Development of the Moynihan Complex

Professor Gary Roth
Teaching Assistant Taylor Miller

Jawaher Al Sudairy
Shuran Chen
Olga Chernomorets
Bingrui Duan
Kirk Logan
Qihao Wang
Juting Xu

Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT OVERVIEW</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING CONDITIONS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCHOR TENANT</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For over ten years, the State of New York has pushed to transform the James A. Farley Post Office, located opposite Pennsylvania (Penn) Station, into the new transportation hub for New York City. This project, the Moynihan Station Development, is named after Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the United States Senator representing New York, who championed the idea. The aspiration for this redevelopment is to provide capacity relief to Penn Station by constructing a train hall in the Farley Building (or the Moynihan Complex) and additional passenger access to the Penn Station platforms that extend below. Additionally, the project aims to incorporate mixed-use functions in the above grade portion of the building, which is currently vacant following the exit of the United States Postal Service (USPS) mail sorting facilities that originally occupied the space.

The project is currently managed by the Moynihan Station Development Corporation (MSDC), a New York State agency. It has finally broke ground in 2010\(^1\) on the below grade components of the station concerned with constructing the West End Concourse Expansion.\(^2\) MSDC has also engaged our studio, a team comprised of eight students from the Urban Planning program at the Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, to explore options for the mixed-use portion of the Development.

The following report presents a set of recommendations, developed by the studio team, on the redevelopment and branding of the future Moynihan Complex. This report was produced through an extensive three-month study that included interviews, surveys, research and analysis. The recommended program for the above grade portion of Moynihan contains three components: public services, an anchor tenant and public space.

Public services are proposed to be located in the lower floors of Moynihan. This would allow the services to cater to and benefit from incoming traffic, including building tenants, the local community, and commuters accessing the train platforms below Moynihan’s east building (Moynihan East). These services would include retail functions that match the needs of local residents and incoming commuters such as groceries, cafes, a bank and other. Placing the public services aspect into the building anticipates capturing as well as attracting existing and new foot traffic.

\(^1\)MASNYC, Moynihan Station - [http://www.mas.org/urbanplanning/moynihan-station/](http://www.mas.org/urbanplanning/moynihan-station/)

\(^2\)Moynihan Complex Corporation - [http://empire.state.ny.us/Subsidiaries_Projects/MSDC/MSDC.html](http://empire.state.ny.us/Subsidiaries_Projects/MSDC/MSDC.html)
The anchor tenant is proposed to occupy the largest portion of the building, mostly concentrated in the top floors of both the east and west buildings of Moynihan. The anchor tenant is necessary as a primary generator of revenue, attracting people, businesses and other services to Moynihan. The studio team proposes an incubator and research & development (R&D) facility as the anchor tenant, which would include collaborative working space for start-ups, research labs and event spaces. The suggested host for this incubator space would be a strategic partnership between an academic institution and private sector players relevant to a specific industry – to be determined. The studio team believes that such a collaboration and industrial focus would benefit the affiliated start-ups and provide a platform for an industry cluster. This use of the space would also be cost effective, as it requires minimal renovation of the building’s interior - further discussed in the report.

Incorporating public space in the rooftop and/or the interior courtyards of Moynihan is an important component of the recommended program. This is to ensure that the building serves the local community and remains accessible to the public. It also offers the opportunity to optimize use of the space and contribute to making Moynihan a New York destination.

The proposed program was designed on the premise that Moynihan will not become a train station. It is the opinion of this studio that while the limitations on Penn Station’s capacity have been a main driver for the Moynihan Station Development project, there is concern that it may not achieve a comprehensive solution. Today, an estimated 600,000 commuters riding Amtrak, Long Island Rail Road (LIRR), New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) and the New York City Transit Subway pass through Penn Station daily making it the busiest transit hub in the Unites States. However, only Amtrak has committed to relocating to the Moynihan Complex, which carries a mere 4% of daily ridership into Penn Station. More importantly, Moynihan’s location only allows access to the central tracks extending from Penn Station, limiting its ability to alleviate overall congestion.

Additionally, the name “Moynihan Station Development” implies that this is primarily a transportation project, when in fact transportation is only a component of the entire development. While this name may be a means for attracting investment and acquiring grants, such as the United States Department of Transportation’s -Transportation Investment Generating Economic

---

Recovery (TIGER) grant program, it does not reflect the mixed-use functions in the rest of the development.

With these considerations combined, the studio recommends that the programming of the future Moynihan Complex should be conscious of the transportation component of the project and ensure effective value capture that will be provided by the flow of commuters into Moynihan and Penn. However, the construction of additional passenger access within Moynihan should not determine the programming and branding of the entire Complex. Beyond offering services to commuters, the development should incorporate functions that ensure financial sustainability for the Moynihan Complex as well as aim to attract an anchor tenant who would enhance local economic development in the surrounding area and the city. Similarly, the future branding of the Moynihan Complex should be expanded to leverage the building’s aesthetic and historic value as well as its internal functions. Finally, the recommendation of this studio also emphasizes the need to maintain pressure on Madison Square Garden (MSG) to move from its location above Penn Station. Only through the revision of MSG’s location will it be possible to execute a comprehensive solution to Penn Station’s congestion.

---

4 The Studio Team has chosen the name “Moynihan Complex” to refer to the physical building, previously known as the James A. Farley Building, and “Moynihan Station Development” to refer to the project carried out by MSDC.
The MSDC is a subsidiary of the New York State Urban Development Corporation, which does business as Empire State Development (ESD). MSDC is charged with the redevelopment and rebranding of the Moynihan Complex, which previously served as a mail sorting facility for the USPS in New York City. The Moynihan Complex is currently owned and operated by the State of New York, while USPS still retains control of the historic front lobby. MSDC aims to redevelop the Complex into the Moynihan Station Development, intended to become the newest destination transit hub in New York City.\(^5\) MSDC anticipates that “the resulting super-hub will revitalize the neighborhood and create a new business district.”\(^6\)

MSDC’s position as a New York State entity, working in New York City, has brought to light tensions between the priorities of the State versus those of the City. New York State’s role as a development corporation, their primary objective for the Moynihan Station Development project is to create a financially sustainable development. In leaving the Moynihan Complex empty, since the time it was acquired from the United States Postal Service, New York State has incurred extensive losses to keep the building running. Therefore, their objective is to identify solutions that improve revenue generation to help maintain the building.

Though it is not pre-determined that MSDC will only consider rent-generating programs, funding for the project is still necessary, either from direct payments (rent) or another mechanism. One of these alternative mechanisms comes in the form of development rights, also known as ‘air rights’. Air rights refer to the space or air above the current building height and the maximum allowable height for which the parcel is zoned. The Moynihan Complex yields approximately 2.5 million sq. ft. of undeveloped air rights that could be transferred to another site within the neighborhood, in order to generate sizeable revenue.\(^7\) Hence, the goal is to leverage the development rights to either to fund or attract a private developer to lead redevelopment of the building. However, pursuing a program that is lead by a private developer promises no inherent public benefits outside of the train hall. The project would be exclusive to the Moynihan Complex with no commitments to addressing the


\(^6\) MSDC (2010), Final Amended General Project Plan

needs of the surrounding area, midtown Manhattan, which is desperately underdeveloped. Thus, the quality of the surrounding neighborhood is only relevant within the limited scope of locating a site for air rights transfer.

In contrast, the City government, under normal circumstances, would likely prioritize development of the neighborhood as opposed to focusing solely on the programs inside Moynihan Complex. This is one of the numerous conflicts of interest, between City and State, facing this particular project. Another potential point of contention regarding New York City’s role in the Moynihan Station Development project is related to the future developments to the west of the site. The municipal government created bonds that were used to fund the new 7 Line subway extension, which will culminate at the Hudson Yards development site. Since a financial investment was made, it is understood that the City has more of a stake in the success of Hudson Yards than the Moynihan Station Development. If the Moynihan Development is considered a potential rival to the success of Hudson Yards, the City would likely attempt to divert attention from Moynihan to Hudson Yards, where there is a greater financial incentive in the success of the project.

The conflict of interest between the City and State reveals the City’s goal to make Hudson Yards as lucrative as possible, potentially deprioritizing the development of Moynihan, and the State’s goal to make the development of Moynihan as lucrative as possible, potentially at the expense of the neighborhood. One must confront and negotiate the obvious trade-offs between the two development routes, that being said New York State as a development entity has one major inherent advantage over the City as a developer. Appeals for zoning variances go through the State of New York as opposed to New York City proper. Thus, the State has an advantage through the ability to override New York City regulations. This affects all aspects of the project, including its coming to fruition. For example, the site on which the Moynihan Complex is located is not, as-of-right, zoned for transportation. Nevertheless, because the property is owned by the State, local zoning was overruled in order to proceed with the construction of a transit hub on the site.

The trade-offs and advantages presented by the State as the developer also apply to the site’s historic preservation status. Now that development of the Moynihan Complex has begun, MSDC abides by the New York State Landmark Preservation Act, which is less comprehensive than New York City’s

---

preservation laws. MSDC appeals to State departments for variance approvals and given that the building is New York State owned, currently losing State money, every day it is left vacant, the State is likely to act in the manner of a for-profit developer. Meanwhile, if the City were the development entity, it would most likely be held to a more rigorous preservation and zoning standard.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In order to understand this multifaceted development project, it is important to examine how it came about. This section discusses the site’s history and the various factors that contributed to its currently vacant state, the need for its redevelopment, and the drivers behind the transportation component of the project.

When Penn Station opened in 1910 it was considered one of most successful pieces of North American urban architecture of the period. The original Penn Station was developed for and by the Pennsylvania Railroad, a private interest, and was designed by McKim, Mead & White. In 1912, McKim, Mead & White also designed the General Post Office Building, later renamed the James A. Farley Post Office, after the General Post Master. The James A. Farley building, referred to as the Moynihan Complex in this report, was envisioned and constructed as a complementary structure to Penn Station. Together the buildings were considered to be ‘masterpieces’ of the American Neoclassical architecture. The two buildings worked together programatically, as mail at the time was carried by rail, and the complementary facades worked together to activate the urban streetscape between each other.

---

In 1934, the West Annex building was added to the Moynihan Complex, designed by William Kendall and Lawrence White, of McKim, Mead, & White, primarily to include service spaces to the building and to allow for greater mail volume. Together these two buildings are connected to create the Moynihan Complex, designed specifically to accommodate the United States Postal Service. The current re-programming of the building becomes a more difficult task if also attempting to abide by the Landmark Preservation Laws. The entirety of the Moynihan Complex is designated as an individual landmark in New York City, the State of New York, and the National Register.

Figure 1 Penn Station 7th Avenue façade


The Post Office was sited adjacent to Penn Station and its tracks because it allowed for mail to directly enter into the USPS mail sorting facility. As such, Moynihan East was designed to have access to the west of Penn Station's platforms. The train cars with the mail stopped directly below Moynihan East, whereas passenger cars were designed to stop at more central areas of the platforms that were on the east side of 8th Avenue, directly below Penn Station.

The exterior of the Moynihan Complex has remained largely unchanged since the construction of the West Annex, likely because of its landmark status. Penn Station, however, has changed significantly, and replaced by Madison Square Garden (MSG), though its tracks and platforms have remained as they were originally designed. Because of this notable difference in the rate of development of the two buildings, the once complementary relationship no longer exists. Additionally, as mail is no longer delivered by rail, the past complementary programmatic arrangement between the two buildings has been rendered moot.

Figure 2 The General Post Office Building 8th Avenue 1922

The demolition of the original Penn Station structure was driven by the losses incurred by the Pennsylvania Railroad due to the decline in rail usage at the time. Because Pennsylvania Railroad was a private interest with no real allegiances to New York City, it was able to option the development rights above Penn Station. This model is reminiscent of MSDC and the State’s current interest, which is susceptible to market and real estate pressures while attempting to develop the Moynihan Complex in and for New York City.

![Figure 3 Madison Square Garden - 1968](image)

The optioning of Penn Station’s air rights enabled the demolition of Penn Station’s original head house and train shed. This was a major catalyst in the creation of New York City’s Landmark Preservation Laws, by which the Moynihan Complex is now protected as an Individual Landmark

---

building, as well as the expanded definition and area for the transfer of development rights. At the time when Penn Station was demolished the latitude for transferring their development rights was narrow in scope, and since then the distance for possible receiving sites has been expanded in an effort to avoid future mishaps similar to what had occurred with Penn Station.

Shortly after the optioning of its air rights, in 1964, Penn Station was complete with all of its services consolidated underground and MSG was built at its current site above Penn Station. This new below-grade Penn Station, the one that exists today, was designed at a time when rail usage was thought to be in decline, and did not anticipate the surge of rail usage in the future. Hence, MSG’s location above Penn Station now presents a significant impediment to Penn Station’s capacity to expand and meet its current demand. Ever since this additional strain on the space, rail systems, and a general increase in rail usage in New York City, Penn Station has been unable to respond to the growing rail usage.

Considering Penn Station’s congestion, this studio sees the Moynihan Station Development project as offering an opportunity to improve capacity by re-establishing the original, complementary relationship between the Moynihan Complex and Penn Station. There is also a valuable lesson to be learned from this misconceived prediction of rail usage. As the current congestion problems are to be addressed through the Moynihan Complex, it is important to learn from the past and not make irreversible recommendations based solely on past and present trends.

BACKGROUND OF THE MOYNIHAN STATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The Moynihan Station Development project has been in the works for over ten years, however only broke ground in 2010. In the late 1990’s the project was first proposed by the United States Senator from New York Daniel Patrick Moynihan; after whom the project takes its name. Senator Moynihan’s motivation was for the new station to be a mechanism to solve Penn Station’s growing


16 MASNYC, Moynihan Station - http://www.mas.org/urbanplanning/moynihan-station/

17 ibid
congestion and over-crowding, and to bring back the glory of rail travel. His suggestion was immediately accepted and brought into popular discourse within the urban planning, urban design and architecture fields. The civic agencies hosted a number of competitions asking New Yorkers and famed architects to propose a vision for the station that was to solve not only the problems of Penn Station, but also all the problems of Midtown West.

The design competitions produced numerous productive and even promising solutions to the problems facing Penn Station and Midtown West. However, even though momentum, behind the redevelopment of the Moynihan Complex, was growing, none of the designs were adopted. The United States Postal Service announced their moving their mail-sorting operations from Moynihan Complex in 1992, though they retained the historic lobby as a fully-functioning post office. Soon after, Amtrak, New Jersey Transit, and the Long Island Railroad all expressed interest in becoming lead tenants for the newly proposed Moynihan Station Development. These factors contributed to the continued possibility of the project becoming a reality. However, the status of the project remained largely unchanged until 2004, with no real progress or development taking place. Thus, it began losing media attention and its place in the public conscious as an ideal solution to the growing problems of Penn Station and Midtown West.

Proposed development of Moynihan picked up momentum again in 2004. This was due to the expressed interest of the Related Companies (Related) and Vornado Realty Trust (Vornado) partnership, to develop the above-grade portion of the Moynihan Complex. These two companies revealed plans for moving MSG from its current site, above Penn Station, to the West Annex building. In 2005, as partners, Related Companies and Vornado Realty Trust, won the competition to redevelop the Moynihan Complex for up to one million square feet of air rights, which became available upon the 2005 re-zoning of the neighborhood. Soon after, in 2006, Venture and Cablevision signed a tentative agreement to move MSG to the West Annex building of the Moynihan Complex. This relocation would allow for the redevelopment of an above-grade component of Penn Station, resolving the station's growing congestion problems. Public backing for the project was revived and Empire State

\[18\text{ The New York Times (2005), Madison Square Garden's Owners Are in Talks to Replace It, a Block West http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/12/nyregion/12garden.html?_r=0}\]
Development purchased the Moynihan Complex from USPS in March of 2007. The allure of this project is understood based on the combination of utility it was, and largely still is, expected to provide New York City, along with the ability to transfer air rights to neighboring properties. It also offered potential utility to the real estate bubble that was in effect at the time, giving large development projects at least the illusion of being financially lucrative.

The year 2008 brought several complications for the project, starting with New York State Governor Elliot Spitzer’s resignation from office, following a scandal. Governor Spitzer was a great proponent of the Moynihan Station Development project. His resignation halted the negotiations with Related, Vornado, and MSG that would have allowed for the development of the Moynihan Complex in exchange for development rights. It is widely thought that given the economic climate following 2008, this was the last point at which the development of the Moynihan Complex seemed not only to provide a necessary public good, but was also slated to be a financially viable development. The pause that Governor Spitzer’s resignation created in the negotiations was long enough for MSG to reconsider their involvement. Later that year, The MSG Company announced its plan to renovate the current arena and to retain its location above Penn Station. As a result, the Moynihan Station Development project was again halted.

A year later the conversation was revived, this time between Spitzer’s successor, Governor Patterson, Mayor Bloomberg, and The Port Authority of New York & New Jersey (Port Authority). At this time, the State had just recently acquired the majority of the Moynihan Complex, from the United States Postal Service. This made the prospect of development attractive, as the State was spending money on maintaining the mostly vacant building. However, the project was made less feasible than ever before, due to the current economic climate and the decreased value of development rights, connected with the Moynihan Complex, which manifested as a loss of interest from the private sector.

19 ESD (2011), Moynihan Station Civil and Land Use Improvement Project - http://www.esd.ny.gov/AboutUs/Data/BoardMaterials/March2011/07_Moynihan_Station.pdf
21 Crain’s (2008), Spitzer Development Chief Resigns - http://www.crainsnewyork.com/article/20080317/FREE/63754-7245/spitzer-development-chief-resigns#
23 Friends of Moynihan, Moynihan Station Project Timeline - http://www.moynihanstation.org/newsite/2005/08/project_timeline.html
MSDC applied for federal grants because there was limited private money for the Moynihan Station Development project. The TIGER Grant became the principal funding mechanism for the project. For the application to be successful, the project was separated into phases, such that the first phase was a discrete transportation project and therefore eligible for the grant. In putting together their grant application, the Moynihan Station Development Corporation had Amtrak agree to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) stating that they would be the head tenant of the Moynihan Station Development upon its completion. This MOU requires that Amtrak relocate from their current residence in Penn Station (which Amtrak owns and pays no rent to occupy). Furthermore, the application required identification of resources for the subsequent development phases of the project. Initially, funding for these phases was meant to come from the sale of development rights and then from the Port Authority. The selling of development rights became unlikely because of the economic downturn and the lack of receiving sites ripe for development in the area. At the same time, the Port Authority’s ability to fund the project was largely altered; as the new PATH Station development at the World Train Center site came in vastly over-budget.

Though the application for the federal TIGER Grant was successful, the funding that it provides ($83.3 million) only partially covers the first phase of the Moynihan Station Development project. The subsequent phases are slated to start after this first phase is complete (tentatively in 2016), however, funding for these phases has not yet been identified.

Moynihan Station Development project is primarily understood and conceptualized as a transportation project. This is partly because of Senator Moynihan’s proposal of the project as such, but more importantly because of the need for a transportation intervention in Penn Station. Upon observation of Penn Station today, it is clearly no longer neither able to effectively or efficiently serve its function, nor is it an appealing gateway to New York City.

25 MSDC (2010), Final Amended General Project Plan.
CURRENT STATE OF THE MOYNIHAN STATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The redevelopment of the Moynihan Complex broke ground in October of 2010.26 This marked the beginning of the first phase, or Phase I, of the development; the only phase that is fully conceptualized, planned out, and funded. Regarding the phasing of the Moynihan Station Development project, MSDC has stated that, “each phase stands alone, with its own independent utility, in providing transportation, economic, and other benefits.”27

Phase I (2012 - 2016)

Below Grade Infrastructure Development:
Transportation Systems and Circulation Efficiency

Phase I is devoted primarily to below grade infrastructure development, transportation, and circulation efficiency. This phase is what characterizes the project as a transportation project. It is on the basis of Phase I that Moynihan Station Development project was approved for the Federal TIGER Grant. Its primary aim is to provide capacity relief for Penn Station by reducing passenger congestion and decreasing train dwell time. Upon implementation of Phase I there is an expectation of

---

26 ibid
27 MSDC (2010), Final Amended General Project Plan.
28 ibid
capacity increase for existing intercity subway and commuter rail services, as well as ease of circulation for subway and rail passengers.

Phase I attempts to achieve these goals primarily through the five components listed below.  

1. The West End Concourse: The West End Concourse will be doubled in width and more than doubled in length to provide access to eight tracks that are not currently served by the existing concourse, ease circulation by providing more space for movement and incorporate the sale of tickets by vending machines to begin to consolidate operations on the West End Concourse.

2. Nineteen new vertical access points: These access points will be stairs, escalators and elevators that will connect platforms, subway connections and street level to the West End Concourse, through Moynihan East.

3. Two New Above-Grade Entrances: Two new entrances that provide direct access to the train hall in Moynihan East, located on 8th Avenue. These will be created at West 31st and West 33rd Streets, on either side of the monumental stairs that lead to the Post Office lobby. These entrances are designed to decrease the congestion at Penn Station and improve access to the newly developing district to the west.

4. The 33rd Street Connector: The 33rd Street Connector, an underground connection which runs between the West End Concourse and Penn Station’s Level A, under West 33rd Street and across 8th Avenue. The 33rd Street Connector will be expanded and reconfigured to accommodate a greater pedestrian flow in Phase I of the project. The 33rd Street Connector will remain under the control of the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA).

5. Emergency Platform Ventilation System: A ‘state-of-the-art’ emergency platform ventilation system will be installed underneath Moynihan East to improve adherence to the National Fire Protection Association’s Standard and improve safety for the users of the future Penn-Moynihan Complex.

__________________________

29 MSDC (2010), Final Amended General Project Plan.
Phase I work occurs mostly within the train shed and due to active rail use during the day on weekdays, much of the work will occur at night and over weekends. This limited work schedule prolongs the construction timetable. Currently Phase I of the project is expected to be completed by 2016.

While Phase I will alleviate congestion in Penn Station, it is unlikely to conclusively resolve Penn Station’s capacity constraints. This is due to the physical location of Moynihan in relationship to Penn Station and the limited access to train infrastructure extending from Penn Station under the Moynihan East. As a result, at maximum, the Moynihan Complex would be able to provide overflow space for passengers that Penn Station cannot currently accommodate. Much of the below-grade infrastructure provides connections from these passenger over-flow spaces to Penn Station; these are major components of the second phase of the project.

Currently funding has not been identified for the second phase, or Phase II, nor has its design been finalized. However, if funding can be identified, the main components of Phase II are as listed below.\(^30\)

1. Train Hall: A new 200,000 sq. ft. train hall and public circulation space (larger that Grand Central Terminal’s) will be constructed in Moynihan East’s courtyard space. It will have direct access to the train platforms below, the West 31st and West 33rd Street mid-block entrances, and the West End Concourse that would have been completed as a component of Phase I. Connected to the “iconic” train hall will be the construction of approximately 100,000 sq. ft. for Amtrak’s front- and back-of-house spaces in which all of their services will be consolidated. The previously mentioned MOU requires Amtrak to move these services from Penn Station into the Moynihan Complex, upon completion of this Phase. This new gateway has been conceived to “comfortably and generously” accommodate both existing passengers and future ridership increases.

\(^{30}\) ibid
2. Intermodal Hall: An intermodal hall will be constructed one floor up from the train hall premises, between the West 31st and West 33rd Street mid-block entrances and would act as another “high-quality” internal circulation space at street level, providing efficient connections internally and externally to a taxi pick-up and drop-off area.

3. Vertical Circulation: Additional development of vertical circulation spaces will be made in Phase II to give the Moynihan Complex direct access to 10 of the 12 platforms in the Penn-Moynihan complex, at track level.

4. Restoration of the Moynihan Complex: Restoration of “historic features” of Moynihan East, focusing on the monumental stairs, and some restoration of the exterior façades and entrances.

5. 32nd Street Pedestrian Corridor: A through-block connection for pedestrians between the train hall premises and 9th Avenue to create an urban connection and serve to ease pedestrian connections and circulation through the superblock that is the Moynihan Complex.

---

31 ibid
6. The ‘Empire Platform’: The complete renovation and new activation of the Diagonal Platform and the two tracks that are adjacent to it, beneath Moynihan East to accommodate additional Amtrak Service, which in the future can be a potential connection to the Metro-North Lines.

7. Commercial/Mixed-Use Development: There is expected to be approximately 1,000,000 sq. ft. of unspecified private commercial or mixed-use development within the Moynihan Complex, around the Amtrak operations, the train hall, the intermodal hall, and the USPS Post Office lobby. This is largely the scope of our recommendations.

Figure 6 Moynihan Station Development project Phase II (Unspecified Development)\textsuperscript{32}

**PROJECT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

Based on the description above, the scope of this studio is primarily concerned with providing recommendations for the programming and physical connectivity of the Commercial & Mixed-use portion of Phase II. This relates to all above grade development in the Moynihan Complex, which includes over 1,350,000 square feet of development space.

\textsuperscript{32} ibid
Accordingly, our team identified the following mission statement to summarize the goals we hope to achieve through our recommendations:

*To create a program that serves commuters and anticipates the needs of local residents; contributes to local economic development; and maintains the historic identity of the building while allowing for greater urban connectivity and maximizing use*

Our team commenced its study of the Moynihan Complex with a series of conversations and interviews that included industry specialists and individuals who have been involved with the Moynihan Station Development project over the past 10 years: Related, Vornado, SHoP and others, as listed below. The insight our team received from these interviews was coupled with analysis of existing and future conditions of the Moynihan Complex and area surrounding, including: a physical assessment, land use and transportation trends, and the anticipated impact of future developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juliette Michaelson</td>
<td>Regional Planning Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Gilchrist</td>
<td>Moynihan Station Development Corporation (Former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Lynn</td>
<td>Port Authority of New York &amp; New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Rosen</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vin Cipolla</td>
<td>The Municipal Art Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ward</td>
<td>Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishaan Chakrabarti</td>
<td>Columbia University, SHoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Samuelian</td>
<td>Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Compton</td>
<td>Community Board 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Fields</td>
<td>Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Evans</td>
<td>President MSDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Bartoli</td>
<td>Transportation Project Manager MSDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this general overview of the Moynihan Complex and the area surrounding, the methodology for determining our final recommendation included three streams of analysis:
- **Public Services**: The mission statement prioritizes both the residents and commuters. Therefore, the first part of our recommendation is concerned with identifying services and functions that would respond to the immediate needs of the commuters and residents in the study area. This stream of analysis aims to ensure value capture of traffic flow coming to Penn Station into the Moynihan Complex. Analysis included surveys of local residents and incoming commuters, demographic and retail trends, and a leakage assessment of retail industries.

- **Anchor Tenant**: To address maximizing the building’s use and contributing to local economic development, Moynihan Complex will need an anchor tenant, to encourage other uses within the complex. Therefore, the second part of our recommendations aims to identify an anchor tenant who would fully utilize the unique location and structure of the Moynihan Complex, contribute to local economic development, and ensure sustainable revenue generation. This analysis included case studies, economic competitiveness analysis, as well as a survey of public programs and funding opportunities. Our analysis also benefited from the interviews mentioned above, which helped our team eliminate, as well as prioritize, options.

- **Urban Connectivity**: The final steam of analysis focused on the physical design of the building, and how our recommendation can ensure efficient flow of traffic within and around the Moynihan Complex. This section included several case studies of transit-oriented developments (e.g. Hong Kong, Tokyo) and greening developments (e.g. Lincoln Center).

| Public Services | • Demographics of commuters and local residents  
|                | • Survey of Needs and Preferences  
|                | • Retail Trends  
|                | • Leakage Analysis |
| Anchor Tenant  | • Expert Interviews  
|                | • Physical Analysis: Criteria  
|                | • Case Study: Cooperative Office Spaces |
| Urban Connectivity | • Traffic Circulation  
|                   | • Urban Connectivity |

Figure 7 Methodology
In order to be able to make any recommendations or analyze any pertinent data and information related to the Moynihan Complex, it is important to examine the existing conditions of the sites, the area surrounding the site, and the important contributing factors surrounding the site. This section addresses Physical Consideration, Land Use, and Transportation Services.

PHYSICAL CONSIDERATION

The Moynihan Complex is located on the superblock between West 31st and West 33rd Street and bound by 9th Avenue to the west and 8th Avenue to the east; directly opposite of the MSG-Penn Station site. The map below indicates the site in a dashed red line.  

The complex is comprised of two buildings, Moynihan East and the West Annex, connected by an enclosed courtyard. The East building is enclosed around an interior courtyard, with windows overlooking the street as well as the courtyard, and was designed as an office campus.

Additionally, the East building is often recognized for its iconic flight of steps extending the full length of the 8th Avenue colonnade. Unlike the East building, the West Annex building has large continuous floor plates, and limited windows that provide natural light. The whole building is surrounded by large, deep, dry moats that are fenced off from the sidewalks. These moats were initially intended as a security provision, as well as to allow light and air into workspaces in the basement.

---

33 Google Maps. (2014). [Moynihan Station] [Street map].
https://www.google.com/maps/search/moynihan+station/@40.7511552,-73.9954791,906m/data=!3m1!1e3
The size of the Moynihan Complex is significant, as its footprint takes up the entirety of the superblock. It is six-stories high, making the total available square footage for development upwards of 1,350,000 square feet, comparable to the area of 24.5 football fields.\textsuperscript{34} The size of the Moynihan Complex presents a conflict in that there are few partitions that create distinctions in spaces, which if required by a program would add to the cost of retrofitting the space accordingly. Another conflict presented by the size of the complex is that it requires multiple tenants to fill the developable spaces, which also complicates creating a uniform and comprehensive branding strategy for the development.

Another important consideration for any development in the Moynihan Complex is its designation as an Individual Landmark by the New York City Landmark Preservation Commission,\textsuperscript{35} and the New York Historic Preservation Office,\textsuperscript{36} in addition to being on the National Register of Historic Places.\textsuperscript{37} This means that the building is protected under preservation laws, and many of the changes that would be necessary for any development to take place in the building will require the MSDC to petition for variances. Though designated under City, State and national standards, as MSDC is a New York State entity, it appeals to the State for any variances to the preservation laws, which protect the building. The complex’s landmark designation can also significantly increase the cost of development, as it requires use of potentially costly, unique materials and fixtures.

**LAND USE**

Initial analysis of the area surrounding the Moynihan Complex site included the entire Community Board 4 (CB4) and a western section of Community Board 5 (CB5). This study area constitutes a sizeable portion of Midtown West, covering the entire area west of 7\textsuperscript{th} Avenue, between West 59\textsuperscript{th} Street and West 14\textsuperscript{th} Street.

Examining the distribution of land uses, it is evident that transportation facilities take up the majority of land within the study area. The northeastern portion is almost homogeneously commercial,

\textsuperscript{34}MSDC (2010) – GPP Attachment.  
\textsuperscript{36}National Historic Preservation Office - http://nysparks.com/shpo/  
\textsuperscript{37}National Register of Historic Places - www.cr.nps.gov/nr/
while the area directly south of the Moynihan Complex site is predominantly residential. This means that Penn Station and the Moynihan Complex must try to accommodate both the residential community to the south and the working community to the north.

The total residential population in this area is 123,128 people, constituting one tenth of the entirety of the Manhattan population. The size of the working population in the study area is approximately 78,000 individuals.

Despite the apparent concentration of residential and commercial buildings north and south of the Moynihan Complex, the population density in this area is 81 people per acre, which is well below the overall Manhattan average of 110 people per acre. This is a remnant of the previous industrial period, resulting in rail yards, factories, and warehouses dominating the area.  

However, as more and more warehouses are converted to residential lofts, along with the future developments of residential buildings, our team expects to see the residential density match or even exceed the overall Manhattan average of 110 people per acre.

---

38 New York City Department of City Planning, Esri, 2008-2012 American Community Survey.
39 Ibid
With this in mind, questions arise of how and why this area, around Penn Station, defies one of the staple principals of urban planning, that the areas closest to major transit hubs are the most vibrant and desirable areas within a city. Upon observation of the blocks surrounding Penn Station it is clear that this old adage is simply not true. This neighborhood is common for low quality buildings and streets, and an abundance of surface and structured parking lots.

In short, our team believes that the undesirable conditions within Penn Station, acting more as a conduit than a public space, coupled with the consequences of MSG’s location, creates a climate that is incompatible with local economic development. The reasons for this unfavorable outcome and the

\[\text{ibid}\]
various factors contributing to it would require further extensive research and are out of the realm of this studio’s focus. However, in contrast with Grand Central Terminal and its surrounding neighborhood, Penn Station and its surrounding neighborhood are clearly the antithesis of one another. It is important to consider the land uses around these two areas, or other similar transit hubs, and compare and contrast the various uses and factors, and how these could be applied toward improving the area around Moynihan Complex. However, due to time constraints and limitation, this analysis was not performed at this time, and perhaps requires further exploration in the future.

Figure 11 Residential and Commercial Use\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{41}ibid
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

The project has an important transportation component, and due to its location in respect to Penn Station, transportation services are closely considered in order to make relevant recommendations.

![Figure 12 Commuting through Penn Station](http://library.rpa.org/pdf/RPA-MAS-Penn-2023.pdf)

The Moynihan Complex is located directly across from Penn Station, the busiest transportation hub in America. Penn Station is home to Amtrak, NJ Transit, and LIRR, and receives an estimated 600,000 commuters daily. This number is greater than the combined daily passenger traffic at John F. Kennedy, LaGuardia and Newark Liberty Airports. LIRR and NJ Transit carry the largest number of commuters to and from the city.

Penn Station also includes two of the most heavily used subway stations in the city, servicing the 1-2-3, and A-C-E subway lines. Herald Square subway station is also accessible, as it is only a block east of Penn Station. These three subway stations receive more traffic than any other station in the city, including Times Square and Grand Central Terminal.

---

42 Source: Station Circulation Analysis
44 ibid
13 subway lines pass through the study area:
- A-C-E
- 1-2-3
- B-D-F-M
- N-Q-R

Figure 134 Subway Stations

45NYU Wagner, The Penn Station Study Area, Trends and Opportunities May 2012.
In addition to the commuter rail and subway lines, the area is a destination for the NJ Transit, bus services, taxis, personal cars, and bicycles. There are seven MTA bus lines making stops around Penn Station. There are also additional bus services in the area, including the Port Authority Airporter, as well as intercity buses like Bolt and Megabus.

* Figure 14 MTA Bus Routes

In comparison to the taxi traffic in Manhattan overall, the map above shows two of the busiest taxi stops are located on West 33rd Street, at 7th and 8th Avenue, as they compete to access the station.

This account of the transportation trends surrounding the Moynihan Complex offers a great contrast with the areas that lack strong localized economies. As a destination for commuters and visitors coming into Manhattan, the proportion that actually remains in the area is low. However, there is great potential for better value capture if the Moynihan Complex is developed to cater to this incoming traffic.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

To better understand how the Moynihan Complex can fit into its neighborhood upon completion, it is important to examine anticipated developments also coming into the area. These future developments will help to determine the best recommendations to complement the new additions to the neighborhood.

On the transportation front, there are two primary projects planned for Midtown West: the 7 Line extension and the proposed Amtrak Gateway Project. As for real estate projects, there are also two upcoming developments that are adjacent to the Moynihan Complex: Brookfield’s Manhattan West development and Related’s Hudson Yards development. In addition to transportation and mixed-use development projects, the area is also anticipating several new public spaces that will be located just west of the Moynihan Complex.

Figure 16 The Gateway Project

The Gateway Project, which is currently under construction, constitutes building a tunnel box under Hudson Yards. This is the last possible opportunity for this tunnel to be constructed because the land it occupies will be decked over by the Hudson Yards development. Construction of the Gateway Tunnel began in September 2013 and is funded by Amtrak. While there is skepticism that the tunnel can pass an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), it remains critical to Amtrak's future plans of adding a high-speed rail (HSR) that would connect Washington D.C., Philadelphia, New York City, and Boston directly. The new trains are expected to reach speeds of up to 220mph, which would be a significant increase compared to the current top speed of 85mph. The HSR project is targeted to be completed by 2030, but has not yet secured funding for the entire installment. The tunnel that is currently under construction will not serve any purpose if the project is not completed.

The second transportation project is the extension of the 7 Line subway, which is likely to have a major impact on transportation patterns in the area. The new 7 Line stop will connect the Hudson Yards development with Grand Central Terminal, and the Port Authority Bus Terminal. This is significant as there are currently no direct connections between Grand Central and Hudson Yards. The new 7 Line stop is funded by the City using Tax Increment Financing (TIF). The City also created what is known as a Uniform Tax Exemption Policy (UTEP) zone.

Figure 17 Mixed-Use and Transportation Developments in Midtown West

---

that acts as a development incentive in the short term and then in the long term increases in tax revenue are used to pay off the bonds that financed the 7 Line extension.\textsuperscript{55}

This is relevant because the Moynihan Complex is currently within the zone with the weakest development incentives and this further demonstrates how the City has made Hudson Yards a higher priority than the Moynihan project and its surrounding neighborhood.

The first major development occurring directly adjacent to Moynihan is Brookfield’s Manhattan West campus.\textsuperscript{56} This project is representative of most future developments coming to Midtown West. It will include two office towers, a luxury residential tower, retail and a 1.5-acre plaza. The project is expected to be completed by 2016, and will create over 5 million sq. ft. of new commercial and residential space in Midtown West. This is expected to add significant demand on current transportation facilities. Brookfield Office Properties also recognizes the importance of the Moynihan project to their development, especially with respect to providing a pedestrian thoroughfare along West 32nd Street - cutting through the center of the Moynihan Complex – to create direct access from their site to the train hall.

The Hudson Yards development, which is considered the largest real estate development in United States history with approximately 28 million sq. ft. of development, is slated to be complete by 2024.\textsuperscript{57} The project includes: 14 acres of open space, over 20 new buildings, a variety of retail options and commercial spaces like the City owned Culture Shed, an innovative home for creative industries, which is expected to bring in numerous visitors.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{54}Google Maps. (2014). [Hudson Yards] [Street map]. https://www.google.com/maps/@40.7536824,-74.0010442,906m/data=!3m1!1e3
\textsuperscript{56}Manhattan West, http://www.manhattanwestnyc.com/
\textsuperscript{57}Hudson Yards, http://www.hudsonyardsnewyork.com/
These two projects will add a combined total of 6,000 residential units and 12.5 million sq. ft. of office space. In total the development surrounding and including Hudson Yards expects to bring in 40,000 people daily and have as much office square footage as the present day City of Seattle.

A third aspect of the master planned community to the Moynihan Complex’s west is the intersection of three major public spaces. The first of these is the now world famous High Line, created by repurposing a historic freight rail line. Depicted in the image to the right, the High Line runs from Gansevoort Street in the Meatpacking District to West 34th Street, between 10th and 11th Avenues. Its Phase III section, which has an anticipated completion date of 2015, will curve around the Hudson Yards.

---

60 The High Line - http://www.thehighline.org/
Development, and is likely to bring even more visitors to the area. The second public space is Hudson River Park, a connected series of piers along Manhattan’s western shoreline that runs from Battery City Park on Manhattan Island’s southern tip until it meets Riverside Park. The last public space known as Hudson Park & Boulevard will be completed in late 2014 and will host the final stop along the new 7 Line subway extension. This boulevard is made up of a multitude of small intimate parks that will span from just south of Times Square to the heart of Hudson Yards covering roughly 10 blocks.

Between these three public spaces, two transportation projects and a myriad of major real estate developments, it is clear that the once depressed area surrounding the Moynihan Complex is poised for a huge surge in income, public spaces, offices, retail, and restaurants. Our goal is to consider all the factors shaping the future of Midtown West and develop a recommendation for Phase II of Moynihan that will complement as well as enhance the overall neighborhood vitality.

61 Hudson Yards Park - [http://www.hudsonriverpark.org/](http://www.hudsonriverpark.org/)
After considering the past, present, and future conditions and contributing factors of the Moynihan development, and various other projects within the study area, it is important to consider the stakeholders involved. This project is surrounded by a complicating web of stakeholders, all contributing to its continuously slow progression, and on occasion even its complete loss of momentum.

There have been multiple proposals for the development of the Moynihan Complex that sought to address the future conditions of the neighborhood, but none of them have gone through. This is partially due to the large number of players associated with the project. Hence, our team performed a stakeholder analysis to better understand the various perspectives surrounding the project, and how different parties envision the project will benefit their interests.

Figure 20 Stakeholder Map - A
There are a total of seven general levels of interest in the Moynihan project: municipal, state, federal, private, transit, preservation, and community. However, this structure is significantly complicated when examining each of the actors pursuing these individual interests.

MSDC, as a subsidiary of ESD, oversees the development of the Moynihan Complex and represents the State’s interest in the project. This association creates a tension in that MSDC operates under State rules, and can override City priorities. Moynihan is also relevant to the Federal Government, considering that it was identified on the United States National Register of Historic Places, which is operated by the United States National Park Service.
Beyond the State, the Moynihan project is also affected by municipal interests that are concerned with Moynihan’s role in expanding Penn Station’s capacity as a transportation hub, as well as the preservation of the Moynihan Complex. The New York City municipal government has three public divisions, each of which holds a stake in the development of Moynihan:

- The NYC Department of City Planning (NYCDCP) has a general stake in any urban development project in New York City. Additionally, NYCDCP’s zoning regulations place a special constraint on the Moynihan project. While MSDC initially expects to generate revenue from the transfer of their development rights, there are currently very few suitable sites that can receive development rights, due to zoning regulations that limit the area for air rights transfers. In 2014, MSDC issued an RFP to assist in selling the development rights. Furthermore, NYCDCP has a stake in the project in its capacity to unlock the potential revenue that is locked by Penn Station’s inability to accommodate additional rail usage.

- The 34th Street Partnership is the business improvement district to which the Moynihan Complex and Penn Station belong. This BID has a definite stake in the project and its capacity to bring clients to businesses in the BID and in the programming of the West Annex building to be complementary to existing retail and commercial sites, rather than compete with them.63

- The New York City Landmark Preservation Commission has given the Moynihan Complex an individual landmark designation, which deems that the building has significant cultural and historical value to the City.64 Hence, the Commission is committed to ensuring that the building’s original architecture is preserved, and that it is not impacted by any future development.

In addition to public entities, there are numerous private interests, mainly real estate companies who are undertaking developments in the area. Brookfield, Vornado, and Related all have projects in sites adjacent to the Moynihan Complex. While all three developers benefit from Moynihan and Penn Station, bringing people to their developments, they would not want the programming in Moynihan to compete with their residential, commercial, and retail functions. Additionally, it is likely that these developers are also interested in the transfer of air rights available to MSDC, which is

---

63 The 34th Street Partnership - [http://www.34thstreet.org/](http://www.34thstreet.org/)
64 Landmark Preservation Commission (1966) - [http://www.neighborhoodpreservationcenter.org/db/bb_files/Main-Post-Office.pdf](http://www.neighborhoodpreservationcenter.org/db/bb_files/Main-Post-Office.pdf)
regulated by the New York City Department of City Planning. However, this relationship is two-fold in that the NYCDCP also depends on private developers for the City to grow and to accommodate residents and commercial spaces.

All the train operators providing service out of Penn Station: the MTA, NJ Transit, and Amtrak, have a stake in the development of Moynihan as it is expected to allow for greater efficiency in moving trains and people. This would allow for an increase in the frequency of trains; hence generating more revenue. Amtrak, the owner of Penn Station, has additional stake in the development of the Moynihan Complex as they have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with MSDC to move into the Moynihan Complex, as the main tenant upon its completion.

At the private/individual level, commuters who currently pass through Penn Station stand to benefit from the project, as they would hope to have an easier connection from the train to the street level, or to connecting trains. Hence, the expectation is that Moynihan would create a generally more pleasant commuting experience, as a result of the added capacity and circulation space. Similarly, residents living or working in Community Board 4 have an obvious stake in the Moynihan Complex as it is located in their neighborhood and has the potential to serve their needs, as well as provide a more efficient and pleasant commuting experience.

The “Friends of Moynihan” coalition was created by the Regional Planning Association in 2004. It is composed of public and civic groups who have aligned their interests in the Moynihan project. These interests include: the creation of a new grand station in New York, promotion of economic revitalization, and the preservation of Moynihan’s identity and historic value. Members of The Friends of Moynihan coalition include the Regional Planning Association, the Municipal Arts Society, the 34th Street Partnership, the New York City Metro American Planning Association Chapter, the New York City American Institute of Architects Chapter, the General Contractors Association of New York, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, New York Building Congress New York Landmarks Conservancy, New York League of Conservation Voters, New York State Laborers, Partnership for New York City, the Preservation League of New York, and Transportation Alternatives.

Due to this lengthy list of stakeholders, each projecting different interests with regard to the various individual components, progress of the Moynihan project was stalled. Great effort is needed to recruit this network of players, and improve coordination over the future of Moynihan.
This studio’s mission statement addresses the needs of the residents of the community around the Moynihan Complex and the needs of the commuters entering Penn Station and Moynihan. In order to further assess the needs of area residents and to begin to understand the needs of commuters two surveys were created, a Community Survey and a Commuter Survey.  *(See Appendix for copies of both surveys)*

**COMMUTER SURVEY**

The Commuter Survey includes 10 questions including: whether individuals were commuting to or from Penn Station, what their starting point was, which train line they used, their final destination, and the errands they ran on their commute. This survey also inquired if the commuter would like to see a certain type of service or amenity accessible to them around Penn Station, and if there is a certain type of service and amenity that would compel the commuter to change their typical daily routine. QR codes were generated for the online survey link, 350 flyers were printed out and distributed outside of Penn Station.

Unfortunately, this survey was unsuccessful, and only returned two responses. Both individuals were riders of NJ Transit, with Penn Station being their final destination. With only one of the responders indicating their errands around Penn, which were stopping for breakfast and running into Staples. This individual would like to see a better variety of food options around and within Penn Station. Hence, due to the shear scarcity of responses no substantial recommendations could be generated from administering the commuter survey.
COMMUNITY SURVEY

The Community Survey consists of nine questions inquiring about the needs of the residents within CB4. The survey was distributed to CB4 members via email, containing an online link. The survey asks the responder to indicate the location of their residence and their preferred starting transit station/stop, and if they commute for work to any of the indicated areas within CB4. Respondents were asked about their commuting patterns, errands they run inside and outside of their neighborhoods, what services are lacking in the area, and what programs they would like to see go into the development of the Moynihan Complex through a number of open-ended questions.

The survey was successful in providing us with 67 responses; these were then analyzed based on the overall total responses of the community board, versus the responses from the residents living within walking distance of Penn. The results showed an overwhelming affinity for the need of a grocery store or supermarket with a wide variety of fresh fruits and vegetables. The second most desired amenity was green open space available to the public such as parks, playgrounds, or simply more trees and seating. Lastly, residents want a better mix and variety of retail options.
In response to the question "What services or facilities would you like to see more of in your neighborhood?" the overall response for CB4 revealed the highest to be grocery store or supermarkets, with varieties of food and fresh fruits/veggies. The next response showed the need for green space open to the public such as parks, playgrounds, or simply more trees and seating, and a better mix and variety of retail, which is mainly shopping for things other than groceries.

The responses to the same question, for residents within walking distance from the Moynihan Complex, provided similar answers, with grocery store, green space, and retail being the services most scarce in the neighborhood. However, the residents here indicate a higher need for green space.
In response to the question “What errands do you run regularly (if any) between your home and beginning your commute?” the overall response for CB4 revealed the most common errands to be post office, groceries, dry cleaners/laundry services, healthcare, which includes clinics and pharmacies, and finally the Bank.

![Figure 26 Errands (Between Home and Train) CB4](image)

The responses to the same question, for residents within walking distance of the site, also proved closely related in comparison, with healthcare, cleaners, post office, and banking to be the most common errands on the way to work.

![Figure 27 Errands (Between Home and Train) Study Area](image)

In response to the question “What errands do you run regularly (if any) between the end of your commute and your final destination?” the overall response for CB4 revealed the most common errands to be groceries.

The responses to the same question, for destinations within walking distance of the site, showed groceries as the most common errand, and also revealed restaurants in close second, including delis and breakfast stops.
Other errands carried out in the neighborhood were cleaners and the pharmacy, while a number of residents run basic errands like banking, postage, laundry and dry cleaning outside of their neighborhood, perhaps indicating a leakage of these retail sectors.

In response to the question “Do you anticipate any benefits for you or your community from any of the following developments: Hudson Yards, Manhattan West, the 7 Line Extension, the Moynihan Station Development?” the overall response for CB4 and residents within walking distance of the site, revealed the majority of the residents expecting to benefit from these developments. These benefits are mostly in the form of overall improvement of the community, increased public green space, better and nicer facility options, and the expected new varieties and mixes of grocery and other retail options.
In response to the question “What would you like to see go into the Moynihan Complex? (What type of amenities, services, facilities, retail, etc.?)” The overall response for CB4 revealed a variety of ideas, with the most common being a Grand Central type of facility, with better mixes and varieties of retail shopping, better food options, and an overall monumental, historic, and more inviting atmosphere. Other common ideas included public green space, restaurant, retail, adequate public bathrooms, grocery or supermarket, and cultural facilities.

The responses to the same question, for residents within walking distance of the site, showed public green space, cultural facilities, and retail shopping as the most common ideas to go into the Moynihan Complex. The several references made to Grand Central Terminal referring to its diversity of retail and food options, vibrant atmosphere, and overall monumental and historic brand.
RETAIL TRENDS

In response to the vast number of survey responses highlighting a desire for greater retail options, we performed a quantitative analysis of recent retail trends spanning from 2008 through 2012. Using Census Bureau NAICS codes and our indicated study area, between 6th Avenue and 10th Avenue, and West 38th Street and west 26th Street shown on the map to the right.\(^{65}\)

Analysis of the establishment counts within the study area revealed growth in industries related to food service and catering, cafes, bars, restaurants, financial services including mortgage lenders, and electronics stores. Most importantly the analysis revealed that there has not been much change, growth or decline, of grocery and other food stores, and a decline in the laundry services sector. These findings parallel those found for the city as a whole, with the exception of laundry services, which shows growth in the city overall. These findings give us an insight into the growing industries within the area, and the potential to capitalize on this growth by offering these retail options within Moynihan.

![Figure 32 Retail Analysis Study Area](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Electronics and Appliance Stores</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Building Material and Supplies dealers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>General Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Credit Intermediation and Related Activities</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 33 Establishment Counts by Industry in Study Area](image)

\(^{65}\) Census - [http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/](http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/)
RETAIL LEAKAGE ANALYSIS

While the retail trends were useful in revealing the growing industries within the study area as well as the city, these results were inconsistent when compared to survey responses that revealed a significant need for grocery stores. Also, the survey responses indicated a lot of the errands involving basic services were accomplished outside of the study area. A Leakage Analysis was selected as a tool to help clear up the discrepancies between the survey responses and the Retail Trends Analysis. The Leakage Analysis is based on the study area population and per capita income, and the city population and per capita income and is a good way to see which industries are performing at or below potential within the area, and which are underperforming, thus establishing the need for more of that particular industry within the neighborhood surrounding the Moynihan Complex.

---

66 Census - [http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/]
A Leakage Analysis is meant to be a guide to understanding the retail opportunities within a neighborhood. It is a supply and demand analysis, or sometimes referred to as a gap analysis that: indicates how well the retail needs of the local residents are being met; and reveals unmet demand and possible opportunities, but not necessarily unconditional opportunities. Just because there is potential for a certain industry within the area, does not guarantee a need for this industry.\(^67\)

The following equation is used to determine the trade area capture, the top of the equation that is then divided by the study area population, to achieve the pull factor.

\[
Pull \ Factor = \frac{\text{Study Area Sales}}{\text{Boro Population}} \times \frac{\text{Study Area Per Capita}}{\text{Boro Per Capita}}
\]

A pull factor resulting in a number below one reveals leakage and means that the residents are spending more for products than local businesses capture, there is unmet demand in the trade area, and the community can support additional store space for that particular type of business/retail. As previously mentioned this does not necessarily indicate an unconditional opportunity, because a strong competitor could be dominating the market or the industry could benefit from clustering in certain parts of the city. A pull factor resulting in a number above one reveals a surplus supply of that industry good and means that the community trade area is capturing the local market, plus attracting non-local shoppers. This does not necessarily mean that the community cannot support additional business in that industry, especially in cases where strong clusters of certain retail are established as a neighborhood destination.

At first, the calculations for the three digit NAICS codes revealed most of the industries in the area as over performing, however, food and beverage stores are among the top three lowest results.

\(^{67}\)Retail Leakage and Surplus Analysis. [http://www.columbus.in.gov/Cityofcolumbus/assets/File/site_2_51-66.pdf](http://www.columbus.in.gov/Cityofcolumbus/assets/File/site_2_51-66.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS Codes</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Trade Area Capture</th>
<th>Pull Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores</td>
<td>59,845.11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Electronics and Appliance Stores</td>
<td>213,878.75</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Building material and garden equipment and supplies dealers</td>
<td>47,024.53</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores</td>
<td>18,631.72</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>61,708.90</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>9,774.52</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores</td>
<td>170,298.84</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores</td>
<td>121,294.64</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>General Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>374,647.58</td>
<td>24.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>77,430.06</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Credit Intermediation and Related Activities</td>
<td>20,147.58</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places</td>
<td>49,016.48</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>128,748.59</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>84,494.13</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total 110,236.76  7.28

Figure 35 Leakage by Three Digit NAICS

A more in depth analysis, utilizing the 8 digit NAICS codes, revealed that grocery stores and supermarkets are in fact underperforming in the area, perhaps because the majority of the existing options only include smaller stores and inadequate variety of products. This solidifies the argument and need for better food stores within the area to accommodate the needs of both community residents and commuters, the top priority of our mission statement. These analysis show community weaknesses and possible opportunities for expansion in the industries indicated as leaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Trade Area Capture</th>
<th>Pull Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets and Grocery Stores</td>
<td>7,113.79</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Needlework and Piece Goods Stores</td>
<td>8,485.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Stores</td>
<td>9,174.94</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>9,774.52</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Markets</td>
<td>12,025.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet and Weight Loss Centers</td>
<td>12,594.62</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Contractors</td>
<td>14,597.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet and Pet Supplies Stores</td>
<td>15,152.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage and Nonmortgage Loan Brokers</td>
<td>18,015.94</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores</td>
<td>18,631.72</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterers</td>
<td>19,443.06</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Intermediation and Related Activities</td>
<td>20,147.58</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and Vegetable markets</td>
<td>21,715.95</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty Salons</td>
<td>21,778.04</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden equipment and supplies dealers</td>
<td>47,024.53</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places</td>
<td>49,016.48</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores</td>
<td>59,845.11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>61,708.90</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>77,430.06</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>84,494.13</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36 Leakage by Eight Digit NAICS

The Public Services analysis gives us a better understanding of how to address the needs of the area’s residents and commuters, however, with Moynihan’s massive size, it would be impossible to maximize the use through only these functions. Therefore, it is necessary to address the ability of the complex to attract these public services, maximize the use of the floor plates, and generate revenue for the State. Decidedly, it is determined that an anchor tenant would have the potential to address this part of the mission statement. This section discusses the research and analysis that helped to lead our studio toward creating an appropriate recommendation for an anchor tenant within the Moynihan Complex.

After researching a number of possible anchor tenants for the West Annex building of the Moynihan Complex, we recommend an education, research & development facility, specifically a collaborative and strategic partnership between one or multiple educational institutions and a specific industry. This proposal has been modeled on the Roosevelt NYC Tech Island, operated by Cornell University and Technion, Israel Institute for Technology. This institution was a product of former Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s call for proposals for Roosevelt Island. A similar type of competition could be held to determine the anchor tenant for the Moynihan Complex, the winner of which would ultimately be the group leading the strategic partnership and maintaining a large portion of the services located in the Moynihan Complex. The number of viable entries in the Bloomberg administration’s Competition, leads us to believe that a competition would produce several feasible options for an anchor tenant for the Moynihan Complex. We believe that an anchor tenant of this nature mediates between responding to the MSCD’s goals for their development and the studio’s goals regarding the tenant’s providing some utility to the neighborhood, in addition to productively making use of the space’s inherent physical qualities.
The primary programmatic components for the strategic partnership envisioned would be a research lab and a combination of permanent Class-B office spaces for small businesses and both public and leased cooperative working spaces. In studying various models of the organization of several partnerships of this variety we have found that complementary programmatic elements are generally auditorium and exhibition hall-type spaces. These spatial usages would be useful for this tenant and provide the potential for an extended land-use and possible revenue generation. Both spaces could be rented out or made available for use by the community when available and outside of standard hours of operation of the research facility. As such, the inclusion of an auditorium space and an exhibition hall could provide a significant private as well as public benefit. Some uses proposed for the auditorium space are town hall meetings, community board meetings, lectures, plays, movie screenings or conferences. The exhibition hall could serve as space for job fairs, events, sporting or gaming events. We see the addition of these spaces as an important layer as we move from ground floor public uses to the upper floors that are predominantly
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69 Cornell University - [http://www.now.cornell.edu/nyctech/](http://www.now.cornell.edu/nyctech/)
private uses, as they allow for interactions between various users and in their physical location in the building could serve to create a gradient from public to private users.

There are multiple factors that contribute to recommending this particular programmatic arrangement. Primarily, the building’s massive floor plates could be leveraged as a positive for both the research lab, cooperative working spaces and exhibition hall as all generally require large open-concept plans to be the most effective. As such, this spatial arrangement would require minimal retrofitting in the conversion from mail sorting facility to a research and development office campus. This is ideal from the point-of-view of the State, which has not allocated the necessary funds to invest in retrofitting the existing infrastructure. The desire for minimizing up-front cost has also informed our decision to repurpose the upper floors of the eastern part of Moynihan Complex with permanent Class-B office space as the current configuration contains a number of offices previously used by the managerial staff of the United States Postal Service. Making the combination of Research and Development, co-op working spaces, exhibition hall and standard office spaces a preferable programmatic arrangement for the future Moynihan Complex. Furthermore, the surrounding area is already favoring this type of use, given there is already tech clustering along the High Line near Chelsea Market and the new Google building that occupies one of The Port Authority of New York’s former establishments just to the south of our site, and soon to be Hudson Yards to the west of our site will be a major enclave of professional and tech related offices.

IMPLEMENTATION

Though not a novel idea, this model for a partnership between an educational institution and industry is relatively new and its operations can seem quite complex. To further demonstrate the

---

70 Google Building - http://nypost.com/2013/10/01/google-grows-to-the-west/
feasibility of how such a tenant would come to use the Moynihan Complex, we looked into the strategic partnership at an operational level. As mentioned earlier a competition could be held to determine the institution or university that will make up the research and development component of the anchor tenant, but before this can occur a funding source is needed. This source could be private, public or a public-private partnership. Often these institutional partnerships are spearheaded by companies looking to solve a known future problem that is perceived to become an issue to their earning capacity in the future, as was the case with British Petroleum’s creation of the Energy Biosciences Institute. The Energy Biosciences Institute includes multiple universities most notably the University of California, Berkeley. The main focus of the Institute is on "developing sustainable next-generation biofuels and reducing the impact of fossil fuels on global warming."\(^{71}\)

It is important to note that one company or entity does not always supply all the funding or maintain funding over the long term. Instead, the goal is largely to kick-start the process and get all the key actors involved. Once these key actors are in place the strategic partnership should be able to generate enough outside investment from venture capitalist and research grants to be sustainable and autonomous.

After funding is secured and competition winners are selected a board is created. This board would include representatives from both the industry and university sides of the partnership. The role of the board is substantial. It includes management of the property, selection of the start-ups, and in this capacity acts as a steering committee. That being said, their most important role is creating and enforcing contracts, most notably intellectual property and term limits for businesses. Several case studies highlighted the importance of well-defined intellectual property agreements and longer tenures for business, which leads us to the public utility of our proposed strategic partnership and how the Moynihan Complex can fill a void that does not exist in other parts of Manhattan.

This strategic partnership is essentially an incubation strategy for start-up businesses but differs from traditional cooperative working spaces in that incubation is not achieved primarily by investment, but rather by the reliable knowledge base offered by universities that allows for specialized knowledge and collaboration across fields of study. Startups and small businesses are able to leverage the knowledge and stability of the university against the inherent volatility and risk any start-up must take
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on. The stability provided by the educational institution provides an ideal environment for outside investment from venture capitalist and angel investors alike, helping to catalyze local economic development in the area. Furthermore, this type of strategic partnership is more likely to provide public utility than a traditional R&D lab, managed and operated by one or two private firms. Traditional R&D labs generally yield innovations to benefit a few key investors, solely based on financial motivation. The stability of an educational component offers the freedom to innovate with the utility of the public at large in mind. This is made possible via the structure of the intellectual property agreement and creates a sort of shared ownership over new innovations.

**CO-WORK SPACES AND SMALL BUSINESS SERVICES**

Cooperative working spaces are largely regarded as beneficial to the local economy in their capacity of incubating small businesses by providing affordable space and the opportunity to and take advantage of other businesses with similar or different expertise and connect with venture capitalist, angel investors and other key players that are necessary for the maintenance and growth of businesses of this size. Clustering businesses in this stage is also attractive in that it provides an efficient means by which investors can browse businesses that they can potentially partner with, encouraging investments in the cities in which these spaces are located. The businesses that tend to locate in these spaces that are instead of simply being established non-employers or have few employees are in emerging fields are especially important to city-scale economies.

The average monthly cost of a shared desk in a co-working facility in Manhattan is $349 in Manhattan, compared to $162 in New York City’s other four boroughs. Likewise, the average monthly cost for a dedicated desk at a co-work space in Manhattan is $526 versus the average cost in the other four boroughs of $320.\(^ {72} \) This price differential not only reflects the difference in property values in the boroughs, but also the high demand for these spaces in Manhattan. There are over 50 spaces of this type in Manhattan but only six of them currently have openings for designated desk spaces and shared desks often fill up upon opening, every morning.\(^ {73} \) In the blocks surrounding the Moynihan
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\(^ {73} \) Mapping of Co-working Spaces
Complex there is a desert of co-working spaces. The most proximate of these general co-working spaces are found in a cluster by Times Square to the north. Our site is in a neighborhood with particularly high density of commuters and easy connections to other parts of the city (and regional area) provides an ideal location for an easily-accessible workspace.

The offering of cooperative working spaces operated by an educational institution would allow for the businesses that locate in these spaces to take advantage of the Start Up NY initiative that exempts start-ups who locate on an educational campus from paying corporate taxes for 10 years. Furthermore, as the educational institution that would most likely offer said space would be a not-for-profit institution they would be able to offer much more affordable office space than the Manhattan average. In addition, to contributing a function that does not currently exist in the neighborhood (or elsewhere on the island of Manhattan), this focused education and research & development mix is complementary to the Hudson Yards development, because unlike Hudson Yards, the Moynihan Complex can offer affordable office spaces to pre-revenue generating and experimental start-ups who cannot afford to locate in the prohibitively priced offices in the Hudson Yards development. Hudson Yards is marketed as being the newest location for the creative class in Manhattan. Despite the fact that the Hudson Yards Development cannot necessarily accommodate the business that would constitute much of the creative class, the development of the Moynihan Complex can offer this opportunity.

In order to feasibly operate the cooperative working space component of the anchor tenant’s programming, start-ups would be required to pay rent. Although this rent would be far less expensive than rents at Hudson Yards, they would still be prohibitive to some area-residents looking for flexible workspace. As per our strategy to provide programming at multiple price points, we recommend that
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74 Start Up NY - [http://startup.ny.gov/](http://startup.ny.gov/)
Empire State Development retains space in the Moynihan Complex to offer free or discounted, publically accessible cooperative working spaces. These fully democratized spaces would be part of our three-pronged pricing strategy concerning available workspaces.

Additionally, we believe that a Small Business Services Center would be a useful complement to the cooperative working spaces that are included in the programming and could serve to support and foster local economic development in the surrounding area. Small businesses are defined by the State of New York as any business that employs less than 100 employees. Cooperative working spaces are almost exclusively occupied by this type of business and 97% of the businesses in our study area fit this definition of a small business and could likewise benefit from the provision of such services. Both the State and the City provide services to aid small businesses in centers in Manhattan. Both these centers are, however, located at a distance from the neighborhood in Kips Bay and the Financial District, respectively. The ESD could feasibly retain a portion of the Moynihan Complex and use it to provide a third Manhattan location from which they could provide specialized services to set-up and maintain small businesses.

\footnote{NYCEDC - \url{http://www.nycedc.com/tags/small-business}}

\footnote{Bureau of Labor Statistics.}
After researching and analyzing the various uses that would best fit the interests of all involved, we now take a look into how these uses best fit into the Moynihan Complex itself. As different floors are intended for varying traffic, similarly the uses should be accommodated accordingly.

Moynihan Complex has a total of six floors, not counting the platform area located below grade (blue). All entrances to the building are located on the street level (green), with two additional ones planned on the east side entering the floor below street level (purple). These two entrances are designed to give pedestrians direct access to the “train hall” area, where escalators to the platforms will be provided. All floors above street level are highlighted in orange. As mentioned earlier, the floors on the east side are shaped like a donut, overlooking a courtyard, which is the future “train hall” area. While the large continuous floor plates mainly characterize the western side of Moynihan Complex.

Figure 39 Floor Levels -Moynihan Complex
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STRATEGY FOR LOCATING PROGRAMS

The anticipated traffic that each of these floors will receive in the future is likely to vary. The two primary groups that will frequent the Moynihan Complex most regularly are: commuters who will be entering and exiting the platforms, and building tenants who will be working in the building. Commuter flow is expected to be high volume, concentrated during rush hour and limited to the bottom floors (platform and train hall areas). Tenant flow is expected to be lower volume, concentrated in the daytime, and occupying the areas where their offices will be located.

The other group expected to frequently use Moynihan Complex are area residents (outside of their capacity as commuters or as employees of either the education or industrial component of the anchor tenant's programming). These users are likely to be drawn to most regularly using the retail programming, public cooperative workspaces and green spaces.

Proposed programs will be located according to these expected trends, to promote efficient flow of traffic and to allow for programs that benefit from being proximate from one another located accordingly. Hence, all services geared toward commuters will be located on lower floors of Moynihan East, above the platforms. This will allow commuters to access services without creating congestion in other parts of the building. Similarly, offices and associated facilities servicing the anchor tenant will be located in the top floors of the Moynihan Complex, so as to facilitate ease of movement without encountering commuter traffic.

Another strategy for the organization of programming is by concentrating the most public programs in the lower floors and as programs become more targeted to specific users, they will be located on higher levels to make the most public and heavily used programs the easiest to access.

POSSIBLE LAYOUT OF PROGRAMMING

A potential layout for locating programs Moynihan Complex would be as follows:

**Top Levels:** The anchor tenant will occupy the top floors, where people using this space can move and work without disruption. The upper levels of Moynihan East were originally designed as office space for the managerial staff of the USPS facility and as such can be easily renovated to be used as collaborative office space. The large, continuous floor plates in the West Annex building offer the
open space and square footage required by R&D facilities and the affiliated programming of an auditorium space and an exhibition hall.

Figure 40 Locating Tenant and Commuter Programs - Moynihan Complex Section

Figure 41 Public and Green Space - Moynihan Complex Section
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**Ground Level:** Retail services that serve commuters, area-residents and building tenants alike at ground level and clustered around the post office to make them readily accessible to all populations using them. These services include cafes, bars, and restaurants, a grocery store, gym, bank, office supply store and the like.

In this layout, it is also possible to include a prominent interior garden that serves to facilitate orientation with the massive floor and contributes to making the development a destination. The rooftop may also be converted into a public garden, to take advantage of this unique space.

**URBAN CONNECTIVITY**

Our recommendations for Moynihan Complex include two primary interventions towards improving its physical connectivity to the surrounding area:

**Entrances:** All existing entrances to Moynihan Complex are located on the street level. Only those located on the east side (8th Avenue) are in use by pedestrians. Those located on the west side (9th Avenue) are either not in use, or are designed for automobile access. Two additional pedestrian entrances are planned below street level to access the train hall, which will also be located on the east side.

Our recommendation with regards to entrances is to incorporate additional ones on the west side. The 32nd Street Corridor is a space intervention that has already been explored in several proposals for the development of the Moynihan Complex. Its inclusion in the final design would create a more easily accessible space, as well as improve circulation through the west. Additionally the 32nd Street Corridor would break up the superblock and provide an easy indicator by which to orient in the building.
Moats: Wide moats separate the Moynihan Complex from the surrounding sidewalks. These moats no longer serve any purpose and take up a sizeable area on the sidewalks. Moats on the east side are shallow, and can be redesigned and integrated into the sidewalk. They could be reused as public space for passing pedestrians. Moats on the north side of the complex are deep, and can be enclosed and incorporated into Moynihan Complex’s internal space, below street level.
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Rendering created by the studio, using an image of the steps at Alice Tully Hall front entrance, Lincoln Center.
Today, the Moynihan development is largely understood as a transportation project that seeks to provide congestion relief to the current overcrowding in Penn Station. However, the entire branding of the development as a station revolves around a single programmatic function within the Moynihan Complex: the train hall, to be located in Moynihan East’s courtyard.

Considering that the proposed program for Moynihan includes other components, namely: public services, an anchor tenant and public space, our recommendation for the future brand is to be comprehensive of these functions. Building on our mission statement, the future Moynihan Complex will be a development that caters to both local residents and incoming commuters by offering accessible and customized services and retail functions. It would also contribute to local economic development by attracting an anchor tenant, such as an incubator and research and development facility, that would generate revenue for Moynihan and bring employment and investment to the local neighborhood. Additionally, the anchor tenant would benefit from and build synergies with other upcoming developments in the area, including Hudson Yards. Finally, the development would maintain the historic value of the building and optimize use of its space by incorporating green space, such as a rooftop and interior gardens.

This program creates the potential to expand Moynihan’s identity to leverage the services it offers, the unique physical characteristics of the building such as its architecture and the proposed green spaces, as well as its future anchor tenant.

Figure 46 Moynihan Access to Train Tracks 82
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82 Trains - cs.trains.com/trn/f/111/t/187204.aspx
Furthermore, we believe that the implication of branding the Moynihan Complex as a station is that it emphasizes its claim of being the solution to the congestion in Penn Station. However, upon examining the transportation component of the plans for the complex, we believe that the project is limited in mitigating the issues of congestion in Penn Station. This is not because of an inefficient design, but rather the way in which the Moynihan Complex relates to the tracks that extend from Penn Station. Considering that the Moynihan Complex can only provide access to the middle tracks, Phase II of the project will not result in an alternative train station but instead an extension of the current Penn Station.

Hence, while the Moynihan Complex may be able to provide the capacity relief that Penn Station requires, this function can be achieved without branding the entire complex as a train station. Branding Moynihan Complex as a station is at once misleading to the public’s understanding of the building and potentially masks the problems of Penn Station’s congestion, without properly addressing them. By shifting the development's branding from train station to focus on incorporating other programming components could potentially alter the project's identity, allowing for the uncritical acceptance of MSG’s location above Penn Station. We believe that the relocation of MSG is ultimately the only comprehensive solution to Penn Station’s overwhelming congestion. In branding the Moynihan Complex as something other than a train station it becomes possible to create a pivot in the path to dependency that could allow MSG to renew its operating permit for its current site upon the existing permit’s expiration in 2023.

To conclude, the branding of the development of the Moynihan Complex as anything other than a train station, hopefully creates a condition that maintains the pressure on the movement of MSG to allow for the expansion of Penn Station. As the surrounding neighborhood is slated to see massive developments, such as Hudson Yards, rapidly added to its fabric, a sustainable solution to Penn Station’s congestion is necessary. If by rebranding the development the impetus is created for change, then it would be the greatest contribution the project could make to the current and future neighborhood of Midtown West.
**APPENDIX**

**Penn Station Commuter Survey**

1. Which category below best represents your age group?
   - Under 18
   - 18-35
   - 36-60
   - Over 60

2. At what station do you start your commute?

3. Which train do you use?
   - NJ Transit
   - AMTRAK
   - LIRR
   - PATH
   - Other (please specify)

4. Did you make a transfer? If so, where?

5. Is Penn station your final transit stop?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Other (please specify)

6. Which of the following best represents the proximity of your final destination?
   - West of 6th Avenue, btw 56th Street and 53rd Street
   - West of 6th Avenue, btw 52nd Street and 48th Street
   - West of 8th Avenue, btw 52nd Street and 43rd Street
   - West of 8th Avenue, btw 49th Street and 38th Street
   - West of 8th Avenue, btw 38th Street and 33rd Street
   - West of 8th Avenue, btw 33rd Street and 28th Street
   - West of 6th Avenue, btw 26th Street and 23rd Street
   - Other (please specify)

7. What errands do you run regularly (if any) between home and beginning your commute?
   - Between home and beginning your commute:

8. What services or facilities would you like to see accessible to you around Penn Station? In the area of your final destination?
   - Around Penn Station:
   - In the area of your final destination:

9. How often do you commute through Penn Station?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Biweekly
   - Monthly
   - Only on occasion
   - Other (please specify)

10. When you exit the train, is there a service, facility, or amenity for which you would consider changing your daily routine? (a certain type of food, coffee, shop, etc. for which you would go out of your way)


1. In which of the following areas do you reside?

- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 58th Street and 49th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 48th Street and 39th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 38th Street and 29th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 28th Street and 14th Street
- Other (please specify)

2. What services or facilities would you like to see more of in your neighborhood?

3. At what station (if any) do you start your commute?

- 59th St - Columbus Circle [A, B, C, D, 1]
- 57th St-7 Av [N, Q, R]
- 7 Av [B, D, E]
- 50 St [C, E]
- 60 St [1]
- 49 St [N, Q, R]
- 42 St - Port Authority [A, C, E]
- Times Sq-42 St [S]
- Times Sq-42 St [7]
- Times Sq-42 St [N, Q, R]
- 34 St-Penn Station [A, C, E]
- 34 St- Penn Station [1, 2, 3]
- Other (please specify)

4. At what stations do you transfer (if any)?

5. Do you commute to any of the following areas?

- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 58th Street and 49th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 48th Street and 39th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 38th Street and 29th Street
- West of 7th Avenue, b/w 28th Street and 14th Street
- Please specify the nature and frequency.

6. What errands do you run regularly (if any) between your home and beginning your commute?

What errands do you run regularly (if any) between the end of your commute and your final destination?

7. Do you anticipate any benefits for you or your community from any of the following developments Hudson Yards, Manhattan West, the 7 Line Extension? If so, please explain.

- Yes
- No

If yes, please specify the benefit.

8. What are your thoughts on the redevelopment of Farley Building into Moynihan Station? (Do you think it could relieve congestion in Penn Station, provide potential business opportunities, provide more retail services and/or amenities for the neighborhood, pose a threat to landmark preservation of the building, etc.)

9. What would you like to see go into the development of Moynihan Station site? (What type of amenities, services, facilities, retail, etc.?)