

Re: **Borough-Based Jails Neighborhood Advisory Committee
(NAC) Manhattan - First Meeting**

Date: January 16, 2019 6:30 pm

Location: 253 Broadway, 8th Floor, New York, NY

Prepared by: Kathryn Kramer and Ryan Walsh

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation	
Gale Brewer	Manhattan Borough President	Perkins Eastman Architects DPC
Kenny Chan	Fujian American Council	
Ian Chan	Council Member Margaret Chin's Office	
Wellington Chen	Chinatown Partnership	PERKINSEASTMAN.COM
Amy Chin	CREATE in Chinatown, Inc.	
Margaret Chin	Council Member	
Tony Chuy	American Legion Chinatown Post	Boston
Eric Dillenberger	Walker Street Neighborhood Association	Charlotte
Venus Galarza-Mullins	State Senator Brian Kavanaugh's Office	Chicago
Wayne Ho	Chinese-American Planning Council	Dallas
Jacqueline Hsia	Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez's Office	Dubai Guayaquil
Fiona Jung	State Senator Brian Kavanaugh's Office	Los Angeles
Nancy Kong	Chatham Towers	Mumbai
Charles Lai	Chung Pak	New York
Jan Lee	Chinatown Core Block Association	Pittsburgh
Alysha Lewis-Coleman	Manhattan Community Board 3	San Francisco
Gigi Li	Council Member Margaret Chin's Office	Shanghai
Kenneth Ma	Chinatown Optical	Stamford
Monica Martinez	State Assembly Member Niou's Office	Toronto
Anthony Notaro Jr.	Manhattan Community Board 1	Washington DC
Angel Rodriguez	Avenues for Justice, Andrew Glover Youth Program	
Chung Seto	Community Member	
Susan Stetzer	Manhattan Community Board 3	
Jennifer Sun	Asian Americans for Equality	
Diana Switaj	Manhattan Community Board 1	
Aixa Torres	Smith Houses	
Matthew Washington	Manhattan Borough President's Office	
Jacky Wong	Community Member	

Jo-Ann Yoo	Asian American Federation
Gabrielle Dann-Allel	CAU
Eric Fang	PE
Chatodd Floyd	MOCJ
Dana Kaplan	MOCJ
Kathryn Kramer	PE
Tahirah Moore	IGA
Lindsey Shields	DMOps
Joseph Thomas	CAU
Nicole Torres	MOCJ
Ryan Walsh	FHI

ACTIONS ITEMS

- Next NAC meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, January 30th from 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM.

NAC REQUESTED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

- Examples of any changes to study area boundaries for projects in Manhattan due to public comment during CEQR Scoping review or CEQR DEIS review
- Information on the zoning requirements of the existing site including FAR and height
- The square footage of the existing facilities in use on Rikers Island
- A copy of the 1983 Manhattan Detention Center (“MDC”) EIS, which NAC member/community members have also requested through submitting a FOIL request
- What level of design detail will be included in the Master Plan and available during ULURP?

NAC DISCUSSION

NAC Process

- NAC members suggested that meeting minutes be detailed, clear, complete, and reflect NAC members’ sentiments and provide a high level of transparency.
- NAC members expressed a desire to share information from the NAC meetings with constituents and other stakeholders. The City confirmed that all minutes and presentations will be posted on the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice’s website.

- The City explained that the final work product of the NAC will be a list of recommendations called “Guidelines and Principles” that will be shared with the ULURP players as an advisory document before ULURP certification.

Overall Process

- NAC members asked whether CB1 would be the only Community Board in Manhattan to officially hold a public hearing on the project during ULURP. The City confirmed that consistent with the City Charter, only the Community Board that contains a proposed jail facility will hold a public hearing.
- NAC members inquired about the New York City Department of Design and Construction’s recent Request for Proposal (RFP) and asked if it was an RFP for construction of the borough-based jails. The City clarified that the RFP released by DDC is for a Program Management Consultant and that this RFP is not for a design-build team. The Program Management Consultant will help the agency prepare for work that will be conducted by the design-build team, including helping DDC develop best practices and manage design guidelines and principles for the design-build team.

CEQR/ULURP

- NAC members inquired about the boundaries of the study area being studied in the environmental review. The City explained that each of the different technical areas of analyses in the environmental review has a different methodology for determining study area. The City explained, for example, the study area of shadow analysis is as long as the longest cast shadow.
- NAC members asked how they could change the study area size of a particular technical area of analysis like socioeconomic conditions, for example. The City responded that submitting comments on the Draft Scope of Work and on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) were both ways to influence the boundaries of a particular technical area of analysis.
- NAC members inquired why scoping was not being started over in light of the Manhattan site changing from 80 Centre Street to 124/125 White Street. NAC members noted that if the City re-did scoping for the new location, it might once again receive public comments, like it did with 80 Centre Street, that could cause the City to deter from using

124/125 White Street as the jail site The City explained that the scoping document spells out what will be studied and how, not the results of the studies. The City also explained that because 124/125 White Street is in close proximity to 80 Centre, the areas of analysis in the environmental review should not be materially different and there is a lot of overlap between the impacted area and impacted community. Additionally, the City looked at the comments received and saw that moving the location to 124/125 White Street was consistent with the comments received on 80 Centre Street. For example, some comments asked why not keep the location at 124/125 White Street, and other comments indicated that the new location addresses some of the potential impacts presented by 80 Centre Street. The City explained that the scoping process is the beginning of the environmental review process. Scoping narrows down the focus of the environmental impact statement and allows the City to get initial community comments. There is a lot of process still left and there will be numerous opportunities for meaningful public engagement, including commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and engagement throughout the Universal Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). All of the public comments offered at the DEIS public hearing and submitted during the DEIS comment period will be addressed in the final EIS. NAC members indicated that switching the sites will have very different impacts despite the short distance between the two sites. NAC members expressed concern that moving from 80 Centre Street to 124/125 White Street is a significant change with respect to the immediately adjacent neighbors who will be impacted.

- The City responded by noting that the NAC is one structured form of engagement for the City to receive community input on how best to engage and communicate with the community. Additionally, the City noted that it will have individual meetings with stakeholders and meetings with impacted residents and businesses to ensure there is an outlet for residents to tell the City what they are concerned about.
- The NAC inquired what alternatives will be studied as part of the environmental review process. The City responded that the alternatives will include a No Action Alternative and an Unmitigated Impacts Alternative.
- The NAC asked about the current zoning requirements of the site and how the proposed project would go beyond those limits. The City offered to return to the next NAC meeting with that information and added that a special permit will be created and applied for to accommodate those differences.

- NAC members inquired if the ULURP process for the Manhattan site could be uncoupled from the other boroughs, noting they feel very strongly that the Manhattan site should be unbundled from the other three sites. Additionally the NAC members asked why the project is moving forward as one ULURP when the four sites are very different. The City explained that closing the jails on Rikers Island and replacing them with a system of modern and humane borough-based jails is a citywide criminal justice project to implement system-wide change, not piece by piece. The City explained that the closure of Rikers Island jails would not be possible without the four sites to house the borough-based jails. The City determined that a single ULURP process would be the best way to accomplish this system-wide change.
- The NAC asked if the Community would have access to the EIS and supporting documents once the study is complete. NAC members stated a desire to be able to return to the document in the future to ensure that obligations are fulfilled. The City responded that all of those documents will be preserved online and publicly available.
- The NAC stated that FOIL requests for the 1983 EIS have been submitted and those requests are still pending.

Site Selection

- NAC members asked about the site selection process and why the Manhattan site changed from 80 Centre Street to 124/125 White Street. The City presented the site selection criteria and explained that although the City originally believed 80 Centre was the superior site, the complexity and cost of moving 80 Centre's multiple occupants ultimately made this site not viable. The City explained that 124/125 White Street hits all the marks – proximity to the courthouse, easy access to public transportation, city-owned property, and sufficient size to fit an equitable distribution of the City's jail population across four boroughs. NAC members indicated they would have liked the City to have included community impact as a site selection criterion.
- NAC members asked what other sites in Manhattan were considered. The City responded that looking at the City's site selection criteria of adjacency to courthouses was considered paramount and the only Manhattan sites that met that particular criterion were 80 Centre Street and 124/125 White Street.

- The NAC asked if the programming reforms could be done entirely on Rikers Island. The City responded that a primary goal of closing Rikers Island jails and creating a system of borough- based jails is to allow family members, service providers, and attorneys greater access to the people in detention, as well as closer access to the Courts. Rebuilding the jails on Rikers Island would undermine the goal of allowing family members, service providers, and attorneys to have greater access to the people in detention. The facilities on Rikers Island are built under a philosophy of another era and achieving the design and programmatic goals of the Close Rikers program cannot be done through renovating the existing facilities on Rikers.
- NAC members expressed the sentiment that the Chinatown neighborhood already bears its fair share of civic facilities and that they were disappointed that other areas in Manhattan were not considered for the proposed jail.

Community Engagement

- NAC members suggested that the Mayor’s office directly reach out to the impacted businesses in the immediate area (on Centre, Walker, Mott, and Baxter Streets), especially the tenants located on the ground floor of MDC. The City indicated that meetings with those local businesses are being planned. NAC members noted that scheduling meetings with and engaging the local businesses may be challenging due the vast majority of them being “mom and pop” shops.
- NAC members suggested that the process should be collaborative.

The Proposed Facilities

- NAC members asked which borough jail will house a “central disease unit.” The City clarified that there would be a Specialized Medical Annex (SMA), which would include an Urgent Care Center, Infirmary, Communicable Disease Unit and Dialysis Units. The City explained that all facilities will provide medical and mental health services operated by Correctional Health Services (CHS), including a healthcare clinic and therapeutic housing for detainees with mental health and sub-acute medical conditions, and people with substance use disorders. The City believes the majority of issues will be treated via these on-site, borough-based medical services. Infirmary services for more elevated medical care will be centralized in a Specialized Medical Annex (SMA) co-located in one of the facilities. The SMA will include an infirmary for treatments like dialysis and communicable diseases, and an urgent

care facility. Queens is currently considered the likely location for the SMA. Hospitals will still be utilized for life-threatening emergencies.

- NAC members indicated that the surrounding streets are all one-way and that impacts to the circulation in the neighborhood could have significant impacts for local businesses.
- NAC members indicated that the City should be mindful of the the existing wall between MDC and the senior housing behind it.
- NAC members asked about the level of design that will be included in the Master Plan and available during ULURP. The City agreed to address these questions at a future NAC meeting.

Jail Population

- NAC members inquired about the driving factors behind the decline in the City's jail population. The City responded that the numerous initiatives at the local and state level have contributed to the historic decline. NAC member spoke about historic racial disparities in the criminal justice system, including racial profiling and systematic violations of individuals' constitutional rights. NAC member also spoke positively about the de Blasio Administration's neighborhood policing program as being very successful.