



## **Testimony of the Cobble Hill Association**

### **BMT Scoping Meeting, December 1, 2025**

Good evening. My name is Amanda Nichols, and tonight I am testifying on behalf of the Cobble Hill Association, a volunteer civic organization dedicated to preserving, protecting, and enhancing quality of life in Cobble Hill. As a member of the BMT Task Force, the CHA supported the Vision Plan because, given that redevelopment was inevitable, we were able to secure community benefits including waterfront access, transit upgrades, and open space. But we've also been clear about our concerns: more trucks, noise, and pollution from port expansion, and added strain from 6,000 new homes. We were assured these impacts would be analyzed during environmental review, and we now expect to see them thoroughly evaluated.

The BMT development will be embedded in neighborhoods with distinct identities but deeply interconnected daily life. Our written comments will identify a number of changes to address this reality, including that the EIS must account for the cumulative impacts of, at a minimum, 1,000 new residents at the former LICH site roughly a quarter mile from BMT. Without that population, the EIS cannot provide an honest accounting of service demand, infrastructure strain, or traffic generation.

Tonight, we want to focus on some of the revisions to the transportation study, because traffic is the top concern for our community—not out of NIMBYism, but because we already live with the health and safety consequences of the BQE and inadequate truck enforcement. As an initial matter, the draft scope's description of the traffic study area is far too vague, and the final scope must clearly identify the boundaries and key intersections to be analyzed.

In addition, the study area can't be limited to neighborhood streets "accommodating traffic bypassing the BQE"; it must include streets likely to serve as spillover routes from the new BMT development. That means extending the study to Court Street, where a recently implemented redesign has shifted southbound cars and trucks onto Henry and Columbia Streets. This is a clear example of how a change on one corridor in this neighborhood creates cascading impacts—exactly the lived-experience information scoping is meant to capture.

Next, it is not credible for the scope of work to assume status-quo BQE conditions in 2038 as the basis for its transportation modeling. This assumption directly contradicts the City's own projections. As recently reported in *The New York Times*, City officials acknowledged that by

2029—even with continued maintenance—the BQE triple-cantilever will not be able to sustain current car and truck volumes.

For that reason, the EIS must treat deteriorated BQE capacity as the default build-year scenario. Anything else risks generating materially inaccurate traffic projections that understate impacts and lead to ineffective or inappropriate mitigation. Consistent with the approach used for flood modeling, the EIS should also analyze scenarios in which BQE capacity is further reduced beyond 2038.

Finally, the scope of work must require the EIS to analyze the closure of the Atlantic Avenue BQE on-ramp as both a build alternative and a potential mitigation measure. Throughout the Task Force process, this closure was repeatedly identified as essential to managing project-generated traffic. It was also understood that the redevelopment presents the first realistic opportunity to advance such a change. Excluding a study of this closure would artificially minimize the project's transportation impacts and deprive decision-makers of one of the most consequential mitigation tools available.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.