

PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING CENTER II CHAPTER 23: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS¹

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) summarizes and responds to all substantive oral and written comments received during the public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed Public Safety Answering Center II (PSAC II). Public review began on August 18, 2008, with the issuance of the Notice of Completion for the DEIS. The public hearing on the DEIS was held concurrently with the hearing on the project's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) applications by the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) on December 17, 2008. The period for public review remained open until December 31, 2008.

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. The comments are organized by subject area. Where multiple similar comments were made on the same subject matter, a single comment combines and summarizes the individual comments. After each comment is a list of the people who made the comment. Where no further elaboration is required to address a comment, or where comments do not relate to the analysis of the Proposed Action in the DEIS, the response provided is "comment noted." Written comments received on the DEIS are included in Appendix B.

II. DEIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the PSAC II project during a period commencing with the City Planning Commission public hearing held at the New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP) in Spector Hall on December 17, 2008, and extending through December 31, 2008. Written comments received on the DEIS are included in Appendix B.

This section lists and addresses comments made on the DEIS. The comments are organized by subject area, following the organization of the DEIS document. The organization and/or individual who made the comment is identified next to each comment, using a numerical reference keyed to the list of commenters below. Comments on the DEIS were received from the following individuals and organizations:

1. Honorable Adolfo Carrion, Bronx Borough (Borough President Recommendation on ULURP applications, dated December 2, 2008)
2. Amanda M. Burden, FAICP, Chair of the New York City Planning Commission (oral statement at public hearing)

¹ This chapter is new to the EIS

3. Kenneth J. Knuckles, Esq., Vice Chair of the New York City Planning Commission (oral statement at public hearing)
4. Betty Y. Chen, Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
5. Karen A. Phillips, Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
6. John Merolo, Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
7. Irwin G. Cantor, P.E., Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
8. Richard W. Eaddy, Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
9. Nathan Leventhal, Commissioner (oral statement at public hearing)
10. Marvin Mitzner, Blank, Rome, LLP; Representative of the Hutch Metro Center (oral statement at public hearing)
11. Joseph Kelleher, Executive Director of the Hutch Metro Center (oral statement at public hearing)
12. Terrell Estes, Director, Office of City Project Review, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (written statement submitted December 23, 2008)
13. Steven Finkelstein (written statement submitted December 26, 2008)

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment A1: PSAC II, one of the Bronx's tallest buildings at [an elevation of] 374 feet, would stand in dramatic contrast to its low-density surroundings. (1)

Response: As described in Chapter 5, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the proposed PSAC II building would be substantially taller than most buildings in the surrounding area. At an elevation of 374 feet, the PSAC II building would be highly visible and prominent within the Bronx skyline. It would have a strong presence on the Pelham and the Hutchinson River Parkways, which abut the proposed development site to the north and east, respectively. To minimize the structure's bulk and height from the abutting parkways, the building would be setback from the site's northern and eastern lot lines towards the Amtrak right-of-way with abundant greenery and landscaping proposed between the building and the Pelham and the Hutchinson River Parkways.

Chapter 19, "Alternatives" has been updated to include a new alternative, the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative, in which the proposed PSAC II development would be reduced in scale and program. Under this alternative, the proposed PSAC II building would have 11 levels above grade and a height of 260 feet tall (elevation of 284 feet) and include approximately 550,000 gsf.

Comment A2: The installation of an entrance-exit ramp between the Hutchinson River Parkway and the Hutchinson Metro Center (HMC) facility must accompany construction of PSAC II. (1)

Response: Any infrastructure improvements to the Hutchinson River Parkway are made at the discretion of the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). The City has reached out to NYSDOT to express support for any infrastructure enhancements in the vicinity of the HMC campus, including the addition of entrance/exit ramps from the Hutchinson River Parkway.

Comment A3: What is the design concept [for the proposed PSAC II development]? (2)

Response: The proposed PSAC II building would be a very robust, fully redundant, load balanced facility with extensive data and mechanical systems. The design of the building puts the critical floors – call center dispatch, data and mechanical/electrical – as far above grade as practical for reasons of protection.

The PSAC II building would be sited at the rear of the site, with ample landscape frontage in front of both the Hutchinson River Parkway and Pelham Parkway. The landscape includes a berm, which would conceal the accessory parking garage and other sensitive areas of the site. This berm would be planted with native grasses and is intended to extend the appearance of parkland from the adjacent New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR) lands abutting the parcel to the north. The proposed project would also improve an existing pedestrian path extending from the Pelham Parkway to the Hutchinson Metro Center (HMC). This pathway would be lit and adjacent to patrolled areas of the project and would connect the bus stops on the Pelham Parkway with the proposed facility and HMC.

Comment A4: I'm wondering about the need for the [PSAC II] building's height of 400 feet. (3)

Response: The necessary mechanical and data systems, stand-off distances, and the floor plate, which is sized by the call center dispatch operations, for PSAC II define the height of the proposed development (elevation of 374 feet tall). The high floor-to-floor heights are required to accommodate the essential mechanical and data systems and the large display screens in the call center dispatch floor are also a factor.

As discussed in the response to Comment A1, Chapter 19, "Alternatives" has been updated to include a new alternative, the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative, in which the proposed PSAC II development would be reduced in scale and program. Under this alternative, the proposed PSAC II building would have 11 levels above grade and a height of approximately 260 feet tall (elevation of 284 feet) and include approximately 550,000 gsf.

Regardless of whether the Proposed Action or the Alternative Proposal alternative is built, there are additional communications requirements for an array of antennas that would require a height of approximately 300 feet, which would need to be placed on the roof of the PSAC II development. The program for these antennas is currently being developed by the City, and will be integrated into the design of PSAC II as soon as it becomes available.

Comment A5: Isn't this virtually a stand-alone site where you have the opportunity to keep the public away from the site completely? (7)

Response: The proposed development site is an ideal location for PSAC II in terms of its size, configuration, and relative isolation. The site comprises approximately 8.75 acres and is bounded by the Pelham Parkway to the north, the Hutchinson River Parkway to the east, and an Amtrak right-way to the west. It is relatively remote and severed from the surrounding area bordered by wide thoroughfares and their associated mapped open space to the north and east. The nearest buildings to the development site are a 4-story office building and a single-story warehouse within the HMC, which are located more

than 150 feet to the south. Vehicular access is provided from the south via Industrial Street (future Marconi Street), which is private access roadway that extends north from Waters Place to the southern boundary of the site. This private access roadway would be mapped as a public street as part of the Proposed Action.

Although a fence/wall would encircle the proposed development and provide a security perimeter, a publicly accessible pedestrian path would be established along the western edge of the property just outside of the perimeter fence, which would continue to provide a public pedestrian connection between the Pelham Parkway on the north and the HMC on the south.

Comment A6: Generally we [the HMC] support the project. We support the need for the call center and the application for site selection acquisition. (10)

Response: Comment noted

B. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Comment B1: The March 2008 Phase II Environmental Site Investigation Report chooses to evaluate results via NYSDEC's Part 375 for Unrestricted Use along with some comparisons to TAGM 4046. It is unclear why Unrestricted Use was chosen, as this project is evidently more commercial in nature, but the results indicate that the site clearly does not meet requirements for Unrestricted Use. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) recommends that the results be reevaluated utilizing a more appropriate end use scenario. (12)

Response: Chapter 7, "Hazards Materials" has been updated to reflect that results of the Phase II Environmental Site Investigation Report will be reevaluated utilizing a more appropriate end use scenario than Unrestricted Use, as the project is generally commercial in nature.

Comment B2: As described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, a Remedial Action Plan and Construction Health and Safety Plan should be prepared and submitted to the NYCDEP for approval prior to the commencement of any construction activities. (12)

Response: A Remedial Action Plan and Construction Health and Safety Plan will be prepared and submitted to the NYCDEP for approval prior to the commencement of any construction activities .

C. TRAFFIC & PARKING

Comment C1: The additional traffic this project would generate may overburden Water Street, the only current access to the HMC office complex. Resolution of this problem requires diligence and consideration of mass transit access, which must include Metro North

rail service via a reactivated Morris Park station stop and on site bus service provided by the MTA. I support construction of a ramp access directly from the Hutchinson River Parkway to the HMC, which will dramatically reduce the impact of traffic on local streets. (1)

Response: While it is unclear whether any bus routes can be added in the current fiscal environment, as part of the mapping of a new public street, the City is including a turnaround at the end of Marconi Street (former Industrial Street) that meets the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (MTA) standards to accommodate a bus route that may become more economically feasible in the future. In addition, the City will discuss the possibility of adding a route with the MTA closer to the opening date of PSAC II.

As discussed in the response to Comment A2, any infrastructure improvements to the Hutchinson River Parkway are made at the discretion of the NYSDOT. The City has reached out to NYSDOT to express support for any infrastructure enhancements in the vicinity of the HMC campus, including the addition of entrance/exit ramps from the Hutchinson River Parkway.

Comment C2: We [the HMC] have some concerns regarding traffic and transportation. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates that the increase in traffic will have an impact upon the new road that's going to be Marconi Street at its terminus, and I think that location and its intersection with Water Place becomes a point of concern, particularly since it's a dead end street. (10)

Response: Chapter 12, "Traffic and Parking" examines the traffic and parking impacts associated with the Proposed Action. As described in Chapter 12, the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at the intersection of Waters Place and Industrial Street (future Marconi Street) under both the Typical and Consolidated Operations of PSAC II. The mitigation plan described in Chapter 18, "Mitigation," which would result in a dedicated right-turn lane at the westbound approach of Waters Place, would eliminate the significant adverse impact at Waters Place and Industrial Street (future Marconi Street) under the Typical Operations of PSAC II. As the proposed PSAC II development is expected to accommodate the consolidated staffs of both PSAC I and PSAC II only on a temporary emergency basis when PSAC I in Downtown Brooklyn is non-operational, the NYPD is committed to mitigating traffic impacts at the intersection of Waters Place and Industrial Street through the use of traffic enforcement agents. The traffic enforcement agents would be under the purview of the NYPD. This approach has been recommended by the NYCDOT as the appropriate method of addressing temporary/emergency conditions when all of the City's PSAC workers are at the proposed development site.

Comment C3: We [the HMC] support the Borough President's recommendations, particularly that there be another safety valve way of getting into the facility through the entrance, another entrance on the Hutchinson Parkway. That would alleviate some of the pressure at the intersection of Marconi and Waters. (10)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in the response to Comment A2, any infrastructure improvements to the Hutchinson River Parkway are made at the discretion of the NYSDOT. The City has reached out to NYSDOT to express support for any

infrastructure enhancements in the vicinity of the HMC campus, including the addition of entrance/exit ramps from the Hutchinson River Parkway.

D. TRANSIT & PEDESTRIANS

Comment D1: We [the HMC] are concerned about the lack of public transportation to the site, which would further exacerbate the traffic and the traffic conditions. We believe that in terms of public transportation, there's an existing unused station at this location, which should be reactivated to provide access to the site, as well as to direct bus access. Other than Pelham Parkway there is no direct bus access to the site. The bus travels along Water Street; there is no way of getting into the site, a drop off near the site, by public transportation. (10)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in the response to Comment B1, the City is proposing to map a turnaround at the end of proposed public street (future Marconi Street) that meets the MTA standards for accommodating a bus route.

As described in the response to Comment G3, the reopening of an existing unused Morris Park railroad station is not part of the PSAC II project and would require approval of the MTA and/or Amtrak.

E. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Comment E1: The City of New York and its construction contractors must commit to employ Bronx residents in construction and long-term jobs and support Bronx based suppliers and contractors through the Buy Bronx/Buy New York and Bronx-at-Work programs. (1)

Response: The PSAC II team will do everything allowable under City procurement rules to ensure that the local community benefits from this important project, and will work with the Borough President's office on this issue. The NYPD and the Fire Department of New York City (FDNY) strongly believe that as permanent jobs are posted for PSAC II, they will attract Bronx residents, and maintenance contracts will also be bid-out to operate the facility.

Comment E2: Construction practices for the project must utilize the most advanced technology for emission controls. These include low sulfur emissions for on-road vehicles and electric vehicles for on-site use, compliance with Local Law 77, which requires City construction projects to use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuels and the best available emissions controls. (1)

Response: As per standard City contracts, ultra-low sulfur diesel vehicles will be used and all contractors will comply with Local Law 77 regarding Best Available Technology (BAT) emission controls.

Comment E3: All concrete mixing must occur on-site to minimize truck traffic during construction and concomitant air and noise pollution. (1)

Response: It is anticipated that all concrete mixing would occur on the proposed development site. The construction coordinator for the project, Tishman Technologies Corporation (TTC), has outlined a site logistics plan that includes an on-site concrete plant.

Comment E4: A comprehensive traffic management plan including a routing plan for construction related vehicles and long-term circulation must be designed and implemented. (1)

Response: Tishman Technologies Corporation, the project construction coordinator, has drafted a routing plan for construction-related vehicles and is currently in negotiation with the owner of the HMC to minimize impacts on the neighboring buildings and land uses. All construction-related trips, including construction worker vehicles and trucks, would access the development site from Waters Place via Industrial Street. Trucks en route to and from the proposed development during construction would use NYCDOT-designated truck routes to access the site. A long-term circulation plan is a part of the site design and takes into account emergency access to the site

Comment E5: Traffic control during construction is a major project. The access is limited, so knowing how people and trucks come and go is going to be very important to us [the HMC]. (11)

Response: As described in Chapter 16, “Construction Impacts,” during the construction of PSAC II, vehicular access to the HMC would be maintained at all times. A maintenance and protection plan of traffic (MPT plan) would be prepared in coordination with NYCDOT to maintain safe and convenient vehicular access to the HMC and the proposed development during construction of PSAC II and the construction of Industrial Street (proposed public street [Marconi Street]). Traffic impacts can be minimized using construction sequencing and land closure management measures within an overall MPT plan. The MPT plan would require that a 24-foot wide, two-way roadway be maintained at all times during construction to provide access between Waters Place and the HMC and the proposed development site This would allow for one moving lane in each direction as is currently provided along the existing Industrial Street.

F. ALTERNATIVES

Comment F1: One of my issues more than the design of the original [building] was the site and accessibility to the site. It’s so far off of a main direct access point; it is really hard for someone who would have to use public transportation. Is there a possibility of getting a different site that might fit the needs of just the call center itself without the operations, now that the building has been scaled down? Sites that are not so isolated in terms of access to transportation? (5)

Response: As described in Chapter 19, “Alternatives,” over the past decade, several other alternative sites for PSAC II have been considered, most of which are located outside

of the borough of the Bronx across the City. Several of these alternate locations included one other site in the Bronx, six sites in Queens, one site in Staten Island, and one site in Manhattan. Some of the sites considered included: the Harlem River Yard in the South Bronx; Fort Totten in northeastern Queens; the Ridgewood Reservoir in southwestern Queens; Sixth Road and 151st Street in northern Queens, 30-30 Northern Boulevard in western Queens; the former Elmhurst Gas Tank location in southwestern Queens, the Phelps Dodge site in southwestern Queens, the former GATX property in northern Staten Island, and West 44th Street and 11th Avenue in Midtown Manhattan. These sites consisted of both private and publicly owned property. None of these alternate locations proved viable options.

As discussed in further detail in Chapter 19, each of these alternative locations for PSAC II was found to be unsuitable, as each alternative site did not meet one or more to of the selection criteria for siting the proposed public facility. These include: access to public transportation; vicinity to main arterial roadways; available utilities (access to separate grids/distributions); location of technologies; radio propagation; and security requirements.

Comment F2: Do you have a change to your programmatic [scope for the PSAC II project]? (2)

Response: As described in the response to Comment A1, the EIS has been updated to include a new alternative, the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative, in Chapter 19, which modifies the program and scope of PSAC II. Under the Proposed Action, PSAC II would have three main functions including 911 call and dispatch operations and operation centers for the NYPD and the FDNY. In the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative, PSAC II would only accommodate the 911 call and dispatch center operations.

Comment F3: The site is one of the most visible locations in the entire borough of the Bronx. The [proposed development] premise of the façade was on a building that had a significantly aggressive and interesting form. And to simply turn it into a box is something quite different. (2)

If you stick with your cube [design for PSAC II], you're putting a lot of pressure on your façade design in order to make this the captivating design that some would want it to be. (3)

Response: Under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative, the facades of the cubic form of proposed PSAC II development will need to achieve the same goals as under the Proposed Action. While the original proposal under the Proposed Action benefited from a dramatic silhouette, it did show a longer face to the Hutchinson River Parkway, so there were demands on that façade as well. The siting and the façade treatment of the cube scheme under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative will work together to create a dynamic whole. By turning the building to face corners to both the Pelham and Hutchinson River Parkways, there is a tension and an increased play of light and dark. The façade will respond to the moving traffic along the parkways, offer change and variety of some sort, and continue to camouflage to some degree the limited windows and louver spaces of the building.

Comment F4: Did the form of the [PSAC II] building change purely because of the height reduction? Because if not, I'm wondering if you tried to replicate the kind of design that you had in the taller building, what would you sacrifice in terms of space? (3)

Response: As described in the response to Comment A4, the program, both in terms of floor sizes and stacking, defined the form of the proposed PSAC II development under the Proposed Action. Changes in the program stemming from the financial constraints of the project, led to the conclusion that the original massing and form of the PSAC II building under the Proposed Action is no longer feasible. The design of the PSAC II development under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative seeks to make a similar statement.

The changes mandated by the fiscal climate affected all aspects of the project. The original massing only fit on the site because of the smaller footprint possible at the bottom. Once the tapering structure was rejected for cost reasons, the building had to be re-sited to stay within the security parameters. The design team did study keeping the parallelogram shape, extruded vertically, but moved to the center of the site; however there were programmatic challenges that could not be resolved.

Comment F5: The design is a cube. I don't know that it's perfect. It will be a matter of continuing scrutiny I'm sure. (3)

Response: The cubic building form of the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative was selected because it is a primal shape and efficiently houses the required program. The building was intentionally rotated on site by almost 45 degrees in order for two of the building's facades to be visible from the Pelham and Hutchinson River Parkways.

The design of the proposed PSAC II development under the Proposed Action got its strength from the unorthodox massing. This option under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative is no longer available. As mentioned in the response to Comment F3, the façade of the PSAC II development under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative will be developed to continue the minimal themes of the pure geometry while addressing the dynamism of the site- the confluence of the movement of the parkways, and visibility of the site.

Comment F6: I know there are issues of standoff distance and the blast resistance. I'm troubled by how brutal and severe [the building] appears to be, and the apparent lack of fenestration, for both the workers inside the building and for the people in the neighborhood. And at 260 feet or so, this is a very imposing building in the community. So I'm wondering what flexibility there is on the client's side to work with the design. (4)

Response: There is flexibility. The fenestration design of the proposed PSAC II development is not complete, but will need to respond to security concerns (i.e., blast and ballistic protection) and to control light levels and glare in the call center dispatch floor.

The original proposal under the Proposed Action included ideas that should still hold true for the design under the 911 Call and Dispatch Center Alternative. Design Team has continued to attempt to maximize windows within the security concerns, and will continue to do so. In addition, mechanical louvers were 'camouflaged' in identical

expression to the windows so as not to give the building an institutional/mechanical appearance. The same attempt will be made to find modules and variety to break down the scale. Brutal and severe are to be avoided, but minimal, strong and pure are ideas, which the Design Team and the Design Commission have discussed as being appropriate for the building. The windows and openings will continue to be designed in ways which allude to, and strengthen themes of the massing concepts.

Comment F7: You've changed the facility use to be primarily a Public Safety Answering Center? I would suspect that that would also change criteria requirements in terms of terrorism. Therefore issues with regard to fenestration also are mitigated. Is that a fair assumption? So right there you have opportunities to create an architecture that would be more fitting within the neighborhood. (7)

I suspect that with the lower building and with the modification of use, is it fair to assume that the criteria that you are going to be working to have been adjusted? (7)

Response: To a point, that is a fair assumption. Please refer to the response to Comment F6.

As of this writing, the NYPD and the City have made subtle changes, but it is unclear whether they will have any effect on the glazing opportunities of the building. If they do, the Design Team will attempt to take advantage of them.

G. MISCELLANEOUS

Comment G1: This project will require a conservative estimate of approximately one billion dollars for construction and communications equipment, and includes a total of 1.9 million square feet of Class A, tax revenue producing office space. It therefore behooves the City to invest relatively modest monies to reduce traffic congestion, noise and air pollution and to improve accessibility. (1)

Response: The Proposed Action involves the mapping of a new public street (Marconi Street) that would follow an existing private access roadway (Industrial Street) extending north from Waters Place to the southern boundary of the proposed development site. At its terminus, the proposed public street would have a mapped cul de sac that would meet the MTA's standards for a potential future bus route. Pedestrian accessibility from the bus stops on Pelham Parkway would also be retained, with an improved pedestrian pathway circling the perimeter of the PSAC II site to provide access to both PSAC II and the adjacent HMC.

As described in Chapter 12, "Traffic and Parking," the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at a total of six signalized intersections (three in the AM, six in the midday) under Typical Operations of the proposed PSAC II development when the facility would normally operate with a staff size of approximately 850 employees (PSAC II staff only) that would work primarily in three main shifts throughout a 24-hour period. As proposed PSAC II development is expected to typically operate at this staffing level, a traffic mitigation plan was therefore developed to address these impacts. This mitigation plan, which is described in Chapter 18, "Mitigation," consists of changes to signal timing and phasing, changes

to curbside parking regulations on impacted approaches, and striping changes at some impacted intersection approaches. The proposed traffic mitigation measures would fully mitigate the traffic impacts that would occur as a result of the Proposed Action in both the AM and midday peak hours, under Typical Operations.

As also described in Chapter 12, the Proposed Action would result in significant traffic impacts at a total of nine intersections under Consolidated Operations of PSAC II. The mitigation plan proposed for the six signalized intersections significantly impacted by the proposed PSAC II development under Typical Operations would also fully mitigate the traffic impacts at most of these intersections under the temporary Consolidated Operations of the facility (i.e., PSAC I employees would temporarily be relocated to PSAC II and staff members of PSAC I and PSAC II would be combined). As the proposed PSAC II development is expected to accommodate the staffs of both PSAC I and PSAC II on a temporary/emergency basis, measures to mitigate traffic impacts have been coordinated with the NYCDOT and would include NYPD traffic enforcement agents. The NYPD has agreed to place traffic enforcement agents at all unmitigated intersections including four intersections in the AM peak hour and five intersections in the midday peak hour when PSAC II is operating under its temporary Consolidated condition and accommodating the staffs of PSAC I and PSAC II.

Comment G2: The Department of Transportation and Department of Parks and Recreation must commit to reconstruct and improve all of Pelham Parkway. (1)

Response: The NYCDOT and NYCDEP are planning a major reconstruction of Pelham Parkway, including its service roads, between the Bronx River Parkway and the Hutchinson River Parkway beginning in 2010. This work involves improvements to the sewer and water lines, street lighting and traffic work. The NYCDPR is also planning to reconstruct and enhance the Pelham Parkway malls between Boston Road and the Hutchinson River Parkway.

Comment G3: The City must commit to seeking reactivation of the Morris Park railroad station along with Metro North service to Co-Op City, Parkchester and Hunts Point. Within a ¼ mile radius of the PSAC II site, this additional station stop would serve major Bronx institutions, three of which include the Albert Einstein Medical Center, Mercy College, and Jacobi Hospital. (1)

Response: The Morris Park railroad station is not a part of the PSAC II scope or budget. The ultimate decision to re-open the station will be a business decision made by Metro North or Amtrak. The City supports as many feasible transportation options in the area as possible, though it is unlikely that this station will reopen in the near future.

Comment G4: The City must commit to brief Bronx Community Board 11 and interested citizens on a routine basis during the construction period, concerning progress and issues associated with the project as raised by residents and neighboring institutions. (1)

Response: The City is committed to communicating on progress of the PSAC II project during design as well as during construction. The New York City Department of Design and Construction (NYCDDC) has an active community outreach program and the project construction coordinator, Tishman Technologies Corporation has experience in

community briefings as evidenced by their recent work at Einstein Medical Center. The NYCDDC will work with the project architects, Tishman, client agencies and Community Board 11 to create a briefing schedule.

Comment G5: [The NYPD] seems to indicate that it would be very difficult to get staff in and out of Staten Island if a site like this was brought to Staten Island. I'm glad that was brought up at a public hearing. It might be a great thing for our state officials and our City officials to maybe work on that in the future so that we could get sites like this to Staten Island. (6)

Response: As described in Chapter, "Alternatives," one site, the GATX property in northwestern Staten Island was considered as a possible location for PSAC II. However, as this site lacks public transportation service, it would not be suitable for the proposed PSAC II development. Furthermore, the site is located within the Northern Staten Island/Harbor Herons Special Natural Waterfront Area (SNWA) and contains sensitive natural features that are recognized and protected under a variety of regulatory programs, which would substantially limit the development potential of the site. Public investment within SNWAs should focus on habitat protection and improvement and should not encourage activities that interfere with the habitat functions of the area.

Comment G6: How large is the PSAC I facility in Brooklyn in terms of square footage? Is the staffing level at PSAC I (at 350,000 sf) similar to what is contemplated for PSAC II (at 500,000 sf)? PSAC II is therefore a substantially larger facility for the same numbers of people as PSAC I? (8)

Response: The PSAC I facility is approximately 350,000 sf, and the staffing level is comparable to what is being contemplated for the PSAC II facility. Both PSAC I and PSAC II would have a typical staff size of approximately 850 employees that work throughout a 24-hour day with a maximum shift size of about 315 workers. However, PSAC II facility is larger due to the addition of a multi-use auditorium, as well as increased data center space and the related mechanical and electrical equipment.

Comment G7: When we [the HMC] first arrived, we opened the site in 2000 – 2003; the Visiting Nurse Services of New York was our first tenant. The first building was a half million square feet; we are now fully occupied. Mercy College has their main Bronx campus there. Other tenants include the Internal Revenue Service, the New York City Housing Authority, the Administration of Children's Services and the medical pavilion, with about a hundred thousand square feet of different physicians who are affiliated with Montefiore, Jacobi, Einstein, or Calvary hospitals, which are roughly within walking distance from the complex. We have about 3,500 employees between [Mercy] College and the HMC itself at this time. (11)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment G8: The access to the [HMC] site is very important. We absolutely support and would hope that with the PSAC building coming, we could get a road off the Hutchinson

River Parkway. It's something we have talked about for a long time. As the complex starts to develop and more buildings are built, you will need additional access. (11)

Response: As discussed in the response to Comment G1, as part of the Proposed Action, a new public street would be established that would map an existing private access roadway to provide permanent vehicular access and utility services to the site. Furthermore, as noted in the response to Comment A2, the City has reached out to NYSDOT to express support for any infrastructure enhancements in the vicinity of the HMC campus, including the addition of entrance/exit ramps from the Hutchinson River Parkway.

Comment G9: Public transportation is critical. We [the HMC] have our own bus shuttle service that takes people from our complex to Westchester Square Station so our employees and tenants can get to and from the site. The B21 bus, which is the one that comes up Waters Place, at one time did come all the way back to where our building is now, the existing building when it was part of the Bronx [Psychiatric Center] site. Once we acquired the property, they stopped bringing that bus in. We have written letters to the MTA, and the response has been that there's not enough ridership. (11)

Response: Comment noted

Comment G10: Could you describe the sizes and heights of the [HMC] buildings that are currently on site right now? (9)

Response: The HMC's main building is a four story office building containing approximately a half million square feet. There is also a single-story warehouse building that is leased to the state. Recently, the HMC completed a second office building, Tower One, which is approximately 150 feet tall. It is a ten-story building containing approximately 250,000 gsf with enclosed parking on its lower levels. The HMC has plans to build a second commercial building, which will likely contain approximately 250,000 gsf and it could be around 200 feet in height (Tower Two). In addition, if there continues to be a market for commercial space, the HMC intends to build a third building, which will be approximately the same height as Tower One.

Comment G11: What is the Westchester station to which the [HMC's] shuttle bus goes? Does the shuttle service also go to a Metro North Station? (5)

Response: The HMC's private shuttle service runs every 20 minutes during the weekdays and takes people from the HMC site to Westchester Square, which is a main transportation hub, where a number of local buses have a stop and is the final subway station on the No. 6 subway line train.

Comment G12: You have people walking through this project site [i.e. the PSAC site] coming to your [HMC] center from Pelham Parkway? (5)

Response: Yes.

Comment G13: Do you know what percentage of the 3,500 [employees and students of the HMC] uses the pathway [from the Pelham Parkway]? (5)

Response: According to Joseph Kelleher, the Executive Director of the HMC, the majority of people come from the south via Waters Place and either drive to the site or utilize the HMC's private shuttle bus service that provides a direct connection between the Westchester Square subway station serving the No. 6 subway line and the HMC. However, a number of Mercy College students, as well as the staff of Visiting Nurses of New York, which are tenants of the HMC, utilize the pathway. The pathway provides a connection to the Bx 12, which travels on the Pelham Parkway.

As described in Chapter 13, "Transit and Pedestrians," very few pedestrians were observed using the pathway in the peak AM (6:30 to 7:30 AM) and midday (2:30 to 3:30 PM) periods. The pedestrian pathway currently operates at a platoon-adjusted LOS A.

Comment G14: Please provide me with a copy (paper only, no electronic media) of the Draft Environmental Impact State for the Public Safety Answering Center II project. (13)

Response: A hardcopy of the Draft Environmental Impact State for the Public Safety Answering Center II project has been forward as per the request.