Meeting Date: April 4, 2013

Members in attendance: Barbara Albrecht, Robert Berne, Corey Blay, Sewin Chan, Mariam Ehrari, Allyson Green, Wen-Jui Han, James Jacobs, Angela Kamer, Perri Klass, Marty Kurth, Ted Magder (chair), Laurence Maslon, Tony Movshon, Rosemary Scanlon, Andrew Schotter, Jalal Shatah, Matt Stanley, David Vintinner, Diane Yu

Members unable to attend: John Billings, Mary Cowman, David Engel, Panos Mavromatis, Tony Saunders, Larry White

1. Call to order and announcements

In addition to the members noted above, Michael Patullo attended as staff coordinator for the Group.

The meeting began with a discussion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the NYU Core Plan, which was submitted to the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission and finalized in May 2012. This document, which is available at the following link, presents the details and effects of the plan prior to the conclusion of the ULURP. Members noted that it is important for the community to recognize that the plan as presented in the FEIS document may not represent the exact details of the final implemented plan, as many details, like the inclusion of a hotel, were disallowed by the City and since the Working Group’s deliberations and recommendations are not bound by this document.

2. Discussion of recent Town Hall Meetings

- **Space:** Members of the subcommittee on academic and non-academic space summarized the proceedings at the town hall meeting on March 27. They suggested that some of the most important things that they realized were the need to connect more with students and their concerns, and the need to discuss the issues surrounding athletic and recreational space. Members also recognized the challenge in asking for community input before forming recommendations, and signaled support for another round of community input prior to the release of a final report.
• Finance: Members of the subcommittee on finance noted that their meeting, which had somewhat low attendance, was largely a conversation with a vocal cohort of students. While some faculty raised questions about the interconnections between the finances of the University and the Medical Center, members noted that the conversation was not charged nor was the meeting well attended.

The Working Group engaged in a broader discussion about the lower-than-expected attendance and discussed various potential attributing factors, including an overall lack of engagement surrounding these issues, cynicism on the part of the community, and an easing of tensions as a result of the work undertaken by the Group thus far. Members agreed that while the meetings helped with transparency, there may be a need to further engage with students and to schedule further meetings once preliminary recommendations had been formed.

3. Update on Quality of Life Subcommittee

Members of the subcommittee on quality of life described their recent meetings with Executive Vice President Alison Leary and Dave Gruber from Community Board #2. The subcommittee plans to hold an additional meeting with members of the Washington Square Village and Silver Tower Tenants Associations, respectively. In particular, the subcommittee is examining the following broad issues: remediation and mitigation measures; possible uses of school and community space (Bleecker building); planning and stewardship of current and proposed open/public spaces; status of supermarket/retail/commercial spaces on the superblocks; and the covenant of trust between NYU and the local community. Members noted that many of these issues are related to both the northern and southern blocks, despite that the Working Group is primarily focused on the plans for the southern block. Members not on the Quality of Life Subcommittee urged the committee to examine the issue of trust between NYU and the residents of Washington Square Village and Silver Towers, including following up on promises made to residents in the past.

4. Discussion of principles and objectives

Addressing several comments offered at the town hall meetings regarding the timing of the Working Group’s proceedings, members discussed the following possibilities for activities before the end of the Spring semester:
  o Continue to deliberate this semester, reconvene in the fall, and delay producing a final report until fall 2013
  o Work to have a final report by mid-May 2013
  o Produce an interim report or year-end report by mid-May 2013 that offers tentative recommendations, reconvene in the fall, and produce final report by end of October 2013

Members discussed the merits of each proposal and individually signaled their support for one of the aforementioned plans. Some members noted that the subcommittees may need
more time to gather and analyze data before being prepared to offer recommendations. All agreed that the foremost concern is producing a report of high quality and that addresses the issues set forth in the charge.