

**A. INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of an analysis of alternatives to the proposed Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center (MSK)/The City University of New York (CUNY)-Hunter project, as set forth in the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, is to provide the decision makers with the opportunity to consider practicable alternatives that are consistent with the goals and objectives of the project sponsor and that could potentially reduce or eliminate significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

This chapter considers:

- A No Action Alternative, which is mandated by the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and CEQR, and is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the consequences of not selecting the proposed actions.
- A No Unmitigated Impact Alternative that would avoid the significant adverse impacts for which mitigation is not available. In this case such an alternative would avoid or reduce the significant adverse impacts to open space (see Chapter 3, “Open Space”) and to traffic (see Chapter 9, “Transportation,” and Chapter 17, “Mitigation”).

**PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS**

The No Action Alternative is the future without the proposed project described in each of the analysis sections of this document. In this case it assumes that the project site would remain undeveloped with only a surface parking lot and the remnants of the former New York Department of Sanitation (DSNY) garage.

Since all other significant adverse impacts were mitigated, the No Unmitigated Impact Alternative focuses on the significant adverse impacts to open space and to traffic.

- For open space, neither reducing the population nor providing publicly accessible open space on-site were considered feasible measures. The former would reduce the proposed employee population from 4,516 to 570 to represent a decrease of no more than a 5 percent in the open space ratio. A reduced staffing level of this nature would not yield workable institutional uses. The later would require that a major portion of the proposed project not be constructed. Therefore, there a No Unmitigated Adverse Impact Alternative does not exist.
- For traffic, the proposed project would result in unmitigated traffic impacts at the intersection of York Avenue and East 79th Street. Due to congested No Build conditions at this intersection, even a small increase in traffic would result in unmitigated impacts. Based on a sensitivity analysis of this intersection, no other feasible mitigation measures could be implemented to mitigate the impacts at this intersection and the project generated vehicle trips would have to be reduced by 95 percent for this intersection to not be impacted. This reduction would not yield workable institutional uses. Therefore, no reasonable alternative

could be developed to avoid such impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's stated goals.

## **B. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Throughout the earlier chapters of this EIS, the No Action Alternative is considered under the future without the proposed project as the baseline for determining impacts.

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed actions would not be adopted and the proposed project would not be constructed. Instead the existing conditions on the project site would remain: a 128-car surface parking lot and the remnants of the former DSNY garage.

Conditions with the No Action Alternative as compared to the probable impacts of the proposed project are summarized below.

### **LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY**

The No Action Alternative would not change land use or zoning in the area. The existing parking lot would not be removed and the project site would not be redeveloped with new active, institutional uses supportive of the health care institutions in the area and beneficial to the education of New Yorkers. No new ambulatory care center and no new science and health professions building would be built to complement the existing and planned health- and education-related institutional uses in the study area. The open parking lot and vacant site occupied by the remnant walls of the DSNY garage would stand in contrast to the residential and commercial uses in the study area, many of which cater to the faculty, staff, and student populations of the institutions.

No new buildings would be built and no new population would come to the project site. Without the proposed structures, there would be no setbacks and overhangs to create a visually dynamic waterfront and become part of the surrounding development.

The discretionary approvals being requested for the proposed project would not be approved. There would be no disposition of City property; no zoning map amendment to rezone the project site from a M3-2 Heavy Manufacturing District (Low Performance) to a C1-9 Local Retail District and to extend the existing M1-4 Light Manufacturing District (High Performance) zoning district to the west to cover the adjacent 5.7 feet of the sites to the west; no zoning text amendment to establish a new provision of the Large Scale General Development (LSGD) special permit to allow a predominantly community facility development wholly within a C1-9 district within Community District 8 in Manhattan to obtain a floor area bonus of up to 20 percent by providing a public park improvement within the same community district or within a 1-mile radius of the proposed project; and no special permits to waive bulk, lot coverage, side yard, rear yard equivalent, and height and setback regulations.

Leaving the site vacant and undeveloped except for a surface parking lot or completely vacant would not be supportive of public policies applicable to the study area including PlaNYC, the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act, the Coastal Zone policies, and the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP).

## **OPEN SPACE**

### *DIRECT EFFECTS*

Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not remove any open space. Since no new buildings would be built no new shadows would be cast on the portion of the East River Esplanade near the project site in the afternoon in all seasons of the year and no new shadow would be cast on John Jay Park on winter afternoons.

There would be no new private (or public) open space on the project site as it would remain a parking lot and a vacant site. There would be no development on the project site to provide funding to the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for improvements to Andrew Haswell Green Park.

### *INDIRECT EFFECTS*

Since there would be no increase in the population using the project site, there would be no new open space users generated by activities the project site. The total, active, and passive open space ratios in the study area would not decrease by 31.7 percent. As with the proposed project, the passive open space ratio would remain above the City's passive open space guidelines.

Funding would not be provided by development on the project site for DPR's Phase 2B plan for Andrew Haswell Green Park, and the larger Community Board 8 area would not benefit by this improvement.

## **SHADOWS**

Under the No Action Alternative there would be no new structures on the project site to cast new shadows on portions of the adjacent East River Esplanade in the spring, summer, and fall afternoons; on John Jay Park located two blocks north of the project site on winter afternoons; or on the Roosevelt Island esplanade and adjacent open space in the spring, summer, and fall afternoons.

## **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Neither the proposed project nor the No Action Alternative would have a significant adverse impact on historic and cultural resources. There are no architectural resources or archaeological resources on the project site. There are two known architectural resources in the study area: the Con Edison East 74th Street Steam Plant (Con Edison Steam Plant) and the garage at 524 East 73rd Street. The OPRHP has determined these architectural resources are eligible for listing on the S/NR. The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) indicated that the structures were not eligible for New York City Landmark (NYCL) status. There is one potential architectural resource in the study area; a late-19th-century carriage house on East 74th Street. Because the two known architectural resources are located within 90 feet of the project site, a Construction Protection Plan (CPP) would be prepared and implemented to avoid inadvertent construction-related impacts on these architectural resources.

Without the proposed project, views of the south façade of the Con Edison Steam Plant and the north façade of the garage at East 74th Street across from the vacant project site would remain. However, with the proposed project unobstructed views of the plant from surrounding streets and from Roosevelt Island, the East River, and the East River Esplanade would remain. Similarly, views of the garage from East 73rd Street would remain. Views of the late-19th-century carriage house

would not be obstructed with or without the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not have any significant adverse contextual or visual impacts on architectural resources in the study area.

### **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

Without the proposed project, no new structures would be built on the project site and the area would not be enlivened by new active uses and new populations coming to the project site. Instead of new buildings with active ground floors, the lot would remain largely vacant and underutilized. East 74th Street would not be improved with new entrances and new street trees and landscaping. Vehicular access to the parking lot would cross both the East 73rd and East 74th Street sidewalks, and parked cars would most likely continue to be found on the east end of East 74th Street sidewalk.

Views across the project site would include the Con Edison Steam Plant on East 74th Street as well as parked cars and remnant walls from the DSNY garage formerly located on the project site. Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not have any significant adverse impacts on urban design or visual resources.

### **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

In the No Action Alternative, it is assumed that all the hazardous materials concerns identified in the Phase I ESA and the Subsurface (Phase II) Investigation for the project site—including historical uses such as a DSNY incinerator and garage (with vehicle fueling and maintenance); petroleum contamination of soil and groundwater; partially demolished structures and/or fill materials possibly containing asbestos-containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and/or polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing elements—would remain.

There would be no demolition and excavation and remediation in compliance with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) spill requirements; additional investigation to delineate the extent of contamination; and proper management of excavated soil and dewatering during construction would be undertaken. No (E) Designation for hazardous materials would be placed on the project site.

In the No Action Alternative there would be no new research laboratories provided for Hunter College, and none of the chemical, biological or radiological materials used in such laboratories would be handled on the project site. However, even with the proposed project there would be no significant adverse impacts because Hunter College adheres to all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

### **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**

In the No Action Alternative there would be no new buildings or uses on-site. There would be no increase on the project site's water consumption, sewage generation, and storm water runoff. However, even with the proposed project no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, wastewater or storm water conveyance, and treatment infrastructure are anticipated.

## TRANSPORTATION

### TRAFFIC

In the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in vehicular traffic associated with the project site and potential significant adverse impacts would not be projected for 11 different intersections, 8 intersections each during the weekday AM peak hour, midday, and PM peak hours, as follows:

#### *Weekday AM Peak Hour*

- York Avenue and East 79th Street – eastbound and northbound approaches;
- York Avenue and East 74th Street – eastbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 73rd Street – northbound approach, southbound defacto left-turn, and southbound through/right-turn;
- York Avenue and East 72nd Street – eastbound defacto left-turn and northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 71st Street – northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 61st Street – westbound right-turn; and
- First Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach.

#### *Weekday Midday Peak Hour*

- York Avenue and East 79th Street – eastbound and northbound approaches;
- York Avenue and East 75th Street – northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 74th Street – eastbound and westbound approaches;
- York Avenue and East 73rd Street – northbound and southbound approaches;
- York Avenue and East 72nd Street – eastbound defacto left-turn and northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 66th Street – northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach; and
- First Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach.

#### *Weekday PM Peak Hour*

- York Avenue and East 79th Street – eastbound approach and northbound through/right-turn;
- York Avenue and East 74th Street – eastbound and westbound approaches;
- York Avenue and East 73rd Street – westbound approach, northbound approach, southbound defacto left-turn, and southbound through/right-turn;
- York Avenue and East 72nd Street – eastbound defacto left-turn and northbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 66th Street – southbound approach;
- York Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach;
- First Avenue and 72nd Street – eastbound defacto left-turn; and
- First Avenue and East 65th Street – eastbound approach.

*TRANSIT*

The No Action Alternative would not increase the population coming to the site and would not increase transit ridership. However, even with the proposed project no significant adverse impacts on bus or subway line-hauls or circulation and control area elements at the future Second Avenue Subway station were projected.

*PEDESTRIANS*

The No Action Alternative would not result in any increase in pedestrians on the sidewalks, corner reservoirs, and crosswalks near the project site. However, even with the proposed project no significant adverse pedestrian impacts on pedestrian conditions are anticipated.

*VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY*

Based on New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) traffic accident data for the period January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011, respectively, two study area intersections were identified as high accident locations: First Avenue at East 72nd Street and York Avenue at East 72nd Street.

With the No Action Alternative the moderate increases in vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the intersection of First Avenue and East 72nd Street due to the proposed project would not be anticipated and the traffic impact during the weekday PM peak hour would not occur. However, even with the proposed project the predicted impact at this intersection could be fully mitigated with standard traffic engineering measures (see Chapter 17, "Mitigation"), which would avoid exacerbating any of the current causes of pedestrian-related accidents.

With the No Action Alternative the noticeable increases in vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the intersection of York Avenue and East 72nd Street would not be anticipated and the intersection of York Avenue and East 72nd Street would not experience vehicular impacts during all three analysis peak hours. However, even with the proposed project the predicted impacts at this intersection could be fully mitigated with standard traffic engineering measures (see Chapter 17, "Mitigation"), which would avoid exacerbating any of the current causes of pedestrian-related accidents.

With or without the proposed project, additional safety measures, such as the installation of countdown timers on all pedestrian crosswalks and the installation of pedestrian safety signs warning turning vehicles to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk, can be implemented to improve pedestrian safety at these intersections.

*PARKING*

In the No Action Alternative, the existing surface with public parking for 128 cars would not be displaced, and the proposed accessory parking garage with up to 250 spaces for MSK patients would not be built. Without the new patients seeking parking facilities, there would not be a parking shortfall during the weekday midday period within the ¼-mile off-street parking study area. Drivers would not necessarily need to seek facilities beyond the ¼-mile radius. Even with the proposed project, the parking shortfall resulting does not constitute a significant adverse parking impact, due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation in Manhattan, as stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

*SUMMARY OF MITIGATION ANALYSIS*

The No Action Alternative would not have impacts on the 11 locations identified above and mitigation measures, such as signal retiming and changes to parking regulations would not be required.

**AIR QUALITY**

The No Action Alternative would not increase the vehicular traffic in the area or the resulting concentration increments from mobile sources. However, even with the proposed project there would be no violation of ambient air quality standards.

There would be no new enclosed parking garage on the project site. However, even with the proposed accessory garage no significant adverse impacts on air quality are anticipated. Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would have significant adverse impacts from mobile source emissions.

In the No Action Alternative there would be no boiler systems using fossil-fired fuel or cogeneration. However, even with the proposed project, no potential significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts are anticipated from pollutant emissions from fossil fuel-fired and cogeneration boiler systems.

With the No Action Alternative there would be no new laboratories on the project site that would raise issues in the event of a chemical spill. However, even with the proposed project, the laboratory's exhaust system would avoid the potential for significant impacts on the surrounding community.

With the No Action Alternative there would be no new uses that would be of concern for nearby existing sources from manufacturing or processing facilities for their potential impacts on the proposed project. There are no existing permitted sources of manufacturing use emissions within the study area that could affect the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts on air quality.

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

In the No Action Alternative, the use of energy for buildings and vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would not occur at this location. However, if the demand for health care and academic uses is met in an area less served by public transportation, without the commitments made by the proposed project to a high level of energy efficiency, more energy would be required to meet that demand and as a result more greenhouse gases would be emitted.

Note that the greenhouse gas emissions and consistency analysis, according to the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, does not attempt to identify the net emissions of the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative, but rather identifies the total emissions associated with the proposed project and analyzes a proposed project's consistency with the City's greenhouse gas reduction goal by analyzing design and efficiency measures. In that context, in addition to the building energy use that may increase by leaving the project area vacant, the continued underutilization of the area under the No Action Alternative would be inconsistent with the PlaNYC goals of avoided sprawl and pursuit of transit-oriented development, and would be contrary to the sustainable development principals of promoting infill development and mixed-use neighborhoods.

## **NOISE**

The No Action Alternative would result in fewer vehicles to contribute to the noise levels on the side streets, East 73rd and East 74th Streets and York Avenue. However, even with the proposed project there would be no significant adverse impacts due to operations of the project.

In the No Action Alternative there would be no structures requiring up to 38 dBA of building attenuation to meet CEQR interior noise level requirements and no (E) designation for noise would be placed on the project site. There would also be no new open spaces facing the Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) Drive (for use by occupants of the proposed buildings) with projected noise levels greater than the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  CEQR guideline. Even with the proposed project, noise levels on these open spaces would be comparable to those in other parks around New York City, particularly those located along the FDR Drive and Route 9A/West Street. Therefore, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would have significant adverse noise impacts.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH**

Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in substantial effects from air quality, water quality, or hazardous materials.

There would be no new open spaces for project occupants overlooking the FDR Drive where noise levels would exceed the 55-dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  threshold contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet. Even with the proposed project, noise levels in these open spaces would be comparable to other parks around New York City and the proposed project would not have a public health impact.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

In the No Action Alternative no new buildings would be built to contain any uses similar to others in the area nor would any improvement to the largely vacant and underutilized lot be made. It would not bring any new population to enliven and activate the project site. While the No Action Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on open space and traffic, these technical areas are not defining features of the neighborhood. The No Action Alternative would not provide funding for improvements at Andrew Haswell Green Park. Overall, the No Action Alternative would not revitalize the project site—replacing a largely vacant lot with active uses and enlivening the neighborhood with street-level activity.

## **CONSTRUCTION**

The No Action Alternative would not involve construction or any of the disruption that it creates. In this case it would avoid significant adverse impacts with respect to vehicular traffic and pedestrians. However, without construction on the project site, any existing hazardous materials on the project site would remain and the site would not be remediated in compliance with all federal state and local regulations.

## *TRANSPORTATION*

### *Traffic*

There would be no peak of construction activities in the No Action Alternative. There would be no increase in vehicular traffic to the project site for construction, and there would be no traffic



impacts and no need for mitigation. There would be no potential for cumulative traffic impacts with the construction of the approved HSS project to the west of the project site, which is assumed to occur in the future without the proposed project.

There would be no need to develop Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) plans to be reviewed, and approved by NYCDOT's Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination (OCMC), because there would be no curb-lane and sidewalk closures or equipment staging activities. Nevertheless, even with construction of the proposed project, it is expected that traffic and pedestrian flow along all surrounding streets would be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

#### *Parking*

With the No Action Alternative there would no new construction workers coming to the area increasing parking demand by up to a maximum of 277 spaces. There would not be a shortfall of parking spaces during peak-construction periods requiring that the excess demand be accommodated with a slightly longer walking distance beyond the ¼-mile radius. However, as stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a parking shortfall resulting from a project located in Manhattan does not constitute a significant adverse parking impact, due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation.

#### *Transit*

In the No Action Alternative there would be no new transit trips generated by construction on the project site. However, even with the proposed project the estimated 282 total peak-hour transit trips would occur outside of peak periods of transit ridership, would be distributed and dispersed to nearby transit facilities, and would not result in any significant adverse transit impacts during construction.

#### *Pedestrians*

The No Action Alternative would not increase the number of construction worker pedestrian trips to the site. However, even with the proposed project's estimated number of total peak hour pedestrian trips of up to 552 traversing the area's sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks would have minimal effects on pedestrian operations. Even with construction of the proposed project there would not be any significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

#### *AIR QUALITY*

The No Action Alternative would not require any construction equipment operating on-site or construction vehicles coming to the site—both of which would increase air pollutant emissions. However, even with the proposed project, no significant adverse air quality impacts would be expected due to implementation of an emissions reduction program for all construction activities, including: diesel equipment reduction; clean fuel; best available tailpipe reduction technologies; utilization of newer equipment; source location; dust control; and idle restriction; and due to the distance to most sensitive receptors in the area. Furthermore, the construction would not result in increases in vehicle volumes higher than those identified in the operational condition and, therefore, even with the proposed project an off-site construction mobile source analysis is not warranted.

*NOISE AND VIBRATION*

With the No Action Alternative there would be no noise generated by construction equipment on-site or construction vehicles coming to the project site. However, even with construction of the proposed project significant adverse noise impacts are not anticipated due to adherence to the noise control measures required by the New York City Noise Control Code, including both path and source controls; the distance to the nearest sensitive receptors; and the limited duration (less than 24 months) of the most noise-intensive construction activities. Noise levels on the East River Esplanade opposite the project site from the FDR Drive traffic would be expected to remain as such in the No Action Alternative. Thus the No Action Alternative would avoid only minimal exceedances of 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria at this location.

The No Action Alternative would not require the use of construction equipment that would have the most potential to exceed the 65-VdB criterion, sensitive-receptor locations (e.g., equipment used during pile driving and rock blasting), which would be perceptible and annoying. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would avoid perceptible vibration levels, which may be experienced for limited time periods by occupants and visitors to locations on and immediately adjacent to the construction site. While perceptible, these vibration levels with the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

*OTHER TECHNICAL AREAS*

*Land Use and Neighborhood Character*

With the No Action Alternative there would not be any of the disruption normally associated with periods of peak-construction activity—predominantly noise. There would be no construction trucks and construction workers coming to the project site. None of the noise from building construction as well as trucks and other vehicles backing up, loading, and unloading would be generated. None of these disruptions would occur and there would be no need for sidewalk or lane closures usually anticipated during construction. Nevertheless, due to their short duration these disruptions would not affect land use with the proposed project.

*Socioeconomic Conditions*

With the No Action Alternative none of the anticipated construction jobs, sales, and tax revenues would be generated. None of the construction activities that might affect socioeconomic conditions including restricted access, lane closures and utility service disruptions would occur.

*Community Facilities*

Again with the No Action Alternative there would be no temporary increases in traffic and no potential restrictions of access to and from any community facilities in the study area. There would be no activities such as excavation and foundation construction that might be perceptible and intrusive to the school located west of the project site on East 74th Street. However, even with the proposed project these issues would not be considered long-term or significant according to CEQR criteria.

*Open Space*

In the No Action Alternative there would be no construction to generate noise that might be heard in the nearest open space, the East River Esplanade. However, even with the proposed project there would not be a construction impact on open space.

*Historic and Cultural Resources*

In the No Action Alternative there would be no potential construction-period impacts on historic resources within 90 feet of the project site, specifically the Con Edison Steam Plant and the garage at 524 East 73rd Street. However, even with the proposed project implementation a CPP would to avoid such impacts.

*Hazardous Materials*

With the No Action Alternative there would be no exposure to contaminated materials during subsurface disturbance and demolition of the remnant walls. However, even with the proposed project these adverse impacts would be avoided by placement of an (E) designation for hazardous materials on the project site and by carrying out all remedial activities in accordance with applicable regulations; conducting additional subsurface investigations to delineate the extent of the free-phase petroleum product; disposing of any contaminated soil or rock in accordance with applicable federal, state and local regulations; remediation of significant soil and/or groundwater contamination in accordance with all applicable regulations; disposing of any demolition debris containing suspect ACM, LPB, PCBs, and/or underground storage tanks in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations; and testing, prior to excavation, to evaluate the need for pre-treatment prior to discharge for compliance with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) discharge permit/approval requirements.

**C. NO UNMITIGATED IMPACT ALTERNATIVE**

**OPEN SPACE**

The analyses undertaken for the proposed MSK ACC and CUNY-Hunter Building identified a significant adverse impact on open space for which no mitigation was available within the study area. The open space impact is based on the increase in potential open space users coming to the project site, 4,516 new workers and the lack of potential open space locations in the study area. In order to reduce the decrease in the open space ratio to less than 5 percent, the increment in open space users would have to be reduced to 570 new workers. This level would not yield workable institutional uses. Similarly, providing publicly accessible open space on the project site is not feasible given the programs of the two institutions and the need for large floor plates for both. Therefore, there is no feasible No Unmitigated Impact Alternative.

It is noted that as part of the zoning approvals, MSK would contribute funding to DPR for Phase 2B plan for Andrew Haswell Green Park, which is located along the East River Esplanade but to the south outside the ¼-mile open space study area. The project would also provide open space on terraces and balconies for the use of the project occupants. Although it would serve the occupants of the proposed project, it cannot be considered in the quantitative analysis because it is not publicly accessible.

**TRANSPORTATION**

*TRAFFIC*

The analyses undertaken for the proposed MSK ACC and CUNY-Hunter Building in Chapter 9, “Transportation,” identified significant adverse traffic impacts at 11 different intersections, 8 intersections each during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours. As discussed in Chapter 17, “Mitigation,” with the implementation of standard mitigation measures, the

significant adverse traffic impacts could be fully mitigated during all three analysis peak hours, with the exception of those at the York Avenue and East 79th Street intersection. Due to congested No Build conditions at this intersection, even a small increase in traffic would result in unmitigated impacts. Based on a sensitivity analysis of this intersection, no other feasible standard mitigation measures could be developed to mitigate the impacts at this intersection and the project generated vehicle trips would have to be reduced by 95 percent for this intersection to be not impacted. This reduction would not yield workable institutional uses. Therefore, no reasonable alternative could be developed to avoid such impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's stated goals.

#### *CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC*

As discussed in Chapter 15, "Construction," the peak construction traffic increments would be lower than the full operational traffic increments associated with the proposed project in 2019. Therefore, the potential traffic impacts during peak construction would be within the envelope of significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the Build condition in Chapter 9, "Transportation." Nonetheless, because existing and No Build traffic conditions at some of the study area intersections through which construction-related traffic would also travel were determined to operate at unacceptable levels during commuter peak hours, it is possible that significant adverse traffic impacts could occur at some or many of these locations during construction. In order to alleviate construction traffic impacts, measures recommended to mitigate impacts associated with the operational traffic of the proposed project could be implemented during construction before full build-out of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 17, "Mitigation," measures to mitigate the operational traffic impacts in 2019 were recommended for implementation at 10 out of the 11 different impacted intersections during weekday peak hours. These measures would encompass primarily signal timing adjustments and other operational measures, all of which could be implemented earlier at the discretion of NYCDOT to address actual conditions experienced at that time. However, traffic impacts during construction at the York Avenue and East 79th Street intersection would likewise be unmitigatable. Between the Draft and Final EIS, in coordination with NYCDOT, additional analysis of construction traffic will be prepared. \*