

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

Over the past year, the Cobble Hill Association has taken part in the community-informed planning process for the Brooklyn Marine Terminal Vision Plan.

As the scheduled vote approached, we began receiving a wave of community emails, many in opposition to the Vision Plan. Some of that opposition stemmed from real, thoughtful disagreement. But some also reflected significant confusion or misinformation about the process and the plan. We've always tried to present information as clearly and neutrally as possible, sharing community wins while being candid about outstanding issues. That doesn't mean we agreed with every part of the process. But we believed that presenting facts respectfully, and avoiding inflammatory rhetoric, was the best way to build trust and keep the conversation constructive.

In hindsight, our choice not to go on the record correcting every misconception may have backfired. In trying to stay out of the fray, we may have created space for misrepresentations to take root and spread. That became clear as opposition surged, often fueled by claims that simply weren't accurate.

So on June 24, we sent out [an email](#) trying to distinguish between what's settled and what's still on the table—between subjective concerns and factual misunderstandings. That message wasn't a defense of the plan, or of the process. It was an attempt to clarify, at a moment when things were becoming increasingly muddled. Those are reprinted at the end of this document as entries 13 to 18.

These were not the only objections raised. However, because many of the responses involve a degree of subjectivity, we were hesitant to issue formal replies prior to the Board's vote. In the interest of transparency, below are my responses to the objections received, I am presenting this to the Board at the time of the vote, along with my recommendation.

All of these responses were shared in public meetings that were recorded, board and committee meetings, community updates, in conversations, and in written responses to community members. Many of them can be found on the dedicated [CHA BMT website](#). What's different now is that they're all in one place. I share this document in the spirit of transparency, respectful disagreement, and a shared commitment to making the best possible decisions for our neighborhood and our city.

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

BMT Questions & Answers: July 15, 2025

1. How can the CHA consider voting for a plan that many community members oppose—especially when survey results show limited support for housing and maritime uses?
2. How should we factor into the decision that we may have a new Mayor after November? And can't a new Mayor can just undo the whole thing?
3. We can't hand over city-owned land to developers.
4. The traffic and congestion impacts on the neighborhood from the proposed housing are unacceptable given current unbearable conditions. How can you approve a Vision Plan without more traffic studies, especially since the EIS is basically predetermined?
5. Why can't we hold out for a "Brooklyn Bridge Park 2.0" – a beautiful park with only enough housing to support its upkeep?
6. EDC is untrustworthy and any benefits obtained through this process are merely illusory.
7. The entire site should be "port-first" and paid for with public funds because the container port and Blue Highway are critical to our economy, safety, and environment.
8. What guarantee do we have that anything in the Vision Plan will actually be adhered to?
9. The affordable housing is not "affordable".
10. The build out will inhabit a decade of construction noise, pollution and disruption to small communities and businesses which will be overrun with heavy traffic.
11. It's inappropriate to build housing in a flood zone.
12. It's wrong for the CHA to have opposed towers in their own neighborhood as part of the LICH redevelopment, but support a project that would place towers adjacent to the Columbia Street Waterfront District and Red Hook.
13. This is not a vote between the Vision Plan and the status quo.
14. A "no" vote does not result in a new process under the City's ULURP, but rather will go through the GPP process
15. The Task Force structure is not guaranteed in a future GPP.
16. This is only the first stage of a multi-stage process.
17. The CHA represents one voice in a multi-stakeholder process.
18. Community input was incorporated into the Vision Plan

1. How can the CHA consider voting for a plan that many community members oppose—especially when survey results show limited support for housing and maritime uses?

The CHA Board, not just myself, takes this concern seriously. We've read the emails, attended the meetings, reviewed the survey data, and listened to every resident who reached out—whether in support or opposition.

But the role of the CHA board isn't simply to tally opinions. When CHA joined the Task Force, we committed to a collaborative process. That meant working with City Hall, elected officials, maritime and industrial stakeholders, citywide housing and transportation advocates, and adjacent neighborhoods to reach a compromise. Insisting on a plan that reflected only Cobble Hill's preferences would have weakened our credibility and limited our ability to advocate for meaningful outcomes. To now base our vote solely on whether the plan meets all of Cobble

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

Hill's preferences would undermine the good-faith negotiations we engaged in—and could seriously hinder our ability to advocate effectively for our community in the future.

The CHA survey was an important tool that helped identify community priorities and shaped our Position Statement. That statement set conditions for earning our support—on open space, affordability, design, and traffic—and many of those conditions have now been met. Still, the survey was not a vote. Our responsibility is to weigh community input alongside broader factors: how the site is being redeveloped, what's realistic in a state-run GPP process, and what alternatives are likely.

For example, the survey showed strong support for open space (~90%) and far less for maritime or industrial uses (~20%). But support for maritime use from other Task Force members, elected officials, and adjacent communities made clear that continued maritime use would be a central feature of any plan. Rather than insisting on an outcome that was never politically viable, we focused on securing open space priorities—which, because of that pragmatic approach, we did.

Survey respondents also expressed little support for housing. That's understandable—most already have housing in the neighborhood. But the CHA recognized both the scale of the affordable housing crisis and the political and financial reality that housing would be part of this redevelopment. Rather than opposing all housing, our Position Statement identified housing-related concerns and offered reasonable guidelines. After sustained advocacy, those guidelines were incorporated into the plan.

We're now tasked with weighing this compromise plan—and its impacts—against likely future alternatives. While we can't know exactly what a future EDC might propose, we don't have to guess what the plan could have looked like without the Task Force. In January 2025, EDC presented a set of concept plans reflecting little to no community/Task Force input, which included denser housing, significantly less open space, fewer affordable housing units, and no additional community benefit commitments. Their first transportation plan included a "Spine Road" that would have induced even more truck traffic through the neighborhood. Those outcomes would have been objectively worse, not just for Cobble Hill, but for the broader area.

The key question is whether the negotiated outcomes, while not perfect, produced a stronger site plan, better commitments, and more community oversight than we're likely to get in a reset process. This isn't a simple decision, and reasonable people will disagree. The Vision Plan is not perfect. No plan of this scale ever will be. But I believe it reflects hard-won community input and delivers meaningful benefits, not only to Cobble Hill, but to our neighbors across Brooklyn, while keeping the community at the table as the next phase of the project takes shape. This doesn't mean ignoring opposition. But it also doesn't mean that supporting the Vision Plan is a betrayal of Cobble Hill. To the contrary, I believe the plan reflects the hard work of compromise and includes real, lasting gains that would not have been secured without our involvement.

2. How should we factor into the decision that we may have a new Mayor after November? And can't a new Mayor can just undo the whole thing?

There's no clear answer to how a new mayoral administration might approach this project. A second Adams term would likely mean continuity. A new mayor, whether it's Assemblymember Zohran Mamdani, or another candidate, could decide to scrap the plan,

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

revise it, or leave it largely intact. But it's impossible to know now how a future administration will prioritize this project, especially in the context of other citywide needs.

More relevant are the real strains on the City's financial resources created by a turbulent economy, federal cuts to crucial services for low income and immigrant communities, and a recently passed federal budget bill that will slash public benefits. These will exist regardless of who is Mayor. Any future administration will face tough choices about where to allocate limited public resources. Major investments in port infrastructure and public open space may not rise to the top of that list. And while a new administration may emphasize affordable housing, building it at scale still requires substantial public funding and long lead times, especially outside of projects like this that generate their own cross-subsidies.

Another relevant consideration is that, regardless of the outcome in November, the elected officials who helped shape this Vision Plan will remain in office. They played a meaningful role in negotiating key commitments and have every incentive to push for follow-through, especially on interim transportation measures to address existing traffic conditions. It's also true that those same officials would likely advocate for community priorities in any new process. But as with other GPPs, the only binding vote from elected officials comes at the very end, when the final plan is presented to the Public Authorities Review Board. Until then, much of their influence depends on the structures and momentum already in place.

3. We can't hand over city-owned land to developers.

The City is not selling the land; it will retain long-term control through a ground lease, with community oversight embedded in the governance structure. While we cannot control how the City chooses to manage its property, the Task Force, guided by community feedback, secured meaningful obligations on future developers. These include RFP requirements for pedestrian-priority streets, reduced car and truck dependence, resilient design, and sustainability standards. Just as important, the newly created BMTDC will have the authority to approve contracts and enforce compliance, helping prevent outcomes like Atlantic Yards, where a developer's failure to deliver affordable housing was ultimately excused. Rejecting this plan doesn't avoid private development, but it could result in losing the safeguards, leverage, and enforcement mechanisms we've secured here.

4. The traffic and congestion impacts on the neighborhood from the proposed housing are unacceptable given current unbearable conditions. How can you approve a Vision Plan without more traffic studies, especially since the EIS is basically predetermined?

Traffic is one of Cobble Hill's most pressing concerns, particularly on Columbia, Hicks, and Clinton Streets. For decades, these corridors have borne the brunt of regional through-traffic: vehicles cutting through our neighborhood to bypass the BQE trench or access regional routes. This traffic burden is largely unrelated to local population or development, it existed long before the Vision Plan and absent intervention will remain even if this plan doesn't move forward.

Much of the current debate around BMT conflates this longstanding, regional through-traffic with traffic that may result from future development. That distinction is critical. The Vision Plan does not significantly worsen existing regional traffic. In fact, thanks to persistent advocacy by the Task Force, it avoids designs that would have made it worse, most notably, a

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

previously proposed “Spine Road” that would have routed trucks through residential streets to reach the Atlantic Avenue on-ramp.

EDC is right when it says the Vision Plan “won’t solve existing traffic problems.” But it does offer tools and leverage we’ve never had before—alongside specific strategies to reduce future development-related traffic. Opponents are right to be frustrated that the plan doesn’t resolve the traffic conditions we live with today, and to question whether our streets can handle even a modest increase. But advocates are right to point out that the proposed transit investments, site design, and agency coordination could, for the first time in years, create meaningful pathways to address both.

This is a difficult and good-faith disagreement. The CHA Waterfront & Infrastructure Committee has reached a different conclusion, one I respect, even if I interpret the data and risks differently.

What follows is the reasoning behind my view: that while this plan doesn’t offer guarantees, it presents the best opportunity in years to reduce car reliance, improve transit access, and gain traction on a long-neglected traffic problem. When balanced against the very real risk of a future plan with more density and less oversight, and considered alongside the structure we’ve secured for continued community involvement, it deserves serious consideration.

1. Population-Driven Traffic

Density in and of itself doesn't increase vehicle traffic--it increases the number of *people* in an area. Whether those people rely on cars depends on a number of factors including parking and roads, public transportation options, and proximity to daily needs like grocery stores, schools, and retail. The same strategies that reduce car reliance for new residents can do the same for existing ones. But most of these improvements—like walkable/bikeable street design, roadway improvements, transit enhancements, and local amenities, aren’t coming without new development. While no single strategy is enough, working together they create a comprehensive plan to tackle current traffic problems while also managing future growth.

a. Pedestrian-forward design

The Vision Plan includes a comprehensive set of strategies as part of the new development aimed at reducing reliance on private cars. It requires developers to include strategies that reduce car and truck use, limit freight impacts, and prioritize pedestrian-first street design. The plan also emphasizes early integration of bike and micro-mobility options. Two full circulation plans, developed with community input, will study off-site traffic impacts, extending beyond Columbia Street. While traffic is a valid concern, it’s also dynamic: better transit and street design can shift behavior and reduce demand over time. Induced demand is the same theory the CHA has relied upon in advocating for a two-lane BQE, and it would be disingenuous to dismiss its applicability here. People change their behavior depending on traffic, like walking, using transit, combining trips, or avoiding peak times. Not everyone can make this choice, but many can and do.

b. Public Transit

New residential development at BMT is what makes expanded public transit viable. The MTA uses ridership and population data to shape service, and the expected growth has

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

prompted a commitment to work with agencies and officials on improvements. This could include upgrades to the B61 and potential extensions to routes like the B63, B57, and B81, as well as a study exploring a direct bus to Manhattan. The plan also allocates \$25 million for a shuttle to nearby subways, and NYC Ferry service will be improved with shorter wait times. These transit upgrades wouldn't happen without increased density, and while some residents will still drive, expanded alternatives help reduce overall car reliance for everyone.

c. Commercial & Community Spaces

While school and infrastructure planning typically follows the EIS process, the Vision Plan takes a proactive approach by reserving space for a new school in BMT North. It also commits to prioritizing community-serving retail, like a grocery store. These measures aim to meet local needs, reduce car trips and deliveries, and support a more connected, walkable neighborhood.

2. Through Traffic

The redevelopment has created momentum with the DOT to address current traffic and pedestrian safety issues, including a commitment to working with EDC on interim measures once the BQE traffic modeling is complete, and an openness to study the closure of the Atlantic Avenue on ramp. The plan also allocates \$2 million for updated studies on decking or bridging the BQE trench, critical early steps toward long-term infrastructure fixes that will improve the flow of pedestrians to and from the waterfront, which in turn will also reduce traffic. For the first time, we have a structure in place: an Advisory Task Force, buy-in from DOT, and a commitment to resume traffic studies post-BQE planning.

Conclusion

The guarantees people want on traffic are never available at this stage of planning—and that uncertainty understandably feels like a major risk. But once you accept that redevelopment is happening, it becomes clear that any future plan would face the same unknowns. The difference is that with this plan, the community has already shaped the early outcomes and secured a formal role in what comes next. A reset would mean starting over without those gains or guarantees of ongoing influence.

5. Why can't we hold out for a "Brooklyn Bridge Park 2.0" – a beautiful park with only enough housing to support its upkeep?

Unlike Brooklyn Bridge Park, there is a strong and coordinated push, by labor advocates, maritime operators, elected officials, and state and city agencies, to preserve and invest in BMT's role as a working waterfront. This includes expanding the "Blue Highway," a growing effort to move goods by water rather than by truck. While some view this vision as speculative, the City is already investing in it at multiple sites, including through infrastructure improvements and pilot programs. The container port at BMT is central to this effort. It's not just about cargo, it's also about job preservation, climate resilience, and emergency response infrastructure.

This opportunity was at risk of slipping away as the piers deteriorated. The City saw a chance to address both infrastructure needs and the housing crisis by combining them: using housing to fund critical pier repairs and deliver deeply affordable units. The open space,

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

waterfront access, and public amenities included in the Vision Plan are made possible by that housing component.

Calls for a plan with no housing are not about creating a park. In fact, Borough President Antonio Reynoso [has said](#) he opposes housing at BMT specifically to protect manufacturing uses, and cited Brooklyn Bridge Park as a cautionary tale of how the borough lost much of its industrial waterfront.

Even if it were politically feasible, a “Brooklyn Bridge Park 2.0” scenario wouldn’t guarantee fewer housing units. In that case, housing was limited to cover park maintenance. Today, housing, especially affordable housing, is a top political and policy priority. With limited public funding and high demand, any residential development on City-owned land will be expected to include significant affordable housing. That won’t change with a “no” vote. If housing is built, it will likely be at a scale necessary to meet affordability targets—and there’s no guarantee that would result in fewer units or less traffic than the current plan.

6. EDC is untrustworthy and any benefits obtained through this process are merely illusory.

It is understandable that people are hesitant to move forward with a redevelopment effort involving EDC, especially given the lack of transparency at the outset about the plan to cross-subsidize pier infrastructure repairs with housing, and the decision to site a concrete recycling facility across from a residential neighborhood without adequate dust mitigation. But voting “no” won’t remove EDC from the process—and if distrust of the EDC is what drives your decision, that’s actually a reason to vote yes. In this case, the Task Force acted as a real check on EDC. The difference between the original proposal and the final Vision Plan reflects the impact of sustained, community-led oversight. That influence goes beyond the plan itself: the Task Force also secured structural guardrails on EDC’s future role, shifting authority to the BMTDC, which will now have the power to determine the scope of EDC’s continued involvement.

7. The entire site should be “port-first” and paid for with public funds because the container port and Blue Highway are critical to our economy, safety, and environment.

No one on the Task Force, including maritime labor, disputes the importance of a strong working waterfront. The Red Hook Container Terminal is essential infrastructure, with climate, economic, and emergency response benefits. But the question before the Task Force wasn’t whether the port matters, it was how to save it, how much land it actually needs, and how to pay for it.

The financial analysis and expert reports concluded that a modernized port could operate effectively within the 60 acres now allocated in the Vision Plan. In fact, some believed it could function with less. Maritime labor and port stakeholders were deeply involved in that decision, and [they support this plan](#). With every delay, the piers deteriorate further and the future of the port becomes more uncertain.

For decades, no one has been willing to invest in this infrastructure. The Vision Plan finally breaks that cycle, unlocking a total of \$1.75 billion in investment, including funding for

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

critical repairs and a new marginal pier. In addition to the \$364 million public contribution, the new BMTDC will have the authority to seek additional funding and private partnerships.

Could there be even more space for the port or more public funding? Maybe. But the stakeholders who know this industry best aren't asking for that. They're asking us not to lose this moment. Rejecting the plan on the grounds that it doesn't go far enough for the working waterfront ignores the fact that the people whose livelihoods depend on that waterfront are asking us to say yes.

8. What guarantee do we have that anything in the Vision Plan will actually be adhered to?

There are no absolute guarantees, this is true with every major New York City development, whether through a GPP or ULURP. These projects evolve over years and are subject to changing political, financial, and regulatory conditions.

That said, the Vision Plan includes stronger accountability mechanisms than most. Informed by those risks, the Task Force prioritized commitments that are harder to reverse, like limits on building height and density, and established oversight structures to ensure continued community involvement. The Advisory Task Force will remain active throughout the GPP process, and a separate Oversight Task Force, modeled on the Gowanus example, will monitor compliance long-term.

The Brooklyn Marine Terminal Development Corporation (BMTDC), which will implement the plan, must include representatives from Community Board 6 and adjacent neighborhoods. Unlike in some past projects, the BMTDC will have formal contract approval and enforcement authority, an added layer of accountability often absent in similar efforts.

The plan's financial model does introduce risk, as many benefits depend on future housing revenue. However, several early actions, like NYCHA repairs and off-site affordable housing, are designed to move forward independently. The BMTDC will also be empowered to seek additional funding sources.

While no structure can eliminate uncertainty, this one includes more oversight tools and community safeguards than most. And because many commitments were made publicly by elected officials, they carry added weight and transparency. In this context, maintaining a structured framework is likely to produce better outcomes than starting over without one.

9. The affordable housing is not "affordable".

The income levels used to determine affordability are set by the federal government, not this project. And while this project does include luxury and market-rate housing, having 40% of the on-site housing permanently affordable is significant, especially when considering the project started at 25%. That hard-fought increase came with increased funding, not density. As the New York Times recently observed, "This is a significantly higher share of affordable units than most new developments provide. And they would serve people at lower income thresholds than these projects ordinarily deliver. Even opponents of the overall concept admit that the configuration is impressive."

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

Between on-site and off-site commitments, 53% of the total housing will be permanently affordable, spanning a range of income levels. That includes deeply affordable options for extremely and very low-income residents, as well as housing for moderate-income earners—like two teachers or a healthcare worker and a transit operator—who want to stay in the neighborhood. The affordable housing breakdown is governed by strict caps, with a maximum affordability limit set at 100% of Area Median Income (AMI). Because of this, more than half of the affordable units will be targeted to residents at extremely low, very low, or low-income levels, based on thresholds set by HUD. And a minimum of 25% will be reserved for family-sized units. Details on 2025 New York City Area AMI can be found [here](#).

It's also important to remember: there is no housing currently on the site. This is not a project that demolishes existing homes or forces out tenants. On the contrary, it will add new affordable homes, dedicate funds to repair and preserve NYCHA units, and support off-site affordable housing in adjacent communities, directly investing in the people most at risk of being pushed out of the broader area.

This plan reflects real efforts to not just build new housing, but to protect existing communities, and to do so with long-term affordability and oversight built in from the start.

10. The build out will inhabit a decade of construction noise, pollution and disruption to small communities and businesses which will be overrun with heavy traffic.

Construction is an inevitable part of any development. One way the Vision Plan mitigates the negative impacts is by phasing the construction. Additionally, in response to community concerns regarding construction impacts to local residents and businesses, the following commitments and guidelines were included in the Points of Agreement:

To directly address small business and neighborhood concerns, the Points of Agreement includes commitments for the BMTDC to work with local stakeholders and City agencies to “to minimize potential disruption on small businesses and residents that may be caused by large-scale infrastructure investments” (VP 34, 37, 39) and to work with agencies, nonprofits, and developers “to create a BMT Small Business Grant Program to assist businesses that are directly displaced or impacted by infrastructure and development construction.” (VP 34, 37, 39)

In addition, the Vision Plan outlines a “Blue Highway” strategy—a commitment to use barging, not trucks, to transport construction and demolition materials. This approach, modeled on successful practices at JFK and elsewhere in NYC, is designed to reduce road congestion and pollution.

There are more opportunities as this process progresses to address additional concerns. But this plan is ahead of most large-scale developments in how it phases disruption, mitigates harm, and keeps communities in the loop through governance mechanisms that ensure accountability across all phases.

11. It's inappropriate to build housing in a flood zone.

Housing in flood zones is not prohibited—many recent projects, including Pierhouse and Quay Tower in the BMT adjacent Brooklyn Bridge Park (which also flooded extensively during Hurricane Sandy), and River Ring in Williamsburg, were built to modern resilient standards in

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

flood zones. While some people may choose not to live in a flood zone, that's not the same as saying housing there is inappropriate.

More importantly, the Vision Plan makes resilience a core principle—not just for housing, but for the full site. Its design strategies are intended to protect both the future BMT neighborhood and surrounding communities from future climate and flood risk.

The BMT Vision Plan is designed to integrate with the Red Hook Coastal Resiliency (RHCR) project, which is already fully funded and in progress. The RHCR project includes floodwalls, raised street grades, and deployable flood gates, and will tie into the BMT site through a system of passive and deployable flood protection features. The BMT Vision Plan builds on this foundation by committing to a multi-layered flood protection system that includes:

- Elevating streets and development sites to withstand a 100-year storm event projected for 2100.
- Integrating green and hybrid stormwater infrastructure throughout the site.
- Managing stormwater on-site to reduce runoff and protect upland neighborhoods.

Additionally, NYCEDC has committed to a \$5 million study to explore future floodwall tie-ins that will connect BMT resiliency infrastructure with a broader Red Hook peninsula.

Not only is housing permissible in the flood zone, but the CHA was supportive of including housing, particularly affording housing, as part of the BMT. That support was not only principled, given the city's housing crisis, it strengthened our ability to secure better outcomes, from deeper affordability to stronger design, infrastructure, and open space commitments.

12. It's wrong for the CHA to have opposed towers in their own neighborhood as part of the LICH redevelopment, but support a project that would place towers adjacent to the Columbia Street Waterfront District and Red Hook.

The CHA opposed the former developer's proposed ULURP for the LICH site for several reasons—one of which was the proposed building heights. But the choice was never between towers and no towers; it was between towers and even taller towers. The as-of-right plan, which remains in place and is likely to resume at some point, allows for a 36-story tower on Pacific Street and potentially an even taller one at Amity and Henry if the H-building is resold.

There is no need to re-litigate what the community should have done as part of that process, but LICH should serve as a cautionary tale of what can happen when the community has no leverage/voice, or when it overplayed its hand. The LICH buildings are being built as-of-right. There was no meaningful community input, no required environmental review, and no affordable housing requirement. When the pits were dug five years ago, it was precisely to avoid laws that would have triggered affordability mandates.

BMT is similar in the sense that towers are likely whether we vote to approve this Vision Plan or not. The difference here is that we still have the opportunity we have to negotiate real improvements to transit, traffic safety, and public space. We can't afford to squander it.

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

13. This is not a vote between the Vision Plan and the status quo.

The Brooklyn Marine Terminal (BMT) site will be redeveloped. The question is not whether development will occur, but what shape that development will take and how it will affect surrounding communities. Any future proposal will likely also impact Cobble Hill in some way. Whether it is worse or better is subjective, but whether it will happen is not.

14. A “no” vote does not result in a new process under the City’s ULURP, but rather will go through the GPP process

For purposes of the CHA’s decision, we are proceeding on the assumption—based on available facts—that any future version of this project would continue under the State’s GPP process. The City’s ULURP process cannot legally apply unless the Port Authority transfers the land to the City, which is extremely rare and would require State-level approval. While not technically impossible, the likelihood is low enough that it would be imprudent to base our vote on that possibility.

15. The Task Force structure is not guaranteed in a future GPP.

The Task Force was created specifically for this iteration of the process. It is **not** a required component of GPP and therefore may not be replicated if the process restarts. This does not mean that a future process will not incorporate community input, but is a relevant consideration.

16. This is only the first stage of a multi-stage process.

The Vision Plan is only the first stage of the GPP process. It sets the land use framework but does *not* finalize infrastructure investments. Those are studied and decided in the next phase, through a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is required by state law. The EIS will analyze impacts on schools, transportation, water and sewer systems, open space, emergency services, and more. Based on those findings, the City and State are required to identify mitigation measures before the final GPP is approved.

17. The CHA represents one voice in a multi-stakeholder process.

Cobble Hill is one of several adjacent communities with interests in this redevelopment. Other stakeholders include, for example, the maritime industry, industrial development corporations, business associations, city agencies, state authorities, elected officials, and other neighborhoods. CHA’s responsibility is to advocate for Cobble Hill, but we cannot assume this community’s preferences will always carry the day. Reasonable people can come to different conclusions about the risks of moving forward versus starting over. But it’s important to assess those risks based on what’s likely—not just what we want—from a future GPP.

18. Community input was incorporated into the Vision Plan

While there may be different views on whether *enough* input was reflected, it is objectively true that community advocacy changed the content of the plan. A non-exhaustive list of changes includes:

- **Governance:**
 - Creation of both an Advisory Task Force and an Oversight Task Force.

BMT Questions and Answers: July 16, 2025

- BMTDC board must include at least 3 Mayoral and 1 Gubernatorial appointee who live or work in adjacent neighborhoods, plus a seat for CB6.
- BMTDC granted contract approval and enforcement power.
- Commitment to legal review of BMTDC documents and partial independence from EDC.
- Defined percentage of surplus from ground revenues reserved for a trust fund for neighborhood and infrastructure needs of the adjacent communities.
- **Transportation & Street Design:**
 - Measures to reduce reliance on vehicles including, but not limited to, public transit plans, shuttle commitments, ferry commitments, pedestrian and bike infrastructure, developer requirements, and parking maximums
 - Expanded geographic scope of site circulation analysis to include surrounding neighborhoods.
 - \$2M secured for BQE decking or pedestrian crossing feasibility study.
- **Public Realm & Open Space:**
 - Pier 7 open space restored after initial 2/3rds reduction (\$200 million value).
 - Specific school site and community-serving retail commitments added.
 - Commitment to all open space in BMT North being fully public.
 - Commitment to working with the community on design and open space programming.
- **Housing:**
 - Density in BMT North reduced by ~500 units.
 - Density caps and height caps
 - 40% of units now permanently affordable at an average of 60% AMI, capped at 100% AMI.
 - Minimum 25% of all units (including affordable) will be family-sized.
 - \$330M total in City commitments to create/preserve affordable housing, including:
 - \$50M for 450 off-site affordable units in CB6.
 - \$80M in HPD funding for 450 new and preserved affordable units.
 - \$200M for NYCHA capital repairs affecting 575 units.

These are just some of the examples.