



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE MANHATTAN BOROUGH BOARD

June 16th, 2016

In Attendance:

Presiding: Matthew Washington, Deputy Borough President for Budget and Policy; Jessica Mates, Chief of Staff; Jim Caras, General Counsel; Lucille Songhai, Director of Community Affairs; Athena Moore, Director of Northern Manhattan Office; Vladimir Martinez, Director of Budget; Jefferson Mao; Urban Planner; Diana Howard, Community Liaison; Yissely Ortiz, Community Liaison; Bodi Du, Capital Projects and Budget Analyst

Council Members: Hon. Mark Levine; Vincent Fang (representing Hon. Margaret Chin); Matt Viggiano (representing Hon. Rosie Mendez); David Moss (representing Hon. Corey Johnson); Liam Bland (representing Hon. Daniel Garodnick); Stephanie Arroyo (representing Spkr. Melissa Mark-Viverito)

Community Boards: Catherine McVay Hughes, accompanied by Alice Blank, Jeff Ehrlich, Michael Ketring, Elizabeth Lewinsohn, Anthony Notaro & Calli Tedesco (CB 1); Tobi Bergman, accompanied by Carter Booth, Bob Ely & Bob Gormley (CB 2); Gigi Li, accompanied by Susan Stetzer (CB 3); Frank Holozubiec & Burt Lazarin (representing Delores Rubin) (CB 4); Vikki Barbero, accompanied by Nicholas Athanail (CB 5); Rick Eggers (CB 6); Michele Parker & George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero (representing Elizabeth Caputo) (CB 7); Jim Clynes (CB 8); Padmore John (CB 9); Henrietta Lyle, accompanied by Brian Benjamin, John Lynch & Keith Taylor (CB 10); Jewel Jones & Marie Winfield (representing Diane Collier) (CB 11); Shahabuddeen Ally, joined by Ebenezer Smith via telephone conferencing (CB 12)

Minutes: Morris Chan, Community Liaison

Agenda for June 16th, 2016 Borough Board – Adopted
Minutes for May 19th, 2016 Borough Board – Adopted

Presentation: Alcoholic Beverage Control Law Modernization (SLA)

Presenter: Vincent Bradley, Commissioner/Chair

On April 13th, 2016, Governor Cuomo's Alcoholic Beverage Control Law (ABC Law) Working Group its report and recommendations. The Working Group, with its members selected by Governor Cuomo, held four public meetings, all tape-recorded as required by law, and accepted public comments in the run-up to report and



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

recommendations. A number of Community Boards have since adopted resolutions commenting on the recommendations. It is worth noting, however, that resolution often reflects particular perspectives, especially if it comes from a Community Board with liquor license over-saturation.

Of the Working Group process, there have been suggestions that 1) it fails to include Community Boards in the process; 2) Working Group extended special invitations to particular interest groups. In fact, Ebenezer Smith, District Manager of Manhattan Community Board 12, was part of the Working Group and served as the voice of the general public. The Working Group did not hold any closed-door meeting; all were allowed to speak or to observe.

Deputy Borough President Washington: The Community Boards hope that State Liquor Authority is here both to answer questions and to take stock in proactive outreach. To have more interactions in the process is always critical to its success. Did the Community Boards receive agency and Working Group press releases? Also, district managers do not usually attend the Borough Board while chairs expect that Ebenezer Smith provide updates on the Working Group. What is everyone's role, purpose and responsibility on the Working Group?

Stetzer (CB 3): Resolutions reflect what Community Boards knew and heard at the time of adoption. Community Boards do not have the resources to reach out to all agencies and request press releases; they often depend on outreach from others, such as NYC Hospitality Alliance, for necessary information.

Bergman (CB 2): Were district managers aware that Ebenezer Smith was a member of the Working Group?

Bradley (SLA): Press release was from Governor's Office, not from this agency. Ebenezer Smith did state that he did not have the authority to represent all 59 Community Boards. Meetings went on for about ten weeks and were all public.

Smith (CB 12): George Fernandez, Jr., then-CB 12 Chair, did authorize participation on the Working Group. All proceedings were reported and discussed at both CB 12 Executive committee and the Borough Service Cabinet. The Working Group was aware that I could not even speak for CB 12, let alone for all 59 Community Boards.

Lyle (CB 10): Governor appointed Working Group members with no notification and no news release. One must wonder how could Governor Cuomo select a random district manager and say that he or she represents all 59 Community Boards.



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Ehrlich (CB 1): Information distribution list for the entire state is needed. Is it possible to have a Community Board section on the State Liquor Authority website?

McVay Hughes (CB 1): Borough Presidents can help disseminate information once State Liquor Authority appoints an agency point of contact for this purpose. CB 1 is a very dense neighborhood of only 1.45 mi², yet it reviewed 66 new liquor license applications and 175 renewal applications in 2015. It has become a major source of quality-of-life complaints, especially in TriBeCa.

Bradley (SLA): ABC Law Working Group was constituted according to Governor Cuomo's instructions, with the explicit objective to "examine the current law and make recommendations for changes." In its 35-page report and recommendations, only two pages address Community Board concerns. The main objective, a full re-organization of the ABC Law, remains incomplete. Working Group spent over 30 hours in deliberation, of which only about three hours were devoted to Community Board-related matters. Much of the work is related to industry needs and not to community life. One should note that State Legislature has five bills on pushing up Sunday alcohol sale hours alone. Further discussions results in the exclusion of New York City from various provisions. As for a Community Board section on agency website, agency can do so if it is deemed feasible.

Stetzer (CB 3): Community concerns had mostly no effect on the Working Group, whose membership was heavily industry-based. Would it have been possible to have one Working Group meeting exclusively devoted to community concerns?

John (CB 9): Industry decisions on sales, exchange and commerce structure do affect the volume of alcoholic beverages sold. Communities are also stakeholders, no less than the industry, and many of them who are vital to the process were not at the table. Could there be voices of the people in these working groups in the future?

Bradley (SLA): The Working Group was meant to open the floor for the industry to explore options and reach consensus on changes. There is no plan to re-convene the Working Group as of yet. Working Group issued recommendations, not bills. State Assembly Members and State Senators from New York City have been expressing opinions and have been heard. There has been representation in the process, and State Liquor Authority is here to deliver your concerns back to Governor Cuomo.

Li (CB 3): The explanation is helpful in illustrating the big picture. The concerns are about communications and transparency. Community Boards receive very limited information and have schedules that only allow for reactions at one month's notice.



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Working Group issued its report mid-April, Governor Cuomo proposed the Program Bill late May, and it is expected to pass the State Legislature and be signed into law by June. Much of the news is still slowly tricking down to the neighborhood level, and engaging community stakeholder organizations does take time. People count on their local Community Board to filter information up and down; excessive pace and the lack of structural communications have significantly hampered this process.

Bergman (CB 2): A number of Community Boards have expressed dismay on the record that they were completely kept out of this process. Many of them learned of the Working Group only through words from their fellow Community Boards. All Community Boards in a borough is part of the Borough Board; at the least, the Borough Presidents should be made aware who is representing Community Board interest in the matter. Community Boards find it unconvincing that a single district manager is deemed “adequate representation” of community interests of all five Borough Presidents and 59 Community Boards, let alone all communities in the state. Alcohol is both an industry and a community concern. It is widely known that the industry is adding pressure to have more alcoholic beverages sold.

Lazarin (CB 4): Community Boards cannot be left to depend on informal messaging for new policies or legislations. There has to be institutionalized means of organized communications, and the five Borough Presidents are the perfect channel for such.

John (CB 9): Can the State Liquor Authority approach Governor Cuomo to request additional outreach and engagement resources?

Deputy Borough President Washington: Can the agency devise a mechanism to channel information to all 62 counties? As for New York City, it is possible to funnel information via Community Boards and Borough Boards.

Bradley (SLA): This agency is “State” Liquor Authority. New York City is but a municipality in a state of 62 counties and hundreds of cities, towns and villages. Buffalo has just as much right to State information and services as New York City. All agencies are now increasingly asked to do more with less; one can ask for more but is unlikely to get much more. Agency now has a more robust social media operation. Michael Jones, Deputy CEO, is the point of contact for New York City for the agency.

Ehrlich (CB 1): Will there be changes to the current license class structure?

Bradley (SLA): There will be no change to the nine license classes currently in effect. The original proposal was to simplify it into three categories—beer only, beer &



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

wine, full liquor—with no distinction between bar, restaurant, tavern or club. It is in response to concerns from applicants confused over which class of license to apply.

Parker (CB 7): Community Board members are volunteers with limited resources.

Zeppenfeldt-Cestero (CB 7): State Liquor Authority does have an immense task. New York City and much of the downstate, however, is the densest nationwide owing to its very large population in a very small area. It is not suburban or exurban, where a home may sit on two acres. Any of these changes has serious quality-of-life effects.

McVay Hughes (CB 1): On average, a Community Board has a staff of three. It must keep track of a full constellation of agencies. One must take note of the ripple effect of a bar—rodent infestation due to garbage on street, crowded sidewalks, truck delivery-induced congestion and even damaged basement vaults due to vehicles jumping the curb. Financial District is a neighborhood with a 300-year-old street grid that was not designed to support or accommodate all these bars and clubs.

Bradley (SLA): Not many State agency commissioners or State authority chairs meet with New York City in such a manner; given its peculiar environment, New York City is very vital to this agency by default.

Stetzer (CB 3): Are there additional changes with impact on New York City?

Bradley (SLA): There is basically none. The final legislation, A10728/S8140, does not include 1) statute re-organization; 2) general rule-making power; 3) license class consolidation; 4) relaxation of liquor license bans against felons; 5) discretion on the “200 ft. rule”; or 6) “walk-between” for off-premises establishment with on-premises operations. It includes 1) importer’s license without wholesaler’s license; 2) reduced bond requirements for solicitor’s permit; 3) combined manufacturer’s license; 4) wine growler and open bottle from winery; 5) “pass through” delivery for on-premises operations at grocery stores; and 6) appointment of acting chair from one of the commissioners. The only item with impact to New York City, however, is statewide 10:00 AM opening hour on Sunday; provision for up to 12 special permits a year for 8:00 AM operations does not apply in New York City.

Ally (CB 12): Liquor license applications represent over 50% of CB 12 work. Inwood has seen rapid increase in alcohol-serving establishments; CB 12 sends 35 to 40 resolutions to State Liquor Authority a month. State Senator Espaillat has proposed a moratorium in response to this rapid rise over the past 24 months. Agency effort on dissemination via Twitter may represent a way to communicate going forward.



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Stetzer (CB 3): How about Community Board stipulations? If the law will now be 10:00 AM opening on Sunday, are the stipulations for noon on Sunday still valid? Communities are concerned with outdoors drinking in residential areas. The new hours may force the Community Boards to re-negotiate stipulations upon renewal.

Bradley (SLA): Agency cannot bar any eligible applicant from seeking a license. Someone in Queens tried to ask this agency to stop a particular applicant from filing applications in an over-saturated area, but it is not possible. As for stipulations, it will be a case-by-case matter. State Liquor Authority will continue to be accessible to Community Boards. Much of the modernization is Governor Cuomo's initiative; State Liquor Authority has very little say on the matter.

Presentation: Theater Sub-District Fund Text Amendment (DCP)

Presenter: Edith Hsu-Chen, Borough Director, Manhattan

Theater Sub-District, established by text amendment in 1998 and codified in New York City Zoning Resolution §81-744, is a special district covering 45 Broadway theaters to enable transfer of development rights for the financial benefit of these "listed" theaters. The text amendment stipulated the creation of Theater Sub-District Fund and mandated compulsory contribution of a portion of development rights transfer revenue into the Fund.

All listed theaters within the special district are between Sixth Avenue and Eighth Avenue, from West 40th Street to West 57th Street; all theaters are located in the district of Community Board 5, except for the ones on the west side of Eighth Avenue, which are in the district of Community Board 4. The district has a base floor area ratio (FAR) anywhere between 10.0 and 15.0, which is a reflection of the large-bulk commercial nature of its surrounding areas. A listed theater may transfer up to the basic maximum floor area, minus existing building floor area and past rights transferred; each transfer leads to reduction of allowable rights at the granting site, and maximum transfer may not exceed 20% of floor area of the receiving site.

The listed theaters, all pre-1929 structures, are all designated landmarks. The City has long taken special care to recognize their peculiar contributions to the economic vitality of New York City. City created a special district to cover the theaters in 1967; it was further re-organized into Special Midtown District in 1982 and given a sub-district in 1998. The special district regime promotes theater rehabilitation, firmly restricts demolition and enables development rights transfers. Theater Sub-District Fund was created to support the educational mission of the theaters; its established contribution rate is subject to review every three to five years.



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Theater Sub-District Fund is calculated on one-time contribution basis upon rights transfer. It is calculated as a fixed dollar amount per each ft² transferred. Initially set at \$10.00/ft², it has been raised twice, first to \$14.91/ft² in 2006, then to \$17.60/ft² in 2011. Theater Sub-District has seen 23 transfers from nine listed theaters to 15 receiving sites since its creation; the transfers totaled 600,000 ft² and contributed \$8.6 million to the Theater Sub-District Fund. Theater Sub-District Council, who administers grants from the Fund, has awarded four rounds of grants totaling \$5.7 million, with 37 grants awarded to 25 recipients. It has announced a new round of funding available in March 2016.

The proposal will continue to allow transfers up to 20% of the floor area of the receiving site. It seeks to calculate the value of development rights based on the actual market value, as opposed to the assessed value. Market study by appraisal firm will determine the base price of development rights. It will calculate Theater Sub-District Fund contribution amount based on either market valuation of the rights transferred or 20% of the actual price of the development rights. Dept. of City Planning requests ministerial certification by City Planning Commission Chair.

Lazarin (CB 4): How much is still available for transfer? CB 4 adopted resolution asking for 1) a dedicated fund for community-based organizations with an annual budget of less than \$250,000; 2) an accelerated process for Theater Sub-District Fund grants; and 3) changes only by approval of the full City Planning Commission.

McVay Hughes (CB 1): CB 1 is also asking why Water Street text amendment does not include any provision for a dedicated fund for area parks. CB 1 is getting nothing out of the Water Street proposal—no resiliency funding, no transportation study, no funding to address congestion or traffic safety. All it hears from the Dept. of Parks and Recreation is that these parks are “well used” and nothing else.

Hsu-Chen (DCP): Theater Sub-District Fund process does not require hearing; all public comments are welcome, and all information is available to the public. The listed theaters all have lots of floor areas available. Theater Sub-District Fund model is not applicable to Water Street—the Fund is a one-time contribution basis through exhaustion of development rights. City could not accurately appraise the value of privately-owned public space (POPS), as the bonus floor area is extant. This model only works if nexus exists between the benefit and the burden; in the case of Water Street, no nexus exists between the arcades and other district needs.

Robin Kramer (Duval & Stachenfeld LLP): I am here to speak on behalf of three theater organizations who are the owners of most of the 45 listed theaters. The



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

three organizations find that contribution calculated at 20% of total transferred development rights price represents a significant burden and an artificial and arbitrary base for contribution floor. Theater business was in extreme distress in the 1980s and the 1990s; many went “dark” during this period. A “dark” theater still carries a massive fixed cost; the threat of conversion to other uses was very much looming during those days. The amount deposited into Theater Sub-District Fund should reflect what each individual theater is willing to commit; the current “arms-length” determination of the contribution rate does not serve this purpose. Theaters sell these rights to developers all hope to maximize the price. Transfer tax form, which is a sworn statement in itself, already reflects amount in consideration for development rights sold. Price varies from sale to sale according to demand. To have an artificial floor price means one price for all transactions. It is also inflexible; reviews every three to five years cannot accommodate the rapid real estate market cycle in New York City. A contract for development rights sales is usually locked in a year in advance of the transaction, with the contribution amount toward Theater Sub-District Fund totally unknown. The Fund is meant to provide for resources in support of the listed theaters, as their owners are required to commit to this line of business just about forever. The listed theaters are all very old, very expensive to maintain and in need of major upgrades, all within very tight revenue constraints. Development rights transfer is a one-time business; there is no guarantee that there will be an active market for development rights when a theater is in need of cash. The listed theaters would like to say that base price serves no valid purpose. At last, theaters did not come forward until not because Dept. of City Planning never made any announcement on this proposal. It did not become organized until it came across the proposal. Theaters have also reached out to meet with CB 4.

Barbero (CB 5): Industry attitude toward the Community Board has been a long-standing issue. Everyone should be aware that CB 5 fully participates in this matter. CB 5 heard nothing from the theaters whose representative just spoke. CB 5 has its agenda posted online and meetings open to the public. It is time for all stakeholders engage the Community Boards proactively; volunteer work by Community Board members should not count for nothing. CB 5 agrees with the Dept. of City Planning calculations; it does not agree that the matter should be administrative certification. CB 5 also asks that Dept. of City Planning improve its restrictive declarations procedure and add a CB 5 representative on the Theater Sub-District Council. CB 5 has already adopted resolution on the matter; should CB 5 revisit the matter now?

Bergman (CB 2): It makes sense to have applicable standards like a price floor, but it seems that price floor is used in a way to finalize a deal and cover up the real value of these rights. Is there any appeal for the price floor to make it more agreeable?



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Hsu-Chen (DCP): The final agreement could also include considerations for cash value, as well as other measures such as access to property and other non-cash benefits. The goal is to reflect the true value of the transferred development rights, including non-cash benefits. Listed theaters represent one of only two industries citywide protected by zoning. Agency does not understand why there is a problem with floor or base price, as long as all transactions are under good faith. In 1998, listed theaters were arguing for 20% contribution rate; the current rate is in the range of 4%. There is no price floor appeal mechanism proposed; however, the idea is worth considering. Agency announced the proposal at City Planning Commission meeting in March and conducted extensive outreach to theaters.

General Counsel Caras: Borough President Brewer understands these concerns and will include all views in the recommendations. It may not help to solve the matter but will at least ensure that CB 5 is heard. What are the consequences for having no floor in the pricing mechanism? Theaters should return to the two Community Boards at their committees to re-open the matter. Borough President Brewer is open to suggesting something akin to a compromise. Item is likely going before City Planning Commission Chair Weisbrod no later than July 27th.

Deputy Borough President Washington: Borough President Brewer has made no announcement thus far; discussion on supplemental actions can continue.

Office of Borough President Report

Chief of Staff Mates: Borough President Brewer will hold another information session on funding available from the Regional Economic Development Council. The session will take place on June 20th at 8:30 AM at the Harlem State Office Building. Community Board member training and reception is also taking place on June 20th at the American Museum of Natural History. New York City PRIDE Parade will be on June 26th; please encourage community members to sign up to march in Borough President Brewer's contingent. Borough President Brewer will host LGBT PRIDE Dance at Surrogate's Court on June 29th. Iftar Dinner event is on June 30th. Dept. of Housing, Preservation and Development is seeking to alter regulatory regime in relation to housing development fund corporations (HDFCs); agency will be presenting at the July 21st Borough Board.

Council Member Reports

CM Mendez: In relation to homeless shelters without active community advisory board (CAB), Council Member Mendez is requesting that the Dept. of Homeless



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Services provide information on violent incidents occurring within shelter premises. It is in light of the proliferation of incidents at the East 30th Street men's shelter, and the information will help the City Council to see how incidents are addressed, how shelter clients access services and which services are actually working. Concerns over the "transformation" of Mt. Sinai Beth Israel Medical Center are ongoing; CB 3 and CB 6 are working together to address the matter. Possible development rights transfer from Stuyvesant Town/Peter Cooper Village housing estate may result in further contentions on the matter. East Houston Street re-zoning is moving forward. Community is having concerns over asbestos abatement at Friends Seminary, as the work is said to be not in accordance with City regulations and specifications.

Community Board Reports

Community Board 1: CB 1 will elect officers for 2016-2018 at its general board meeting on June 28th. So much has taken place over the years—9/11 attacks, the "Great Recession" of 2008, Hurricane Sandy—and it is an honor to serve this community throughout the re-building years. CB 1 would like to note that FY 2017 Budget still contains no resiliency funding, no transportation study funding and practically no funding for CB 1 priorities. A hit-and-run resulted in the death of a cyclist at the intersection of Rte. 9A and Chambers Street this past weekend. CB 1 thanks Borough President Brewer and Council Member Chin for their commitment to lead a resiliency steering task force. Mayor's Office of Recovery and Resiliency will begin community engagement for the Manhattan Tip in July. Water Street text amendment is now before City Council and awaiting final vote on adoption. National 9/11 Memorial and Museum will host a vigil for Orlando shooting victims at 1:00 PM today. WTC Transportation Hub "Oculus" and passageway to Fulton Center opened; temporary PATH station will be closed soon. CB 1 calls for a seamless transition for the temporary PATH station site for WTC Performing Arts Center. Almost all Community Boards are on the waterfront; combined sewer overflow is a borough-wide issue. CB 1 is disappointed that there was little outreach on the public meeting on New York City Storm Water Management Plan on June 23rd.

Community Board 2: CB 2 saw three applications for new enclosed sidewalk café in the past six months after seeing none in about the last 20 years. CB 2 finds enclosed sidewalk café a misnomer; it is an extension of the building that juts out onto public sidewalk, inhibits pedestrian visibility and goes contrary to its intended purpose of enlivening the street. The sheer value of commercial real estate is now pressuring business owners to put up more and more of such enclosures. CB 2 is looking to request a zoning text amendment to address the issue on a peculiar, street-by-street basis. It also hopes to partner with neighborhoods seeking business expansion.



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

Community Board 3: CB 3 will elect officers for 2016-2017 at its general board meeting on June 28th. Three members are running to become the next chair. City selected Seward Park to advance to Round II of “Parks without Borders” funding competition; the program has \$40 million available for final award winners. CB 3 hopes that a win for Seward Park could free up spaces on the budget priorities list for other parks to take precedence. CB 3 is working with CB 6 on East Coast Resiliency and on Mt. Sinai Beth Israel Medical Center transition. First meeting on Two Bridges resiliency is scheduled for July. CB 3 thanks all its fellow Community Boards for the support at the ABC Law press conference on June 3rd. Is it possible for the State Liquor Authority to take on a more responsive tone and attitude toward the Community Boards? This question will be one for the new CB 3 leadership in defending community needs going forward.

Community Board 4: CB 4 is witnessing a major wave of tenant harassment, often in the form of temporary relocation followed by demolition. Dept. of Buildings is under immense pressure to authorize development, which means a lot of room to work around the law and exploit loopholes in self-certification. The fact that Dept. of Buildings has a forensic engineering unit consisting of one staff for the entire city does not help. CB 4 also finds the new Port Authority Bus Terminal proposal almost entirely driven by New Jersey interests and often a result of agency internal politics; it is working hard to have Manhattan and New York City voices heard. The proposal will destroy a neighborhood of vibrant retail, tenement housing and a church.

Community Board 5: Initial report is suggesting that St. Sava Serbian Orthodox Cathedral, almost destroyed by fire on May 1st, may not be salvageable; Dept. of Buildings has yet to reach a decision. CB 5 is on the record requesting landmark designation and commitment to rebuild as is. Landmarks Preservation Commission held hearing on Hudson Theater back in August 2015; CB 5 requested a stay of the application; “applicant cannot wait” was the agency staff reply. CB 5 thanks Borough President Brewer for help in this matter. CB 5 Landmarks committee adopted resolutions opposing demolition at 21 West 17th Street and at 16 West 18th Street. These two properties had their application for demolition turned down in the past and are returning for the second time. CB 5 thanks Borough President Brewer for the recommendation on 42 West 18th Street; it is the first application for special permit in the district since the adoption of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH). CB 5 also thanks State Senator Krueger for the opposition to the removal of the FAR cap of 12.0 in New York City; the proposal has been tabled for future review.

Community Board 6: CB 6 continues the effort to address the planned transition of Mt. Sinai Beth Israel Medical Center; it is working with CB 3 to address a number of



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

shared concerns over the 70-bed hospital plan. Future use of the current hospital site will loom even larger. Medical services and delivery are shifting away from the old inpatient model; there may be legitimate reasons for this plan, but a careful look is needed. Areas in CB 6 are seeing negative impacts from the work on Park Avenue Tunnel ventilation; the area is already under the impact of East Side Access, and the added construction leads to concerns that there are too many projects too close to each other. CB 6 is reaching out to CB 1 to learn from its experience in construction proliferation; working with other Community Boards certainly yields benefits.

Community Board 7: CB 7 has learned that funding toward affordable housing is available for the West 108th Street garage; questions remain over the future of the most affordable parking garage in the area. CB 7 Public Housing task force work is ongoing. CB 7 thanks Borough President Brewer for supporting the co-naming of the corner of West 102nd Street and Amsterdam Avenue after painter Norman Rockwell. CB 7 continues to address pros and cons of American Museum of Natural History expansion proposal. It is also evaluating and revising its enclosed sidewalk café guidelines. Does the zoning variance granted for for-profit and non-profit healthcare facilities run with the land and the building? In case the institution changes hand or the building is no longer for healthcare use, does the benefit of this variance go toward the new institution or even the new building owner?

Deputy Borough President Washington: Approved variances remain with the land.

Zeppenfeldt-Cestero (CB 7): There could be very little difference between a for-profit and a non-profit healthcare facility. The sense is that small organizations relying on community benefit agreements have “missed the boat” in the rush for ever more variances for ever larger facilities.

Community Board 8: Representative unable to stay to deliver the report.

Community Board 9: Representative unable to stay to deliver the report.

Community Board 10: CB 10 elected Brian Benjamin as its new chair at the June 1st general board meeting; he will officially assume the position on July 1st. A developer has purchased the James L. Varick Community Center and is seeking to convert it to a Safe Haven facility; CB 10 Health committee will meet with both the developer and the Dept. of Homeless Services to address this matter, especially as this location is already home to at least six shelters. Khalid Gibran Muhammad, director of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, is leaving to take a professorship at Harvard University. Greater Harlem Nursing Home has been sold and now re-



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

branded as “Harlem Center”; CB 10 hopes that it will not lead to another lifted deed restriction and a real estate flip like what took place at Rivington House.

Community Board 11: Representative unable to stay to deliver the report.

Community Board 12: “Day with CB 12” took place on June 11th with six stops; CB 12 thanks Borough President Brewer for participating. The event helps to bring awareness to the diverse offerings of this community. CB 12 plans to continue the initiative through information tables at various locations throughout summer. CB 12 will conduct a “Walk with the Police” event targeting youth in the community on June 18th. A job fair is planned for June 28th. Economic Development Corp. will present its plan for Inwood in mid-July. CB 12 will hear George Washington Bridge Bus Terminal updates in late June. CB 12 has seen a great increase in liquor license applications in recent years, with 36 alone this month. Over half of CB 12 work is now on liquor licenses. Is there a way to better handle the workload?

Borough Board adjourned.