

Below are the answers to the questions that you sent over. Please remember that all of these questions have been submitted for the EIS (some cannot be answered now).

There may be additional information that will come out after the EIS is done.

---

### **Questions from the Park Row Alliance**

#### **EIS Issues**

##### **A. General Questions about [80 Centre Street](#).**

**1. There is a currently height restriction on this building. See [this link](#). How is that being addressed?**

**Answer: The City intends to seek a Special Permit which would allow for the proposed height.**

**2. This is a design / build process. Can changes to design be made after EIS process? What if that effects the impact on the community? Is there a new EIS?**

**Answer: The design/build team will be limited by the project/actions evaluated as part of this environmental review process and the ULURP process. If the design/build team wanted to propose an approach that deviated significantly from what is currently being evaluated, it is possible that an additional or supplemental environmental or public review would be required.**

**3. Perkins Eastman is only the architect to produce the environmental impact statement and ULURP information. They aren't designing the buildings. How is that going to work?**

**Answer: The city is proposing the project based on a scoping study being prepared by Perkins Eastman. The design/build team will be limited by the special permit/ULURP actions/project description being proposed as part of this land use process and environmental review.**

**4. The Draft Scope and the Environmental Assessment Statement appears to not acknowledge that this building lies in a residential area. Is that proper?**

**Answer: The Draft Scope is referencing the zoning district which, for this building, is commercial.**

**B. The Study Is Not Broad Enough**

**Answer: The analyses in the EIS will evaluate potential impacts from the proposed project on the surrounding neighborhood in accordance with the CEQR technical manual. While the Draft Scope of Work describes a standard general study area, each analysis will evaluate the areas potentially impacted by the project. The study area can vary depending on what subject matter is being assessed and the potential for significant adverse impacts. However, the specific comments on study area below will be reviewed to determine if additional areas should be included.**

**1. The 400 Ft. Study Area**

**a. The Draft Scope proposed to study a 400 ft area. That is too small, and appears not to account for following areas:**

**b. The second tower at Chatham Towers. (It only accounts for one.)**

**c. Residents affected on Mulberry Street, Park Row, and Canal Street.**

**d. All Chinatown businesses, including the parking spaces associated with those business.**

**e. Any schools, including P.S. 124 on Division Street, Transfiguration School on Mott Street, and schools in Tribeca.**

**(1) The Draft EIS (page 15-16) appears to only plan for analysis of schools at the Bronx site, but not the Manhattan site.**

**2. The Traffic**

**a. The limited scope appears to fail to sufficiently study the effect of traffic, including questions such as whether there are sufficient traffic signals around the area.**

**Answer: The draft EIS will evaluate project-related potentially significant impacts to traffic in the area and determine if mitigation is necessary.**

**b. The Draft Scope (page 23) states that the “the EIS will provide a detailed traffic analysis focusing on these peak hours.”**

**(1) What is the scope of that analysis? What blocks will in include? Is it limited to the 400 sq. foot radius?**

**Answer: The traffic analysis will include the intersections with potentially significant traffic impacts; it is not limited to a 400 square foot radius. The intersections/areas that will be evaluated were made available for public review and comment as part of the Draft Scope of Work (DSOW) on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018 (see DSOW Figures 22 through 25).**

**c. The Draft Scope (figure 24, between pages 23 and 24) appears to only plan to study traffic on limited intersections.**

**(1) This does not including traffic on Worth Street, including at the intersections of Bowery and Worth, Mulberry and Worth, and Centre Street and Canal.**

**(2) Why are these excluded? They should be included.**

**Answer: The traffic analysis will include the intersections with potentially significant traffic impacts; it is not limited to a 400 square foot radius. The intersections/areas that will be evaluated were made available for public review and comment as part of the Draft Scope of Work (DSOW) on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018 (see DSOW Figures 22 through 25).**

**d. Does the Draft Scope account for the closing of Hogan Place (as planned) and the rerouting of traffic?**

**Answer: The proposed project does not close Hogan Place to traffic, the city is requesting the street be de-mapped so that a pedestrian bridge over Hogan Place**

can be constructed connecting [80 Centre](#) to [100 Centre Street](#).

**3. The Parking Impact**

a. The Draft Scope (page 24) stated if facility parking is insufficient, "existing on-street parking and off-street parking inventories will be conducted for the weekday AM and midafternoon periods (when parking in the jails area is at peak occupancy due to shift changes) to document existing supply and demand for each period"

(1) Why is this limited to weekday AM and midafternoon? Shift changes are not a sufficient reason.

Answer: The parking demand from the project is expected to result largely from arriving/departing employees. For this reason, the project's potential parking impacts would be greatest at shift change.

(2) What blocks will be inventoried and studied?

Answer: Existing on-street parking and off-street parking inventories will be conducted on blocks with ¼-mile of the project site for the weekday AM and midafternoon periods. As noted in the DSOW (page 24), should a parking shortfall be identified, parking within a ½-mile radius of the project site may also be considered, in accordance with the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

b. The Environmental Assessment Statement (PDF page 60, EAS Full Form page 4) projects a net increase of 125 parking spaces.

(1) Does it account for the loss of street spots by closing off Hogan Street?

Answer: The proposed project does not close Hogan Place to traffic.

(2) Does this account for the potential loss of parking at the to-be-closed [125 White St.](#) facility?

Answer: The Parking analysis will account for any loss of parking caused by the project.

4. The Transit Impact

a. The Draft Scope (page 25) states "The Manhattan and Queens sites are not expected to generate 200 or more peak hour trips during the analysis peak hours," so they will not study the effect on transit hubs.

b. How was the conclusion that there will not be 200 or more peak hour trips reached? Is it valid?

Answer: We looked at the number of visitors and employees expected and the means by which they are expected to travel. Surveys of existing employees and visitors were conducted to support this assessment.

5. The Shadows

a. Assuming the 400 ft. study area applies to shadows, this appears to not account for the full length of the shadow to be cast by the 40-story building

Answer: The shadows analysis will assess the longest shadow that could be casted by the project building and any sunlight sensitive areas that could be reached by that shadow, regardless of where located.

6. The Business Impact

a. The Draft Scope (page 15) states that "a preliminary analysis" will be conducted to determine "proposed project to introduce trends that could make it difficult for businesses to remain in the study areas."

**(1) What are those "study areas"? Is that limited to the 400 ft. radius?**

**(2) When will that preliminary analysis be conducted and made available to the public?**

**Answer: Analysis results will be made available for review and comment in the Draft EIS.**

**b. But the Environmental Assessment Statement (PDF page 62, EAS Full Form page 6) appears not to plan for study of "Indirect Business Displacement."**

**Answer: Each analysis area has a threshold against which potential effects of the project are measured. If a threshold is not met or exceeded, then there is no significant effect for that area and no further analysis is required. As identified on the EAS PDF Page 62, EAS Full Form page 6, the proposed Manhattan facility would not exceed the thresholds triggering the need for a preliminary assessment of Socioeconomic Conditions, including Indirect Business Displacement. As such, a preliminary assessment of indirect business displacement resulting from the proposed Manhattan facility is not required.**

**7. The Environmental Impact.**

**a. Pearl River runs through and the City cannot hit bedrock.**

**b. How is that being addressed? Is the EIS going to study the effects of building a skyscraper over the subterranean river?**

**Answer: Thank you for raising these concerns, we will review and incorporate into the project and environmental review as necessary.**

**8. The Historical Impact**

**a. Is the EIS taking into consideration the historic architectural value of [80 Centre St](#)? If so, how?**

**Answer: Historical impact will be evaluated in accordance with the CEQR technical manual.**

**C. The Study fails to account for 2nd stage of project—renovating [125 White Street](#) to provide a new Court and new District Attorney facilities.**

**1. The failure to account for this 2nd stage means that the EIS over projects the benefits of this project.**

**a. For example, the Environmental Assessment Statement (PDF page 61, EAS Full Form page 5) projects minus 1,900 court workers, but those court workers are actually just moving to the [125 White Street](#) location, and their transit trips and parking (among other things) should be accounted for, and not removed.**

**Answer: The environmental review will take into account the impacts of moving the District Attorney's offices from [80 Centre street](#) to [125 White street](#).**

## **Substantive Questions**

**I. Policy Issues with Borough-Based Jails / 40-Story Jail**

**The City has not explained the following:**

**1. What studies of potential sites were conduct? By whom? When? Can you provide those studies? What sites were considered?**

**Answer:** The Administration considered both [125 White Street](#) and [80 Centre Street](#) as locations for the replacement detention facility for the Manhattan Detention Center. Both buildings are city-owned and adjacent to the courthouse. While the Administration solicited feedback on both options as possible replacement facilities, [80 Centre Street](#) was selected by the Administration because it was closer to the civic core and comparably scaled buildings; the [125 White Street](#) location would have been a taller building, and [80 Centre Street](#) opened up a community development opportunity for the neighborhood.

**2. When was the decision to use [80 Centre](#) made? Who made it? What were the considerations?**

**a. Why was renovating Rikers rejected?**

**Answer:** Renovating Rikers Island would not meet several of our criminal justice goals that we believe will make the City fairer and safer. One of the key priorities of the new jail system is to strengthen connections to families, communities, and support networks, which renovating Rikers would not achieve. Rikers Island is not near our public transportation infrastructure. As such, families (including children) have difficulty staying in contact with loved ones who are detained. Borough-based jails allow for increased opportunities for family visiting. In addition, renovating Rikers Island would not ameliorate current busing issues associated with transferring people who are detained to court. Currently, court cases are sometimes delayed simply because of traffic issues as Rikers Island is far away from the borough based courts. Case delays increase the jail population and extend people's time in jail. By building jails near court houses, we believe that we can vastly reduce the number of case delays associated with travel time to courts.

**b. Why was renovating the Tombs rejected?**

**Answer:** The Administration considered both [125 White Street](#) and [80 Centre Street](#) as locations for the replacement detention facility for the Manhattan Detention Center. Both buildings are city-owned and adjacent to the courthouse. While the Administration solicited feedback on both options as possible replacement facilities, [80 Centre Street](#) was selected by the Administration because it was closer to the civic core and comparably scaled buildings; the [125 White Street](#) location would have been a taller building, and [80 Centre Street](#) opened up a community development opportunity for the neighborhood.

**3. How they determined that a 40-story is feasible? From all we've seen, this concept is untested and unproven.**

**Answer:** It is important to note that the EIS simply offers parameters for the size and height of the proposed facility.



**There are several examples of tall, functioning jails. For instance, Chicago has a 28 story jail that was built several decades ago. Moreover, jails in several large cities have capacity for more than 1500 detainees.**

**Lastly, these new, modern facilities will require much less movement of people who are detained as programming and recreation will be provided within their housing units. Currently, DOC has to move large numbers of people throughout their facilities to shared recreation and programming areas. This practice creates operational and safety challenges that could be remedied through a modern facility design. As such, the City as well as national experts in jail design that are consulting for the City, are confident that the new facilities will function more efficiently, will be safer, and will ensure people who are detained have greater access to evidence-based programming and other vital services.**

**4. What happens if a reduction to 5,000 people in jail is not achieved? What is the back-up plan? Use the Tombs?**

**Answer: The City's crime and jail projections indicate that reaching a 5,000 person average daily population is feasible—even without state cooperation and/or legislative changes. The City has achieved more than 25 years of declining crime and jail population reduction. Since the Mayor took office, the jail population has fallen by 27%. The City is working tirelessly to achieve this goal through expanded pretrial release programs, alternatives to incarceration programs, and various crime prevention programs like the Mayor's Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety and the Office to Prevent Gun Violence.**

**MDC North will be decommissioned as a jail and the community will decide how to best use that building. Chinatown will not have a new jail and MDC North.**

**5. What does NYC Dep't of Corrections think of this plan? NYC Board of Corrections? Have they done any studies on these topics?**

**Answer: The Department of Correction supports the City's borough based jail plan.**

**II. Community Impact of 40-Story Jail**

**A 40-story jail will cast shadows over park and Chinatown neighborhood, and it is out of character for buildings in this neighborhood. Notably, the City continually refuses to show a picture of the height of the 40-story building.**

**Answer:** A shadows analysis is being conducted in accordance with the CEQR technical manual as part of the Environmental Review for this project. The results of that analysis will be made available for public review and comment in the Draft EIS.

**If the City intends to return the North Tower of [125 White Street](#) to the community, why not do it as part of this process? A new Administration could reverse this plan (as has happened in the past), leaving the community with almost nothing.**

**Answer:** The City is currently reviewing all of its legal options.

### III. Criminal Justice Reform

**The City's proposal essentially sets up Justice Reform (and its physically structure) for the next 50-100 years. How can this be rushed and not fully vetted? Concerns raised by the Corrections Union and Wardens have not been addressed. Certain wardens have indicated that the ideal number of detainees is 500-600.**

**Answer:** The City's plan for reducing the jail population and building borough-based jails is the result of thousands of hours of analysis, Justice Implementation Taskforce meetings, focus groups with service providers and formerly incarcerated, and consultant meetings with national jail-design experts. Moreover, independent expert groups have indicated that our plan is feasible and would present a vast improvement to the current detention facilities on Rikers Island.

**It is also important to note that there are several functioning jails throughout the country that have at least 1500 people who are detained—including Philadelphia, Denver and Los Angeles. It is also not appropriate to compare the ideal number of people in a facility on Rikers Island with a modern facility that is designed to reduce violence and would provide smaller housing units.**

### IV. Property Values and Real Estate Taxes

**The City claims that property values will be unaffected. What is their evidence? And how is this fair to those who have invested in this community?**

**Answer:** Property value near the current Brooklyn and Manhattan facilities have continued to increase after the construction of their respective facilities. Moreover, property value in downtown Denver, where a modern jail was built in 2010, has continued to increase.

**Questions from CCBA and Chinese Freemasons:**

**1. Why is [125 White Street](#) no longer feasible? (background, [125 White](#) and [80 Centre](#) were originally presented as two options that the community could decide on, which is why many stakeholders were confused when less than a month later, a decision was made without them)**

**Answer:** The Administration considered both [125 White Street](#) and [80 Centre Street](#) as locations for the replacement detention facility for the Manhattan Detention Center. Both buildings are city-owned and adjacent to the courthouse. While the Administration solicited feedback on both options as possible replacement facilities, [80 Centre Street](#) was selected by the Administration because it was closer to the civic core and comparably scaled buildings; the [125 White Street](#) location would have been a taller building, and [80 Centre Street](#) opened up a community development opportunity for the neighborhood.

**2. What is estimated cost of closing Rikers and where will funding come from?**

**Answer:** This is expected to be a multi-billion dollar project financed by the City of New York.

**a. How will demolition and construction contracts be awarded?**

**Answer:** The city is moving forward with a Design/Build procurement approach for these projects.

**b. Part of the city's plan to reduce the prison population bail reform. By referring people who have been arrested to social service organizations who will help ensure they go to trials and provide other services, many low level and nonviolent offenders will be diverted from unnecessary jail time. How will the city be assisting social service groups with this work?**

**Answer:** The City's proponents for moving away from monetary bail and giving judges more options are supervised release and a citywide pretrial diversion program.

Supervised release works effectively to supervise low-risk people in the community who otherwise would have had bail set and could be sitting in jail for months while waiting for trial unnecessarily, costing us money and derailing their

lives because they would be unable to work or take care of their families. The City has launched and expanded a supervise release program that contracts with community-based organizations to provide social services and monitor thousands of individuals whom judges place in the program.

It is also important to note, that the City has one of the highest rates of releasing people who are arrested on their own recognizance (ROR). Roughly 70 percent of all people arrested are released on their own recognizance.

**3. Many people are also concerned that in focusing on closing Rikers and how the borough-based jails will look, Will the guards and staff be retrained to change the culture?**

**Answer:** Culture change is underway through hiring and training. Approximately 5000 officers have been newly hired by DOC in the past 5 years. We have increased the length of our academy training for new hires by several weeks because of the inclusion of new and additional required training. Further, under the Nunez consent judgment, PREA and other DOC led reform initiatives the Department has added approximately 2 weeks of new training for existing members of the Department.

Moreover, the City has implemented several initiatives designed to improve the culture of our jail facilities. As the Mayor announced in March 2017, the City is building a system in which every person who enters city jails will be provided with new tools and services that will help to promote a stable future. By addressing vocational, educational, therapeutic and other needs in an individualized way, time inside jail can be used productively to lay a foundation that can prevent future interaction with the criminal justice system. The administration's new system begins with an expanded risk and need assessment on the first day that someone enters jail, offering five hours every day of programming that addresses an individual's unique needs, and continuing with support – including new employment and educational programs called Jails to Jobs – after someone leaves jail and returns to the community.

Additionally, the City has increased the number of programming options and hours available to people who are detained, created a new veterans unit, and improve visitation services to provide families with more opportunities to visit their loved

ones who are detained. Lastly, through the Justice Implementation Task Force, the City convenes the Culture Change Working Group that is comprised of experts, advocates, formerly incarcerated and practitioners that all work together to produce research and generate ideas to further improve the culture of our jail facilities.

**4. How will the city address the lead and asbestos issues that may come up in demolishing a building from the 1930's?**

**Answer:** Demolition of buildings that may contain lead and/or asbestos is not unusual and will be done in accordance with health and safety plans designed to contain such materials that will be prepared before work begins.

**a. Will federal agencies be monitoring environmental impact & air quality during all phases of project?**

**Answer:** The city is expected to conduct any appropriate monitoring.

**b. How will the shadows on the site impact the trees and greenery at Columbus Park?**

**Answer:** A shadows analysis is being conducted in accordance with the CEQR technical manual as part of the Environmental Review for this project. The results of that analysis will be made available for public review and comment in the Draft EIS.

**5. How does city plan to address added traffic volume during and after project?**

**a. How will this project impact Emergency Medical Services?**

**Answer:** The new, modern facilities will be designed to provide greater access to appropriate medical services. Under the City's proposed plan, there would be an outpatient clinic in each facility. There would also be behavioral health and substance abuse services as well as a medical procedure room available for decentralized clinic services. The proposed plan also contemplates having a centralized urgent care center.

**b. How will city address additional loss of curbside parking?**

**Answer:** Potentially significant traffic impacts of the proposed project are being evaluated in accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual as part of the Environmental Review for this project. The results of that analysis will be made available for public review and comment in the Draft EIS.

**6. Isn't the current MDC mis-used by housing convicted inmates?**

**Answer:** MDC is not being mis-used by housing a number of people who are sentenced in addition to detainees at MDC. The Department is authorized to house any pre-trial detainee or sentenced individual in any DOC facility, whether on Rikers or in the boroughs. Individuals who are convicted and sentenced to more than one year are transferred to prisons upstate.

**7. There is a lot of skepticism that the city will be able to reduce its jail population to 5000 individuals. If the city is unable to reduce the population to 5000 detainees, where will the extra individuals be housed?**

**Answer:** The City's crime and jail projections indicate that reaching a 5,000 person average daily population is completely feasible—even without state cooperation. The City has experienced more than 25 years of declining crime and the jail population. As the City expands its pretrial release programs, alternatives to incarceration programs, and various crime prevention programs like the Mayor's Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety and programs via the Office of Gun violence prevention – the City is certain it will reach its goal.

**8. Residents of Chinatown have complained that MDC does not adequately take care of its surrounding sidewalks, including problems with de-icing, garbage and litter removal. What steps are being taken to address these concerns and prevent them if the new facility is built?**

**Answer:** The Administration is committed to providing opportunities for community members to engage in fruitful dialogue with the New York City Department of Corrections (DOC) and others from the administration regarding the existing Manhattan Detention Center.

**9. When will online and other written materials about the city's plan be translated to other languages to ensure that community understands the changes being made?**

Email from the Mayor's Office to Congressmember Nydia Velasquez in Response to Questions from September 21, 2018 Meeting, Received October 11, 2018

**Answer:** The City's public brochure outlining the proposed project has been printed in 7 languages (English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Urdu, Haitian Creole, and Urdu)

We've brought translators and headsets to our public meetings to ensure that all public presentations are delivered in the language the community understands.

**10. What are some of the proposed community givebacks for the current MDC towers, as well as community space proposed for 80 Centre Street? What would be the timeline for those projects?**

**Answer:** The City is proposing a community-driven participatory process to determine the potential future usage of Manhattan Detention Center's North Tower ("MDC North") – a 226,000 square foot building that will be returned to the community at the completion of the project. The future use of MDC North could include affordable housing, senior housing, or another use.

**11. How is the Mayor's office incorporating the community feedback they have received already?**

**Answer:** Comments received on the Draft Scope of Work, will be addressed the Final Scope of Work and will be reflected as appropriate in the Draft EIS.

Yes, this is how we received it. In the body of an email.