-4340
(212) 758-4616 (Fax)
info@cb8m.com – E-Mail
www.cb8m.com – Website

**The City of New York
Manhattan Community Board 8
Transportation Committee**
Wednesday, June 6, 2018 - 6:30 PM
New York Blood Center, 310 East 67th Street, Auditorium

Minutes

Present: Michele Birnbaum, Anthony Cohn, Craig Lader, David Menegon, Rita Popper, David Rosenstein, Barry Schneider, Tricia Shimamura, Russell Squire, Charles Warren; Jordan Wouk (public member), Peter Borock (public member)

Absent (Excused): Rebecca Lamorte, Lori Bores, Valerie Mason

Absent (Unexcused): None

Resolutions for Approval: None

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 PM.

**Item 1: Presentation by the NYC Department of Design and Construction regarding the 92nd Street ramp that will connect to the 91st Street Marine Transfer Station
(Joint with Environment and Sanitation Committee)**

Jeff Margolies and Bharat Parekh of the NYC Department of Design and Construction (DDC) presented a brief powerpoint providing a schematic overview of the proposed 92nd Street ramp for the East 91st Street Marine Transfer Station (MTS). DDC was requesting Community Board support for the design of the 92nd Street Ramp, which will be constructed to mitigate community health and safety concerns regarding the existing 91st Street ramp that bisects the Asphalt Green complex. The new 34-foot wide ramp will allow for bidirectional operation of sanitation vehicles entering and exiting the MTS.

The preferred future alignment depicted in the presentation showed a line on a Google satellite photo that extended 92nd Street in a straight line across York Avenue and over DeKovats Playground, before curving to hug the eastern wall of Asphalt Green's main building where the current southbound entrance ramp for the FDR Drive is situated. DDC indicated that the bridge will start rising at the east side of York Avenue/East 92nd Street intersection. The new ramp would connect the southern side of Asphalt Green to the existing 91st Street ramp, with enough room provided so trucks would safely be able to make the required turns on the ramp to access the MTS. The bridge will cantilever over the FDR drive, with columns next to the Asphalt Green building and in the median of the FDR drive, and cross beams supporting the structure. The clearance will be 12'-6", which is the same clearance as the 91st Street bridge.

The preferred alignment of the 92nd Street ramp would require some reconfiguration of the three current southbound lanes of the FDR Drive, along with the relocation of the current automobile entrance to the southbound FDR Drive at 92nd Street. DDC indicated that the Greenstreets triangle in-between the two

access ways to the FDR drive may have to be moved by about 10 feet, but would be replaced in-kind. There will also some impact to the open space in front of the Asphalt Green building.

The ramp project is currently in design, and received approval in principle by the Department of Transportation (DOT) on May 16th for its schematic geometric design and conceptual structural design, as well as its proposed 12'-6" vertical clearance. DDC staff stated that the amount of study required to design these changes far exceeded what was originally anticipated, and that the no-build traffic analysis and geometric design work are ongoing and being performed by DOT. Current ongoing work includes geometric design and creation of geometric drawings for the 92nd Street Ramp, the reconfigured southbound general traffic lanes of the FDR Drive and S/B FDR access (including input of traffic data into models and related analysis to ensure traffic flow is maintained and protected), the no-build traffic analysis of the southbound 92nd Street FDR Drive entrance, structural modeling for design the ramp, including for beams and columns, and the constructability analysis. Tasks completed thus far include traffic data collection, tree/topographic/utility surveys, and sub-surface investigations.

Although DOT has accepted the conceptual plans in principle, they must wait until geometric design drawings are submitted before providing approvals. The project will be presented to the NYC Public Design Commission (PDC) in June 2018 in order to get a conceptual approval. The project is currently expected to have a final design in place by April 30, 2019, and is anticipated to go out to bid on June 30, 2019. Based on those milestones, construction is anticipated to begin in March 2020, and be substantially complete by the end of 2022.

Members of the public, as well as Community Board members, expressed frustration and disappointment that the presentation lacked specific details and was given without input and perspective from the City's Sanitation, Parks and Transportation Departments. The presentation did not include any construction documents, renderings or discussion of materials to be used, so concerns raised regarding visual impacts could not be addressed and many questions regarding specific impacts were unable to be answered. Renderings showing anticipated visual impacts from various vantage points within and outside DeKovats Park were requested for presentation at a future meeting.

Numerous questions were raised about the impact on DeKovats Park. DDC stated that bridge/ramp would go over a portion of the park's playground, since the ramp needs to rise to its 12'-6" clearance by the time it reaches the FDR drive. Although this would not result in alienation of park space, DDC was clear in indicating that the project would have an impact on the playground and park. However, since the project is currently in design, DDC did not have any specific details regarding how high the ramp would be over the park or if it would require removal of any existing play space or trees.

Multiple follow-up questions involved matters related to how the facility will be impacted by the eventual construction of the 92nd Street ramp and how the overall operations of the MTS will function with the new ramp. Specifically, the community would like to understand whether the 91st Street ramp will remain in place or ultimately be removed, how the 91st Street ramp would be used if it is not removed, and which streets will be used in the future as truck routes to access the 92nd Street ramp and how traffic on those streets would be affected. There was also particular interest in obtaining more information on how the intersection at 92nd Street and York Avenue would need to be reconfigured to allow eastbound traffic on 92nd Street to access the FDR Drive southbound. DDC staff indicated that they were only responsible for the design of the 92nd Street ramp, whereas other departments such as Transportation and Sanitation would have to answer questions on all other matters as they would ultimately determine those future outcomes. Neither the Department of Transportation nor Sanitation had the appropriate staff present at the meeting to provide responses to these questions.

There were also some attendees expressing concerns regarding the need for this project since, if the City is sincere in their longer-term vision to move towards zero waste, the MTS would eventually not be

needed. A request to obtain the results and data from the traffic study was also made by an audience member, and will be requested by CB8.

DDC will return to Community Board 8 at a future date with updated designs that incorporate preliminary input from the PDC. DDC pledged to provide many more specific details, including architectural and structural drawings. The Department of Sanitation and the DOT will also be invited to attend the next hearing so all questions can be answered.

Item 2: Discussion of City Council Proposals to Create a Residential Parking Permit System

Abigail Bessler, Legislative Director for Council Member Keith Powers, described the proposed City Council bills regarding creation of a residential parking permit system.

Intro #848, which is co-sponsored by Council Member Powers, along with Mark Levine, Helen Rosenthal and Diana Ayala, would require DOT to create a residential parking permit program for all areas in Manhattan north of 60th Street. The bill would require that up to 80% of parking spaces eligible for the program be reserved for those with residential parking permits; at least 20% of spaces would be available to non-residents for short-term parking of at least 90 minutes in duration. DOT would develop all other policies regarding the manner in which the program would be operated, including determining the specific areas where residential parking permits would be required, the times and days in which the regulations would be in effect, and the cost to obtain a permit. Streets containing properties zoned for commercial, office and/or retail use would not be eligible for reserved parking for residents with permits.

Intro #857 was introduced by Council Members Ydanis Rodriguez, Mark Levine, James Van Bramer, Stephen Levin and Carolina Rivera, and contains identical language to Intro #848 but expands it to a citywide program rather than for only Manhattan north of 60th Street.

The impetus for Intro #848 was a concern that if congestion pricing was implemented for the Central Business District with a boundary near 60th Street, there would be an influx of drivers who would be attempting to park in areas north of 60th Street to avoid the congestion fee. Intro #848 aims to protect parking in such areas; it was also stated that residential parking programs are commonplace in most major cities in the United States, and that this proposal could make parking spaces more readily available to local residents. It was noted that there is not consensus in the belief that such a program would be effective in preserving parking for residents if congestion pricing was implemented, and that there is debate as to whether congestion pricing would even result in changes in driver behavior that would increase the burden for areas bordering congestion fee zones.

The bill provides a basic framework for a program, and is intended to be a starting point for the matter. There was an initial City Council hearing on the topic scheduled for 10AM on June 12th, where public input was encouraged and constituents would have the ability to make suggestions as to potential rules and policies of a program. This is the beginning of the legislative process, and no City Council vote is expected in the near-term.

There were some speakers who were clearly in favor of the general concept of residential parking, but wanted more information regarding specific details that have yet to be determined. Others had concerns about whether this would make parking easier or harder for residents, and if it would overburden persons ineligible for parking permits such as contractors, service staff of residential buildings, or employees of small businesses who would be most inconvenienced by such a policy. Some people also expressed the need for this policy to be considered in the wider context of broader parking and street use, as it could provide an opportunity to integrate parking solutions with other contributing factors to congestion such as double parking, turning movements and bike/pedestrian activity.

Eligibility and fees were a clear concern. Some people expressed philosophically that on-street parking is a public good and thus should not require a fee or that a fee would be nominal and not be used for the purpose of generating revenues, while others believe that fees should be more significant given the value of parking spaces and the competition for curbside space. There was also discussion of the need to clearly define what it means to be a resident, as the program would work very differently depending on whether a resident is defined as someone who lives in a specific zip-code, community district, borough or anywhere in New York City. Also, there may need to be a certain length of time in which someone is a resident before they would be eligible for a permit. If parking zones were to be established, the matter of how zones would need to be organized so those living near borders would not be at a disadvantage would also need to be fleshed out.

It was also unclear whether a residential parking program could be established solely through action by New York City, or if there is any component of the proposed program that would require approval from the Governor and State Legislature.

Although overall there were differing views expressed by the audience and CB8 Transportation Committee members, there was general agreement that the proposal was yet to be formulated to the specific degree necessary to cast judgement on the concept, and that additional study and fleshing out of details would be necessary before action can be taken by CB8.

Item 3: Old and New Business.

One resident noted that although substantial completion of the 81st Street Bridge has been completed, there are still punch list items that have yet to be addressed and that there are times where the gate that leads to the area under the bridge have been left open resulting in people accessing the off-limits location.

One Community Board member noted that when the 2nd Avenue streetscape was restored by the bus stop near Ruppert Park between 90th and 91st Street, a streetlight that had previously been in place has yet to be replaced and darkness continues to be an issue.

One Community Board member requested DOT provide an explanation regarding how neckdowns are designed and in some instances extending beyond crosswalks and taking an existing parking spot.

A Community Board member mentioned the City's pilot program to replace existing general parking spaces with spaces dedicated to for-profit car-sharing companies such as ZipCar. Although this program is not initially going to be implemented in CB8, it is a matter that we should be monitoring. Another member added that DOT is about to pilot a dockless bike sharing program in the outer boroughs and that dockless scooters are gaining popularity nationally; DOT should keep CB8 abreast of any developments regarding all of these matters.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Warren & Craig Lader, Co-Chairs