

The *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual* states that a public health assessment may not be necessary for many proposed actions, but a thorough consideration of health issues should be documented. In determining whether a public health assessment is appropriate, the following has been considered:

- Whether increased vehicular traffic or emissions from stationary sources would result in significant air quality impacts. The potential for these impacts from the proposed actions was examined in Chapter 18, “Air Quality.” The results show that the development of the projected and potential development sites would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts from mobile sources for carbon monoxide (CO) and PM_{2.5}. The analysis also determined that the proposed actions’ parking facilities would not result in significant adverse impacts.

With respect to stationary sources, the analyses determined that there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from air-conditioning (HVAC) systems at the projected and potential development sites. At certain sites, to preclude the potential for impacts from HVAC systems at certain potential and projected development sites, an air quality E-designation would be mapped as part of the proposed zoning or a Memorandum of Understanding would be prepared for City-owned property with a subsequent Restrictive Declaration at disposition (as described in Chapter 18). With these restrictions in place, there would be no potential for any significant air quality impacts from HVAC system emissions and no impact on public health.

In addition, existing industrial sources, businesses with air emission permits, and institutional, commercial, and large-scale residential developments within 400 feet of a residential projected or potential development site were identified. A search for large industrial sources within 1,000 feet of proposed sensitive uses was also conducted. It was concluded that no existing sources of air toxic emissions of concern or large sources would have the potential to impact the reasonable worst-case development scenario under the proposed actions.

- Whether there is an increased potential for exposure to contaminants in soil or dust during construction. The proposed actions have this potential; however, the magnitude of the impact is not expected to be substantially different from that at most other urban sites. Based on the results of environmental investigations conducted for the project sites, E-designations, Land Disposition Agreements, or Memorandums of Agreement would be placed on certain properties with identified potential historical and present sources of contamination to address the management of soil and groundwater during construction activities at the site and to ensure that any subsurface disturbance does not result in unnecessary or unacceptable hazards to the workers or those in the surrounding community (as described in Chapter 11, “Hazardous Materials”). These measures would require the owner of the property to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepare and implement a soil and groundwater testing protocol, prepare a Phase II report where potential

Coney Island Rezoning

contamination is identified, and conducting remediation where appropriate before development-related building permits can be issued by the Department of Buildings. Additionally, construction-phase health and safety plans would be required and would include procedures to address both any known concerns as well as contingencies should unexpected contamination be encountered. These reports and protocols would be submitted to the New York City Department of Environmental Protection for review and approval, and additionally to the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development where a property is regulated by a Land Disposition Agreement. In addition, if there are any asbestos-containing materials, lead paint-coated surfaces, or PCB-containing equipment in structures on-site, all appropriate federal, state, and local regulations and engineering controls would be closely followed to ensure that there would be no potential impacts from such materials before and during all demolition and other construction activities.

With implementation of all these measures, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials are expected to occur as a result of the construction activities associated with the development of the project sites and there would be no adverse impact on public health.

- Whether the proposed actions could result in solid waste management practices that could attract vermin and result in an increase in pest populations (e.g., rats, mice, cockroaches, and mosquitoes). No solid waste management practices are proposed beyond those at most residential and commercial uses in the City. These practices would include all contemporary solid waste collection and containment practices and conformance with the laws of the New York City Board of Health.
- Whether new odor sources would be created. The proposed actions would not result in new odor sources.
- Whether the proposed actions would result in potentially significant adverse impacts to sensitive receptors from noise. As discussed in Chapter 19, “Noise,” the proposed actions would result in significant adverse noise impacts at two of the eleven noise receptor locations—at receptor site 6 outside of the rezoning area on West 17th Street between Neptune Avenue and Mermaid Avenue, and at receptor site 11 within the Coney East subdistrict on Stillwell Avenue between Surf Avenue and the Boardwalk. At receptor site 6, project-generated traffic on West 17th Street would impact noise sensitive uses on the block, which include both residential uses and the Our Lady of Solace Roman Catholic Church. This significant adverse impact is identified in this DEIS as unmitigated. However, between the Draft and Final EIS, additional studies will be performed to examine whether there are any feasible and practicable mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate this impact. At receptor site 6, both traffic and façade treatment (i.e., storm windows and air conditioners for alternative ventilation) mitigation options will be explored. Identified feasible and practicable mitigation will be described in the FEIS.
- At receptor site 11, which is located within the Coney East subdistrict, project-generated traffic, combined with noise generated by the proposed amusement uses, would result in a significant adverse noise impact at this location. This significant adverse impact is also identified in this DEIS as unmitigated. Additional studies will be performed to examine whether there are any feasible and practicable mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate this impact. For receptor site 11, traffic mitigation

measures and noise reduction measures for the amusement uses will be evaluated. Identified feasible and practicable mitigation will be described in the FEIS.

- With mitigation in place, there would be no adverse noise impacts around the two receptor sites. Absent the implementation of such measures, the proposed actions would result in significant unmitigated noise impacts at these locations. However, these significant adverse noise impacts would not result in public health impacts. The proposed actions would not result in a change in acceptability category at receptor site 6, with noise levels remaining in the “marginally unacceptable” category in the future with the proposed actions. At receptor site 11, there are no existing noise-sensitive uses and the significant adverse impact would occur within the proposed 27-acre amusement area. Further, there would not be any noise impacts from amusement uses on surrounding residential areas.
- Whether potential impacts of the proposed actions would result in exceedances of accepted federal, state, or local standards. No activities are proposed that would exceed accepted City, State, or Federal public health standards.

For the reasons above, a full assessment of the proposed actions’ potential impacts on public health is not necessary, and no significant adverse impacts are expected as a result of the proposed actions. *