

April 13, 2015



Vanderbilt Corridor Proposed City Actions

Zoning Text Amendment

- 1. Create new special permit *Grand Central Public Realm Improvement Bonus* (ZR§ 81-64)
- 2. Modify existing special permit *Grand Central Subdistrict Landmark Transfer* (ZR§ 81-635)
- 3. Create new special permit for Hotel Use (ZR§ 81-65)

City Map Amendment

1. Designate Vanderbilt Ave between 42nd and 43rd streets as a "**Public Place**" dedicated to pedestrian use under the jurisdiction of DOT



Vanderbilt Corridor Area Profile

East Midtown

- 70 million sf office space
- 250,000 jobs
- NYC financial core
- Major Tax Base
- Regional Transit Hub





Vanderbilt Cornicion Transit & Pedestrian Network





East Side Access LIRR



Second Avenue Subway NYCT

Courtesy of MTA

East Midtown Long-Term Challenges

Limited New Office Development

- Less than 5% of office stock constructed within last two decades
- Only two mid-sized buildings in last decade

Aging Building Stock

- Average age 75 years old
- 80% over 50 years old
- Outdated structural features

Pedestrian and Transit Network

• At-grade and below-grade challenges

Zoning Issues

• Current regulations limit development







Current Zoning: Special Midtown District, est. 1982

Basic Maximum FAR

15 FAR on Avenues (C5-3, C6-6) 12 FAR in Midblock (C5-2.5, C6-4.5)

Additional FAR permitted via:

As-of-Right

- 1 FAR Plaza Bonus
- 1 FAR Landmark Transfer in Grand Central Subdistrict

Special Permit

- 6.6 FAR Landmark Transfer in Grand Central Subdistrict (ZR §81-635)
- 20%+ Landmark Transfer (ZR §74-79)
- 20% Subway Improvement Bonus





Current Zoning: Grand Central Subdistrict, est. 1992

GC Landmark Transfer Special Permit (§81-635)

- Meant to facilitate TDR from GCT and other landmarks
- Allows 21.6 FAR development in GC Core
- Requires pedestrian/transit related improvement
- Used only once in 20+ years (383 Madison)

Landmark Transfer Special Permit (§74-79)

• Permits unlimited FAR transfer to adjacent sites in highdensity commercial districts

> GC Landmark TDRs Transferred: 488,036 sf **Remaining: ~1,500,000 sf**

Subway Station Improvement Bonus (§74-634)

Permits 20% increase in FAR for transit improvements



2013 East Midtown Proposal (Withdrawn)

Proposal Summary

- Encouraged new development on large sites through as-of-right increase in FAR via District Improvement Bonus (DIB)
- DIB monies to be collected into District Improvement Fund (DIF) to pay for transit and public realm improvements
- Focused highest density around GCT: 24 FAR as-ofright, 30 FAR by special permit
- Created broader transfer for landmark TDRs

Concerns Raised During Public Review

- Extent of as-of-right development
- District Improvement Bonus rate
- Administration of District Improvement Fund
- Specificity and timing of infrastructure improvements
- As-of-right hotel use



2013 East Midtown As-of-Right Maximum FAR (Proposal Withdrawn)

Vanderbilt Corridor 2014 Renewed Effort

Greater East Midtown

Vanderbilt Corridor



Vanderbilt Corridor 2014 Renewed Effort

Greater East Midtown (GEM)

Longer-term process to develop framework East Midtown area

Steering Committee

- Council Member Garodnick (Co-Chair)
- Manhattan Borough President Brewer (Co-Chair)
- Build Up NY
- East Midtown Partnership
- Grand Central Partnership
- Landmarks Conservancy
- Manhattan Community Board 5
- Manhattan Community Board 6
- Multi-Board Task Force
- Municipal Art Society
- Real Estate Board of New York
- Regional Plan Association

Recommendations expected Spring/Summer



	1967		i sana nu den <mark>den s</mark> ana se		591h /	E.«
)					Hin Friday Contents	
k for						
		(EI) = = (5 (B)		百合		
)						
		810 (14) *11 (1)				
		-1111 10 11 -				
NET 2015		DRAFTING,	REVIEW &			
STRATEGIES		AGENCY VE COMM RECOMMEN	ITTEE			
	er son For the Argentie For the Argentie		and the second sec		E.	

Vanderbilt Corridor 2014 Renewed Effort

Vanderbilt Corridor

Addresses:

- Near-term development sites
- Limited ability for landmarks to transfer unused development rights
- Transit and Public Realm challenges:
 - Grand Central subway station
 - Sidewalk widths
 - Public open space
 - Vanderbilt Avenue pedestrian experience





Vanderbilt Corridor Public Realm Challenge: Grand Central Transit Network



Text Amendment

1. <u>Create New Special Permit: Grand Central Public Realm</u> <u>Improvement Bonus (ZR §81-64)</u>

- Permits floor area bonuses for developments in Vanderbilt Corridor in exchange for significant pedestrian and transit network improvements
- Permits increase in max density from 15 to 30 FAR
- Allows range of improvements to qualify for bonus: on site, off site, at-grade, below-grade; transit and/or public space improvements
- <u>Requires completion of improvements before temporary</u> certificate occupancy for bonus floor area
- Proposals must meet site planning, building massing, sustainable design requirements
- Bulk and urban design requirements may be modified in order to allow development of the proposed building and improvements
- Based on existing Subway Improvement Bonus Mechanism



Vanderbilt Corridor Text Amendment

New Special Permit Grand Central Public Realm Improvement Bonus (ZR §81-64) cont'd

Proposed special permit based on existing Subway
Improvement Bonus Mechanism





Text Amendment

2. Modify Existing Special Permit Landmark Transfers in Grand Central Subdistrict

(ZR §81-635)

Major enhancements to facilitate floor area transfers from landmarks:

- Raises maximum FAR on receiving sites in Vanderbilt Corridor from 21.6 to 30 FAR
- Eliminates requirement for infrastructure improvement as part of landmark transfer



Vanderbilt Corridor Manhattan CBD Density

Vanderbilt Corridor Maximum Density

- Block Size
- ~ 43,000 SF
- 15 to 30 FAR ~ 645,000 to 1.29 M ZSF

In comparison:



383 Madison 21.6 FAR 1.2M GSF 950,000 ZSF



~27 FAR 1.8M GSF



200 West ~24 FAR 2.1M GSF



One Bryant Park ~23 FAR 2.2M GSF



1 WTC ~52 FAR 3.5M GSF



15 Penn (Approved) 18 FAR 2.8M GSF 2.05M ZSF

Vanderbilt Corridor Proposed Text Amendment

3. Hotel Use Special Permit (ZR §81-65)

- Hotel use restricted in Vanderbilt Corridor except by special permit
- Applies to new development or conversion
- Ensures that new hotels are full-service to support and strengthen area as business district



Vanderbilt Corridor Proposed City Map Amendment

Designate "Public Place" on Vanderbilt Avenue between 42nd and 43rd streets

- Allows permanent improvement as a pedestrian space
- Remains in City ownership and control under the jurisdiction of DOT







Proposed Stairwells Text Amendment for non-residential buildings





BACKGROUND



Who: Joint effort of the Department of Buildings and the Department of City Planning with the support of FDNY

What: Fire Safety – enhanced full building evacuation

Why: World Trade Center Disaster investigation recommended

- Exit capacity of tall buildings should be increased
- Redundancy of exit pathways is needed

When: City Council adopted Local law 141 at end of 2013:

- > After an extensive mediation process
- Requires a zoning text amendment to exempt additional floor area needed for the safety measures

Implementation of the safety provisions are dependent on the text amendment Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers

edetal Reliding and fire Safety Investigation I the Would Londo Centor Disatter

THE BUILDING CODE PROVISION

Where:

New development containing <u>non-residential</u> uses at or above a height of 420 feet Examples: Offices, Hotels, Mixed-use



PLANNING

THE BUILDING CODE PROVISION

Where:

New development containing <u>non-residential</u> uses at or above a height of 420 feet Examples: Offices, Hotels, Mixed-use

Why Not Residential?

- Egress requirements are generally more stringent for nonresidential buildings
- The density of people per floor is higher in non-residential buildings
- In 2008, the Building Code increased required residential stairway widths by 8 inches, which also required a text amendment to exempt floor area

Why 420 feet?

- The additional stairwell requirements are based on the International Building Code (IBC)
- The rules found in the IBC are based on national expertise derived from stakeholders in multiple professions



AREAS WHERE BUILDINGS ARE LIKELY TO EXCEED 420 FEET

From 1997-2014, *only 29 non-residential buildings* exceeding 420 feet were constructed in New York City; **About 2 buildings per year.**

Zoning Districts: 10 FAR: C4-7, C5-2, C5-4, C6-4, C6-5, C6-8, M1-6 15 FAR: C5-3, C5-5, C6-6 C6-7, C6-9

Community Districts:

Manhattan

- CD1 Lower Manhattan
- CD2 Hudson Square, Subdistrict A
- CD3 Scattered C6-4 Sites
- CD4 Hudson Yards, West Midtown
- CD5 Midtown
- CD6 East Midtown
- CD7 Columbus Circle / Lincoln Center area
- CD8 Upper East Side

Queens

- CD1 Long Island City
- CD2 Long Island City
- Brooklyn CD2 – Downtown Brooklyn



N'EPLANNING



Requirements:

New development may select one of these three options:

1. Occupant Evacuation Elevators

Designate <u>ALL</u> passenger elevators as "Occupant Self-Evacuation Elevators" with emergency generators capable of running all of them simultaneously; or

2. Increased Fire Stair Width

Increase required fire exit stairway width by 25% and provide "Occupant Self-Evacuation Elevators" with emergency generators capable of running a portion of them based on an approved egress plan; or

3. Additional Fire Stair

Provide an additional "emergency" exit stairway than is normally required based on the number of building occupants.

THE PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT

Proposal: Modify the definition of Floor Area to exempt the additional stairwell or stairway width from counting towards Zoning Floor Area



PROPOSED FLOOR AREA EXEMPTION: Height Analysis



Building Type: Small Floor Plate (less than 10k sq. ft.)



PROPOSED FLOOR AREA EXEMPTION: Height Analysis

Building Type: Medium Floor Plate (10k-15k sq. ft.)



PROPOSED FLOOR AREA EXEMPTION: Height Analysis



Building Type: Large Floor Plate (Greater than 15k sq. ft.)



Results of Public Review



11



Borough Presidents:

Manhattan – APPROVAL Brooklyn – APPROVAL Queens – APPROVAL

Borough Boards:

Queens - APPROVAL

Community Boards:

Manhattan **CB1** – APPROVAL **CB3** – APPROVAL **CB4** – APPROVAL **CB6** – APPROVAL **CB7** – APPROVAL **CB8** – APPROVAL

Queens CB1 – APPROVAL CB2 – APPROVAL

Brooklyn **CB2** – APPROVAL

Helen Gitelson Executive Director, Code Development New York City Department of Buildings

Hearing before the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises N 150167 ZRY April 13, 2015

Good morning Chairmans Weperin and Greenfield, and members of the City Council. My name is Helen Gitelson. I am the Executive Director of Code Development at the Department of Buildings. I am joined by my colleague Gus Sirakis, the Executive Director of Technical Affairs. We are pleased to be here to testify, and ask your support for the proposed zoning text amendment, application number N 150167 ZRY. Its passage would effectuate additional safety requirements in the 2014 NYC Building Code for super-high rise, non-residential buildings.

Following the collapse of the World Trade Center in 2001, the City recognized the need to review and modernize the Building Code, which – at that time – had last been comprehensively updated in 1968. The work to bring New York City construction requirements up to date culminated with the passage of Local Law 33 of 2007, also known as the 2008 New York City Construction Codes. An important feature of that legislation was a mandatory periodic revision cycle; a system designed to prevent code standards from becoming obsolete for want of timely revision. It is believed that if New York's buildings are to continue to function as monuments of the City's ingenuity, vision, and expertise, its Construction Codes should do the same.

In 2011 the Department of Buildings began work on the mandated code revision. The revision effort was truly a public/private partnership involving more than 350 participants on 11 committees. These committee members donated more than 48,500 hours attending more than 255 technical, advisory, and managing committee meetings. They worked together to resolve issues and craft the revisions to the code that reflect the needs of the city. Their work resulted in the revisions enacted as Local Law 141 of 2013 which is collectively known as the 2014 NYC Construction Codes.

Local Law 141 includes many provisions that increase safety within buildings, especially highrise buildings. Some of these safety provisions implement the recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) World Trade Center Report. Specifically they called for measures that:

- decrease the time it takes to evacuate an entire building in an emergency,
- increase the ability of first responders to access building occupants, and
- provide greater redundancy in escape routes to insure that should one such route become unavailable for building occupants, there would be adequate capacity to exit or evacuate the building.

Section 403.5.2 of the Building Code is a new provision that implements the recommendations of the NIST report. It requires that all new, non-residential buildings greater than 420 feet in

height provide one additional "emergency" exit stairway more than is otherwise required based on occupant loading <u>or</u> that all passenger elevators are constructed as "occupant self evacuation" type, with additional safety requirements that include connection to emergency standby power, emergency communications, and special lobby dimensions to accommodate floor occupants including wheelchairs or the required "emergency" exit stairways are 25% wider than otherwise required AND all passenger elevators must be constructed as "occupant self evacuation" type but the standby power generating equipment must only be sized to accommodate the limited number of elevators, defined by an approved timed egress analysis.

Unlike the majority of the provisions of Local Law 141/2013 (the 2014 NYC Construction Codes) that became effective on December 31, 2014, *Section 403.5.2* of the Building Code, *Additional Exit Stairway*, will take effect only after the enactment of an amendment to the NYC Zoning Resolution providing for the exclusion of the floor area of the additional exit stairway and additional exit stair way width from the calculation of floor area. Hence the need for the application before you.

The Department of Buildings has collaborated with the Department of City Planning and the New York City Fire Department in proposing this city-wide Zoning Text Amendment. The proposed action will enact key NIST World Trade Center recommendations and enhance public safety in affected buildings by requiring additional exiting capacity for building occupants during emergency situations.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify before you. We urge you to approve this application, and welcome any questions you may have.



MAS Testimony to New York City Council Regarding the Vanderbilt Corridor Rezoning and One Vanderbilt

April 13, 2015

Good morning. My name is Sami Naim, and I am Vice President of Law and Policy at the Municipal Art Society. I am here on behalf of MAS to testify in support of the One Vanderbilt project and the Vanderbilt Corridor rezoning.

As you may know, MAS is a 122-year-old civic advocacy group dedicated to strengthening New York's urban fabric through innovative planning and policy. In 2013, MAS successfully convinced the City to reconsider its proposal to rezone East Midtown, and just last year MAS joined the East Midtown Steering Committee - a body formed under the leadership of Borough President Brewer and Council Member Dan Garodnick - to ensure an inclusive, transparent, and effective planning process for the area.

One Vanderbilt

Regarding the One Vanderbilt project, MAS believes that the building provides significant benefits to the City and the East Midtown area. The building also could serve as a model for future development in the city, especially around critical transit hubs. We commend the developer, SL Green, for its responsiveness to the community's concerns and questions throughout the ULURP process.

Our support for One Vanderbilt rests on the following contributions:

- Significant transit improvements to Grand Central Terminal, in anticipation of increased ridership from East Side Access and the 2nd Avenue Subway;
- A pedestrian plaza on Vanderbilt, with initial seed funding for maintenance, in an area that sorely lacks publicly-accessible open space;
- Thousands of square feet of Class-A office space, ensuring that the area remains competitive with other business districts in the region; and
- A world-class architectural design that also addresses sustainability concerns.

Having said that, we have just two concerns that we would like to see addressed. First, we still believe that the building should include publicly accessible space at its top floor, as well as the

second-floor terrace that overlooks Grand Central Terminal. Second, we ask that the City take clear steps to provide inter-agency coordination for both the off-site transit improvements and the pedestrian plaza – from the review stage to final construction – to ensure that these amenities are delivered to the public without undue burden or delay.

Vanderbilt Corridor

Regarding the Vanderbilt Corridor rezoning, MAS believes that this rezoning makes sense for the City and the East Midtown area as well. We applaud the City Planning Commission for its thoughtful and deliberate approach as it relates to this important rezoning. Specifically, we are particularly supportive of the following components of the rezoning:

- Situating high-density commercial development adjacent to Grand Central Terminal and above the \$11 billion East Side Access project, so as to leverage private development to help secure necessary transit improvements; and
- Requiring all major development projects within the corridor go through a full public review process, so that maximum density is achieved only after receiving public input and taking into account a project's individual circumstances.

That being said, we have two concerns regarding the rezoning. First, we share the concern of both the local community boards (CB 5 and CB 6) and Borough President Brewer regarding the appropriateness of 30 FAR buildings along those blocks that are bounded by narrow streets on three sides. However, we are confident that the rezoning's public review process will allow for the public and the City Planning Commission to carefully address these concerns in due course.

Second, we are concerned that the Landmarks Preservation Commission has yet to consider or make a determination regarding the important historic buildings within the Vanderbilt Corridor. This is of particular concern to MAS as these historic resources will be subject to increased development pressures should the rezoning move forward. We therefore ask that the City Planning Commission coordinate with LPC to ensure that these buildings are reviewed in an expeditious manner.

As a member of the East Midtown Steering Committee, MAS looks forward to working with the City and other stakeholders to continue discussing critical issues - from the appropriate levels of density, to addressing issues around landmark air rights transfers, to easing pedestrian congestion, to creating new public spaces in the district.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

NYPIRG Straphangers Campaign NYC Transit Riders Council Riders Alliance Tri-State Transportation Campaign

Testimony of Transportation Groups on One Vanderbilt Proposal

Public Hearing of the City Council's Zoning Subcommittee

Monday, April 13, 2015

I am Gene Russianoff, Staff Attorney for the NYPIRG Straphangers Campaign. I am Nick Sifuentes, Deputy Director of the Riders Alliance. We are submitting testimony today to the public hearing of the Subcommittee on Zoning of the Land Use Committee of the New York City Council on behalf of four transportation groups.

Last year, when Mayor Bloomberg proposed to rezone a broad swath of East Midtown for increased development, our groups expressed concern that transit improvements might not be guaranteed, timely, or sufficient to meet the needs of the riding public. Thanks in large part to the affected community boards and the area officials, the proposal was withdrawn from further consideration.

This year, just one portion of the proposed East Midtown rezoning is moving forward so far—the One Vanderbilt proposal under discussion today. And more is on the table: decisions made regarding this development will set an important precedent for 1) further land use changes in the East Midtown area; and 2) major zoning bonuses make vital subway improvements possible.

A community board has many aspects of a proposal to consider: neighborhood impact, height, density, aesthetic judgments and so on. We can speak to one aspect of the project within our expertise: We believe the transit improvements that the developer SL Green has committed to undertake would make a significant difference in the lives of hundreds of thousands of daily riders.

Currently, the MTA runs fewer rush-hour trains than the Lexington Avenue tunnel can handle, in part because of design flaws on the platform level at the Grand Central-42nd Street subway station. Outdated infrastructure also hinders the free flow of riders who are transferring between trains or entering or leaving the station. Without improvements, the flow of pedestrians around the Grand Central-42nd Street station will become worse when East Side Access attracts many thousands of LIRR riders every day.

The improvements that SL Green proposes to make – generated in consultation with the MTA about its top priority needs – would take a significant step toward fixing some of these longstanding problems. These include new entrances, wider platforms, longer sight lines for better navigating this packed station, and thousands of square feet to be added to station mezzanines. They are likely to be finished, and in a timely way, as occupancy of part of the building is contingent on completion of the improvements. They set an important precedent that development in midtown – and elsewhere in the city – will rely on improved transit infrastructure and must provide funds for such improvements.
Our groups cannot speak to every aspect the community boards are considering regarding the proposal. But we support what this project would do for the public transit infrastructure.

.

NYPIRG Straphangers Campaign NYC Transit Riders Council Riders Alliance Tri-State Transportation Campaign

.



MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

VANDERBILT CORRIDOR TEXT AMENDMENT ONE VANDERBILT SPECIAL PERMIT

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES APRIL 13, 2015

The Real Estate Board of New York, Inc. (REBNY) is a broadly based trade association of over 16,000 owners, developers, brokers, managers and real estate professionals active throughout New York City. We have been long time advocates for the rezoning of East Midtown and support the proposed Vanderbilt Corridor Text Amendment and the Special Permit Application for One Vanderbilt. The Proposed Actions will strengthen East Midtown and New York City's economy and we hope will be the beginning of the rezoning of the greater East Midtown area.

The East Midtown business district is critical to the City's tax base and economy. It is the city's most prominent commercial district and regional transit hub with approximately 70 million square feet of office space and numerous commuter transit connections into Grand Central Terminal. However, to retain its position as a preeminent global business district, the City needs to address the problems of its aging office buildings and of its insufficient office development.

The Department of City Planning has developed a sound proposal along the 5-block Vanderbilt Corridor to encourage modern commercial development by allowing more flexibility in the transfer of landmark development rights.

The proposal to create a mechanism to link new development to much needed infrastructure and public realm improvements in the Grand Central area is important and the only realistic source of funding in the foreseeable future.

In addition, the new buildings along Vanderbilt Avenue will reflect modern ideals and set new standards in sustainability and design. This proposal provides the most appropriate way to ensure that meaningful transit improvements are fully integrated into this plan so that all five blocks can take full advantage of Grand Central, especially once East Side Access is completed.

Relatedly, the Proposed Action would permit SL Green to construct an approximately 1.8 million gross square foot mixed use office building ("One Vanderbilt") with an enclosed public space at ground level. One Vanderbilt is exactly the type of dense, transit-oriented development that belongs immediately adjacent to Grand Central Terminal. We think this building will be a model for the type of development we can look forward to on Vanderbilt. Designed with careful attention paid to the needs of modern tenants, One Vanderbilt will feature open and efficient floor plans and will be a LEED-certified, Class A building. SL Green will finance, facilitate and complete the construction of all public improvements, including enhanced transit connectivity and new public spaces. In fact, the



applicant has worked diligently with the Community Board and Borough President's Office to further improve urban design elements that may impact public space.

In total, SL Green will invest \$210 million in transit infrastructure and public realm improvements and complete this work as a condition of occupancy of their new building. We want to stress the significance of the commitment to complete this work as a condition of occupancy. Below ground transit work is costly, uncertain and prone to overrun. This investment will immediately improve pedestrian circulation in and around Grand Central Terminal.

Additionally, One Vanderbilt is projected to create 5,200 construction jobs, 190 permanent union building service jobs, and approximately \$50 million in annual tax revenues.

There is general agreement that East Midtown's existing zoning is an impediment for the necessary modernization of its aging building stock and that the Grand Central transit network is in desperate need of improvement.

It is important to note that the 30 FAR proposed by City Planning is the best opportunity to maximize the needed transit improvements while at the same time affording an opportunity to utilize the unused air rights in this district. SL Green's blend of transit improvements and utilization of air rights is a model for future development. This model will the makes substantial and needed public realm improvements and the better addresses the long simmering problem of the transferability of development rights from a landmark.

The Vanderbilt blocks also offer unique and unparalleled conditions that justify 30 FAR, such as the proximity of these blocks to the superior transit connections at Grand Central Terminal that would offer a direct indoor link at Grand Central Terminal to East Side Access and the network of subway lines; and full blocks sites that would permit a new development to front on four streets that would improve and enhance pedestrian flow.

The higher FAR serves as a catalyst for new development that allows owners to embark on a challenging and unique opportunity to improve urban design, make an important architectural statement and fund needed transit improvements. Lastly, new development that uses the higher allowable FAR along the Vanderbilt corridor will go through a special permit process. If there are legitimate and compelling reasons to lower a projects FAR, it should be done at that time. We should not prematurely preclude the opportunity to maximize the transit improvements which are much needed in this area as well as maximize the opportunity for the transfer of unused landmark development rights which has been a contentious point in this process.

The Proposed Actions are an important effort to strengthen East Midtown, to enhance its competitiveness locally and globally and to provide for the critical transit investment needed to make these objectives a reality.

We urge the City Council to approve these actions that will strengthen our city's economy.

Statement to the New York City Council On Behalf of the Trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral Concerning Vanderbilt Corridor Zoning Proposal and One Vanderbilt Project L.U. No. 197 April 13, 2015

Good morning Chair Weprin and Members of the City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. I am Joseph Rosenberg, Director of the Catholic Community Relations Council ("CCRC") representing the Archdiocese of New York and the Diocese of Brooklyn on local legislative and policy matters. This statement is submitted on behalf of the Trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral in support of the proposed zoning amendments for the Vanderbilt Corridor and the proposed special permits for the One Vanderbilt development.

St. Patrick's Cathedral, known to New Yorkers as "St. Pat's," is the spiritual home to millions, including the 2.6 million Catholics residing in the Archdiocese of New York. St. Patrick's is not just a church, it is an icon for the Catholic faith, beloved and recognized by people throughout the world, enjoyed by over 5.5 million visitors annually. St. Patrick's received landmark designation in 1966.

As one of the oldest structures in East Midtown, St. Patrick's has seen well over a century of change in this neighborhood. Continued revitalization is critical if this community is to prosper.

The proposed Vanderbilt Corridor zoning would appropriately allow for increased density near a major transit hub. The potential benefits to transit infrastructure resulting from this proposal are demonstrated by the wide array of improvements proposed as part of the One Vanderbilt project.

We particularly support the increased opportunities for landmarks to transfer development rights under the City's proposal. Absent the ability to transfer unused development rights, it is very difficult to fund the upkeep of landmark structures as is required under the Landmarks Law.

This is particularly difficult in the case of landmarks owned by religious entities. For example, the current program to fully restore St. Patrick's to ensure that it endures for future generations is estimated to cost in excess of \$175 million. The available zoning tools do not provide any opportunities for transfer of the unused development rights from the Church, and an expansion of transfer opportunities is critical to enable owners of landmarked properties to properly maintain their buildings.

By allowing development up to 30 FAR by Special Permit (of which up to 15 FAR may be transferred from a landmark), the City's proposal is substantially increasing opportunities for landmarks to transfer unused development rights.

80 Maiden Lane, 13th Floor New York, New York 10038 We urge that the upcoming planning efforts for East Midtown follow the lead of the Vanderbilt Corridor and expand opportunities for the transfer of development rights from landmarked properties.

The Vanderbilt Corridor rezoning will encourage re-investment in Midtown and keep New York City competitive. The One Vanderbilt project demonstrates this. We therefore support these proposals and urge this Committee and the City Council to approve them.

Testimony for the City Council Subcommittee on Zoning

Leo Korein - April 13, 2015

Hello, I am Leo Korein, and I am here representing my family office as the owners of Lever House and two other Landmarks, 240 Central Park South and 608 5th Avenue.

I am here to speak in favor of City Planning's applications regarding the Vanderbilt Corridor.

Rezoning the Vanderbilt Corridor is a crucial piece in preparing East Midtown for the demands of the 21st Century. This preparation must encompass the roles of both new buildings and landmarked buildings that, together, represent the best of New York. By providing a broad, straightforward and manageable transfer of landmark development rights, we believe it will put landmark owners like us in a position to properly maintain and preserve the properties for their continued historic significance to the city's character.

The existing provisions for transfer of development rights from landmarks are intended to provide some compensatory benefit for the burden imposed on a property owner as a result of landmark designation. While the owner of a building that is not landmarked may demolish its building and build a new one, as-of-right, using all development rights permitted under its zoning classification, the owner of a landmark building is severely limited, and typically precluded from using its development rights on the landmark site. Some compensation is afforded by Zoning Resolution Section 74-79, which permits landmarks to transfer air rights across the street. However, transfers using this mechanism require a cumbersome ULURP process, which typically takes about two years, and is often impractical for the developer of a receiving site.

The Modification of the Existing Grand Central Subdistrict Landmark Transfer Special Permit is an excellent first step in refreshing East Midtown for the 21st Century. Many landmarks will only be able to contribute their unused development rights to the planning goals in the area if this modification is enacted and expanded. Unfortunately, the modification proposed still requires the ULURP process, limiting its potential benefits.

Further, we are concerned that the Modification to the Landmark Special Permit and the Public Realm Improvement Bonus will compete with each other. This creates a potential conflict if developers are allowed to negotiate the value of landmark development rights against the value of public realm improvements; such negotiations would divide stakeholders and deeply undermine the potential benefits that this rezoning seeks to create. It would be greatly preferable to create a Public Realm Improvement Bonus that developers would be incentivized to use in tandem with the Landmark Transfer Special Permit, as opposed to having them in direct competition.

We are committed to ensuring that Lever House remains an iconic building and an active part of a thriving and globally competitive East Midtown. We believe that thoughtful changes like the *Modification of the Existing Grand Central Subdistrict Landmark Transfer Special Permit* for the Vanderbilt Corridor proposal can be beneficial to landmarks and the neighborhoods they belong to. We hope that the Vanderbilt Corridor Proposal and any further rezoning in East Midtown consciously support Landmark's ability to transfer their development rights without creating unintended conflicts with other planning goals.

Thank you to the Committee for the opportunity to be here.



Contact: Ya-Ting Liu (212) 361-6350 x 203 yliu@nylcv.org

April 13, 2015

Statement of Ya-Ting Liu Director, NYC Sustainability Program New York League of Conservation Voters

One Vanderbilt Avenue City Council Hearing April 13, 2015

Good morning. My name is Ya-Ting Liu, and I am Director of the New York City Sustainability Program at the New York League of Conservation Voters (NYLCV). NYLCV represents over 25,000 members in New York City and we are committed to advancing a sustainability agenda that will make our people, our neighborhoods, and our economy healthier and more resilient.

I am here today to testify on behalf of NYLCV in support of One Vanderbilt Avenue. This project is a model for the type of sustainable, transit-oriented developments projects that not only help the city reduce its carbon footprint, but also provide concrete public benefits to New Yorkers.

First, SL Green's commitment of \$210 million dollars will improve the commuting experience of straphangers riding the 4/5/6 and S trains, improving connectivity, circulation and crowding at the city's second busiest subway station. These improvements will create a new direct connection to the East Side Access concourse level from One Vanderbilt's subgrade levels. In addition to East Side Access connectivity, this new subgrade corridor at One Vanderbilt will enable commuters to effectively access and travel between the S-shuttle, the 4/5/6/7-lines and MetroNorth lines without entering the overcrowded main concourse of Grand Central Terminal.

Second, One Vanderbilt will also activate public space surrounding the Terminal by creating a new 12,000 square foot public plaza on Vanderbilt Avenue adjacent to the Grand Central as well as a 4,000 square foot transit hall at the base of the tower. The public transit hall will have direct subgrade connection to Grand Central and will serve as an additional train waiting area and gateway to East Side Access. These new public spaces will improve circulation and alleviate crowding within the terminal and provide new designated places for commuters to congregate.

Third, One Vanderbilt has an ambitious sustainability program that shows a deep commitment to green design. One Vanderbilt provides extensive access to amenities and uses, walkability and utilization of the broad mass transit system, and it will not include parking for tenants, reducing congestion in the area and also the building's carbon footprint. In addition, the building includes a 60,000 gallon rainwater collection feature, high efficiency heating and cooling, LED lighting, aggressive recycling measures, and many other measures that collectively increase the high water mark for sustainable design.





Contact: Ya-Ting Liu (212) 361-6350 x 203 yliu@nylcv.org

April 13, 2015

The public improvement plans for One Vanderbilt will create a faster, more efficient commute for residents and visitors at one of the country's busiest transit terminals while setting higher standards for what green buildings can achieve in New York City.

HEADQUARTERS 30 Broad Street, 30th Floor | New York, NY 10004 T 212.361.6350 F 212.361.6363 | WWW.NYLCV.ORG info@nylcv.org

To:New York City CouncilDate:April 13, 2015Re:One Vanderbilt Avenue

The Regional Alliance is a 501(c) 3 organization incorporated in 1990 to provide supportive services to minority, women-owned, disadvantaged and small businesses. The Regional Alliance was established through a unique public-private cooperative venture among several public agencies and large construction-related firms. The Regional Alliance Board of Directors includes many of the region's key public agencies, major construction firms, and successful M/WBE firms. John Tishman, former Chief Executive Officer of Tishman Realty and Construction Corporation, served as Chairman of the Regional Alliance from 1995 to 1997. And today Jay Badame, Chief Operating Officer of Tishman Construction Corporation of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, serves as its current Chairman. This commitment by the Tishman company has been unwavering during our nearly 25 years in existence as there is a company belief of supporting small, minority and women firms that provide services to the construction industry, as well as inclusion of minorities and women in the labor forces working on the projects for which they have oversight.

Since 1998, the Regional Alliance has provided contract monitoring and compliance services on five major projects, three of which are located in New York City: (1) JetBlue Airways \$800 million terminal expansion at John F. Kennedy International Airport; (2) Delta | JFK IAT \$1+ billion Redevelopment Program at John F. Kennedy International Airport; and (3) Delta LaGuardia Airport Connector Project. The Regional Alliance exceeded the M/WBE and work force participation goals on all of the aforementioned projects. The Regional Alliance in

collaboration with Tishman Construction developed an "out-of-the-box" M/WBE, labor force, and community relations program for the aborted NY Jets New York Sports and Convention Center.

The Regional Alliance has worked closely with SL Green in the past – we worked together to develop a very progressive minority/woman business and minority/women labor force program for SL Green's Aqueduct project proposal. SL Green was extremely interested in ensuring that its community benefits program maximized the utilization of M/WBE firms, as well as maximizing the number of job opportunities for minorities and women during the construction, and operational/maintenance phases of the project.

We know that SL Green will ensure that a similarly robust M/WBE program is in place for 1 Vanderbilt Avenue. We urge the City Council to approve the ULURP for the Vanderbilt Corridor and for 1 Vanderbilt Avenue.

The growth of the regional economy is dependent upon the economic growth of small businesses and its diverse population, and SL Green is committed to supporting the City's economy. Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Earle J. Walker, Executive Director Regional Alliance for Small Contractors, Inc.



TASK FORCE ON EAST MIDTOWN

MANHATTAN COMMUNITY BOARDS FIVE & SIX

Vikki Barbero, Chair, Community Board Five

Sandro Sherrod, Chair, Community Board Six

TESTIMONY BY VIKKI BARBERO, CHAIR OF COMMUNITY BOARD FIVE, AT THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES, APRIL 13th, 2015

We want to thank Chair Weprin and the Committee for giving us the opportunity to speak before you today. We especially want to especially thank, as well, our Councilmember, Dan Garodnick, for always keeping his door, as well as his mind and heart, open to us and our concerns.

It is said that it is so difficult to do the work that is needed to improve the subway below Grand Central Terminal precisely because it is below Grand Central Terminal and, thankfully, that great landmark is not going anywhere. But we have before us now a once in a lifetime opportunity to make the right decisions at the One Vanderbilt site, as that block will be entirely uprooted. All of us have the responsibility to make sure the opportunity is seized so that, when the work is completed, the needs of the vast traveling public at this busiest of intersections are as fully accommodated as possible. This is, after all, the singular role and ultimate test of government.

We come here today, as well, to reemphasize our concerns about the Vanderbilt Corridor. We appreciate that on 42nd Street, with the right considerations pertaining to daylight and sustainability, along with the aforementioned public improvements at and below grade, a 30 FAR building makes sense. We have seen how the Bank of America building works well - on 42nd Street and adjacent to Bryant Park (though it must be noted that even the Bank of America building is NOT 30 FAR).

However, we cannot see any way a series of 30 FAR buildings north of One Vanderbilt, adjacent to no wide streets and with no vast expanse of greenery in sight, will ever be acceptable public policy. Such a conglomeration of towers, no matter what the public amenities, cannot help but create a deadening canyon effect up Madison that we will regret forevermore.

The City Planning Commission counters that each of these proposed projects will be required to go through a full public review process. But as sure as we know that the MTA is short half its capital budget, to the tune of \$15 billion dollars, and unable to pay for the desperately needed capital projects already in the pipeline, we all know that the pressure to use private developers to pay for long-overdue improvements will only grow and ultimately overshadow – pun intended – the public's right to a decent amount of light and air. We have no doubt that, if given the allowance to ask for up to 30 FAR, every developer in the Corridor will ask for the full floor area ratio and the pressure to approve these oversized towers will prove overwhelming. The ULURP before you today is government's only opportunity to decide what is right and in the public interest for the corridor as a whole and we are convinced that an unbroken string of the tallest towers in the world is not the correct answer.

It so happens that there is already a scheme, put forth by Task Force and City Club member John West, and others, that would create a metric for the amount of FAR that should be allowable at each of the sites along the Corridor. It is simple and smart. It would create a series of four or five questions regarding each site, such as whether the site fronts a wide street or avenue and whether it is above a transit hub. If the answer is yes to a particular question, a certain added level of density would be allowable, above what is currently permitted. If the answer is yes to all the questions, as it is at One Vanderbilt, then, and only then, a grand total of 30 FAR would be permitted. We think this metric makes sense and is good public policy.

We ask the Council to seriously consider this metric, which would create a smarter standard and a better precedent for the Corridor and the East Midtown district as a whole.

We thank you for your time.



April 13, 2015

STATEMENT OF THE NEW YORK LANDMARKS CONSERVANCY AT A PUBLIC HEARING OF CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES REGARDING THE PROPOSED VANDERBILT CORRIDOR REZONING AND THE SPECIAL PERMIT FOR ONE VANDERBILT

Good morning Chair Weprin and members of the City Council. I am Andrea Goldwyn, speaking on behalf of the New York Landmarks Conservancy. The Landmarks Conservancy is a private, independent, not-forprofit organization, founded in 1973. Our mission is to preserve and protect historic resources throughout New York. Our Public Policy Committee has met with City Planning Commission Chair Weisbrod and his staff, and representatives of SL Green and of Midtown Trackage and we thank all for their continued willingness to discuss these issues.

We fail to see why the Landmarks Commission is not acting in concert with City Planning to calendar unprotected historic resources on Vanderbilt Avenue. In previous statements, we had requested designation for 51 East 42nd Street, at the site of One Vanderbilt, but recognize that it will likely be demolished. There are still three buildings along the corridor eligible for listing on the State and National Register of Historic Places, the LPC has stated that it is considering two for designation.

These fine masonry buildings were designed by significant architects such as Warren & Wetmore, James Gamble Rogers, and George B. Post. Some were part of historic Terminal City, which rightly recognized Grand Central Terminal as a focal point. Any new plan for this area should consider how they can be reused and supported. Otherwise, we risk losing the special sense of place they create and their graceful relationship with Grand Central, in favor of a wall of anonymous glass towers that could be found anywhere in the world, with no connection to New York, nor to one of the nation's most important landmarks.

Regarding One Vanderbilt, in testimony to the Landmarks Commission, we were not able to find a harmonious relationship with Grand Central, and regretted the loss of 51 East 42nd Street, which Warren and Wetmore designed to stand across from the Terminal. Any tower of perhaps 1,500 feet will overwhelm and shadow the landmark. At the ground floor, the design attempts a relationship and exposes a view of the Terminal, but with its abundance of angles and sloping corner column, we feel that it detracts from its neighbor. The visual connection between the two buildings should be stronger, with a simplified base that does not compete with Grand Central. Following our initial meeting, the architects showed us modifications which other groups had requested, and took substantial time to discuss the building. We appreciate this response, but did not feel that those changes rectified our key concerns.

Transit improvements for this district are critically necessary, and you must decide whether these would benefit anyone beyond workers in One Vanderbilt. As a preservation group, we must analyze the proposed Public Realm Improvement Bonus for the effects it could have on landmarks of today and tomorrow. We have been assured that the two public goals of preservation and transit will not be set against each other, but we are not fully convinced. Transit bonuses have existed for many years, used mostly for small FAR increments, and they have been used in tandem with landmark transfers. We hope that the unprecedented increase of up to 15.0 for transit, along with the City's backing implicit in today's presentation does not portend a less viable environment for landmark transfers.

One Whitehall Street, New York NY 10004 tel 212.995.5260 fax 212.995.5268 nylandmarks.org We appreciate that this proposal includes provisions to ease landmark transfers, but in a practical sense, the most likely development site within the limits of this rezoning area is being taken off the table with this application, so those provisions might be moot. In order to incentivize both landmark transfers and transit bonuses, they should be structured to work together, as they have in the past.

Moreover, we don't believe that the current, piecemeal proposals are best for Midtown East, and that a plan encompassing all of Midtown East, in conjunction with designation of landmark-quality buildings, would be a more rational approach to preserve not only the individual buildings, but the rhythm of a diverse and dynamic architecture that, along with transit, makes this a desirable neighborhood.

Thank you for the opportunity to express The Landmarks Conservancy's views.



FIRE DEPARTMENT

9 METROTECH CENTER

BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201-3857

Edward T. Ferrier	Deputy Assistant Chief Fire Prevention
Date:	April 13, 2015
Testimony:	City Council Zoning and Franchises Subcommittee

The New York City Fire Department firmly supports the inclusion of the additional exit stairway provision in the 2014 NYC BC. The additional stair is a direct result of NIST WTC Recommendation #17 for timely full-building evacuation of occupants. It has been adopted and included in the 2012 International Building Code which serves as the foundation document for NYC's brand new 2014 Building Code. This provision is not only applicable to specific buildings but also affects neighboring buildings if large scale natural and man-made events are threatening. The extra stair provides alternate egress capacity if one of the required exits is lost as a consequence of the event or due to firefighting operations. Standard FD procedures require the exclusive use of a standpipe equipped exit enclosure for operations and staging. Exiting occupants from upper floors using this same stair will be exposed to heat, smoke and gases migrating upwards from the open fire floor stair door. If one of the two required stairways is lost, descending occupants, ascending firefighters and the attack on the fire will all be conducted from the same remaining stairway. Those with mobility impairments will complicate the scenario. Collectively this will slow egress flow, delay controlling the fire and endanger more lives. Which group should be given priority? Why should we have to choose?

The New York City Fire Department supports the inclusion of the additional stair into the 2014 Building Code for other than R-2 multiple dwelling buildings and is hopeful you will support this amendment. The proposed action will enhance public safety in high rise buildings and move the built environment into the new millennium.

City Council Hearing

Vanderbilt Corridor Rezoning / One Vanderbilt Special Permit

<u>April 13, 2015</u>

Statement by Jim Gutmann

Good morning.

I am Jim Gutmann, Vice President at the New York office of Hines. Hines is a global development and investment management firm which has developed in excess of 275 million square feet around the world of all use types. In New York City and the surrounding region, we have been involved in the development of approximately 15 million square feet of new space, mostly of large scale and complex projects including 450 Lexington Avenue and 383 Madison Avenue the only two major projects developed around Grand Central Terminal over the last 25 years.

I am speaking today in favor of the proposed Vanderbilt Corridor rezoning and in favor of the Special Permit for One Vanderbilt, a project that Hines is an active project team member as development manager for SL Green. This rezoning and the One Vanderbilt project not only address a fundamental urban planning objective of locating density adjacent to mass transit and the supply of new modern commercial

1

office space, it will also create thousands of jobs and a source of new business for those involved in the construction industry for many years to come.

Although building construction for One Vanderbilt is not expected to start until the first quarter of next year immediately following the site demolition, SL Green and Hines have already begun to think about a contracting program that offers the opportunity for qualified suppliers and contractors to provide portions of the project's trade work. Through the selection of the general contractor for the project in the coming months, the project will voluntarily implement a subcontracting program that will target 15% of the total trade costs to minority or women owned businesses. We will do this by working closely with the general contractor as we have done on other projects to require subcontractors to stipulate with their bids their commitments for WMBE businesses and holding them contractually employing accountable for those percentages as trade work is awarded. New York City has an abundance of experience and skilled contractors and SL Green and Hines are determined to make the projects contracting program for MWBE businesses a high priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

2

FOR THE RECORD

FOR THE RECORD

Testimony in favor of One Vanderbilt and the Vanderbilt Corridor Carol Willis Founding Director, The Skyscraper Museum City Council hearing, April 13, 2015

Good day. My name is Carol Willis and I am the founding director of The Skyscraper Museum, although I speak here today as an individual. I speak in support of One Vanderbilt and the Vanderbilt Corridor because these proposals represent the balanced goals of good urbanism in our historic, aging, and continuously aspirational and energetic city.

As the engine of midtown's historical and current development, Grand Central Terminal and its surrounding blocks demand density, efficiency, and, not the least, an improved public realm. The plans for public space enhancements proposed by the Department of City Planning for the Vanderbilt Corridor and the plans for One Vanderbilt will create a far more urbane and efficient space for the increasing number of pedestrians who use Grand Central or flow around it. KPF's design for One Vanderbilt demonstrates the understanding of both efficient connectivity and impressive monumentality that is the hallmark of the historical Grand Central.

For nearly a century, there has been *no public realm* on the block between Vanderbilt and Madison Avenue–only small doors and commercial stores. One Vanderbilt will open up the corner of 42^{nd} Street to better views of Grand Central, and it will welcome commuters emerging from the station with a great public room in the spirit of the terminal's soaring concourse.

The proposal for increased density on the additional sites on the Vanderbilt Corridor should be viewed in historical perspective. At the 30 FAR achievable by accrued bonuses, these buildings will equal the ratios of successful skyscrapers of two different eras: first, of the great Art Deco landmarks of the late 1920s, such as the Empire State and Chrysler buildings, which are slightly larger and smaller than 30 FAR respectively. The Twenties towers are tall and distinctive because they were erected before the 1961 zoning law imposed the constraints of FAR.

It should be noted that the 1961 law and its later revisions *always* envisioned the possibility of bonuses based on the idea of public good. That principle was leverage by government at Times Square in the guidelines of the 1980s to create the 30 FAR skyscrapers on 42nd St. – 4 Times Square and the others, *all logically located just above the transit nexus*– that have fueled the success of Times Square's revival as both an office location and a tourist hub.

For these reasons, among many others, I urge the City Council to vote yes in favor of the One Vanderbilt and the Vanderbilt Corridor proposals. Thank you.

Carol Willis

laselle an



Alfred C. Cerullo, III President/CEO

Peter S. Kalikow Chairman

. - Y

Testimony of the Grand Central Partnership before the New York City Council on the Vanderbilt Corridor Rezoning Proposal and the One Vanderbilt Development Project

April 13, 2015

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Committee Members. My name is Peter Lempin representing the Grand Central Partnership, the midtown Manhattan business improvement district, which is proud to have the subject applications within our district. On behalf of our Board of Directors, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the SL Green One Vanderbilt project, and the City's Vanderbilt Corridor proposal.

Today, our community faces a new challenge that if not properly and promptly addressed will put the preeminence of our area at risk by allowing it to decline into competitive disadvantage. This challenge comes in the form of an aging infrastructure of commercial properties that frequently fail to meet the needs of Class A and high tech firms in the growing 21st century world economy.

While we know the longer term zoning plan for the east Midtown neighborhood is currently the subject of on-going discussions in a Steering Committee cochaired by your colleague Dan Garodnick, and Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer, of which we are a participant, in our view, today's proposals represent an important step forward in addressing this issue as the proposed actions would allow for the creation of exactly the type of modern, efficient and sustainable commercial office space that today's corporate tenants demand.

For example, the Vanderbilt Corridor text amendment would allow for an increase in the floor area ratio to 30, a sensible, rational and lasting idea which is sustainable given that the transit improvements, now underway and those in the making, can support this change in density. We believe that by approving the One Vanderbilt tower which contributes millions of dollars in public transportation improvements that will help to ease commuter congestion in and around Grand Central Terminal, a huge step will be made towards modernizing our aging transit infrastructure in Midtown east. The project will also create thousands of good paying jobs and will generate significant annual tax revenues.

One Vanderbilt will also stimulate the public space surrounding the Terminal by creating a new public plaza on Vanderbilt Avenue as well as a cutting-edge transit hall at the base of the tower. With direct access to sub-grade connections this hall will serve as an integral gateway to the Terminal and to East Side Access.

These vitally-needed improvements will be solely-funded by SL Green and would not be possible without the investment at One Vanderbilt – a significant benefit for tenants, commuters and the community-at-large.

We urge you to approve these proposals which will help to revolutionize the Vanderbilt Corridor and the adjacent surroundings to preserve the Grand Central area as a world-class destination for business, and for those who visit and live nearby. This is exactly the type of development our city needs to grow and strengthen the local economy.

Thank you.

. **1** 5



, •

Regional Plan Association

RPA testimony before the New York City Council Zoning and Franchises Subcommittee on April 13, 2015, in support of Vanderbilt Corridor and Private One Vanderbilt Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Amendment ULURP No. 150130(A) *Thomas K. Wright, President*

Good morning.

My name is Tom Wright. I am the President of Regional Plan Association and I am here today to testify in strong support of the Vanderbilt Corridor rezoning and application for One Vanderbilt.

By almost any measure – jobs, office space, salaries, taxes, rents – East Midtown has few rivals around the globe. It is the heart of the central business district that fuels the economy of the city and metropolitan region. It is one of the greatest generators of prosperity and wealth that humans have ever invented – a 24-hour district with iconic buildings, wonderful public spaces, extraordinary transit access, and a concentration of firms that literally shape markets and businesses around the world. This is where land, labor and capital all come together unlike anywhere else on the planet. But the older building stock in this neighborhood needs regular rebuilding, to ensure that we can provide the services, amenities and technology requirements of rapidly improving industries. With an estimated 2 million new jobs destined for the region over the next twenty-five years, we will also need room to expand in East Midtown as well as Lower Manhattan, the Far West Side and other office districts throughout the region. Securing and safeguarding the future of this district is our responsibility for future generations, who will benefit from the decisions you make today.

At Regional Plan Association, we pay special attention to the infrastructure systems that make this concentration of activity possible, including the housing markets that provide our labor force, the movement of goods to support those workers, and of course the transit system which is the lifeblood of our city. The transit system of our region is a modern wonder, providing over ten million daily trips in, out and around the city and region efficiently, sustainably and sometimes even comfortably. The maintenance and expansion of this system is among our highest priorities.

Fortunately, the proposal before the Council today achieves both of these goals – safeguarding and modernizing our commercial building stock while upgrading and improving our transit system – in proportional measures.

As we all know, two major transit investments – the Second Avenue Subway and East Side Access – will increase the supply of transit in and around this district. The day East Side Access opens, over half of the LIRR riders will enjoy a direct ride to the offices in East Midtown – some 80,000 travelers each day. Fortunately, the first phase of the Second Avenue Subway will be completed before then, providing some relief for long-suffering riders on the over-crowded Lexington Avenue line by siphoning 200,000 daily riders off the existing trains and buses on the east side.

The decision before you is critical to the future of the district. Through the application for special permits, the proposed zoning text change will address the challenges facing East Midtown in the coming years by incentivizing new, modern offices, retail, restaurant, enclosed public spaces and rooftop amenity spaces while expanding the potential for transit and public realm improvements.

New York 4 Irving Place, 7th Floor New York, NY 10003 212,253,2727 New Jersey 179 Nassau Street, 3rd Floor Princeton, NJ 08542 609.228.7080 Connecticut Two Landmark Sq, Suite 108 Stamford, CT 06901 203.356.0390



In particular, the increase in allowed height and density for One Vanderbilt Avenue in exchange for over \$200 million in public improvements is a good deal for New York City. Improving pedestrian circulation within Grand Central Terminal and its vicinity will greatly improve platform access and circulation for the 4, 5 and 6 subway lines with new stairs, an expanded mezzanine and trimmed columns and stairs on the platforms. These should improve circulation enough to allow the MTA to add an additional subway train during rush hour, helping relieve overcrowding on the system.

By creating an exit for the new LIRR terminal being built below Grand Central's subway and MetroNorth platforms, the project will address a critical shortcoming of East Side Access. Without these improvements, it will take LIRR passengers several minutes to reach the street from the train level, cutting into the value of the \$10 billion project. By creating a new exit that will bypass crowded train platforms and the food court, passengers will be able to reach the street much more quickly and easily.

Most importantly, if these improvements are not made now and integrated into the design and construction of One Vanderbilt, we cannot come back later and say "whoops, we would like to build that connection after all." This is a one-time option that the city should grab.

I want to note that these investments won't fix all of the circulation problems at Grand Central Terminal, especially those involving the #7 train, where use and congestion will increase when the new West 34th Street station opens in 2015 and as the Far West Side is developed. Additional funding will be required to address these issues and to give the station a complete overhaul. Future development in East Midtown should address these priorities.

Attention must also be paid to barriers to walking. RPA would rather see the subway sidewalk entrances in front of the Mobil building on Third Avenue moved into the building itself, as we have done in other districts with zoning changes that created incentives for off-sidewalk entrances – such as Times Square. And newsstands that are removed for the construction period should probably not be put back where they block the free flow of pedestrian traffic, notably at the northwest corner at Vanderbilt and 42nd Street.

And as with all public-private agreements, the terms of this transaction need to be open and transparent, and the City and the MTA need to set very specific performance standards for the improvements with reasonable penalties to be imposed if the terms and standards are not met.

However, the most important decision before you today is to approve this zoning application, so that One Vanderbilt and the improvements to our transit system can move forward as quickly as possible. The future of our city and region depends on these investments to maintain and improve our economy.

Thank you.

ć

New Jersey 179 Nassau Street, 3rd Floor Princeton, NJ 08542 609.228.7080 Connecticut Two Landmark Sq. Suite 108 Stamford, CT 06901 203.356.0390



Testimony of Richard T. Anderson President, New York Building Congress At a Hearing of the New York City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises Regarding One Vanderbilt Place April 13, 2015

The New York Building Congress strongly supports SL Green's redevelopment proposal for One Vanderbilt Avenue. This project will anchor a much-needed renewal of the area's building stock <u>and</u> offer a model for future private investment in public infrastructure. We urge the Council to approve this plan.

A study sponsored by the Real Estate Board last year demonstrated that East Midtown's building stock is inadequate to accommodate the changing needs of many commercial office tenants. With an average building age of 70 years, many buildings contain antiquated layouts and building systems unable to meet the needs of modern office tenants.

One Vanderbilt changes this paradigm. SL Green will deliver an iconic new design that complements its historic neighbor, Grand Central Terminal, to the east. Inside, the office spaces will offer the layouts and amenities essential to attracting and retaining technology firms and other sectors that increasingly drive the City's economy.

East Midtown is also home to MTA's East Side Access project, providing a direct rail link between Long Island and Manhattan's east side for the first time, bringing tens of thousands of new commuters to the neighborhood. One Vanderbilt capitalizes on this multi-billion dollar infrastructure investment, building direct access from Grand Central Terminal into the building.

Finally, as the Council is aware, for the right to erect this tower, SL Green will invest more than \$200 million, up front, to construct improved transit access and create public open space where virtually none exists today. This investment is a model – where government can use its zoning power to create value which private builders use to implement important public benefits.

Finally, the Building Congress further supports the larger Vanderbilt rezoning which the Council is also considering. We believe it is contextual while creating important opportunities for future development that will complement One Vanderbilt.

One Vanderbilt is not simply another office building. It is an example of the type of sound planning and public/private collaboration the City must embrace if it is to remain competitive in the twenty first century.

Thank you.



Good morning, my name is Daniel Contreras, NYC Political Organizer for Local SEIU 32BJ.

We represent 75,000 member janitors, doormen and security officers who live and work in New York City and 150,000 members nationwide. I am here today to express 32BJ's strong support for the proposed Office Tower called 1 Vanderbilt at Vanderbilt Avenue.

As part of SL Green's plan to build a state-of-the-art office tower at One Vanderbilt Avenue, they have committed \$210 million to funding public capital improvements in the heart of East Midtown and at the door step of the Midtown commuter gateway.

This development will not only spur the creation of thousands of construction jobs, but will also create a pathway to the middle class for over 900 32BJ members that work in its New York City buildings, which will provide good family health coverage, retirement security and training benefits. These are the kinds of jobs make it possible for our members and their families to thrive in New York City.

This development will provide funding to improve the commutes for subway riders and enhance connectivity and circulation for East Side Access riders and all users of Grand Central, but will also generate \$50 million in annual tax revenues.

The public improvements associated with the plans for One Vanderbilt will have a tangible impact on New Yorkers from every corner of the city—not just those who work or live in the area.

SEIU 32BJ strongly supports the proposed 1 Vanderbilt development and the significant public benefits it will bring for all New Yorkers. Thank you.



April 13th, 2015 Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises, New York City Council Testimony of John Tritt, Deputy Political Director, NYHTC, AFL-CIO

My name is John Tritt, I am the Deputy Political Director of the Hotel Trades Council. Our union represents 32,000 hospitality workers in the New York City metropolitan area, many of whom work in or near east Midtown.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to be here today to testify in support of SL Green's plan to build a state-of-the-art office tower at One Vanderbilt Avenue and in support of the zoning text amendment for the Vanderbilt Corridor.

Development that is done right, that creates good jobs, that improves the infrastructure of our city and encourages positive business growth are vital to our city's future.

By making sure Vanderbilt Corridor anchors a strong, 21st century business district with the right combination of modern office buildings, full service hotels and transit improvements will lift all boats, so to speak, by providing a healthy commercial district to help drive NYC's economy. The proposed new office tower at One Vanderbilt Avenue is a great beginning to that end.

SL Green's commitment to invest \$210 million in capital project and public transit improvements, is important for the thousands of New Yorkers and visitors who work and travel through the area everyday.

Importantly, the rezoning includes a hotel special permit which will ensure that any hotel development in the corridor will have a positive impact on the community and such special permits should be included in all future rezoning of Midtown East.

We feel that the DeBlasio administration has proven responsive to concerns of the community, the business community and labor with its Vanderbilt Corridor proposal. And we thank the developer, SL Green, for working alongside labor and the community to ensure that this development creates good jobs and responsible development.

Thank you.

Nontraditional Employment for Women (NEW) Testimony: One Vanderbilt

Nontraditional Employment for Women (NEW) is testifying today in support of SL Green and One Vanderbilt and the opportunities this project with provide for New York City Tradeswomen and men.

There are limited opportunities for low-income and minority women to obtain secure jobs that provide a living wage and essential benefits, such as health insurance. NEW students, particularly minority women, often face the greatest challenges. The poverty rate in New York City in 2012 was 21 percent. The poverty rate is higher for females, blacks, and Hispanics. This is the population NEW chiefly serves.

Careers in the unionized construction trades provide opportunities for minority, low-income women to secure jobs that are at a living wage and include essential benefits. After participating in NEW's programs, the improvement in wages and standard of living is dramatic. The average wage for NEW permanent job placements is \$17 per hour. These wages go up to around \$40 per hour after a four to five year apprenticeship program. NEW's program and direct entry opportunity into union apprenticeship programs allows low-income women in New York City to provide a secure future for themselves and their families.

Founded in 1978, NEW prepares, trains and places women in careers in the skilled construction, utility and maintenance trades, helping women achieve economic independence and a secure future. In that work we have the opportunity to work with many of New York City's leading development companies and I can attest that SL Green is committed to advancing our mission of expanding opportunity for women in the construction trades. The One Vanderbilt project will provide opportunities for women from across New York City.

SL Green is a longstanding partner of NEW and in promoting tradeswomen on their projects across the City. NEW is excited to continue our partnership by putting more women to work in highly skilled union jobs at One Vanderbilt. SL Green's investment in new transit infrastructure with One Vanderbilt will provide additional opportunities for NEW women. These opportunities will assure economic security for these women and their families.

Through the unprecedented investment of \$210 million in funding for public capital improvements in the heart of East Midtown and at the door step of the Midtown commuter gateway, SL Green's plans to address Midtown's transportation infrastructure crisis while creating 5,200 construction union jobs and 190 permanent union jobs.

NEW is proud to support SL Green and One Vanderbilt through our partnership with the Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater New York (BCTC), who has joined with other labor leaders and City business leaders to form the Coalition for a Better Grand Central, which supports the vast public transit improvements built-in to the development.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Marquisha Page – Insulator - Nontraditional Employment for Women (NEW) Graduate Testimony: One Vanderbilt

I am testifying today in support of SL Green and One Vanderbilt and the opportunities this project with provide for New York City Tradeswomen and men.

My name is Marquisha Page, and I am an Insulator and a graduate of Nontraditional Employment for Women (NEW). I have been an Insulator with the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Allied Workers Local 12 since 2010. I am now a journey level tradeswoman. Having been through NEW's programs, I can personally vouch for the opportunities that they provide to the women of New York City. I know becoming a unionized construction worker has changed my life and my child's life.

Founded in 1978, NEW prepares, trains and places women in careers in the skilled construction, utility and maintenance trades, helping women achieve economic independence and a secure future. In that work we have the opportunity to work with many of New York City's leading development companies and I can attest that SL Green is committed to advancing our mission of expanding opportunity for women in the construction trades. The One Vanderbilt project will provide opportunities for women from across New York City.

SL Green is a longstanding partner of NEW and in promoting tradeswomen on their projects across the City. NEW is excited to continue our partnership by putting more women to work in highly skilled union jobs at One Vanderbilt. SL Green's investment in new transit infrastructure with One Vanderbilt will provide additional opportunities for NEW women. These opportunities will assure economic security for these women and their families.

NEW provides the women of New York City with free training and access to high-paying careers in the skilled trades. With NEW's training, graduates have access to careers with starting wages averaging \$17 per hour, benefits, and a path to higher-wage employment. NEW prepares low-income women for careers that provide prosperity and security. NEW conducts recruitment in low-income neighborhoods, increasing access to skilled trades careers, and target employment of local residents on construction projects.

NEW graduates are working as carpenters, electricians, ironworkers, laborers, plumbers, porters, door attendants, and operating engineers thanks to a unique partnership between NEW, the building and construction trades, contractors, and owners in New York City. Since 2005, NEW has placed more than 1,000 graduates in the building and construction trades unions and another 1,000 graduates in other industry related careers.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.



Testimony of Russell Unger Executive Director, Urban Green Council Before the New York City Council SubCommittee on Zoning and Franchises April 13, 2015

Good morning Chair Weprin and members of the Council.

My name is Russell Unger, Executive Director of Urban Green Council. We are the New York affiliate of the U.S. Green Building Council, which developed and maintains the LEED green building rating system.

I am here to testify concerning the differences between the most recent version of LEED (know as LEEDv4) and the previous version (know as LEED 2009). I am providing this information as background for your deliberations, but will not be commenting on the merits of the particular zoning application before you today.

LEED is continuously evolving and becomes more stringent with each new version. Desinging an office building under LEED v4 is a significantly greater challenge than designing one under earlier versions of LEED.

The energy bar in LEED v4 for a core and shell office building in NYC is about 14% higher than the bar in LEED 2009. This is because they use different versions of the ASHRAE model energy code as their energy baseline.

The energy bar in LEED v4 is the same ASHRAE energy code now required in New York City. An office building designed to beat today's code by 14%, would be about 30% more efficient than a standard code-compliant building built in the last several years.

Given the significant differences in energy baseline, a Gold LEED v4 building would probably achieve Platinum under LEED 2009. Developers still have the option of using this older version of LEED. Any developer that opts for LEEDv4 is doing so voluntarily and choosing a higher bar for themselves.

No office building has yet been built in NYC under LEEDv4. The first to do so will hopefully make LEEDv4 the new norm for NYC office buildings.

Thank you and I welcome your questions.

Urban Green Council U, S. Green Building Council New York 13-33-33 20 Broad Street Suite 709 New York, NY 10005 Phone (212) 514-9385 Fax (212) 487-9504 urbangreencouncil.org

13 April 2015 City Council Land Use Committee Hearing Vanderbilt Corridor and One Vanderbilt

I am Terrence O'Neal, chair of the Land Use & Waterfront Committee of Community Board 6 and a member of the Multi-Board Task Force. Thank you for allowing me to share this testimony. I have some comments on both the Vanderbilt Corridor and One Vanderbilt.

Vanderbilt Corridor

This rezoning proposal treats five sites the same, although the conditions are quite different. Each site is proposed to be rezoned to an FAR of 30. Imagine a canyon of 5 buildings in a row, all at 30 FAR. That is unacceptable. I can accept a higher FAR, and perhaps that number is 30, at One Vanderbilt. However, the remaining 4 sites are separate and need to be treated in a different manner. As one moves north, the site conditions change dramatically. It is much more logical for maximum floor area ratios to decrease for each building north of the One Vanderbilt site as one moves away from the Grand Central transit hub. We should consider the negative impact on the quality of light and air in East Midtown if a solid block of 30 FAR buildings were permitted.

One Vanderbilt

Most news accounts, many politicians, and those in the business world often applaud the public improvements to be completed by SL Green for constructing One Vanderbilt. And, it is an impressive package of improvements. I still believe, however, that there is one important aspect of the project that is missing. And that is, a publicly accessible lobby. While Borough President Brewer was able to achieve some concessions in this area through the addition of an entrance from the transit hall to the lobby, much more needs to be done. This building is receiving 532,750 SF of bonus floor area. This is unprecedented in East Midtown. At the very least, at this prominent location near a major transit hub, an open, public lobby should be provided. One needs to do more than walk in, observe, and walk out if the developer is rewarded with a generous Public Realm Improvement Bonus of 41% of the building's total floor area. Put another way, the generous Public Realm Improvement Bonus is permitting the developer to nearly double the allowable floor area. A member of the public deserves to pass through this state-of-the-art lobby as one moves to and from Grand Central, the subway system, and East Side Access. One should be able to pass through, as well, while moving from Vanderbilt to Madison Avenue. The developer at one Vanderbilt has cited security concerns with open public access. This is understandable. The developer needs to respond to the concerns of prospective tenants. However, with innovative design, and the will to do so, an open, accessible lobby is very achievable, while maintaining high security for tenants. For example, at 4 World Trade Center, a state-of-the-art tower recently completed in Lower Manhattan, the goal of inviting the public in while maintaining high security for tenants is gracefully achieved.

Why is this so important? It is because the public deserves to experience a state-of-the-art public space that was made possible through awarding massive zoning bonuses. The public deserves the best deal possible. And a completely accessible lobby should be made part of that deal. Thank you.

e.

٠

•

Ellen R. Imbimbo

40 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10016

Testimony – City Council Committee Hearing

April 13, 2015

One Vanderbilt and Vanderbilt Corridor

Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen – My name is Ellen Imbimbo, and I am Vice-Chair of the Land Use Committee of Community Board 6, as well as a member of the Multi-Board Task Force.

The last time I had the privilege of addressing this group was when we successfully advocated for the adoption of Community Board 6's 197-a Plan, our vision for a better New York to enhance its standing as one of the world's great cities.

In my view, the proposals being reviewed today are not nearly sufficient in returning to the City gains equivalent to those being granted.

More discussion is needed about the problems to be faced regarding pedestrian circulation above ground. The resolution of the Multi-Board Task Force states "as whatever agreements are established between S L Green and the City at One Vanderbilt will set a precedent for all future agreements in the Corridor and East Midtown, a comprehensive plan identifying all the infrastructure and public space needs in the area is essential prior to the completion of ULURP."

While there has been discussion of the requirement to widen Madison Avenue there remains the issue of handling the flow of pedestrian traffic on Madison Avenue, not to mention the already crowded sidewalks of Lexington Avenue. With added numbers of pedestrians due to East Side Access, One Vanderbilt, and other buildings that may be constructed along the corridor, it is essential to study public space needs in a comprehensive way.

An attempt was made to engage the public about circulation issues in the first East Midtown zoning plan; to my knowledge there has been no equivalent attempt with the current proposals.

There has been much worthy discussion about relieving the burdens of pedestrian circulation below ground but surely an equivalent effort is needed to assess the fate of pedestrians when they arrive at street level.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

AIA New York Chapter



Statement Submitted for the Record on One Vanderbilt Avenue

New York City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises April 13, 2015

Dear Chair Weprin and members of the City Council Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises,

On behalf of the American Institute of Architects New York Chapter and our more than 5,000 architect and affiliate members in New York, we are pleased to offer testimony in regard to the One Vanderbilt proposal. As we have previously said in regard to the East Midtown Rezoning discussion, projects such as One Vanderbilt will allow for the development of a world-class business district and major job generator for the future of New York City, a future that is characterized by the design of the next generation of great buildings.

In cities around the globe, there are numerous excellent examples of transit-oriented development that improve the accessibility, quality, and competitiveness of business centers. It is sound planning for the City's future to have first-class commercial space and added density linked to enhanced transportation connectivity. This project replaces outdated and obsolete buildings with a new, sustainable structure that contributes to the public realm, while at the same time enhancing the grand character of the heart of New York City's primary business district.

We commend Kohn Pederson Fox Associates and SL Green for their efforts in going beyond a simplistic solution and their willingness to engage in open discussion about the future of East Midtown. The proposed changes to Vanderbilt Ave extend the below-grade transit pathways, augmenting the intermodal transportation function of the building complex, fundamental to moving large numbers of commuters and visitors through the primary transit center in the country. This is especially important after East Side Access comes on line, relieving some of the pressure on Penn Station, but significantly increasing the numbers of people coming from Long Island to this part of Midtown. Through the extension of on-grade public space by creating a pedestrian zone on Vanderbilt Ave, the neighborhood gains an outdoor living room that can also function as an extension of Grand Central.

The new building creates a "three-part" harmony between the three scales of design intervention that create world-class cities: the streetscape, the interior public space, and the skyline-defining scale. We commend the City Council for this discussion. We urge approval as a first step on the path to a coordinated effort to reimagine the above and below grade experience for those living, working, and visiting in East Midtown, and we offer continued guidance as this conversation continues.

Sincerely,

Tomas Rossant, AIA 2015 President

Dan hum

David Burney, FAIA Interim Executive Director

536 LaGuardia Place New York, NY 10012 212 683 0023 info@aiany.org www.aiany.org

137 Seventh Avenue South New York, NY 10014 www.dominiqueanselkitchen.com

New York City Council 250 Broadway, Suite 1804 New York, NY 10007 Attn: Council Member Corey Johnson

April 1, 2015 Re: Sidewalk Café, 137 7th Avenue South, New York, NY 10014 – DCA # 726-2015-ASWC

Council Member Johnson:

With regards to the sidewalk café license application at the above address, I hereby state that I am the owner of Innovation Kitchens, LLC, d/b/a Dominique Ansel Kitchen, and further, agree to the stipulations set by Community Board #2 that state:

- 1. The bike rack must be removed prior to NYC Council hearing on April 13th, 2015;
- 2. The sidewalk café must close by 7:00pm, daily; and
- 3. Applicant must submit a revised plan to DCA to reflect the addition of a sound- attenuation awning.

Additionally, I do hereby state that the subject bike rack has been removed, and a revised plan, containing an approved sound-attenuation awning has been submitted to DCA, as of March 10th, 2015.

Sincerely,

Partner

Dominique Ansel, 4-1-15

Sworn to before me this:

notes R. Nevy 4/1/15

CYNTHIA R D'ANGELO NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK No. 01D 6284472 Qualified In Westchester County My Commission Expires June 17, 2017

002 Mercury Tacos LLC 131 7th Avenue South New York, NY 10014

April 6, 2015

City Council Member Cory Johnson 224 West 30th Street, suite 1206 New York, NY 10001

Re: Sidewalk Café Agreement Letter 002 Mercury Tacos LLC 131 7th Avenue South New York, NY 10014

Dear Council Member Johnson,

Otto Cedeno, managing member and of 002 Mercury Tacos LLC, in connection with our application for an unenclosed sidewalk café, hereby commit to the City Council, in light of the concerns of the tree pit:

1) We have finished the tree pit as requested. Please see attached photos.

If there are any questions please call my office. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Otto Cedeno, Managing Member

Cc: Otto Tacos

John Pettit West III 250 W 94 Street New York, NY 10025 John.west.iii@gmail.com

Testimony at City Council Concerning the Vanderbilt Corridor and One Vanderbilt – 7 April 2015

I am John West. I am a member of Community Board Six and the MultiBoard Task Force. I am also a member of the City Club. I believe that what I am about to say is consistent with their concerns.

If the City Council is going to approve the proposed zoning for the Vanderbilt Corridor and the special permits thereunder for One Vanderbilt it should first make two changes. These changes would modify the expectation that all sites within the corridor can achieve 30.0 FAR and would grant One Vanderbilt only the FAR it has really earned.

First, not all of the sites within the Vanderbilt corridor are equal. Some are better positioned to accommodate greater density than others. Of the five blocks, the one to be occupied by One Vanderbilt enjoys the most density justifying characteristics:

- It faces on two wide streets,
- It overlooks the "air park" above Grand Central,
- It is adjacent to and will connect to a subway station, and
- It is adjacent to and will connect to the pedestrian circulation system of Terminal City.

The proposed zoning should be modified to make explicit that sites that enjoy fewer of these density justifying characteristics should be limited to proportionally less maximum FAR. (See footnote¹ for possible text.)

- 1. The lot fronts on two wide streets,
- 2. The lot abuts and the building significantly improves access to an adjacent subway station,

¹ Consider changing the proposed addition to footnote 6 of the table in Section 81-211 to read:

[&]quot;... and for any zoning lot within the Vanderbilt Corridor limited to 30.0 FAR if it has four of the following characteristics, limited to 27.0 FAR if it has three, limited to 24 FAR if it has two, and limited to 21.6 FAR if it has one. The four characteristics are:

^{3.} The lot is contiguous with the interior pedestrian circulation system of Grand Central Terminal and the building connects to and significantly improves that system, and

^{4.} The lot is adjacent to Grand Central Terminal such that the building overlooks the "air park" above the terminal."
Second, One Vanderbilt should only be granted bonus floor area for density ameliorating amenities that truly improve the public realm, not for investments that are of little or no real benefit to the community or which should rightly be provided by others.

For example: the Transit Hall is awkwardly located on 43 Street, adjacent to the building's loading dock, such that it does not provide a significant public benefit. If it were located on the opposite corner of the building, on the corner of Madison Avenue and 42 Street, it could provide an important new entrance to Grand Central. (See attachment: "Terminal City, Vanderbilt Corridor".) However, the developer prefers to reserve the 100% corner for a branch bank rather than the public realm.

Another example: approximately \$42 million of the improvements to the Lexington Avenue subway station are mitigation for East Side Access and for the extension of the 7 line to Hudson Yards and are already obligations of the MTA and the City. (See attachment: "Grand Central Subway Station Complex: Public Realm Improvements or Mitigation?".) These are much needed improvements but if they are part of the bonus, One Vanderbilt gains 2.5 FAR of density without corresponding density ameliorating amenities for the community.

One more example: Community Board Six has recommended that the existing, but long closed, entrance to the subway at the lobby recess of the Mobil Building be reopened by the MTA rather than building new stairs obstructing the 42 Street sidewalk. This is a requested bonus of nearly half an FAR for a public benefit that is marginal at best and perhaps a disbenefit.

Also, One Vanderbilt should not be relieved of the usual requirement to provide a major improvement to the pedestrian circulation network for the privilege of remotely transferring development rights from the Bowery Savings Bank.

A detailed analysis is attached. (See Attachment: "One Vanderbilt: Earning its Bonus?".) By this calculus One Vanderbilt would earn approximately 6.0 FAR less. This would either leave the building a bit smaller, at 24.0 FAR, or require it to provide additional improvements to the public realm. Either alternative would be in the public's interest.

Thank you.

Attachments:

One Vanderbilt: Earning Its Bonus? Terminal City, Vanderbilt Corridor Grand Central Subway Station Complex: Public Realm Improvements or Mitigation?

One Vanderbilt: Earning Its Bonus?

The FAR of One Vanderbilt is proposed to be increased from 15.0 to 30.0 through a transfer of 2.63 FAR of development rights from the Bowery Savings Bank and a Public Realm Improvement bonus of 12.37 FAR.

Bowery TDR: A transfer of development rights under the current rules requires¹ a major improvement to the pedestrian circulation network in the Grand Central Subdistrict. 383 Madison received 6.6 FAR from Grand Central Terminal under this provision and provided several improvements² to the pedestrian circulation system, both on- and off-site. Under the proposed text, One Vanderbilt does not propose to provide such improvements for the privilege of a remote transfer of development rights.

Omitting the requirement for a pedestrian circulation improvement increases the value of the development rights transferred from the Bowery to the benefit of SL Green but reduces the benefits to the public.

383 Madison has the same size site as One Vanderbilt. 2.63 FAR is approximately 40% of 6.6 FAR. One Vanderbilt should provide a pedestrian circulation improvement equal to at least 40% of that provided by 383 Madison.

Public Realm Improvements: One Vanderbilt proposes improvements on-site, off-site in Vanderbilt Avenue, and off-site in the 4/5/6 Lexington Avenue subway station to earn its PRI bonus. SL Green estimates its cost for these improvements at a total of \$210 million and allocates that cost among 11

² Improvements to the pedestrian circulation system made by 383 Madison. On-site at grade:

> Thru-block lobby along Vanderbilt Av, 200' X40' = 8,000 sf, ceiling 20' Transit entrance on 47 St, 86' X37' = 3,200 sf, ceiling 20', with escalators and stair

Sidewalk widening along Vanderbilt Av, 200' X 3' = 600 sf

On-site below grade:

Passage to transit, 31' X 24' = 740 sf

Off-site:

Enclosure of Northeast and Northwest Passages, 1,680' X 20' = 33,600 sf

¹ "Section 81-635 Transfer of development rights by special permit: As a condition for granting a special permit pursuant to this Section, the design of the #development# or #enlargement# shall include a major improvement of the surface and/or subsurface pedestrian circulation network in the Subdistrict (as shown on Map 4 in Appendix A of this Chapter). The improvement shall increase the general accessibility and security of the network, reduce points of pedestrian congestion and improve the general network environment through connections into planned expansions of the network. The improvement may include, but is not limited to, widening, straightening or expansion of the existing pedestrian network, reconfiguration of circulation routes to provide more direct pedestrian connections between the #development# or #enlargement# and Grand Central Terminal, and provision for direct daylight access, retail in new and existing passages, and improvements to air quality, lighting, finishes and signage."

improvements. The following table shows the improvements and their estimated costs. It also uses the percentages of the total cost to estimate the portion of the total bonus FAR to allocate to each of the 11 improvements³.

On-	site			
1	Add 2 escalators, a stair, and an elevator between concourse of East Side Access and concourse to shuttle. Approx. 2,700 sf.	\$16,578,500	7.9%	0.98 FAR
2	Add entrance between sidewalk and platform level of shuttle station with 2 escalators and an elevator. Approx. 4,800 sf.	\$15,723,500	7.5%	0.93 FAR
3	Add concourse among Grand Central, stair to Transit Hall, access to East Side Access, and shuttle station. Approx. 8,600 sf on-site + 1,500 sf in Grand Central, ceiling 7.5'.	\$18,098,500	8.6%	1.06 FAR
4	Add Transit Hall as entrance to Grand Central with a stair and an elevator. Approx, 4,200 sf, ceiling 35'.	\$9,800,200	4.7%	0.58 FAR
Off-	site – Vanderbilt Av			
5	Landscape Vanderbilt Plaza. Approx 12,900 sf.	\$10,786,000	5.1%	0.63FAR
Off-	site – 4/5/6 station			
6	Enlarge and refinish central portion of mezzanine. Approx. 10,000 sf, total; half new space.	\$47,200,250	22.5%	2.78 FAR
7	Enlarge and refinish north end of mezzanine and add 2 stairs to platforms. Approx. 8,000 sf; one third new space.	\$37,384,200	17.8%	2.20 FAR
8	Modify 7 stairs and 25 columns at platforms.	\$27,434,500	13.0%	1.61 FAR
9	Replace entrance from Lexington Avenue with a new stair and an elevator.	\$14,523,500	6.9%	0.85 FAR
10	Add sidewalk stairs to the Mobil Building passage.	\$7,347,500	3.5%	0.43 FAR
11	Add stair to southbound platform at south end of mezzanine. Approx 900 sf.	\$5,311,500	2.5%	0.32 FAR
		\$210,188,000	100%	12.37 FAR

This approach falls into the trap of equating cost and public benefit. The correct approach would equate an improvement to the public realm with an amount of bonus floor area depending on the public benefit of the improvement, not its cost. Plazas, the original bonused density ameliorating amenities, are denominated in this fashion⁴.

³ This approach concedes the accuracy of the estimated costs, based on MTA and DCP assurances, and assumes that 535,000 sf of bonus floor area is worth \$210,000,000, or \$392/sf. It also equates the bonus to the cost rather than the public benefit.

⁴ For a plaza that meets the requirements of the zoning resolution, in a high density district, a bonus of six square feet of zoning floor area is provided for each square foot of plaza. Over the years the plaza rules have been modified to benefit from experience and require qualitatively better plazas. This also means that each building that provides a plaza is bonused equitably.

With One Vanderbilt the analysis is also hampered in that the 12.37 FAR bonus is not allocated in the application among the various improvements. Such an allocation is needed in order to better understand whether particular improvements are worth the portion of the total bonus they are earning or how the bonus should be adjusted if an improvement is found wanting or is modified to increase, or decrease, its public benefit.

Therefore, with these reservations, the table above is offered as a basis for the following discussion.

Vanderbilt Concourse: Items 1 and 3 provide circulation between the LIRR concourse of East Side Access and the shuttle station as well as access to Grand Central, the proposed Transit Hall, the rest of the 42 Street subway complex, and 42 Street. Unfortunately it requires intermodal passengers to go up to the mezzanine level of the shuttle station to go down to the platform level and, as a result, the ceiling of the Vanderbilt concourse is only seven and a half feet high. If the concourse were at the level of the shuttle platforms circulation would be more direct and the ceiling would be twice as high.

Also, passengers would be able to use the proposed escalators between the platform level of the shuttle and the 42 Street sidewalk rather than the stair from the mezzanine level.

The alternative configuration of the Vanderbilt concourse ought to cost more or less the same as the planned configuration but be of greater public benefit, better earning its 2.04 FAR bonus.

New Shuttle Entrance: Item 2 provides direct access between sidewalk level on 42 Street and the platform level of the shuttle station, using a pair of escalators and an elevator⁵. This seems a very useful improvement.

A subway station improvement bonus is different. These special permits are negotiated on a case by case basis and may not achieve an equal ratio of benefit to bonus floor area from project to project.

⁵ On-site bonused public amenities are usually designed, built, operated, maintained, and replaced, as necessary, by the owner of the bonused property for the lifetime of the building. This is reasonable in that the public should have the benefit of the amenity as long as the owner has the benefit of the additional floor area.

In the case of special permit amenities it is important to include effective means of enforcement in the restrictive declaration that accompanies the approval so that the City, and in this case the MTA, are able to ensure the continued usefulness of the new subway entrance and its benefit to the public. The default cure is to revoke the CofO for the building (or at least the bonused portion thereof) which is akin to opening a walnut with a sledgehammer.

Note that two existing buildings on the One Vanderbilt site each have off-street subway entrances. The unbonused replacement for both of them, required by the Special Midtown District, is the proposed stair between sidewalk level and the mezzanine level of the shuttle station. Consider whether there should be two replacement entrances or should some portion of the platform level entrance be included in the unbonused replacement?

Transit Hall: Item 4 is a proposed entrance and waiting area to Grand Central at the corner of Vanderbilt Avenue and 43 Street. It is difficult to imagine this space being useful. It is directly across the street from the entrance to the Biltmore Room, which provides a similar route into and out of Grand Central via 43 Street. Actually, the Biltmore Room is 20% larger than the proposed Transit Hall (5,000 sf versus 4,000 sf) and is more convenient to trains, toilets, and shops and services. And it is very little used.

If the Transit Hall were relocated to the corner of Madison and 42 Street (displacing the planned bank) it could provide a significant new route into and out of Grand Central. This would provide an important public benefit and justify its earning a bonus⁶. Where it is, the space risks becoming a liability⁷ and should not be granted a bonus.

Vanderbilt Plaza: Item 5 contemplates redesigning the block of Vanderbilt Avenue between 42 and 43 Streets as a public pedestrian space. If this is a good idea why has it not yet been tried on an experimental basis, as the City DoT has done in many other locations?

The successful redesign of Vanderbilt Avenue as a pedestrian area depends in large part on the use of the ground floors of the buildings that front it⁸ and would best be based on a plan for the entire street and on experimental installations to better understand how people will use the space. As currently proposed

⁷ When public spaces are poorly used property owners have been known to ask City Planning for relief, such as limiting hours of use or even eliminating the space. In the case of the Transit Hall, as a worse case, one can imagine a future request to convert it to retail space.

⁸ Among the improvements to the public realm proposed by the Grand Central Partnership in its 1987 report prepared by Benjamin Thompson & Associates, titled *New Life for a Midtown Business District, A Draft Master Plan for Reviving the Public Face of New York's Grand Central District,* was a plan to make Vanderbilt Avenue a more attractive place for pedestrians. An essential part of Vanderbilt Avenue becoming a greater asset to Terminal City's public realm was the use of the ground floors of the fronting buildings. For example, Ben Thompson would replace the Pam Am Building's arcade with retail spaces.

⁶ The Transit Hall has an area of approximately 4,200 sf and claims a bonus of approximately 25, 000 sf. This is a bonus rate of 6:1 - 6 sf of bonus floor area for each square foot of Transit Hall. If the Transit Hall qualified as a Covered Pedestrian Space (which it does not for several reasons, including the lack of retail frontage) the portion within ten feet of the property line would have a bonus rate of 3:1 and the remainder a bonus rate of 11:1 for an average bonus rate of 8.3:1 and a total bonus of 35,000 sf.

Vanderbilt Plaza is simply a setting for the main entrance to a big new office building. It benefits the building and not the public and should not be granted a bonus.

Enlarging the 4/5/6 mezzanine: Item 6 would enlarge the center portion of the mezzanine of the 4/5/6 subway station by approximately 5,000 square feet of space that is currently controlled by and used by the Grand Hyatt Hotel. The MTA is responsible for obtaining the space; SL Green would be responsible for the improvements.

This seems a useful improvement but it is contingent on the space becoming available. Is there an alternative improvement of similar public benefit that SL Green would provide if this proves impractical?

New platform stairs for the 4/5/6: Items 7 and 11 would enlarge the mezzanine of the 4/5/6 subway station at its north and south ends and add three new stairs between the mezzanine and the platforms. These stairs seem to be critical to increasing the capacity of the station by an additional southbound express train in the morning and an additional northbound express train during the evening.

The importance of items 7 and 11 is supported by their having been identified as mitigation for the extension of the #7 line and for East Side Access. The northern extension of the mezzanine and a new stair to each platform was committed to by the City as part of the project to extend the #7 to Hudson Yards and the new stair at the south of the mezzanine to the southbound platform was committed to by the MTA as part of the East Side Access project to bring LIRR service to Grand Central.

Items 7 and 11 should be paid for by the City and the MTA, respectively, and should be completed by the time the extension of the #7 and ESA open. They should not be included in the PRI bonus for One Vanderbilt. If they were included in the PRI bonus, One Vanderbilt would include 2.52 FAR of additional density without corresponding density ameliorating amenities.

Stairs and columns at the 4/5/6 platforms: Item 8 would narrow existing stairs and columns at the platforms of the 4/5/6 subway station to slightly increase circulation space on the platforms. This seems a useful improvement.

Lexington Avenue entrance of 4/5/6 station: Item 9 would replace the existing entrance to the 4/5/6 subway station from Lexington Avenue with a larger stair and a new elevator. This seems a useful improvement.

Entrance to 4/5/6 station at Mobil Building: Item 10 would truncate the currently closed passageway to the Mobil Building and add a pair of stairs to the subway on the south sidewalk of 42 Street just east of Lexington Avenue.

The Mobil Building has two connections to the subway, both of which have been closed⁹ for a long time. The passageway from the 4/5/6 station opens into the western end of the recess at the lobby entrance to the building. This allowed weather protected circulation between the building and the subway; it also allowed sheltered access to the subway entrance from the sidewalk. On the east side of the lobby there are a set of doors between the 7 station and the lobby, near the turnstiles. This also has been closed for a long time.

Off-sidewalk, on-site, subway entrances are particularly appropriate in the Terminal City area both because of sidewalk congestion and because one expects the entrances to be in buildings, since almost none are on the sidewalks. A better outcome at the Mobil Building would be to reopen the existing subway entrances rather than to obstruct the sidewalk with a new entrance. The proposed pair of stairs should not be granted a bonus.

One Vanderbilt PRI: Several items for which One Vanderbilt asks a Public Realm Improvement bonus should not be granted a bonus, either because there is no substantial public benefit or because the improvement is already committed for other reasons.

4. [0.58 FAR] The Transit Hall is not of significant public benefit in its current location.

5. [0.63 FAR] Vanderbilt Plaza is not likely to be of significant public benefit absent a plan for all of Vanderbilt Avenue.

7. [2.20 FAR] The north extension of the 4/5/6 mezzanine and the two stairs to the platforms are part of the mitigation for the #7 extension.
10. [0.43 FAR] The sidewalk stair at the Mobil Building is less of a public benefit than reopening the existing subway entrances would be.
11. [0.32 FAR] The stair to the southbound platform at the south end of the mezzanine is part of the mitigation for East Side Access.

By this reckoning, a total of 4.16 FAR should be deducted from the requested PRI bonus.

Furthermore, some amount – say 2.00 FAR – should be deducted from the PRI bonus to compensate for the lack of a major improvement to the pedestrian circulation network for the privilege of a remote transfer of development rights from the Bowery Savings Bank.

Absent changes to the application for One Vanderbilt to provide additional density ameliorating improvements to the public realm, these deductions would reduce the total FAR of the building from 30.0 to 23.84.

John West

⁹ What agreements support the subway entrances at the Mobil Building and what are the rights of enforcement? Apparently the MTA has rights to the entrances but has not exercised them.



Terminal City Vanderbilt Corridor

Presumably the reason for the Vanderbilt Corridor special zoning is to improve physical and visual access to the LIRR concourse that is being built below it as part of East Side Access.

If so, one would expect the district to include all of the sites that could reasonably contribute to access and a plan as to how that access would be provided. To the contrary, the corridor as proposed would need to extend two blocks further north and include both sides of Vanderbilt Avenue to encompass the affected area and there is no plan for improvements to the public realm in the corridor.

The following pages suggest that there are important improvements that could be made to the LIRR concourse, including a much higher ceiling by removing a platform and pair of tracks from the Madison Avenue yard above it, and argue that the improvements at One Vanderbilt could be more conducive to the public good and better earn the bonus floor area that is being claimed.

In particular, it is noted that the 100% location at the northeast corner of Madison Avenue and 42 Street would be better used as a grand new entrance to Grand Central Terminal than as a retail location for a bank.

John West

Piranesi



The site of One Vanderbilt sits astride two primary lines of desired circulation at Grand Central.

One (solid red arrow at left) provides a new entrance for Grand Central at the corner of 42 Street and Madison Avenue. It serves those with destinations to the southwest and it connects the street level at 42 and Madison with the level of the Main Concourse, below street level at 43 Street and Vanderbilt Avenue.

The other (dashed red arrow at left) will provide a southern entrance for East Side Access. It needs to connect the LIRR concourse (that is replacing tracks and platforms at the lower level of Grand Central under and west of Vanderbilt Avenue) with both 42 Street and the subway stations below 42 Street.



The LIRR concourse of East Side Access is to be at the lower track level of Grand Central just west of Vanderbilt Avenue. The drawing at the far left shows both the concourse and the station, much deeper, under Park Avenue. The drawing at the near left shows an enlargement of the southern end of the concourse.

On both drawings the site of One Vanderbilt is shown in a red outline and the axis of the LIRR concourse is shown by an orange line.

A goal at One Vanderbilt is to provide access between the LIRR concourse and areas to the south and southwest at street level and to the S and 4, 5, & 6 subway lines under 42 Street. This is indicated by the yellow arrow.

Other goals at One Vanderbilt include replacing the access between sidewalk and mezzanine at the shuttle and adding access between the sidewalk and platform level, providing an appropriate entrance to Grand Central and East Side Access from the southeast, and integrating the new building with Terminal City.



The current proposal for One Vanderbilt includes three significant improvements to the public realm:

- Replacement access between the subway mezzanine level and the street and new access between the subway platform level and the street.
- A connection between the LIRR concourse and the subway.
- A public room entrance to Grand Central.

Unfortunately, the connection between the LIRR concourse and the subway is indirect in that one goes up to go down.

Unfortunately, the public room is not located so that it satisfies a significant route in and out of Grand Central.

And unfortunately the several elements are separate so that they do not add synergistically to the public realm .



Transit Hall moved to southwest side of building and replaced with retail facing on Vanderbilt Avenue.

Relocated Transit Hall to provide ramp between the corner of 42 Street and Madison Avenue and the level of the Main Concourse of Grand Central at a point near 43 Street and Vanderbilt Avenue.

New vertical access between sidewalk and platform level of S.

Replacement vertical access between sidewalk and mezzanine level of S.

New vertical access between level of Main Concourse and lobby.

New vertical access between level of Main Concourse and platform level of S.

New concourse at level of shuttle mezzanine and Main Concourse.

New ramp between the level of the Main Concourse at a point near 43 Street and Vanderbilt Avenue and the corner of 42 Street and Madison Avenue.

New vertical access between platform level of S and sidewalk, bypassing this level.

Replacement vertical access between mezzanine of S and sidewalk.

New vertical access between platform level of S and level of Main Concourse.

New vertical access between platform level of S and LIRR concourse.

New concourse between platform level of S and LIRR concourse.

New vertical access between platform level of S and sidewalk.

Terminal City One Vanderbilt

An alternative configuration of the public realm in One Vanderbilt would provide all of the proposed elements but would modify them to provide a more useful, better integrated system.

Alternatively, the escalators from the LIRR concourse might stop at the platform level of the S rather than continuing to the mezzanine level of the S, providing a more direct transit to transit connection.

Alternatively, the Transit Hall might be moved to the opposite corner of the building where it could provide an entrance to Grand Central from the corner of 42 Street and Madison Avenue.

And, alternatively, the several additions to the public realm might be combined into a continuous series of spaces so that each contributes synergistically to all of the public purposes.

In addition, like other buildings in Terminal City, One Vanderbilt should, for the convenience of its tenants and visitors, connect directly between its lobby and the concourse system of Grand Central.



The current proposal for One Vanderbilt (top left) would provide a route between LIRR's East Side Access concourse and the shuttle to Times Square. It would, however, bring passengers from the LIRR concourse to the mezzanine level of the S, from which they would then descend to the platform level – going up to go down.

An alternative (bottom left) would bring passengers from the LIRR concourse to the platform level of the S, allowing a more convenient transit to transit connection.

The alternative has the additional advantage of creating a two story high space between the low ceilinged LIRR concourse and the S station, more in keeping with the scale of Grand Central.

Bringing passengers to the platform level of the S also provides a convenient route to the 4/5/6/7 through the paid passage at the platform level of the S.



Old Grand Central had a passage, now closed and reused for retail space, at the level of the Main Concourse and running along, and one story below, Vanderbilt Avenue adjacent to
 One Vanderbilt (red arrow at left). It was on axis with the Vanderbilt Passage to the north and the lower lobby of the Lincoln Building to the south. (Its ends are forensically visible in wall recesses and material changes.)

If reopened, the passage would provide a convenient access to the mezzanine level of the shuttle, on axis with the Lincoln Building and the Vanderbilt Passage (see red arrow at left).

The restored passage could be designed to be open on its west side so as to overlook a new concourse within One Vanderbilt connecting the platform level of the S with escalators to the LIRR concourse (see orange at left).



PCS: The Special Midtown District requires 1 sf of pedestrian circulation space for each 300 sf of building zfa. The sketch at left suggests this might be satisfied by an arcade on Madison, replacement access to the shuttle, and lobby entrance recesses on Madison and Vanderbilt. These spaces do not earn bonus floor area.

TDR: No major improvement to the pedestrian circulation system has been identified as a benefit to Terminal City justifying the transfer of development rights under the Grand Central Subdistrict.

PRI: The sketch at left suggests that the on-site public realm improvement might be a four story space, two stories above grade similar to a Covered Pedestrian Space and Arcade and two stories below grade similar to a Through Block Arcade. With 6,600 sf of CPS at a bonus rate of 14:1, 2,800 square feet of Arcade at 3:1, and 8,850 sf of Through Block Arcade at 6:1 the space would earn a bonus of approximately 144,000 zsf.





Terminal City

LIRR trains will use a double cavern station located 150 feet below Park Avenue. Each cavern will have four tracks and two platforms. Passengers will climb by escalators at 44, 45, 46, and 47 Streets to a new concourse below and just west of Vanderbilt Avenue. From there passengers will use additional escalators, stairs and elevators to reach street level.

Because the new concourse for the LIRR will be in the lower track level of Grand Central, replacing some tracks and platforms, it will have a relatively low ceiling, although it will be some 1,300 feet long.

At the cost of one platform and two tracks at the upper track level of Grand Central, the new LIRR concourse could have a much taller ceiling. This would allow a concourse more in keeping with the scale and character of Grand Central.

In selected locations the LIRR concourse could include space above street level in buildings on the west side of Vanderbilt Avenue. This would provide visual orientation between the concourse and the street.

Grand Central Subway Station Complex:

Public Realm Improvements or Mitigation?

Some of the improvements to the Lexington Avenue subway station at Grand Central that are claimed as part of the Public Realm Improvement (PRI) bonus for One Vanderbilt are also mitigation committed to by the City or the MTA, respectively, for the extension of the #7 line and for East Side Access. (See the attached extracts from the Findings Statement and the Record of Decision.) They include a northerly extension of the mezzanine, a stair between the extended mezzanine and the northbound platform, and a stair between the extended mezzanine and the southbound platform as mitigation for the extension of the #7 line and a stair between the south end of the mezzanine and the southbound platform as mitigation for the extension of the #7 line and a stair between the south end of the mezzanine and the southbound platform as mitigation for the extension of the #7 line and a stair between the south end of the mezzanine and the southbound platform as mitigation for East Side Access.

Of the \$210 million of on- and off-site improvements to the public realm claimed for bonus floor area for One Vanderbilt, \$42.7 million, or approximately 20%, are these two items to which the City and the MTA are already committed as mitigation. 20% of the 12.3 FAR claimed for the PRI bonus would be approximately 2.5 FAR.

Of course the Lexington Avenue station desperately needs these improvements; however, if they are provided as part of the PRI bonus for One Vanderbilt the city and the MTA will have been relieved of obligations totaling over \$42 million and One Vanderbilt will include 2.5 FAR of additional density without corresponding density ameliorating amenities.

Why does this matter?

It matters because it undermines public trust in the City's zoning regulations and in the agencies responsible for them; and because it is probably illegal.

Granting One Vanderbilt bonus floor area for fulfilling obligations of the City and the MTA has the appearance of selling zoning – zoning-for-dollars.

Granting One Vanderbilt a bonus for improvements required as mitigation for other projects rather than for new density ameliorating amenities means that the additional density of the building has not been ameliorated through the bonus.

Using the Public Realm Improvement bonus to relieve the City and the MTA of multimillion dollar obligations rather than for additional improvements to the public realm appears to be a conflict of interest between the City reducing its financial obligations and protecting the public interest.

The improvements that were identified as mitigation for the extension of the 7 line and for East Side Access should be paid for and built as part of those projects and should be completed by the time the projects become operational. They should not be delayed and they should not be paid for through zoning bonuses.

-- John West

No 7 Subway Extension and Hudson Yards

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

November 22, 2004 / Calendar No. 4

N 040500(A) ZRM

IN THE MATTER OF an application submitted by the Department of City Planning pursuant to Section 201 of the New York City Charter, for an amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, relating to Article VIII, Chapter 1, (Special Midtown District), Article IX, Chapter 6 (Special Clinton District), Article XII, Chapter 1 (Special Garment Center District), and the elimination of the Special Jacob K. Javits Convention Center District and the creation of the Special Hudson Yards District in Article IX, Chapter 3.

ENHIBIT A

CO-LEAD AGENCIES FINDINGS STATEMENT

State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

This Findings Statement has been prepared in accordance with Article 3 of the Environmental Conservation Law, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and its implementing regulations promulgated at 6 NYCRR Part 617.

Co-Lead Agencies:	Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) City of New York City Planning Commission (CPC)
Name of Proposed Action:	No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program
SEQRA Classification:	Type I Action

The City of New York would provide the required funding for all transit mitigation (subway station improvements and new MTA buses) pursuant to arrangements satisfactory to the MTA and the City. The costs of the remaining mitigation measures would be bome by the City, except that the cost of the pedestrian bridge over Route 9A near West 33rd Street would be assumed by the New York Jets, and the cost of the pedestrian bridge between West 39th Street and West 40th Street would be allocated among the City of New York, the State of New York, and the New York Jets.

The CPC has considered the relevant environmental impacts, facts and conclusions disclosed in the FGEIS and has weighed and balanced relevant environmental impacts with tocial, economic and other considerations. Bated on the foregoing, the CPC certifies that, consistent with tocial, economic and other estential considerations from among the reasonable alternatives available, both the Proposed Action and Alternative S avoid or minimize adverte environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable, and that adverte environmental impacts will be avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable by <u>incorporating as conditions to the decision those initigative</u> measures that were identified as practicable for both the Proposed Action and Alternative S. The CPC further finds that the Proposed Action and Alternative S are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with New York City's local waterfront revitalization program.



5 10.7 SLEWAY EXTENSION-HUDSON YARDS AND CEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

East Side Access

RECORD OF DECISION

East Side Access Project

prepared by

U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT) Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

and

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)

in cooperation with

Long Island Rail Road (LIRR)

Decision

The FTA, pursuant to 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 771.127 and by this environmental Record of Decision (ROD), finds that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) have been satisfied for the East Side Access Project ("Project"). The Project is Option 2 of the Preferred Alternative that was evaluated in the East Side Access Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) issued by FTA on March 6, 2001.

ATTACHMENT A MITIGATION MEASURES

Committed mitigation measures that are now incorporated into the Project are described in detail in the FEIS. This attachment summarizes the incorporated mitigation. The MTA-LIRR is required to make sure all mitigation measures committed to in the FEIS and summarized here are implemented.

MITIGATION FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS

TRANSIT

With the East Side Access Project, a number of improvements would be made to elements of the New York City Transit Lexington Avenue line subway station at 42nd Street/Grand Central Terminal. These measures are designed to mitigate congestion on stairwells, platforms, and line-haul capacity of the Lexington Avenue subway by improving circulation patterns and train throughput. The specific mitigation measures are listed below and illustrated in Figure S-6:

- Increase use of the free passage connecting NYCT fare control area 236 at the shuttle turnstile area entrance and fare control area 238 at the Lexington Avenue line western turnstile bank.
- Create a new turnstile bank just west of fare control area 238 to attract passengers from the free passageway area into the mezzanine area and relieve use of the western stair/escalator bank.
- Widen the corridor mouth into space currently occupied by the Pershing Building's basement to create a new stair P10.
- Restore stair P16.
- Enlarge fare control area 238's turnstile line farther east into the mezzanine area.



Stairwell and Fare Control Area Improvements 7 Lexington Avenue Subway at Grand Central Terminal





SLG IS THE TOP COMMERCIAL OWNER IN NYC



SOURCE: Cushman & Wakefield Research

3

SIZABLE NYC FOOTPRINT



r.

0

Retail 841K SF DPE 14.4M SF

Portfolio includes approximately 15% of commercial space in East Midtown

Interests in 101 Manhattan properties totaling 42.4M square feet (1)

Over 1,000 tenants



MIDTOWN

(1) As of 12/31/14

SIZABLE NYC FOOTPRINT

Grand Central

Π



23 Office Properties

13.3M Square Feet

CHALLENGES FACING EAST MIDTOWN

- Dated Building Stock Inefficient Floor Plates Low Ceiling Heights Aging Infrastructure
 - Lack of Environmentally Sustainable Features

IMPORTANT FOR EAST MIDTOWN:

PRESENT:

Halt Exodus from East Midtown

<u>FUTURE:</u>

- Speculative Office without Residential that will Require Unprecedented Rents
- Density Where Density Should Be
- \$210 Million of Transit Improvements
- Blueprint for Future Development
- Iconic Building & Beacon for East Midtown



James von Klemperer

Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates PC | Design Principal

PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Density at the heart of the city



PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN

Building Slopes Back for Light and Air





RECTANGULAR SCHEME

ONE VANDERBILT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Tapered Form



PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN

Transparency next to Solidity



PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Lifting to Reveal Grand Central Terminal



PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Building opens up to Grand Central


PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Contextual Materiality





PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Visual Transparency in Transit Hall



PROJECT DESCRIPTION & DESIGN Direct Public Access to Grand Central Terminal



Robert Schiffer

SL Green Realty Corp. | Managing Director

PUBLIC REALM BENEFITS Public Realm Improvement Bonus

- · Highest priority projects identified by the MTA and DCP
- SL Green is responsible for completion of these high priority projects
- This defined scope of work will be constructed by SL Green and its contractors
 - Improvements deliver benefits well in excess of the \$210mm cost

· Cost overruns are SL Green's responsibility

PUBLIC BENEFITS Components



PUBLIC BENEFITS Components



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS 4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Current Condition



PLATFORM LEVEL

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS 4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Current Condition at 6 PM



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS

4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Solution



PLATFORM LEVEL

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS

4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Solution



PLATFORM LEVEL

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS 4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Solution



MEZZANINE LEVEL

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS

4/5/6/7 at Grand Central Terminal: Solution



28

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Lexington Station SB Platform - Existing



NORTH EAST VIEW



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Lexington Station SB Platform - Proposed



NORTH EAST VIEW



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Lexington Station Expanded Mezzanine - Existing



NORTH VIEW



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Lexington Station Expanded Mezzanine - Proposed



NORTH VIEW



PUBLIC BENEFITS Components



ON SITE

ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Transit to Street: Current Condition (2023 - Projected ESA Completion)



ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Transit to Street: Solution



ONE VANDERBILT TRANSIT SIMULATION

ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS Proposed MTA Concourse



LOOKING AT TRANSIT HALL AND NEW STAIR



ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS Proposed MTA Concourse



PROPOSED MTA CONCOURSE, LOOKING AT ESA ESCALATOR AND STAIR TO STREET



ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS Transit Hall

\$~. _____



PROPOSED TRANSIT HALL, EXTERIOR VIEW LOOKING WEST

ON SITE IMPROVEMENTS Transit Hall



PUBLIC BENEFITS Topics



OPEN SPACE

OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS

Sidewalks and Vanderbilt Today

SIDEWALKS

- Congestion at corner of 42nd and Vanderbilt
- Overcrowding on Madison Avenue Bus stop on Madison Avenue adds to sidewalk congestion



42ND STREET AND MADISON

VANDERBILT

- Closed to traffic majority of the day
- When open, pedestrian / vehicle conflicts
- Drab and forgettable forecourt to GCT



42ND STREET AND VANDERBILT AVE

OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS

Sidewalk Widening and Vanderbilt: Solution

SOLUTION:

SIDEWALK

 7ft sidewalk widening along Madison Ave

Eroded South-East Corner at 42nd Street and Vanderbilt

VANDERBILT

Highest long-term value as plaza integrated with GCT

Functional pedestrian space

New public foyer to Midtown & iconic GCT

Eliminates pedestrian / vehicle conflicts

Closure has a de minimis impact on local traffic flow

50+% INCREASE IN WIDTH OF MADISON AVE

SIDEWALK

IMPROVEMENTS



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Sidewalk Widening at Madison Ave- Existing



LOOKING SOUTH ON MADISON AVE AND 42ND STREET

OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Sidewalk Widening at Madison Ave- Proposed Design



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Vanderbilt Public Place- Existing



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Vanderbilt Public Place- Potential Design



OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS Vanderbilt Public Place- Potential Design



PERMANENT OPERATING LABOR		TEMPORARY LABOR *	
LOCAL 32 BJ	145	CONSTRUCTION JOBS	3,400
LOCAL 94	25	SPILL-OVER JOBS	1,800
LOCAL 1,2,3 AND OTHER	20		
TOTAL PERMANENT OPERATING LABOR	190	TOTAL TEMPORARY LABOR	5,200

• TARGET 15% M/WBE

Ж

*

COMMITMENT TO A DIVERSE WORKFORCE (e.g. NEW)

CURRENT REAL ESTATE TAXES: \$7.9 MILLION

PROJECTED REAL ESTATE TAXES: \$49.7 MILLION

6X+ INCREASE IN REAL ESTATE TAXES

TIMELINE



PROJECT SUPPORTERS

- Hotel Trades Council
- · SEIU 32BJ
- Building and Construction Trades Council of Greater NY
- Regional Plan Association
- Straphangers Campaign
- Rudin Center for Transportation
- Grand Central Partnership
- · ABNY
- Building Trades Employers Association
- New York Building Congress
- American Institute of Architects
- · REBNY
- Nontraditional Employment for Women
- · Municipal Art Society
- · Riders Alliance
- · Regional Alliance of Small Contractors NY
Stephen Lefkowitz

Fried Frank | Partner

ULURP ACTIONS

 Special permit to allow transfer of unused development rights from Bowery Savings Bank (2.63 FAR) – Section 81-635

 Special permit to grant floor area bonus for construction of public realm improvements (12.37 FAR) – Section 81-641

Special permit to modify height and setback, streetwall, retail continuity, and other regulations – Section 81-642

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE GREEN SL Green Realty Corp. 2014 Sustainability Report



SLGREEN'S COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY IS **MULTIDIMENSIONAL: TENANT EXPERIENCES ARE ENHANCED, PORTFOLIO** QUALITY IS IMPROVED, **PROFITABILITY IS DRIVEN BY EFFICIENCIES, AND OUR POSITION AS BOTH AN** INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY LEADER IS DEMONSTRATED.

A Message From Our CEO:

With a property portfolio located in America's most dynamic and dense urban setting, the sustainability enhancement opportunities SL Green encounters in New York City are substantial. We continue to move forward, taking advantage of emerging technologies and the ongoing dedication and ingenuity of our employees.

From 2010 through 2013, SL Green has invested \$28.5 million toward energy efficiency opportunities, exceeding our target goals by more than \$2.4M, to save \$9.6M annually. In 2013, we expanded LED lighting across eleven additional properties, installed state-of-the-art building management systems, and upgraded core heating and air conditioning equipment. To support our tenants' use of electric vehicles, we installed electric vehicle charging stations at 17 suburban properties. 24 properties were awarded the US EPA Energy Star Label, including 15 buildings representing more than 12.5% of all Manhattan properties to receive this national designation. These achievements establish a strong position for continued success in 2014 and prompted Newsweek to name SL Green the sixth greenest real estate company in its rankings of "America's Greenest Companies 2014."

Our commitment to a 15% energy reduction by 2020 will not only result in significant economic benefits for SL Green. It also will work toward minimizing our environmental impact. Superstorm Sandy proved that New York City is, indeed, vulnerable to extreme weather events linked to climate change. We have responded by making improvements to our infrastructure that make our properties both more resilient and sustainable.

SL Green will maintain our leadership position in environmental innovation as we explore and implement progressive technologies that optimize building performance, and improve efficiency and resiliency through fuel cell, co-generation and renewable energy systems. New programs across the portfolio will achieve new environmental certifications and continue to exceed tenant sustainability goals. We will expand our involvement to the international environmental stage through ongoing participation in global environmental events, and our reporting initiative using the International Greenhouse Gas protocol standards.

The success of our sustainability program is integral to the overall success of the company. We are committed to being an industry leader in this effort – benefitting our stakeholders and sharing insights with our peers.

Marc Holliday, Chief Executive Officer

Our Approach: The Three Buckets of Sustainability

Sustainable development is responsible proactive decision-making and innovation that provides positive impacts on our economic and ecological prosperity. Today, new technologies related to electrical, steam, and lighting systems, real-time energy use analytics and onsite renewable energy are making sustainability in our industry more realistic than ever before. This is joined by opportunities in water conservation, recycling, municipal regulations, certification programs, incentives, emerging capital markets, tenant engagement, community outreach, awards, reporting, and speaking engagements. By organizing SL Green's sustainability initiatives into three categories – efficiency, tenant experience and industry leadership – we have built a framework that creates an avenue for successful quantifiable programs and positions us to capitalize on existing and emerging opportunities.

Efficiency is key to improving our business, saving resources and reducing costs. During the past year we have been successful both by tackling low hanging fruit and by implementing breakthrough technologies. Through LED lighting, we have saved enough energy to shut off more than three thousand televisions running 24/7/365, and recycled more than 3.5M square feet of carpet and ceiling tile since 2007, including 165,000 square feet from a single 2013 project at 100 Church Street alone.

Additionally, through **Tenant Experience**, we provide a "best in class" environment for our tenants. In one-on-one meetings we discuss building recycling programs; via webinars and through lobby and electronic messaging we build support and educate our tenants on sustainability. We assist with employee Earth Day events, provide critical building data for sustainable reporting, and host community events, such as "Re-Green NYC" where SL Green tenants and employees gathered to plant 76 ten foot tall trees at NYC's Randall's Island.

Finally, we demonstrate **Industry Leadership** by sharing these experiences throughout the community and showcasing our achievements via industry speaking events. We continually strive to strengthen and develop our leadership position by pursuing additional LEED certifications, most recently for 180 Maiden Lane.

As the importance of sustainability initiatives continue to grow, SL Green will continue to maintain a well-organized approach and ensure our position at the forefront in sustainability.

Jay Black, Director of Sustainability

<section-header>

Tenant Experience



Industry Leadership





Efficiency

8,000 LED LAMPS INSTALLED AT 11 PROPERTIES IN 2013 TO SAVE \$300,000 ANNUALLY



Um



GREEN IS INVESTING IN A BRIGHTER FUTURE

SL Green's commitment toward efficiency continues to grow rapidly. Since 2010, \$28.5M has been spent, including \$9.1M in 2013, to reduce consumption, improve maintenance costs, lower peak demand and optimize building performance. Active programs that introduce new state-of-the-art technologies including LED lighting, real time energy management solutions, and progressive HVAC automation systems, continue to yield significant cost savings. These accomplishments fuel our ambitions for tomorrow's emerging technologies including solar, cogeneration, fuel cells, continuous building analytics and wireless control systems.

The exploration of these exciting new opportunities coincides with our ongoing commitment, spending \$15.4M since 2010, to replace of endof-useful-life, and obsolete building equipment. Systems such as boilers, elevator systems and primary HVAC equipment across the portfolio are ultimately replaced to offer both improved operation and energy efficiency.

Better Bulbs – More Buildings

Cutting Edge LED Technology Expands to 11 Properties. Building on the successful installation of LED lighting at 22 properties in 2012, SL Green has expanded its program, installing more than 8,000 LED lamps at 11 properties to save \$300,000 annually. Focusing on high usage areas including lobbies, stairs, and mechanical rooms, LED lighting's superior efficiency, and lamp life, often greater than 8 years, and three to four times longer than other lighting technology, maximizes SL Green's energy savings, while significantly reducing material replacement costs throughout its portfolio. To date, this program has installed more than 24,000 LED Lamps to reduce operating expenses by more than \$900,000 annually, while achieving a payback of less than three years.



Critical Path

Project incentives are monies received from state and utility organizations to reduce overall efficiency project costs. These incentives play a vital role within SL Green's efficiency program, covering 20-50% of total project costs, and reduces our average project payback to less than three years.

Annual Incentives Received In Dollars



\$28.5 million dollars invested on energy efficiency since 2010.

Efficiency Exceeds Target

Actual savings from SL Green energy efficiency projects continue to show gains versus targeted annual savings.



Environmental Performance

As part of our 2013 reporting initiative, SL Green evaluates its environmental performance metrics for energy consumption, Greenhouse Gas emissions per the GHG Protocol, water consumption, and waste management data. These metrics utilize assessment standards consistent within all primary sustainable reporting programs today, incorporating information from all SL Green owned and directly operated buildings, located within New York City and the greater metro area.

Energy Consumption

The energy consumption by SL Green properties' shared landlord services between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Fuels (Natural Gas, Oil Fuel, Diesel fuel) District Services (Stearn, Chilled Water) Electricity 48,032 мwh 236,395 мwh 207,494 мwh

The energy consumption by SL Green tenants between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Fuels (Natural Gas, Oil Fuel, Dieset fuel)4,846 MWhDistrict Services (Steam, Chilled Water)6,503 MWhElectricity197,883 MWh

The total renewable energy produced on-site at SL Green properties and purchased off-site between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Renewable Energy Produced On-Site	102 мWh
Renewable Energy Purchased Off-Site	1,646 mwh

GHG Emissions

The daily business operations of organizations in the real estate sector generate direct and indirect GHG emissions. These Greenhouse gases are widely acknowledged to contribute to climate change. In order to identify SL Green and its tenant's impact on the environment due to these gases, the company's carbon emissions for the period January 1, 2013 until December 31, 2013 were calculated.

The Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 GHG Emissions generated by SL Green properties between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 were:

Scope 1 Emissions Base building direct energy Scope 2 Emissions Base building indirect energy Scope 3 Emissions Tenant energy usage

Total Combined Scope 1, 2 and 3 Emissions

Water Conservation

The total water consumed by SL Green properties between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Total Water Consumption

1,963,980 м3

25,563 mtCO2e

123,183 mtCO2e

58,126 mtCO2e

206,872 mtCO2e

Waste Management

The total waste from SL Green properties by type between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Total Weight of Hazardous Waste50 short tonsTotal Weight of Non-Hazardous Waste10,159 short tons

The total proportion of waste by disposal route from SL Green properties between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 was:

Recycled	79	%
Landfilled	21	%

Tenant Experience

79% OF ALL WASTE WAS RECYCLED IN 2013 – A TWO PERCENT INCREASE FROM 2012

ON

WAIT FOR WALL





Sustainability Creates A New "Best-in-Class" Experience

GREEN IS MAKING IT EASY TO PITCH IN

SL Green's focus on healthy working environments supports our tenants' growing commitment toward corporate environmental initiatives. By providing a new level of service throughout its portfolio, SL Green helps tenants develop reporting initiatives, build employee awareness, bolster program development and achieve critical LEED-Commercial Interior points for tenant construction. This is achieved through advancements in SL Green's effort to strengthen its relationships through outreach and education, electronic media, one-on-one meetings, building wide presentations, education webinars and environmental activities within our community. In 2013, SL Green made significant strides to offer its tenants new ways to engage our community, and capitalize on emerging technologies that build interest, awareness and participation in environmental sustainability.



SL Green Goes Electric

Charging Stations Installed at 17 Suburban Properties. Mass transit is the leading form of transportation within New York City, however throughout suburban properties, the car remains as the primary means of transportation. Recognizing the growing demand for more environmentally friendly forms of transportation, SL Green installed electric vehicle charging stations at 17 suburban office properties. This program is designed to benefit tenants who own both electric vehicles that run solely on electric power, as well as plug-in hybrid electric cars (PHEV's), which combine battery and gas-powered technology. A standard electric vehicle can be fully charged in about four hours.



Earth Action Day

SL Green, in conjunction with the New York Restoration Program and Urban Air Foundation, hosted "Re-Green NYC" at Randall's Island to Celebrate Earth Day. As part of the "MillionTreesNYC" program, more than sixty SL Green tenants and employees joined in to plant seventy-six, ten-foot tall trees. Planting trees within an urban environment helps reduce air pollutants, capture carbon dioxide, stabilize soil, prevent erosion and provide shade. One tree can absorb as much carbon in a year as a car produces driving 26,000 miles.



35Vsquare feet of carpet and ceiling tile, totaling more than 1,350 tons of debris, diverted from landfills since 2007

Industry Leadership

IN 2013, SL GREEN WAS AWARDED 12.5% OF ALL ENERGY STAR LABELS IN MANHATTAN



GREEN IS DOING MORE ABOUT USING LESS

SL Green's sustainability programs have rapidly transformed the commercial real estate landscape — creating new avenues for savings, improved performance and healthier work environments. While significant reductions in energy usage, water usage and waste generation benefit SL Green and its tenants, they also demonstrate SL Green's leadership in sustainability. As a result, we have been able to "Talk Green," maximizing our marketing opportunities throughout the industry by way of local and national events. Speaking engagements and media outreach, reporting and certifications, as well as participation in environmental organizations now play a critical role in SL Green's sustainability program.



Setting the LEED Stage

Sustainable Plans & Policies Expand the Portfolio. SL Green was among the first commercial office landlords in New York City to embrace green initiatives, receiving one of the city's first LEED-EB Silver certifications at 100 Park Avenue in 2009. Adding two LEED-EB Gold certifications in both 2011 & 2012, SL Green continues to utilize LEED across the portfolio, introducing its plans & policies to establish an environmental foundation at each property. Existing programs including no smoking, water efficiency, recycling requirements, integrated pest management, hardscape management and green cleaning continue to develop throughout the portfolio, while additional properties begin the initial steps toward certification.

LEEDing By Example

SL Green continues to play a prominent role within the industry and community to share education and awareness through participation in various speaking engagements and environmental committees. This participation offers a unique opportunity for SL Green to extend its leadership and experiences, combined with industry awards and certifications to drive visibility, brand recognition, and establish our position as a market leader in sustainability.

Industry Organization Sustainability Program Member

Urban Green Council (NYC Chapter of the US Green Building Council)—Platinum Sponsor, Committee Member, and Board of Directors Member

Real Estate Board of New York (REBNY) Sustainability Committee Member

Urban Air Foundation Committee Member

Urban Land Institute Sustainability Committee Member

The White Plains Earth Week Event Sponsor

Westchester Green Business Challenge Sponsor, Committee Member

Speaking Engagements

Indus	stry	Acad	lemic
3/13	BOMA NY Energy Action Conference	1/13	VCU Energy & Sustainability Conference
3/13	Westchester Business Council Mega Mixer	2/13	Yale University Sustainability Seminar
4/13	IREM Asset & PM Symposium: Energy Efficiency	3/13	Yale University Energy Efficiency Panel
8/13	Bisnow Sustainability Symposium	3/13	Temple University Sustainability Symposium
10/13	BNY Mellon Sustainability Summit	4/13	PACE Law Sustainability Seminar
			Cornell Environmental Studies - Guest Lecture

Environmental Awards & Recognition

BOMA: SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT: "BEST GREEN INITIATIVE: PORTFOLIO"

WESTCHESTER COUNTY GREEN BUSINESS CHALLENGE: ENERGY EFFICIENCY

NYC URBAN GREEN COUNCIL: EBIE AWARD WINNER

WATER EFFICIENCY: 360 Hamilton Avenue LEED Certification (37% Water Reduction)

NYC URBAN GREEN COUNCIL: EBIE AWARD FINALIST

LIGHTING EFFICIENCY: 919 3rd Avenue LED Lighting Project

BEST GREEN PROJECT: 360 Hamilton Avenue LEED Certification

UNIQUE GREEN PROJECT: Portfolio Real Time Energy Management System

LOOKING FORWARD

A Green Skyline

18

SL Green's vision of a new state-of-the-art office tower within midtown Manhattan will undoubtedly enhance our presence across the dynamic New York City skyline. The proposed development of One Vanderbilt will deliver a 21st century modern structure that responds to its vibrant and historical context, while introducing our continued vision for sustainability by exceeding LEED Gold standards, under its latest and most stringent version four, transforming how our tenants will conduct business, and enhance their work experience.

GREEN IS ALWAYS THINKING ABOUT WHAT COMES NEXT

Looking forward, SL Green is already developing next steps in its marketleading program. Continuing to address key initiatives within efficiency, tenant experience and industry leadership, SL Green is targeting new milestones and achievements over the next year, capitalizing on the rapid development of technology, information, and awareness surrounding its environmental sustainability program.

Optimize

Optimize building performance through real-time analytic software. Piloting this cutting edge technology will explore new opportunities to deliver key building insight at the granular level for operations staff to make more informed decisions to improve efficiency and peak performance.

Reduce

Explore state-of-the-art steam efficiency equipment on building hot water and HVAC systems with the potential to reduce steam usage by more than 30%.

Generate

Generate environmentally friendly onsite energy through cogeneration (CHP: Combined Heat Power) systems to enhance grid reliability and resiliency, while significantly reducing peak energy demand, and ensuring back-up generation capabilities available for building tenants.

Expand

Expand LED lighting retrofit program, installing 8,000 LED lamps across nine properties. Capitalize on additional market leading technology, LED lighting is 55% more efficient than other lighting products and significantly improves lamp life, often greater than 8 years, with a projected cost savings of \$370,000 annually.

Certify

Certify additional properties, including 180 Maiden Lane, to improve environmental standards, addressing energy efficiency, water consumption and recycling. Expand certification plans & policies, including green cleaning, integrated pest management, and no smoking throughout the portfolio to improve the portfolio's environmental footprint.

Collaborate

Collaborate with tenants to bolster building and office environmental initiatives. SL Green continues to improve awareness and education through extensive outreach programs including informational webinars, one-on-one meetings, electronic announcements, newsletters, lobby signage and community activities.

Conserve

Conserve water usage across NYC properties through the implementation of simple and cost effective retrofit opportunities. Continue to utilize LEED guidelines to establish improved water efficiency standards for fixtures including faucets, water closets and shower heads.

Advance

Advance recycling within SL Green's suburban portfolio through the expansion of its single stream program utilized across our New York City properties that diverts more than 79% of its office waste from landfills. Introduction of this program will double recycle rates within suburban properties.

About This Report

This is SL Green's second annual sustainability report and covers the 2013 calendar year. This report is a self-declared Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Application Level C report based on the GRI G3.1 and Construction and Real Estate Sector Supplement (CRESS) guidelines. A GRI G3.1 Content Index identifying the location of the Standard Disclosures in this report can be found on page 22.

There are no re-statements of information provided in earlier reports and no significant changes from previous reporting periods. In future years, SL Green plans to issue a sustainability report annually. The contact person for this report is Jay Black, SL Green's Director of Sustainability (jay. black@slgreen.com).

In developing this report, SL Green applied the 'Guidance on Defining Report Content,' the associated Principles and the Technical Protocol: 'Applying the Report Content Principles' to determine the report's scope, content, materiality and stakeholders. SL Green collected available data from all properties in which SL Green maintains direct operational control, including New York City and suburban buildings. Data from subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other entities are not included in this report.

In order to produce the most complete and accurate environmental performance inventory, SL Green hired CodeGreen Solutions, a sustainability and energy efficiency consulting firm to oversee the data collection process. CodeGreen Solutions worked with SL Green management and building staffs as well as the company's external consultants and service providers. SL Green distributed electronic questionnaires that collected facility energy consumption, Greenhouse Gas (GHG), water consumption and waste management data.

The GHG Inventory process was performed in accordance with quantification methodologies of the GHG Protocol. Each facility reported the annual consumption of all energy types including electricity, fuel, steam and chilled water used by the base building and direct and sub-metered tenants. To convert the raw data collected into carbon emissions, CodeGreen Solutions applied industry standard emissions factors published by the GHG Protocol.

About SL Green

SL Green Realty Corp., New York City's largest office landlord, focused primarily on acquiring, managing and maximizing value of Manhattan commercial properties. Formed in 1997, SL Green is a self-managed real estate investment trust, or REIT, with in-house capabilities in property management, acquisitions, financing, development, construction and leasing.

As of September 30, 2014, SL Green held interests in 96 Manhattan buildings totaling 44.1 million square feet. This included ownership interests in 28.0 million square feet of commercial buildings and debt and preferred equity investments secured by 16.1 million square feet of buildings. In addition to its Manhattan investments, SL Green held ownership interests in 35 suburban buildings totaling 5.9 million square feet in Brooklyn, Long Island, Westchester County, Connecticut and New Jersey.

The Board of Directors of SL Green Realty Corp. sets high standards for the company's employees, officers and directors. Implicit in this philosophy is the importance of sound corporate governance. It is the duty of the Board of Directors to serve as a prudent fiduciary for shareholders and to oversee the management of the company's business. To fulfill its responsibilities and to discharge its duty, the Board of Directors follows the procedures and standards that are set forth in these guidelines. These guidelines are subject to modification from time to time as the Board of Directors deems appropriate in the best interests of the company or as required by applicable laws and regulations.

The SL Green Realty Corp. Board held four meetings during fiscal year 2013, attended by all directors in office for meetings held during fiscal year 2013, with acting Chairman of the Board, Stephen L. Green, who is also an executive officer of SL Green Realty Corp. The Board has a unitary structure with four independent, non-executive members, including four standing committees: an Audit Committee, a Compensation Committee, a Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee and an Executive Committee. The current charters for each of the Audit Committee, Compensation Committee and Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee are available on our corporate website at www.slgreen.com under the "Investors— Corporate Governance" section.

As of December 31, 2013, SL Green had 305 corporate employees and 792 union employees. Our 401k benefits are made available to all full-time, non-union employees with monthly enrollment after 90 days of service. Other benefits offered to SL Green's Corporate employees include: Medical and Prescription Plans, Dental plans, Vision plan, Short-term and Long-term disability Insurance, Life and A&DD Insurance, Discounted Employee Stock Purchase Plan, Flexible Spending Accounts, Commuter Benefit Accounts, Paid-time off for vacation, holidays, and personal days, Health Club discounted membership, Wellness Program and Corporate Discounts.

Global Reporting Initiative G3.1 Content Index

The following GRI G3.1 Context Index is required within a GRI report and lists which Corporate Social Responsibility metrics are disclosed by the reporting company. The "Description" column includes pre-selected criteria developed by GRI. The "Cross-reference/Direct answer" column lists where the "Description" column criteria are found within this report.

Standard Disclosures Part I: **Profile Disclosures**

1 Strategy and Analysis

Profile Disclosure

1.1

Oescription

Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organization.

Oirect answer A Message from Our CEO

Cross-reference/

2. Organiz	rational Profile	
Profile Disclosure	Description	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
2.1	Name of the organization.	About SL Green
2.2	Primary brands, products and/or services.	About SL Green
2.3	Operational structure of the organization, including main divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries and joint ventures.	About SL Green
2.4	Location of organization's headquarters.	About SL Green
2.5	Number of countries where the organization operates, and names of countries with either major operations or that are specifically relevant to the sustainability issues covered in the report.	About SL Green
2.6	Nature of ownership and legal form.	About SL Green
2.7	Markets served (including geographic breakdown, sectors served, and types of customers/beneficiaries).	About SL Green
2.8	Scale of the reporting organization.	About SL Green
2.9	Significant changes during the reporting period regarding size, structure, or ownership.	About SL Green
2.10	Awards received in the reporting period.	Industry Leadership: Environmental Awards & Recognition

3. Report Parameters

Prohie Disclosure	pescription Description	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
3.1	Reporting period (e.g., fiscal/calendar year) for information provided.	About this Report
3.2	Date of most recent previous report (if any).	About this Report
3.3	Reporting cycle (annual, biennial, etc.)	About this Report
3,4	Contact point for questions regarding the report or its contents.	About this Report
3.5	Process for defining report content.	About this Report
3.6	Boundary of the report (e.g., countries, divisions, subsidiaries, leased facilities, joint ventures, suppliers). See GRI Boundary Protocol for further guidance.	About this Report
3.7	State any specific limitations on the scope or boundary of the report (see completeness principle for explanation of scope).	About this Report
3.8	Basis for reporting on joint ventures, subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other entities that can significantly affect comparability from period to period and/or between organizations.	About this Report
3.9	Data measurement techniques and the bases of calculations, including assumptions and techniques underlying estimations applied to the compilation of the Indicators and other information in the report. Explain any decisions not to apply, or to substantially diverge from, the GRI Indicator Protocols.	About this Report
3.10	Explanation of the effect of any re-statements of information provided in earlier reports, and the reasons for such re-statement (e.g.,mergers/acquisitions, change of base years/periods, nature of business, measurement methods).	About this Report
3.11	Significant changes from previous reporting periods in the scope, boundary, or measurement methods applied in the report.	About this Report
3.12	Table identifying the location of the Standard Disclosures in the report.	About this Report

4. Governance, Commitments, and Engagement

Profile Disclosure	Description	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
4.1	Governance structure of the organization, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organizational oversight.	About SL Green
4.2	Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer.	About SL Green
4,3	For organizations that have a unitary board structure, state the number and gender of members of the highest governance body that are independent and/or non-executive members.	About SL Green
4,4	Mechanisms for shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body.	About SL Green
4.13	Memberships in associations (such as industry associations) and/or national/ international advocacy organizations in which the organization: * Has positions in governance bodies; * Participates in projects or committees; * Provides substantive funding beyond routine membership dues; or * Views membership as strategic.	Industry Leadership
4.14	List of stakeholder groups engaged by the organization.	Industry Leadership
4.15	Basis for identification and selection of stakeholders with whom to engage.	Industry Leadership

Standard Disclosures Part III: Performance Indicators

Economic		
Performance Indicator	Description	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
ECONOMIC PE	RFORMANCE	
EC3	Coverage of the organization's defined benefit plan obligations.	About SL Green
Environme	ntal	
Performance Indicator	Description	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
ENERGY		
EN5	Energy saved due to conservation and efficiency improvements.	Efficiency
ËN6	Initiatives to provide energy-efficient or renewable energy based products and services, and reductions in energy requirements as a result of these initiatives.	Efficiency
EN7	Initiatives to reduce indirect energy consumption and reductions achieved.	Efficiency
WATER		
EN8	Total water withdrawal by source.	Efficiency: Water Conservation
EMISSIONS, EF	FLUENTS AND WASTE	
EN16	Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight.	Efficiency: GHG Emissions
EN17	Other relevant indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight.	Efficiency: GHG Emissions
EN22	Total weight of waste by type and disposal method.	Efficiency: Waste Management
EN24	Weight of transported, imported, exported, or treated waste deemed hazardous under the terms of the Basel Convention Annex I, II, III, and VIII, and percentage of transported waste shipped internationally.	Efficiency: Waste Management

Social: Labor Practices and Decent Work

Performance Indicator	Dascription	Cross-reference/ Direct answer
EMPLOYMENT		
LA3	Benefits provided to full-time employees that are not provided to temporary or part- time employees, by major operations.	About SL Green

SL Green Realty Corp., New York City's largest office landlord, is the only fully integrated real estate investment trust, or REIT, that is focused primarily on acquiring, managing and maximizing value of Manhattan commercial properties.

As of September 30, 2014, SL Green held interests in 96 Manhattan buildings totaling 44.1 million square feet. This included ownership interests in 28.0 million square feet of commercial buildings and debt and preferred equity investments secured by 16.1 million square feet of buildings.

In addition to its Manhattan investments, SL Green held ownership interests in 35 suburban buildings totaling 5.9 million square feet in Brooklyn, Long Island, Westchester County, Connecticut and New Jersey.

If you would like to learn more about this report or any of our other exciting initiatives, please visit the sustainability section of our website: www.slgreen.com or contact Jay Black, SL Green's director of sustainability at jay.black@slgreen.com





slgreen.com



SOLID TO THE CORE

	THE COUNCIL	
THE	CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card	
I intend to appear and	speak on Int. No Res. No)
V	in favor in opposition Date: 41315	
\bigcap	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Name: dichau	d T Anderson	
Address:	w Tark Building Con	Ne
I represent:		0
	THE COUNCIL	
THE	CITY OF NEW YORK	
	······	
	Appearance Card	
	speak on Int. No Res. No in favor _ in opposition).
	Date:	
Name: Margui	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Address: 623-He		
I represent: NEW	/ Local 12	
Address:		
•	THE COUNCIL	
THE	CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card	
I intend to appear and	speak on Int. No Res. No)
	´ in favor 🛛 in opposition	
	Date:4/13/1 (PLEASE PRINT)	15
Name: Colin		
	164th st MIC NV	
	Viele land Course pt	r. Vi
	York League of Conservation	

.

	THE	THE CO CITY OF		ORK	
		Appearan	ce Card		
	Ŷ	i speak on Int. I in favor	in oppositi Date:		No
	Mille S	stattery			
Address: I represen Address:			<u>;;;;;,,,,,1</u>		
		THE CO			
	THE	CITY OF		'ORK	
		Appearan	ce Card		
I intend		in favor			۱ا Noا
	1			J II	
Name: _	Bour Hen	(PLEASE	Date:		105
Address:	Bar the	(PLEASE	Date:		05
Address: I represen		(PLEASE	Date:		0\$
Address:	tJan Hen n: ABN	(PLEASE Strept - E BY R.L. THE CO CITY OF	Date: PRINT) The The DUNCIL NEW Y	Mopoul	05
Address: I represen Address:	totan Hen n: ABM THE	(PLEASE Strong F THE CO CITY OF Appearance speak on Int. N	Date: PRINT) Frie The DUNCIL NEW Y ce Card	Mopoul ORK	
Address: I represen Address:	totan Hen n: ABM THE	(PLEASE Strict Free THE CO CITY OF Appearant in favor	Date: PRINT) The The DUNCIL NEW Y ce Card No in opposition Date: PRINT)	Mopoul ORK Res. I	
Address: I represen Address: I intend Name: Address:	Dear Hkn n: ABM THE	(PLEASE Strop E THE CO CITY OF Appearant speak on Int. N in favor	Date: PRINT) Free The DUNCIL NEW Y ce Card No in oppositie Date:	Mopoul ORK Res. I	

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
in favor [] in opposition
Date:
(PLEASE PRINT) Name: Jom Witzught
Address
I represent: Regnomet 1 Plater Assecretion
Address:
THE COUNCIL Valerbilt
THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. <u>[197</u> Res. No
☐ in favor ☐ in opposition Date: <u>4[(4</u>
Date: <u></u> (PLEASE PRINT)
Name: Joseph Bsenberg
Address: Ro Maiden Long
I represent: Cathlic Community Relations Council
Address:
THE COUNCIL Varler 517
THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 10197 Res. No.
In favor in opposition Date: <u>4/14</u>
(PLEASE PRINT)
Name: Michael Silverman
Address:
I represent: <u>Central Synogage</u>
Address:
Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

	THE COUNCIL
	THE CIEV OF NEW VODV
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK Vanderbilt
	Appearance Card
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor in opposition
	Date: 04/13/15
	(PLEASE PRINT)
	Name: David Haase
	Address:
	I represent: MTA
	Address: 2 Broadwarp
	THE COUNCIL States and a second s
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK Vanderbilt
	Vanderbill
	Appearance Card
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor \Box in opposition $04/13/15$
	Date:
	(PLEASE PRINT) Name: Fredericka Cuenca
2	Address:
	I represent: MT4
	Address: 2 Broadwary
3	
	THE COUNCIL COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
	DCA# 12(0 - 2015 - A 5WC I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No.
	X in favor
	Date: Paril 1314, 2015
	(PLEASE PRINT)
	Name: Bobert Anic - RPO Inc.
	Address: 146 W. 29th ST. 2E NYC NY 10001
ł	1 represent: Dominique Ansel Kitchen LLC
	Address: 137 7th Ave South, NY, NY 10014
	Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

	πης σαινομ
	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to	appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor 🔲 in opposition
_	Date:
Name:	bsc Schiffer
Address: _	CH1/Lain
I represent:	St. Greden
Address:	THE CALINCII
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to	o appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	A in favor in opposition
	(PLEASE PRINT)
Name:	Tendre Mont Kelemperer
Address:	1: Slepredreen
I represen	
Address:	THE COUNCIL
	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend	to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor 🔲 in opposition
-	/ Date:
Name:	
Address:	Date: Stephen (PLEASE PRINT) Day - Black
	Date: Stephen (PLEASE PRINT) Day - Black

٦,

	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to a	ppear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor [] /in opposition Date:
Name:M	arc Holiday
Address:	
I represent: _	St Green
Address :	
Nga bata	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to ap	ppear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition Date:/13/wls
Name: U	ISSELL (PLEASE PRINT)
I represent:	
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to ap	pear and speak on Int. No Res. No X in favor I in opposition
	Date:
. 0	(PLEASE PRINT)
Name: <u>Co</u>	DISTADINO (GUS) SIRAKIS
Name: Address: I represent:	(PLEASE PRINT) DIJSTADINO (GUS) SIRAKIS 280 BROADWAY, NY NYC DEPT. OF BUILDINGS

•

٢

•

÷
THE COUNCIL VANDERBILT THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition Date: $\frac{4}{13}/2215$
(PLEASE PRINT) Name: WALLY RUBID
Address:
I represent: EVIKKI BARBERD Chair, Community Board
Address: 450 SEVENTH ANE FINCE
THE COUNCIL RE-ZONING
THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor I in opposition Date:
(PLEASE PRINT)
Name: ROXANNE WARPEN AIA
Address: 18:41 PARADWAY #1208, NYC 10023
I represent: VIGIONAL PROPOSAL OF INSTITUTE FOR
Address: RATIONAL URBAN MOBILITY, NC.
THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Appearance Card
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
in favor in opposition
Date: Date: Date: Philip Rubertson Address: I PAYK PLACE NY NY 10007 I represent: TACOS LLC Address: 131 7th Ave South
Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

T	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to appea	ar and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor Ø in opposition Date: 7.13.15
۸	(PLEASE PRINT)
Name:	drea Goldwyn
	Y Landmarks Conservoncy
	Whitchall 81- NITC 10004
	THE COUNCIL
- 1	HE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to appear	r and speak on Int. No. <u>LU 205</u> Res. No
	⊠ in favor □ in opposition Date:
	(PLEASE PRINT)
llater	
Name: Helen	Citelson
Address: 280	Citelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007
Address: 280 I represent: 7	Citelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007
Address: 280 I represent: 7	Citelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 073
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address:	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: 7	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address:	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: TH Vander bilt	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No.
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: Address: TH Vander bilt I intend to appear	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No. Res. No. □ in favor ∑ in opposition
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: 7 Mander bilt	Gitelson Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No.
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: TH Vander bilt I intend to appear Name: <u>Jahn</u>	Gridelian Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No Res. No In favor ⊠ in opposition Date:
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: TH Vander bilt I intend to appear Name: Jahn Address: 250	Gitelsin Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor ⊠ in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) W 94 St, Kow Yor K, NY
Address: 280 I represent: 7 Address: 7 TH Vander bilt I intend to appear Name: John Address: 250	Gridelian Bduy 7th Floor NYC 10007 OB THE COUNCIL IE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card and speak on Int. No Res. No In favor ⊠ in opposition Date:

.

	THE CITY	OF NEW Y	ORK	.
	Арре	earance Card		
I intend to a	ppear and speak on X in favor	📋 in oppositi		
Name: Address: I represent:	Edison Wa	EASE PRINT) Alkes Heeres		
Address:	32BJ			No. 12 and 13 and 14 and
		COUNCIL OF NEW Y	YORK	
	App	earance Card]	
I intend to a	ppear and speak on A in favor	📋 in oppositi	ion	
Name:	(PLI	Date:		
Address: I represent: Address:	3 Minicipals	te Arsta Se	ciety	sirval
	TUE	COUNCIL		
. '		OF NEW J	ORK	
	Арр	earance Card] ~	
I intend to a	ppear and speak on			No
Name: KM	(PLI	Date: EASE PRINT) Farg &		
Address:	us Nerettadritidu	Et deniplayn	nent for	spittmen

	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
Lintend to	appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
i intenu to	in favor
	// Date:
N	(PLEASE PRINT) Bondillastreastre Thomajoulos
Name:	Donaide Shrangsute Midnugouius
I represent:	BUSNALLY Trade Employers Association
Address:	- showing read a wisges resources
and the second secon	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to	appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor 🔲 in opposition
	Date: (PLEASE PRINT)
Name:	Dichler 11 Audresson
Address:	
I represent:	NY, Brendelinger Congress Transformeter
Address: _	
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to	appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor 🔲 in opposition
	Date:
Name	(PLEASE PRINT)
Address: _	
Address: _	
Address: _	SkyBertopog (Museurs

•

	THE COUNCIL	
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card]
T · / 1		J
I intend to app	pear and speak on Int. No Res. No X in favor _ in opposition	-
	/\ Date:	
Neme: /	(PLEASE PRINT) 20 Korien	
Address:		
I represent:	Lever House	
Address :		-
	A MARCHINE COUNCIL	
1	THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card	
I intend to app	pear and speak on Int. No Res. No	
	in favor 🗌 in opposition	
	Date:	
	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Name: <u>JO</u>	(PLEASE PRINT) Of Rosen bug	
Address:	or Rosenberg	:
Address:	•	
Address:	de Rosenberg Archdiocoge	
Address: I represent: Address:	Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL	
Address: I represent: Address:	de Rosenberg Archdiocoge	<u></u>
Address: I represent: Address:	Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL	*:= x1133
Address: I represent: Address:	Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card	ME
Address: I represent: Address:	Ole Rasen bug Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card Dear and speak on Int. No Res. No Dear and speak on Int. No Res. No	*: .
Address: I represent: Address:	Ole Rasen bug Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card Marchaeler and speak on Int. No Res. No Marchaeler in opposition Date:	₩.= 3
Address: I represent: Address:	Ole Rasen bug Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card Dear and speak on Int. No Res. No Dear and speak on Int. No Res. No	
Address: I represent: Address: I intend to appe	Ole Rasen bug Archdiocoge THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card March and speak on Int. No Res. No March and speak on Int. No	
Address: I represent: Address: Address: I intend to appending Name: Bill	Ole Rasen bug Archdiocare THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card Marchaeter and speak on Int. No Res. No Marchaeter and speak on Int. No Res. No Date:	

		CITY OF		VIII		
		Appearan	ice Card			
I intend	1	speak on Int. in favor] in oppositio	on	No	
Name: _	Vishaa	(PLEASE	Date: PRINT) abarti			
Address:	1-1	1				
I represe	mt: <u>SHa</u>) 5.65% %c5 .3	ich pas	ISKID	<u> </u>	
Address:	میں					
		THE CO			97 <u>7</u> 1	
	THE	CITY OF	NEW Y	ORK		i
	٠	Appearan	ce Card			<u> </u>
I intend	to appear and	speak on Int.	J	Res.	No	
	, i A]´in oppositio		٩	
	1	(PLEASE	Date:		•	
Name: _	Refes e	Lempin				
Address:				1	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	
I represe	m: Drand	2 Contra 1	Pertine	rship		
Address:					TE C 15 CT	
		THE CO		ADIZ	r ŋer	ļ
	THE	CITY OF	NEW Y	UKK		
,		Appearan	ce Card		U 202	
I intend	to appear and	speak on Int. I	No	<u> </u>	No	
,		in favor 🔲	_			
	, I	A (PLEASE	Date: PRINT)			-
	Joshua	(PLEASE Rinesmith			۰	
Àddress:		evelopment	F forn.*	<u> </u>	1 1 1 1 1 1	-72
I represen	nt: 30^{nu}	evel privit	to Terperse	ຍ	· · ·	

- THE COUNCIL STAIRWELL	
THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
Appearance Card	
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No	
Kin favor in opposition	
$Date: - \frac{7 \left(\frac{13}{3015} \right)}{(PLEASE PRINT)}$	
Name: EDWARD FERRIER / 1.	
Address: METROTECH BKUN	
I represent: <u>F.D. N. Y.</u>	
Address: <u>9 METROTECH BKYN</u>	
THE COUNCIL	
THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
Appearance Card	
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. VAMER BLTRes. No.	
in favor in opposition	
Date: (PLEASE PRINT)	
Name:	
Address: 155 E. 38 ST	
I represent: CBGM MULTI BO. TASK FORCE	-
Address: 846 UN AZA NYNY 55	
THE COUNCIL Vandebilt	اهت
THE CITY OF NEW YORK	,
Appearance Card	·
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition	
Date:	
(PLEASE PRINT)	
\sim 1.4/0 (AISI/CO	
Name: 1700915100 .	
Name: $17000000000000000000000000000000000000$	
atu satu (+	

172	
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. UANDERBIL Res. No.
	in favor M in opposition
	Date:
	Name: ELLEN IMBIMBO Address: 40 PARK AV.
	Name:
	Address: RAIM MULT, BR TACK GREE
	I represent: CB6M_ MULTI BD. TASK FORCE
	Address:
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK Vanderbilt
	Appearance Card
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor in opposition
	Date:
	Name: Robert Paley
	Address:
	I represent: MTA
	Address: 2 Broadway
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK VANDERBILT
	Appearance Card
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor in opposition 4/13/15 Date: 4/13/15
	(DI FASE DRINT)
	Address: Goldman Harris LLC
	I represent: Roosevelt Hotel
	Address: 45 245
	Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms
	7 1

.

Т	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to appe	ar and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor
	Date:
Name:	Blue 1 St (13 tt trere S
I represent:	BJades Councita
Address:	
	THE COUNCIL
1	HE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to appe	ar and speak on Int. No Res. No
	Date:
grand & 1	(PLEASE PRINT)
	heen Buchthame
Address:	A ALL F. IK. G. HI F. LA
	where this the h-Eng potymaset (Eng, homen ??
Address:	
	THE COUNCIL
T	HE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend to appea	ur and speak on Int. No Res. No
	in favor 🔲 in opposition
	Date:
Name: Carl	Contractions
Address:	
I represent: Bu	Ading Construction Trades Council
r tehresent: 1240	

I represent: Rider Aller Aller Address: Address: THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:	TH	THE COUNCIL E CITY OF NEW Y	YORK
Address: I represent:		Appearance Card	
(PLEASE PRINT) Name: Address: I represent: NTHE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL I represent: Address: I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. (PLEASE PRINT) Name: THE COUNCIL I represent: PLACE Address: I represent: I represent: PLACE THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL Address: I represent: Appearance Card Intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Mage		in favor 📋 in opposit	ion
Address: I represent: Name: Address: Intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. I in favor I in favor I in favor I in opposition Date: I represent: Res. No. I represent: Res. No. I represent: Res. Address: I represent: Res. I represent: Res. Address: I represent: Res. Address: I represent: Res. Name: CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card Intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Min favor I in opposition Date: I represent: Res. I represent: Res. No. Res. Res. No. Res. Res. I represent I represent I represent I represent I represent I represent	Name: Jene	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Address:	Address:		
THE COUNCIL THE COUNCIL Appearance Card	•	YET RHAME	
THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Mame: Madress: I represent: Res. Present: Res. Present: Res. Present: Res. Present: Address: I represent: Res. Present: Res. Present: Res. Res. Name: Control Intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Res. Res. No. Res. Res. No. Res. Res. No. Res. Res. Res. No. Res. Res. Res. Res. Res. <th>Address:</th> <th></th> <th></th>	Address:		
Appearance Card I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. I in favor I in favor I in favor I in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name: Then WSIF yeardes Address: I represent: Riders: THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Kin favor I in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT)			
I intend to appear and speak on Int. No	TH	E CITY OF NEW Y	UKK
in favor in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:		Appearance Card	
(PLEASE PRINT) Name: Thich Wilfrentes Address: I represent: Riders: Allence Address: THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor [] in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name: Russell Mage(
I represent: Rider Aller Aller Address: Address: THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:	Name: Dirch	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Address: THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No Kin favor [] in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name: Name:	Address:	3	
THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Min favor In opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT)	I represent:		C 199 03
THE CITY OF NEW YORK Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No. Min favor In opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:	موسيتين السباب والمتحالية المتحالية والمتحسين المت		
Appearance Card intend to appear and speak on Int. No. In favor In opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:			ADV
intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor [] in opposition Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:		GITY OF NEW Y	UKK
Image: Russell Junger		Appearance Card	
Date: (PLEASE PRINT) Name:Russell Mager	I intend to appear an	SF7	
(PLEASE PRINT) Name: Russell Mager	ų,	יא –	'n
	0	(PLEASE PRINT)	······
	Name: 18455e	11 Unger	
	Address:	Hotacith Cound	.1
	Address:	States Counce	····

,

T.	HE CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card	
I intend to appea	r and speak on Int. No Res. No In favor I in opposition	
Name: Do	Date: (PLEASE PRINT) PRIET Contreras	
Address:	SEIU 32BJ	· ·
I represent:		
T	HE CITY OF NEW YORK ^{1 V}	
,	Appearance Card	
I intend to appea	r and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor in opposition	
,	Date:	<u> </u>
Name: <u> </u>	Son Walkes	<u>.</u>
Address:	SEIU 32BJ	
A . 171		
	THE COUNCIL	
Ţ	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK Vo	ndeih
	Appearance Card	. <u> </u>
I intend to appe	ar and speak on Int. No Res. No.	
I mond to app	🕼 in favor 🗌 in opposition	ļ
	Date:	
Name: Edi	(PLEASE PRINT)	
Name: <u>Edi</u> Address:	(PLEASE PRINT)	

	THE CAINA	TT
	THE COUNC THE CITY OF NE	W YORK Vanderli
	Appearance Car	
I intend to a	ppear and speak on Int. No	Res. No
<i></i>	🗊 in favor 🔲 in op	position
Names F	Da (PLEASE PRINT (GMC Luchald	ute:
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Address:	NCP	
Address:		
and the second secon	THE COUNC	
	THE CITY OF NEW	-
	Appearance Car	ď
I intend to a	ppear and speak on Int. No	Res. No
	🕼 in favor 🗌 in op	position (*
		ite:
Name:	Anita Larement	,
Address:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
I represent: .	NCK	<u>}</u>
Address: <		
عظيين المستعملين بدراف	THE COUNC	Trey Je
	THE CITY OF NEW	
	Appearance Car	d 60202
I intend to a	ppear and speak on Int. No.	Res. No
	🗋 in favor 🔲 in op	position
		ste:
Name: 10	(PLEASE PRINT	
Address:	57 WOST 3857.	
Address:		

	THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
,	Appearance Card	
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor	
	Date: (PLEASE PRINT)	
	Address:	
	I represent: Hoteltientrades Countil	
	Address:	
	THE COUNCIL	
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card	
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No	
	in favor 🔲 in opposition	
	(PLEASE PRINT)	
	Name: Dehna thuckatan	
	Address:	
	I represent: Regionand's Alliances of Small Contractors NY	
	Address: THE COUNCIL Stainells	
	THE COUNCIL Stainells THE CITY OF NEW YORK	
	Appearance Card 205	
	I intend to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No	
	Date:/	
	Name: Frank Ruchalo	
	Name: / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	
	I represent: DCV	
	Address: 22 Kreide	

	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
	Appearance Card
I intend	d to appear and speak on Int. No Res. No in favor [] in opposition
Name:	(PLEASE PRINT)
Address:	
I repres	ent: NAM VS. Lingue & Conservation Visters
Address	
•	Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms
	THE COUNCIL
	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
I intend	THE CITY OF NEW YORK
I intend	Appearance Card Image: Card to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Image: Card Image: Card
I intend Name:	Appearance Card Image: Card to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. Image: Card Image: Card Image: Card
	Appearance Card to appear and speak on Int. No. Res. No. in favor in opposition Date:

.

.

	[OF NEW Y	VII V	
		earance Card		<u> </u>
I intend t	o appear and speak or Xin favor	r 🔲 in oppositio		
Name:	(PL Stephentlief	EASE PRINT)		
		<u> </u>		
	SL Gaver	<u> </u>		
Address:	lease complete this card	l and return to the Ser	geant-at-Arm	
		and the second		
		OF NEW YO	ORK	
	Appe	arance Card		
	appear and speak on			
I intend to	💢 in favor	in opposition		
I intend to	$A^{\circ} X$	_		
I intend to	i X	Date: ASE PRINT)		
I intend to Name:	i X	Date:		
-	i X			