



Meeting Summary

East Bronx Waterfront Planning Meeting #9

Thursday, November 13, 2014, 6:30 to 8:00 p.m.

City Island Nautical Museum | 190 Fordham St, Bronx, NY, 10464

Attendance: (Committee members, firm representatives, invited guests, members of the public)

John Doyle	Committee Member	Alex Zablocki	NY Rising Regional Lead
Marjorie Hooks	Committee Member	Tom Jost	Planning Team
Cynthia McIntosh	Committee Member	Kevin Maddox	Planning Team
Chrys Napolitano	Committee Member	Theresa Cassano	Planning Team
Denise Noble	Committee Member	Tanya Gallo	Planning Team
Valerie Wilson	Committee Member		
Jane Protzman	Committee Member		
Ron Rauch	Committee Member		
JoAnn Sohmers	Committee Member		

Agenda Item: Meeting Goal Discussion

Presenters: Alex Zablocki, NY Rising Regional Lead

Summary of Discussion:

The goal of the meeting was for the committee to discuss the projects and funding that should be allocated to each project. The following items were discussed:

- Overview of voting and allocation
 - GOSR explained that allocation is \$3 million. The East Bronx Waterfront could receive \$4 to \$4.5 million if the region wins the Rising to the Top Competition. Final voting should end up with 1.5 times allocation worth of projects.
 - Committee members will be sent a ballot by email November 14, 2014, to vote.
- Committee member asked in members should vote on projects regardless of cost.
 - GOSR responded that cost will be on ballot, and projects need to equal approximately \$4.5 million.
 - Projects that do not end up being proposed will be featured.
- Committee member asked if the group would be we editing this list at the meeting or changing featured projects to priority projects.
 - Consultant team answered that the goal is to do a little of both. Committee should think about how much money they are allocating and figure out how much we should put towards the projects that are scale-able. For example, the Street end project can include a pilot and study or just a study.

Agenda Item: Project discussion

Presenter: Tom Jost, Planning Team

Summary of Discussion:

Details of the individual projects were discussed. The following projects were discussed:

Vulnerable coastal edge discussion

- Committee feels that if they elect to do a study, they also have to do a pilot project.

- Several members of the Committee felt that one of the street ends must be in City Island to spread funds.
- Two projects that got the most votes at Public Meeting #3 were Locust Point and Firehouse. Committee member suggests that Committee should vote for those, and then select more than one pilot in a different neighborhood.
- Committee suggests that street end pilots could attract other funding and involve City; pilots also facilitate discussion with community.
- Committee member asked who would maintain the street ends, and who would be liable.
 - Consultant team responded by explaining that they had talked to the city on this issue. DOT has already recognized that they have a need in this area. DOT was more interested in this as regional strategy than a single street end.
 - City also has \$100 mill for bulkheads and revetments and needs to prioritize, and this project may be an opportunity to leverage funds.
- Committee member asked if there would there be a caveat of public access.
 - Consultant team explained that public access may not be necessarily. If DOT takes over project, however, they may require access.
- Committee member wanted to know if project included study alone, would it set the City in motion to fund the pilots.
 - Consultant team explained that the challenge for the Bronx was that the area was not hit as hard by Sandy, so if DOT moves forward, East Bronx Waterfront may not be high on the priority list.
- Committee member thought that any revetment or retaining wall becomes the responsibility of NYC Economic Development Corporation (EDC).
 - Consultant team explained that EDC is a corporation and does not have jurisdiction, so the Department of Design and Construction (DDC) would likely do construction.
- Committee members suggest that pilots should prioritize neighborhoods of City Island, Throggs Neck, and Country Club.

Locust Point and Firehouse Discussion

- Committee member suggested that the cost estimates for Firehouse and Locust Point were high.
 - Consultant team explained that in Locust Point, they had talked to DCAS. High end was full replacement of building. If committee elects to do full replacement, DCAS will re-appraise property and may raise lease.
 - Consultant team said that the committee could also allocate money to do some basic flood-proofing for \$650,000.
 - With the firehouse, consultant team said that they did not want to undercut the pricing because construction would be a Federal process with prevailing wage restrictions and a GC bidding guidelines.
- Committee supported suggested pricing for Firehouse and floodproof pricing for Locust Point

Recovery plan discussion

- Committee member questioned if one community does not want a regional project, would it mean that the project does not get funded.
 - Consultant team responded that universal support was not necessarily. If specific community did not want to participate, it would not change cost because most of the money for regional projects is staff funding.

- Committee member feels that recovery plan should include safe locations, safe water, and vulnerable population information. Ability to communicate plans in a timely fashion when it is not an emergency is important.
 - Consultant team agreed that Committee would be funding a consultant or staff person to make a plan that Committee should shape. It would be a continuation of the NY Rising dialogue to prepare and deal with these disaster events. This is something that is less “off the shelf” and more community-based.
- Committee does not want NY Rising process to end without having a definitive plan on how to identify resources and raise public consciousness.
- One committee member wants to keep audit program, but others say this information could be incorporated into recovery plan.

Committee decides to take Hammond Cove and City Island Wetlands off the funded list because of the cost estimated for each project.

Harding Park discussion

- Consultant team explained that City had raised some concerns regarding Harding Park, and there are City agencies working in the area.
- Committee decided to remove from the list.

Ferry Point Drainage study discussion

- Consultant team suggested that Westchester Creek was more of an economic resiliency strategy that would attract better uses to the area.
- Committee member notes that even after snow, streets around Westchester Creek were flooded for a very long time.
- Consultant team said that they had a conversation with DOT. DOT finds the design without sidewalks problematic. Full cost of project would be about \$1 million per street for 3 streets.
- GOSR suggested that if Committee put a token amount of money, they may change the dialogue. If the money was not ultimately allocated to this project because Agency did not want to participate, could get re-allocated. This money must be allocated by Dec 30, 2017 and spent by December 30, 2019.
 - Committee members agree that small amount of money should go towards project.

Committee member question asked how many projects from round 1 have started to build.

- GOSR answered that projects were decided in March. For construction, sub-recipient must do a full environmental review. About 10 projects are moving forward currently.

Critical facilities capital fund discussion

- Committee member wanted to know if Scanlon High School be funded.
 - Consultant team said that the High School could if it was serving a community purpose.
- Other Committee members noted that lack of community facilities is still a problem.
 - Consultant team suggested that Committee add a recommendation that all large, new projects must provide community space for things like zoning changes, etc.
- Committee decided that they would rather put more money towards other projects.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Due Date
Committee to receive voting form for projects	GOSR	11/14/2014

Agenda Item: Rising to the Top Competition

Presenter: Alex Zablocki, NY Rising Regional Lead

Summary of Discussion:

GOSR – Application was sent to co-chairs. Committee can apply for 1-3 projects. GOSR, as judges, cannot help write the application.

DRAFT