

**Families Advisory Council
Infrastructure and Transportation Meeting
Tuesday, October 22, 2002
5:30-7:30pm
1 Liberty Plaza, 20th floor
LMDC Board Members Tom Johnson and Lew Eisenberg**

Tara Snow, Vice President for Government Relations and Community Affairs, opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda for the evening, which included a discussion about the new program that was recently announced, an infrastructure presentation by Andrew Winters, and an update on the temporary PATH station. She then asked the meeting participants to introduce themselves for the record.

After the introductions, Ms. Snow discussed the briefing that was conducted on October 11th with the six new design teams. She went on to say that a significant portion of the day was spent talking about the memorial. Although the teams are not being instructed to design the memorial, the LMDC felt it was important to brief them on the memorial tour and the public dialogue regarding the memorial. She stated that many of the architects feel that the entire site is a memorial to the victims, and thus should be designed with this in mind. Ms. Snow indicated that the briefing concluded with a visit to the LMDC Family Room.

LMDC Board Member Tom Johnson then asked for a moment of silence to be observed prior to the beginning of the presentation.

Andrew Winters, Director of Design and Development, then went through the highlights of the briefing document that was given to the design teams, entitled, “A Vision for Lower Manhattan.” This provided the teams with the context for how to move forward with designs for the World Trade Center site and adjacent areas.

Anita Contini, Vice President for Memorial, Cultural, and Civic Programs, went on to discuss the portions of the document that relate to the memorial. Despite the fact that the designers are not being asked to design a memorial, the LMDC felt that it was important to include the draft Memorial Mission Statement and other information about the memorial. A participant interjected by stating that some of the family members disagree with the site design preceding the memorial. Ms. Contini then continued her discussion regarding the cultural elements of the new program. Mr. Winters continued to discuss the briefing document and all of the elements included.

Tom Roger of the Families Advisory Council mentioned that in the briefing book there is no indication of where the footprints of the Twin Towers are. Mr. Winters explained that the design teams received extensive information, CDs, and maps of the site that do include visuals indicating the locations of the footprints.

Participants then made several comments with respect to the new program, including concerns regarding streets running through the site. One participant pointed out the section of the briefing book that talks about the vision refers to the memorial being seen from a distance. Mr. Winters clarified that the language does not suggest that the memorial must be tall, but rather that the site itself and the approach to and view of the site must make a statement. Another participant asked if clarifications and/or additional information can be given to the design teams, and Mr. Winters explained that they are working with the design teams on a continuous basis. In particular, members of the Advisory Council expressed interest in providing the teams with their revised Memorial Mission Statement. In response to a question regarding commercial properties, Tom Johnson emphasized that no commercial properties will be built unless developers acknowledge that it is feasible to rent and insure the office space.

In response to a question about the timeline of the new study, Mr. Winters emphasized that the end result of this study will not be a final plan for the site, but rather design options and alternative ideas. After eight weeks, the design teams will have something to exhibit to the public.

There followed a discussion about the integration between the site planning and the memorial planning, and Tom Johnson emphasized that integration is key – he briefed the design teams himself and can confirm that the message has gotten through. One participant mentioned that the Families Advisory Council would like the final say on the Memorial Mission Statement and the program elements. In response to one member’s concerns about the Advisory Council members’ level of involvement in decision-making, LMDC Board Member Lew Eisenberg stated that the families have been involved every step of the way, and that he personally does not think that this should be a concern. Tom Johnson commented that while not everything that is said can be acted upon, the input is being gathered, and the role of the LMDC is to make sure that all input is heard and that the best possible decisions are made.

Andrew Winters then proceeded with the transportation and infrastructure presentation, which explored other infrastructure and transportation elements throughout New York City, and the specific limitations and requirements associated with the World Trade Center site.

After the presentation, questions were raised about the amount of people that will visit the site within a limited amount of space, how terrorism planning will be addressed, and if the architects are planning the infrastructure as part of this phase of the design process. There was also a discussion about the location of the permanent PATH station and whether or not it will

infringe on the footprint of the North Tower, and if the slurry wall can be preserved down to the bedrock without having to sustain the PATH station above.

Mr. Winters then gave an update on the status of the temporary PATH station, which is on schedule to open at the end of 2003.

Questions were raised regarding what will happen to the temporary station once the permanent station is decided upon, the issue of the PATH tracks running through the footprints, and the reasoning behind keeping the tracks in their existing places. One participant requested that the permanent station not infringe on the footprints. Another participant asked if the permanent station could be considered a “memorial station.” Mr. Winters explained that the design of the station could dictate this in terms of how it is expressed. Another participant requested that the design teams be given a map of the site that shows all of the areas where remains were found. Another member agreed to provide this map to the LMDC.

There was a brief discussion about having a fixed meeting day and time in the future, after which, Ms. Snow and the LMDC Board members thanked participants for attending, and the meeting was adjourned.

