

CHAPTER 23: ALTERNATIVES

23.1 Overview

This chapter reviews alternatives considered as part of the planning process led by the Homeport Task Force (HTF) and analyzes two development alternatives: a No Action Alternative that assumes the Homeport Site is vacant in the future, and a Studio Use Alternative that assumes Parcel B4 is developed with a film studio instead of an office building as is assumed in the Build Condition.

23.2 Alternatives Evaluation Process

A variety of options for reuse or redevelopment of the Homeport Site that meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action were explored with the community through an extensive planning process. The Proposed Action is the end result of that process, with a number of other alternatives previously explored and rejected.

Since the closure of the Homeport facility and its transfer to the City in 1994, there have been several unsuccessful plans and proposals for the redevelopment of the site. The HTF, established by Mayor Bloomberg in April 2003, is comprised of key City officials, local elected representatives and community leaders. The HTF was charged with developing an economically sound plan for the Homeport Site and collaborated on a three-phase planning process that led to development of the New Stapleton Waterfront Development Plan.

In the initial phase, the team identified job creation, connection to the Stapleton community, public access to the waterfront, improved transportation and the creation of a new destination as key goals for developing the plan. A planning and market analysis of the existing site was presented at a public forum in November 2003, including a physical assessment of the site and the surrounding area. Once this work was completed and linkages, site access, and limitations and opportunities were understood alternative development scenarios were developed to be examined in the Phase II of the study.

In Phase II, three alternative development scenarios were examined; a harbor park concept, a cultural destination and a neighborhood scenario. There were common elements in each of these alternatives in terms of providing open space and waterfront access, offering economic opportunities and infrastructure improvements, and incorporating residential uses. The basic elements in the three alternative options include the following.

- Harbor Park –two residential buildings totaling 250 units, a banquet Hall/restaurant facility, an ice rink, indoor soccer, a 3.4 acre waterfront park and an economic development use, and parking.
- Cultural Destination –a sculpture garden, a major cultural use, hotel and banquet space, a destination waterfront restaurant, an economic development use and 100 units of senior citizen housing.

- Neighborhood Scenario –500 residential units in four separate locations on the site, an office building with ground floor retail, a 2 acre waterfront park, and farmers’ market and an economic development use.

The final mixed-use plan, which harmonizes elements of the three alternatives, was developed in Phase III and presented publicly in June 2004 as the New Stapleton Waterfront Development Plan. The final plan, comprised of 350 residential units, a restaurant/banquet facility, sports complex, commercial use, retail use and farmers market, is the basis for the Build Condition.

Alternatives previously explored and rejected, modified or reconfigured by the community in developing the New Stapleton Waterfront Plan will not be reevaluated or discussed in this chapter.

23.3 No Action Alternative

In the No Action Alternative the temporary uses now located on the Homeport Site (New York City Police Department Staten Island Taskforce, New York City Fire Department Marine Company No. 9, New York City Department of Transportation Marine Repair Unit, and the Richmond County State Supreme Court) would be removed and all upland buildings and structures demolished. The Site would be vacant and completely fenced; all current activities would cease.

There would be essentially no change in land use anticipated for the affected properties west of Front Street and east of the SIR tracks, between Thompson and Wave Streets in the No Action Alternative.

The infrastructure improvements including providing open space resources, sewer upgrades and reconstruction and realignment of Front Street would not be provided in the No Action Alternative.

As discussed below, the many positive aspects related to the Proposed Action, such as the economic benefits, the improved neighborhood character and urban design, the provision of a significant open space resource and considerable infrastructure improvements, would not be present in the No Action Alternative. The negative effects such as those relating to the increase in traffic and the increase in the number of school aged children would also not occur.

23.3.1 Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Land use on the Homeport Site would change from temporary community facility use to vacant land as all buildings would be vacated and all buildings and structures demolished. Assuming that little or no new development, redevelopment or renovations occurs on the rezoning properties west of Front Street, there would be little change in land use for the remainder of the Project Area. These properties would remain in their present underutilized state, with various industrial and commercial enterprises mixed in with no

unified theme. There would be no change in zoning in the No Action Alternative and no effect on public policy.

23.3.2 Socioeconomic Conditions

Unlike the Proposed Action, there would be no employment or socioeconomic contribution from the Homeport Site since it would be vacant in the No Action Alternative. Also, any additional employment gained by rezoning and redeveloping the properties west of Front Street would not be realized in the No Action Alternative.

23.3.3 Community Facilities

Elementary and intermediate schools in CSD 31 are approaching or over capacity. The Proposed Action would increase the demand for seats in public elementary and intermediate schools but not beyond the CEQR threshold level requiring additional analysis. The No Build Alternative would not exacerbate the need for additional school seats.

23.3.4 Open Space and Recreation

In terms of open space resources, unlike the Proposed Action, the No Action alternative would not increase the number of residential and commercial open space users. Also, unlike the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not generate a significant new 12 acre open space resource along the waterfront.

23.3.5 Shadows

There would be no significant change in shadows from buildings west of Front Street in the No Build Alternative. However, all structures currently on the Homeport Site would be demolished in 2015 in the No Action Alternative and thus shadows associated with these structures would no longer exist.

23.3.6 Neighborhood Character

The positive benefits of the Proposed Action on neighborhood character would not occur under the No Action Alternative. The improved visual aspects, the increased economic activity and the enlivened pedestrian activity found in the Proposed Action would not be present in the No Action Alternative. Similar to the Proposed Action, this Alternative would have no significant adverse impact on traffic or noise conditions that affect neighborhood character.

23.3.7 Urban Design and Visual Resources

Unlike the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not significantly enhance the urban design or visual character of the Project Area or the Stapleton neighborhood in general. The landscaping, open space, signage and uniform bulk, massing, height and setbacks and design elements provided as improvements by the Proposed Action would be absent from the No Action Alternative. The overall visual connection to the remainder of the Stapleton neighborhood would not be present as it is in the Proposed

Action, nor would the public open space with its numerous opportunities for enjoying views of New York Harbor, the Manhattan Skyline, Brooklyn and the Verrazzano-Narrows Bridge. The properties proposed for rezoning west of Front Street would remain in essentially the same condition as now, and the Homeport Site would be vacant and fenced.

23.3.8 Historic Resources

Unlike the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would have no significant adverse impact on historic structures since the one property eligible for inclusion on the State and National Register of Historic Places identified on Front Street (144 – 150 Front Street) would not be demolished. In addition, unlike the Proposed Action there is no potential in the No Action Alternative to disturb archaeological resources of the former piers/wharfs that existed in the Project Area in the 1800s.

23.3.9 Natural Resources

Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would have no significant adverse impact on natural resources.

23.3.10 Hazardous Materials

The No Action Alternative would not be expected to have significant hazardous material impacts since protective measures such as those defined for the Proposed Action in Chapter 12 would be utilized in demolishing the structures on the Homeport Site. Additionally, little to no construction activity is likely to occur for the properties west of Front Street. Additionally, any clean-up that would occur as a result of construction on the properties west of Front Street in the Proposed Action would not happen in the No Action Alternative.

23.3.11 Coastal Zone/Waterfront Revitalization Program

Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would have no significant adverse impacts of the coastal zone or the LWRP. However, the enhanced pathways and connectivity of the waterfront to the Stapleton neighborhood and the ability to access and enjoy the waterfront inherent in the Proposed Action would be lost in the No Action Alternative.

23.3.12 Infrastructure

The improvements to grading and drainage along Front Street would not be present in the No Action Alternative. There would be no need to improve pipes or regulating chambers or CSO outlets, and the stormwater from the Homeport Site would not be collected and directed to the sewer network. Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action alternative would generate no significant adverse impacts on water supply, sewage transport, stormwater runoff or CSO conditions.

23.3.13 Solid Waste and Sanitation

The No Action Alternative would generate far less solid waste than the Proposed Action since the waste-generating temporary uses found on the Homeport Site would be removed, and the larger potential development associated with the Proposed Action would not occur. Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not cause a significant adverse impact on solid waste or sanitation services.

23.3.14 Energy

Like the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on energy resources in the area.

23.3.15 Traffic and Parking

There would be no significant growth in population or employment in the Project Area in the No Action Alternative; however, traffic and the demand for parking would grow due to anticipated background growth and the construction of the anticipated development sites identified in Chapter 2, "Analytical Framework." Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not generate unmitigated significant adverse impacts on area traffic or parking resources. The traffic currently accessing the Homeport Site to utilize the temporary facilities would not be present during the No Action Alternative, since these temporary uses would be removed.

23.3.16 Transit and Pedestrians

The Project Area currently has relatively light pedestrian activity, and limited mass transit ridership, particularly on the SIR. The number of people accessing the temporary uses on the Homeport Site by transit or on foot is fairly small and removal of these trips when the temporary uses at the site close would have little affect on pedestrian or transit conditions in the No Action Alternative. General background growth anticipated in the area, plus the addition of anticipated development, would increase the number of pedestrians and mass transit riders. However, similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not generate a significant adverse impact in either of these areas.

23.3.17 Air Quality

The No Action Alternative would remove stationary sources of air emissions when the temporary uses currently housed on the Homeport Site are closed. The amount of mobile source emissions would also be reduced, but this decrease would partly offset due to general background growth and traffic from other anticipated development sites in the area. Neither the Proposed Action, nor the No Action Alternative would cause a significant adverse impact on air quality conditions in the vicinity of the Project Area.

23.3.18 Noise

In a manner similar to that discussed above for air quality, the No Action Alternative would remove both stationary and mobile sources of noise as the temporary uses

currently found on the Homeport Site are removed. The amount of vehicular noise would also be reduced with the decrease partly offset by general background growth and traffic from anticipated development sites. Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative would not cause a significant adverse impact on air quality conditions in the vicinity of the Project Area.

23.3.19 Construction Impacts

There would be far less construction associated with the No Action Alternative, and thus impacts associated with construction such as noise, fugitive dust and increased traffic would be fewer. The length of construction (demolition of structures on the Homeport Site) for the No Action Alternative would be less than for the Proposed Action.

23.3.20 Public Health

The No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Action, would have no significant adverse impact on public health since there would be no significant impact on air quality, noise or from release of hazardous materials.

23.4 Studio Use Alternative

The Studio Use Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action, and would meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action. In this alternative the 75,000 square foot commercial office building identified on Parcel B4 of the Proposed Action would be replaced by a working film/TV studio. The studio could be housed in the existing, approximately 60,000 square foot building near the end of Canal Street adjacent to the waterfront (identified as Building 2 in Figure 1-3). There would be no difference between this alternative and the Proposed Action for the properties west of Front Street.

It is anticipated that the studio would be multi-function and could be used for filming movies, television shows and possibly still photography. It would likely operate on an irregular schedule and could be open for some shoots at nighttime or early morning. Weekend work would also be possible. It is anticipated that a studio facility would require use of ancillary trailers to house sets, auxiliary power, lighting, etc., as well as to support vehicles for meals and transportation.

It is anticipated that this alternative would employ approximately 150-200 people for certain shoots and that the working day would often be 12 hours long.

23.4.1 Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Since most of the buildings in the Studio Use Alternative would be the same as in the Proposed Action, the effects on Land use would be similar. The main difference would be replacing the 75,000 square foot commercial office building proposed for Parcel B4 of the Homeport Site with the film/TV studio. Like the Proposed Action, this alternative would change the predominantly industrial land uses on the properties west of Front Street and the vacant land found in the Homeport Site in 2015 to a mixture of residential and commercial uses.

23.4.2 Socioeconomic Conditions

Neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts associated with direct and indirect residential, commercial and institutional displacement. Similar to the Proposed Action, this alternative would have a positive impact on area socioeconomics since it would increase the number of residences and job opportunities in the area. The Proposed Action, with a 75,000 square foot commercial office building on Parcel B4 would generate more employment than the Studio Use Alternative. Spin-off revenue for the Studio Use Alternative would include jobs to support set building, maintenance and possibly food preparation, while the Proposed Action would support maintenance, delivery, security jobs and people employed in local businesses. The Proposed Action better fits the stated purpose and need since there would be more day-to-day workers coming into the area to work and in so doing supporting local businesses.

23.4.3 Community Facilities

Parcel B4 would not house residential uses in either the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative. The Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action, due to the residential uses on the other parcels, would adversely affect public intermediate schools since they would increase the demand for intermediate school seats where projected demand already exceeds estimated capacity. Additionally, study area elementary schools would operate at near capacity levels under the Build Condition for the Proposed Action and Studio Use Alternative. In both the Proposed Action and this alternative, since there is a substantial amount of planned intermediate school seats for CSD 31, intermediate school capacity is expected to be sufficient and no deficit is anticipated for the CSD.

Under CEQR, if an action results in a five percent or more increase in the shortfall of available seats, a significant impact may result and may warrant consideration of mitigation. Relative to the No Build Condition, the capacity of study area intermediate schools is estimated to increase from 102 percent to 104 percent (with a deficit of 24 seats) under the Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action. However, neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to public schools.

23.4.4 Open Space and Recreation

The Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action would supply the same amount of open space (approximately 12 acres) and the same amenities such as landscaping and park-related retail to the neighborhood, and thus either of these options would have a significant positive impact in terms of open space. The commercial user population would be larger in the Proposed Action than the Studio Use alternative due to the larger number of workers, so there would be more users of open space within a one-quarter mile radius of the site. However, neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would cause a significant adverse impact on area open space.

23.4.5 Shadows

The length of the shadow cast by the Studio Use Alternative would be shorter than that of the Proposed Action due to its lower height. Estimating that the existing building is approximately 30 feet tall, the difference in building height between the Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action would be 20 feet, and the maximum length of the shadow cast by the Proposed Action would be 86 feet longer than the Studio Use Alternative. Thus, the area coverage of the shadow in Upper New York Bay and upland would be less for the Studio Use Alternative. However, neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would have a significant adverse impact related to shadows.

23.4.6 Neighborhood Character

The character of the neighborhood would be improved under the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative. Both would enhance the neighborhood character of Stapleton under the future Build Condition. The isolation of the Stapleton waterfront would be replaced with a strong sense of place. Increased opportunities for street-level activity and the availability of a substantial new waterfront open space, a sports complex, residential and retail space would create an area that serves as a destination. For pedestrians traveling east from Bay Street toward the Project Area, a sense of invitation would replace the discouraging conditions found currently. By allowing better connections between the upland and waterfront, both options would help to revitalize the neighborhood.

In terms of land use, the SSWD would promote mixed use development in both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative that is in keeping with the character of Stapleton, and is an enhancement of neighborhood character in the neighborhood. Significant changes in urban design and visual quality would occur, providing the neighborhood much needed urban design enhancements, open space and visual amenities.

Although there is one historic building within the historic study area, its demolition would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character under the Proposed Action or Studio Use Alternative, as historic resources are not a defining characteristic of this area. Additionally, the residential and economic displacements caused by either alternative would not significantly impact neighborhood character in an adverse way. Stapleton would gain a much needed economic growth project in keeping with its neighborhood character in both alternatives.

Neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would cause a significant immitigable adverse impact on traffic. In conjunction with increased levels of traffic, noise levels at study sites would increase, but these increases are expected to be below the three dBA CEQR impact threshold for both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative, and thus would not have a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

23.4.7 Urban Design and Visual Resources

Under the Proposed Action and Studio Use Alternative, much of the Project Area would be rezoned from M2-1 and M3-1 to C4-2A, and the proposed SSWD would modify the underlying C4-2A zoning district with an R6B residential equivalent. The SSWD would govern urban design and visual issues such as height, setback, parking, landscaping, land use, use of materials and location of structures (to respect urban design principles and view sheds of Upper New York Bay). Additionally, design guidelines relating to issues such as use of material, green technology, landscaping, etc. would be part of the package sent to developers when the City solicits bids to lease/sale the development parcels on the Homeport Site.

While the commercial office building found on Parcel B4 in the Proposed Action would be subject to design guidelines and the provisions of the SSWD regulations, the Studio Use Alternative would occupy the existing building on this parcel that does not comply with the SSWD requirements or with the proposed design guidelines. While this difference would not represent a significant adverse impact, the Studio Use Alternative building would not be in keeping with the proposed urban design character defined by the two guidance documents.

23.4.8 Historic Resources

The documentary research of parcels that would be developed as a result of the Proposed Action determined that there are areas of potential archaeological significance in the archaeological study area relating to former piers/wharfs. Thus, the Studio Use Alternative, like the Proposed Action, would have the potential to have an adverse effect on archaeology. The research also determined that there is one historic property located at 144 – 150 Front Street that would be directly impacted by development of the Studio Use Alternative or the Proposed Action. Therefore, both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative would have a significant adverse unmitigated impact on this historic resource.

23.4.9 Natural Resources

Like the Proposed Action, the Studio Use Alternative would provide infrastructure to improve drainage and storm water collection on Front Street. Both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative would provide significant new open space, and neither is expected to have a significant adverse impact on threatened or endangered species or significant habits. Both options would use Best Management Practices (BMP) during construction to control runoff and erosion.

23.4.10 Hazardous Materials

Potential hazardous materials present within the study area include VOCs, SVOCs, metals, PCBs, pesticides, herbicides, cyanide, ACM, LBP, and PCB-containing equipment. During construction of either the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative they would be managed or isolated to protect public health and the environment. Construction measures, including the implementation of site-specific

health and safety plans, dust control measures, contaminated soil and groundwater management plans, and abatement of hazardous building materials prior to construction, would aid in the avoidance of adverse health impacts to workers and the general public. Because hazardous materials would be abated, managed, or remediated during construction, no significant adverse impacts are expected during either the construction or operational phases of either alternative.

The proposed rezoning implemented in either the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative also would not result in significant adverse impacts on development sites identified with the potential to contain hazardous materials. No significant adverse hazardous materials impacts are anticipated as a result of the zoning map amendments because (E) Designations would be placed on the Zoning Map for all tax lots containing the potential to result in hazardous materials contamination.

Since contaminants found in soil or groundwater would be further investigated as necessary prior to construction, and, if encountered, handled according to all appropriate laws, regulations and good practice standards, neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would have significant adverse impacts from hazardous materials.

23.4.11 Coastal Zone/Waterfront Revitalization Program

The Proposed Action and Studio Use Alternative would be consistent and supportive of the State's Coastal Management Program (CMP) and the City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) because they would allow, for the first time in many years, the use of the City's public waterfront while promoting mixed-use development and economic growth. Furthermore, either of these alternatives would balance the interests of public and private water-dependent and water-enhancing uses along the Stapleton waterfront. Both alternatives would benefit the public by improving the area near the water in terms of visual access to the water and urban design and neighborhood character. Both would add open space at the water's edge that would serve as a public benefit for the area.

23.4.12 Infrastructure

Both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative would provide the same level of infrastructure improvements. Both alternatives would improve grading and storm water drainage along Front Street. Neither of these alternatives would have a significant impact on the City's water supply since they would only consume a small fraction of the available supply. Additionally, neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would have a significant adverse impact on the sewer network or the Port Richmond WPCP.

23.4.13 Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

Neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would generate a significant amount of solid waste as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Although the development associated with both the Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action

would create new demand for the disposal of solid waste, DSNY and private solid waste services would have adequate capacity to meet the increases in demand. The incremental addition of waste generated in the area, and the additional truck trips necessary to transport and dispose of the additional waste, would be relatively few. Furthermore, the Proposed Action would comply with the Draft New SWMP. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on solid waste and sanitation services would result from the Studio Use Alternative.

23.4.14 Energy

Development under the Studio Use Alternative and the Proposed Action would comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Construction Code, which sets minimum standards for the design and construction of all new buildings. Construction within the Project Area would incorporate all applicable energy conservation measures, including compliance with energy efficiency and combined thermal transmittance policies.

The area would continue to receive electric and gas services from Con Ed and KeySpan, respectively. Relative to Existing Conditions, the annual operational energy consumption of both the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative is projected to increase by several thousand percent. However, this does not represent a substantial additional load, and thus neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative is expected to have significant adverse effects on energy service to the area.

23.4.15 Traffic and Parking

In an effort to obtain a comparable trip generation estimate for the Studio Use Alternative, the studio portion of the Chelsea Piers DEIS was utilized. Based upon that document a studio would generate approximately 10 employees for every 1,000 square feet of studio building space. Thus since the building on the site that would be used by the Studio Use Alternative is 60,000 square feet it would yield approximately 600 employees. Approximately 12 percent of these employees would arrive in the AM peak hour, yielding approximately 72 trips to the site. If one assumes that 60 percent of these trips would be by auto, then there would be 43 trips. If the vehicle occupancy rate is 1.5 persons per car, then the contribution to AM peak hour vehicular traffic for the Studio Use Alternative (29 vehicles) would be far lower than the 75,000 square foot office building (118 trips) that is part of the Proposed Action. Even adding in delivery trips, this number would remain quite low. Since there would be no significant unmitigated traffic impacts for the Proposed Action, the lower intensity Studio Use Alternative would also have no significant unmitigated impacts on vehicular traffic. Like the Proposed Action, the Studio Use Alternative would not be expected to cause a significant adverse impact on parking.

23.4.16 Transit and Pedestrians

Similar to the situation discussed above for traffic, the Studio Use Alternative would have fewer pedestrian and mass transit users than the Proposed Action since it would have fewer workers. Since there would be no significant adverse impact due to the Proposed

Action with its greater number of pedestrian and mass transit trips, the Studio Use Alternative, with fewer trips, also would have no significant adverse impacts on pedestrian conditions or mass transit.

23.4.17 Air Quality

The predicted total maximum ambient air quality concentrations of all pollutants at all worst-case locations would not exceed the NAAQS for the Proposed Action. Since the building to be utilized in the Studio Use Alternative is smaller it would likely consume less fuel oil in heating and the stationary source air emissions would also be less. Additionally, there would be fewer vehicular trips for the Studio Use Alternative and thus a lesser impact on air quality from mobile sources. The worst-case impacts from the Proposed Action and Studio Use Alternative also would not exceed State or City impact thresholds. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on ambient air quality, and short- and long-term NAAQS would be maintained within the study area and immediate vicinity for either alternative.

Since the ambient air quality standards would be met and impact thresholds would not be exceeded, the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative are not expected to cause or contribute to a new violation of the standards, to increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation, or to delay the timely attainment of the standards.

23.4.18 Noise

The Proposed Action would result in an increase in traffic volumes. However, increases in noise levels between the No Build and Build Conditions would be minimal, since the noise levels associated with the growth in traffic on local streets would be 1.2 dBA or less for each peak period at the six measurement sites. The Studio Use Alternative would generate less traffic than the Proposed Action, and would thus have lower noise levels. The increase in noise levels from mobile sources for the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative would not be perceptible to the average individual, and would be below established CEQR standards. Like the Proposed Action, residential development that would occur on the privately-owned parcels west of Front Street under the Studio Use Alternative would likely require proper attenuation in order to achieve acceptable indoor noise levels. The provision for providing sufficient building attenuation (either 30 or 35 dBA, depending on the particular site), would be mandated by placing an (E) Designation on City Zoning Map for these Project Area tax lots. Noise from HVAC units, or other stationary sources, in either the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative would be mostly shielded by the building roof and structures. Thus, based on CEQR criteria, significant adverse noise impacts attributed to mobile or stationary sources are not anticipated under the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative.

23.4.19 Construction Impacts

Neither the Proposed Action nor the Studio Use Alternative would have significant adverse impacts associated with construction. While construction of either the Proposed Action or the Studio Use Alternative would have fairly intense construction activity, the

NEW STAPLETON WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

potential impacts would be intermittent and short-term, and measures to control impact would be employed in either scenario (e.g., watering dusty soil and developing and implementing Maintenance and Protection of Traffic Plans). Impacts from the Studio Use Alternative would be of lesser intensity and of a shorter duration since an existing building would be reused instead of being demolished and replaced with a larger structure.

23.4.20 Public Health

With the Proposed Action and the Studio Use Alternative being very similar in nature, and in generating no significant air quality, noise, wastewater or hazardous material impacts, the potential adverse impacts from them are also similarly not significant.