

Pier 76 Task Force

OPEN SPACE CONSIDERATIONS		ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS		LEGISLATIVE/ZONING/REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints	
FESTIVAL PIER - <i>a designated use upon the surface of the pier designed to host large events and with sufficient frequency to generate stable income for Hudson River Park.</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for large building footprint, and thus more open space available for public use during non-event periods. • Takes advantage of a uniquely large site to host events not easily accommodated at most other Manhattan locations. Depending upon the size and nature of the event, attendance could draw from a relatively large market area, including tourists. Pier 76 location, with pier separated from the inland community by West Street and the multi-block Javits expanse, partially mitigates possible neighborhood noise and other concerns. • Allows for both a variety of unique event experiences and waterfront public open space during non-event periods. • Generally allows for small revenue-generating concessions and in-water uses to co-exist, subject to Act, zoning and regulatory issues. • Could work within the existing pier footprint, or footprint could potentially be modified. • Some events may provide community amenities, such as ice skating, tennis or sports demonstrations, free concerts and other performances. Ticketed events would likely be open to the general public, albeit at a cost. • Portions of the pier could potentially be developed to accommodate permanent park-like uses (such as lawns, trees, gardens, playgrounds, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs majority of pier surface to be hardscape (which can still be attractive) and flexible to accommodate large crowds, tents, stages, servicing, load-in vehicles, etc. • Amount and type of planting likely limited. However, festive lights, canopies and other treatments can be attractive design elements creating a different type of park landscape. • Large crowds and festival-type events may generate noise, foot traffic, drop-off traffic. • Large events need servicing (load-in, load-out), and cleaning periods, vehicular deliveries using designated driveways, permanent or temporary electrical and other infrastructure, portasans, etc. • We may all have different kinds of events in mind when we think about this option. • Need ability to have large tents and other temporary structures to extend the use season. • While minimum public access can often be maintained during event periods, the quality of that access will likely be affected depending upon the nature/intensity of the event. • Rather than placing a permanent building on the pier, relies on "privatizing" (i.e., making inaccessible for free public use) all or portions (likely in excess of 50%) of pier open space at defined times. Closures would be significantly more than what the park does currently under event conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pier 76's size and location will be appealing to producers and others looking for large, flexible Manhattan-based outdoor spaces to conduct events. • There is no comparable Manhattan waterfront outdoor space of this size. • HRPT could retain the opportunity to conduct some large, free, community-oriented events such as Blues BBQ and Submerge, and could also offer the space as a venue for West Side Fest and other neighborhood programming. • Generally can be paired with other revenue-generating uses including most in-water uses, • Visitorship and potential revenue attracts from wide audience (both tourists and community residents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate marketing, promotional/activation, and employee benefits markets that sponsor events can be unpredictable. Certain types of uses and clients prefer "new" and "never before" venues rather than familiar spaces. Having long-term contracts with financially capable entities will help mitigate this risk. • Public would need to cover entirety of pier infrastructure/open space costs up front. Event costs including clean-up, crowd and traffic management, security, utility charges and the like would be responsibility of event producers. • There is a very wide range of event types that could be considered. HRPT would likely need to secure one or more long-term commitments from concert operators, events producers, or other contractually bound sources to ensure the desired annual income target is raised. This is an opportunity or a constraint, depending on the vantage point, which will provide greater predictability of use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRPT would need legislative clarity to ensure we are not challenged for closures and periodic privatization of the pier. • Zoning to protect Pier 76 from certain potential future nuisance complaints might also be required (Forest Hills, Coney Island lawsuits, e.g.). • Various other zoning actions or waivers could be needed including for WPAA requirements
ICONIC TOURIST ATTRACTION				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes advantage of a uniquely large waterfront site in proximity to other tourist attractions and Javits • May (but not necessarily will) allow for a larger open space footprint not occupied by a building enclosure, structure and queueing areas • Brings something unique to Hudson River Park and New York City • Could work with the existing pier footprint or footprint could potentially be modified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs ample hardscape, restrooms, space for ticketing, queue lines, concessions and related event uses. • Will likely want the western end of the pier, likely obstructing certain views. • Taxis, vehicles, Ubers, buses likely - and therefore need for driveways or laybys and robust traffic management solutions. • Likely requires significant hardscape in the area around the attraction: potential significant spill-over into open space area for lines, ticketing, group rendezvous points, etc. • Emphasis on tourist experience could affect local uses of the park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-conceived and executed, this use may create a signature asset reputationally for NYC. • If the tourist attraction offers significant economic benefits to NYC/NYS it may help attract government support for related park infrastructure. • May allow for revenue-generating in-water uses to co-exist, depending on the scale of both. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relies on heavy attendance and high admission fees to be successful. May offer relatively few direct neighborhood benefits. • Competition with many other attractions in NYC and extraordinary development costs will be a challenge: difficult to predict success. • Financial feasibility may prove difficult without public support, potentially crowding out additional government funds for core pier and park infrastructure. • Extraordinary construction costs assumed for anything tall given the need for a very robust in- and below-water foundation structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tall structures will need significant in-water infrastructure for support -- potentially very difficult to get regulatory approvals. • Act change needed to allow amusements and entertainment. • Possible zoning changes almost certainly needed and would require further discussion.

Pier 76 Task Force

OPEN SPACE CONSIDERATIONS		ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS		LEGISLATIVE/ZONING/REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints	
OFFICE - <i>could be commercial office or any other use requiring an "office-like" configuration -- e.g., life science, light manufacturing, etc.</i>				
<p>• Use can be concentrated on a limited portion of the pier. Foot traffic minimal outside of work hours, including during peak park use. Provides a clear delineation between public and private space. Will afford a larger footprint for purely open space than some other uses.</p> <p>• Allows significantly more than 50% of the pier footprint to be dedicated for permanent public open space.</p> <p>• Pier footprint should be modified to enable office building to be placed on the northeast (presumably preferred location so that contiguous open space is maintained on balance of pier).</p> <p>• Could easily coexist with many in-water uses if such uses are also desired.</p> <p>• HRPT can require the office developer to create dedicated community benefit space at the base of the office building, as is the case for Pier 57.</p> <p>• If successfully developed, office affords the most stable source of income to HRPT as it will be based on a long-term ground lease with a financially capable entity and supported by substantial private investment.</p>	<p>• Requires height (appx. 11 stories) unless reduced because of other commercial uses on-site.</p> <p>• Needs careful design parameters to avoid creating a feeling of privatization of adjacent public open space areas.</p> <p>• Needs a dedicated vehicle area for deliveries and servicing.</p>	<p>• Could encompass variety of vertical or horizontal uses, from traditional office to light manufacturing (e.g. product prototyping), life sciences, academic, commercial sports, etc.</p> <p>• Possible there is a large user/tenant that views site as a unique asset given waterfront and highway location, and proximity to midtown.</p> <p>• Could co-exist with certain in-water uses such as marina, blue-highway, etc.</p> <p>• Presumed to pay for construction of the underlying foundation beneath the building, reducing initial construction costs for the public pier portion.</p> <p>• Offers greatest potential revenue to HRPT. Continuing obligation for payment-in-lieu of taxes (PILOT) provides significant income upside.</p>	<p>• Very poor economy currently for office use; only viable for unique user in the near term or wait for next office market cycle. Either way, this will be a high rent location for ultimate office tenant.</p> <p>• Meeting logistical challenge of constructing an office building at this location will be expensive.</p>	<p>• Act change needed for office -- Pier 57 Act change says: (vi) solely at pier 57, business, professional or governmental offices. Act change also needed to modify pier footprint and to allow commercial use east of the bulkhead line.</p> <p>• Rezoning also needed.</p>
HOTEL				
<p>• Use is concentrated in one geographic area leaving the balance of the pier for permanent open space.</p> <p>• Could coexist with many in-water uses - many would serve as enhancements for the hotel as well as for the public space.</p> <p>• Hotel use itself offers some enhancements for the park -- e.g., bathrooms, places to eat -- and potential synergies for certain amenity uses such as gym, pickleball courts, health club, etc.</p> <p>• Pier footprint modification likely desirable to maximize public open space benefits.</p>	<p>• Requires either height or a larger horizontal footprint to be viable.</p> <p>• Relatively isolated from major tourist and business destinations.</p> <p>• Needs careful design parameters to avoid creating a feeling of privatization of public areas.</p> <p>• Needs a dedicated vehicle area for deliveries and servicing; likely high amount of regular vehicle access required: visitor dropoff, service, etc.</p>	<p>• Should create a long term source of revenue, though less stable than office. Inclusion of requirement for PILOT will help HRPT grow income over time.</p> <p>• Potentially strong demand for mid-market tourist hotels at scale. Proximity to Javits may be a plus for certain conventioners willing to pay a premium for waterfront views, and increase demand for hotel meeting space.</p> <p>• Future hotel room supply unlikely to grow significantly owing to City restrictions on new development and short-term rental listings. This will enhance financial feasibility over time.</p> <p>• Generally allows for small revenue-generating concessions and in-water uses to co-exist, subject to Act, zoning and regulatory issues.</p>	<p>• Somewhat difficult to make the economics work due to construction cost premium for in-water work.</p> <p>• Higher room rates needed to support expensive development costs may be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>• While tourist hotels are somewhat sheltered, hotel revenue is generally cyclical and prone to ups and downs of business cycle.</p>	<p>• Act and zoning changes needed similar to office use above.</p>
FLOATING SPA, FLOATING RESTAURANT				
<p>• Docked vessels present an opportunity to generate additional revenue while reducing the extent or intensity of the commercial use footprint on the pier deck. Aside from gangways and deliveries, footprint on the pier itself would be minimal.</p> <p>• Vessels take advantage of the unique river location of Hudson River Park.</p>	<p>• Permanently moored boats need gangways. If vessel is very large, entrance towers and elevators (see Intrepid) may be required. These can be robust structures extending significantly onto the pier footprint depending on the size and also because of the 2x/day, 3- to 6-foot tidal differences and requirements for accessible access for commercial uses. These structures are intrusions onto the pier perimeters, and to address safety and other issues when the vessels are closed, gates and other structures might also be needed.</p> <p>• Depending on the uses aboard the vessels, could create noise, us/them feeling for those on the pier.</p>	<p>• Type, size, and revenue potential of concessions likely to be driven by anchor use.</p>	<p>• May require expensive breakwater to mitigate wake action from passing ships.</p> <p>• Universe of available vessels suitable for repurposing for attractive commercial use relatively small and vessels themselves are costly to maintain in a salt water environment.</p>	<p>• Act change needed to specify that various in-water uses are water-dependent at this location specifically to secure regulatory approvals. Regulatory approvals are difficult and would likely require mitigation for additional platform coverage. If Act would allow a certain amount of coverage for this use, it would be a more feasible lift.</p> <p>• Water is shallow. Act change needed to clarify navigational dredging limitation.</p> <p>• Additional consultation required with NYSDEC re. certain Act language.</p>

Pier 76 Task Force

OPEN SPACE CONSIDERATIONS		ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS		LEGISLATIVE/ZONING/REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints	
BOATEL - floating hotel with wide range of sizes				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active vessels present an opportunity to generate additional revenue while reducing the extent of the commercial use footprint on the pier deck. Large vessels could have a significant influence on pier design -- a pro or a con, potentially dependent on individual preferences. Vessels take advantage of the unique location of Hudson River Park. North (or west?) sides of pier preserve views to the south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large permanently moored boats need gangways (or even entrance towers and elevators -- see Intrepid) that can be robust structures extending significantly onto the pier footprint depending on the size and also because of the 2x/day, 3-to 6-foot tidal differences and requirements for accessible access for commercial uses. These structures are intrusions onto the pier perimeters, and to address safety and other issues when the vessels are closed, gates and other structures might also be needed. Vessels block views and as with buildings, can create shadows. Boats can themselves be considered view-worthy of course. In HRPT's experience, beauty of certain of these vessels is very much in the eyes of the beholders. Boatel use may confront significant DOB challenges because of code and other reasons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar economic/market considerations as hotel. A historically relevant boatel use could have the added benefit of serving as a tourist attraction/destination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively few examples of successful boatels. Maintaining vessels is costly. May require expensive breakwater to mitigate wake action from passing ships. Need for dredging may be expensive and generate significant regulatory costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act change needed to allow boatel. Act change needed to specify that various in-water uses are water-dependent at this location specifically to secure regulatory approvals. Regulatory approvals are difficult and would likely require mitigation for additional platform coverage. If Act would allow a certain amount of coverage for this use, it would be a more feasible lift. Act change needed to clarify navigation limitation.
COMMERCIAL MARINA				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessels take advantage of the unique location of Hudson River Park. Marina designs can vary from boats basically berthed alongside the pier to lots of smaller docks accessed from one or two gates. Footprint on the pier itself is smaller with the latter, but the latter requires a breakwater which poses some additional regulatory issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People on the vessels could create noise, us/them feeling for those on the pier. Marina footprint and boat drafts obscure water views and potentially contribute to overwater shading. Required supplemental infrastructure (power + water hookups, secure access, marina employee space, bathrooms) will have impact on pier footprint and water views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May include community amenity uses such as sailing school. Revenue potential is greater if marina operated directly by the Trust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May require expensive breakwater to mitigate wake action from passing ships, which increases regulatory approvals challenges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory approvals are difficult and would likely require mitigation for additional platform coverage. If Act would allow a certain amount of coverage for this use and a breakwater, it would be a more feasible lift.
BLUE HIGHWAY				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes advantage of the unique location of Hudson River Park and the combination of access from the water directly to the highway and a street grid. Relatively small footprint means this use can coexist easily with other uses. Location towards the eastern end of the pier (close to roadway) likely most desirable and presumably on the north (adjacent to other commercial uses); this frees up the southern and western aspects of pier to prime public realm space. Returns waterfront to a "working waterfront". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicles or bikes would need to come and go from the pier location and across the bikeway. Delivery bikes could exacerbate bikeway commercialization and speed issues not controlled by HRPT unless the 9A rules/design change. Requires boat-docking and boat-access (gangways) on and along pier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parcel delivery is a large and growing market. River transport may become more economically viable with congestion pricing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no established revenue model for this use. Income, if any, is likely to be limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dredging potentially needed for navigation.