



FAMILIES ADVISORY COUNCIL  
PRESENTATION ON DRAFT SCOPE OF GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT  
AUGUST 5, 2003 5:30 PM -7:30 PM  
LOWER MANHATTAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION  
20<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR

---

Anthoula Katsimatides, Assistant Vice President of the Community Affairs and Government Relations Department for the LMDC opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing the newly appointed members of the Families Advisory Council. The meeting continued with a brief introduction from all FAC members present.

After introductions concluded the meeting was turned to Kevin Rampe, President of the LMDC. Mr. Rampe explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the environmental planning process that is occurring with the World Trade Center site and to clarify any misconceptions among family members involved in the process.

Mr. Rampe introduced Irene Chang, the Vice President of Legal Affairs and general counsel for the LMDC. Mr. Rampe explained that Ms. Chang was present to explain the environmental review process including the scope and how the process will move forward and allow several opportunities for public comment. Mr. Rampe also introduced Andrew Winters, the Vice President and Director for Planning, Design & Development for the LMDC. Mr. Rampe explained that Mr. Winters was present to provide an update of the current status of the site plan and what some of the challenges are that are being tackled as the rebuilding process moves forward.

Mr. Rampe continued his remarks by explaining to the FAC that their concerns have been listened to and will continue to be heard as the planning process continues to evolve. Mr. Rampe touched upon two developments that occurred in direct response to family member concern, with one being, the identification of the Deutsche Bank site as an adjacent site for truck security and

truck surfacing which will allow for those items to be removed from the site and specifically the memorial area. The second development Mr. Rampe mentioned was the identification of an alternative location for the bus garage, previously stated to be located below the Memorial area of the WTC site. Mr. Rampe explained that site 26 in Battery Park City was an alternative that is being heavily considered, but with all things, it was not a definite solution and will continue to be evaluated on many levels until the potential impact on all factors is further understood.

Mr. Rampe then turned the meeting to Ms. Chang who began with a brief overview of the environmental review process. Ms. Chang explained that the environmental review process was another leg of the public process that has led to the selection of the Daniel Libeskind site plan for the World Trade Center site. She mentioned that feedback from the public and those directly affected from the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks was essential to bringing the LMDC where it was in the rebuilding process and that it will continue to play an important role throughout this environmental evaluation phase.

Derived from the public process and for the purposes of environmental review, the rebuilding effort was designated as the World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan. Ms. Chang continued with explaining that the purpose of the review is to look at the impact of the plan on the environment, including both the human and the physical environment. She pointed out that the LMDC is the lead agency with regard to the proposed action of redeveloping the World Trade Center site and therefore developed a list of items that should to be studied during the environmental review. Ms. Chang continued to explain that the list of criteria and the description of the analysis that will be done on each item is called a draft scope. Ms. Chang explained that the term “scope” is used because it defines all of the areas of the analysis that will be conducted; it is the scope of the environmental review.

Ms. Chang continued by emphasizing that public information and participation are key components throughout the environmental review process. At this time the FAC members were shown a slide containing the list that outlines all of the chapters that are expected to be in the generic environmental impact statement. The draft scope document that contained this list was released for public comment, and can be modified in response to public reaction. Ms. Chang continued by explaining that after review of public comment a final scope is released reflecting changes made in response to comments and it then becomes the guide for the environmental studies and analysis that will be performed.

Ms. Chang informed the FAC that the environmental review process is occurring simultaneously with the site planning process and that no construction can begin on the site until the EIS is completed. Ms. Chang noted that the term “generic” will continue to be used in regard to this review process to account for the fact that there are certain components of the plans that cannot be defined in detail at various phases throughout the process, i.e. the memorial.

Ms. Chang summarized her presentations and detailed the next steps within the environmental process. She described that the final scope was being prepared in the aftermath of the recent public comment period. She continued to state that the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement will be released this fall with public hearings soon to follow. In the spring there will be a review of the final GEIS and again an opportunity for public review and comment.

Once Ms. Chang completed her presentation, Mr. Rampe turned the meeting over to Mr. Winters to discuss the site plan. Mr. Rampe emphasized the elements he would like the FAC to consider during Mr. Winters presentation, specifically that the site plan had not changed from what they had seen previously and reiterated the two major components currently being reevaluated, including the acquisition of the Deutsche Bank Milstein Property for the truck security and relocating the proposed bus terminal. With that Mr. Winters began a description of the environmental presentation he had given to the public the week prior.

Mr. Winters described the two programs that form the plan for the World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment plan with one being the memorial and cultural plan which provides for the construction of the memorial and memorial related improvements and the other being the public transportation infrastructure plan. It was explained that the LMDC will be overseeing the review of the memorial and cultural plan and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) will be following the same process for the public transportation infrastructure review.

Mr. Winters continued his presentation with descriptions of the site plan and the specific components under review. He specifically mentioned the cultural elements that will be incorporated into the site as well as the renewal of Greenwich Street and Fulton St through the WTC site area. Mr. Winters emphasized that the site plan has evolved in response to different items that have surfaced through working with the many stakeholders in the process. He

explained that they will continue to work extremely hard on keeping the originally selected proposal as much intact as possible, but will be responsive to alternatives that will mitigate environmental impact.

With the conclusion of Mr. Winters presentation Ms. Katsimatides addressed the FAC and explained that the color handouts members received related directly to the previous walk-thru of the PATH with the PANYNJ. Then the floor was open for questions.

Questions began with a new member of the FAC asking a question regarding the memorial jury process. He asked what the interaction the FAC had with the jury that is selecting the memorial. Ms. Katsimatides explained that the FAC had two opportunities to interface with the jury and express their hopes and expectations for the memorial. Mr. Rampe interjected by explaining that beyond the meetings that included the Advisory Councils, the jury had been given printouts of the transcripts to those meetings as well as a hard copy of all the public comment received in regards to the memorial selection. Mr. Rampe continued to describe how the process will move forward with the jury selecting approximately five designs that will be reviewed by the public and then the jury will select the winning design. Discussion continued concerning a possible separate meeting that the FAC would like to have between the release of the finalists and selection of the winner. Mr. Rampe explained that there would be no meeting in order to adhere to the traditional memorial process that the LMDC has committed to uphold.

Another FAC member posed a question on a different topic by asking why the option of the bus depot located below the memorial area was still being evaluated in the environmental review process if it was not acceptable by public opinion and an alternative had been determined. Mr. Winters explained that the review process in place included the responsibility to review all decisions that have been made. There is a requirement to document the decision process even for things that have been dismissed.

The meeting continued with an FAC member returning to the topic of the memorial and the FAC's interaction with the jury. He emphasized that he felt strongly that there should have been more meetings with the jury and that he felt there wasn't enough time for the FAC to communicate how they felt about the site. Another FAC member pointed out that she felt confident that the memorial jury did have enough information from the families and she reiterated that they were working with the memorial mission statement and program that was

created by family members and others to serve as a direct guideline when choosing the memorial.

Discussion continued concerning the status of the footprints of the towers and what will or will not be located on the footprints. Mr. Rampe noted the importance of the discussion but re-directed the meeting to the topic of the EIS and its process. An FAC member followed the direction and asked a question regarding the evaluation of alternatives and mitigating circumstances and alternatives. He specifically asked that if after the evaluation of alternatives, the LMDC was not bound by law to select the alternative with the least environmental impact. Ms. Chang confirmed this and explained that by evaluating all alternatives, these alternatives become a basis for comparison and each of the alternatives may have one or more components or entire features that are different from the proposed action.

The next question asked by an FAC member reverted back to the issue of the bus terminal. This member wanted to know what was being planned for the 30 feet of space below the memorial since the bus terminal was to be relocated. Mr. Winter's responded to the question recognizing the importance of the bedrock within the footprints to family members and explained that he was unsure of what infrastructure may be necessary because the memorial was yet to be selected. The family member continued to discuss the issue of bedrock and described that he was convinced that something would be put in the space below the memorial other than infrastructure for the memorial itself.

An FAC member brought up a new question regarding the safety of the proposed buildings and the Federal, State and local fire codes. Mr. Winter's explained that all that information will be addressed in the design guidelines which will serve as a road map for the development. Another FAC member moved onto a question regarding the economic benefit of the memorial that is described in the draft scope. She emphasized that she hoped that the memorial was being looked at for what it is rather than just an economic stimuli and that a distinction is not clearly described in the draft scope. She went on to discuss the specific numbers of potential workers and visitors that had been forecasted for the memorial area. She felt that those numbers should be included in the draft scope to better describe the impact on the area. Mr. Rampe explained that those numbers were presented by the PANYNJ and the LMDC will perform its own analysis of visitation and that will be included in the process.

Another FAC member mentioned three topics she wished to discuss: she advocated for the preservation of bedrock within the footprints of the towers, she agreed that there needed to be more involvement with the memorial jury, and finally that there was a lack of green space within the cultural area of the site plan. She also mentioned the fourth track of the temporary PATH terminal that is being installed and questioned if that could possibly be reserved solely for memorial use. Another FAC member responded to the request for more interaction with the jury by explaining that the FAC had a very long meeting with the memorial jury and members were able to effectively depict their concerns. An additional FAC member interjected by asking again if the FAC could have approximate five finalists presented to them prior to public release. Mr. Rampe addressed this by explaining that his role in the memorial selection is to protect the integrity of the process and he understood there will be debate and discussion over the selections made by the jury, but there are rules in place for a reason and those rules need to be respected in order for the jury to complete their very important task.

An FAC member remarked that she felt that the FAC had received an adequate opportunity to be involved in the memorial process but did hope to see the finalists separate from the general public. Ms. Katsimatides and Mr. Rampe both remarked that there would be a separate viewing of the finalists for family members.

Circular discussion continued on the topics of the memorial and access to bedrock with a final comment from an FAC member asking if the LMDC would add preserving the footprints to bedrock as an alternative in the EIS. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.