

CHAPTER 10: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The No Action Alternative assumes that no shaft and no new water mains (either the potential connections to Shaft 33B or as conceptualized for the Water Main Only Alternative) are constructed. In the event that the proposed Shaft 33B were not constructed, the City Tunnel No. 3, Stage 2 Manhattan Leg west-east tunnel spur would terminate at Shaft 32B on E. 35th Street.

NYCDEP would not pursue the No Action Alternative because it would leave a large and densely populated area of Manhattan without sufficient water distribution mechanisms when City Tunnel No. 1 is taken off-line for inspection and rehabilitation.

10.2 EVALUATION OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

10.2.1 Introduction

Chapters 2 through 8 of this EIS described the construction and operation of Shaft 33B and the associated water main connections. For the analyses presented in the preceding Chapters, existing conditions were forecast to assess the environmental conditions that would exist if the proposed project were not built. Therefore, the No Action Alternative has been analyzed in the previous sections of this EIS as part of the baseline from which to assess the potential impacts of the project, and is presented as the Future Conditions Without the Project assessment. Chapter 9 summarized the potential impacts of the Water Main Only Alternative.

As with the proposed project, under the No Action Alternative, there would be no temporary or significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; infrastructure and energy; traffic and parking; transit and pedestrians; air quality; vibration; hazardous materials; and public health.

Summarized below are the potential impacts of the No Action Alternative discussed in the context of impacts associated with the construction of Shaft 33B and the water main connections.

10.2.2 Land Use and Community Facilities, Zoning, and Public Policy

As a result of this alternative, there would be no potential effects on surrounding land uses, including community facilities, the underlying zoning and any applicable public policies. Under this alternative, no significant adverse land use and community facilities, zoning or public impacts would occur. The unmitigable adverse impact experienced at the Manhattan Center for Early Learning and Manhattan Center for Early Intervention immediately adjacent to the E. 61st Street Shaft Site would not occur under this alternative.

10.2.3 Open Space

If this alternative were adopted, there would be no additional residents or workers introduced to the area, and none of the open spaces in the Study Areas would be physically changed, diminished, or eliminated or reduced in its utilization or aesthetic value. The elevated noise levels from on-site construction activity at the E. 54th Street/Second Avenue Shaft Site would detract from the quality and attractiveness of Connaught Tower plaza open space; this unmitigable adverse impact would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

10.2.4 Socioeconomic Conditions

Potential socioeconomic impacts include direct and indirect displacement. Direct displacement is the involuntary displacement of residents, employees, and businesses from the site of a proposed action, while indirect displacement is the involuntary displacement of residents, employees, or businesses due to changes in living conditions or costs that could potentially result from the project. There would be no direct displacement of businesses or residents under this alternative, and the costs of construction of Shaft 33B and its associated water main connections or the Water Main Only alternative would not be incurred. The noise from construction activities at the Shaft Site and from the water main construction, which could reduce the appeal of surrounding businesses to their customers, would not occur. No significant socioeconomic adverse impacts would occur under this alternative.

10.2.5 Historic Resources

No construction would occur under this alternative, thus, no archaeological monitoring would be required and no impacts on architectural resources would occur. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts on historic resources from this alternative.

10.2.6 Urban Design and Visual Resources

There would not be any changes to block form; street pattern or hierarchy; topography; natural features; or building arrangement, bulk, use, or type. No views to surrounding visual resources would be eliminated or dominated. The temporary adverse impact on urban design from the potential elimination of mature street trees would not occur from this alternative. Therefore, there would be no potential significant adverse impacts to the urban design and visual resources of the Study Areas.

10.2.7 Neighborhood Character

This alternative would not have any adverse impact on land use patterns, urban design, visual resources, historic resources, socioeconomic characteristics, traffic, and noise that are generally

considered to be a composite of elements that give a neighborhood its identity. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character under this alternative.

10.2.8 Infrastructure and Energy

As a result of this alternative, there would be no increased demand for water supply or wastewater treatment capacity; no relocation or disruption of utility lines during construction; and no increased stormwater runoff. In addition, there would be no affects on the transmission or generation of energy. Also, there would be no direct or indirect consumption of energy. Therefore, no potential significant adverse infrastructure or energy impacts would be anticipated to occur under this alternative.

10.2.9 Traffic and Parking

Unlike the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not generate traffic or affect on-street traffic and parking. The potential temporary adverse traffic impacts from the construction of the water main connections construction would not occur under this alternative. In addition, the potential significant adverse impact from the Water Main Only alternative would not occur. The potential short-term stoppages of traffic from blasting at Shaft Sites or the temporary disruption to traffic to allow large vehicles to enter the Shaft Site would not occur under this alternative. The temporary loss of parking during water main construction would not occur. No significant or temporary adverse impacts on traffic or parking would occur under this alternative.

10.2.10 Transit and Pedestrians

Pedestrian and transit patterns would not be disrupted as a result of this alternative. Therefore, no potential significant adverse impacts to transit or pedestrians would result from this alternative.

10.2.11 Air Quality

There would be no diesel-fueled construction equipment on-site, or generation of project-induced traffic, or effect on on-street traffic under this alternative. Therefore, there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from this alternative.

10.2.12 Noise

Loud construction activities such as blasting, concrete operations, and excavation work, would not occur under the No Action Alternative. The potential significant adverse impacts from Shaft Site construction at all analyzed Shaft Site locations would not occur under this alternative. In addition, potential temporary adverse noise impacts along water main construction routes would not occur. In comparison to the proposed project there would be no unmitigable significant adverse noise impacts from the No Action Alternative.

10.2.13 Vibration

No construction would occur, and therefore, there would be no significant adverse vibration impacts under this alternative.

10.2.14 Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the preventive measures described in Section 5.14, “Hazardous Materials,” for Chapter 5, “Water Main Connections,” would not need to be implemented, and there would be no potential significant adverse hazardous materials impacts for this alternative.

10.2.15 Public Health

Since there would be no impacts on traffic, noise, air quality and hazardous materials, there would be no predicted significant adverse impacts on public health.

