

One Police Plaza Security Plan EIS
CHAPTER 16: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (New Chapter to the EIS)

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes and responds to all substantive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the One Police Plaza security plan made during the public review period. These consist of comments made at the public hearings held by the New York City Police Department (NYPD) on September 14, 2006 and October 4, 2006, and written comments submitted to the NYPD. The period of public review remained open until October 24, 2006.

Section II below lists the individuals who commented on the DEIS, and summarizes and responds to comments made at the public hearing and received in writing. Written comments received on the DEIS are included in Appendix B to the FEIS.

II. DEIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The Notice of Completion for the DEIS was issued on July 28, 2006. Comments were accepted on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the One Police Plaza Security Plan during a period commencing with the NYPD public hearings held at the Department of Health's auditorium on September 14, 2006 and October 4, 2006, and extending through October 24, 2006. Written comments received on the DEIS are included in Appendix B.

This section lists and responds to comments on the DEIS. The comments are organized by subject area, following the organization of the DEIS document. Where comments on the same subject matter were made by more than one person, a single comment summarizes those individual comments. The organization/individual that made the comment is identified next to each comment, using a numerical reference keyed to the list of comments below. Comments on the DEIS were received from the following individuals and organizations:

1. Jim Quent, representing Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver (oral statement and written statement submitted 9/14/06)
2. Council Member Alan Gerson (oral statement at public hearing and written statement dated 9/14/06)
3. Scott Stringer, Manhattan Borough President (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 10/24/06)

4. Jimmy Yan, representing Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 9/14/06)
5. State Senator Martin Connor (oral statement at public hearing)
6. Jeannie Chin, Resident and Civic Center Residents Coalition (CCRC) (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted 10/24/06)
7. John Ost, CCRC (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 10/22/06)
8. Toby Turkel, President, Chatham Towers Co-op (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted on 9/14/06)
9. Anna Goldstein, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted on 9/14/06)
10. Dave Cheng, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted on 10/10/06)
11. Rocky Chin, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted on 10/23/06)
12. Paul J.Q. Lee on Behalf of Deborah Katz, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
13. Paul J.Q. Lee on Behalf of Richard and Mae Wong, Oliver Street Block Association (oral statement at public hearing)
14. Linda McCall, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
15. Graham Beck, Transportation Alternatives, (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted on 9/14/06)
16. Albert Hom, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
17. Paul J.Q. Lee, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
18. Martin Torelli, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
19. Laura Leigh Davidson, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
20. Joanne Chernow, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
21. Cynthia Gardner-Brim, Mariners' Temple Baptist Church (oral statement at public hearing)
22. Nancy Linday, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
23. Richard Scorce, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted 10/23/06)
24. Wai-Mon Chan, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
25. Marian Lizzio, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
26. Danny Chen, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted 10/04/06)
27. Jan Lee, Resident and Business Owner (oral statement at public hearing)
28. Rev. Dr. Henrietta Carter, Mariner's Temple Baptist Church (oral statement at public hearing)
29. Wellington Z. Chen, CPLDC (oral statement at public hearing)
30. Susan Stetzer, Community Board 3 (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement submitted 10/23/06)
31. Bruce Martin, Mariner's Temple Baptist Church (oral statement at public hearing)

32. Charles Komanoff, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
33. Richard Wong, Mae Wong, Oliver Street Block Association (oral statement at public hearing, and written testimony submitted 9/12/06)
34. Bergo Lee, Representing Peter Chui, President Chatham Green Co-op Board (oral statement at public hearing, written statement submitted October 4, 2006)
35. Arlyne Wishner, SBT (oral statement at public hearing)
36. Stephanie Pinto, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
37. Cara Lucy, The Mariner's Temple Baptist Church (oral statement at public hearing)
38. Anne K. Johnson, Community Board 3, Smith Houses (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 10/14/06)
39. Irving Zuckerman, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
40. Minerva Chin, Resident (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 10/4/06)
41. Elizabeth Lee, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
42. Geoffery Lee, Resident (oral statement at public hearing and written statement submitted 10/04/06)
43. Maureen Albanese, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
44. Shane Yamane, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
45. Ora Gelberg, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
46. Roy Taub, Dewey Ballantine LLP (oral statement at public hearing, and written statement dated 10/24/06)
47. Benjamin Langford, Resident (written statement dated 10/3/06)
48. Robert Killi, Resident (written statement dated 09/08/06)
49. Maria Zatuchney, Resident (written statement dated 09/11/06)
50. Eugene Falik, (written statement submitted 10/23/06)
51. Aldo Bandini, Dewey Ballantine LLP, (written statement dated 10/24/06)
52. Kenneth Kimmerling, Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF) (written statement dated (10/24/06)
53. Civic Center Residents Coalition (CCRC) (petition and written statement submitted 10/23/06, signed by 65 people)
54. Asian Americans for Equality (written statement dated 10/20/06)
55. Betty Lee Sung & Charles Chia Mous Chung, Residents (written statement dated 9/15/06)
56. Mary Ann Jung, Resident (written statement dated 9/14/06)
57. Fai Cheng, Resident (written statement, unknown date)
58. Ronald D. Bruce, Resident (written statement dated 10/02/06)
59. Irving Howard, Resident (written statement dated 9/26/06)
60. Chuck Lee, Resident (written statement dated 9/15/06)
61. Lawrence F. Hughes, AICP (written statement dated 9/16/06)
62. Wayne Wong, Resident (written statement dated 9/10/06)
63. Vita Sabella, Resident (written statement dated (9/15/06)

66. Carol Towbin, Resident (written statement dated 9/17/06)
67. Mariana James, Resident (written statement dated 9/13/06)
68. Daniel Levine, Resident (written statement, unknown date)
69. Raymond Cheung, Resident (written statement dated 9/13/06)
70. Wai-Mon Chan, Resident (written statement dated 9/14/06)
71. Theodore J. May, Resident (written statement dated 9/9/06)
72. Joyce West, Resident (written statement dated 9/9/06)
73. Roberta Singer, Resident (written statement dated 9/10/06)
74. Karen Glasser, Resident (written statement dated 9/11/06)
75. Concerned Residents of St. James Church & School (written statement form letter submitted by 81 people dated 10/15/06)
76. May Lee, President, PS 1 PTA (written statement, date unknown)
77. Oliver Street Block Association (written statement and petition submitted, date unknown, signed by 282 people)
78. Fay Lee, Resident (written statement dated 10/20/06)
79. Cindy Ma, Resident (written statement dated 10/21/06)
80. John Hung, Resident (written statement dated 10/22/06)
81. Philip Seid, Chinatown Ice Cream Factory (written statement dated 10/22/06)
82. Tracy Chan, Bayard LC Pharmacy Corp. (written statement, date unknown)
83. United Health Pharmacy, local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
84. Joe's Shanghai Restaurant, local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
85. Mr. Tang of Mott Street, local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
86. Happy Time Café, local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
87. New Wonton Garden, local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
88. AX Cell Phone Makeup Inc., local business (written statement dated 10/22/06)
89. Green Tea Café, local business (written statement dated (10/22/06)
90. Manhattan Florist & Gifts, Ltd., local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
91. Kevin Chin, Resident (written statement dated 10/3/06)
92. Thomas Lee, Jr., Resident & business owner (written statement dated 10/3/06)
93. Jade Garden Arts and Crafts Co., local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
94. Chanoodle, local business, (written statement dated 10/3/06)
95. Mark's Wine and Spirits Inc., local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
96. Damon Leong, Long Life Pharmacy Inc. (written statement dated 10/3/06)
97. HPT Gift Shop, local business (written statement dated 10/1/06)
98. Bradford Kwong, Asia Market Corporation (written statement dated 10/3/06)
99. Cwong B. Ly, Resident (written statement dated 10/3/06)
100. Wong Fashion Outlet Inc, local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
101. New Bo Ky Restaurant Inc, local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
102. Danny Lee, Luck Shing Corp., local business (written statement, unknown date)
103. Wong Fashion Outlet, local business (written statement dated 10/3/06)
104. Top Ten Hair Design, local business (written statement dated 9/29/06)

105. Michael Lam, Canalberry Pharmacy (written statement dated 10/3/06)
106. Carol Tsao, Resident (written statement dated 9/29/06)
107. Robert Yee, New Beef King Corp (written statement dated 10/3/06)
108. Victor Theung, Fay Da Bakery (written statement dated 10/3/06)
109. David Nguyen, Haagen Daz (written statement dated 10/1/06)
110. Shirley Lou, local business owner (written statement dated 10/1/06)
111. Kang Chen, Hong Xhun Inc. (written statement dated 10/1/06)
112. Nancy Seid, Resident (written statement dated 9/29/06)
113. Sai Hung Lam, Hop Lee Restaurant (written statement dated 10/1/06)
114. Linda Ng, Ming Fay (written statement dated 10/1/06)
115. Billy (last name unknown), Golden Labe Corp. (written statement dated 10/1/06)
116. Bok Lei Po Inc., local business (written statement dated 10/1/06)
117. Lou Young Inc, local business (written statement dated 10/1/06)
118. Ying Cheung Wong, local business owner (written statement dated 9/29/06)
119. Name Unknown, local business (written statement dated 9/29/06)
120. Winnie Yee, Resident (written statement dated 9/29/06)
121. Juan Tsao, Resident (written statement dated 9/29/06)
122. Name Illegible, Resident (written statement dated 10/1/06)
123. Dorothy Thom, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, written statement dated 10/17/06)
124. Eric Ng, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (written statement, date unknown)
125. Michael Leon, Resident (written statement dated 10/13/06)
126. Herman Philips, Resident (written statement dated 9/31/06)
127. Gloria Gallowitz, Resident (written statement dated 9/11/06)
128. Name Unknown, Resident (written statement dated 9/9/06)
129. Michael Cham, representing Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver (oral statement and written statement submitted 9/14/06)
130. Cynthia Lee, Resident (oral statement at public hearing)
131. Marty Rosenblatt, Resident (oral statement at public hearing, written statement, date unknown)
132. Mariners' Baptist Church, (written statement and petition submitted, date unknown, signed by 141 people).

A. Project Description

Comment A1: Re-open Park Row (1,6, 9, 11, 31, 32, 44, 53, 54, 55, 57, 60, 62, 75, 77, 81, 93-122, 124, 129)

Response: As discussed in the DEIS, in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, NYPD's Counter Terrorism Bureau conducted security assessments of numerous potential terrorist targets within

New York City, including government and law enforcement facilities. Experience and research demonstrate that terrorists avoid “hardened” targets, which are targets that have been reinforced with barriers and other deterrents that make the target less vulnerable and accessible to attack. In assessing the security of One Police Plaza, the Counter Terrorism Bureau concluded that the “secure zone” created around the building immediately following the terrorist attacks should be maintained to prevent the possibility of a vehicle bomb attack on NYPD Headquarters. As such, Park Row and the other streets located within the security zone will continue to remain closed to general vehicular traffic for the foreseeable future. Authorized NYPD and government personnel and emergency vehicles are permitted through the checkpoints after displaying valid identification. Residents of Chatham Green seeking vehicular access to the Chatham Green parking lot along Park Row are permitted through the checkpoint at Park Row at Worth Street after displaying valid identification, but are not permitted into the security zone through any other checkpoint. In 2005, three bus routes (M103, M15, and B51) that had previously been rerouted around Park Row due to the security plan, were restored to their original routes down Park Row.

Comment A2: Closing Park Row is the easy answer to One Police Plaza’s security needs, but it is neither the most practical nor the most just solution. (1)

Response: **Comment noted. See response to Comment A1.**

Comment A3: I recognize and respect the need for strong security measures that enable the NYPD to continue its great work keeping New Yorkers safe from terrorism and crime. But we owe it to the people of Lower Manhattan to ensure that these security measures do not degrade the quality of life and economic vitality of the very community that was most directly affected by the 9/11 attacks. (3, 4)

Response: **The DEIS took a hard look at the effects of the action and provided a detailed analysis of various technical areas; it was found that the action has resulted in several significant adverse impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed within the EIS include a major reconfiguration of Chatham Square, a redesign of Park Row and the return of three bus routes to Park Row.**

Comment A4: It is hard for me and for anyone in this community and for anyone to accept that Park Row is the only street, which has to be closed permanently beyond bus traffic for security purposes. (2) It’s time to come

up with a more feasible plan than this. (20)

Response: In addition to Park Row (between approximately Worth Street and the Brooklyn Bridge) being closed to general vehicular traffic, Pearl Street between Foley Square and St. James Place, Madison/Rose Streets, between Frankfort Street and St. James Place, and Avenue of the Finest are also closed to general vehicular traffic. After September 11, 2001, the Counter Terrorism Bureau concluded that the secure zone created around One Police Plaza immediately following the terrorist attacks be maintained to prevent the possibility of a vehicle bomb attack on NYPD headquarters and adjacent government facilities. The security zone ensures a safe standoff distance from potential terrorist attacks.

Comment A5: With all the modern technology available, there should be no reason why we cannot apply this technology and figure out a way, whether it's detection technology, reinforcement of certain walls or sidings, additional surveillance. We could have adequate protection and allow traffic to flow through this important street [Park Row]. (2)

Response: The Counter Terrorism Bureau has determined that the current physical standoff distance is presently necessary in order to protect the buildings within the security zone from potential terrorist attacks.

Comment A6: The DEIS does not take into consideration of other planned projects in the area. (2,7,23, 30, 46, 51, 52)

Response: As the security plan (the action) has already been implemented, this represents an atypical situation as proposed actions are usually assessed prior to being implemented. As such, as discussed above, the With-Action condition would be the security plan currently in place in 2006 as the action has already been implemented. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, predictions for future growth are made for the year that the action would be completed. As the action is currently in place, the action has already been completed and therefore the analysis year is 2006. Under the No-Action condition, the security plan is not in place in 2006 and takes into account changes in the study area that have occurred since the security plan has been in place.

Comment A7: Provide increased and greater and indeed full pedestrian access to Park Row. (3)

Response: With the exception of one corridor, the streets in the security zone are fully accessible to pedestrians. The pedestrian corridor running between NYPD headquarters to the intersection of Madison Street

and Pearl Street was closed to pedestrians as part of the security plan. With this route closed, pedestrians must travel along the south side of the headquarters building along Avenue of the Finest and Madison Street. This alternate route increases walking distance for pedestrians by approximately 240-feet or about one average city block, which does not constitute as a significant adverse impact.

Comment A8: There is a failure to address the totality of the NYPD security program. The security zone implemented in 1999 and closure of the municipal garage should be considered part of the Action. (6, 30, 46, 51, 52)

Response: Certain streets proximate to One Police Plaza were closed in 1999, as indicated in an EAS, dated April 2, 1999, prepared by the New York City Department of Transportation at the request of the NYPD (CEQR No. 99DOT011M). Following the issuance of the EAS in 1999, a negative declaration was issued on May 13, 1999. These pre-September 11, 2001 street closures, listed below are not part of the action but are considered as part of the No-Action condition in this EIS:

- **Madison Street between Avenue of the Finest and Pearl Street (full closure)**
- **Avenue of the Finest between Madison Street and Park Row (full closure except for motor vehicles destined to the municipal garage)**
- **Pearl Street between Park Row and Madison Street (partial closure - southbound direction only)**

As part of another unrelated action, in early 2001, an EAS was prepared for the Public Safety Answering Center II (CEQR No. 01NYP002M), to be located in an existing building at 109-113 Park Row. The EAS analyzed the closure of the 400-space municipal garage to the public, and a negative declaration was issued on June 12, 2001. The garage was then officially closed to the public on June 30, 2001. However, following the events of September 11, 2001, the NYPD decided not to go forward with the above-mentioned project and the building remained vacant. The municipal garage was rehabilitated and re-opened to NYPD authorized vehicles in April 2004. As the closure of the municipal garage occurred prior to the post-9/11 security plan, it is also included in this EIS as part of the No-Action condition. Therefore, potential combined impacts of the action in conjunction with the 1999 closures and the municipal garage closure, if any, are revealed by the analyses conducted of the action and disclosed in the DEIS.

- Comment A9:* *The refusal of the NYPD to examine all elements of the NYPD security plan is an example of illegal segmentation. (6, 30, 46, 51, 52)*
- Response:** **See response to Comment A8. As the closures of the 400-space municipal garage and the 1999 street closures occurred previous to and independent of the post-9/11 security plan, these previous actions are not part of the With-Action condition.**
- Comment A10:* *The idea of NYPD decentralizing is, in and of itself, an excellent security measure. Many companies now decentralize and encourage telecommuting. (7)*
- Response:** **One Police Plaza is located in close proximity to a unique concentration of civic and governmental land uses. Several of these are located wholly or partially within the security zone itself, namely, the Metropolitan Correction Center and a United States District Courthouse, as well as the Municipal Building, the United States Courthouse, containing the U.S. Court of Appeals, and the New York County Courthouse, home to the New York State Supreme Court. Given the functions hosted by One Police Plaza, and the close coordination required between the NYPD and the criminal justice system, it is essential for all of the functions within police headquarters to be located within close proximity to the court facilities and detention centers, as well as the seat of government. As such, the decentralization of NYPD headquarters is not a feasible option.**
- Comment A11:* *Park Row is a major artery for the Chinatown community and it has been cut off. (9)*
- Response:** **Comment noted.**
- Comment A12:* *Street closures of more than five years are not temporary. (9)*
- Response:** **The security zone will be in effect consistent with the Counter Terrorism Bureau's current threat assessment.**
- Comment A13:* *The objective of the DEIS is not to provide greater access through Park Row, but to keep the area locked down. (1, 129)*
- Response:** **The objective of the DEIS is to analyze the effects of the action, pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which is the security plan that was implemented after September 11, 2001 to restrict unauthorized vehicles from the roadways adjacent to the civic facilities located near One Police Plaza, including NYPD headquarters, the New York State Supreme Court, and the United**

States Courthouse.

Comment A14: Although the DEIS is more comprehensive than the previous EAS, the NYPD should do additional air quality, traffic, and economic impact studies and present their findings to the community before finalizing the EIS. (1, 129)

Response: The air quality, traffic, and socioeconomic scope of work were established in the Final Scope of Work (dated June 26, 2006) for this EIS. However, in response to comments on the DEIS, additional surveying and analysis for the socioeconomic analysis has been undertaken.

Comment A15: Police headquarters is a terrorist target not from the buses or people driving cars who might be a terrorist bomb, the real terror is beneath the ground because you have an extensive system of subways that go underneath Police Plaza. (133)

Response: Comment noted. The NYPD and Counter Terrorism Bureau continuously conduct threat assessments and undertake actions accordingly.

Comment A16: Pearl Street between Park Row and Madison Street is not southbound. It runs east-west. It is supposed to be one-way but there is always two-way traffic on it. (18, 24)

Response: Pearl Street between Park Row and Madison Street runs north-south. It is closed to southbound traffic and is considered a one-way northbound roadway. Consideration of violations of traffic regulations on this roadway is not within the scope of work for this EIS.

Comment A17: The study refers to Park Row as a north-south route, but it was actually a major vehicle conduit between the east and west sides of Lower Manhattan for the past 20 years. (20)

Response: Comment noted. The DEIS states in Chapter 6, "Neighborhood Character" that Park Row was an active through street connecting the Financial District to Chinatown and the Civic Center area prior to September 11, 2001. The geographic orientation of the streets makes it more logical to describe it as north-south versus, say, Worth Street which is east-west oriented.

Comment A18: There is no logic that indicates that Park Row is in need of a security hardening process. The claims of the police department that this is necessary must be analyzed instead of taken as a given. (20, 50)

Response: See response to Comment A1.

Comment A19: Why does the buffer around police headquarters extend 700 feet to the north, but only 300 feet on the Brooklyn Bridge FDR ramp, 500 feet from St. James Place, and 300 feet from Park Row south exit of the Brooklyn Bridge? Shouldn't it be 700 feet in all directions from the center of One Police Plaza? (23)

Response: In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, NYPD's Counter Terrorism Bureau conducted a security assessment of Police Headquarters and the other adjacent civic facilities. It was determined that the current standoff distance in the security zone is necessary to protect these facilities from a potential terrorist threat.

Comment A20: Relocate the northern barriers so that they would be south of the Chatham Green driveway. (23)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 12, "Alternatives," an analysis of relocating the current checkpoint on Park Row approximately 125 feet to the south in an effort to establish a free-flowing entrance/exit to the Chatham Green parking lot was performed. However, this proposed alternative was reviewed and evaluated by NYPD's Counter Terrorism Bureau and it was determined that this alternative would not allow sufficient stand-off distance between NYPD headquarters and the Chatham Green parking lot.

Comment A21: The choice of 2006 as a study year ignores the effects of the action over the past 5 years. (26)

Response: The DEIS analyzes the baseline condition (pre-9/11 street closures), the No-Action condition (2006 without the post-9/11 street closures in place), and With-Action condition (2006 with the post-9/11 street closures in place). In each chapter of the DEIS, a discussion of pre-9/11 conditions and post-9/11 conditions within the study area, which includes changes in the study area between the baseline condition and the action condition, is included. Therefore, the choice of 2006 as the analysis year includes discussion of the effects of the action over the past 5 years.

Comment A22: Madison Street and Avenue of the Finest were not closed in 1999. Both streets were used as approaches to the municipal garage until it was closed in 2001. (26)

Response: The EAS for the 1999 street closures, dated April 2, 1999 (CEQR# 99DOT011M), indicated that Madison Street between Avenue of the Finest and Pearl Street was fully closed, while Avenue of the Finest

between Madison Street and Park Row was closed to traffic with the exception of vehicles destined to the municipal parking garage. This information is included within the DEIS.

Comment A23: *The DEIS fails to comply with State law in letter and intent. (30)*
Response: The DEIS was prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto at 6 NYCRR Part 617 (State Environmental Quality Review Act or “SEQRA”), Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York (“CEQR”). In addition, the EIS is being prepared in satisfaction of requirements for community reassessment, impact and amelioration (CRIA) pursuant to Local Law 24 of 2005. The CEQR process, which includes public review and hearings, will fully satisfy the CRIA requirements including the public forum requirement.

Comment A24: *I prefer to have Park Row closed. (46)*
Response: Comment noted.

B. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

No Comments

C. Community Facilities

Comment C1: *Ambulance response times for residents who live in and around the security zone have gone up. I am concerned that emergency response vehicles have to navigate through standstill traffic to reach New York Downtown Hospital (1,3,4,6, 9, 55, 60, 66, 68, 73, 90, 124, 129)*

Response: The subject of ambulance response times were analyzed in detail in Chapter 3, “Community Facilities,” of the DEIS. Response times are generally the same throughout the study area when compared to Manhattan and Citywide. As stated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS, although response times within the study area have increased slightly between 2000 and 2005, the same is true for Manhattan as a whole as well as Citywide. As further stated in the DEIS, emergency service vehicles dispatched from and destined to New York Downtown

hospital, if necessary, are granted access through the security zone at the barrier locations after displaying proper identification.

Comment C2: For the health and safety of those who live and work in Lower Manhattan, it is imperative that the effect of the street closures on emergency response time is accurately measured and that appropriate mitigations are carried out. (3, 4)

Response: Data on emergency response times for the study area, Manhattan, and Citywide were provided by the FDNY. Although response times within the study area have increased slightly between 2000 and 2005, the same is true for Manhattan as a whole as well as Citywide. As such, no impacts to emergency facility access have occurred as a result of the street closures and no mitigation is warranted. In addition, although response times in the study area are comparable to response times in Manhattan and City wide, the proposed traffic mitigation plans described in the DEIS would improve traffic flow in the area which may improve EMS response times in the area.

Comment C3: We have seen and we have had confirmed by experts, including the director of the emergency room of our local hospital, New York Downtown Hospital, that there is a delay in ambulance response times as a direct result of the closure and the way the closure is maintained, and this does jeopardize lives of people within the security area and without because of the difficulty in transversing, as well as reaching the victims of cardiac arrest or other life-threatening situations. (2, 42)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in Chapter 3 of the DEIS, several interviews were conducted with New York Downtown Hospital emergency department staff. While all interviewees provided anecdotal information regarding the effect of the street closures on emergency response times, none could provide actual data as emergency response times are kept by the FDNY and not by the hospital. Although there were differences in the opinions of New York Downtown Hospital emergency room and emergency medical service staff on whether access to the hospital's emergency room has been affected by the street closures, FDNY response times, which are detailed and quantitative, indicate that response to emergencies in the study area have not been affected by the street closures.

Comment C4: The DEIS does not explain why the increase for the study area is more than twice the increase for the rest of the city. Further research must be conducted. Interviewing emergency medical technicians could provide invaluable insight as to why there has been an increase in response times.

- Response:** (3)
A more important indicator to examine whether response times in the study area have been affected by the street closures is to compare response times before and after the security zone was in place. Between 2000 and 2005, response times increased by 13 seconds, 22 seconds, and 21 seconds in the study area, Manhattan, and Citywide, respectively. As stated above, response times are generally the same throughout the study area when compared to Manhattan and the Citywide. Therefore, the increases and decreases in response times cannot only be directly attributed to the street closures, but can be attributed to various factors that can affect response times.
- Comment C5:* The DEIS concludes that the increase in emergency response time is not due to the street closures in the security zone and therefore no mitigation is offered. This conclusion has not been adequately justified. (3, 46, 51, 52) A potential mitigation worthy of study is to have EMS units posted inside of the barricades 24 hours a day. (3)
- Response:** See response to Comment C2 and C4.
- Comment C6:* Despite EIS claims to the contrary, FDNY vehicles do not traverse the secure zone. Likewise, ambulances from NY Downtown Hospital do not enter the secure zone. (7)
- Response:** Comment noted. While FDNY vehicles and ambulance destined to NY Downtown Hospital are permitted through the security zone, an ambulance or FDNY vehicle may re-route around the security zone at the discretion of the operator.
- Comment C7:* Data on ambulance response times pre- and post-9/11 should be included. (6, 11, 46, 51, 52) Anecdotal information/data should be provided from Downtown Hospital's staff. (6)
- Response:** Ambulance response times pre- and post-9/11 were included in the DEIS for the quarter-mile study area, Manhattan, and Citywide. This data was provided by the New York City Fire Department. Anecdotal information from New York Downtown Hospital's staff is also included in the DEIS in Chapter 3, "Community Facilities" (see response to Comment C3)
- Comment C8:* The average emergency vehicle response time stated in the DEIS is 4 minutes. But it takes longer than four minutes for ambulances to arrive to an emergency. (29)
- Response:** Comment noted. The average emergency response times stated in the DEIS provided by the FDNY, range between 4:29 and 5:02 between

the years 2000-2005 for the study area. As these times reflect average response times, it may sometimes take more or less time to respond to a specific emergency in the study area.

Comment C9: The emergency response times in the DEIS are based on off-hour statistics. (68)

Response: The emergency response times listed in the DEIS are averages times of responses to emergencies that occur at all hours of the day and night, weekdays and weekends, and therefore represents conditions in the field.

Comment C10: There is a mesh wire fence that encircles a fire hydrant in front of Murray Bergtraum HS which cannot be accessed. (6)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in the DEIS, the FDNY stated that they are able to respond and operate within the security zone.

D. Socioeconomic Conditions

Comment D1: I am gravely concerned that businesses are closing their doors because they have lost customers due to increased traffic and decreased accessibility. (1,6, 44, 129)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 4, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the observed vacancy rate within the Chinatown Historic District was approximately 1.7% and the overall study area had an observed vacancy rate of approximately 8% based on field surveys conducted in 2005. As discussed further in Chapter 4, the vacancy rate for the overall study area appears to be lower than the vacancy rate in the Downtown area below Canal Street (23.3% vacancy rate), while the vacancy rate in Historic Chinatown is significantly lower. The low vacancy rate in the Historic Chinatown District and the study area as a whole indicates a low number of vacant storefronts/buildings.

Comment D2: The methodology for the selection of businesses and business areas surveyed is not adequately explained and to the extent that it is explained, it does not comport or conform to normal scientific statistical sampling methodologies. (2, 10, 27)

Response: As explained in Chapter 4 of the DEIS, in order to assess whether proximity to the security zone has a direct correlation to business patterns, field surveys were conducted within the Historic Chinatown sub-area and other portions of Chinatown north of Canal Street and east of the Bowery/Catherine Street. A random sample of

approximately 20 businesses in each of those three geographic areas was selected, and an attempt was made to divide the surveys equally between restaurants and retail businesses (gifts, jewelry, clothing, supermarket, etc.) in each area.

The business surveys included questions regarding business conditions in 2005 compared to the previous year (2004), whether the security zone has affected the business, and if so, in what way. Other questions related to business category, number of employees, and duration of time each business has been at the current location. Comments and suggestions for improving business conditions were also noted.

However, as a response to comments, a new survey has been conducted and the methodology and results of the survey have been included in the FEIS in Chapter 4, “Socioeconomic Conditions” and in Appendix A.

Comment D3: Need to recognize the impact of the closure of Park Row in curtailing business, visitation and tourism. (2, 46, 51, 52)

Response: The socioeconomic chapter includes a detailed analysis of indirect business displacement and tourism, which concluded that the action has not resulted in indirect business displacement or in impacts to the tourism industry.

Comment D4: There are several flaws in the execution of the [socioeconomic] assessment. Many Chinatown small business owners and workers speak Chinese as their first or only language. The DEIS states that a translator was present when necessary for the surveys, but there is no detail provided on precisely how the surveys/interviews were conducted. The DEIS does not indicate any degree of cultural sensitivity outside the need to have a translator “present when necessary.” There is no information provided as to exactly which businesses were surveyed. The DEIS only covers generally the types of questions asked, but does not include a copy of the survey instrument, nor all the collected responses. (3, 11, 27, 46, 51, 52)

Response: As a response to comments, an expanded survey was conducted. All of the surveyors for the new survey spoke both English and Chinese. A description of the methodology for the survey is discussed in detail in Chapter 4, “Socioeconomic Conditions” and a copy of the survey is included in Appendix A.

Comment D5: The DEIS relies heavily upon vacancy rates and rents to gauge the economic vitality of the study area. These are important measures, but they must be assessed in conjunction with other data such as turnover rates and the types of tenants the succeeded the previous tenants. (3)

Response: As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and discussed in Chapter 4 of the DEIS, field observations were made during peak business times to determine level of activity, condition of buildings, and presence or absence of vacant properties – all of which can be indicators of economic conditions. The retail corridors throughout the Historic Chinatown sub-area and the study area are very active, with a low observed vacancy rate. Field observations also indicate that the majority of businesses within the study area are neighborhood services such as personal care, travel services, and cleaning and tailoring; shopping goods such as apparel, jewelry, and gift stores; and eating and drinking places. As illustrated in Table 4-12 of Chapter 4, the Historic Chinatown sub-area represents the retail heart of the study area with 80% of the study area’s eating and drinking places, 78% of its neighborhood services, and 68% of its food stores. This data indicates that these types businesses (eating and drinking places, retail, food stores, neighborhood services), which have always been predominate within the study area, continue to be the predominate businesses.

Comment D6: The [business] survey results support the conclusion that the street closings directly impacted nearby businesses and warrant mitigation. One possible mitigation could be hosting a forum or a series of forums for small business owners in the area that inform them of various financial resources available to them a how they can apply to those programs. (3)

Response: The results of the business survey are, at most, inconclusive. While registering individual beliefs, the survey results show that respondents in the study area are almost evenly split regarding that the barriers have had on local businesses. While most respondents in Historic Chinatown attributed the barriers to a decline in business than in other neighboring areas, businesses east of the Bowery, which also borders the barriers, largely indicated that the barriers have not had an impact. The survey results are also not supported by objective economic measures identified in the *CEQR Technical Manual* such as property values and vacancy rates. The security zone has not significantly adversely affected the viability of the Chinatown retail and restaurant sectors, which continue to be a major draw for both residents and tourists. As such, no mitigation is required.

- Comment D7:* The DEIS uses a generic research model to determine economic health and does not consider indicators of detrimental impact on the character and local sustainability of the community. There must be collaboration with local organizations in order to obtain a more accurate assessment of business activity. (3, 27)
- Response:** The DEIS followed the guidelines within the *CEQR Technical Manual* in preparing the socioeconomic analysis.
- Comment D8:* The Asian American Federation of New York conducted surveys from it's two reports on the economic impacts of 9/11 on Chinatown. The data from those reports could be utilized for the EIS and the methodology for the survey research could be adopted and tailored to the needs of this study. (3)
- Response:** The data presented in these reports do not directly relate to the socioeconomic analysis conducted in the EIS. In addition, these reports analyzed the overall effect of 9/11 on the Chinatown community, whereas the EIS analysis tries to isolate the effects of the security plan on Chinatown from the overall effects of 9/11. However, these reports were utilized in the socioeconomic analysis in the discussions of the garment and tourism industry. Also, see response to Comment D4.
- Comment D9:* The economic effects of 9/11 are still being felt in the study area. The DEIS uses that fact to conclude that any decline in economic activity is most likely due to the 9/11 aftermath and not the street closures. (3)
- Response:** See response to Comment D6.
- Comment D10:* The closure of Park Row and barricading One Police Plaza have not only brought great inconvenience to residences and businesses, but there has been an economic loss, and proper survey of the Chinatown community would indicate that there has been a lot of lost business. (5,9)
- Response:** See response to Comment D4.
- Comment D11:* Since the closure of Park Row, my extended family prefers not to come to Chinatown to dine and have family get-togethers. (9) The street closures have an effect on people who want to shop and dine in the area. (6, 7, 130)
- Response:** Comment noted.
- Comment D12:* An overwhelming majority of the merchants disagree with the DEIS report's conclusion that the Park Row closure has had little impact on the local business community. (10)
- Response:** Comment noted. See response to Comment D6.

Comment D13: These apartments [Chatham Green and Chatham Towers] are susceptible to changes in property values dues to market forces. (10, 33) Chatham Green is not a Mitchell-Lama housing development. (12,14,18,19, 23,24,25,26, 34, 46, 51, 52, 57,66, 68,71)

Response: The EIS has been revised to clearly state that Chatham Green and Chatham Towers are are susceptible to changes in property values.

Comment D14: The claim that the street closures do not have effect on the City's tourism industry has little bearing on the local problems addressed by this DEIS. This is an example of inappropriate use of data made by the investigators to support NYPD's claims. (10)

Response: The DEIS presents an overview of the City's overall tourism industry in addition to a detailed analysis of how the action has affected Chinatown's tourism industry, specifically. The comparison of the tourism industry in Chinatown and the City shows that the effects of 9/11 were felt throughout the entire tourism industry and these negative effects seemed to have lessened with time in both Chinatown and the City as a whole.

Comment D15: The question is not whether the 9/11 attacks affected the decline of the tourist activities, but how to separate the impact of the Park Row closure from other contributing factors to the recovery of the 9/11 attacks. The report made no attempt to separate the effect of these contributing factors. (10)

Response: This statement is incorrect. The DEIS does attempt to isolate the effects of the street closures from the overall effect of 9/11. As stated in Chapter 4, "Socioeconomic Conditions," in order to isolate the effects of the action, from the overall effects of the 9/11 attacks, the study area patterns were compared to all of Lower Manhattan as well as another geographic area to the west of Broadway (Tribeca), all of which were affected by the events of September 11, 2001. This comparative analysis identified whether there were any trends that are applicable to the study area that are not evident in Lower Manhattan as a whole and/or in a sampled area to the west of the study area (Tribeca). The DEIS concluded that study area patterns are consistent with trends throughout Lower Manhattan and that there is no evidence that the limit in accessibility has resulted in any secondary business displacement.

Comment D16: A careful reading of Chapter 4 reveals that the presented data are either not directly relevant to the issue discussed or totally inadequate to justify

- these conclusions. (10)*
- Response:** Chapter 4, “Socioeconomic Conditions,” was prepared following the guidelines presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Per CEQR guidelines, the chapter included a detailed analysis of indirect residential displacement, indirect business displacement, and adverse effects on specific industries (in this case, tourism). The methodological approach developed for the analysis (see Chapter 4 for detailed methodology) did provide a relevant and meaningful analysis, while adhering to the CEQR guidelines. The conclusions found in the DEIS were supported by extensive relevant and reputable data sources such as the U.S. Census, The New York City Department of Finance, and the New York State Department of Labor, for example (see Chapter 4 for detailed sources).
- Comment D17: There is no indication that the consultant consulted with any of the several scholars that have conducted studies about Chinatown. (11)*
- Response:** The socioeconomic analysis utilized relevant studies, articles, and data sources such as *Chinatown One Year After September 11th: An Economic Impact Study* by the Asian American Federation of New York and the U.S. Census for example (see Chapter 4 for complete data sources). In addition, field survey and business interviews were conducted. The findings and conclusions of this detailed analysis were documented in the EIS.
- Comment D18: The DEIS took an incomplete “snap-shot” of Chinatown businesses, which does not tell the story of how the closure of Park Row has impacted the Chinatown business community. (11)*
- Response:** The socioeconomic analysis examined employment, business, and commercial real estate trends between 2000 and 2005 within the study area, which includes Chinatown. By looking at trends from the past 5 years, this provides a picture of how the street closures have affected businesses within the area.
- Comment D19: Churches were not considered in this survey. (21)*
- Response:** As churches are not businesses, they are not considered in the socioeconomic analysis.
- Comment D20: Property values at Chatham Green have gone down since the streets have been closed. (25, 26, 57,71)*
- Response:** As discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, although specific data on average and median sales prices for Chatham Green co-ops, which is located within the security zone, are not available, recent real estate

listings in the *New York Times* and on real estate firms' websites indicate that asking prices for Chatham Green co-op apartments are comparable to the average and median sale price in the Financial District for the 3rd Quarter 2005. Therefore, as the sales values of the Chatham Green co-ops are comparable to other co-op sales values within Lower Manhattan, it appears that the street closures have not affected property values at Chatham Green.

Comment D21: No interviews were conducted with residents or businesses inside the security zone. (26)

Response: Interviewing residents is not part of a CEQR socioeconomic analysis and therefore not within the scope of work for this socioeconomic analysis. Businesses were surveyed as part of the DEIS, and since it was issued additional interviews with businesses in the study area have been conducted including businesses within the security zone.

Comment D22: The conclusion of no measurable impact on businesses does not match up with actual experiences. (26)

Response: Comment noted. However, the data presented in the socioeconomic analysis supports the conclusion the action has not resulted in any significant adverse impacts to indirect residential displacement, indirect business displacement, and tourism.

Comment D23: The sample size for the survey was too small. (6, 27, 46, 51, 52)

Response: As presented in Chapter 4 of the DEIS, a random sample of approximately 20 businesses from three geographic areas (Historic Chinatown, Chinatown north of Canal Street east of the Bowery/Catherine Street) to determine whether the security zone has affected business in those areas. As a response to comments, an additional survey was conducted between the DEIS and FEIS with approximately 300 businesses surveyed in those three geographic areas.

Comment D24: There was no commentary expressing the anger, frustration of anyone who was interviewed. (27)

Response: The questions asked were very specific and the interviewer recorded the responses. Emotional commentaries, if any, were not considered as the state of mind of the interviewee is not relevant to the analysis.

Comment D25: The closer you get to Park Row and Mott Street, the more times a storefront has changed hands in the last 5 years. (27) The street closures have had a negative impact on Mott Street. (132)

Response: See response to Comment D5. As discussed in the EIS, the median rate of property values increased on Mott Street (between Worth Street and Canal Street) between tax years 2001/02 and 2005/06, with the median rate of increase actually highest in the section of Mott Street closest to the security zone (between Worth and Mosco Streets). Therefore, with increased property values, the findings do not support that there has been a negative impact on Mott Street.

Comment D26: The street closures have affected the economic vitality of our neighborhood and have negatively impacted businesses. (6, 45, 56, 60, 81-90, 93-122,124, 125) The street closures have dampened Chinatown's economic recovery effort (130).

Response: Although the action has limited traffic accessibility to some parts of the study area, there is no evidence that this limit in accessibility has resulted in any secondary business displacement, and as such, no significant adverse impacts have occurred.

Comment D27: The section of the socioeconomic analysis in the DEIS that deals with property values on Mott Street did not use any actual data to arrive at conclusions but instead provided some estimates of property values over a period of time. No sales figures were provided which would have shown the true measure of what property values would have been. (131)

Response: The property value analysis on Mott Street that was included in the DEIS utilized the New York City Department of Finance's 5-year Market Value History Reports for Tax Years 2001/02 through 2005/06 for each tax lot fronting on Mott Street.

Comment D28: The conclusions in the DEIS about property values on Mott Street is contrary to what has actually happened. A walk down Mott Street and discussions with storeowners would have painted a different picture. (131)

Response: See response to Comment D25.

Comment D29: New York City Department of Finance assessment information and year-to-year changes are measured by percentage changes to arrive at data and not median calculations in any measure. This fact was missing in the DEIS. (131)

Response: The DEIS reports the Department of Finance data for year-to-year changes in percentages for property values along Mott Street. However, in order to provide a more accurate basis for assessment, the median rate of property value increase was calculated for each portion of Mott Street analyzed. The median is more appropriate as a measure of central tendency in this case because, unlike the average, it

is not sensitive to abnormally high or low values.

Comment D31: The following tables should have been included in the Mott Street property value analysis in the DEIS (see tables prepared by commenter in Appendix B):

- Comparing tax assessments of Mott Street with Manhattan for fiscal years 2005-2006
- Comparing Mott Street tax assessment changes by sections of Mott Street for fiscal years 2005-2006
- Comparing Mott Street tax assessments arranged by median numbers by sections of Mott Street for fiscal years 2005-2006
- Table showing tax assessments for all of Mott Street by section and side of Mott Street. (131)

Response: The DEIS does include a comparison of property values on Mott Street between tax years 2001/02 to 2005/06. A comparison of property values pre-street closures to post-closures provides a better indicator for evaluating whether the security plan has had an adverse impact on property values than comparing property values and tax assessments between 2005 and 2006. Also, see response to Comment D25.

E. Urban Design and Visual Resources

Comment E1: The DEIS readily acknowledges that the features of the security zone have had significant adverse impacts on urban design. (3)

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comment E2.

Comment E2: The closure of the public walkways and extensive security features and fences makes the area aesthetically unpleasant. (6, 7, 40)

Response: The security plan has altered the urban design of the security zone area, yielding a significant adverse impact. Chapter 11, "Mitigation," provides a description of measures to be developed to mitigate the urban design impacts. These recommendations are intended to address the closure of Park Row by making it more aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian and bicycle friendly.

F. Neighborhood Character

Comment F1: The residents of Chatham Green and Chatham Towers will forever feel as though they live in a lock-down barricaded zone, making simple tasks and arduous and complicated procedure. (1, 40, 41, 43, 50, 129)

Response: Although Chatham Towers is partially located within the security zone, vehicular and pedestrian access is not restricted into this building. At Chatham Green, also partially located in the security zone, vehicle access is controlled for residents destined to the parking lot. Pedestrian access is not restricted for pedestrians destined to Chatham Green.

Comment F2: Chinatown and other neighborhoods of Lower Manhattan should not be forced to bear an undue burden nor do they want their communities turned into fortresses. (11)

Response: As stated in the DEIS, the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 resulted in greater security measures being implemented all over the City, particularly in Lower Manhattan due to the large number of government offices and financial institutions located there. Security devices such as, delta barriers, French barriers, bollards, and concrete planters, although typically not aesthetically pleasing, have become part of the landscape of the City after September 11, 2001. The street closures are necessary security measures and will continue to stay in place, while the threat remains.

Comment F3: The closure of Park Row is trampling upon the Chinatown community. (32)

Response: Although the action has resulted in increases in traffic and noise around the perimeter of the security zone, this has not altered the defining neighborhood characteristics of the study area, and in particular Chinatown, which has always been heavily trafficked. However, as discussed in Chapter 11, "Mitigation," the urban design impacts that have occurred as a result of the action has affected neighborhood character (within the security zone) will be mitigated to enhance the streetscape and make the area more aesthetically pleasing.

Comment F4: The NYPD has created a police state in the neighborhood that is very off-putting to residents and visitors. (45)

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comments F2 and F3.

Comment F5: The surrounding neighborhood was bustling with activity now it looks like a parking lot for NYPD and court officials. (6)

Response: As stated in the DEIS, after conducting a detailed Neighborhood Character analysis, the action was found not to have altered the defining neighborhood characteristics of the study area surrounding the security zone. Also, see response to Comments to F3 and G13.

Comment F6: Chatham Green seems to have been closed off from the rest of the community. (67)

Response: The DEIS recognizes that the action has created a disconnect between the security zone area (where Chatham Green is located) and the surrounding neighborhood. Despite this negative alteration, the security features are considered necessary to protect potential terrorist targets and these features will remain in place as long as a potential terrorist threat exists.

G. Traffic and Parking

Comment G1: The most obvious impact of the closure of Park Row has been bottleneck traffic on the streets surrounding Park Row causing delays. (1,21,55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 67, 79, 92, 126, 127, 128, 129)

Response: A detailed analysis of traffic has found that the action has resulted in significant adverse impacts at 4 locations (see Chapter 7, “Traffic and Parking” for list of impacted intersections). Full mitigation is proposed for all impacted locations; however, one impacted location (Robert F. Wagner Sr. Place and Pearl Street) will remain unmitigated.

Comment G2: The NYPD needs to maintain and expand its commitment of prevent the parking abuse in the surrounding community and that includes the use of Park Row as a parking lot for civilian vehicles by either uniformed or civilian employees of the police department. (2,8, 53, 54)

Response: Currently, there is no parking permitted on Park Row for anyone, including City employees. In addition, as stated in the DEIS, while illegal parking by both government employees and civilians is prevalent in the study area, the security plan has not resulted in this condition.

Comment G3: There needs to be a plan including the full reopening of the Police Plaza garage and full utilization of the federal garage on Hester Street, which is currently underutilized. (2)

Response: The 400-space garage located at 109-133 Park Row is currently open to NYPD authorized vehicles and is fully utilized. The EIS has been updated to clearly state this. The federal parking garage is not under City control, and therefore the City cannot take any steps to insure that it is more fully utilized.

Comment G4: The security zone did not create the traffic congestion and parking shortage, but it has exacerbated those problems. (3, 74)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment G5: The DEIS partially relies upon traffic data from the 2004 One Police Plaza Security Plan EAS. This is inappropriate considering that New York State Supreme Court judgment against the NYPD specifically mentioned the need to re-examine the traffic and parking analysis in the 2004 EAS. (3)

Response: The traffic analysis in the EIS relies on multiple sources to construct a baseline pre-9/11 condition. The 2004 One Police Plaza Security Plan EAS was utilized for pre-9/11 traffic volumes at some study area intersections in addition to the 1993 *Foley Square FEIS*, the 2004 *World Trade Center Memorial and Redevelopment Plan GEIS* and additional source material provided by NYCDOT to construct a baseline traffic network. In addition, traffic data was collected in the field in 2005 that was utilized for With-Action traffic analysis.

Comment G6: In order to provide the fairest assessment for the community, conservative traffic data should be used for the baseline and no-action conditions. Additionally, there should be extensive and thorough fieldwork conducted to determine the current conditions, and less reliance on the traffic modeling software. (3)

Response: Extensive fieldwork was conducted within the traffic study area. Traffic counts were conducted in 2005 at 28 intersections in addition to vehicle classification counts, parking surveys, physical inventories of intersections, and speed runs to record existing conditions. It was found that several significant adverse traffic impacts have resulted as a result of the action. Traffic simulation was utilized to provide a visual representation of how the street closures have affected congestion and traffic queuing within the immediate vicinity of the security zone and to help test mitigation measures.

Comment G7: The DEIS does not divulge whether or not the municipal garage is being fully utilized [by NYPD-authorized vehicles]. (3, 50, 74)

Response: See response to Comment G3.

- Comment G8:* Under-reporting of vehicles calls into question the air/noise pollution data. (6,30)
- Response:** **No-Action and With-Action traffic volumes in the EIS have not been under-reported. With-Action traffic volumes are based on actual field counts and therefore provide an actual measure of traffic in the study area. The air quality and noise analyses which also include actual field measurements, are accurate and reflect the effects of the street closures.**
- Comment G9:* The Park Row exit ramp from the Brooklyn Bridge that was closed formerly processed 500 to 700 vehicles an hour onto Park Row north. Its closure in 2001 diverted them somewhere. Nowhere in the DEIS is this discussed. (6, 11, 30)
- Response:** **All vehicles that formerly traveled on streets within the security zone, including the now closed Brooklyn Bridge off-ramp, were diverted elsewhere within the immediate surrounding network to streets such as Pearl Street/St. James Place, Centre Street and Worth Street. This is shown in the With-Action traffic volume diagrams. In addition, the baseline traffic volumes description in Chapter 7, “Traffic and Parking,” includes a discussion of vehicles that formerly entered the security zone from Park Row, Pearl Street, and the Brooklyn Bridge Manhattan bound exit ramp to Park Row.**
- Comment G10:* Conditions beyond 2006 are totally ignored in the DEIS. No mention of the redevelopment of Lower Manhattan and Downtown Brooklyn. (6, 30, 35, 46, 51, 52, 56) The EIS must examine conditions at least 10 to 20 years into the future, not simply the present year. (11, 30)
- Response:** **See response to Comment A6.**
- Comment G11:* With Park Row closed, narrow Worth Street has been transformed into one of Downtown’s few cross-town streets. (6) The closure of Park Row has resulted in a high volume of traffic on Worth Street. (9) Park Row was an essential connector for Lower Manhattan neighborhoods. (54)
- Response:** **Based on field counts conducted for this EIS, traffic volumes have increased substantially along Worth Street partially as a result of the street closures, which have resulted in traffic impacts at the intersection of Worth Street at Chatham Square. Proposed mitigation for this impact, which include the reconfiguration of Chatham Square is required to fully mitigate these impact.**
- Comment G12:* Back-ups are caused by NYPD taking out a lane in each direction on the

*Brooklyn Bridge that results in noise, air pollution and traffic congestion.
(7)*

Response: **Comment noted. The NYPD actions on the Brooklyn Bridge, on Broadway south of Vesey Street, and at other locations are on-going security measures that are independent of the security zone analyzed in this EIS.**

Comment G13: All the parking that once existed for the residents and visitors of Chinatown prior to 9/11 has become almost nonexistent. Parking has been usurped by not only court personnel, but by private cars bearing police placards. (6, 9, 40, 42, 44, 69, 130)

Response: **As stated in the DEIS, out of the approximately 1,217 illegally parked cars observed within the study area, approximately 1,120 of those vehicles displayed City placards. However, while illegal parking by both City employees and civilians is prevalent in the study area, the security plan has not caused this condition.**

Comment G14: Illegal parking and the lack of legal parking has had a negative impact on Chinatown retail and wholesale businesses. (11)

Response: **While illegal and lack of legal parking is a recognized problem in Chinatown and elsewhere in Manhattan, the security plan has not caused this condition. See response to Comment G13.**

Comment G15: The closing of the 400 space municipal garage has severely reduced parking opportunities in the area. (7,38)

Response: **The closure of the municipal garage was a separate action and not part of this action. See response to Comment A8.**

Comment G16: Because of the street closures, traffic is much heavier on St. James Place. (12, 75) However, the DEIS shows that St. James Place at Madison Street has a satisfactory level of service. We do not want additional lanes of traffic and no parking on St. James Place. (75)

Response: **The DEIS showed that traffic volumes have increased along St. James Place/Pearl Street partially as a result of the street closures, which have resulted in traffic impacts at the intersections of Pearl Street/Robert F. Wagner Place, Pearl Street/Frankfort Street, and Chatham Square. However, the HCS analysis showed a satisfactory level of service at the intersection of St. James Place and Madison Street. Proposed mitigation for these impacts, which include the reconfiguration of Chatham Square in addition to signal timing adjustments, and lane striping adjustments fully mitigate these impacts at Pearl Street/ Frankfort Street and Chatham Square.**

However, the impacted intersection of Pearl Street/Robert F. Wagner Sr. Place will remain unmitigated. Nowhere in the DEIS is it stated that St. James Place is proposed to be widened and have no parking lanes.

Comment G17: There is no rationale for reversing the traffic direction on Oliver Street provided in the DEIS. It will invite trucks and buses into the street from Chatham Square. Access to the church and school on this street will be hampered by this. (13, 28, 31, 38, 46, 51, 52, 75, 77) If the traffic is reversed parking will be a problem and very unsafe. It does not take into consideration children or seniors. (28, 75, 76)

Response: Comment noted. The reversal of Oliver Street is no longer being proposed. See response to Comment K16.

Comment G18: Cars and trucks are constantly looking for parking which slows traffic and adds to the congestion in the area. (15, 123)

Response: Curbside space in this portion of Manhattan is fully utilized. However, this is not a consequence of the security zone.

Comment G19: During rush hours Water Street is a huge traffic jam and not a feasible alternative to Park Row. (20)

Response: The traffic and parking analysis of the EIS shows that Water Street traffic has increased as a result of the action. Significant adverse impacts were identified at Pearl Street at Frankfort Street and Robert F. Wagner Sr. Place.

Comment G20: The inventory of available parking garage parking spaces presented in the DEIS seems to include parking lots that are no longer available. (26)

Response: The off-street parking survey was conducted in early 2006 as a snapshot of parking conditions in the study area. A new survey was conducted in early 2007 and the updated parking survey results have been included in the FEIS.

Comment G21: The traffic study area is very limited and does not include the Brooklyn Bridge. (30, 46, 51, 52)

Response: The study area analyzed intersections that includes vehicles directly entering/exiting the Brooklyn Bridge. In addition, see response to Comments G12 and G40.

Comment G22: The DEIS shows With-Action volumes at sites close to the security zone 30-40% lower than in 1993. The difference indicates the magnitude of the impact of the closures. 30,000 to 40,000 vehicles a day are no longer

moving through the security zone. (30)

Response: As noted in the DEIS, actual field counts were conducted to measure the With-Action conditions. As also discussed, in the EIS, there have been several changes in the network in the No-Action conditions that affect the circulation in the study area. These include street closures at Foley Square, the 1999 security plan, Vesey Street between 9A and Church Street, Duane Street east of Broadway, and at the New York Stock Exchange. In addition, the loss of millions of square feet of office space in Lower Manhattan has also resulted in a decrease of vehicles moving through the area. These No-Action changes have caused a decrease in traffic in the study area.

Comment G23: The DEIS underestimates the 2000 traffic volume within the limited study area by 21% to 22%. It is improper to use 2000 as the baseline traffic year for traffic because it is an artifice that provides a shaky foundation upon which the DEIS is built. The analysis ignores volumes reported in the 1993 Foley Square EIS and the official annual bridge and tunnel counts. (30)

Response: The DEIS used various sources in addition to the 1993 Foley Square EIS to construct the 2000 baseline traffic network. The baseline traffic network is utilized as a reference in the discussion of pre-9/11 traffic conditions in the study area. Determining significant adverse traffic impacts was based on comparing No-Action conditions to With-Action conditions. In addition, see response to Comment G22.

Comment G24: The NYPD has occupied many of the permissible public street spaces on St. James Place and in the rest of the area. They park at metered spots for longer than permitted and do not put money in the meter. This is not mentioned in the EIS. (34, 42, 74, 94)

Response: Chapter 7, “Traffic and Parking,” provides in depth documentation of parking conditions within the study area. See response to Comment G13.

Comment G25: Traffic along Canal Street on the weekend should be examined. (30)

Response: An analysis of weekend traffic along Canal Street is not within the scope of work for this EIS. Weekday peak period conditions that were analyzed are adequate. Due to the distance between Park Row and Canal Street, the EIS did not identify measurable traffic flow changes along Canal Street resulting from the action.

Comment G26: The EIS must provide a worst-case condition for baseline conditions. (30)

Response: In compliance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the EIS compares

No-Action condition with the With-Action condition to assess impacts. It should be noted, however, that the FEIS does provide additional documentation of the historical data available prior to 2001.

Comment G27: Clarify this statement in the DEIS: "...as long as the increase in delay is 10 seconds or more."(30)

Response: The text in Chapter 7, "Traffic and Parking," of the DEIS has been revised to more clearly indicate that CEQR impact criteria was utilized in the traffic analysis. Using the impact criteria in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a No-Action LOS A, B or C condition deteriorates to unacceptable mid-LOS D, or a LOS E or F in the With-Action condition, then a significant traffic impact has occurred. The *CEQR Technical Manual* further states that for a No-Action LOS A, B or C, which declines to mid-LOS D or worse under the With-Action condition, mitigation back to mid-LOS D is required.

Comment G28: The DEIS does not discuss the benefits of opening the municipal garage to NYPD vehicles. (30)

Response: See response to Comment G3.

Comment G29: The Synchro traffic model the consultant created needs to be released for review. It was requested through the FOIL process, but the request has not been answered yet. (30)

Response: The Synchro traffic model was provided on 2/15/07.

Comment G30: LOS calculation sheets were not included with the on-line DEIS (30) Data sheets were not provided with the DEIS to permit checking No-Action traffic volume assumptions. (30)

Response: LOS calculation sheets are not typically provided with the published DEIS. The sheets are considered back-up data for the traffic analysis and when requested by NYC DOT are submitted to NYC DOT for review and comment. The back-up data is also available for public review and can be accessed through the Freedom of Information Law process.

Comment G31: The With-Action AM peak period traffic diagram shows more than a 1,000 vehicles in the westbound right turn lane at the intersection of Canal Street at the Bowery. This is not shown in the LOS summary. (30) Traffic did not get diverted to Canal Street and the Bowery as a result of the street closures as it shown in the DEIS. (30)

Response: At the intersection of Canal Street at the Bowery, the westbound right turn lane is controlled by a separate signal as it is a channelized right

turn lane. A footnote has been added to Table 7-6 of the FEIS to further clarify this.

Comment G32: The CEQR Technical Manual's approach for determining traffic impacts is not appropriate for this traffic analysis. A traffic simulation model would be more appropriate in this situation. (30)

Response: The guidance provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual* does not address this situation. The particular methodology that was used in this analysis was reviewed by NYC DOT and approved for use in connection with this project. While simulation is not a substitute for this type of traffic analysis, it does provide an effective tool to test improvements such as those proposed for Chatham Square.

Comment G33: The DEIS must disclose the effect of Park Row and other closures that reduced travel within Chinatown by increasing traffic elsewhere in Lower Manhattan. The displacement of tens of thousands of vehicles daily must be analyzed under CEQR. (30, 46, 51, 52) The shifting demand in regard to traffic as it relates to Chinatown discussed in the DEIS is not explained clearly. (30)

Response: The DEIS discloses the change in traffic patterns and identifies several significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts as a result of the number of vehicles being diverted by the action as discussed in Chapter 11, "Mitigation."

Comment G34: By using CEQR traffic methods, the DEIS fails to disclose actual unacceptable delays that are characteristic of Chinatown corridors. (30)

Response: See response to Comment G32.

Comment G35: The DEIS fails to account for the actual effect of the street closures on traffic. (46, 51, 52)

Response: This statement is not correct. While action conditions are rarely measured in the field, for this action, the transportation effects of the security plan have been accurately documented with detailed data collection and are presented in the DEIS.

Comment G36: The DEIS fails to monitor and measure the traffic congestion on St. James Place. (46, 51, 52)

Response: The DEIS included an analysis of six intersections along St. James Place/Pearl Street between Chatham Square and Fulton Street. The DEIS disclosed significant adverse traffic impacts at two of the six intersections: at Peal Street and Robert F. Wagner Place and Pearl Street at Frankfort Street. While the impact at Pearl Street and

Frankfort Street would be fully mitigated, the impact at Robert F. Wagner Sr. Place and Pearl Street will remain unmitigated.

Comment G37: The DEIS says that there is a parking lot at 130 Duane Street with 126 spaces, yet this is outside the study area. In addition, this parking lot does not exist. (46, 51, 52)

Response: Typically for off-street parking surveys, off-street parking facilities located within the study area or in close proximity to the study area are included. A recent off-street parking survey was conducted to update the list of off-street parking facilities included in the DEIS. It was found that the parking garage at 130 Duane Street does not exist; possibly closing between the time the first survey and second survey were performed. The FEIS has been updated to reflect this new information.

Comment G38: The DEIS does not explain why the earlier study (PSAC II EAS) found that the loss of the municipal garage would cause an impact and yet the current study finds no shortage of parking. (46, 51, 52)

Response: Please see response to Comment A8. The Public Safety Answering Center II EAS (CEQR#01NYP002M) stated that the closure of the municipal garage to all vehicles (both civilian and NYPD) would create a maximum shortfall of 88 parking spaces in the area. However, the EAS also acknowledged that the *CEQR Technical Manual* provides that for proposed actions within the Manhattan CBD (area south of 61st Street), the inability of the proposed action or surrounding area to accommodate projected future parking demands would generally be considered a parking shortfall, but would not be deemed a significant adverse impact.

Comment G39: The DEIS failed to include news articles regarding illegal parking in Chinatown. (42)

Response: News articles are typically not included in EIS traffic and parking analysis. Detailed field data collection of parking conditions, including supply and demand, are provided in the EIS.

Comment G40: The entire area south of Canal Street, including the primary replacement routes of South Street and Water Street, should have been included in the study. (20)

Response: The study area for the traffic analysis includes major corridors with readily identifiable diverted traffic from the closure of Park Row and other streets within the security area. The portion of Water Street

between Dover Street/Frankfort Street and John Street is in fact included in the traffic study area.

H. Transit and Pedestrians

Comment H1: Worth Street has five lanes of traffic converging on two narrow west-bound lanes and makes it a congested area, particularly hazardous for children, seniors and disabled to navigate. There is not a single crosswalk from Park Row to Centre Street. (6, 8, 9, 22, 44, 62) It is difficult to cross the street in the area surrounding the security zone. (6, 21, 38, 56,67, 71, 74)

Response: The segment of Worth Street noted above has more than doubled its traffic volume due to the action. NYC DOT has stringent requirements for “warrants” for mid-block traffic signals. The DEIS did not identify this segment as a high-accident location caused by the action.

Comment H2: Those who live on the eastern side of police headquarters lost the use of a wide stairway and were relegated to a steep and narrow staircase that lies by the side of police headquarters. This staircase can only accommodate one person walking in each direction. The alternative is to use the staircase or navigate an extra two blocks around it. (8)

Response: As disclosed in the EIS, for security purposes, this staircase connecting Madison Street to the pedestrian corridor along police headquarter is currently closed and will remain closed as part of this action. With the exception of this one corridor, the streets in the security zone are fully accessible to pedestrians. With this route closed, pedestrians must travel along the south side of the headquarters building along Avenue of the Finest and Madison Street. As discussed in Chapter 8, “Transit and Pedestrians,” this alternate route increases walking distance for pedestrians by approximately 240-feet or about one average city block.

Comment H3: Between Pearl Street and St. James Place there are no shelters at the bus stops. (12)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment H4: In the vicinity of the barriers, the sidewalks and roadway are broken up and bumpy. (12)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in Chapter 11, “Mitigation,” as part of the mitigation for urban design and traffic impacts, improvements to

Park Row and Chatham Square will be made. Some of the recommendations relating to streetscape improvements include the following:

- **Reduce most of Park Row’s right-of-way to two lanes, one in each direction.**
- **Realign the northern end of Park Row to conform to the Chatham Square reconfiguration.**
- **Install a landscaped esplanade along Park Row, including attractive paving, trees, shrubs, planters, etc.**
- **Install improved street fixtures, including benches, lighting, and barriers. Attractive trash receptacles may be placed at appropriate locations away from security sensitive areas.**
- **Improve pedestrian wayfinding signage along Park Row and other routes through the area.**

Comment H5: The closure of Park Row will block us without a pedestrian walkway to the new transit hub. (17)

Response: Park Row is currently open to pedestrian traffic. The planned World Trade Center Transit Hub and the planned Fulton Street Transit Center, will both be located approximately half a mile from Park Row and Worth Street. With the exception of one corridor along NYPD headquarters, pedestrian access in the security zone is not restricted.

Comment H6: It is much less convenient to get to Chinatown from Battery Park City due to the rerouting of the M9 bus. (20)

Response: As detailed in the DEIS, the current rerouting of the M9 bus to its new route is somewhat independent of the With-Action condition as Vesey Street, which is adjacent to the World Trade Center, has been closed. As a result, the M9 has stayed on its post-9/11 route even though the M103, M15, and B51 have returned to Park Row.

Comment H7: There are now bicycles all over the sidewalks because the streets are too dangerous for them. Bicycles have access to all sorts of areas. That is a security concern. (22)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment H8: The cement blocks on Park Row make it difficult to walk down the street. (24, 57)

Response: The cement barriers on the sidewalk along Park Row and other deterrents that make the target less vulnerable and accessible to attack are necessary security features. Also, see response to Comment

H4.

- Comment H9:* No plan was presented to re-establish pedestrian access up to Police Plaza from Madison Street. (26)
- Response:** See response to Comment H2.
- Comment H10:* The DEIS needs to secure more recent bus ridership characteristics. (30)
- Response:** The most recent bus ridership data available is from 2005 and the FEIS has been updated accordingly.
- Comment H11:* It is not clear if bus route lengths discussed in the DEIS are for the entire route. (30)
- Response:** The bus route lengths discussed in the DEIS are for the entire route length, round trip. This has been clarified in the FEIS.
- Comment H12:* The cost in wasted time and lost productivity due to bus delays should be analyzed. (30)
- Response:** This type of analysis is not within the scope of work for the EIS. As noted in the FEIS, New York City Transit bus routes that had been rerouted around Park Row (with the exception of the M9) are now operating on Park Row as part of the mitigation plan.
- Comment H13:* Delays in bus travel time as a result of having to pass through the barriers on Park Row should be discussed. (30)
- Response:** The EIS has been updated to provide a discussion of the minimal delays encountered by buses as they enter the security zone.
- Comment H14:* Chinatown bus services located in the area should be described and their routes and ridership reported in the EIS. (30)
- Response:** NYCT bus routes and other express bus routes that travel through Chinatown are discussed in Chapter 8, "Transit and Pedestrians," which also includes a discussion of ridership statistics. A separate analysis of Chinatown private bus services located in the study area is not within the scope of work for the EIS.
- Comment H16:* The community needs more detail about numbers and types of pedestrian accidents covering more years. (30)
- Response:** The pedestrian accident analysis presented in the DEIS provides pedestrian high accident locations pre-street closures (year 2000) and post-street closures (2002-2005). The pedestrian accident tables in the DEIS presented the number of accidents at intersections within the study area. The years 2000-2005 provide an adequate representation

of how the street closures have affected pedestrian/vehicle conflicts at intersections in the study area. By comparing these years and data, it was determined that a high accident pedestrian location appears to have been created at Worth Street and Broadway as result of the security zone.

Comment H17: The diversion of traffic will increase vehicle miles of travel (VMT) in the area and traffic accidents grow in number in proportion to VMT. This is ignored in the DEIS. (30)

Response: The DEIS provides a detailed evaluation of potential high accident locations and discloses a significant adverse impact.

Comment H18: The DEIS ignores the effect of the street closures have had on disabled persons. The security plan measures do not comply with the American with Disabilities Act. (46, 51, 52, 56,78)

Response: The closure of Park Row has created essentially a pedestrian mall, and reduced pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Vehicle access to Chatham Green and Chatham Towers is maintained for handicapped vehicle drop-off/pick-up.

Comment H19: The bus stops for the M15, M9, M22, B51, and M103 are constantly shifting. (55)

Response: Comment noted. The M103, M15, and B51 bus routes have now returned to their original routes along Park Row resulting in a shift in bus stops from their “temporary” route.

Comment H20: The DEIS does not consider the NYCDOT express bus service in the transit analysis, particularly the BM1, BM2, BM3, and BM4 bus routes. (61)

Response: A discussion of the rerouting of the BM1, BM2, BM3, and BM4 bus routes has been included in the FEIS.

Comment H21: The barriers to foot traffic have increased the time it takes to get to Chinatown. (54)

Response: As discussed in the DEIS, with the exception of one corridor, the streets that are closed to vehicular traffic as a result of the security plan are open to pedestrian activity. The pedestrian corridor running between Police Headquarters to the intersection of Madison Street and Pearl Street was closed as part of the security plan. This corridor connects the plaza in front of Police Headquarters to the intersection of Madison and Pearl Streets. The distance through this corridor from the edge of the plaza to the intersection is approximately 540'.

There is a staircase along this corridor and, it is therefore not a handicapped accessible route. With this route closed, pedestrians must travel along the south side of the headquarters building along Avenue of the Finest and Madison Street. The distance for this alternate route from the edge of the plaza to the intersection of Madison and Pearl Streets is approximately 780'. There is a staircase along this route as well. The increase in walking distance for pedestrians equals 240' or about one average city block and an approximate walking time of an additional 60-90 seconds.

Comment H22: *There is no M22 bus stop going west at South Bridge Towers. (67)*
Response: The M22 bus route was not analyzed in the EIS as it was not affected by the action.

Comment H23: *It takes longer to walk to the subway at the Municipal Building. (55)*
Response: As discussed in Chapter 8, the pedestrian corridor running between Police Headquarters to the intersection of Madison Street and Pearl Street was the only pedestrian corridor closed as part of the security plan. With this route closed, pedestrians must travel along the south side of the headquarters building along Avenue of the Finest and Madison Street. This increase in walking distance is approximately 240' or an average city block. While this pedestrian detour does represent an increase in walking distance, the increase is not considered a significant adverse impact.

I. Air Quality

Comment I1: *The amount of toxins in the air from trucks and cars idling in traffic as they make their way down Worth Street or St. James Place has increased. (1, 24, 56, 125, 129) The air quality in the area has gone down. (3, 25, 66, 126, 128)*

Response: The DEIS identified significant adverse air quality impacts at Worth Street and Foley Square and Worth Street at Chatham Square. As discussed in Chapter 11, "Mitigation" of the DEIS, the rerouting of the M103, M15, and B51 from their "temporary" route along Worth Street back to Park Row has mitigated these air quality impacts. However, with revisions to the air quality analysis for the FEIS based on revised standards for fine particulates, slight changes in the traffic network, and updated information on modeled pollutant concentrations, the With-Action condition has not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

- Comment I2:* *The heavy traffic makes me concerned about the levels of pollution surrounding Columbus Park. (9)*
- Response:** **Vehicular pollutant concentrations are highest at intersections due to vehicles idling at traffic signals. If no air quality impacts are projected for the worst-case intersections, then none are likely at other locations. Since no air quality impacts are anticipated for the modeled intersections, none are likely for Columbus Park.**
- Comment I3:* *The DEIS fails to give quantitative measurements as to the level of vehicular exhaust as well as its impact on young children. (33) I am gravely concerned about the increased levels of asthma in our community, which has high rates among our children. (1, 38, 75, 129)*
- Response:** **The CAL3QHC and CAL33HCR models provide quantitative values for worst-case concentrations of carbon monoxide, PM10, and PM2.5. The action routes traffic formerly on Park Row to St. James Place and Worth Street. Therefore, the regional emissions of pollutants are the same for both No-Action and With-Action conditions.**
- Comment I4:* *More can be done to improve air quality than rerouting three buses. (3)*
- Response:** **The DEIS disclosed that significant adverse air quality impacts have resulted from the action. The rerouting of the three bus routes back onto Park Row has mitigated this impact. Also, see response to Comment I1. No additional air quality improvement measures are required as part of the action.**
- Comment I5:* *The carbon monoxide and particulate matter analysis should be performed for 2026. (30, 46, 51, 52) The DEIS fails to consider the 20-year time frame required by the National Ambient Air Standards (“NAAQS”) in making it’s determination. (51,52)*
- Response:** **The analysis of air quality is typically done for the year of analysis, or build year, which has been defined as 2006. The action resulted in diverted traffic due to the security plan and therefore has not generated additional traffic. Highway improvement projects often project traffic and air quality 20 years into the future because the improvements to the highway's capacity result in induced traffic. That is, drivers are attracted to the highway due to the improved traffic flow. For this action, the traffic has been diverted to other streets. This does not constitute an incentive for drivers to use these streets that would result in induced traffic over the next 20 years. Therefore, a 20-year future analysis year is not carried out for these types of projects. In addition, pollutant emissions decrease with future years**

due to changes in technology and the fleet mix. Therefore, the worst case for this action is considered to be the analysis year, when the diverted traffic volume would be added and when the vehicular emission factors would be higher than in the future. Therefore, no analysis of air quality in 2026 is necessary to demonstrate that no impacts would occur.

Comment I6: Table 9-2 appears to be mislabeled as providing intersection volumes for 2005. (30)

Response: The table has been revised in the FEIS.

Comment I7: The results of the vehicle classifications are not included in the DEIS. (46, 51, 52) The percentage of SUV's accounted for in this analysis seems very low. (30)

Response: The vehicle classification counts were conducted as part of the traffic data collection. The vehicle classification count sheets are considered back-up data for the traffic analysis and air quality analysis and when requested by NYC DOT and/or NYC DEP are submitted to NYC DOT and/or NYC DEP for review and comment. The back-up data is also available for public review and can be accessed through the Freedom of Information Law process.

Comment I8: It is not clear what "free-flowing" links are being described in the air quality analysis. (30)

Response: The EIS has been revised to clearly state that for the intersection air quality analyses, free-flowing links are the roadway segments that extend 1,000 feet from each leg of a modeled intersection.

Comment I9: Background concentrations were not measured at ground level and therefore not representative of what people actually breathe. (30)

Response: The background concentrations were provided by NYCDEP, and are considered to be representative of the air quality experienced by a person who is six feet tall.

Comment I10: The DEIS introduces 1991 meteorological data for Foley Square/Worth Street analysis. The analysis year is 2006. Please clarify. (30)

Response: This was the most recent data available in a format suitable for running CAL3QHCR. The CAL3QHCR model uses five years of meteorological data. A five-year period is considered to provide a good range of potential meteorological conditions, and no significant differences would be likely with a different set of years.

Comment I11: The air quality analysis is missing so much information that the analysis cannot be fully reviewed for accuracy and completeness. (30)

Response: The mobile air quality analysis was prepared pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual* and utilized the traffic data provided in Chapter 7, “Traffic & Parking.” Also, see response to Comment I7.

Comment I12: There is no indication of what the air quality impacts would be if the closed Brooklyn Bridge off ramp were to open. (46, 51, 52)

Response: The DEIS analyzed the action, which does not include the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge off-ramp that is currently closed. Therefore, an analysis of such air quality impacts would not be warranted and is not included within the EIS.

J. Noise

Comment J1: Most offensive [noise] is the loud banging mechanical barriers erected on Park Row last fall located just a few yards from the residents’ windows. It is loudest when an articulated bus rolls over them. (8, 25, 44)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 10, “Noise,” the mechanical raising and lowering of hydraulically operated barriers is a source of noise. The barriers are raised and lowered sporadically through the 24-hour period, depending upon the frequency of vehicles entering the security zone area. The FEIS has been updated to reflect this.

Comment J2: The noise pollution has been terrible as a result of the street closures. (25, 58, 66, 71, 72, 73, 126, 128)

Response: The DEIS discloses a significant adverse noise impact Worth Street and Baxter Street and Worth Street and Mulberry Street in the AM peak hour. Although, the rerouting of the M103, M15, and B51 buses back to Park Row from Worth Street have lessened these impacts slightly, it did not eliminate them. No other method of mitigation is feasible, and therefore, these impacts will remain unmitigated.

Comment J3: Noise monitoring was not conducted during normal rush hour. (26)

Response: As discussed in the DEIS, based on the screening analysis presented in Table 10-3 of Chapter 10, noise monitoring was recommended for Worth Street and St. James Place during the AM peak period. As shown in Table 10-4 of Chapter 10, noise monitoring was conducted between 8:02-8:22 AM and 8:49-9:09 AM, which is considered the AM rush hour.

- Comment J4:* Three noise measurements should have been taken and two of the three should have been within 2 dBA of each other. (30, 46, 51, 52)
- Response:** Noise measurements were carried out according to the guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which does not specify the number of measurements or a required range between them.
- Comment J5:* No details of precisely where noise measurements were taken. (30)
- Response:** As shown in Table 10-4 of Chapter 10 of the DEIS, noise monitoring was conducted at Madison Street and St. James Place and Worth Street at Baxter Street. A graphic showing the noise monitoring locations has been added to the FEIS.
- Comment J6:* No details are provided about the vehicle classification. (30)
- Response:** As shown in Table 10-5 of Chapter 10 of the DEIS, a vehicle classification count was conducted during the same period of the noise monitoring at the selected intersections. Table 10-5 shows the number and type of vehicles observed during that period.
- Comment J7:* There are no details about the diversion of buses by time of day due to the closing of Park Row. (30)
- Response:** A discussion of bus diversion by time of day has been added to the EIS. As shown in Chapter 10, "Noise," the traffic has been diverted to other traffic links, especially St. James Place and Worth Street. The diverted traffic on these two streets would include 18 additional buses during the peak AM period, 10 during the peak Midday period, and 15 during the peak PM period.
- Comment J8:* Table 10-3 in the Noise chapter implies huge traffic impacts due to project traffic diversion. (10)
- Response:** Based on guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the noise level impact threshold is an increase of 3 dBA. Table 10-3 shows that noise levels at most intersections would be the same, lower, or slightly higher. Only two intersections are projected to experience impacts, and these would occur only during the peak AM period. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce these potential impacts. See response to Comment J2.
- Comment J9:* There is no indication of what the noise impacts would be if the closed Brooklyn Bridge off-ramp were to open. The DEIS fails to consider the return of commercial traffic to the Brooklyn Bridge (46, 51, 52)
- Response:** The DEIS analyzed the action, which does not include the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge off-ramp that is currently closed. Therefore, an

analysis of such noise impacts would not be warranted and is not included within the EIS. Also, see response to Comment G12.

K. Mitigation

Comment K1: The post-9/11 security plan for One Police Plaza, and in particular the closing of Park Row, has had a serious negative impact on the residential and commercial communities of Lower Manhattan. (3) The DEIS fails to adequately identify and provide solutions for problems created by the closure of Park Row. (1, 3) It is impossible to design appropriate mitigation strategies if the impact of the security measures and the needs of the community are not thoroughly and accurately studied. It necessary to undertake significant mitigations, beyond signal changes and lane striping. (3)

Response: The DEIS disclosed significant adverse urban design, traffic, transit and pedestrian, air quality, and noise impacts. Mitigation measures beyond signal changes and lane striping are proposed within the EIS, including a major reconfiguration of Chatham Square, a redesign of Park Row and the return of three bus routes to Park Row.

Comment K2: Mitigation [for urban design] is a good start, but more research must be conducted to determine the best way to balance safety and aesthetics. (3)

Response: Comment noted. As the design advances in coordination with the community, different alternative strategies will be put forward by the designer.

Comment K3: The DEIS relies solely upon the LMDC report to provide possible mitigations and it primarily focuses on Park Row. However, Pearl Street, Madison Street and Avenue of the Finest should be addressed as well. (3)

Response: Comment noted. Currently, the City is focusing the redesign of Park Row in conjunction with the reconfiguration of Chatham Square. This plan would mitigate the significant adverse urban design impact.

Comment K4: One proposed mitigation - way-finding signs - should be erected only after there has been sufficient community input on the issue. The size, location, content and language of such signs will be of critical importance. Trees should be planted in a way that will provide shade to seating areas and not obscure signage. The proposed seat furniture should be arranged in an inviting manner and the lighting should be environmentally responsible and provide a sense of security. All of the urban design mitigation should be executed with environmental sustainability in mind. (3)

Response: Comment noted. Also see response to Comment K2.

- Comment K5: The DEIS states that more specific mitigation measures will be researched before the FEIS is completed and those mitigation measures should include a thorough analysis of the possibility of opening the closed streets or at least creatively rerouting traffic. (3)*
- Response: See response to Comment K2. See response to Comment A1 regarding opening the closed streets.**
- Comment K6: The proposed mitigation would achieve air quality that is just barely good enough to sidestep any further required mitigation. Surely more can be done to improve air quality than merely rerouting three buses. (3)*
- Response: The DEIS determined that Worth Street was significantly impacted due mainly to the temporarily relocated buses. As such, the return of the buses to Park Row has mitigated the air quality impact. Also, see response to Comment I1.**
- Comment K7: The DEIS does not explain how the air quality on Park Row has been affected by placing three buses back onto it. (3)*
- Response: Under No-Action conditions, Park Row carried autos, trucks, and buses. The removal of the autos and trucks (with buses remaining) due to the action, has substantially improved air quality. Such a substantial reduction in volume at a “receptor” is not typically analyzed for potential impacts.**
- Comment K8: Forty parking spaces for city employees translates into 40 spaces of the NYPD. (11) Restoring parking to government employees behind the barricades is not mitigation. (28)*
- Response: Comment noted. This portion of the proposed mitigation is no longer being proposed and has been deleted from the EIS.**
- Comment K9: Widening St. James Place and reducing the sidewalk would increase the volume of vehicles and therefore encourage more traffic, pollution, and noise. (26, 58, 57, 66, 68, 123)*
- Response: The widening of St. James Place is not being proposed as part of any mitigation plan in the EIS. Nowhere in the EIS is it stated that St. James Place is proposed to be widened.**
- Comment K10: The DEIS makes insufficient mitigation recommendations to deal with increased traffic and completely skirts the central issue of enforcing illegal permit parking by government workers. The DEIS must include a plan to mitigate the abuse of permit parking placards enforcing existing parking laws. (15, 42)*

Response: See response to Comment G13. As illegal parking within the study area is not the result of the action, no mitigation is proposed as part of this project.

Comment K11: The DEIS should offer mitigations to all the adversely affected intersections, not just three of the five. (15)

Response: The DEIS analyzed mitigation measures at all traffic-impacted intersections. All intersections have been mitigated with the exception of Pearl Street and Robert F. Wagner Sr. Place. Mitigation measures analyzed for this impacted intersection resulted in new or worsened impacts on other approaches at this intersection and a reduction in crossing pedestrian crossing times. As such, this impact will remain unmitigated.

Comment K12: The mitigation in the report are not mitigating me back to a life I once had living in the area of Park Row. (17)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment K13: No local residents or small businesses were consulted about real mitigations that might offset the effects of the street closures. (26)

Response: The mitigation measures presented in the DEIS were developed to directly address the impacts to various technical areas. These comments on the DEIS provided the opportunity to respond to the proposed mitigation. As shown in response to Comment K8 and K16 such comments are carefully reviewed.

Comment K14: The reversal of Oliver Street is not going to gain anything. (33)

Response: See response to Comment K16.

Comment K15: If you are worried about traffic mitigation, just open up Park Row. (33)

Response: For security purposes, Park Row is currently closed to unauthorized vehicular traffic and will remain closed as part of this action. See response to Comment A1.

Comment K16: We the community oppose the reversal of Oliver Street. (33, 132) It is not mitigation. (26)

Response: The reversal of the traffic direction along Oliver Street is no longer being proposed as part of the mitigation measure of reconfiguring Chatham Square. The FEIS has been updated to reflect this change.

Comment K17: It is a brilliant move as mitigation to align St. James Place with the Bowery from a purely traffic point of view, but it is a disaster when you

look at it when you consider the effect of widening it and adding additional vehicles on St. James Place and on the school located there. (36, 57)

Response: **It is proposed to align the Bowery and St. James Place, as stated in the DEIS, however, it is not proposed to widen St. James Place.**

Comment K18: *By creating a major truck route down St. James Place, property values at Chatham Green will decrease. (36)*

Response: **St. James Place is not being proposed as a truck route. Mitigation measures for Chatham Square include aligning St. James Place with the Bowery.**

Comment K19: *The DEIS does not discuss other alternatives (such as that proposed by LMDC) for Chatham Square nor does it report the community's reaction to another complete redesign. (30) Residents, business owners, employees and local organizations should be contacted to determine exactly how these street closures and barriers have affected their quality of life and what mitigations would be appropriate. (3)*

Response: **As stated in the DEIS, and in coordination with NYCDOT, the mitigation for the traffic impacts at Chatham Square incorporates some of the recommendations from LMDC's *Chinatown Access and Circulation Study* for the reconfiguration for Chatham Square. The community was able to comment on the entire DEIS, including the reconfiguration of Chatham Square, during the public comment period. The totality of the comments are presented in Comments K1-K26.**

Comment K20: *If the traffic analysis were done to reflect the huge growth in traffic anticipated over the next two decades, a great deal more mitigation would be needed. (30)*

Response: **See response to Comment A6.**

Comment K21: *Mitigation proposed in the DEIS is not appropriate for our community. Measures that would benefit the community would be appropriate mitigation. (26)*

Response: **The mitigation measures identified in the DEIS were developed to reduce or eliminate a significant impact. See responses to Comments K2 and K13.**

Comment K22: *The mitigation to adjust the traffic light by one second at Chatham Square is not acceptable. (6)*

Response: **The DEIS includes a proposed reconfiguration of Chatham Square to**

mitigate the significant adverse traffic impacts at this location. Adjusting the signal timing by one second is not proposed mitigation for the traffic impact at Chatham Square.

Comment K23: Consideration of traffic officers needs to be accounted for in the suggested mitigation and alternative proposals. (46, 51, 52)

Response: The provision of NYPD traffic control officers are coordinated with each precinct. However, if the physical makeup of an artery is inadequate to handle vehicle flow, then physical or operational (signal) changes are needed. These can be supplemented by on-site control as determined by each precinct.

Comment K24: The opening of Park Row to buses has had a negative effect on the location of bus stop locations. It has become inconvenient to walk to the bus stop. (63)

Response: The NYCTA determines the location of bus stops. Putting the M103, M15, and B51 buses back on their original route improves travel time and also improves traffic.

Comment K25: The Park Row closures have not had any adverse impacts. (48)

Response: The DEIS discloses several impacts in the technical areas. The EIS includes proposed mitigation for these impacts as required by CEQR.

L. Alternatives

Comment L1: If we were today to put our police headquarters somewhere, we'd never put it in downtown Manhattan. We have to go back to the drawing boards and start right now planning for the new police headquarters in a hardened site in a place that's not near residents and businesses and that's not in Lower Manhattan where it's a prime target. Let's move it and find another use for that building that doesn't require this [security]. (5)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 12, "Alternatives," One Police Plaza is located in close proximity to a unique concentration of civic and governmental land uses. Several of these are located wholly or partially within the security zone itself, namely, the Metropolitan Correction Center and a United States District Courthouse, as well as the Municipal Building, the United States Courthouse, containing the U.S. Court of Appeals, and the New York County Courthouse, home to the New York State Supreme Court. Given the functions hosted by One Police Plaza, and the close coordination required between the

NYPD and the criminal justice system, it is essential for the police headquarters to be located within close proximity to the court facilities and detention centers, as well as the seat of government.

Although other sites in the city could offer similar or better benefits in terms of floor area or more modern facilities, none can offer a similar or near equal advantage in terms of proximity to the court system and the City's administrative heart.

It should also be noted that, should police headquarters be relocated from the area, the current security measures would not be entirely eliminated. NYPD's Counter Terrorism Bureau seeks to protect government facilities in the "civic center" portion of Lower Manhattan, which continue to be considered potential terrorist targets. Given the presence of a number of other sensitive facilities within the security zone (such as the Municipal Building, the United States Courthouse, the New York County Courthouse, the U.S. District Court, and the Metropolitan Correctional Center), all of which would still remain and it would be necessary to maintain some, if not all, of the current security measures in the area.

Comment L2: Police Headquarters claims that it must have a buffer zone that no other terrorist target in the city has. Move Police Headquarters to a site where they can have all the buffer distance and parking they want. (6, 11, 20, 131)

Response: See response to Comment L1. Please note that police headquarters is not unique in having a security buffer surrounding the building. The New York Stock Exchange, for example, also requires a security buffer zone in which roads have been closed to unauthorized vehicular traffic.

Comment L3: Thinking about moving computers, telephones, file cabinets etc., to a decentralized location could not (when compared to the cost of all this "super security") be that expensive. (7)

Response: Comment noted. The relocation of police headquarters would be an expensive undertaking, that would require the City to spend large sums of money to acquire an appropriate site (if no suitable City-owned sites are available), and to construct a new facility and the necessary physical and operational infrastructures that would be required for such a facility. Also, see response to Comment L1.

Comment L4: If it is necessary to keep a safe perimeter around Police Plaza, it is time to

move police headquarters somewhere else, perhaps Governors Island or Randall's Island. (9, 25)

Response:

See response to Comment L1. As discussed in Chapter 12, "Alternatives," although Randall's Island and Governor's Island have been suggested as possible locations, because their placement in the East River is thought to provide a natural security barrier, neither of them represents a suitable location for police headquarters in a major city. Governor's Island in particular, which is only accessible by water, lacks the basic transportation infrastructure that would be essential for linking police headquarters to other court and government facilities in the City as well as to the general public. Randall's Island, while easily accessible from three of the five boroughs via the Triborough Bridge, is so far removed from the facilities in Lower Manhattan (approximately more than seven miles away), rendering it not easily accessible, especially by transit, to the public, the employees who currently work at One Police Plaza, or other city agencies and government organizations. Such a location would add substantial time and cost to the daily interactions that would be required for New York City's police headquarters to function properly.

Comment L5:

On the alternative of relocating police headquarters, the report reiterated all the claims made by the NYPD, without any critical analysis on whether those claims are appropriate to the situation. (10) The Mayor should commission an independent study to examine whether police headquarters should be located in Lower Manhattan or relocated, and hold public hearings to discuss findings of that study. (11, 53)

Response:

An analysis of relocating police headquarters was provided in Chapter 12 of the DEIS. It was found that the relocation of police headquarters would not be feasible. According to the NYPD, there are no plans to relocate police headquarters from its current location. Regardless of where police headquarters is located, however, security measures would still be required for the Federal facilities in the immediate vicinity of Park Row.

Comment L6:

On the alternative for the Chatham Green parking lot, a third party, such as a counter terrorism bureau from a federal agency, make an independent assessment whether the long standoff distance is justified in light of the severe impacts it has on the neighborhood. (10)

Response:

The NYPD Counter Terrorism Bureau reviewed the Chatham Green Access Alternative and determined that that this alternative would not allow sufficient standoff distance between NYPD headquarters

and the Chatham Green Houses parking lot, which would become accessible to trucks. In addition, this alternative would also result in significant adverse traffic, urban design, transit and pedestrians, and noise impacts. As such, the mitigation measures for the action described would also be required for this Chatham Green Access Alternative.

Comment L7: By refusing to fund the move of the police headquarters, the government is making Chinatown bear the cost of their inactions. If funding is a real issue, the NYPD should have applied for funds from the state and federal governments as part of the war on terrorism. (10) The protective measures needed after the relocation of the NYPD would not be anywhere as drastic to Chinatown and would not require the closure of Park Row. (10)

Response: Comment noted. However, funding for the relocation is not the only concern for this alternative. Please see response to Comment L1, L4, and L5.

Comment L8: There is no detailed explanation of why Community Suggested Alternative Plan #2 is not feasible. This alternative would have permanently closed our exit onto Pearl Street and increased the buffer space from 80 to 100 feet. (23)

Response: See response to Comment L6.

Comment L9: Relocate police headquarters. (23, 28, 39, 41, 42, 45, 54, 56, 71, 73, 125, 127, 128) OEM and FDNY moved operations out of Lower Manhattan to the waterfront in Brooklyn. There is no reason why the NYPD cannot do the same. (23)

Response: See response to Comments L1 and L4.

Comment L10: An actual analysis of the best location for police headquarters was not performed in the DEIS. (26)

Response: See response to Comment L5.

Comment L11: The DEIS did not take a "hard look" at alternatives to the action. (46, 51, 52)

Response: According to the CEQR Technical Manual, alternatives considered should reduce or eliminate impacts of an action while substantively meeting the goals and objectives of the action. The range of alternatives to be considered, which include a No-Action Alternative, is determined by the nature of the specific action, its potential impacts, the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor, and

feasibility. Based on this criteria, in addition to the No-Action Alternative, three other alternatives were considered in the DEIS.

However, the proposed four alternatives analyzed in the DEIS were found to be infeasible as none of them met the goals and objectives of the action which is to protect government facilities in the “civic center” portion of Lower Manhattan that continue to be considered potential terrorist targets.

Comment L13: Do not move police headquarters. (46-48)

Response: Comment noted. According to the NYPD, there are no plans to relocate police headquarters from its current location.

M. Miscellaneous

Comment M1: We want an environmental impact statement that speaks to the community, the people that live there and work there. (5, 131)

Response: Comment noted. The DEIS included a detailed analysis of various technical areas, while also taking into account the communities concerns as much as possible.

Comment M2: The DEIS is an insult to our intelligence and common sense. It demonstrates no understanding of the cumulative effect of changes that have transformed our communities with street closures that encompass a larger area than the WTC site. (6)

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comment M1.

Comment M3: Insurance companies view Chatham Towers as a high-risk area. Our insurance has gone up 600 percent. (8,9)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment M4: The DEIS made use of data to support conclusions favorable to the NYPD. (10,11)

Response: The objective of the DEIS is to analyze the effects of the action, pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The DEIS utilized data to determine whether the action has resulted in significant adverse impacts - which it has - in several technical areas including urban design, traffic, transit, pedestrians, and noise. These impacts are disclosed and mitigation measures identified in the DEIS.

Comment M5: The barriers on Park Row close to Worth Street and St. James Place never

- seem to work right. (12, 55)*
Response: **Comment noted.**
- Comment M6: It is difficult to get a taxi or get picked up by a car service from Chatham Green. (14, 19, 55, 72) Car service ridership statistics pre- and post-9/11 in the neighborhood should be included in the EIS. (6)*
Response: **An analysis of car service and taxi ridership is not within the scope of work for this EIS. Although vehicular access is controlled into the Chatham Green parking lot along Park Row, there are no vehicular restrictions on taxis or any other vehicles along St. James Place, where Chatham Green also has frontage.**
- Comment M7: Police headquarters has 40,000 gallons of diesel fuel under the building. (131). Eliminate the fuel tank that sits 100 feet from Chatham Green property. (6, 23)*
Response: **Comment noted.**
- Comment M8: The sirens that go off when there are traffic jams at Confucius Plaza are very disruptive. (16)*
Response: **Comment noted.**
- Comment M9: Nothing has changed since the streets have been closed. (17)*
Response: **The DEIS discloses significant adverse urban design, traffic, transit and pedestrian, air quality, and noise impacts. Mitigation measures that are proposed within the EIS include a major reconfiguration of Chatham Square, a redesign of Park Row and the return of three bus routes to Park Row.**
- Comment M10: The report is way too limited in its assumptions about who uses Chinatown and how they use it. (20)*
Response: **The DEIS took a hard look and analyzed numerous technical areas to determine whether the action had resulted in significant adverse impacts. See response to M9.**
- Comment M11: This report makes no mention of how many people in the police department actually need to make physical contact with the justice system over any period of time. (20)*
Response: **Given the functions hosted by One Police Plaza, and the close coordination required between the NYPD and the criminal justice system, it is essential for the police headquarters to be located within close proximity to the court facilities and detention centers, as well as the seat of government. For example, the Criminal Justice Bureau**

acts as the operational liaison between the New York City Police Department and other agencies involved in the criminal justice community, including the five county District Attorney's Offices, the New York State Office of Court Administration, the Division of Criminal Justice Services, and the Mayor's Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office. Given this synergistic relationship, proximity to the court system's facilities is critical. No statistics on how many or how frequently members of the NYPD have to appear at the above mentioned facilities are available.

Comment M12: There should be a daily protocol for the police officers on duty around the security zone to make people's lives a little easier. (18)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment M13: Even if Park Row re-opened, Chinatown would still be in bad shape. (29)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment M14: It is upsetting that the Mariner's Temple Baptist Church and school would be on a street that would now have trucks weighing tons going down it and it seems like we are being ignored. (37)

Response: See response to Comment K18.

Comment M15: The following should be incorporated to improve the conditions in Chinatown:

- *Pedestrian access to Park Row*
- *An ambulance posted within the Park Row area that will provide immediate service to Downtown Hospital, or a shifting of the present barricade*
- *Establishment of a free shuttle from the Seaport to Chinatown so that residents can be linked to the Downtown Alliance Shuttle.*
- *A new drop-off area for sight-seeing buses for easy access to Chinatown shops and restaurants*
- *A commitment from NYPD to utilize their nearly 1,000 parking spaces in 1 Police Plaza and to end the blatant police parking abuses.*
- *A trolley line on Fulton Street to better connect Chinatown with the rest of Lower Manhattan.*

Response: Pedestrian access is not restricted on Park Row. Ambulance operations are determined by the FDNY and New York Downtown Hospital. Any service changes or additions to the Downtown Alliance Shuttle would be decided on and created by the Downtown Alliance.

As discussed in the DEIS, Chinatown currently has one tour bus drop-off location. As the action has not resulted in any impacts to Chinatown's tourism, no mitigation plan is proposed as such. The 400-space (not 1,000 space) former municipal garage is fully utilized by the NYPD. The M1, M6, M9, and M15 buses provide service from Chinatown to Lower Manhattan.

Comment M16: Many cars have been damaged and drivers injured by the delta barriers. (125)

Response: Comment noted. Claims for damage to vehicles resulting from the delta barriers can be filed through the New York City Office of the Comptroller. Automobile property damage claim forms can be accessed through their website at www.comptroller.nyc.gov.

Comment M17: It is difficult to receive deliveries at Chatham Green. The police officers do not let them through. (66)

Response: Trucks represent a severe threat and therefore require extensive screening procedures before they can be permitted into Chatham Green.

Comment M23: I was affected economically after September 11, 2001. (59)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment M24: Developments under construction in the South Street Seaport area has increased construction vehicles, construction workers, noise, and congestion to the surrounding area. (6)

Response: Comment noted. Consideration of construction of new developments in the South Street Seaport area is not within the scope of work for this EIS.

Comment M25: Mayor Bloomberg should do something about the street closures because we are losing businesses and making residents want to leave. (43)

Response: Comment noted.