

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

Date: April 2, 2019 6:30 pm

Location: 96 Baxter Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, NY

Prepared by: Kathryn Kramer and Ryan Walsh

**Attendees:**

Perkins Eastman  
Architects DPC

Name	Affiliation	
Gale Brewer	Manhattan Borough President	
Kenny Chan	Fujian American Council	
Ian Chan	Council Member Margaret Chin's Office	<a href="http://PERKINSEASTMAN.COM">PERKINSEASTMAN.COM</a>
Wellington Chen	Chinatown Partnership	Boston
Amy Chin	CREATE in Chinatown, Inc.	Charlotte
Margaret Chin	Council Member	Chicago
Alex Chu	East Bank, N.A.	Dallas
Jonathan Chu	Nickel & Diner / Chikarashi	Dubai
Tony Chuy	American Legion Chinatown Post	Guayaquil
Eric Dillenger	Walker Street Neighborhood Association	Los Angeles
Tara Duvivier	Urban Planner for Manhattan Community Boards 1, 2, 3	Mumbai
Stephen Freid	Park Row Alliance	New York
Vidal Guzman	JustLeadership USA	Pittsburgh
Jacqueline Hsia	Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez's Office	San Francisco
Howard Huie	Park Row Alliance	Shanghai
Fiona Jung	State Senator Brian Kavanagh's Office	Stamford
Nancy Kong	Chatham Towers	Toronto
Charles Lai	Chung Pak	Washington DC
Hong Lee	Chinatown Manpower Project	

Irving Lee	Confucius Plaza Resident
Alysha Lewis-Coleman	Manhattan Community Board 3
Gigi Li	Council Member Margaret Chin's Office
Joseph Mirabella	Park Row Alliance
Kareem Muhammad	Street Corner Resources
Anthony Notaro Jr.	Manhattan Community Board 1
Angel Rodriguez	Avenues for Justice
Jim Shelton	Manhattan Community Board 3
Susan Stetzer	Manhattan Community Board 3
Jennifer Sun	Asian Americans for Equality
Aixa Torres	Smith Houses Resident Association
Jacky Wong	Community Member
Alice Wong	Chinese-American Planning Council
Jo-Ann Yoo	Asian American Federation
Gabrielle Dann-Allel	CAU
Eric Fang	PE
Dana Kaplan	MOCJ
Julia Kerson	DMOps
Kathryn Kramer	PE
Tahirah Moore	IGA
Lindsey Shields	DMOps
Joseph Thomas	CAU
Ryan Walsh	FHI

**ACTIONS ITEMS:**

- NAC members to provide final comments on Manhattan Guidelines and Principles by Friday, April 12<sup>th</sup>.

**DISCUSSION OF BUILDING HEIGHT & DENSITY AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS):**

- The City explained that in response to community feedback and the City's commitment to demonstrating progress in reducing the

height/density and impact on neighborhoods, we have modified our plan to reduce the heights of the proposed buildings.

- The proposed Manhattan facility now has a reduced height of 450 feet, which is a reduction of 45 feet.
  - We reduced the number of beds in the proposed plan by 250, by reducing the inefficiency rate to 15%.
  - The City has decided to have a centralized women's facility proposed to be in Queens that allows dedicated women only space for programming, visitation, healthcare services, and intake.
  - We removed the proposed arraignment court from the Bronx facility, and moving forward, we will engage stakeholders on the appropriate location for the parole court currently housed on Rikers Island.
  - Additional strategies to further reduce the height and density are under continued review by the City, and as decisions are made we will continue to share the impact on the proposed plan.
- The City confirmed it will absolutely adjust its jail population projections based on passage of State legislation in order to right size the proposed facilities.
  - The City is actively exploring and considering whether there is a more appropriate environment to house and serve a sub-population of therapeutic units (complex and acute mentally ill and substance abuse). This includes exploring using space in or adjacent to hospitals to house this particular sub-population (not hospitalizing people or putting them in hospitals).
  - NAC member asked how the new height reductions translate to floor area ratio (FAR) and to the existing zoning.
    - The City responded that we are seeking a special permit that would define the height of the proposed jail. Current zoning has no height limits.
  - NAC members asked for the modelled height of the proposed Manhattan facility and whether it includes mechanicals.
    - The City responded that environmental review analyses include the mechanical space on top of the proposed jail.
  - NAC members asked whether there is a tie between State criminal justice reforms and reducing the total number of beds underlying the proposed project.

- The City shared that State legislative changes were passed this past week. These changes included bail reform, speedy trial reform, and discovery reform and will go into effect in January 2020. The City is currently modeling the newly passed legislation to better understand how these reforms will impact the City's projected total number of beds needed.
- NAC member asked how the City's bed reduction ties into the current ULURP process for the proposed project.
  - The City explained that the ULURP process will continue. The ULURP applications represent the maximum permitted possibility for the proposed jails. In ULURP, the City is not committed to a final design or height. As the City works through the numbers of the State legislative reforms, it can right size the system. It is expected that this will occur within the ULURP timeline.
- NAC member asked whether the City has any other information to share about the current or expected State criminal justice reforms.
  - The City responded that we are supporting the "Less is More Act" for State parole reform. Parole is entirely a State process and currently, State Parole violators are the only sub-population of people not decreasing at Rikers Island. We are also looking at charitable bail funds, looking to expand those up to \$10,000 and applicable to more offenses. Each of these additional State reforms would impact the average number of people in correctional custody on a daily basis.
- NAC member commented that a reduction of 50 feet for proposed Manhattan facility is not a substantial reduction and referenced the Lippman Commission stating the ideal jails system would be comprised of 20 jails with about 300 detainees in each.
  - The City responded that we do not believe our numbers are in conflict with what the Lippman Commission recently issued. The City is taking the newly passed State criminal justice reforms into consideration to get to a right sized system. The newly passed State reforms did not completely eliminate cash bail, so the City is trying to understand what the implications will be on the criminal justice system they relate to the proposed project. We are also looking at State parole reforms that may pass later in the session. In

addition, the Lippman Commission did not recommend a jail system of 20 facilities.

- NAC member asked whether there would be “checks” along the Design Build process where the City can continue to evaluate what is needed.
  - City responded that if the average daily population continues to decline such that the City needs fewer beds than what is currently proposed, the City can reduce the number of beds during the design-build process.
- NAC member asked whether the City has breakdowns of the amount of space needed for various components of the proposed program.
  - City responded that the DEIS states how much space is dedicated to housing, community space, parking, and support space.
- NAC member commented that the space needed for the various components of the proposed program cannot change during the Design Build process.
  - The City clarified that the space needed for the various components of the proposed program can change during the Design Build process. The City confirmed it will absolutely adjust its jail population projections based on passage of State legislation in order to right size the proposed facilities and has no intention of building a facility that is larger than necessary to house the adjusted jail population projection and related programming.
- NAC member asked whether any other sites were looked at to reduce the scale of the proposed Manhattan facility.
  - The City explained that the locations of the borough-based jails were based on: (1) proximity to courthouses; (2) accessibility to public transportation; (3) sufficient size to fit an equitable distribution of the City’s jail population across four boroughs, with space to provide a humane, safe, and supportive environment; and (4) City-owned land. The City’s starting point for identifying the proposed sites was looking at the three existing DOC borough facilities (Manhattan Detention Center, Brooklyn Detention Center, and Queens Detention Facility). In Manhattan, the City considered 80 Centre Street, but we discovered that relocating the occupants of 80 Centre Street in Manhattan would be more

- timely and costly than initially anticipated. As such, we returned to the original site of the existing MDC (124/125 White) because it meets the criteria of being close to the Courts, City-owned, and accessible by public transportation. Since there is direct court adjacency at all three existing facilities and they meet all of the other criterion, there was no need to look any further in those three boroughs.
- NAC member asked what congestion pricing has to do with this project?
    - The City responded that congestion pricing could change how people move around the neighborhood. The City said it is too early to tell how congestion pricing could affect the project. There are a number of things that need to be ironed out at the State level.
  - NAC member asked what will be the impact of congestion pricing on local businesses.
    - City responded the impact of implementing congestion pricing will likely require its own environmental study separate and apart from the borough-based jail system study.
  - NAC member raised concern about future air quality in the surrounding area of the proposed site and how it would impact seniors. NAC member asked how the City will control the air quality during demolition and construction.
    - The City responded that we have received the community's report describing the community's suspected air quality impacts of construction. The City would implement best practices for dust control and would determine the most effective way to demolish the existing jail with minimal impact to the neighborhood. The City would perform real-time air quality monitoring using air quality monitors set-up around the site. If thresholds for particulate matter are exceeded, DDC project staff would be automatically alerted and work would stop. The construction team will also be required to develop a Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP). The City explained that the demolition will be very carefully designed.
  - NAC member noted that the DEIS Historical and Cultural chapter, indicates that 124 White Street is eligible for State and local consideration. This chapter says the City will consult with the

Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). NAC member asked what if LPC does not approve the demolition.

- The City explained that there are review processes during Design-Build, including the Public Design Commission review. The LPC will be consulted to determine measures to partially mitigate the potential for impacts.

**NAC DISCUSSION OF UPDATED DRAFT GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES:**

- The NAC members reviewed the Updated Manhattan Draft Guidelines and Principles and their discussion included:
  - Existing ground floor businesses in the Manhattan Detention Complex (MDC) should have right of first refusal;
  - Whether maintain access for bicycles should be included. No consensus or resolution to this point;
  - Clarification regarding use of “ultra” low sulfur vehicles;
  - Public parking may be more feasible under Roosevelt Park or as part of the GSA facility at Howard and Centre;
  - The City should fund any potential shuttle service; and
  - Non-food businesses should be prioritized to reduce competition with existing businesses.