

Rescuing and Revitalizing Privately Owned

Public Spaces:

A Strategic Plan for Community Board 8

April, 2013

Prepared by:

Antwan Allen
Andy Lee Chao
Kalinka Kamenoff
Paul Lozito
Greg Mastroianni
Grazyna Sloma
Libby Wann

**Hunter College Graduate Students
Department of Urban Affairs & Planning
Non Profit Strategic Planning Course**

Manhattan Community Board 8

Nick Viest, Board Chair
Teri Slater & Elaine M. Walsh
Co-Chairs Zoning & Development committee

Executive Summary

POPS (Privately Owned Public Spaces) emerged from the 1961 zoning resolution as a tool to develop more open spaces in dense, primarily commercial districts. These spaces were achieved through the implementation of additional floor area ratio (FAR) bonuses to developers in return for the inclusion of atriums, plazas, arcades, and other publicly accessible communal spaces in their commercial and residential developments. The program proposed a visionary concept that was ultimately poorly executed in its early phases, producing a proliferation of POPS that consisted of little more than concrete plazas and building setbacks. Subsequent major amendments aimed at creating spaces more expressly developed for public use were made in 1975, 1995, and most recently in 2001.

Today, there are a host of issues impacting the utilization of Upper East Side POPS in a manner consistent with their original intent of providing air, light, and publically accessible communal gathering spaces. These issues revolve around the diversity and number of stakeholders involved, the complexity of zoning laws that govern the spaces, the perceived safety concern over spaces that are vulnerable to crime and inappropriate use, and a history of poor communication regarding the correct usage and existence of the spaces.

The mission of Community Board 8 (CB8) is to act as an instrument for residents to engage in issues that affect their neighborhood. More specific to the POPS program, the Board's land use committee of CB8 wishes to work with various impacted stakeholders on processes that more evenly distribute the benefits of these areas, thus leading to greater overall utilization and value by the public.

The following document presents a strategic plan for Community Board 8 to carry out its vision of revitalizing POPS as community assets. There is a great need to integrate POPS more seamlessly into the Upper East Side community, thus meeting the spirit of the program under which they were originally created. CB8 seeks to ensure that every POP in the Upper East Side is

safe, inviting, and appropriately utilized by the community. Based on research, interviews, and surveys, the following recommendations for achieving CB8's vision are proposed:

Short-term:

- Increase community awareness of POPS through upgrades to signage and a marketing plan tailored to specific stakeholder groups;
- Develop programming to encourage community use and social interaction;
- Reduce confusion and potential tension among stakeholders over the appropriate use of POPS by the public; and
- Work with the city to update City Planning records into one consistent, reliable, and easily accessible document.

Long-Term:

- Work with city to develop more efficient processes for approving amendments to POPS;
- Encourage more public engagement through the installation of benches and other amenities; and
- Establish a third party entity charged with the sole purpose of managing POPS.

Introduction

Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) were first conceptualized as a way for the city of New York to partner with commercial and residential properties to create urban public space in densely developed commercial and residential neighborhoods. First introduced in 1961, the POPS program was a product of legal amendments to existing zoning laws that created 'incentive zoning'. The initial 1961 zoning resolution was the city's first attempt to create a policy that affirmatively encouraged the creation of privately owned public spaces through zoning bonuses in the form of additional floor area ratios (FAR). Each district has a maximum FAR that restricts the heights of buildings as a means of protecting access to light and air for communities. Developers of both commercial and residential buildings could apply to receive these bonuses, which would allow them to build beyond the standard FAR in an area, in return for the inclusion of atriums, plazas, arcades, and other publicly accessible communal spaces in their buildings. The initial 'as-of-right' zoning, which required no administrative review process

to guide the construction of new POPS spaces, led to a proliferation of new arcades and plazas in the city. This initial phase in the POPS zoning history was also characterized by zoning laws that required developers to offer few, if any, additional amenities. Many POPS during this initial phase can be characterized as barren concrete spaces with little ability for public engagement.

1975 marked a significant revision to the established zoning policies pertaining to POPS. These revisions were primarily in response to ‘as of right’ policies that granted great variation in the way developers were allowed to use incentive zoning to receive their bonus, resulting in the rapid proliferation of POPS that were of little public value. To address this problem, revisions were enacted with the goal of creating more public value through imposing higher design standards, mandatory amenities such as seating, trees, bicycle parking, and drinking fountains, and the creation of a special administrative review process to guide the development of new spaces. Responding to public pressure over safety concerns, the city also added an amendment that allowed the City Planning Commission to authorize building owners to apply for reduced hours of operation. Finally, in 2000 an amendment called the ‘Unified Bulk Program’ was proposed, which abolished the right of residential plazas to apply for POPS spaces, stating that going forward, only community facilities could apply for POPS bonuses. This has significantly reduced the amount of potential publicly owned private spaces, with the last residential POPS constructed in 2001.

The POPS program represented a new form of public-private partnership. In theory, all the stakeholders involved, including residents, developers, and the general public, were set to benefit from this arrangement, with developers gaining additional square footage and residents and the general public benefitting through the acquisition of greatly needed public space. In practice, however, there is a general consensus that the POPS program has not lived up to its ambitious beginnings and has instead favored the interests of the developers and failed to provide the public with the benefits they were originally promised. While there is a feeling that POPS have improved significantly since the first round of barren concrete spaces in 1961, there still remains a large discrepancy between the physical conditions, compliance with zoning laws, and overall knowledge of and use by stakeholders of these spaces. While some POPS are being utilized in a manner consistent with how they were originally intended, a significant number are in major

violation of the mandatory zoning laws. This disjointed history of zoning laws can be partially blamed for a lack of awareness or knowledge about POPS by a large majority of the stakeholders. Going forward, POPS also face issues that arise out of having diverse, and in some cases, competing interests among stakeholders.

Mission Statement

Community Board 8 (CB8) is an instrument for neighborhood stakeholders to engage New York City's initiatives. The community board maintains a multifaceted purview which comments on city development, policing, waste management, and environmental actions. The Board's land use committee oversees the development of the physical environment in the Upper East Side.

In its objectives for 2013, the community board stated that, "CB8 and local civic groups have urged the Department of City Planning to review the Community Facility provisions of the Zoning Resolution. CB8 is the only district where community facilities are entitled to a 5.1 FAR in the R8B mid-blocks. CB8 has proposed modifications to the Department of City Planning to change the current community facility in R8B areas from a 5.1 to a 4.0 FAR."

Community Board 8 positions itself as an arbiter of zoning rule changes in its work with the Department of City Planning. In this context, CB8 currently serves as the appropriate venue to address the primary zoning and compliance issues facing POPS.

Vision

Community Board 8 seeks to ensure that every POP in the Upper East Side is safe, inviting, and appropriately utilized by the community. Currently, many POPS are not being utilized as they were originally intended: to provide air, light, and communal gathering spaces. Open space is a vital asset in these densely populated neighborhoods, so there is a great need to better integrate POPS into the the community. To that end, the community board seeks to modify spaces that are of poor quality, raise the public's awareness and use of POPS, and ease zoning regulations so that the community can be empowered to implement changes to POPS that will better serve the needs of its stakeholders.

Key Stakeholders

- **Developers:** built POPS and benefit from the FAR bonuses received from the City.
- **Building management/property managers:** currently responsible for maintaining POPS and ensuring that zoning requirements are met.
- **Building Residents:** share safety concerns as it relates to hours of operation, crime, and outside people using spaces in their residence.
- **Public:** potential and intended users of these spaces.
- **Community leaders** (i.e. block associations and community groups): have an interest in POPS being leveraged in creative ways to better serve the needs of the community.
- **Police:** respond to safety issues, frequently receiving complaints for unlawful actions

External Assessment

There are a host of issues impacting the utilization of Upper East Side POPS in a manner consistent with their original intent. These issues revolve around the diversity and number of stakeholders involved, the complexity of zoning laws that govern the spaces, and a history of poor communication regarding the correct usage and existence of the spaces. More specifically, an external assessment revealed the following issues:

Diverse set of Stakeholders: One of the greatest challenges to forming a cohesive strategy for the POPS is the fragmented nature of the constituents involved.

- POPS were created for the benefit of the neighborhood; the unique nature of these spaces as privately owned spaces regulated by a municipal authority and open to the public creates a complex ecology that incorporates a diverse set of stakeholders.
- Impacted parties include: developers, building management, building residents, city governing bodies, police, non-profit organizations, and the general public.

While the diversity of stakeholders presents a challenge, it also presents an opportunity to capitalize on a large range of knowledge and interest in the POPS. Given the right forum for a more focused approach, stakeholder diversity could prove to be an asset.

Lack of Central Organizing Venue: Based on the fragmented nature of the POPS constituents, one of the greatest challenges CB8 faces is the lack of a centralized venue/authority with the appropriate capacity for funneling feedback and constructing a strategy for future usage. Given

appropriate resources and authority, however, processes pioneered by CB8 have the opportunity to serve as a model for other Community Boards in New York City and beyond.

Communication and Outreach: The lack of either a centralized venue for stakeholders to communicate to each other or an easily accessed resource to guide usage has caused widespread confusion in regards to the rules and regulations that govern POPS.

- Confusion regarding the correct procedure for resolving issues or getting additional information.
- Complex zoning rules and regulations spanning nearly fifty years have also compounded the challenge of reaching clarity.
 - Not even the City, which is the ultimate authority, seems clear on the guidelines, thus leaving a gray area in regards to the interpretation of rules.

Based on this confusion, there has also been a general lack of outreach to engage and educate the public on the existence or purpose of these spaces.

Vision of Success: There is a lack of a single, mutually agreed upon ‘vision of successes’ for the POPS, as each stakeholder has a different relationship with the POPS with a different set of vested interests. The definition of an appealing open space is subjective and differs from one stakeholder to the next. Although this presents a challenge, it also presents the opportunity for all stakeholders to have feedback on the formulation of a strategic plan.

Process for Amendments: POPS are permanent spaces in the community. As such, even the simplest modifications (such as adding a bench or removing a planter) cannot be made without re-entering the New York City’s Uniform Land Use Review Procedure, which requires lawyers, architects, community input, the planning board, and possibly a City Council vote. This permanence creates unique issues surrounding the flexibility of POPS to grow with the needs of the Upper East Side community.

Lack of Flexibility: Because POPS are ultimately under the jurisdiction of the city, CB8 must operate within a very strict set of guidelines, giving the community board little flexibility to institute change.

Caretaker Deficit: Developers often leave POPS once they have created the building. This has often resulted in residential owners of POPS, who do not fully understand their role as caretakers, being responsible of these public spaces. This lack of understanding often leads to hostility towards the general public using POPS. This issue is complicated by the types of owners that oversee the diverse number of POPS. Ownership of POPS could be vested in a single owner or many condo owners within the same building. The complexity creates several legal issues regarding deed restrictions and liability for someone who hurts himself or herself in a poorly maintained POPS.

Second Avenue Subway Construction and Mitigation: As, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) has begun construction on the Second Avenue Subway, it has seized many POPS to host construction materials and staging sites. These POPS are not available for public use, and currently, the MTA will not be responsible for restoring the POPS to their former design when subway construction is completed. As a state authority, the MTA can make changes that supersede local zoning. As it stands now, when the building owners and MTA come to an agreement on how to restore the seized POPS, their agreement does not need to restore a POPS to its former design or keep its status as a POPS.

Existing Conditions

The POPS program has created 502 public spaces in New York City. The Upper East Side's CB8 includes 76 POPS; just fewer than 20% of the program total. These POPS can be separated into three general cohorts by the dates they were built, and further broken out into public space designation.

- 38POPS were built between 1965 and 1975
 - 136 1961 plazas;
 - 57 arcades
- 37 residential plazas' were constructed between 1980-present; and
- Other POPS were constructed pursuant to other legal requirements.

POPS Assessment: The team created a survey targeted at examining the existing conditions of POPS. The Department of City Planning was extremely helpful with suggestions and guidance

and their knowledge of the phases and zoning law that played a role in how POPS were created over time. The team surveyed 90 sites that the community board identified as POPS to assess the physical condition in order to prepare a qualitative understanding of the usability and readability of each space:

- the actual presence of a POP at that site
- any barriers to public use
- general maintenance of the space
- presence of landscaping features, such as grass and plantings/flowers
- general impression of how inviting and pleasant the space is for someone to use
- the presence of signage clearly identifying the space as a POP

A number of POPS, typically the residential plazas, are required to have planting or landscaping elements. Overall, 36% of the total POPS surveyed include floral and grass landscaping.

All of the POPs in the survey were well maintained, which the group defined as being clean, free of debris, and having well-kept landscaping (if landscaping was present). While a number of POPS are permitted to have a nighttime closing, (depending on the year of construction) nearly half of the POPS have barriers that inhibit active entry and use by the public; these barriers include walls, gates, locked entry, and construction materials. A number of POPS are required to have some type of seating element, almost half contain no seating and were perceived by the surveyors to be unwelcoming and uninviting for someone to stop and utilize. Therefore, a significant number of POPS that were originally intended to alleviate the visual monotony of concrete buildings fail to meet the goal

Of the POPS that are required to have public space signage, at least 86 % of the POPS in the survey did not have the required signage that clearly identifies the space as a POP that is open for public use. This significantly impacts the public's awareness of their presence and suppresses community usage.

Overall, the assessment demonstrates that while Upper East Side POPS are in good condition, there are design issues that limit their ability to provide pleasant communal spaces. In addition,

the lack of signage and the barriers to open access that exist present a clear message to the community that POPS are not for public use.

Community Survey Results: The community survey assessed the general public's level of awareness and feelings towards POPS. A random cross-section ninety individuals who live in, work in, or were visiting in an Upper East Side community were surveyed about their experiences with POPS. 44% had knowledge that Privately Owned Public Spaces existed. 23% of those surveyed indicated that they actively visit POPS on a regular basis, providing support for CB8's concern that POPS in these neighborhoods were underutilized.

When those surveyed were asked what would make them more inclined to visit a POP, 56% indicated clear signage would lead to greater use and 27% stated that events would encourage them to use one.

The survey shows that there is a lack of awareness amongst the public when it comes POPS. Of greater concern is the lack of people who are actively taking advantage of this resource. The survey demonstrates that increasing community awareness through signage and outreach would increase the overall utilization of the spaces.

Interviews with Property Managers: A majority of POPS fall under the purview of property management companies who acquire the responsibility of the open spaces by nature of their agreement to manage a property. A significant issue the group found is that these managers were unaware of the conditions and issues of the POPS on their property. Questions regarding the actual conditions of the plazas were typically forwarded to building superintendents, who acknowledged responsibility for upkeep of the space as part of the overall maintenance of the building. However, these superintendents were not aware of the zoning requirements and regulations of the POPS. The responses of the property managers and superintendents appear to be aligned with the findings of our POPS survey: the plazas were in excellent condition because they were regularly maintained by building staff. However, there was an inconsistency in compliance that can be partially attributed to the fact that many property management companies were unaware that adhering to the requirements of the POPS is their responsibility.

Internal Assessment

CB8 consists of a small group of dedicated, active, well-informed Upper East Side residents who are deeply engaged in their community and passionate about the wellbeing of their neighborhood. CB8 is successful at representing the interests of the community in regard to POPS and seems to be very well respected. However, the Board is not necessarily in a position to bring about change given its current capacity and authority. Acting on behalf of a diverse set of constituents, CB8 doesn't have the institutional structure to implement the change needed to reach its goals and is further bound by City planning laws. Board members, also, do not necessarily possess the detailed knowledge of zoning regulations and city planning codes/law necessary to effectively bring about the change they desire.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths:

- Publicly owned open spaces in New York City are valuable commodities that can be leveraged in ways that can be very beneficial to the Upper East Side community
- There are 76 uniquely zoned open spaces in existence that are protected from future development in the Upper East Side of Manhattan;
- A diverse set of public, private, and government stakeholders share an interest in the future of these POPS;
- The Community Board has the ability to act in the interest of the community;
- The Community Board has the power to influence the Department of City Planning and Development in directing the future of the POPS

Weaknesses/Challenges:

- Lack of awareness about POPS by stakeholders, particularly property owners and potential users in the community;
- Diffusion of responsibility for POPS among diverse set of stakeholders;
- Public zoning records lack cohesive and consistent formatting. Therefore, they are unable to provide accurate information to stakeholders;
- Many POPS have a poor design and/or contain barriers that limit public use;

- Any changes to POPS regulations must go through lengthy Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP) process, which requires an extensive investment of time and resources;
- The Community Board does not have the necessary tools/authority in order to implement changes to POPS.

Opportunities:

- Open spaces offer a range of creative options for POPS, enabling them to become more inviting and better utilized by the community;
- Community feedback indicates that marketing and community outreach initiatives would increase use of open spaces;
- Business Improvement Districts, block associations, and community volunteers hold a strong interest in making the most of POPS as community assets;
- Long-term, these spaces may be used in diverse ways to not only fulfill the mission of creating air, light, and communal gathering spaces, but can also serve added benefits for the city, such as environmental land banks for city water runoff.

Threats:

- Legal liability for property owners of privately owned spaces that are open to the public;
- Lack of focused leadership, coordination, and accountability structures;
- Inconsistent compliance regulations for individual POPS.

Recommendations and Implementation Timeline

Recommendations

We propose the following strategies and goals to be pursued, which we separated into two groups based on recommended duration for completion. We begin with immediate to short term goals (from present time to six months), followed by long term goals (from six months to three years).

Immediate and short-term goals

Goal #1: Increasing community awareness of POPS and the purpose of the space.

Strategy: Develop a marketing plan:

- Create a brochure that highlights area POPS and their amenities
- Promote POPS in local newspapers, magazines, and guides.
 - Encourage journalists to write about local POPS, programming, issues, and benefits.
- Post flyers throughout the community to raise awareness of local POPS.
- Work with the Municipal Art Society to enhance its website on Upper East Side POPS so that it includes social media tools for updating the community on issues and events related to local POPS.
- Identify POPS that lack signs and petition the City to install uniform signage on all POPS.

Timeframe: Immediate to three months.

Goal #2: Inform residents, specifically resident-owners of POPS, of their caretaker role for a public space.

Strategy:

- Build upon the media campaign model identified in Goal #1 with specific outreach to residential stakeholders.
- Solicit the Department of City Planning and the Municipal Arts Society to host information sessions on the duties and benefits of owning or living in a POPS building.
- Letter from the community board chair: reaching out to buildings with POPS in community board 8 offering assistance where there are concerns regarding POPS. Community Board 8 will liaison with the building owners and City Planning in regards to POPS
- Recruit a pro-bono legal team to advise residents of legal ramifications of owning a POPS.

Timeframe: Three to six months

Goal #3 Update current City Planning records in order to reflect consistent and reliable information on POPS.

Strategy:

- Work with stakeholders to identify the details on a POPS that are crucial to adequately inform the public.
- Ask the Department of City Planning to create a one-page template with all the critical details on a POPS. This could be similar in format to the HUD-1 Statement.

Timeframe: Three to six months

Goal #4: Recruit a single volunteer, fellow or intern to implement the short-term and long-term goals identified in the plan.

Strategy:

- Recruit an individual with the time and interest in developing quality open spaces in the Upper East Side. This person would serve under the authority and supervision of Community Board 8.
 - Reach out to graduate schools, neighborhood groups, and respected retired members of the community to make the time investment.
- Ensure that this individual can sustain a commitment of up-to-10 hours a week toward the effort

Timeframe: Three to six months

Goal #5: Establish a political strategy to advocate for changes to the POPS program.

Strategy:

- Develop a comprehensive list of issues and recommended remedies surrounding POPS.
- Contact influential members of the community and solicit their buy-in on making meaningful changes in POPS.
- Discuss the feasibilities of legislative change with the Department of City Planning.
- Lobby the local city councilperson with the aforesaid workgroup to make amendments to the residential POPS program.
- Contact state assembly and senate officials to discuss POPS mitigation in the Second Avenue Subway catchment area.

Timeframe: Three to six months

Long-term goals

Goal #6: Develop a shorter, more efficient process to amend POPS.

Strategy:

- Document the process and costs for making a change to a POPS
- In concert with the Department of City Planning, identify ways to streamline approvals and eliminate costly barriers, such as the involvement of lawyers and architects.
- Lobby the local city councilperson to promote legislative change, where necessary, to eliminate legal barriers to potential city planning policy changes.

Timeframe: Six to nine months

Goal #7: Form a program modeled after *the Broadway Program* to work around Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP) by providing temporary upgrades to the POPS, such as installation of benches and planters.

Strategy:

- Identify a POPS with few public amenities
- Solicit buy-in from the owner of a local POPS to make a temporary installation of removable items including planters, chairs, and tables.
- Market the temporary installation to the local media.
- Lobby to make the changes permanent using the political strategy, where feasible.

Timeframe: Six to nine months

Goal #8: Establish a new entity for the purpose of handling all responsibilities associated with POPS.

Strategy:

- Assess the enthusiasm of a POPS owner's caretaker role using Goal #3.
 - Identify sites where POPS owners are unenthusiastic.
- Assess the interest of business improvement districts in maintaining POPS for residential owners that are uninterested in the responsibility.
- Explore the concept of creating a new non-profit organization to manage the development of POPS where business improvement districts are uninterested in the role.
- Solicit legal support to explore the terms of lease agreements necessary to transfer the maintenance role from residential-owners to a vested agency.

Timeframe: Two to three years

Conclusion

The Upper East Side's street-scapes contain a variety of privately owned public spaces, including outdoor plazas developed under standards that have evolved over time. Outdoor plazas are intended to provide light, air and—depending on the year of construction and plaza type—other amenities may be required..

POPS is a complicated program with layers of regulation changes over the course of 40 years. There are currently 76 residential POPS in the Upper East Side, more than in any other community in New York City. Therefore a significant number of POPS that were originally intended to alleviate the visual monotony of concrete buildings fail to meet that goal.

Each of the buildings that contain a POPS has different ownership and management structures, and each maintains itself according to its own terms. With that level of diversity, it is understandable that there are many issues with POPS.

Because of the diversity of issues, solutions surrounding POPS must be nimble and nuanced. There are no silver bullets to tackle every problem. This team concluded that Community Board 8 must employ a large tool kit to open up opportunities for POPS to change. Many of the solutions proposed will work for some POPS, but not for others. Some POPS need no changes at all. Yet despite the diverse recommendations, there is one overarching theme—communication. Once more people are informed of their local POPS, there will be more interest, more resources, and more solutions generated than the above proposal. Ultimately, these are public spaces and it is the public's role to take these spaces as their own.

POPS REPORT FINAL 2013

Timestamp	Address	Does the site	Landscaping	Is the landscaping
11/19/2012 10:42:12	211 E 79th between	Yes	Concrete	
11/19/2012 11:38:58	111E 85th &Lex N	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/19/2012 11:57:41	900 Park Av &79St	No	Concrete	
11/12/2012 14:25:57	444 E 86th St	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/10/2012 17:37:05	300 E. 75th Street	No	Floral	Yes
11/10/2012 17:28:33	400 E. 70th Street	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/10/2012 17:32:40	330 E. 75th Street	In Spots	Grass	Yes
11/12/2012 12:43:33	ID# 303, 200 E 61st	No	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 13:03:55	ID #819, 300 E 62nd	No	Floral	Yes
11/19/2012 11:29:35	171 E84th Street &	Yes	Concrete	
11/12/2012 12:53:00	ID#804, 188 E 64th	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 13:13:01	ID# 875, 303 # 60th	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/10/2012 17:22:33	524 E 72nd Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:51:08	200 E 89th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:13:42	422 E 72nd Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 13:06:21	ID# 8100, 401 E	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 10:20:36	50 E 89th Street	No	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 13:58:52	445 E 80th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 13:59:38	445 E 80th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:20:06	330 E 80th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 12:46:20	ID # 801, 118 E 60th	No	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 13:15:48	ID # 809, 200 E	No	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 13:55:56	353 E 83rd st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:24:25	435 E. 70th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/10/2012 17:39:37	300 E. 74th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/19/2012 9:56:22	980 5th Av NE	In Spots	Concrete	
11/10/2012 17:17:17	1385 York Avenue	No	Grass	Yes
11/12/2012 12:56:00	ID# 805, 160 E 65th	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 12:59:45	ID#810, 200 E 64th	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 14:42:44	351 E 84th St	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:33:37	1725 York Avenue	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/19/2012 12:20:49	178 E80th Street &	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/19/2012 12:33:36	115 E 87th Street	No	Floral	Yes
11/9/2012 13:53:23	345 E 80th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:15:23	60 East End Ave NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:32:03	1675 York Avenue	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:45:26	301 E 87th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 13:54:48	303 E 83rd st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:30:07	353 E. 72nd Street	No	Grass	Yes
11/11/2012 20:12:26	211 East 70th Street	Yes	Grass	Yes
11/12/2012 14:48:25	201 E 87th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:15:59	1365 York Avenue	No	Grass	Yes
11/9/2012 13:52:17	301 E 79th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:25:43	400 E. 71st Street	No	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:00:30	401 E 80th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/19/2012 10:20:51	200 E 82nd &3rd Av	No	Concrete	No
11/9/2012 14:06:34	515 E 79th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 12:49:26	ID# 802, 167 E 61st.	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/9/2012 14:17:08	400 E 79th st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/19/2012 12:51:30	1524 3rd Av	No	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 14:29:03	455 E 86th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:29:42	304 East 65th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/11/2012 19:32:50	200 East 65th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/12/2012 14:38:36	401 E 89th St	In Spots	Concrete	Yes

11/12/2012 14:44:04	300 E 85th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/10/2012 17:19:00	525 E 72nd Street	No	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:40:02	400 E 84th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 20:15:04	200 East 69th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/9/2012 14:04:04	350 E 82nd st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:05:58	350 E 82nd st NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:14:16	1520 York Ave NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:24:15	1540 York Ave NY	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:36:45	1646 1st Avenue	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/12/2012 14:47:11	233 E 86th St	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 20:28:59	1230 3rd Avenue	No	Grass	Yes
11/11/2012 18:55:25	733 Park Avenue		Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:00:05	254 East 68th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:37:44	220 East 72nd	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:08:28	265 East 66th Street	No	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 18:52:43	200 East 72nd	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:18:17	220 East 65th Street	In Spots	Concrete	Yes
11/11/2012 19:58:19	203 East 72nd	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 9:08:59	108 E 96th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 9:13:54	175 E 96th Street !!!	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 9:19:18	205 E 96th Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 9:23:02	235 E 96th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 9:27:17	1850 2nd Ave			
11/5/2012 9:33:31	301 E 94th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 9:37:27	300 E 93rd Street	Yes	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 9:41:23	340 E 93rd Street	In Spots	Floral	Yes
11/5/2012 9:45:46	345 E 96th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 9:53:41	200 E 94th Street	No	Concrete	No
11/5/2012 10:00:57	206 E 94th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 10:08:17	1601 3rd Ave	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 10:13:10	200 E 90th Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 10:22:42	45 89th Street	No	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 10:29:59	100 E 95			
11/5/2012 16:04:13	40 E 93rd Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 16:04:18	40 E 93rd Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 16:04:21	40 E 93rd Street	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/5/2012 16:13:09	158 e 96	Yes	Concrete	Yes
11/9/2012 14:24:57				
11/19/2012 10:48:29	131 E81st St & Lex	No		
11/19/2012 12:09:05	985 5th Av & 79 th			

What year was the	Required hours of	Does the POPS	Is the site walled	Is the site inviting?
1966	24 hours	No	Yes	NO
1971	24 hours	No	Yes	NO
1973	24 hours	No	Yes	NO
1974	24 hours	No	Yes	NO
1979	24 hours	No	No	NO
1983	Restricted hours	No	No	Yes
1985	24 hours	No	No	Yes
1985	Restricted hours	No	No	Yes
1985		No	No	Yes
1986	24 hours	No	No	NO
1987		No	Yes	Yes
1987	Restricted hours	No	Yes	Yes
1988	Restricted hours	No	No	Yes
1988	24 hours	No	Yes	NO
1990		No	Yes	NO
2001	24 hours	No	No	Yes
	24 hours	No	No	NO
1940	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1940	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1957	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1965	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1966	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1967	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1967		Yes	No	Yes
1967	Restricted hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1967	24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1969	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1969	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1969	Restricted hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1969	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1970	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1972	24 hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1972	24 hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1973	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1974	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1974	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1974	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1975	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1975	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1975	Restricted hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1975	24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1977	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1979	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1979	24 hours	Yes	No	NO
1980	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1980	24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1982	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1983	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1984	24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1984	24 hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1986	24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1987	Restricted hours	Yes	No	Yes
1987	Restricted hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1987	24 hours	Yes	No	NO

1987 24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1988 Restricted hours	Yes	No	Yes
1989 24 hours	Yes	No	Yes
1991 Restricted hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1999 24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
1999 24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
24 hours	Yes	Yes	Yes
24 hours	Yes	Yes	NO
24 hours	Yes	Yes	NO
1962		No	NO
1970 24 hours		No	NO
1973 24 hours		No	NO
1974 24 hours		No	NO
1975 24 hours		No	NO
1979		No	NO
1979 24 hours		No	NO
1979		Yes	Yes
24 hours		Yes	NO
24 hours		No	Yes
24 hours		Yes	NO
24 hours		No	NO
		Yes	Yes
Restricted hours		Yes	Yes
		No	Yes
			Yes
24 hours		No	NO
24 hours		Yes	Yes
24 hours			Yes
		Yes	NO
24 hours			NO
		No	Yes
		No	Yes
		No	Yes
			Yes

Does the site	Is the site being	Is there seating in	Notes
NO	Yes-A particular	Yes	This place has high
NO	No	NO	This POPS has
NO	No	NO	The POPS has no
NO	No	NO	scaffolds all around
NO	No	NO	This addressed is
Yes	No	Yes	Missing amenities:
NO	No	Yes	Sign indicated plaza
Yes	No	Yes	
NO	No	NO	None of the required
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	This POPS has
Yes	No	Yes	Space is well
NO	No	NO	POPs is well
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	Amenities not
NO	No	NO	noticed a sign
Yes	No	NO	The area is under
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	POP's is located
NO	No	NO	This pops provides
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	NO	Nicely landscaped
NO	No	NO	very minimal
NO	No	Yes	
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	Part of Cornell
NO	No	Yes	Is the landscaped
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	The POPS is just
NO	No	NO	Walkway/driveway
NO	No	NO	The site has no
Yes	No	Yes	The site is very
NO	Yes-A particular	NO	being used as a
NO	Yes-A particular	NO	Another driveway
NO	No	NO	This POPS is
NO	No	NO	This POPS has no
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	Yes	
NO	Yes-A particular	NO	Used as a
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	NO	Walkway/driveway
NO	No	Yes	Plaza and Park-Like
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	Walkway/driveway
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	NO	Walkway/driveway
NO	No	Yes	
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	The POPS has no
NO	No	Yes	
Yes	No	Yes	Sign says it has
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	NO	This POPS has only
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	Noticed a sign that
Yes	No	Yes	The POPS is a nice
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	Yes	Only seating if you

NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	another of the few
Yes	No	Yes	
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	one of the few I saw
Yes	No	Yes	Good location of the
NO	No	Yes	
NO	No	Yes	
Yes		Yes	The door man won't
NO	No	Yes	Door man doesn't
NO	Yes-A particular	NO	
NO	No	NO	no pops area could
NO	No	Yes	The address of
Yes	No	NO	The POPS was
NO	No	NO	This is a very
NO	No	NO	The POPS is an
NO	No	Yes	There are 3 open
NO	No	NO	I went inside the
NO	No	NO	The POPS is the
NO	No	Yes	The POPS is gated
NO	No	NO	It is a extended
Yes	Yes-A particular	Yes	Well designed, large
NO	No	NO	It's a building entry
NO	No	NO	The pops consists
			This site has been
NO	No	Yes	May have been
NO	No	Yes	Very inviting, corner,
NO	No	Yes	Plaza integrated into
NO	No	NO	It's a large area but
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	It's a red bricked
NO	No	Yes	I can't tell which is
NO	Yes-A diverse group	Yes	It wraps around the
NO	No	NO	It's a driveway
NO	No	NO	It's an extension of
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	People sit on stairs.
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	People sit on stairs.
NO	Yes-A diverse group	NO	People sit on stairs.
Yes	No	Yes	
			In the City Planning
			The POPS has

POPS COMMUNITY SURVEY FOR 11/11

nn.t.mp	primary interaction in the Upper East Side?	Do you know what a POPS (Partly Public Owned Public Space) is?	How do you feel about POPS?	Do you think it's a good idea?	What would you like to see included in your POPS?	Do you have any concerns about your POPS?	Who do you think should be responsible for caring for POPS?	Who do you think should be responsible for caring for POPS?
11/30/2012 19:08:26	Live	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	No Opinion	No Opinion
11/30/2012 22:39:20	Visit	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:50:06	Work	No	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	City of New York	City of New York
11/30/2012 19:18:49	Live	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:35:49	Visit	No	No Opinion	No	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:41:46	Visit	No	No Opinion	No	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:10:29	Study	Yes	Positive	Yes	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:17:07	Live	Yes	Positive	Yes	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:17:29	Visit	No	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:12:51	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:12:17	Work	Yes	Negative	No	Events	Concern about management	A non-profit conservancy	No Opinion A non-profit conservancy
11/30/2012 19:28:01	Live	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	City of New York
11/30/2012 22:04:05	Live	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:07:19	Work	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	City of New York
11/30/2012 22:08:09	Work	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:09:24	Work	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:27:23	Visit	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:32:00	Visit	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:23:00	Visit	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:55:10	Live	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:56:08	Live	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:57:09	Live	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:23:04	Study	Yes	Neutral	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:25:29	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:25:37	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:25:38	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:25:40	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:26:44	Work	Yes	Positive	Maybe	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/28/2012 16:52:07	Visit	No	Positive	No	Events	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners

nn.t.m.p	primary intracoastal In the Upper East Side?	Do you know what a POPS (Prt) ally Owned Public Sp(Me)ll?	He you upriMd to *--hlll thanl - - 911 POPS an Side?	Do you vllll	What WDUd mallla you 110018 Includaa vllllq yourDolll POPS?	Do you hav'8 any cclic:ne about yourDolll POPS?	Who do you think lhoudbc r:panblle for -- care 01 POPS?	Who do you think lhoudbc r:panblle for -- care 01 POPS?
11/30/2012 19:07:07	Visit	No	Yes	No	Signage	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:11:40	shopping	No	Yes	No	Signage	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:34:32	Visit	No	Yes	No	Signage	Concern about management	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:51:12	Work	No	No	Yes	Signage	Concern about management	No Opinion	No Opinion
12/2/2012 24:16:32	Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Signage	Concern about management	A non-profit conservancy	A non-profit conservancy
11/30/2012 22:45:32	Live	No	Yes	Maybe	Events	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:11:43	Work	Yes	No Opinion	Yes	Events	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:14:39	Live	Yes	Yes	Yes	Events	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:24:55	Live	No	Yes	Maybe	Landscape Improvement	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:32:25	Work	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Signage	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:27:31	Live	Yes	No Opinion	Maybe	Signage	Crime	A non-profit conservancy	A non-profit conservancy
12/2/2012 1:11:04	Live	Yes	Yes	No	Signage	Crime	A non-profit conservancy	A non-profit conservancy
12/2/2012 1:20:31	Visit	Yes	No	Yes	Signage	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:21:03	Live	Yes	Yes	Yes	Signage	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:21:13	Live	Yes	Yes	Yes	Signage	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:22:09	Live	Yes	Yes	Yes	Signage	Crime	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:18:18	Visit	No	Yes	No	Events	Lack of Care	A non-profit conservancy	A non-profit conservancy
12/2/2012 0:52:22	Work	Yes	Yes	No	Events	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:53:15	Work	Yes	Yes	No	Events	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 1:13:57	Study	Yes	Yes	No	Events	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:50:37	Work	No	No Opinion	No	Landscape Improvement	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:53:56	Live	Yes	No Opinion	No	Landscape Improvement	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:54:34	Work	Yes	Yes	No	Landscape Improvement	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:02:53	Live	No	Yes	No	Landscape Improvement	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:10:41	Work	No	Yes	Maybe	Signage	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:12:46	shopping	No	Yes	Maybe	Signage	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 0:51:50	Study	No	Yes	Maybe	Signage	Lack of Care	City of New York	City of New York
11/30/2012 22:02:01	Live	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Signage	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:05:23	Live	No	Yes	No	Signage	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:25:26	Visit	No	Yes	No	Signage, benches, and plants	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:19:54	Visit	No	Yes	No	Both Events & Signage	Lack of Care	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:24:48	Visit	No	Yes	Maybe	Events	No Opinion	Either the City of NY or a non-profit conservancy	Either the City of NY or a non-profit conservancy
11/30/2012 19:28:52	Visit	No	Yes	Maybe	Events	No Opinion	City of New York	City of New York

nn.t.mp	primary intracaon In the Upper East Side?	Do you know what a POPS (Partially Owned Public Space) is?	He you upriMd to "hill than an Side?	Do you villit	What "WUd malli you 110018 villitq yourDell POPS?	Do you ha'8 any ccicars about yourDell POPS?	Who do you think lhoulde r.panlble for -- care 01' POPS?	Who do you think lhoulde r.panlble for -- care 01' POPS?
11/30/2012 19:15: 24 Visit	Yes	Yes	No	Maybe	Events	No Opinion	No Opinion	No Opinion
11/30/2012 19:25: 49 Visit	Yes	Yes	No	Maybe	Events	No Opinion	No Opinion	No Opinion
11/30/2012 19:36: 26 Live	Yes	Yes	No	Maybe	Events	No Opinion	No Opinion	No Opinion
11/30/2012 19:38: 03 Visit	No	No	Yes	No	Events	No Opinion	City of New York	City of New York
11/30/2012 19:13: 19 Visit	No	No	No	Yes	Events	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:17: 52 Visit	No	No	No	Yes	Events	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:35: 18 Live	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Events	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/28/2012 16:53: 53 Visit	No	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:34: 13 Study	No	No	No Opinion	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 19:45 Work	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
12/2/2012 19:12 Work	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	City of New York	City of New York
11/30/2012 19:04: 42 Visit	No	No	No	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:11: 07 Visit	No	No	No	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:01: 58 Work	No	No	No	No	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:03: 03 Study	No	No	No	No	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/28/2012 16:52: 59 Visit	No	No	Yes	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:16: 19 Live	No	No	No	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:26: 54 Live	No	No	Yes	Maybe	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:49: 58 Work	No	No	Yes	No	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:03: 57 Study	No	No	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:05: 49 Study	No	No	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:09: 46 Study	No	No	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:38: 54 Study	No	No	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 19:39: 31 Study	No	No	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/28/2012 16:50: 35 Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/28/2012 16:54: 31 Visit	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners
11/30/2012 22:47: 50 Live	No	No	Yes	No	Events Landscape Improvement	No Opinion	Building owners	Building owners

VisiUShop: 26 yes: 30
47.27%

signage: 50 Management: 21
38.18%

TimeStamp

willityaur
primary in racoon
in the Upper East
Side?
live: 14
25.45%

Do you know what
a POPS (Prty ally
Owned Public
SpMe)ll?
feel about POPS?

He you upriMd
to " - "hill thanl
- - 911 POPS
an
Side?

Do you
lily POPS?

What waUd malla
y000 11018
Includaa
y O U R - Dcill
POPS?
events: 16
29.09%

Do you ha Y's lily
CCilicena about
your iDcill POPS?
No Opinion: 25
45.45%

Who do you think
l should be
r. panBible
care of POPS?

Who do you think
l should be
r. ponillbe for --
care of POPS?

workschool: 14
25.45%

Landscape: 3
5.45%

No Opinion: