



FAMILIES ADVISORY COUNCIL  
REFINED SITE PLAN PRESENTATION  
SEPTEMBER 17, 2003 10:00 AM -12:00 PM  
LOWER MANHATTAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION  
20<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR

---

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) invited the Families Advisory Council to the LMDC offices to view a presentation of the refinements made to Studio Daniel Libeskind's "Memorial Foundations" site plan chosen in February, 2003 as the redevelopment plan for the World Trade Center Site. Kevin Rampe, President of the LMDC, opened the meeting by welcoming the Advisory Council members in attendance and by asking members to take a moment to realize that the site plan is a work in progress and it should not be considered as the final plan. Mr. Rampe mentioned that the memorial competition is still on-going and further refinements may be necessary in conjunction with the memorial competition that is still on-going. Mr. Rampe then turned the meeting over to Daniel Libeskind who began the presentation of the refined site plan.

Mr. Libeskind thanked all the family members for coming to view the improvements that have been implemented into the existing site plan and started by reviewing the many elements considered by rebuilding officials when refining the plan. Libeskind explained the new plan preserves and improves his original vision for the World Trade Center site. He said that "Memorial Foundations" provides a vast and respectful setting for the future memorial. It reduces overall site density and eliminates sub-grade functional conflicts. It also improves commercial buildings, retail and public circulation paths and allows a retail and commercial program to be satisfied. Libeskind continued to explain that this plan eliminated the impact of vehicular ramping in the Memorial and it develops truck security off-site, under open public space. Finally, he mentioned, the site provides more public space, a possible site for the St. Nicholas Church and other potential uses.

The presentation continued with Libeskind explaining each element of the site plan in detail. He spoke of the guiding principles that inspired him to arrange the site the way he did to enhance neighborhoods, develop open public spaces, and to link the memorial experience with the resurgent urban life. He went on to describe examples of specific issues within the site plan that had been reconciled. The most important of these issues was the vehicular ramping and security checkpoints that were located below grade within the memorial area. The Families Advisory Council was shown detailed schematics illustrating the previous plans and the new refined plans that significantly reduce encroachment on the memorial area and specifically the footprints of the twin towers. It was emphasized that a great deal of work and effort was put into rearranging the ramping system that is necessary to accommodate the daily functions of the site plan's five commercial towers.

The Families Advisory Council was also shown site plan schematics at several grade levels to illustrate the temporary PATH terminal and other transportation infrastructure required for the improved transportation facilities at the site. Ron Pisapia, the Director of Capital Projects for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) discussed the latest developments involving the PATH and the intended timeline for its completion in the fall of 2003.

Andrew Winters, Vice President & Director for Planning, Design & Development of the LMDC concluded the presentation with a review of what steps will be taken next to continue the process of redevelopment. Mr. Winters gave an overview of the Environmental Review Process that is currently underway with a completion date expected in the spring of 2004. Mr. Winter's also mentioned that the environmental review process for the PATH terminal is currently underway by the PANYNJ and the expected completion of that review is summer of 2004. Mr. Winters noted that the first public hearing of the draft scope for the PATH station was scheduled for either October 8<sup>th</sup> or October 9<sup>th</sup> and further details would be made public soon.

Mr. Winters continued with an update of the Memorial and Cultural Developments. The families Advisory Council was informed that the memorial jury is still reviewing the 5,200 memorial design proposals and that the announcement of the selected design would come some time this fall. It was reiterated that the site plan and the new refinements will continue to evolve in response to the selected Memorial proposal. The presentation then ended with an animated view of the site plan and the floor was open to questions.

The first question posed by a Families Advisory Council member asked for a basic review of the specific changes that were made from the original site plan to the refined site plan. Libeskind briefly described that the major changes that were made included increasing public/open space, making the commercial towers more slender, removing the vehicular ramping and relocating the security check points from the area of the footprints.

Members of the Families Advisory Council moved into a discussion specifically pertaining to the footprints of the towers. One member emphasized the sacredness and importance of the bedrock within the tower footprints. He went on to describe that it was family members' right to journey to bedrock to remember and reflect at the location of where so many loved ones perished. Other family members expounded on this point by saying that they felt that there was a flaw in the guidelines of the memorial competition because it did not have a directive to create an opportunity for family members, or visitors to the memorial in general, to go to bedrock. It was mentioned that the chosen plan revealed in February maintained the exposure of 30 feet of the slurry wall, but it was the bedrock that remained as the important element to families and there was no access to bedrock in this plan. They explain that they felt that they never had the opportunity to discuss their concern for the preservation of the bedrock and that they had been misled with numerous sources, including, Governor Pataki and Daniel Libeskind, stating that the footprints would be preserved. They continued to say that even now they have never been given a clear definition of what rebuilding officials are considering the actual definition of the footprints. Family members further discussed that they felt that the preservation of the footprints should have been incorporated into the memorial design competition in an effort to keep all infrastructure off the footprints and allow direct access to bedrock.

Mr. Rampe interjected by reminding members of the Families Advisory Council that the site plan will continue to evolve and is by no means in the final stage. He emphasized that throughout the process a great deal of work has been done to move all non-transportation or non-memorial related infrastructure from the footprint area in direct response to concerns that have been voiced by family members. As for memorial related infrastructure, Mr. Rampe again mentioned, that the competition is still on-going and that there won't be any answers as to what may be necessary until there is an idea of what the memorial design will be.

A family member continued the discussion with a question pertaining to the temporary PATH terminal and the number of tracks that were being built. Ron Pisapia, of the PANYNJ

described the reconstructed PATH station as a transit that works on a looping system for more effective travel within the site. He continued to explain that the forecasted demand for travelers to Lower Manhattan dictated the need to build for the future and the additional tracks for the PATH station were essential to upgrade the terminal to allow for greater capacity. Family members continued to question the expansion of the track and expressed concern over further infringement on the South Tower footprint.

Nina Libeskind reiterated the improvements that have been made to the site plan, specifically the removal of the ramping system, as well as the other possibilities for relocating the bus parking facility and the removal of the security check station from beneath the memorial area. She emphasized that the team had worked very hard, again, in direct response to the families concerns and have managed to move three of the biggest infringements on the bedrock of the footprints.

Family members pleaded with the LMDC to guarantee that no infrastructure will be placed on the footprints. Mr. Rampe again emphasized that at the current stage of the process there are too many unknowns, specifically the memorial infrastructure needs, but that he could guarantee that there will be no retail or commercial development anywhere on footprints of either tower. Mr. Rampe noted that the process has been less than perfect, but that it will continue to move forward and issues will be dealt with as more information becomes available. He also emphasized that he and other rebuilding officials have been listening and will continue to listen to public comment and family member concerns, and that many changes were accommodated in the site plan in direct response to both.

A family member noted that there had been progress made in response to their concerns, but that it will need further evaluating at every step of the rebuilding process. Another family said that the Families Advisory Council would appreciate being more involved in the process rather than receiving pieces of information over time to avoid having the families feel left out. After further discussion about the Families Advisory Council involvement it was determined that there would be more frequent meetings initiated by the LMDC.

The meeting continued with several more comments from family members enforcing their feelings that the footprints of the towers are sacred, hallowed ground. Family members

informed the LMDC there had been an application submitted to declare the tower footprints as a National Historic Landmark.

The meeting concluded with Mr. Rampe thanking the Families Advisory Council for attending the presentation.