National Environmental Policy Act and
New York State Environmental Quality Review Act,

JOINT RECORD OF DECISION (ROD) and FINDINGS STATEMENT

New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development
New York City Housing Authority

Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Houses Redevelopment Project

Borough of Manhattan, City of New York,
County of New York, New York

A. INTRODUCTION

This is the Joint Record of Decision (ROD) and Findings Statement for the Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Redevelopment Project ("the Proposed Project"). It is being issued by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), acting as Responsible Entity for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), a New York State public benefit corporation, as local project sponsor and joint-lead agency.

This ROD and Findings Statement is prepared in accordance with NEPA and HUD guidance related thereto and is also prepared in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

This ROD and Findings Statements documents the findings and decision to proceed with the Proposed Project as described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), dated June 27, 2025 and issued pursuant to notices in the *Federal Register* on June 27, 2025 and the New York State *Environmental Notice Bulletin* on July 2, 2025. The FEIS is available via the following web addresses: https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nycha/downloads/misc/FEC_FEIS.zip and https://www.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/zip/FEC_FEIS.zip

The FEIS, as prepared by HPD and NYCHA, identified Alternative 2, the Rezoning Alternative, as the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed Project.

NYCHA intends to submit an application(s) to HUD for disposition of public housing property as authorized under Section 18 of the United States (US) Housing Act of 1937 as amended and implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 970 (Section 18) and the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program created by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012, as may be amended, for the conversion of subsidies under Section 9

of the US Housing Act of 1937, 42 USC § 1437g, to project-based vouchers (PBVs) subsidies under Section 8 of the US Housing Act of 1937, 42 USC § 1437f. Under the Permanent Affordability Commitment Together (PACT) Program, NYCHA would enter into 99-year ground leases involving the Project Sites, with Elliott Fulton LLC, a joint venture between Essence Development and The Related Companies and/or affiliates thereof (collectively, the PACT Partner). Such planned activities and approvals at HUD-assisted Project Sites require environmental clearance under NEPA. HPD, as Responsible Entity for HUD and lead agency under NEPA in accordance with 24 CFR 58.2(a)(7), and NYCHA, serving as local project sponsor and joint-lead agency, in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.7(b)[1] prepared the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), inclusive of Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and FEIS, for the Proposed Project. Because the Proposed Project requires state discretionary actions in addition to federal approvals, the analyses in the EIS satisfies the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) in addition to NEPA. As the Proposed Project also may require future city discretionary actions, the analyses in the EIS are also intended to satisfy the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR). (When discussing the EIS in general, that term is used throughout this document but when a reference pertains specifically to either the DEIS or FEIS, then the more specific term is used.)

The Proposed Project would affect two NYCHA campuses consisting of the Fulton Houses (Fulton Houses Project Site), and the Elliott Houses, Chelsea Houses, and Chelsea Addition Houses (collectively, Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site) in the Chelsea neighborhood of Manhattan.

This ROD and Findings Statement also sets forth that HPD and NYCHA have given due consideration to the Draft Scope of Work for the Preparation of an EIS (DSOW), Final Scope for the Preparation of an EIS (FSOW), DEIS, and FEIS prepared for the Proposed Project and also public comments submitted. HPD, as Responsible Entity, has determined that the requirements of NEPA have been satisfied for the Proposed Project. This ROD and Findings Statement is the conclusion of HPD and NYCHA's review of the Proposed Project as described in herein and in the FEIS. This is the final step in the NEPA and SEQRA processes for the Proposed Project.

Overview of the Proposed Project and FEIS

The Proposed Project evaluated in the FEIS includes the staged demolition and full replacement of existing residential and community facility spaces across NYCHA's Fulton, Elliott, Chelsea, and Chelsea Addition Houses developments (collectively, the Project Sites) as well as the staged development of additional new mixed-use buildings that would create additional permanently affordable and market-rate residential units, as well as new commercial uses, additional community facility space, and accessory open space. Four alternatives were considered for implementation of the Proposed Project and one of them, the Rezoning Alternative, was identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative and is referred to by the latter term for the remainder of this document.

[1] The NEPA Implementing Regulations provided in 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508 were removed as of April 11, 2025. These regulations are referenced as they were in effect at the time of preparation and publication of the DEIS. For information on the removal of the regulations, see: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/25/2025-03014/removal-of-national-environmental-policy-act-implementing-regulations

If either the Preferred Alternative or the Midblock Bulk Alternative are pursued to implement the Proposed Project, a land use application consisting of zoning changes approved through New York City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) would also be pursued. This application would include zoning map and text amendments and a zoning special permit for a general large-scale development. Also, at a later date, discretionary public funding or financing for the Proposed Project may be sought through one or more of the following public agencies: HUD, New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (HCR), New York State Housing Finance Agency (HFA), New York City Housing Development Corporation (NYCHDC), and HPD. Additionally, a Mayoral Zoning Override (MZO) to address, for example, non-compliant interim conditions on the Project Sites during the construction period is indicated as a potential required approval under the Non-Rezoning Alternative and City of Yes for Housing Opportunity (COY) Alternative; however, a MZO is not currently anticipated to be utilized under these alternatives.

The Proposed Project Sites

The Fulton Houses Project Site and the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site are separated by approximately a ¼-mile. Formally called the Robert S. Fulton Houses, the Fulton Houses Project Site was completed in 1965. It is a "towers-in-the-park" development with accessory open areas for building residents including playgrounds, a basketball court, landscaping, seating, walking paths, accessory parking, and ancillary areas.

The Fulton Houses Project Site occupies portions of four blocks that are bounded by W. 20th Street to the north, 9th Avenue to the east, W. 16th Street to the south, and 10th Avenue to the west. Uses on the Fulton Houses Project Site include 944 NYCHA DUs, 14,634 gross square feet (gsf) of neighborhood center space, and 95 accessory parking spaces. The Fulton Houses Project Site includes 12 existing buildings, consisting of 10 residential apartment buildings, one mixed residential and community facility building, and one storage/maintenance garage building, ranging from 1 to 25 stories. The tallest building is 232 feet tall.

The John Lovejoy Elliott Houses (completed in 1947), the Chelsea Houses (completed in 1964), and the Chelsea Addition Houses (completed in 1968) are administered as one entity (Elliott-Chelsea Houses) and comprise the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. The Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site is also a "towers-in-the-park" development, but unlike the Fulton Houses Project Site, this complex does not have on-site accessory parking. The Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site occupies portions of two blocks that are bounded by Chelsea Park to the north, 9th Avenue to the east, W. 25th Street to the south, and 10th Avenue to the west. Uses on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site include 1,112 NYCHA DUs, 42,225 gsf of community facility neighborhood center space, and 10,300 gsf of daycare space. The Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site includes 10 existing buildings, consisting of seven residential apartment buildings, two community facility buildings, and one storage/maintenance garage building, ranging from 1 to 21 stories. The tallest building is 223 feet tall.

Within its northern and northeastern limits, the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site includes W. 27th Drive, a narrow one-way private driveway extending northbound from W. 26th Street approximately 260 feet west of 9th Avenue for a distance of approximately 220 feet, where it then curves to the west and extends to the intersection of 10th Avenue and W. 27th Street. W. 27th Drive physically separates the complex from two other publicly owned sites: Public School (PS) 33, a

school and playground to the east, and Chelsea Park, a mapped park under the jurisdiction of the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) to the north.

In total, the Project Sites include 22 existing buildings, consisting of 17 residential apartment buildings, one mixed residential and community facility building, two community facility buildings, and two storage/maintenance garage buildings, ranging from 1 to 25 stories. The tallest building is 232 feet tall. Combined existing uses on the Project Sites include 2,056 NYCHA DUs, 56,859 gsf of neighborhood center space, 10,300 gsf of daycare space, and 95 accessory parking spaces. More detailed information about the Project Sites is provided below in **Section F, "Analysis Framework**."

B. PURPOSE AND NEED

After more than 60 years of use, the buildings and units on the Project Sites have become severely deteriorated and substandard. In order to effectively address the persistent issues within the buildings, substantial repair, rehabilitation, and inconvenience to the residents would be required. Persistent issues include pervasive mold and leaks, the presence of lead-based paint, and many outdated buildings systems, including, but not limited to, elevators, heating, ventilation, mechanical and electrical systems, and fixtures and appliances. Cumulatively, these issues negatively impact residents' quality of life.

As noted above, the Proposed Project would result in the staged demolition and replacement of all existing NYCHA DUs. The existing NYCHA DUs would be replaced by Section 8 PBV DUs through the PACT Program and would be set aside for existing residents of the NYCHA Fulton Houses and Elliott-Chelsea Houses (FEC). New permanently affordable and market-rate housing options also would be provided on the Project Sites, as well as accessory open space, new community facility space, and new commercial uses. The purpose and need for the Proposed Project is to:

- Improve the quality of life and housing stability for existing FEC residents by constructing new Section 8 PBV DUs[2] in new buildings that would offer enhanced layouts, ventilation, energy efficiency, resident-controlled in-unit heating and cooling, new appliances in every apartment, common area amenities, large multipurpose community spaces, and resident rooftop space, while also preserving permanent affordability and residents' rights under the PACT program;
- Facilitate the construction of additional critically needed permanent affordable housing units, as well as market-rate housing that would financially support the PACT and affordable housing components of the Proposed Project; and

[2] The FEC public housing DUs on the Project Sites are currently funded with Section 9 Federal subsidies via HUD (Section 9 refers to Section 9 of the US Housing Act of 1937). Section 8 PBV is another form of Federal subsidy which provides substantially more Federal funding for DUs in NYCHA's RAD/PACT developments. Under Section 8 PBV, similar to Section 9, lease agreements automatically renew, residents cannot be evicted without cause, and households continue to pay 30 percent of their adjusted gross income towards rent. For more information, please see: "The Facts about PACT" https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nycha/downloads/pdf/PACT-facts-english.pdf
and the "PACT Protects Residents Rights"
https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nycha/downloads/pdf/PACT_ResidentRights_2024_english.pdf

- Facilitate the development of commercial space and additional community facility space for the residents and the surrounding community.

Process of Identifying the Proposed Project and its Alternatives

The Proposed Project arises out of an extensive public engagement process conducted from 2019 to 2023, including consultations with NYCHA residents, elected officials, community representatives, and housing organizations and advocates. Stakeholders engaged in weekly meetings to collect feedback, discuss project financing, and strategize on ways to address the existing buildings' capital needs. Recommendations included that FEC be included in NYCHA's PACT program to rehabilitate DUs within the existing buildings and identified appropriate locations and design guidelines for new mixed-use development.

In 2019, the stakeholders involved in these ongoing consultations and NYCHA agreed to release a request for proposals (RFP) for the selection of a PACT partner to rehabilitate 100 percent of the DUs on the Project Sites, and build new infill mixed-income residential buildings to raise funds needed for the rehabilitation of the existing NYCHA DUs. In late 2021, NYCHA, in consultation with residents of the FEC, selected Elliott Fulton LLC as the PACT Partner.

Following designation by NYCHA, the PACT Partner completed a five-month pre-design due diligence process that revealed significant, additional capital repair needs that had not previously been identified. The study also determined that extensive temporary relocation of residents and a significantly longer timeline would be required to renovate the existing buildings as a result of the particular conditions of major building systems. As a result, resident leaders worked with the PACT Partner to identify alternative development solutions that would offer a feasible means for redressing the deterioration of the Project Sites while also creating and maintaining high quality and financially sustainable affordable housing over the long term, and also allow residents to decide their preferred option for moving forward.

In 2023, the PACT Partner continued its engagement with residents, NYCHA, and the Citizens Housing and Planning Council (CHPC) in a process for NYCHA residents to determine the future of their homes by deciding whether to pursue total redevelopment of their campuses or to rehabilitate existing buildings as originally contemplated. The PACT Partner and NYCHA held information sessions, canvassed thousands of residents, and mailed informational packets to every apartment on the Project Sites, in various languages, to inform the NYCHA residents and nearby community of the options under consideration. Residents could indicate their preference between the construction of new buildings or rehabilitation of existing buildings. If residents selected the construction of new buildings, they could then choose from two variations of new construction plans that would provide the NYCHA residents with new units and also allow for the development of additional affordable and market-rate housing: one requiring a rezoning and one that would be developed without a rezoning. A majority of resident respondents were in favor of building new Section 8 PBV buildings across the Project Sites and, of that majority, more selected the rezoning proposal. As a result of this process, a Rezoning Alternative and a Non-Rezoning Alternative were identified to meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Project.

Subsequently, during the scoping process, several commenters on the DSOW requested analysis of a different arrangement of bulk for the Proposed Project, particularly for the Fulton Houses

Project Site. In response, NYCHA and the PACT Partner identified a Midblock Bulk Alternative that would have the same development program as the Rezoning Alternative (now identified as the Preferred Alternative) but would have a different arrangement of bulk on the Fulton Houses Project Site, with the location of the tallest buildings in midblock areas rather than along 9th Avenue as proposed under the Preferred Alternative. This Midblock Bulk Alternative would have an identical arrangement of bulk as the Preferred Alternative on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. Another alternative, the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative, was also added to the EIS in response to public comments on the DSOW, as discussed below.

Following the publication of the DEIS, the PACT Partner confirmed that a development program utilizing the zoning regulations recently passed under the City of Yes for Housing Opportunity (COY) may be feasible for the Project Sites, though it is not the Preferred Alternative. Accordingly, the FEIS identified and studied the COY Alternative. Similar to the Non-Rezoning Alternative, the COY Alternative would not require changes to the Zoning Map by the City Planning Commission (CPC) pursuant to ULURP.

The level of funding necessary for required renovations and long-term support of the existing NYCHA DUs and building systems cannot be achieved without the Proposed Project. In addition, even if funding were available for in-place renovations through a PACT conversion, some critical outdated building systems could not be upgraded sufficiently to meet long-term or even short-term needs. Moreover, the development of new buildings would require a significantly smaller number of temporary relocations compared to what would be required for rehabilitation, and would provide longer building life cycles, better energy efficiency, and superior conditions for residents. The Proposed Project provides the additional, important benefit of a substantial number of new permanently affordable units in the face of historically low housing vacancy rates.[3] Finally, the Proposed Project also facilitates the construction of market-rate DUs to financially support the PACT and new affordable housing components of the Proposed Project.

Therefore, HPD, NYCHA and the PACT Partner, in consultation with leadership from the Fulton and Elliott-Chelsea Tenants Associations, are proposing the Proposed Project identified in this document.

C. DECISION

NYCHA and HPD's preferred alternative for the Proposed Project is Alternative 2, the Rezoning Alternative, as identified in the FEIS. The Preferred Alternative was selected based on a thorough and careful consideration of the potential short-term and long-term benefits and impacts, mitigation of those impacts, and comments from City, State, and Federal agencies and elected officials, as well as the greater public. In the FEIS, NYCHA and HPD, concluded that the Preferred Alternative best addresses the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. The Preferred Alternative would result in similar impacts as compared to the other alternatives, but is anticipated

[3] *2023 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (NYCHVS)*. Refer to: https://www.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdfs/about/2023-nychvs-selected-initial-findings.pdf and https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/news/007-24/new-york-city-s-vacancy-rate-reaches-historic-low-1-4-percent-demanding-urgent-action-new#/0

to provide a faster pace of replacement housing for existing residents of FEC and provides the maximum amount of both affordable and market-rate housing options. It would also result in an appropriate arrangement of bulk across the Project Sites.

D. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The FEIS identified seven alternatives for the Proposed Project: Alternative 1 – No-Action Alternative; Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative; Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative; Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative; Alternative 5 – Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative; Alternative 6 – No Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative; and Alternative 7 – City of Yes (COY) Alternative. As discussed in more detail below, Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 were analyzed further in the FEIS. Alternative 6 was described in the FEIS but not analyzed further in the FEIS, as also explained below.

In general, alternatives selected for detailed analysis in an EIS are those that are feasible and reasonably satisfy the purpose and need for the project under consideration.

The alternatives analysis is also used as a tool to select a Preferred Alternative by identifying both the benefits and the effects associated with each of the analyzed alternatives. The Rezoning Alternative, Non-Rezoning Alternative, Midblock Bulk Alternative, and COY Alternative were all considered for implementation of the Proposed Project because they would meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. As discussed above, NYCHA and HPD, have concluded that the Rezoning Alternative best addresses the purpose and need for the Proposed Project and therefore the FEIS identified it as the Preferred Alternative.

Alternative 1, the No-Action Alternative, which serves as a baseline for comparison of the effects of the other alternatives, would occur in the absence of the proposed discretionary approvals and implementation of the Proposed Project. This alternative assumes that existing uses, user populations, and buildings on the Project Sites would remain and no new development would occur on the Project Sites by 2041 (the build analysis year for the Proposed Project).

The Preferred, Non-Rezoning, Midblock Bulk, and COY Alternatives (Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 7) were the alternatives considered for the implementation of the Proposed Project because they would satisfy the project purpose and need. Under these alternatives, all existing residential and community facility uses would be replaced. The differences among these four alternatives are: (1) the amount of new (incremental) development that would occur, (2) the arrangement of the site plan and distribution of building bulk, and (3) whether such development would require future discretionary land use approvals under the City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP).

Alternative 5, the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative, was identified and assessed in the EIS in response to comments from Manhattan Community Board 4 and others on the DSOW. These commenters requested that the EIS study an alternative consistent with the development proposal the PACT Partner identified in its response to the 2021 RFP. This development proposal entailed comprehensive renovation of existing NYCHA buildings on the Project Sites as part of the PACT Program and construction of one new residential building plus new infill spaces with commercial and community facility uses.

NYCHA and HPD determined that the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project because it would be financially and logistically infeasible. This alternative would not substantially increase the amount of new affordable housing at locations where opportunities for such increases exist. Nevertheless, to be responsive to comments on the DSOW, the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative was identified and analyzed in the EIS.

In order to provide a conservative analysis, each alternative indicates a development program that reflects the maximum development program that would reasonably be expected. For the Preferred Alternative, Non-Rezoning Alternative, Midblock Bulk Alternative, and COY Alternative, which each involve the replacement of all existing buildings, the PACT Partner has committed to a one-for-one conversion of all 2,056 existing NYCHA FEC DUs to Section 8 PBV DUs, as well as the replacement of existing community facility uses operated by Hudson Guild on a usable square foot (sf) basis (at a minimum) within the first newly constructed buildings (i.e., the Fulton 1 and Elliott-Chelsea 1 buildings). In addition, for the mixed-income residential, commercial, and other community facility (neighborhood center, daycare, and medical office) uses within these alternatives, the development programs reflect intended uses and represent a reasonable worst case in terms of the likely effects of the Proposed Project.

Alternative 1 – No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative is intended to provide the lead, expert, and cooperating agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part. It also establishes the context to assess and compare the environmental impacts among the alternatives.

The No-Action Alternative assumes that without the implementation of one of the Proposed Project's alternatives, the Project Sites would remain in their current condition, the existing buildings would not be replaced or demolished, and no new development would occur on the Project Sites. Additionally, major capital improvements, rehabilitation, or renovations subject to discretionary approvals such as the PACT rehabilitation program would not occur. Funding for renovations of NYCHA DUs as currently subsidized under Section 9 is dependent on allocation from the Federal government through annual Federal capital grants, which have historically declined and failed to keep pace with growing needs. For 2023, NYCHA received $753 million in Federal capital grant funding for its entire inventory of public housing properties, which encompasses 2,411 buildings in 335 developments with 177,569 DUs across New York City. Of this $753 million, only approximately 40 percent (or $301 million) is available to be utilized for capital projects and improvements.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the Project Site buildings would continue to be funded under HUD's Section 9 program, limiting the ability to address capital needs in a different manner than they are currently addressed. As such, the underlying conditions confronting the aging buildings on the Project Sites would not be resolved and the No-Action Alternative would therefore not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project.

Development Program

In summary, the No-Action Alternative includes 22 existing buildings, consisting of 17 residential apartment buildings, one mixed residential and community facility building, two community facility buildings, and two storage/maintenance garage buildings, ranging from 1 to 25 stories. The tallest on-site building is 232 feet tall. The Project Site in No-Action Alternative would continue to include 2,056 NYCHA DUs, 56,859 gross square feet (gsf) of neighborhood center space, 10,300 gsf of daycare, and 95 accessory parking spaces. The community facility uses are operated by Hudson Guild, which is a community-based social services organization rooted in and primarily focused on the Chelsea neighborhood.

The EIS evaluated No-Action Alternative conditions in the 2041 analysis year without the Proposed Project, including other projects independent of the Proposed Project being constructed and/or operated within the same vicinity and time frame.

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative

This alternative would require, in addition to NYCHA and HUD approvals, discretionary land use approvals from the City of New York through ULURP, which are expected to include zoning map and text amendments and a zoning special permit for a Large Scale General Development (LSGD).

Under the Preferred Alternative, the staged demolition and replacement of all existing buildings, DUs, and community facility spaces on the Project Sites would take place. All existing NYCHA DUs would be replaced with Section 8 PBV DUs in new buildings through the PACT Program and would be set aside for existing FEC residents. In addition, new mixed use, mixed income buildings would be constructed containing both market-rate and affordable housing DUs. The new affordable housing units would be provided pursuant to Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH). As such, affordable housing could be provided at either 20, 25 or 30 percent of residential floor area depending on the levels of affordability. Throughout the EIS, the amount of affordable housing DUs to be provided was conservatively assumed to be 30 percent of the total new (incremental) residential floor area in the mixed-income buildings. As a range of 20 to 30 percent of affordable housing DUs could be provided, the number of affordable housing DUs indicated represents an "up to" number.

Development Program

The Preferred Alternative development program is presented in **Table 1a** for the Fulton Houses Project Site and in **Table 1b** for the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. **Table 1b** also includes a summary row showing the full program for the Preferred Alternative on both Project Sites.

Table 1a: Preferred Alternative, Fulton Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Fulton 1	Replacement	717	9 Av, 19 St	204	0	204	0	0	204	235,044	0	0	12,229	0	0	247,273	12	145.40
Fulton 2	Replacement	716	9 Av, 18 St, 19 St	349	0	349	0	0	349	306,653	0	6,580	0	0	0	313,233	30	329.33
Fulton 3	Replacement	715	9 Av, 17 St, 18 St	391	0	391	0	0	391	342,562	4,811	0	2,420	0	0	349,793	36	385.50
Fulton 4	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St, 18 St	0	175	175	407	582	582	494,390	0	0	20,130	0	0	514,520	32	347.92
Fulton 5	New Mxd Inc	714	9 Av, 16 St, 17 St	0	158	158	369	527	527	448,230	10,500	0	5,810	0	0	464,540	34	368.25
Fulton 6	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	88	88	206	294	294	249,700	0	0	6,080	0	0	255,780	23	262.25
Fulton 7	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St, 18 St	0	52	52	120	172	172	146,101	0	0	7,270	0	2,500	155,871	14	180.00
Fulton 8	New Mxd Inc	716	18 St, 19 St	0	64	64	149	213	213	181,390	0	0	0	9,770	0	191,160	17	221.58
Fulton Subtotals																		
1 to 3	Replacements	-		944	0	944	0	0	944	884,259	4,811	6,580	14,649	0	0	910,299		
4 to 8	New Mxd Inc's	-		0	537	537	1,251	1,788	1,788	1,519,811	10,500	0	39,290	9,770	2,500	1,581,871		
All Fulton Buildings				**944**	**537**	**1,481**	**1,251**	**1,788**	**2,732**	**2,404,070**	**15,311**	**6,580**	**53,939**	**9,770**	**2,500**	**2,492,170**		
Fulton Minimum Height																	12	145.40
Fulton Maximum Height																	36	385.50

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 1b: Preferred Alternative, Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Elliott-Chelsea 1	Replacement	724	26 St, 27 Dr	452	0	452	0	0	452	453,291	0	0	49,770	7,266	0	510,327	39	428.50
Elliott-Chelsea 2	Replacement	724	10 Av, 26 St, 27 Dr	407	0	407	0	0	407	338,079	4,060	11,000	0	949	0	354,088	27	301.33
Elliott-Chelsea 3	Replacement	723	25 St, 26 St	253	0	253	0	0	253	214,945	0	0	6,648	0	11,285	232,878	22	257.33
Elliott-Chelsea 4	New Mxd Inc	723	10 Av, 25 St, 26 St	0	136	136	316	452	452	384,101	8,000	0	3,890	0	0	395,991	36	385.33
Elliott-Chelsea 5	New Mxd Inc	723	25 St, 26 St	0	98	98	228	326	326	276,755	0	0	8,400	0	0	285,155	28	312.33
Elliott-Chelsea 6	New Mxd Inc	723	26 St	0	127	127	295	422	422	358,471	0	0	10,200	0	0	368,671	32	346.33
Elliott-Chelsea 7	New Mxd Inc	724	26 St, 27 Dr	0	140	140	326	466	466	396,070	0	0	11,235	0	0	407,305	34	366.67
Elliott-Chelsea subtotals																		
1 to 3	Replacements			1,112	0	1,112	0	0	1,112	1,006,315	4,060	11,000	56,418	8,215	11,285	1,097,293		
4 to 7	New Mxd Inc's			0	501	501	1,165	1,666	1,666	1,415,397	8,000	0	33,725	0	0	1,457,122		
All Elliott-Chelsea Buildings				**1,112**	**501**	**1,613**	**1,165**	**1,666**	**2,778**	**2,421,712**	**12,060**	**11,000**	**90,143**	**8,215**	**11,285**	**2,554,415**		
Elliott-Chelsea Minimum Height																	22	257.33
Elliott-Chelsea Maximum Height																	39	428.50
Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Totals				**2,056**	**1,038**	**3,094**	**2,416**	**3,454**	**5,510**	**4,825,782**	**27,371**	**17,580**	**144,082**	**17,985**	**13,785**	**5,046,585**		

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

The Preferred Alternative would consist of a total of 15 new buildings ranging from 12 to 39 stories. For conservative analysis purposes, the EIS analyzed the tallest building heights (428.5 feet) as well as the largest bulk of the proposed buildings. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Net Increment of the Preferred Alternative

Table 2 identifies the net incremental changes to the Project Sites under the Preferred Alternative as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

Table 2: Preferred Alternative Compared to No-Action Alternative

Land Use	No-Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Increment
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	-2,056
Future Section 8 PBV DUs [1]	0	2,056	+2,056
MIH Affordable DUs	0	1,038	+1,038
Market-Rate DUs	0	2,416	+2,416
Total DUs	**2,056**	**5,510**	**+3,454**
Community facility/Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	144,082	+87,223
Daycare gsf	10,300	17,985	+7,685
Medical Office Related Uses gsf	0	13,785	+13,785
Local Retail gsf	0	27,371	+27,371
Supermarket gsf	0	17,580	+17,580
Total Building Area gsf	1.9 million	5.1 million	+3.2 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	96	+1
Building height (maximum)	232’	428.5’	+196.5’
Building stories (maximum)	25	39	+14

Notes:

[1] The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

Temporary Relocations

Under the Preferred Alternative, project construction staging is designed so that 94 percent of the Section 8 PBV DUs would be completed before the existing NYCHA DUs they replace are vacated, meaning that most existing FEC residents will remain in their current DUs until the replacement buildings are ready for occupancy. During the initial stage of project implementation and prior to construction of the replacement buildings, up to approximately 6 percent of current NYCHA residents—or 120 households from two of the existing 18 NYCHA buildings on the Project Sites[4]—would need to be temporarily relocated and their buildings vacated to facilitate the Proposed Project. They would be relocated either to appropriately sized vacant existing units in other buildings on the Project Sites or, if such units are unavailable, to housing units nearby.

[4] The existing Fulton 11 building at the Fulton Houses Project Site and Chelsea Addition at the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site are the only two buildings in which residents would have to be temporarily relocated prior to the construction of the replacement Section 8 PBV DUs.

The John Lovejoy Elliott Center (hereafter referred to as the Elliott Center) community facility operated by Hudson Guild would also be temporarily relocated and temporary space(s) on- and off-site (identified and designed in coordination with the Hudson Guild leadership team) would be provided to house its existing programming, thereby ensuring minimal interruption of service during the construction of the Proposed Project.

The first replacement buildings on each Project Site, namely Fulton 1 and Elliott-Chelsea 1, once completed, will accommodate all 120 temporarily relocated households. In addition, Fulton 1 and Elliott-Chelsea 1 would house all programming originally housed within the Elliott Center, as well as all existing Hudson Guild programming on the Project Sites.

Any relocations of residents or businesses will be governed by requirements of applicable statutes and regulations. These include but are not limited to: the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (URA), and implementing regulations at 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 24, Notice H 2016-17; Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) 2016-17, as amended, and the corresponding HUD Notice H-2019-09 PIH 2019-2023 (HA) REV-4 (September 5, 2019) as may be further amended from time to time (RAD Fair Housing, Civil Rights, and Relocation Notice); HUD Notice PIH-2024-40 (HA), Demolition and/or Disposition of Public Housing Property, Eligibility for Tenant-Protection Vouchers, and Associated Requirements, (December 26, 2024) ; Section 18 of the US Housing Act of 1937, as amended and implementing regulation, 24 CFR part 970 (Section 18). A Temporary Relocation Plan for the 120 affected households and the Elliott Center will adhere to requirements of applicable statutes and regulations. As required by law, NYCHA and the PACT Partner will submit the Temporary Relocation Plan to HUD for its review and approval prior to construction of the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative

Under the Non-Rezoning Alternative, similar to the Preferred Alternative, all existing NYCHA DUs would be replaced by Section 8 PBV DUs in new buildings through the PACT Program and would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents. In addition, mixed income buildings would be constructed containing both market-rate and affordable housing DUs. The affordability requirements under the Non-Rezoning Alternative for the proposed affordable DUs in the mixed-income buildings would be defined and required through legal agreements between NYCHA and the PACT Partner. While the specific percentage of affordable units has not been finalized, the percentage share of the new DUs that the Preferred Alternative conservatively assumed to be affordable also applies to the Non-Rezoning Alternative (i.e., 30 percent). As a range of 20 to 30 percent of affordable housing DUs could be provided, the number of affordable housing DUs indicated represents an "up to" number. This alternative was considered throughout the EIS.

The Non-Rezoning Alternative would not require any changes to the Zoning Map by the CPC pursuant to ULURP. It would utilize substantially all of the permitted floor area within the limits of the existing zoning in terms of permitted uses and building volumes. This alternative would be developed pursuant to zoning requirements for non-universal affordability preference (UAP) developments, which were in place prior to the adoption of the City of Yes for Housing Opportunity (COY) zoning text amendments, and which remain as an option for redevelopment of the Project Sites.

Development Program

The Non-Rezoning Alternative development program is presented in **Table 3a** for the Fulton Houses Project Site and in **Table 3b** for the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. **Table 3b** also includes a summary row showing the total program for both Project Sites.

The Non-Rezoning Alternative would include 17 new buildings ranging from 12 to 39 stories. For conservative analysis purposes, the EIS analyzed the tallest building heights (428.5 feet) as well as the largest bulk of the proposed buildings. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Net Increment of the Non-Rezoning Alternative

Table 4 identifies the net incremental changes to the Project Sites under the Non-Rezoning Alternative as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

Temporary Relocations

The Non-Rezoning Alternative is anticipated to require the same temporary relocations as described above for the Preferred Alternative.

Table 3a: Non-Rezoning Alternative, Fulton Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residental gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Fulton 1	Replacement	717	9 Av, 19 St	204	0	204	0	0	204	235,044	0	0	12,229	0	0	247,273	12	145.40
Fulton 2	Replacement	716	9 Av, 18 St, 19 St	212	0	212	0	0	212	180,170	0	7,400	0	0	0	187,570	20	236.00
Fulton 3	Replacement	715	9 Av, 17 St, 18 St	193	0	193	0	0	193	164,167	8,351	0	0	0	0	172,518	22	253.92
Fulton 4	Replacement	716	18 St, 19 St	179	0	179	0	0	179	152,026	0	0	1,980	3,206	2,500	159,712	18	215.67
Fulton 5	Replacement	715	17 St, 18 St	156	0	156	0	0	156	132,164	0	0	6,448	0	0	138,612	18	215.17
Fulton 6	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St	0	44	44	102	146	146	123,880	0	0	7,300	0	0	131,180	13	167.00
Fulton 7	New Mxd Inc	714	9 Av, 16 St, 17 St	0	121	121	282	403	403	342,329	11,911	0	8,469	0	0	362,709	23	265.75
Fulton 8	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St, 18 St	0	58	58	135	193	193	164,137	0	0	10,591	0	0	174,728	23	251.92
Fulton 9	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	35	35	80	115	115	97,780	0	0	4,850	0	0	102,630	15	187.67
Fulton 10	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	31	31	72	103	103	87,400	0	0	5,500	0	0	92,900	13	169.00
Fulton Subtotals																		
1 to 5	Replacements			944	0	944	0	0	944	863,571	8,351	7,400	20,657	3,206	2,500	905,685		
6 to 10	New Mxd Inc's			0	289	289	671	960	960	815,526	11,911	0	36,710	0	0	864147		
All Fulton Buildings				**944**	**289**	**1,233**	**671**	**960**	**1,904**	**1,679,097**	**20,262**	**7,400**	**57,367**	**3,206**	**2,500**	**1,769,832**		
Fulton Minimum Height																	12	145.40
Fulton Maximum Height																	23	265.75

Note:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 3b: Non-Rezoning Alternative, Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Elliott-Chelsea 1	Replacement	724	26 St, 27 Dr	452	0	452	0	0	452	453,291	0	0	49,770	7,266	0	510,327	39	428.50
Elliott-Chelsea 2	Replacement	724	10 Av, 26 St, 27 Dr	293	0	293	0	0	293	250,977	0	0	11,624	2,183	0	264,784	20	235.25
Elliott-Chelsea 3	Replacement	723	25 St, 26 St	175	0	175	0	0	175	150,371	0	0	10,649	0	9,546	170,566	17	208.00
Elliott-Chelsea 4	Replacement	723	25 St, 26 St	192	0	192	0	0	192	163,738	0	0	19,396	0	0	183,134	21	246.25
Elliott-Chelsea 5	New Mxd Inc	723	10 Av, 25 St, 26 St	0	89	89	206	295	295	250,342	0	0	8,840	0	0	259,182	21	247.17
Elliott-Chelsea 6	New Mxd Inc	723	25 St, 26 St	0	79	79	185	264	264	224,663	0	0	9,813	0	0	234,476	22	253.25
Elliott-Chelsea 7	New Mxd Inc	724	26 St, 27 Dr	0	79	79	185	264	264	224,438	0	0	7,548	0	0	231,986	21	252.92
Elliott-Chelsea subtotals																		
1 to 4	Replacements			1,112	0	1,112	0	0	1,112	1,018,377	0	0	91,439	9,449	9,546	1,128,811		
5 to 7	New Mxd Inc's			0	247	247	576	823	823	699,443	0	0	26,201	0	0	725,644		
All Elliott-Chelsea Buildings				**1,112**	**247**	**1,359**	**576**	**823**	**1,935**	**1,717,820**	**0**	**0**	**117,640**	**9,449**	**9,546**	**1,854,455**		
Elliott-Chelsea Minimum Height																	17	208.00
Elliott-Chelsea Maximum Height																	39	428.50
Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Totals				**2,056**	**536**	**2,592**	**1,247**	**1,783**	**3,839**	**3,396,917**	**20,262**	**7,400**	**175,007**	**12,655**	**12,046**	**3,624,287**		

Note:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 4: Non-Rezoning Alternative Compared to No-Action Alternative

Land Use	No-Action Alternative	Non-Rezoning Alternative	Increment
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	-2,056
Future Section 8 PBV DUs *	0	2,056	+2,056
Affordable DUs	0	536	+536
Market-Rate DUs	0	1,247	+1,247
Total DUs	**2,056**	**3,839**	**+1,783**
Community facility/Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	175,007	+118,148
Daycare gsf	10,300	12,655	+2,355
Medical Office Related Uses gsf	0	12,046	+12,046
Local Retail gsf	0	20,262	+20,262
Supermarket gsf	0	7,400	+7,400
Total Building Area gsf	1.9 million	3.6 million	+1.7 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	96	+1
Building height (maximum)	232’	428.5’	+196.5’
Building stories (maximum)	25	39	+14

Notes:

***** The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

The Midblock Bulk Alternative was developed in response to comments received on the DSOW. This alternative would have the same development program as the Preferred Alternative but would differ in terms of the arrangement of bulk (i.e., the geographic distribution of buildings, building heights and setbacks, and open areas) on the Fulton Houses Project Site. While both alternatives would result in new high-rise buildings, under the Preferred Alternative the tallest buildings would be located along 9th Avenue and under the Midblock Bulk Alternative the tallest buildings would be located in midblock areas. The arrangement of bulk on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site for the Midblock Bulk Alternative would be identical to the Preferred Alternative. This alternative was analyzed throughout the EIS.

To facilitate development of the Midblock Bulk Alternative, NYCHA and the PACT Partner would seek the same discretionary land use approvals from the City of New York as those anticipated for the Preferred Alternative.

Under the Midblock Bulk Alternative, the staged demolition and replacement of all existing buildings, DUs, and community facility spaces on the Project Sites would take place. All existing NYCHA DUs would be replaced by Section 8 PBV DUs in new buildings through the PACT Program and would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents. In addition, new mixed income buildings would be constructed containing both market-rate and affordable housing DUs. The new affordable housing units would be provided pursuant to MIH. As under the Preferred Alternative, the amount of affordable housing DUs to be provided is conservatively assumed to be 30 percent of the total new (incremental) residential floor area in the mixed-income buildings (see above discussion of the Preferred Alternative for more information). As a range of 20 to 30 percent

of affordable housing DUs could be provided, the number of affordable housing DUs indicated represents an "up to" number.

Development Program

The Midblock Bulk Alternative development program is presented in **Table 5a** for the Fulton Houses Project Site and in **Table 5b** for the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. **Table 5b** also includes a summary row showing the total program for the Project Sites.

The Midblock Bulk Alternative would consist of a total of 16 new buildings ranging from 12 to 39 stories. For conservative analysis purposes, the EIS analyzed the tallest building heights (428.5 feet) as well as the largest bulk of the proposed buildings. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Net Increment of the Midblock Bulk Alternative

Table 6 identifies the net incremental changes to the Project Sites under the Midblock Bulk Alternative as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

Temporary Relocations

The Midblock Bulk Alternative is anticipated to require the same temporary relocations as described above for the Preferred Alternative.

Table 5a: Midblock Bulk Alternative, Fulton Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Fulton 1	Replacement	717	9 Av, 19 St	204	0	204	0	0	204	235,044		0	12,229	0	0	247,273	12	145.40
Fulton 2	Replacement	716	9 Av, 18 St, 19 St	297	0	297	0	0	297	256,796	0	6,580	0	0	0	263,376	25	283.67
Fulton 3	Replacement	715	17 St	443	0	443	0	0	443	392,430	0	0	20,178	0	0	412,608	37	399.92
Fulton 4	New Mxd Inc	715	9 Av, 17 St, 18 St	0	87	87	204	291	291	247,350	8,311	0	0	0	0	255,661	25	281.00
Fulton 5	New Mxd Inc	714	9 Av, 16 St, 17 St	0	135	135	314	450	449	382,500	7,000	0	5,508	0	0	395,008	25	280.92
Fulton 6	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	83	83	191	273	274	232,050	0	0	4,109	0	0	236,159	23	262.33
Fulton 7	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St, 18 St	0	80	80	188	268	268	227,800	0	0	3,236	0	2,500	233,536	28	309.00
Fulton 8	New Mxd Inc	716	18 St, 19 St	0	76	76	178	254	254	215,900	0	0	0	9,770	0	225,670	27	301.25
Fulton 9	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St, 18 St	0	76	76	176	252	252	214,200	0	0	8,679	0	0	222,879	21	243.61
Fulton Subtotals																		
1 to 3	Replacements	-		944	0	944	0	0	944	884,270	0	6,580	32,407	0	0	923,257		
4 to 9	New Mxd Inc's	-		0	537	537	1,251	1,788	1,788	1,519,800	15,311	0	21,532	9,770	2,500	1,568,913		
All Fulton Buildings				**944**	**537**	**1,481**	**1,251**	**1,788**	**2,732**	**2,404,070**	**15,311**	**6,580**	**53,939**	**9,770**	**2,500**	**2,492,170**		
Fulton Minimum Height																	12	145.40
Fulton Maximum Height																	37	399.92

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 5b: Midblock Bulk Alternative, Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Elliott-Chelsea 1	Replacement	724	26 St, 27 Dr	452	0	452	0	0	452	453,291	0	0	49,770	7,266	0	510,327	39	428.50
Elliott-Chelsea 2	Replacement	724	10 Av, 26 St, 27 Dr	407	0	407	0	0	407	338,079	4,060	11,000	0	949	0	354,088	27	301.33
Elliott-Chelsea 3	Replacement	723	25 St, 26 St	253	0	253	0	0	253	214,945	0	0	6,648	0	11,285	232,878	22	257.33
Elliott-Chelsea 4	New Mxd Inc	723	10 Av, 25 St, 26 St	0	136	136	316	452	452	384,101	8,000	0	3,890	0	0	395,991	36	385.33
Elliott-Chelsea 5	New Mxd Inc	723	25 St, 26 St	0	98	98	228	326	326	276,755	0	0	8,400	0	0	285,155	28	312.33
Elliott-Chelsea 6	New Mxd Inc	723	26 St	0	127	127	295	422	422	358,471	0	0	10,200	0	0	368,671	32	346.33
Elliott-Chelsea 7	New Mxd Inc	724	26 St, 27 Dr	0	140	140	326	466	466	396,070	0	0	11,235	0	0	407,305	34	366.67
Elliott-Chelsea subtotals																		
1 to 3	Replacements			1,112	0	1,112	0	0	1,112	1,006,315	4,060	11,000	56,418	8,215	11,285	1,097,293		
4 to 7	New Mxd Inc's			0	501	501	1,165	1,666	1,666	1,415,397	8,000	0	33,725	0	0	1,457,122		
All Elliott-Chelsea Buildings				**1,112**	**501**	**1,613**	**1,165**	**1,666**	**2,778**	**2,421,712**	**12,060**	**11,000**	**90,143**	**8,215**	**11,285**	**2,554,415**		
Elliott-Chelsea Minimum Height																	22	257.33
Elliott-Chelsea Maximum Height																	39	428.50
Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Totals				**2,056**	**1,038**	**3,094**	**2,416**	**3,454**	**5,510**	**4,825,782**	**27,371**	**17,580**	**144,082**	**17,985**	**13,785**	**5,046,585**		

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 6: Midblock Bulk Alternative Compared to No-Action Alternative

Land Use	No-Action Alternative	Midblock Bulk Alt.	Increment
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	-2,056
Future Section 8 PBV DUs*	0	2,056	+2,056
MIH Affordable DUs	0	1,038	+1,038
Market-Rate DUs	0	2,416	+2,416
Total DUs	**2,056**	**5,510**	**+3,454**
Community facility/Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	144,082	+87,223
Daycare gsf	10,300	17,985	+7,685
Medical Office Related Uses gsf	0	13,785	+13,785
Local Retail gsf	0	27,371	+27,371
Supermarket gsf	0	17,580	+17,580
Total Building Area gsf	1.9 million	5.1 million	+3.2 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	96	+1
Building height (maximum)	232’	428.5’	+196.5’
Building stories (maximum)	25	39	+14

Notes:

* The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

Alternative 5 – Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative

NYCHA issued an RFP in April 2021 in response to the efforts of the Chelsea NYCHA Working Group (CNWG), which sought to systematically and effectively address the Project Sites’ capital needs. The RFP response was predicated on a February 2021 report of the CNWG, which estimated a $366 million total cost to repair the buildings and renovate the existing NYCHA DUs on the Project Sites. This total cost was derived from the 2017 NYCHA Physical Needs Assessment (PNA) for the Project Sites, as adjusted by the CNWG after thorough examination. The PNA involves assessing when in the next 20 years the physical assets that make up NYCHA’s buildings and campuses will require replacement or upgrade, and then estimating the costs for these renovations based on current market prices. This investigation and report is conducted by NYCHA approximately every five years as recommended by HUD.

Per the CNWG’s recommendations and consistent with the PACT Partner’s response to NYCHA’s 2021 RFP, the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative would include rehabilitation and renovation of the existing Project Sites’ buildings. The measures would include: comprehensive rehabilitation of apartment kitchens, bathrooms, and floors; building improvements consisting of mold, lead, and asbestos abatement and hazardous materials remediation, installation of new insulated roofs and high-efficiency windows, exterior repairs, emergency rooftop generators, and new lobbies, mailrooms, and laundry facilities; system upgrades or replacements including new hydronic boilers (for reliable heat and hot water), plumbing repairs, elevator replacement, and enhanced security with access controls, foot patrols, and cameras; site and grounds improvements including an art walk with improved landscaping and integrated pest management; enhanced building staffing including live in superintendents and responsive property management; and dry floodproofing and storm gates.

Subsequent to the RFP process and NYCHA's designation of the PACT Partner, the PACT Partner conducted a comprehensive, five-month, pre-design due diligence process revealing significant, previously unanticipated capital repair needs on the Project Sites that would render this alternative financially infeasible. Additionally, deficiencies of the existing buildings cannot be corrected fully with renovations and can only be fully remedied with new buildings. In addition, NYCHA's most recent PNA released in 2023 estimated that the 20-year need across the Project Sites was approximately $927,509,823 (see **Table 7**).

Table 7: 2023 Physical Needs Assessment Renovation Cost Estimate

Development	Cost
Chelsea	$178,933,772
Chelsea Addition	$47,501,323
Elliott	$255,225,394
Fulton	$445,849,334
Total	**$927,509,823**

Source: https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nycha/downloads/pdf/2023-PNA-Report-Physical-Needs-Assessment-NYCHA.pdf

Development Program

Under the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative, all of the existing NYCHA DUs on the Project Sites would be renovated and converted to Section 8 PBV DUs, and three new buildings would be constructed on the Project Sites.

A new 24-story, 240-foot-tall (approximately 148,050-gsf) residential building would be constructed on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site with 110 DUs, of which 50 percent (55 DUs) would be market-rate units; the remaining 50 percent (55 DUs) would be affordable housing units at various income bands including extremely low, low, moderate, and middle. These would include 25 extremely low-income to low-income units at or below 60 percent of area median income (AMI) and 30 mid- to moderate-income units at or below 165 percent of AMI. The existing Hudson Guild spaces on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site would be relocated to this new building, offering the same services that currently exist on the site. The remainder of the new building's podium would be occupied by accessory residential space.

The Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative would also include the conversion of the existing community facility space on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site (at 459 W. 26th Street) to a 10,030-gsf health care center, as well as construction of two new, one-story infill buildings along 9th Avenue with a total of 7,150 gsf of retail space.

This alternative would be as-of-right under zoning and as such would not require any changes to the Zoning Map.

Net Increment of the Rehabilitation & Infill Alternative

Table 8 identifies the net incremental changes to the Project Sites under the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

Table 8: Incremental Development in the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative

Land Use	No-Action Alternative	Rehab. & Infill Alt.	Increment
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	-2,056
Future Section 8 PBV DUs (conversion of existing NYCHA DUs)*	0	2,056	+2,056
Affordable DUs (Middle, Moderate, Low, and Extremely Low Income)	0	55	+55
Market-Rate DUs	0	55	+55
Total DUs	**2,056**	**2,166**	**+110**
Community facility/Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	56,859	0
Daycare gsf	10,300	10,300	0
Medical Office gsf	0	10,030	+10,030
Local Retail(gsf	0	7,150	+7,150
Supermarket gsf	0	0	0
Total Building Area gsf	1.9 million	2.1 million	+0.2 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	95	0
Building height (maximum)	232’	240’	+8’
Building stories (maximum)	25	25	0

Note:

* The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

Temporary Relocations

The Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative would require staggered temporary relocation of all residents and services due to the renovation of existing apartments and community facility uses that would proceed on a rolling basis. Each resident and service on the Project Sites would need to be temporarily relocated for at least three months as their unit is renovated, while lead abatement would be performed and the electrical and plumbing systems would be improved. The Elliott Center community facility operated by Hudson Guild, which would be demolished and replaced by a new facility, is anticipated to require the same temporary relocation as described above for the Preferred Alternative.

Alternative 6 – No Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative

For projects in New York City that are expected to result in significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated, it is often the practice to determine if a No Significant Adverse Impact Alternative or a No Significant Adverse Unmitigated Impacts Alternative can be identified. This alternative identifies which specific components of a proposed project could be changed to avoid all significant adverse impacts associated with the project and would reasonably satisfy the project’s purpose and need. The No Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative is infeasible because the Proposed Project would have to be modified to a point where its purpose and need would not be satisfied. Therefore, a No Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative was not analyzed in the EIS.

Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

Following the publication of the DEIS, the PACT Partner confirmed that a COY Alternative developed pursuant to recently adopted COY zoning text amendments may be feasible for the Project Sites, though it is not the Preferred Alternative. This alternative would utilize the as-of-right UAP zoning rules, which allow increased residential maximum floor area ratios (FARs) and apply different bulk regulations as compared to residential or mixed-use buildings with "standard residences" as defined in the amended Zoning Resolution when certain amounts of affordable housing is provided in accordance with the new provisions of the Zoning Resolution enacted via COY.

Under the COY Alternative, similar to the Preferred Alternative, Non-Rezoning Alternative, and Midblock Bulk Alternative, all existing NYCHA DUs would be replaced by Section 8 PBV DUs in new buildings through the PACT Program and would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents. In addition, the new buildings constructed under the COY Alternative would provide a mix of market rate and affordable housing units; the provision of affordable housing would be defined and required through legal agreements between NYCHA and the PACT Partner and also in compliance with UAP zoning requirements. The assumption of the percentage share of the new DUs that would be affordable under the Preferred Alternative, Non-Rezoning Alternative, and Midblock Bulk Alternative also applies to the COY Alternative (i.e., 30 percent). As a range of 20 to 30 percent of affordable housing DUs could be provided, the number of affordable housing DUs indicated represents an "up to" number. This alternative was considered throughout the EIS.

As with the Non-Rezoning Alternative, the COY Alternative would utilize substantially all of the permitted floor area within the limits of the existing zoning under UAP zoning rules. The potential need for an MZO to facilitate the build out of the COY Alternative to, for example, address non-compliant interim conditions on the Project Sites due to the phasing of development is indicated as a potential approval for this alternative, but based on the current COY Alternative's development scheme, is not currently anticipated to be utilized.

Development Program

The COY Alternative development program is presented in **Table 9a** for the Fulton Houses Project Site and in **Table 9b** for the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. **Table 9b** also includes a summary row showing the total program for both Project Sites.

The COY Alternative would include 19 new buildings ranging from 12 to 39 stories. For conservative analysis purposes, the EIS analyzed the tallest building heights (428.5 feet) as well as the largest bulk of the proposed buildings. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Net Increment of the COY Alternative

Table 10 identifies the net incremental changes to the Project Sites under the COY Alternative as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

Temporary Relocations

The COY Alternative is anticipated to require the same temporary relocations as the Preferred Alternative. Please see that text for information on how temporary relocations will be addressed.

Table 9a: COY Alternative, Fulton Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Fulton 1	Replacement	717	9 Av, 19 St	204	0	204	0	0	204	235,044	0	0	12,229	0	0	247,273	12	145.40
Fulton 2	Replacement	716	9 Av, 18 St, 19 St	261	0	261	0	0	261	240,332	0	7,400	0	0	0	247,732	16	197.00
Fulton 3	Replacement	715	9 Av, 17 St, 18 St	309	0	309	0	0	309	262,444	6,000	0	3,500	3,600	0	275,544	**16**	198.67
Fulton 4	Replacement	715	17 St	170	0	170	0	0	170	163,697	0	0	3,745	0	0	167,442	**14**	178.33
Fulton 5	New Mxd Inc	715	17 St	0	49	49	115	164	164	139,638	0	0	2,000	0	0	141,638	**17**	206.33
Fulton 6	New Mxd Inc	715	18 St	0	65	65	152	217	217	184,800	0	0	6,690	0	0	191,490	**19**	225.00
Fulton 7	New Mxd Inc	716	18 St	0	32	32	74	106	106	90,182	0	0	0	0	0	90,182	**16**	197.00
Fulton 8	New Mxd Inc	716	19 St	0	59	59	138	197	197	167,160	0	0	2,116	0	2,500	171,776	**18**	215.67
Fulton 9	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	34	34	80	114	114	97,118	0	0	3,700	0	0	100,818	**14**	178.33
Fulton 10	New Mxd Inc	714	17 St	0	55	55	127	182	182	154,860	0	0	3,000	0	0	157,860	**18**	215.67
Fulton 11	New Mxd Inc	714	16 St	0	61	61	142	203	203	172,300	0	0	3,000	0	0	175,300	**20**	234.33
Fulton 12	New Mxd Inc	714	9 Av, 16 St, 17 St	0	98	98	228	326	326	276,766	10,317	0	9,399	0	0	296,482	**16**	197.00
Fulton Subtotals																		
1 to 4	Replacements	-		944	0	944	0	0	944	901,517	6,000	7,400	19,474	3,600	0	937,991		
5 to 12	New Mxd Inc's	-		0	453	453	1,056	1,509	1,509	1,282,824	10,317	0	29,905	0	2,500	1,325,546		
All Fulton Buildings				**944**	**453**	**1,397**	**1,056**	**1,509**	**2,453**	**2,184,341**	**16,317**	**7,400**	**49,379**	**3,600**	**2,500**	**2,263,537**		
Fulton Minimum Height																	12	145.40
Fulton Maximum Height																	20	234.33

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads.

Table 9b: COY Alternative, Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site

				Dwelling Units						Gross Square Feet (GSF)							Height (max. building envelope)	
										Residential	Commercial		Community Facility					
Name / No.	Type	Block	Location	Section 8 PBV DUs*	Mix Inc Bldg Affordable DUs	Subtotal, All Affordable DUs	Mix Inc Bldg Market Rate DUs	Mix Inc Bldg All DUs	Total, All DUs	Residential gsf	Local retail gsf	Supermarket gsf	Neighborhood center gsf	Daycare gsf	Medical office related uses gsf	Total gsf	Stories	Feet
Elliott-Chelsea 1	Replacement	724	26 St, 27 Dr	452	0	452	0	0	452	453,291	0	0	49,770	7,266	0	510,327	**39**	428.50
Elliott-Chelsea 2	Replacement	724	10 Av, 26 St, 27 Dr	415	0	415	0	0	415	408,051	0	0	9,500	0	9,400	426,951	**19**	226.67
Elliott-Chelsea 3	Replacement	723	25 St	245	0	245	0	0	245	241,461	0	0	5,615	0	0	247,076	**22**	254.83
Elliott-Chelsea 4	New Mxd Inc	723	10 Av, 25 St, 26 St	0	112	112	262	374	374	317,790	0	0	14,500	0	0	332,290	**17**	208.00
Elliott-Chelsea 5	New Mxd Inc	723	25 St	0	83	83	195	278	278	236,200	0	0	5,500	0	0	241,700	**20**	237.67
Elliott-Chelsea 6	New Mxd Inc	723	26 St	0	83	83	195	278	278	236,200	0	0	5,500	0	0	241,700	**20**	237.67
Elliott-Chelsea 7	New Mxd Inc	724	26 St, 27 Dr	0	78	78	181	259	259	219,915	0	0	8,000	0	0	227,915	**18**	226.67
Elliott-Chelsea subtotals																		
1 to 3	Replacements			1,112	0	1,112	0	0	1,112	1,102,803	0	0	64,885	7,266	9,400	1,184,354		
4 to 7	New Mxd Inc's			0	356	356	833	1,189	1,189	1,010,105	0	0	33,500	0	0	1,043,605		
All Elliott-Chelsea Buildings				**1,112**	**356**	**1,468**	**833**	**1,189**	**2,301**	**2,112,908**	**0**	**0**	**98,385**	**7,266**	**9,400**	**2,227,959**		
Elliott-Chelsea Minimum Height																	17	208.00
Elliott-Chelsea Maximum Height																	39	428.50
Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Totals				**2,056**	**809**	**2,865**	**1,889**	**2,698**	**4,754**	**4,297,249**	**16,317**	**7,400**	**147,764**	**10,866**	**11,900**	**4,491,496**		

Notes:

* Section 8 PBV DUs reserved for existing NYCHA FEC residents. All heights indicated for new buildings are for the maximum building envelope, including up to 40 feet of rooftop mechanical bulkheads

Table 10: COY Alternative Compared to No-Action Alternative

Land Use	No-Action Alternative	COY Alternative	Increment
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	-2,056
Future Section 8 PBV DUs*	0	2,056	+2,056
Affordable DUs	0	809	+809
Market-Rate DUs	0	1,889	+1,889
Total DUs	**2,056**	**4,754**	**+2,698**
Community facility/ Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	147,764	+90,905
Daycare gsf	10,300	10,866	+566
Medical Office Related Uses gsf	0	11,900	+11,900
Local Retail gsf	0	16,317	+16,317
Supermarket gsf	0	7,400	+7,400
Total Building Area gsf	1.9 million	4.5 million	+2.6 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	96	+1
Building height (maximum)	232’	428.5’	+196.5’
Building stories (maximum)	25	39	+14

Notes:

***** The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

Summary of Analyzed Alternatives

Table 11 provides a summary of the development program and key building bulk characteristics for the No-Action Alternative, Preferred Alternative, Non-Rezoning Alternative, Midblock Bulk Alternative, Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative, and COY Alternative. This table identifies the full development program associated with each of these alternatives. The table also identifies whether each alternative requires a change to the underlying zoning, whether each alternative satisfies the purpose and need for the Proposed Project, and whether each alternative has been determined to be feasible. Additionally, the table identifies the total project area (i.e., the geographic area affected) for each alternative.

As shown in the table, the development program is identical for the Preferred Alternative and the Midblock Bulk Alternative. The development program for the Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in less new residential development than the Preferred Alternative and the Midblock Bulk Alternative. The development program for the COY Alternative would result in a density of development between the higher density Preferred/Midblock Bulk Alternatives and the lower density Non-Rezoning Alternative. All four of these alternatives have been determined to be feasible and would satisfy the purpose and need for the Proposed Project to greater or lesser degrees.

Table 11: Summary of Analyzed Alternatives[1]

Land Use	Alternative 1 No-Action Alternative	Alternative 2 Preferred Alternative	Alternative 3 Non-Rezoning Alternative	Alternative 4 Midblock Bulk Alternative	Alternative 5 Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative	Alternative 7 COY Alternative
Existing NYCHA DUs	2,056	0	0	0	0	0
Future Section 8 PBV DUs [2]	0	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
MIH Affordable DUs[3]	0	1,038	536	1,038	55	809
Market-Rate DUs	0	2,416	1,247	2,416	55	1,889
Total DUs	**2,056**	**5,510**	**3,839**	**5,510**	**2,166**	**4,754**
Community facility/Neighborhood Center gsf	56,859	144,082	175,007	144,082	56,859	147,764
Daycare gsf	10,300	17,985	12,655	17,985	10,300	10,866
Medical Office Related Uses gsf	0	13,785	12,046	13,785	10,030	11,900
Local Retail gsf	0	27,371	20,262	27,371	7,150	16,317
Supermarket gsf	0	17,580	7,400	17,580	0	7,400
Total Building Area sf	1.9 million	5.1 million	3.6 million	5.1 million	2.1 million	4.5 million
Accessory Parking Spaces	95	96	96	96	96	96
Building height (maximum)	232’	428.5’	428.5’	428.5’	240’	428.5’
Building stories (maximum)	25	39	39	39	24	39
Project Area[4]	Project Sites	Project Sites	Project Sites	Project Sites	Project Sites	Project Sites
Requires a Rezoning?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Meets Project Purpose and Need?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Feasible?	Not applicable[5]	Feasible	Feasible	Feasible	Infeasible	Feasible

Notes:

[1] The development program indicated for each alternative is the full program under “With-Action” conditions, not the increment as compared to the No-Action Alternative.

[2] The Section 8 PBV DUs would be set aside for existing NYCHA residents and would replace the existing NYCHA DUs that would remain under the No-Action Alternative. As such, while the classification of these DUs would change, the population served and number of units would be the same as under the No-Action Alternative.

[3] The affordability requirements under the Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative for the proposed affordable housing units in the mixed-income buildings would be defined and ensured through legal agreements between NYCHA and the PACT Partner. The COY Alternative also would comply with UAP.

[4] The development boundary is the same for all alternatives and consists of the Project Sites.

[5] Feasibility determinations are not made for a No-Action Alternative.

E. PROCESS, COORDINATION, AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Project stakeholders have been engaged in an ongoing dialogue regarding project goals, defining project alternatives, and assessing the potential adverse environmental effects of these alternatives. These process, coordination, and public participation efforts began in 2019 and are continuing in coordination with the environmental review to inform interested parties of the progress of the project and to encourage agency, community, and public involvement in the decision-making process. To date, HPD, NYCHA, and the PACT Partner have conducted more than 100 outreach events tailored specifically to residents of FEC, other interested members of the public, elected officials, community groups, and public agencies. These efforts inform and involve these groups and individuals at various points in the project lifecycle by presenting project information, providing updates, and obtaining feedback.

The agency coordination and public involvement program has also included specific steps to comply with NEPA.

Environmental Review Process

The environmental review process provides decision-makers with the necessary information to systematically consider the Proposed Project's potential adverse environmental effects. This includes evaluating the potential significant adverse environmental effects from reasonable alternatives, and identifying and mitigating, where practicable, the effects identified as part of this process. The development and evaluation of project alternatives is central to the environmental review process. HPD, as NEPA Responsible Entity for HUD and joint-lead agency, and NYCHA, serving as local project sponsor and joint-lead agency, determined that the Proposed Project had the potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare an EIS was issued and published in the *Federal Register* on Monday, January 8, 2024.[5] In addition, HPD and NYCHA prepared a DSOW to describe the proposed content of the DEIS, explain the methodologies to be used in the impact analyses, and allow for public and stakeholder participation.

The DSOW was published in the *Federal Register* online[6] on Monday, January 8, 2024, and information on its availability was included in the aforementioned NOI and in a Notice of Availability (NOA) of Draft Scope and Public Scoping Session published in the New York State *Environmental Notice Bulletin* on Wednesday, January 10, 2024.[7] Public scoping meetings at which oral statements could be provided were held in-person and online on Thursday, February 1, Monday, February 5, and Wednesday, February 7, 2024, and a public scoping comment period remained open for written statements from Monday, January 8, 2024 until Friday March 8, 2024.

The DEIS was based upon the FSOW, which was issued on Friday, March 28, 2025 and is available at https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page and

[5] https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/01/08/2024-00090/notice-of-intent-to-prepare-an-environmental-impact-statement-for-the-fulton-elliott-chelsea-houses.
[6] https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page.
[7] https://dec.ny.gov/news/environmental-notice-bulletin/2024-01-10/seqr/manhattan-fulton-elliott-chelsea-houses-redevelopment-project.

https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page. The analysis contained in the DEIS and subsequently in the FEIS serve to fulfill the requirements of NEPA, SEQRA and CEQR.

An NOA for the DEIS was issued online at https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page, https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page, and https://cdxapps.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-II/public/action/eis/details?eisId=508181 on Friday, March 28, 2025. The public review period for the DEIS remained open until Monday, May 19, 2025. During this period, the public had the opportunity to comment on the DEIS in writing or orally at public hearings in-person and online on Wednesday, April 23, Thursday, April 24, and Thursday, May 8, 2025. The FEIS included a summary of the comments received on the DEIS, responses to all substantive comments, and any necessary revisions to the DEIS to address those comments.

Agency Involvement

Implementation of the Proposed Project will involve Federal, State, and possibly future local discretionary approvals as follows:

Federal

- HUD – Discretionary approval of disposition of public housing property as authorized under Section 18 of the US Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and under implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 970 and by the RAD Program created by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012, as amended, for the conversion of subsidies under Section 9 of the US Housing Act of 1937 (42 USC 1437g) to PBVs subsidies under Section 8 of the US Housing Act of 1937 (42 USC 1437f). Also potential financing approvals. Pursuant to 24 CFR part 58 (Environmental Review Procedures for Entities assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities), HPD is serving as HUD's Responsible Entity for the environmental review of the Proposed Project.

State of New York

- NYCHA – Under its PACT program, NYCHA would enter into 99-year ground leases with the PACT Partner for the Project Sites. This requires discretionary approval by the NYCHA Board. NYCHA also serves as local project sponsor and joint-lead agency under NEPA for the environmental review of the Proposed Project.
- New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (HCR) – Potential financing approvals.
- New York State Housing Finance Agency (HFA) – Potential financing approvals.
- New York City Housing Development Corporation (NYCHDC)[8] – Advisory agency for review for project activities related to affordable housing. In addition, potential financing approvals.

[8] NYCHDC is a New York State public benefit corporation.

City of New York

- City Planning Commission (CPC) – Future review and approval of actions subject to ULURP for the Preferred Alternative or the Midblock Bulk Alternative if selected for implementation of the Proposed Project.
- HPD – Potential financing approvals.

In addition, the following Federal, State, and City agencies have been consulted in preparation of the EIS:

- US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) – Consultation via USFWS' Information, Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Project on federally listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species or critical habitats on which such species depend for survival.
- US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – Advisory agency[9] for review of project activities related to Environmental Justice.
- New York State Department of State (NYSDOS) – Advisory agency for review of Coastal Zone Consistency.
- MTA, New York City Transit – Advisory agency for review of project activities related to public transportation.
- New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) – Reviewing agency, in its capacity as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), of Federal review process pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 with respect to designated and protected properties on the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR) and properties determined eligible for such listings.
- New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) – Review of Coastal Zone Consistency, and advisory agency for project activities related to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; urban design and visual resources; and shadows.
- New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) – Advisory agency for project activities related to hazardous materials, natural resources, water and sewer infrastructure, air quality, and noise.
- New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) – Advisory agency for project activities related to open spaces and shadows.
- New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) – Advisory agency for project activities related to solid waste and sanitation services.
- New York City Department of Transportation (DOT) – Advisory agency for project activities related to transportation, particularly traffic, parking, and pedestrian conditions.
- New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) – Advisory agency for project activities related to historic and cultural resources, including sites of architectural or archaeological value.

[9] The term "advisory agency" is used here in the same sense as the term "interested agency" under SEQRA and CEQR, which are defined in 6 NYCRR 617.2(u), and the *CTM*, respectively, as agencies that lack the jurisdiction to fund, approve, or directly undertake an action but wish to participate in the environmental review because of special concerns or expertise.

- New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination (MOEC) – Advisory agency for project activities related to energy and greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.
- New York Public Library (NYPL) – Advisory agency for project activities related to public libraries.
- New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) – Advisory agency for activities related to public schools and publicly funded child care.

Public Participation

Prior to and continuing concurrently with agency coordination and consultation summarized above, the Proposed Project and its development alternatives were determined through an extensive public engagement process conducted beginning in 2019 and is currently ongoing, including consultations with NYCHA residents, elected officials, community representatives, and housing organizations and advocates.

Community Engagement: Meetings

A number of community engagement meetings have occurred since the PACT Partner was identified in 2021. These included Tenant Association Leaders meetings, briefings with local elected officials, FEC Resident meetings, workforce training fairs, resident tours, Community Board 4 meetings, and other community events. These meetings are in addition to public involvement specifically mandated for the environmental review process.

Community Engagement: Communication Media

In addition to meetings, information about the Proposed Project has been provided to the community through a variety of communication methods, including:

- **Flyers** – Flyers with information on the process for identifying the Proposed Project were posted in all buildings and distributed to all households in the Project Sites. All outreach materials were available in English, Spanish, Russian, and Traditional and Simplified Chinese.
- **Websites** – The project's website, https://www.fultonelliottchelsea.com, contains project information, published documents, public meeting notes, and contact information. This website also keeps the public notified about upcoming public meetings and functions as the main resource for public information about the project, as well as the primary means for the public to contact the project team. In addition, NYCHA's website includes a webpage for the Proposed Project, https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page, which contains information about the project and its planning as well as information about the environmental review process and related documents. HPD's environmental review webpage includes the EIS documents: https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page.
- **Resident Rights & Protections FAQ** – As part of the process of informing residents about changes to the Project Sites that would occur under the Proposed Project, this document was distributed to all FEC households on August 25, 2023.

Public Scoping and Review of the DEIS

The DSOW, issued on Monday, January 8, 2024, included information on a public comment period during which HPD and NYCHA would accept public comments on the Proposed Project, the alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS, and the DSOW. The DSOW explained that at the end of the comment period, HPD and NYCHA would collect, review, and summarize the written and verbal comments received and prepare an FSOW. The public notice for the scoping hearings was published in newspapers of general circulation in English, Spanish, Russian, Traditional Chinese, and Simplified Chinese. These included: in English in amNewYork Metro, the local and regional paper, on Wednesday, January 10, 2024; in Spanish in El Diario, a Spanish language publication, on Tuesday, January 9, 2024; in Simplified Chinese and in Traditional Chinese in World Journal, a Chinese language publication, on Sunday, January 28, 2024; and in Russian in Forum Daily, a Russian language publication, on Wednesday, January 10, 2024. The notice also included the contact information for HPD and the locations where the DSOW, containing a full description of the Proposed Project, could be reviewed. The DSOW was also published online on a NYCHA-hosted webpage.[10] Additionally, noticing of the DSOW and public meetings was also posted in the New York State *Environmental Notice Bulletin* on Wednesday, January 10, 2024, as well as on New York City's NYC Engage website prior to the public meetings.

The public comment period included three public scoping meetings at which the public was invited to provide oral and written statements. The first meeting was held on Thursday, February 1, 2024, at the Fulton Community Center, 119 9th Avenue, New York, NY. The second meeting was held online (via Zoom) on Monday, February 5, 2024. The third meeting was held on Wednesday, February 7, 2024, at the Elliott Center, 441 W. 26th Street. Simultaneous interpretation services were provided at the three public scoping hearings in Spanish, Russian, Cantonese, Mandarin, and American Sign Language. Approximately 96 people attended the in-person public hearing at the Fulton Community Center; approximately 134 people attended the virtual hearing; and approximately 95 people attended the in-person public hearing at the Elliott Center, including residents, representatives of local officials and community groups, and other interested members of the public.

Originally, as announced in the DSOW, the public comment period was to remain open for the submission of written comments until 10 days after the final public scoping meeting. However, this was subsequently extended, pursuant to public notice, until Friday, March 8, 2024. Both the holding of three public scoping meetings and the extension of the public scoping comment period exceeded the minimum requirements and customary practice.

In total, 117 individuals and organizations provided statements throughout the public comment period, with 63 written submissions and 63 individuals making oral statements at the public hearings (some commenters provided both types of statements), including approximately 350 distinct comments. Responses to all public comments can be found in the FSOW, which was issued on Friday, March 28, 2025.

The DEIS was made available for public review and comment on Friday, March 28, 2025.

[10] New York City Housing Authority. "Fulton & Elliott-Chelsea Houses." NYCHA. https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page.

A copy of the DEIS was available online, initiating the public comment period, at NYCHA's project website: https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page; HPD's Environmental Review webpage: https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page; and EPA's website: https://cdxapps.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-II/public/action/eis/details?eisId=508181.

Three public hearings were held to solicit public comments on the DEIS, including two in-person and one online.

The first meeting was held on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, at the Hudson Guild Fulton Community Center, 119 9th Avenue, New York, NY. The second meeting was held on Thursday, April 24, 2025, at the Elliott Center, 441 W. 26th Street. The third meeting was held online (via Zoom) on Thursday, May 8, 2025. Simultaneous interpretation services were provided at the three public meetings in Spanish, Russian, Cantonese, Mandarin, and American Sign Language. There were approximately 136 attendees at the in-person public meeting at the Fulton Community Center; approximately 135 attendees at the in-person public meeting at the Elliott Center; and approximately 217 attendees at the online meeting; attendees including residents, representatives of local officials and community groups, and other interested members of the public. Information regarding these public meetings was announced and public notices were published on the HPD's environmental review website, in the Federal Register, and in the New York State Environmental Notice Bulletin. A Notice of Availability of the DEIS was published in the Federal Register on March 28, 2025. Notices of Acceptance of the DEIS and Public Hearings were published in the New York State Environmental Notice Bulletin on April 9 and April 30.[11]

The registration instructions were available on NYCHA's project website a minimum of two weeks prior to each public hearing.

Besides oral statements at the DEIS public meetings, written comments on the DEIS were also accepted electronically via email to: nepa_env@hpd.nyc.gov or by mailing a letter to:

Department of Housing Preservation Attn: Anthony Howard
100 Gold Street, #7-A3
New York, NY 10038

Comments on the DEIS were accepted for a period of 52 days from the publication date through Monday, May 19, 2025.

In total, 800 individuals and organizations provided statements throughout the public comment period, with 394 written submissions, inclusive of petitions and correspondence with signatures or submissions by additional individuals, and 84 individuals making oral statements at the public scoping meetings (some commenters provided both types of statements and some commenters provided more than one oral statement), including approximately 238 distinct comments.

[11] The online (Zoom) public hearing was originally scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 2025. Due to a nation-wide Zoom outage that day, that hearing was re-scheduled and held as indicated above. Related to this, the public comment period, originally scheduled to end on Monday, May 12, was extended by one week to Monday, May 19, 2025.

As with the public scoping comment period, the holding of three public meetings and the extension of the public scoping comment period exceeded the minimum requirements and customary practice.

HPD and NYCHA reviewed and considered the oral and written comments before issuing the FEIS, which includes responses to the comments received during the public review and comment period and includes any necessary revisions to the DEIS to address those comments.

The FEIS is available online at HPD's environmental review website: https://www.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page and at NYCHA's project website: https://www.nyc.gov/site/nycha/about/pact/chelsea-fulton.page and on EPA's EIS database: https://cdxapps.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-II/public/action/eis/search and can be found by searching "Fulton Elliott-Chelsea Redevelopment Project" in the Title search field.

F. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The purpose of an EIS is to ensure agencies consider the environmental impacts of actions in decision making. This is done through evaluating the short- and long-term effects, both beneficial and adverse, to the built and natural environment that would result both from the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project requires Federal and State approvals, and, if selected for implementation of the Proposed Project, the Preferred and Midblock Bulk Alternatives would additionally require City approvals. Accordingly, HPD and NYCHA, with the cooperation of involved and interested agencies at city, state, and federal levels, prepared the EIS in accordance with NEPA and the technical analyses required under SEQRA and CEQR.

Organization of the EIS

The EIS considered both the short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) effects of each alternative under consideration for implementation of the Proposed Project. These alternatives have been evaluated for potential adverse effects to the Project Sites and applicable study areas for all relevant potential environmental effect categories in accordance with NEPA, SEQRA, and CEQR.

Categories of Environmental Effects

As appropriate, the EIS provided technical analyses of various categories of environmental effects for the four alternatives that have been determined to be feasible. Also, the EIS provided an assessment of the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative for informational purposes. The EIS also considered the Proposed Project's indirect and cumulative effects and its irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.

The respective EIS chapter for each category discussed the existing conditions and identified the applicable study areas and conditions in the future for each evaluated alternative. The technical analysis identification of potential significant adverse effects focused on the incremental changes to the affected environment that would occur under the alternatives considered as compared with

the No-Action Alternative, subject to the guidance of the 2021 *City Environmental Quality Review Technical Manual* (*CTM),* which serves as the primary guidance issued by the City of New York for environmental reviews carried out in New York City and is a resource for public agencies, applicants, and the general public for completing and evaluating EISs and other required documents.

Project Sites

The Project Sites are located in the Chelsea neighborhood in Community District 4, Borough of Manhattan, New York City, New York.

As the Fulton Houses Project Site and the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site are separated by approximately a ¼-mile, they are described discretely.

Fulton Houses Project Site

Information about the Fulton Houses Project Site is summarized in **Table 12**. The western boundary of the Fulton Houses Project Site varies across the four blocks, from 330 feet west of 9th Avenue on the southern half of Block 716 to 575 feet west of 9th Avenue on the southern half of Block 715 (all these blocks are 800 feet long from 9th to 10th Avenues). The Fulton Houses Project Site is split into multiple zoning designations. The western portions of the complex on Blocks 714 and 715 are zoned C6-3 and are in the Special West Chelsea District (WCh). The eastern portion of the complex on Blocks 714 and 715 and all of the areas on Blocks 716 and 717 are zoned R8, with a C2-5 commercial overlay along 9th Avenue to a depth of 100 feet.

Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site

Information about the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site is summarized in **Table 13**. At its northern and northeastern limits, the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site includes W. 27th Drive, a narrow one-way driveway. W. 27th Drive extends northbound from W. 26th Street approximately 260 feet west of 9th Avenue for approximately 220 feet where it curves to the west and extends to the intersection of 10th Avenue and W. 27th Street. It is not a mapped street, though its westbound portion is located within the bed of a previously mapped segment of W. 27th Street, which was de-mapped in connection with the development of the public housing buildings. Although formally part of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site, W. 27th Drive physically separates the complex from two other publicly owned sites that are not included in the Proposed Project, PS 33 - Chelsea Prep and playground to the east, and Chelsea Park, a mapped park under the jurisdiction of NYC Parks, to the north. The eastern boundary of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site varies across the two blocks from 537.5 feet east of 10th Avenue on the southern part of Block 724 to 700 feet east of 10th Avenue on Block 723.

The Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site is zoned R8.

Table 12: Fulton Houses Project Site Existing Conditions

Block	Lot	Buildings	Zoning[1]	DUs	Lot Area (sf)	Building Area (gsf)	Name	Address(es) / Location	Stories	Height (ft)	Use / Active play areas	DUs	CF gsf	Parking Spaces
714	31	4	R8/C2-5; C6-3 (WCh)	327	80,408									
						47,656	Fulton 1	401, 413 W 16 St	7	62.5	Residential	36	-	-
						168,795	Fulton 2	418 W 17 St	25	218.5	Residential	219	-	-
						47,656	Fulton 3	400, 412 W 17 St	7	62.0	Residential	36	-	-
						47,656	Fulton 4	430, 434 W 17 St	7	63.5	Residential	36	-	-
								9 Av	-	-	Playground	-	-	-
								W 16 St	-	-	Parking	-	-	32
715	10	4	R8/C2-5; C6-3 (WCh)	290	89,700									
						47,656	Fulton 5	427, 431 W 17 St	7	62.5	Residential	36	-	-
						173,512	Fulton 6	419 W 17 St / 420 W 18 St	25	232.0	Residential	218	-	-
						62,290	Fulton 7	117, 119, 121 9 Av	7	62.0	Res., CF com. ctr.	36	14,634	-
							Fulton 12	432 W 18 St	1		Storage garage	-	-	-
								W 17 St	-	-	Playground	-	-	-
								W 18 St	-	-	Parking	-	-	40
716	17	3	R8/C2-5	291	62,560									
						47,656	Fulton 8	401, 411 W 18 St	7	62.0	Residential	36	-	-
						168,795	Fulton 9	420 W 19 St	25	218.5	Residential	219	-	-
						47,656	Fulton 10	400, 412 W 19 St	7	62.0	Residential	36	-	-
								W 18 St	-	-	Parking	-	-	14
								9 Av	-	-	Basketball court	-	-	-
								W 19 St	-	-	Playground	-	-	-
717	19	1	R8/C2-5	36	29,275									
						47,656	Fulton 11	401, 419 W 19 St	7	62.0	Residential	36	-	-
								W 19 St	-	-	Parking	-	-	9
								W 19 St & 9 Av	-	-	Playground	-	-	-
TOTAL		**12**		**944**	**261,943**	**906,984**						**944**	**14,634**	**95**

Notes:

[1] C2-5 overlay district along 9 av to a depth of 100' on Blocks 714 to 717

Abbreviations specific to this table: sf = square feet; ft = feet; CF = community facility

Table 13: Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site Existing Conditions

Block	Lot	Buildings	Zoning	DUs	Lot Area (sf)	Building Area (gsf)	Name	Address(es) / Location	Stories	Height (ft)	Use / Active play areas	DUs	CF gsf	Parking Spaces
723	1	2	R8	284	64,188									
						116,040	Elliott 2	264 10 Av / 466 W 26 St	11	98.5	Residential	142	-	0
						116,040	Elliott 3	443 W 25 St / 446 W 26 St	11	98.5	Residential	142	-	0
								W 25 St / W 26 St	-	-	Playground	-	-	-
723	15	3	R8	425	74,063									
						203,425	Chelsea 1	425 W 25 St / 428-430 W 26 St	21	187.0	Residential	202	-	0
						203,490	Chelsea 2	415 W 25 St / 420 W 26 St	21	184.0	Residential	223	-	0
								W 26 St	-		Storage garage	-	-	-
								W 25 St / W 26 St	-		Playgrounds	-	-	-
								W 26 St	-		Playground	-	-	-
724	1	2	R8	162	44,991									
						116,040	Elliott 1	450 W 27 Dr / 288 10 Av	12	107.0	Residential	162	-	0
						10,300	Children's Ctr	459 W 26 St	1+B	17.0	CF: daycare	-	10,300	-
724	10	2	R8	96	44,921									
						65,136	Chelsea Addition	436 W 27 Dr	14	125.0	Residential	96	-	0
						42,225	Elliott Ctr	441 W 26 St	2+B	20.0 [1]	Res., Cf: com. ctr.	-	42,225	-
								W 26 St			Playground	-		-
724	15	1	R8	145	50,468									
						116,040	Elliott 4	427 W 26 St / 426 W 27 Dr	12	107.0 [1]	Residential	145	-	
								W 26 St			Playground	-	-	-
TOTAL		**10**		**1,112**	**278,630**	**988,736**						**1,112**	**52,525**	0

Note:
[1] Estimated height

Analysis Year

The environmental setting for the technical analyses for the Proposed Project is not the current conditions, but the conditions as they would exist once construction is complete and the buildings are in operation. Therefore, future conditions in the absence of the Proposed Project are projected in order to compare potential impacts. This projection is made for a particular year, generally referred to under NEPA, SEQRA, and CEQR as the "analysis year" or "build year." For this analysis, it is expected that construction of the Proposed Project would be completed and the buildings would be in operation by 2041 for each of the analyzed development alternatives.

Study Areas

Study areas relevant to each analysis category are defined by the geographic areas with the potential to be affected by the Proposed Project and as informed by *CTM* guidance. The limits of study areas differ based on the nature of the analysis category. For example, the potential traffic effects of the Proposed Project would affect a different area than the potential school effects and therefore the respective study areas will be defined accordingly. Also, study area sizes are also based in part on the geographic coverage of data sources needed to establish an analysis framework. For example, the open space analysis requires population data from the US Census and therefore the open space secondary study area is defined in part by following census tract boundaries. Methodology to identify the study areas for each technical analysis area, as well as characteristics of these study areas, are described in the corresponding technical analysis area respective EIS chapter.

G. TECHNICAL AREAS

Table 14 summarizes the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project under the four feasible alternatives. Refer to **Section H, "Mitigation,"** for further details on mitigation measures for each impacted technical area. A summary of each technical area analyzed in the EIS is summarized below.

Table 14: Summary of Impacts

Technical Area	Alternative(s)[1]	Summary of Impact(s)	Impact Mitigated?	Mitigation Measure(s) if Applicable
Shadows	2, 3, 4, 7	Impacts on Chelsea Park & PS 33 Playground	Partial; would remain an unavoidable adverse impact (UAI)	Lighting improvements for Chelsea Park
Historic and Cultural Resources	2, 3, 4, 7	Demolition of S/NR-eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses	Partial; would remain an UAI	Various measures identified pursuant to Section 106 process
Transportation: Traffic	2, 4, 7	Up to 11 intersections in 1 or more peak hours	Partial: all impacts mitigated except at one or more lane groups in one or more peak hours at 2 intersections, which would remain an UAI	Modifications to signal phasing and/or timing
	3	8 intersections in 1 or more peak hours		
Transportation: Pedestrians	2, 4, 7	Up to 5 sidewalks & up to 2 crosswalks	Partial: impact mitigated at 1 sidewalk in the MD and PM peak hours & 1 crosswalk in the PM peak hour; others would remain UAI	Relocation of impediments to sidewalk flow and widening of crosswalk
	3	5 sidewalks	Partial: impact mitigated at 1 sidewalk in all peak hours; others would remain UAI	Relocation of impediments to sidewalk flow
Construction: Traffic	2, 4, 7	Up to 7 intersections in 1 or more peak hours	Partial: All impacts mitigated except at one lane group at 1 intersection in PM construction peak hour, which would remain an UAI	Modifications to signal phasing and/or timing and curbside parking regulations
	3	8 intersections in 1 or more peak hours	All impacts would be mitigated	
Construction: Pedestrians	2, 4, 7	Up to 3 sidewalks & up to 1 crosswalk	Partial: impact mitigated at 1 sidewalk in AM construction peak hour; others would remain UAI	Relocation of impediments to sidewalk flow
	3	2 sidewalks	Partial: impact mitigated at 1 sidewalk in both construction peak hours; other would remain UAI	Relocation of impediments to sidewalk flow
Construction: Noise	2, 3, 4, 7	Noise-sensitive receptors adjacent to the construction work areas under each alternative	Partial: would remain an UAI	Source and path controls beyond requirements of New York City regulations

Note:
[1] Alternative numbers: 2: Preferred Alternative; 3: Non-Rezoning Alternative; 4: Midblock Bulk Alternative; 7: City of Yes Alternative.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy, are anticipated as a result of the four feasible alternatives at the Project Sites (the primary study areas) or within a ¼-mile radius (secondary study area).

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative and Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

Both the Preferred Alternative and the Midblock Bulk Alternative would require a set of land use approvals under the City's ULURP through the NYC CPC and the City Council including zoning map and text amendments and a LSGD special permit. Pursuant to these approvals, several

changes to the Project Site not currently allowed as-of-right under zoning would be permitted. This would include the addition of commercial uses along the 10th Avenue corridor in the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site and in increases in residential density and modifications to height and setback. Apart from differences in the arrangement of building bulk on the Fulton Houses Project Site, these two alternatives would be identical in terms of development program, regarding the range of building heights, floor area allocation by use, completion year (2041), and in the types of approvals required to facilitate their implementation. Their effects on land use, zoning, and public policy also would be substantially similar. The increased density and taller maximum buildings heights would represent an increase over the No-Action Alternative, but would be within the range of the built environment of the surrounding area, reflecting its already heavily-developed character. The Preferred Alternative and Midblock Bulk Alternative would not directly displace any land uses in a manner that has a significant adverse effect on surrounding land uses, nor would it generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policies in the secondary study area. In addition, the Preferred Alternative and Midblock Bulk Alternative would promote the advancement of applicable policies, including NYC coastal zone policies, *NYCHA Sustainability Agenda*, *Housing Our Neighbors*, *OneNYC 2050*, and would not hinder any other public policies.

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative and Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

The Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative would not require changes to the Zoning Map and would be developed in accordance with underlying zoning regulations in terms of permitted uses, floor area ratio (FAR), building volumes, and all other zoning requirements. Furthermore, they would employ site and massing plans that would utilize substantially all the permitted floor area allowed for a non-UAP development that uses height factor regulations. The potential need for a MZO to facilitate the build out of the Non-Rezoning Alternative to, for example, address non-compliant interim conditions on the primary study areas, due to the staging of development, is indicated as a potential required approval although at this time an MZO is not anticipated. As compared to the No-Action Alternative, the Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative would result in increases in built residential density and building heights, but would be within the range of density and height of the already-built environment of the surrounding area, reflecting its heavily developed character. Like the Midblock Bulk Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, the Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative would include the addition of commercial uses on the Fulton Houses Project Site along the 9th Avenue corridor, where such uses are permitted by existing commercial overlay zoning. The Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative would not directly displace any land uses in a manner that has a significant adverse effect on surrounding land uses, nor would it generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policies in the secondary study area. In addition, the Non-Rezoning Alternative and COY Alternative would promote the advancement of applicable policies, including NYC coastal zone policies, *NYCHA Sustainability Agenda, Housing Our Neighbors*, *OneNYC 2050*, and would not hinder any other public policies.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Based on the initial screening assessment, the Proposed Project does not exceed the *CTM* thresholds warranting analyses of direct residential displacement, direct business displacement,

indirect business displacement, or adverse effects on specific industries. As the Proposed Project would exceed the *CTM* threshold warranting a preliminary indirect residential displacement analysis (increase of 200 DUs or more), an assessment of indirect residential displacement was undertaken. In addition, as the Proposed Project under the four feasible alternatives would result in the temporary relocation of up to 120 households and approximately 42,225 gsf of community facility space (the Elliott Center), an analysis of the temporary relocations of these residents and organization and associated workers was conducted.

In terms of their potential effects on socioeconomic conditions, the four feasible alternatives would all be similar. Under all four alternatives, existing residential and community facility uses on the Project Sites would be replaced. In addition, there would be additional residential and community facility uses, plus the introduction of commercial uses. The development program for the Preferred Alternative and the Midblock Bulk Alternative would be identical while the Non-Rezoning and COY Alternatives would result in a smaller increase in residential units and comparable increases in commercial and community facility uses.

None of these alternatives would result in significant adverse socioeconomic conditions impacts. Initial screening-level assessments of direct residential and direct business displacement, indirect business, and adverse effects of specific industries, and a preliminary assessment of indirect residential displacement were warranted and prepared in accordance with *CTM* guidance. These assessments determined that the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions under any of these development scenario alternatives.

Under the four feasible alternatives, all the existing NYCHA public housing units at the Project Sites would be replaced in new buildings with Section 8 PBV DUs set aside for existing NYCHA FEC residents. Additionally, all existing community facility spaces on the Project Sites would be replaced. All 157 existing employees of Hudson Guild, including 126 neighborhood center employees and 31 daycare (universal pre-k) employees are expected to be retained and existing programming/services would occupy the replacement community facility space on the Project Sites in the future with the Proposed Project.

Project construction staging is designed so that 94 percent of residents would not need to be relocated during construction of the new PBV units and would be able to move directly into their new units. Additionally, the community facility space at the Fulton Houses Project Site would also be completed prior to relocating so there would be no need to temporarily relocate this community facility. However, in the first stage of the project, prior to construction of the first two replacement buildings, up to approximately 6 percent or 120 households from two of the existing eighteen residential buildings would need to be relocated temporarily as the buildings housing them need to be vacated and demolished prior to construction of the replacement buildings under the four feasible alternatives. Additionally, the approximately 42,225-gsf Elliott Center would need to be relocated temporarily as the Elliott Center building at the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site would be vacated and demolished prior to construction of the replacement building under the four feasible alternatives.

Temporary Relocation Plans for the approximately 120 affected households and the Hudson Guild Elliott Center will adhere to requirements of applicable statutes and regulations, including but not limited to the URA its implementing regulations and all applicable State and local regulations.

NYCHA and the PACT Partner will submit the legally required Temporary Relocation Plan to HUD for review and approval prior to construction of the Proposed Project. The first stage of replacement buildings, once constructed, would accommodate all 120 affected households as well as all community facility programming originally housed within approximately 42,225 gsf Elliott Center and its associated workers. The residents of these 120 households that are temporarily moved will sign a temporary relocation agreement that guarantees their right to return to the Project Sites once their new home is complete and ensures tenants do not bear any of the costs associated with packing or moving. All temporarily relocated residents would be offered advisory and financial assistance to relocate. With these Temporary Relocation Plan measures in place, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse direct residential or institutional displacement.

The preliminary assessment determined that the Proposed Project under any of the four feasible alternatives would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement. The four feasible alternatives would introduce affordable or income-restricted housing and are expected to expand housing options available to a range of household income levels in the study area. These alternatives are each expected to introduce a residential population whose average income would be higher than the overall average household income in the ½-mile study area population.

The preliminary analysis for the Non-Rezoning Alternative, which would introduce 1,783 DUs (or approximately 3.1 percent population increase) as compared to the No-Action Alternative, and the COY Alternative, which would introduce 2,698 DUs (or approximately 4.65 percent population increase) as compared to the No-Action Alternative, determined that because the ½-mile study area's population would not increase by more than five percent, these alternatives would not introduce a substantial new population that could substantially affect residential real estate conditions in the study area, per *CTM* methodology.

The preliminary analysis for the Preferred and the Midblock Bulk Alternatives, which would increase the study area's population by more than five percent, determined that there is already a readily observable trend toward higher incomes and more costly housing throughout the ½-mile study area, and rents for market-rate housing are already above what is affordable to low- to middle-income households. This trend is expected to continue in the future without the Proposed Project. The Preferred Alternative/Midblock Bulk Alternative would increase the supply of market-rate housing but would also retain existing affordable housing on the Project Sites. Additionally, the Proposed Project would introduce additional permanently affordable housing that would otherwise not exist absent the Proposed Project. Under the Preferred Alternative/Midblock Bulk Alternative, approximately 2,763 market-rate DUs and approximately 691 affordable DUs. In this respect, the Proposed Project would serve to maintain and increase a study area housing stock that is affordable for households with a wider range of incomes as compared to the No-Action Alternative, in which projects in the area are expected to continue the trend towards market-rate development and rising residential rents in the study area. Therefore, according to *CTM* methodology, the Preferred Alternative/Midblock Bulk Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

Community Facilities and Services

Direct Effects

The Proposed Project would not directly displace any public schools, libraries, childcare facilities, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services, as there would be no temporary or permanent closure of any community facilities under the four feasible alternatives. However, under all four alternatives, one existing community facility, the Elliott Center, would need to be temporarily relocated to a nearby location before it is subsequently relocated to a permanent new location within the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site. The Hudson Guild Children's Center and Fulton Community Center, also currently located on site, would remain on site and in operation until the on-site replacement community facility and neighborhood center space is developed. Despite the temporary relocation of the Elliott Center to a nearby site, all three community facilities located on the Project Sites would remain operational throughout the construction process with only minimal disruptions. Therefore, there are no direct significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services under these four alternatives.

Indirect Effects

The four feasible alternatives would not result in a significant adverse impact on public schools, libraries, and childcare facilities. Further, the Proposed Project would not introduce a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before or affect the physical operations of police, fire protection and healthcare services.

Open Space

Direct Effects

The four alternatives would not result in any direct effects related to encroachments on or loss of public open space, or changes in open space such that it no longer serves the same user population. There are no anticipated direct effects related to operational air quality, operational noise, construction air quality, or construction noise on open space resources from these four alternatives. Although some of the private, accessory open spaces on the Project Sites would be temporarily closed or would be subject to temporary noise effects as project implementation advances, these temporary closures and construction noise effects would not constitute significant adverse impacts.

The four alternatives would result in significant adverse shadow impacts at Chelsea Park and PS 33 Playground. The direct shadows impacts on these two open space resources may affect the public's use or enjoyment of these resources. Partial mitigation on Chelsea Park has been identified (refer to **Section H**). However, no feasible mitigation measures that would fully mitigate the shadows on these open space resources have been identified. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would result in unavoidable significant adverse shadows impacts.

Indirect Effects

The Proposed Project would result in a percent change in open space ratio above the threshold signifying a possible adverse impact for total, active, and passive open space under the Preferred and Midblock Bulk Alternatives and for total and active open space under the Non-Rezoning and COY Alternatives. As noted in the *CTM*, before making a determination as to whether significant adverse indirect open space impacts would occur, qualitative considerations also should be considered and were considered in the EIS.

The Proposed Project would provide private, accessory open space to be utilized by the existing NYCHA residents and residents of the new incremental units in mixed income buildings. The open spaces planned for the Project Sites under all four alternatives would feature both active and passive amenities such as basketball courts, play areas, community gardens, shaded lounge areas, seating, and walkways. As shown in **Table 15**, each of the feasible alternatives would result in a decrease of the amount of existing accessory (i.e., private) open space on the Project Sites.

Table 15: Summary of Total Accessory Open Space on the Project Sites

	Existing Conditions (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Midblock Bulk Alternative (acres)	Non-Rezoning Alternative (acres)	COY Alternative (acres)
Fulton Houses Project Site	3.046	2.374	2.370	2.287	2.056
Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site	4.243	2.839	2.839	3.083	3.194
Project Sites	**7.289**	**5.213**	**5.209**	**5.369**	**5.250**

However, given the size of the open space, its close proximity to new buildings, the Proposed Project's improved connectivity between accessory spaces and the increase in accessory open space that is actually usable (up to 57 percent, depending on the alternative considered, compared to the 25 percent under existing conditions), and the high quality of newly reconstructed open space amenities and attendant facilities, it is expected that the population added as a result of the four alternatives would be likely to make substantial use of the Project Sites' accessory open space, despite the decrease. Moreover, rooftop terraces and indoor recreational spaces would be provided in all replacement buildings and would be accessible to each building's residents.

Given the anticipated demand change, the number, condition, and array of amenities of study area open spaces, the availability of open space resources not included in the quantitative analysis, and the fact that most of the study area is located within a Walk to a Park Service Area (WtPSA), as well as the improved accessory open space to be provided on the Project Sites, the Proposed Project under the four alternatives is not expected to significantly impact open space.

Shadows

The four feasible alternatives would result in significant shadows impacts on two open space resources: Chelsea Park and PS 33 Playground. As described in **Section H** lighting improvements have been identified as a practicable and feasible measure to partially mitigate shadows impacts to Chelsea Park resulting from the Proposed Project under the four alternatives. The mitigation measures will be obligations of the PACT Partner that will be memorialized in legally binding

documents. No additional measures were determined to be feasible, practicable, and effective to fully mitigate the predicted significant adverse shadows impacts to Chelsea Park and PS 33 Playground.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological resources are considered only in those areas where new excavation or ground disturbance is likely and would result in new in-ground disturbance as compared to No-Action conditions. Therefore, these areas are limited to the primary Areas of Potential Effects (APE)s—the Fulton Houses Project Site and the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site—that would be developed as a result of the Proposed Project. As determined by LPC and SHPO, none of the lots comprising the Project Sites have archaeological significance. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to result in any significant adverse archaeological impacts and an archaeological analysis is not warranted.

Architectural Resources

The Fulton Houses Project Site does not contain any designated or eligible historic architectural resources, but the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site is S/NR-eligible. Additionally, all or portions of 11 designated and/or eligible historic architectural resources are located within the secondary APEs. The four feasible alternatives would not result in significant adverse indirect or contextual impacts, shadows impacts, or construction-related impacts to historic resources.

However, the four feasible alternatives would all result in the staged demolition of the S/NR-eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses and the construction of new buildings on that Project Site. As such, the four alternatives would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the S/NR-eligible historic resource. The Section 106 Alternatives Analysis conducted for the Proposed Project considered alternatives to the demolition of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses with the goal of avoiding or minimizing the adverse effect, but concluded that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to the demolition of the S/NR-eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses in consideration of the Proposed Project's purpose and need. SHPO has concurred with this determination. The demolition of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses under the four feasible alternatives would result in an adverse effect to a historic resource but would allow for the construction of a financially viable project that would improve the quality of life and housing stability for existing residents of the deteriorating buildings and directly address the critical shortage of affordable housing in New York City.

Measures to partly mitigate these impacts are addressed below in **Section H.**

Urban Design and Visual Resources

There are three study areas used in the assessment of potential urban design and visual resource impacts: two primary study areas, which are coterminous with the two Project Sites, and a secondary study area, which extends approximately a ¼-mile from the Project Sites. The secondary study area is the same for all alternatives. The Proposed Project would not result in any significant

adverse urban design or visual resources impacts in the four feasible alternatives. In all four alternatives, no changes to the existing street patterns or block forms would occur. However, there would be improvements to the streetscapes of the Project Sites, including, but not limited to, new concrete sidewalks and newly planted street trees along all frontages, as well as the activation of the ground floors of the Project Sites with commercial, community facility, and residential uses oriented towards the sidewalk and new exterior lighting, enhancing the pedestrian experience in the vicinity of the Project Sites. The newly constructed buildings on each of the Project Sites would be built out to the lot lines, creating cohesive street walls with active uses oriented towards the sidewalk that are a better reflection of the predominant existing built form of the secondary study area. This style would be more contextually appropriate than the tower-in-the-park-style buildings currently only found on the Project Sites and within nearby Penn South. The accessory open space on the Project Sites would be relocated in building courtyards and in the area between buildings and would be improved with amenities such as lighting and landscaping, enhancing the pedestrian experience on adjacent sidewalks. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to visual resources in the primary or secondary study areas.

Natural Resources

As the Project Sites and immediate environs are an urbanized environment, no natural resources are present on or near them. According to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information, Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website, there is one candidate threatened species, the Monarch butterfly, identified as occurring in or near both Project Sites and one endangered species, the Northern long eared bat (NLEB), identified as occurring in or near solely the Fulton Houses Project Site. Monarch butterflies can be found in a variety of habitats including open meadows and fields containing a variety of wildflowers, coastal beaches with dunes, and man-made butterfly gardens, specifically containing milkweeds that Monarch larvae depend upon. The NLEB, on the other hand, can be found in dense forests or caves and abandoned mines. As the Project Sites contain neither of those features, they do not provide critical habitat for either of these species according to IPaC, and the Proposed Project would not jeopardize these species or adversely modify critical habitat.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse natural resources impacts.

Hazardous Materials

The first-stage sites will comply with the Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP), which was approved by DEP in March 2024, as modified to address DEP's comments and recommendations.

Requirements for site assessment, investigation, remediation, monitoring, and reporting, as warranted, for subsequent stages of the Proposed Project under all four alternatives will be obligations of the PACT Partner that will be memorialized in legally binding documents. Each of these steps in the process will be subject to DEP review and approval. Any DEP required remedial action must be identified before permits for the demolition of a given building can be issued and, thereafter, a DEP-approved site closure report is required to be issued before a temporary certificate of occupancy is sought or issued by the NYC Department of Buildings (DOB).

With these requirements in place, under any alternative selected for the Proposed Project all of the building sites on the Project Sites will be subject to site investigation, testing, remediation (as warranted), and site closure report requirements, subject to DEP review and approvals. Accordingly, the four feasible alternatives would not have the potential to result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

No significant adverse impact on the City's water supply, wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project.

Water Supply

The Proposed Project would generate an incremental water demand of up to approximately 629,998 gallons per day (gpd), depending on the alternative considered, as compared to the No-Action Alternative. This represents approximately 0.06 percent of the approximately one billion gallons of water supplied daily to New York City by DEP. Based on the projected incremental demand, it is expected that there would be adequate water service to meet the Proposed Project's incremental water demand, and there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply.

Sanitary (Dry Weather) Flows

The Proposed Project would generate an increment of up to approximately 602,431 gpd (0.61 mgd) of sanitary sewage, depending on the alternative considered, over the No-Action Alternative. This represents approximately 0.5 percent of the average daily flow of 113 mgd to the North River Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) which serves the Project Sites. This would not result in an exceedance of the plant's permitted capacity of 170 mgd and therefore would not create a significant adverse impact on the City's sanitary sewage treatment system.

Sanitary (Wet Weather) Flows

Generally, the overall volume of stormwater runoff and the peak stormwater runoff rate from the Project Sites is anticipated to increase due to the increase of roof area as compared to the No-Action Alternative. With the Unified Stormwater Rule setting the maximum release rates and the incorporation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP)s required as part of the Site Connection Proposal approval process to be reviewed and approved by DEP, the stormwater runoff volumes from the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the City's stormwater conveyance system.

Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

The Proposed Project would generate an increment of up to approximately 78.3 tons per week of solid waste, depending on the alternative considered, which would be the equivalent of up to approximately six more truckloads per week handled by DSNY and up to one more truck per week handled by private carters. It would be a negligible increase relative to the approximately 13,000

tons of waste handled by private carters every day or approximately 9,566 tons per day handled by DSNY. The incremental solid waste generated by the four alternatives would not overburden the City's solid waste handling systems. It would also not be in conflict with New York City's Solid Waste Management Plan (NYC SWMP) or with State policy related to the City's integrated solid waste management system. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in direct or indirect significant adverse solid waste and sanitation services impacts pursuant to applicable guidance and methodologies.

Energy

The Proposed Project would generate demand for up to approximately 416.7 billion British Thermal Units (BTUs) of energy per year (including electricity and gas), depending on the alternative considered. This increment would represent 0.2 percent of the City's forecasted annual energy requirement of 212.3 trillion BTU for 2041. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse energy impacts.

Transportation

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative

Traffic

Of the 25 study area intersections (all signalized) analyzed, the Preferred Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts at five intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, eight intersections in the midday peak hour, eight intersections in the PM peak hour, and four intersections during the Saturday peak hour, as summarized in **Table 16**. Potential measures to partially mitigate these impacts are addressed below in **Section H.**

Table 16: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections by Peak Hour

Intersection	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
W. 26th Street and 10th Avenue	X			
W. 25th Street and 10th Avenue	X	X	X	X
W. 23rd Street and 10th Avenue	X	X	X	X
W. 17th Street and 10th Avenue		X	X	X
W. 30th Street and 9th Avenue		X		X
W. 29th Street and 9th Avenue			X	
W. 26th Street and 9th Avenue	X	X		
W. 25th Street and 9th Avenue	X		X	
W. 19th Street and 9th Avenue		X	X	
W. 18th Street and 9th Avenue		X	X	
W. 17th Street and 9th Avenue		X	X	
Total	5	8	8	4

Pedestrians

Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at 55 pedestrian elements (20 sidewalks, 25 corner areas, and 10 crosswalks) where new trips generated by projected developments are expected to

be most concentrated. As shown in **Table 17,** based on *CTM* criteria, five sidewalks and two crosswalks would be significantly adversely impacted by the Preferred Alternative in one or more of the analyzed peak hours, and there would be no significant impacts to any corner areas.

Table 17: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts

Impacted Pedestrian Element	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
South sidewalk along W. 27th Dr btwn 10th Ave & W. 27th Dr (east of proposed Elliott-Chelsea Building 7 entrance)	X		X	X
North sidewalk along W. 25th St btwn 8th Ave & 9th Ave			X	
West sidewalk along 9th Ave btwn W. 17th St & W. 18th St	X			X
North sidewalk along W. 17th St btwn 9th Ave & 10th Ave	X	X	X	X
North sidewalk along W. 16th St btwn 8th Ave & 9th Ave	X	X	X	X
North crosswalk at 9th Ave & W. 25th St			X	
North crosswalk at 8th Ave & W. 25th St			X	

Transit

The Preferred Alternative would not result in significant adverse transit impacts during any analysis peak periods.

Parking

The Project Sites are proposed to provide 96 spaces of on-site accessory parking. Under the Preferred Alternative, the parking demand would total approximately 4,279 spaces (74 percent of capacity) in the weekday overnight period, with a surplus of 1,511 available spaces, and approximately 4,130 spaces (73 percent of capacity) in the Saturday overnight period, with a surplus of 1,538 available spaces. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative is not expected to result in significant parking shortfalls during the weekday and Saturday overnight periods.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

Crash data for intersections in the traffic and pedestrian study areas were obtained from NYCDOT for the three-year period between January 1, 2017 and December 31, 2019 (the most recent three-year period for which data are available). During this period, a total of 1,499 reportable and non-reportable crashes, 7 fatalities, 659 total injuries, and 302 pedestrian/bicyclist-related crashes occurred at intersections within the ¼-mile study area. Given the Project Site's location in a heavily pedestrianized and active area for commercial and tourism activities (Chelsea), the 20 intersections classified as high-crash locations are within an area of continued safety concern where elaborate safety management plans under the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and NYCDOT are in effect. Those strategies include having Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs), ongoing major safety projects throughout the ¼-mile radius, and 25 miles per hour (MPH) signal retiming along 8th Avenue, 9th Avenue, and W. 23rd Street.

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative

Traffic

Of the 11 study area intersections (all signalized) analyzed, the Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts at five intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, three intersections in the midday peak hour, six intersections in the PM peak hour, and three intersections during the Saturday peak hour, as summarized in **Table 18**. Potential measures to partially mitigate these impacts are addressed below in **Section H.**

Table 18: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections by Peak Hour

Intersection	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
W. 26th Street and 10th Avenue	X			
W. 25th Street and 10th Avenue	X	X	X	X
W. 23rd Street and 10th Avenue	X	X	X	X
W. 17th Street and 10th Avenue		X	X	X
W. 26th Street and 9th Avenue	X			
W. 25th Street and 9th Avenue	X		X	
W. 18th Street and 9th Avenue			X	
W. 17th Street and 9th Avenue			X	
Total	5	3	6	3

Pedestrians

Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at 41 pedestrian elements (16 sidewalks, 18 corner areas, and 7 crosswalks) where new trips generated by projected developments are expected to be most concentrated. As shown in **Table 19,** based on *CTM* criteria, five sidewalks would be significantly adversely impacted by the Non-Rezoning Alternative in one or more of the analyzed peak hours, and there would be no significant impacts to any crosswalks and corner areas.

Table 19: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts

Impacted Pedestrian Element	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday
South sidewalk along W. 27th Dr btwn 10th Ave & W. 27th Dr (east of proposed Elliott-Chelsea Building 7 entrance)	X		X	X
South sidewalk along W. 17th St btwn 9th Ave & 10th Ave	X	X	X	X
West sidewalk along 9th Ave btwn W. 17th St & W. 18th St				X
North sidewalk along W. 17th St btwn 9th Ave & 10th Ave	X	X	X	X
North sidewalk along W. 16th St btwn 8th Ave & 9th Ave	X	X	X	X

Transit

The Non-Rezoning Alternative would not result in significant adverse transit impacts during any analysis peak periods.

Parking

The Project Sites are proposed to provide 96 spaces of on-site accessory parking. Under the Non-Rezoning Alternative, the parking demand would total approximately 4,021 spaces (69 percent of capacity) in the weekday overnight period with a surplus of 1,769 available spaces and approximately 3,859 spaces (68 percent of capacity) in the Saturday overnight period with a surplus of 1,809 available spaces. Therefore, the Non-Rezoning Alternative is not expected to result in significant parking shortfalls during the weekday and Saturday overnight periods.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

Crash data for intersections in the traffic and pedestrian study areas were obtained from the NYCDOT for the three-year period between January 1, 2017 and December 31, 2019 (the most recent three-year period for which data are available). During this period, a total of 1,499 reportable and non-reportable crashes, 7 fatalities, 659 total injuries, and 302 pedestrian/bicyclist-related crashes occurred at intersections within the ¼-mile study area. Given the Project Site's location in a heavily pedestrianized and active area for commercial and tourism activities (Chelsea), the 20 intersections classified as high-crash locations are within an area of continued safety concern where safety management plans under the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and NYCDOT are in effect. Those strategies include having Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs), ongoing major safety projects throughout the ¼-mile radius, and 25 miles per hour (MPH) signal retiming along 8th Avenue, 9th Avenue, and W. 23rd Street.

Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

As the Midblock Bulk Alternative would have the same total development program as the Preferred Alternative and generally maintain the Preferred Alternative's proposed pedestrian and parking entrances, the number of action-generated vehicle, transit, and pedestrian trips and the demand for on-street and off-street parking would be similar to the numbers of trips and the parking demand that would be generated by the Preferred Alternative. It is anticipated the Midblock Bulk Alternative would result in significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts similar to the Preferred Alternative. The Midblock Bulk Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to transit or parking. As discussed in the Preferred Alternative, safety management plans under the NYPD and NYCDOT are in effect for the study area.

Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

With the COY Alternative, the number of action-generated vehicle, transit, and pedestrian trips and the demand for on-street and off-street parking would be generally less than the numbers of trips and the parking demand that would be generated by the Preferred Alternative. This decrease in demand is not expected to result in conditions appreciably different from those disclosed above for the Preferred Alternative. Overall, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative. Neither the Preferred Alternative nor the COY Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to subway, transit bus conditions, or parking. As discussed in the Preferred

Alternative, safety management plans under the NYPD and NYCDOT are in effect for the study area.

Air Quality

An analysis determined that the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts due to mobile source or stationary source emissions under the four feasible alternatives.

Under all four feasible alternatives, an initial screening determined that projected hourly incremental traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Project would not exceed the *CTM* threshold for analysis of carbon monoxide (CO) under any of the four alternatives. The initial screening determined that projected hourly incremental traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Project exceeded the *CTM* threshold for analysis of particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) at one intersection under the Preferred Alternative and Midblock Alternative, while under the Non-Rezoning Alternative, the number of project-generated vehicles were projected to be below the corresponding *CTM de minimis* criteria for mobile source analysis of $PM_{2.5}$, and thus no mobile source analysis was required. The COY Alternative is projected to result in fewer project-generated vehicles than under the Preferred Alternative and Midblock Bulk Alternative; therefore, no mobile source analysis was performed for this alternative either. A quantified mobile source analysis determined that maximum concentration increments of $PM_{2.5}$ from mobile sources under the Preferred Alternative were projected to be lower than the corresponding *CTM de minimis* criteria, and because the project-generated traffic volumes for the Midblock Bulk Alternative were projected to be slightly lower than the Preferred Alternative, no quantitative analysis of $PM_{2.5}$ was performed for the Midblock Bulk Alternative either. Therefore, no potential significant adverse air quality impacts would result from mobile sources under any of the four feasible alternatives. In addition, an assessment of the proposed parking facilities found that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts under any of the four alternatives under consideration for implementation by the Proposed Project.

Since the new buildings to be constructed at the Project Sites under all four feasible alternatives would utilize electric-powered equipment for heating and hot water systems, no analysis was performed of the buildings, and no potential significant adverse air quality impacts would result from stationary sources of emissions. The exclusive use of electric-powered heating and hot water equipment is required for the Proposed Project and will be obligations of the PACT Partner that will be memorialized in legally binding documents.

The analysis of emissions from the existing NYCHA boiler plants on Proposed Project buildings on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site during construction determined that emissions would not result in a violation of applicable air quality standards under the four feasible alternatives. To ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts on the Proposed Project under the four feasible alternatives relative to nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from the Elliott-Chelsea Addition boilers would be limited to a maximum of 45 parts per million (ppm) and the stack height would be increased to a minimum of 145 feet. In addition, no outdoor rooftop amenity spaces would be permitted on the eastern, 13-story portion of the proposed Elliott-Chelsea 1 building, and no air intakes would be permitted within the area of this roof defined as a distance of less than 32.25 feet from the roof's edge facing 9th Avenue and less than 18 feet from the roof's edge facing W. 26th Street. These project improvements—which would be effective prior to

occupancy of the proposed Elliott-Chelsea 1 building and until the existing NYCHA boiler plants are taken out of service—will be memorialized in legally binding documents requiring compliance with all of the conditions listed above.

In terms of industrial sources, no businesses of concern were found to have a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) air permit or DEP certificate of operation within the study area, and no other potential sources of concern were identified; therefore, no potential significant adverse air quality impacts would occur on the Proposed Project from industrial sources under the four feasible alternatives. In addition, the analysis of the existing large and major sources of emissions determined there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts on the Proposed Project under the four feasible alternatives.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The total projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Proposed Project are estimated to result in up to approximately 46,426 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions per year, depending on the alternative considered, which represents approximately 0.09 percent of New York City's 2023 annual total of 51.2 million metric tons. The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to GHG and climate change as it would be consistent with the City's GHG emissions reduction goals and laws, as defined in the *CTM*. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with State emissions reduction legislation as well as City and State policies and regulations regarding adaptation to climate change.

Each of the four feasible alternatives include elements that are consistent with sustainable land use planning and smart growth strategies to reduce the carbon footprint of new developments. The four feasible alternatives provide: 1) development of mixed-use buildings on previously developed urban land, thereby minimizing vegetation/forest loss; 2) development on sites with existing urban infrastructure, thereby minimizing the need for extensive infrastructure development; 3) development in a transit and pedestrian oriented urban areas, thereby substantially reducing carbon emissions as compared to development in car-dependent areas; 4) buildings that would be required at a minimum to achieve the energy efficiency requirements of NYC's 2020 NYCECC, which is designed to ensure meeting the City and State's GHG reduction goals of 80 percent and 85 percent, respectively, by 2050; and 5) buildings that will use electricity for the normal operation of the heat and hot water systems, thereby avoiding the on-site combustion of fossil fuel for building operations.

Noise Abatement and Control

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse noise impacts. A noise assessment was undertaken to determine the levels of noise attenuation that may be needed to achieve acceptable interior noise levels in accordance with *CTM* guidance as well as HUD guidelines.

Based on the projected noise levels from future vehicular traffic and playground noise, up to 33 dBA window/wall attenuation along with an alternate means of ventilation allowing for the maintenance of a closed-window condition would be required to achieve acceptable interior noise levels at the Proposed Project buildings. The noise attenuation and alternate means of ventilation specifications for each alternative will be obligations of the PACT Partner and memorialized in

legally binding documents. With implementation of the prescribed noise attenuation and alternate means of ventilation, the Proposed Project would provide sufficient attenuation to achieve *CTM* interior noise level guidelines of 45 dBA or lower for residential and/or community facility uses and *HUD Noise Guidebook* interior noise level guidelines of 45 dBA or lower for residential uses. Therefore, the Proposed Project under all four alternatives would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

Public Health

The goal of a public health assessment is to determine whether adverse impacts on human health may occur as a result of a proposed project and, if so, to identify measures to mitigate such effects. No significant adverse impacts on public health are anticipated as a result of the four feasible alternatives.

Neighborhood Character

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to neighborhood character under the four feasible alternatives. The neighborhood character of the study area is defined by a few key components, including its mix of land uses and building types, open space resources, and the street system. The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts in the impact categories of land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; open space; or urban design and visual resources. The demolition of the S/NR-eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses has been identified as a significant adverse impact on architectural resources. However, it is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact with respect to neighborhood character as the existing design and construction of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses is not consistent with the surrounding Chelsea neighborhood, nor would its demolition affect any defining feature of neighborhood character. In addition, the demolition would facilitate the redevelopment of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site with new buildings that would include replacement of all existing NYCHA residential units and community facility uses. The significant adverse transportation impacts that have been identified would not affect any defining feature of neighborhood character, nor would a combination of moderately adverse effects affect a defining feature. Additionally, window-wall attenuation will be required to ensure an acceptable interior noise level for the Proposed Project. While the Proposed Project is expected to result in significant adverse impacts with respect to shadows, these impacts would not affect neighborhood conditions to the degree that they would singularly or in combination result in significant adverse neighborhood character impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse neighborhood character impacts related to shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation, or noise.

Construction

Construction associated with the Proposed Project would result in temporary disruptions on the Project Sites and the surrounding area. As described below, the Proposed Project's construction activities would result in unmitigable significant adverse transportation (traffic and pedestrian) and noise impacts under the four alternatives. Potential mitigation for these significant adverse impacts is discussed below in **Section H**. For all other technical areas, construction activities associated

with the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts. Findings specific to each of the key technical areas are summarized below.

Transportation

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative

Construction travel demand is expected to peak in the first quarter of 2034 under the Preferred Alternative, and this period is therefore analyzed for potential transportation impacts during construction. Traffic and pedestrian impacts during the construction peak period under the Preferred Alternative are discussed below. No subway or bus impacts or significant parking shortfalls are anticipated during the construction peak period under this alternative.

Traffic

Construction traffic conditions were evaluated during the first quarter of 2034 construction AM and PM peak hours at 25 intersections (all signalized) in the operational traffic study area where construction vehicle trips resulting from the Preferred Alternative would exceed the 50-trip *CTM* analysis threshold. As summarized in **Table 20**, the construction traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at one intersection during the weekday AM construction peak hour and six intersections in the weekday PM construction peak hour. Potential measures to mitigate some of these impacts are addressed below in **Section H.**

Table 20: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections – 2034 (Q1) Preferred Alternative Peak Construction Period

Intersection	AM Construction Peak Hour	PM Construction Peak Hour
W. 29th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 25th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 23rd Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 17th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 29th Street and 9th Avenue		X
W. 23rd Street and 9th Avenue	X	
W. 17th Street and 9th Avenue		X
Total	**1**	**6**

Pedestrians

In the first quarter 2034 peak construction period, the increase in pedestrian trips (construction and operational) attributable to the Preferred Alternative would be dispersed among the Project Sites and would be substantially fewer in number than with full build-out of the Preferred Alternative in 2041. They would also primarily occur during the AM and PM construction peak hours, outside of the weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods and the weekday midday and Saturday peak periods when area pedestrian facilities typically experience the greatest demand. Pedestrian conditions during the construction peak hours in the peak construction period are expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Preferred Alternative in 2041.

Construction pedestrian conditions were evaluated during the first quarter of 2034 construction AM and PM peak hours at seven pedestrian elements (five sidewalks and two crosswalks) where pedestrian elements would be significantly adversely impacted during the operational peak hours and experience an incremental increase of 200 or more pedestrian trips in one or both of the construction peak hours in the peak construction period. As shown in **Table 21**, based on *CTM* criteria, three sidewalks and one crosswalk that would be significantly adversely impacted by the Preferred Alternative during the weekday AM and PM peak hours would also be impacted in one or both of the construction peak hours.

Table 21: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts – 2034 (Q1) Preferred Alternative Peak Construction Period

Impacted Pedestrian Element	AM Construction Peak Hour	PM Construction Peak Hour
North sidewalk along W. 25th St btw 8 Ave & 9th Ave		X
North sidewalk along W. 17th St btw 9th Ave & 10th Ave	X	X
North sidewalk along W. 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9th Ave	X	X
North crosswalk at 8 Ave & W. 25th St		X

Transit

The estimated number of total peak hour transit trips would be approximately 432 (346 by subway and 86 by bus) in each of the AM and PM peak hours during peak construction in 2034 (Q1). During these same construction peak hours there would also be a net increase in operational transit trips from completed development on projected development sites (New Fulton 1 to 3 and New Elliott-Chelsea 1 to 3). In the peak construction period, the increase in transit demand (construction + operational) during the AM and PM construction peak hours would total approximately 874 and 1,309 subway trips, respectively, and 132 and 191 bus trips, respectively. By comparison, the net increase in operational subway trips with full build-out of the Preferred Alternative in 2041 would be greater in number, totaling approximately 1,538 and 1,452 trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours, when overall demand on area subway facilities and services typically peaks. Therefore, peak construction period transit conditions during the AM and PM construction peak hours are expected to be comparable to or generally better than during the analyzed commuter peak hours with full build-out of the Preferred Alternative in 2041 and is anticipated that there would be no new subway or bus impacts during construction.

Parking

It is estimated that there would be approximately 960 construction workers on site daily, approximately 41.2 percent of whom would be expected to travel to the Project Sites by private auto. Based on an average vehicle occupancy of 1.21 persons per vehicle, the maximum daily parking demand from project site construction workers would total approximately 327 spaces. These workers are assumed to park in off-street public parking facilities in proximity to the Project Sites. Under *CTM* guidance, as the Project Sites are located in Parking Zone 1, the inability of the Preferred Alternative or the surrounding area to accommodate future parking demands would be considered a parking shortfall but would generally not be considered significant due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, should any parking shortfall occur due to incremental demand from construction workers during the first quarter of 2034 peak

construction period, it would be short-term and not be considered a significant parking shortfall pursuant to *CTM* guidance.

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative

Construction travel demand is expected to peak in the second quarter of 2037 under the Non-Rezoning Alternative, and this period is therefore analyzed for potential transportation impacts during construction. Traffic and pedestrian impacts during the construction peak period under the Non-Rezoning Alternative are discussed below. No subway or bus impacts or significant parking shortfalls are anticipated during the construction peak period under this alternative.

Traffic

Construction traffic conditions were evaluated during the second quarter 2037 construction AM and PM peak hours at 25 intersections (all signalized) in the operational traffic study area where construction vehicle trips would result from the Non-Rezoning Alternative would exceed the 50-trip *CTM* analysis threshold. As summarized in **Table 22**, the construction traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at one intersection during the weekday AM construction peak hour and seven intersections in the weekday PM construction peak hour. Potential measures to mitigate some of these impacts are addressed below in **Section H.**

Table 22: Summary of Significantly Impacted Intersections – 2037 (Q2) Non-Rezoning Alternative Peak Construction Period

Location	AM Construction Peak Hour	PM Construction Peak Hour
W. 29th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 25th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 23rd Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 17th Street and 10th Avenue		X
W. 29th Street and 9th Avenue		X
W. 23rd Street and 9th Avenue	X	
W. 19th Street and 9th Avenue		X
W. 17th Street and 9th Avenue		X
Total	**1**	**7**

Pedestrians

In the second quarter of the 2037 peak construction period, the increase in pedestrian trips (construction and operational) attributable to the Non-Rezoning Alternative would be dispersed among the Project Sites and would be substantially fewer in number than with full build-out of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in 2041. They would also primarily occur during the weekday AM and PM construction peak hours, outside of the weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods and the weekday midday and Saturday peak periods when area pedestrian facilities typically experience the greatest demand. Pedestrian conditions during the construction peak hours in the peak construction period are expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in 2041.

Construction pedestrian conditions were evaluated during the second quarter of 2037 construction AM and PM peak hours at four pedestrian elements (all sidewalks where pedestrian elements would be significantly adversely impacted during the operational peak hours and experience an incremental increase of 200 or more pedestrian trips in one or both of the construction peak hours in the peak construction period). As shown in **Table 23**, based on *CTM* criteria, two sidewalks that would be significantly adversely impacted by the Non-Rezoning Alternative during the weekday AM and PM peak hours would also be impacted in both of the construction peak hours.

Table 23: Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts – 2037 (Q2) Non-Rezoning Alternative Peak Construction Period

Impacted Pedestrian Element	AM Construction Peak Hour	PM Construction Peak Hour
North sidewalk along W. 17th St btw 9th Ave & 10th Ave	X	X
North sidewalk along W. 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9th Ave	X	X

Note:
This table has been revised for the FEIS.

Transit

The estimated number of total peak hour transit trips would be approximately 354 (284 by subway and 70 by bus) in each of the AM and PM peak hours during peak construction in 2037 (Q2). During these same construction peak hours there would also be a net increase in operational transit trips from completed development on projected development sites (New Fulton 1 to 5 and New Elliott-Chelsea 1 to 5). In the peak construction period, the increase in transit demand (construction + operational) during the AM and PM construction peak hours would total approximately 512 and 760 subway trips, respectively, and 93 and 126 bus trips, respectively. By comparison, the net increase in operational subway trips with full build-out of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in 2041 would be greater in number, totaling approximately 851 and 800 trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours, when overall demand on area subway facilities and services typically peaks. Therefore, peak construction period transit conditions during the AM and PM construction peak hours are expected to be comparable to or generally better than during the analyzed commuter peak hours with full build-out of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in 2041 and is anticipated that there would be no new subway or bus impacts during construction.

Parking

It is estimated that there would be approximately 787 construction workers on site daily, approximately 41.2 percent of whom would be expected to travel to the Project Sites by private auto. Based on an average vehicle occupancy of 1.21 persons per vehicle, the maximum daily parking demand from project site construction workers would total approximately 268 spaces. These workers are assumed to park in off-street public parking facilities in proximity to the Project Sites. Under *CTM* guidance, as the Project Sites are located in Parking Zone 1, the inability of the Non-Rezoning Alternative or the surrounding area to accommodate future parking demands would be considered a parking shortfall but would generally not be considered significant due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, should any parking shortfall occur due to incremental demand from construction workers during the second quarter of 2037

peak construction period, it would be short-term and not be considered a significant parking shortfall pursuant to *CTM* guidance.

Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

The travel demand peak for Midblock Bulk Alternative is the same as the Preferred Alternative (2034 (Q1)), and this period was therefore assessed for potential transportation impacts during construction. As the Midblock Bulk Alternative would have the same total development program as the Preferred Alternative and generally maintain the Preferred Alternative's proposed pedestrian and parking entrances, the number of action-generated vehicle, transit, and pedestrian trips and the demand for on-street and off-street parking would be substantially similar to the numbers of trips and the parking demand that would be generated by the Preferred Alternative. As such, the trips generated under the Midblock Bulk Alternative during construction is anticipated to be comparable to that of the Preferred Alternative. Therefore, it is anticipated that the Midblock Bulk Alternative would result in similar significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative. The Midblock Bulk Alternative is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to subway and transit bus conditions or significant parking shortfalls.

Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

Construction travel demand is expected to peak in the first quarter of 2034 under the COY Alternative (same peak construction period as the Preferred Alternative and Midblock Bulk Alternative), and this period is therefore assessed for potential transportation impacts. As the COY Alternative generates fewer traffic, transit, and pedestrian trips than the Preferred Alternative during the construction peak period, this reduction in travel demand is expected to result in conditions comparable to or better than those in the Preferred Alternative. Therefore, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative. The COY Alternative is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to subway and transit bus conditions or significant parking shortfalls.

Air Quality

Measures would be taken to reduce pollutant emissions during construction of the Proposed Project under the four alternatives in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. These include the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel, dust suppression measures, abatement of all asbestos containing materials (ACM), idling restrictions, and diesel equipment reduction. In addition, although New York City Local Law 77 is not applicable to the Proposed Project, construction of the Proposed Project would utilize newer equipment (e.g., equipment meeting the EPA's Tier 3 emission standard) and best available tailpipe reduction technologies (e.g., use of diesel particulate filters) to further reduce air pollutant emissions. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions for both non-road (i.e., equipment) and on-road sources (i.e., worker and truck trips) determined that particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), annual average NO_2, and CO concentrations would be below the National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS).

Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts during construction.

Noise

Based on the projected construction activities predicted at the Project Sites, including both on-site equipment and construction vehicle trips (i.e., worker and truck trips), the Proposed Project would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts at receptors adjacent to the construction areas under the four alternatives.

For each alternative, the construction noise analysis predicted noise levels due to construction could exceed the *CTM* impact criteria at receptors which represent residences, hotels, commercial offices, community facilities, and publicly accessible open spaces throughout the Project Sites, including at Project Site buildings that are completed and occupied while other nearby or adjacent buildings on the Project Sites are under construction. At some receptors, construction could produce noise levels that would be noticeable and potentially intrusive during the most noise-intensive construction activities. While the highest levels of predicted construction noise would not persist throughout the entire construction period, and noise levels would fluctuate resulting in noise increases that would be intermittent, these locations would experience construction noise levels whose magnitude and duration could constitute significant adverse impacts.

At most locations predicted to experience an exceedance of the noise impact threshold criteria, the exceedances would be due primarily to noise generated by on-site construction activities, rather than construction-related traffic. The construction noise analysis examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels resulting from construction in each analyzed time period and is therefore conservative in predicting increases in noise levels. Typically, the loudest hourly noise level during each analysis period would not persist throughout the entire analysis period.

The Proposed Project would comply with New York City Noise Control Code regulations, which regulate, among other things equipment noise emissions and construction work hours, as well as commit to constructing pile installation and foundation elements by drilling rather than impact pile driving, commit to quieter equipment to meet equipment noise emission levels, and other additional noise control measures beyond the minimum required by code. As required under the New York City Noise Control Code, a site-specific noise mitigation plan for the Proposed Project would be developed and implemented.

In addition, a robust noise control program and measures will be implemented during construction of the Proposed Project to minimize noise emissions to the maximum extent practicable. These noise reduction measures (including those that go beyond the measures required by the New York City Noise Control Code) are discussed in detail in **Section H**.

Other Technical Areas

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse construction impacts related to the other technical areas considered in construction analyses, including Vibration, Land Use and

Neighborhood Character, Socioeconomic Conditions, Community Facilities and Services, Open Space, Historic and Cultural Resources,[12] Hazardous Materials, and Natural Resources.

Environmental Justice

The four feasible alternatives would not result in any disproportionate and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations as well as disadvantaged communities and environmental justice populations (collectively, "Environmental Justice Populations"). Moreover, none of these alternatives would result in any disproportionate health and safety impacts on children and would improve children's health and safety in furtherance of EO 13045: *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks.* Additionally, the Proposed Project would not cause or increase a disproportionate pollution burden on disadvantaged communities. Rather, these alternatives are expected to improve quality of life for the Environmental Justice Populations on the Project Sites. Additional development would occur on both Project Sites, including new mixed-income buildings containing permanently affordable housing DUs and market-rate DUs. The new buildings would offer enhanced layouts, ventilation, electric-powered heating and hot water systems, efficient energy systems, resident controlled in-unit heating and cooling, new appliances in every apartment, common area amenities, and resident rooftop space. The Proposed Project would address the critical shortage of housing in New York City with development in close proximity to public transportation. These alternatives would introduce improved accessory open spaces on the Project Sites with new recreational amenities. The Proposed Project would also introduce new commercial spaces, and additional community facility spaces on the Project Sites, which would benefit Project Site residents, as well as the surrounding community, adding amenities that are currently lacking or under-supplied in the area.

H. MITIGATION

Under the four feasible alternatives, the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts with respect to shadows, historic and cultural (architectural) resources, transportation (traffic and pedestrians), construction transportation (traffic and pedestrians), and construction noise. Potential mitigation measures for these impacts were developed in consultation with the lead and expert agencies and are discussed below for each respective technical area. In instances where there was no feasible mitigation, an unavoidable adverse impact is disclosed.

[12] The demolition of the S/NR-eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses has been determined to be a direct significant adverse historic and cultural resources impact of the Proposed Project. This impact is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of the Proposed Project as there are no measures that could avoid or fully mitigate this impact and meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. This is not considered a construction impact as it not a consequence of the effects of construction, such as due to the potential effects of construction vibrations on a historic resource or due to the effects of excavation on an area sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources. Rather, this would be a consequence of the Proposed Project development program, which includes replacement of all of the existing Project Site buildings.

Shadows

The Proposed Project, under the four feasible alternatives, would result in significant adverse shadows impacts on Chelsea Park and PS 33 Playground. Lighting improvements have been identified as a practicable and feasible measure to partially mitigate shadows impacts to Chelsea Park resulting from the Proposed Project under the four alternatives. In particular, this would consist of updating approximately 14 existing incandescent light poles around the sports turf field in the western half of the park with LED bulbs or equivalent, as needed to improve illumination and efficiency, in consultation and agreement with NYC Parks. The measures described above will be obligations of the PACT Partner that will be memorialized in legally binding documents. Although upgraded lighting fixtures around the turf field would improve usability of this amenity, this measure would only partially mitigate the shadows impacts to Chelsea Park. Therefore, despite partial mitigation, shadows impacts to Chelsea Park would remain as unavoidable adverse impacts. No additional measures were determined to be feasible, practicable, and effective to mitigate the predicted significant adverse shadows impacts to PS 33 Playground and therefore, incremental shadows on PS 33 Playground would also be an unavoidable adverse impact of the Proposed Project.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Proposed Project, under the four feasible alternatives, would result in the demolition of the existing S/NR-eligible buildings on the Elliott-Chelsea Houses Project Site to facilitate the construction of new buildings on that Project Site. As such, the Proposed Project under all four alternatives would result in significant adverse direct impacts to the S/NR-eligible historic resource.

NYCHA and the PACT Partner have worked with SHPO and Section 106 consulting parties to develop measures to partially mitigate the adverse effect, as set forth in a MOA pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA. As detailed in the MOA proposed mitigation measures include:

1. The preparation of an Unanticipated Discoveries Protocol.
2. A Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level 2 recordation of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses.
3. The design and installation in a publicly accessible location of an interpretive display that adequately presents the history and significance of the Elliott-Chelsea Houses.
4. The development and implementation of Construction Protection Plans for surrounding historic properties within 90 feet of the Project Site.
5. Review and approval of all plans, final reports, studies, and Construction Protection Plans detailed above by SHPO and LPC (the Section 106 consulting parties).

These measures would not fully mitigate the significant adverse impact, given that in any event the S/NR-eligible resource would be demolished. Therefore, this would be considered an unavoidable adverse impact, notwithstanding the partial mitigation measures.

Transportation

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative

Traffic

As discussed above, the Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 11 study area intersections (all signalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, five intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, eight intersections in the midday peak hour, eight intersections in the PM peak hour, and four intersections during the Saturday peak hour.

Most of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing. The types of mitigation measures proposed herein are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. **Table 24** summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for each of the intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. While the PACT Partner and NYCHA would be required to coordinate with NYCDOT regarding implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements, implementation itself will be subject to final review and approval by NYCDOT. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated during all analyzed peak hours with the exception of one intersection in the weekday AM period, one intersection in the weekday midday period, and one intersection in the weekday PM period. Consequently, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative. This is also applicable to the "Construction Transportation" impact mitigation discussed in the following section.

Table 24: Preferred Alternative Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures

Intersection	Signal Phase	No-Action Alternative Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)				Proposed Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)				Recommended Mitigation
		AM	MD	PM	SAT	AM	MD	PM	SAT	
W.29th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	36	36	36	37	36	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
	NBT	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
	NB	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	17	
W.26th St (EB) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB	36	36	36	36	37	36	36	36	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB in AM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	44	43	44	44	44	
W.25th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	36	39	38	38	39	- Transfer 3s of green time from NB to WB in AM and Saturday.
	PED	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	44	41	42	42	41	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in midday and PM.
W.23th St (E-W) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB/WB	30	30	30	30	30	31	30	31	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB/EB-L in AM.
	EB/EB-L	11	11	11	11	12	11	11	11	
	PED	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB/WB in midday and Saturday.
	NB	42	42	42	42	41	41	42	41	
W.17th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	36	36	38	39	38	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in midday and Saturday.
	PED	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	44	44	42	41	42	'- Transfer 3s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
W.30th St (EB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB	30	29	30	29	30	30	30	31	-Transfer 1s of green time from SB to EB in midday.
	PED/Bike	8	10	8	10	8	10	8	10	
	SB	45	41	45	41	45	40	45	39	-Transfer 2s of green time from SB to EB in Saturday.
	Ped	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
W.29th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	38	37	38	37	38	38	39	37	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to WB in midday and PM.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB	45	43	45	43	45	42	44	43	
W.26th St (EB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB	33	31	33	31	33	32	33	31	- Unmitigatable in AM.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB-T/SB-L to EB in midday.
	SB-T	26	25	26	25	26	25	26	25	
	SB-T/SB-L	24	24	24	24	24	23	24	24	
W.25th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	41	40	41	40	39	38	39	38	- Transfer 2s of green time from WB to SB in AM, midday, PM, and Saturday.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB-TR	42	40	42	40	44	42	44	42	
W.19th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	32	33	32	33	33	34	32	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to WB in midday and PM.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB	50	48	50	48	50	47	49	48	
W.18th St (EB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB	33	32	33	32	33	32	34	32	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to EB in PM.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SBT	26	24	26	24	26	24	25	24	
	SBL/SBT	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	
W.17th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	32	33	32	33	33	35	32	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to WB in midday.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB	50	48	50	48	50	47	48	48	- Transfer 2s of green time from SB to WB in PM.

Notes :

(1) Signal timings shown indicate green plus yellow (including all red) for each phase.

All proposed signal timing mitigations reflect adjustments to the walk timings except during the AM peak hour for 10th Avenue at W. 23rd Street, which reflect adjustments to the FLDW timings for the EB movement and walk timings for the NB movement.

Pedestrians

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at five sidewalks and two crosswalks in one or more peak hours.

Sidewalks

Of the 20 sidewalks analyzed, five are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Preferred Alternative. **Table 25** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse impacts to one sidewalk would be mitigated during the weekday midday and PM peak hours. This would be achieved by relocating a traffic sign located on the western half of the north sidewalk along W. 17th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues. The Preferred Alternative would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact at this sidewalk if the proposed mitigation measure is deemed infeasible and no alternate mitigation measure is identified.

No practicable mitigation measures were identified for significant adverse impacts at four, one, three and four sidewalks during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, and Saturday peak hour, respectively. Accordingly, impacts at these locations would remain unmitigated.

Table 25: Preferred Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Sidewalk Conditions

Sidewalk	No-Action Alternative			Preferred Alternative			Preferred Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Weekday AM Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	395.9	B	1.5	28.4	D *	1.5	28.4	D *	- Unmitigatable.
West sidewalk along 9 Ave btw W 17 St & W 18 St	4.0	99.2	B	4.0	31.3	D *	4.0	31.3	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	66.8	C	1.5	14.1	E *	3.0	31.1	D *	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	24.4	D	1.0	10.4	F *	1.0	10.4	F *	- Unmitigatable.
Weekday MD Peak Hour										
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	52.6	C	1.5	16.3	E *	3.0	35.2	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	30.3	D	1.0	16.4	E *	1.0	16.4	E *	- Unmitigatable.
Weekday PM Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	247.0	B	1.5	28.8	D *	1.5	28.8	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 25 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	5.0	43.1	C	5.0	31.3	D *	5.0	31.3	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	42.4	C	1.5	14.3	E *	3.0	31.5	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	14.2	E	1.0	7.0	F *	1.0	7.0	F *	- Unmitigatable.
Saturday Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	269.2	B	1.5	28.4	D *	1.5	28.4	D *	- Unmitigatable.
West sidewalk along 9 Ave btw W 17 St & W 18 St	4.0	72.9	C	4.0	30.8	D *	4.0	30.8	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	43.7	C	1.5	12.6	E *	3.0	28.3	D *	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	19.0	E	1.0	7.6	F *	1.0	7.6	F *	- Unmitigatable.

Note:
***** Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.

Crosswalks

Out of the 10 crosswalks analyzed, two are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Preferred Alternative in the weekday PM peak hour. **Table 25** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the impact would be fully mitigated at one crosswalk. With the implementation of the proposed traffic mitigation measure shown in **Table 26** and a 2.5-foot widening on the north crosswalk at 9th Avenue and W. 25th Street (to a total of 14.5

feet in width), the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse impact to this crosswalk would be fully mitigated (at LOS D) based on the *CTM*. Based on NYCDOT's guidance, widening the north crosswalk at 8th Avenue and W. 25th Street is not feasible as there is only approximately eight feet of space on the pedestrian island between the travel lanes and bike lanes. Therefore, significant adverse impacts at one crosswalk would remain unmitigated in the weekday PM peak hour. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact would remain unmitigated.

Table 26: Preferred Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Crosswalk Conditions

		No-Action Alternative			Preferred Alternative			Preferred Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
Intersection	Crosswalk	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Weekday PM Peak Hour											
9 Ave & W 25 St	North	12.0	26.2	C	12.0	17.1	D *	14.5	19.5	D	- Widen crosswalk by 2.5 ft.
8 Ave & W 25 St	North	12.0	16.2	D	12.0	13.4	E *	12.0	13.4	E *	- Unmitigated.

Notes:
* Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.
Takes into account traffic mitigation measures

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative

Traffic

As discussed above, the Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at eight study area intersections (all signalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically five intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, three intersections in the midday peak hour, six intersections in the PM peak hour, and three intersections during the Saturday peak hour.

Most of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing. The types of mitigation measures proposed herein are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. **Table 27** summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for each of the intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. While the PACT Partner and NYCHA would be required to coordinate with NYCDOT regarding implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements, implementation itself will be subject to final review and approval by NYCDOT. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated during all analyzed peak hours with the exception of one intersection in the weekday AM, midday, and PM periods. Consequently, these

impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Non-Rezoning Alternative.

Table 27: Non-Rezoning Alternative Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures

Intersection	Signal Phase	No-Action Alternative Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)				Proposed Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)				Recommended Mitigation
		AM	MD	PM	SAT	AM	MD	PM	SAT	
W.26th St (EB) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB	36	36	36	36	37	36	36	36	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB in AM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	44	43	44	44	44	
W.25th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	36	38	37	37	37	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in AM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in
	NB	44	44	44	44	42	43	43	43	midday, PM and Saturday.
W.23th St (E-W) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB/WB	30	30	30	30	31	31	30	31	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB/WB in
	EB/EB-L	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	AM, midday and Saturday.
	PED	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
	NB	42	42	42	42	41	41	42	41	
W.17th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	36	36	37	38	37	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in
	NB	44	44	44	44	44	43	42	43	midday and Saturday.
										- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
W.26th St (EB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB	33	31	33	31	33	31	33	31	-Unmitigable.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB-T	26	25	26	25	26	25	26	25	
	SB-T/SB-L	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	
W.25th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	41	40	41	40	40	38	40	38	- Transfer 1s of green time from WB to SB in AM
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	and PM.
	SB-TR	42	40	42	40	43	42	43	42	- Transfer 2s of green time from WB to SB in
										midday and Saturday.
W.18th St (EB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB	33	32	33	32	33	33	34	32	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to EB in
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	midday and PM.
	SBT	26	24	26	24	26	23	25	24	
	SBL/SBT	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	
W.17th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	32	33	32	33	32	35	32	- Transfer 2s of green time from SB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	10	7	10	7	10	7	10	
	SB	50	48	50	48	50	48	48	48	

Notes :

(1) Signal timings shown indicate green plus yellow (including all red) for each phase.

All proposed signal timing mitigations reflect adjustments to the walk timings except during the AM peak hour for 10th Avenue at W. 23rd Street, which reflect adjustments to the FLDW timings for the EB movement and walk timings for the NB movement.

Pedestrians

The Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at five sidewalks in one or more peak hours.

Sidewalks

Of the 16 sidewalks analyzed, five are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Non-Rezoning Alternative. **Table 28** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Non-Rezoning Alternative's significant adverse impacts to one sidewalk would be mitigated during all analyzed peak hours. This would be achieved by relocating a traffic sign located on the western half of the north sidewalk along W. 17th Street between 9th

and 10th Avenues. The Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact at this sidewalk if the proposed mitigation measures are deemed infeasible and no alternate mitigation measure is identified.

No practicable mitigation measures were identified for significant adverse impacts at three, two, three and four sidewalks during the weekday AM, midday and PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. Accordingly, impacts at these locations would remain unmitigated.

Table 28: Non-Rezoning Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Sidewalk Conditions

	No-Action Alternative			Non-Rezoning Alternative			Non-Rezoning Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
Sidewalk	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Weekday AM Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	395.9	B	1.5	29.4	D *	1.5	29.4	D *	- Unmitigatable.
South sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.0	34.1	D	1.0	15.2	E *	2.5	15.2	E *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	66.8	C	1.5	19.5	E *	3.0	41.1	C	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	24.4	D	1.0	15.0	E *	1.0	15.0	E *	- Unmitigatable.
Weekday MD Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.0	38.3	D	1.0	20.1	E *	2.5	20.1	E *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	52.6	C	1.5	20.0	E *	3.0	42.2	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	30.3	D	1.0	20.9	E *	1.0	20.9	E *	- Unmitigatable.
Weekday PM Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	247.0	B	1.5	28.5	D *	1.5	28.5	D *	- Unmitigatable.
South sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.0	24.4	D	1.0	11.3	E *	2.5	11.3	E *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	42.4	C	1.5	19.1	E *	3.0	40.5	C	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	14.2	E	1.0	9.4	F *	1.0	9.4	F *	- Unmitigatable.
Saturday Peak Hour										
South sidewalk along W 27 Dr btw 10 Ave & proposed EC Building 7 entrance (east of entrance)	2.0	269.2	B	1.5	27.8	D *	1.5	27.8	D *	- Unmitigatable.
South sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.0	24.0	D	1.0	10.9	F *	2.5	10.9	F *	- Unmitigatable.
West sidewalk along 9 Ave btw W 17 St & W 18 St	4.0	72.9	C	4.0	30.9	D *	4.0	30.9	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	43.7	C	1.5	16.9	E *	3.0	36.2	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	19.0	E	1.0	10.8	F *	1.0	10.8	F *	- Unmitigatable.

Note:
***** Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.

Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

Traffic

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to 11 intersections in one or more analyzed peak hours. As the Midblock Bulk Alternative and the Preferred Alternative would generate substantially similar amounts of vehicle trips in each peak hour, it is anticipated that the Midblock Bulk Alternative would not result in any new significant adverse traffic impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative; however, the rearrangement of bulk between the Midblock Bulk Alternative and Preferred Alternative may result in small changes in the directional distribution of action-generated trips at some intersections. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse traffic impacts may also be proposed for the Midblock Bulk Alternative and would improve the traffic conditions of the impacted locations under the Midblock Bulk Alternative.

Pedestrians

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to five sidewalks and two crosswalks in one or more analyzed peak hours. There would be no significant impacts to any corner areas in any peak hour. As the Midblock Bulk Alternative and the Preferred Alternative would generate substantially similar amounts of pedestrian trips in each peak hour, it is expected that the Midblock Bulk Alternative would not result in any new significant adverse pedestrian impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse pedestrian impacts may also be proposed for the Midblock Bulk Alternative and would improve the sidewalk and crosswalk conditions of the impacted pedestrian locations under the Midblock Bulk Alternative.

Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

Traffic

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to 11 intersections in one or more analyzed peak hours. As the COY Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips in each peak hour than would the Preferred Alternative, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse traffic impacts than the Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse traffic impacts may similarly be proposed for the COY Alternative and would likewise improve the traffic conditions of the impacted locations under this alternative.

Pedestrians

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to five sidewalks and two crosswalks in one or more analyzed peak hours. As the COY Alternative would generate fewer pedestrian trips in each peak hour than would the Preferred Alternative, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse pedestrian impacts than the

Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse pedestrian impacts may similarly be proposed for the COY Alternative and would likewise improve the sidewalk and crosswalk conditions of the impacted pedestrian locations under this alternative.

Construction Transportation

Alternative 2 – Preferred Alternative

Traffic

In the first quarter 2034 peak construction period, construction traffic in combination with operational traffic from completed development on projected development sites under the Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at seven study area intersections during one or both analyzed construction peak hours; specifically, one intersection in the AM construction peak hour, and six intersections in the PM construction peak hour.

Many of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing and curbside parking regulations. The types of mitigation measures proposed herein are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. **Table 29** summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for each of the intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the AM and PM construction peak hours. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to final review and approval by NYCDOT. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated during all analyzed peak hours with the exception of one intersection in the PM construction peak hour. Consequently, this impact would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

Proposed Schedule on Traffic Mitigation Measures

Subject to the approval of NYCDOT, the mitigation measures summarized in **Table 29** would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse traffic impacts resulting from the peak construction period of the Preferred Alternative in the first quarter of 2034. Construction of the Preferred Alternative would occur in five stages over 16 years, with an anticipated start date in the third quarter of 2025. As the peak construction period of the Preferred Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. The actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Table 29: 2034 (Q1) Preferred Alternative Proposed Construction Traffic Mitigation Measures

Intersection	Signal Phase	No-Action Alternative Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)		Proposed Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)		Recommended Mitigation
		AM	PM	AM	PM	
W.29th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	39	- Transfer 3s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	NB	30	30	30	27	
	NB/NBL	17	17	17	17	
W.25th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	38	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	42	
W.23th St (E-W) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB/WB	30	30	30	30	- Eliminate parking on the west curb of the NB approach in the PM construction peak hour.
	EB/EB-L	11	11	11	11	
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	NB	42	42	42	42	
W.17th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	40	- Transfer 4s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	40	
W.29th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	38	38	38	38	- Unmitigated.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	45	45	45	45	
W.23rd St (EB-WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB/WB	31	31	30	31	- Transfer 1s of green time from EB/WB to SB/SBL in AM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	32	32	32	32	
	SB/SBL	20	20	21	20	
W.17th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	33	33	36	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	50	50	50	47	

Notes :

(1) Signal timings shown indicate green plus yellow (including all red) for each phase.
All proposed signal timing mitigations reflect adjustments to the walk timings.

Pedestrians

In the first quarter 2034 peak construction period, the Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at three sidewalks and one crosswalk in one or both of the construction peak hours.

Sidewalks

Of the five sidewalks analyzed, three are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Preferred Alternative during the peak construction period. **Table 30** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, in the peak construction period, the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse impacts to one sidewalk would be mitigated during the

AM construction peak hour. Practicable mitigation measures could not be identified for significant adverse impacts at one and three sidewalks during the AM and PM construction peak hours, respectively, and these impacts would therefore remain unmitigated.

With the relocation of a traffic sign located on the western half of the north sidewalk along W. 17th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues, the significant adverse impact would be fully mitigated during the analyzed construction AM peak hour. The Preferred Alternative would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact at this sidewalk during the construction AM peak hour if the proposed mitigation measure is deemed infeasible and no alternate mitigation measure is identified.

Table 30: 2034 (Q1) Preferred Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Sidewalk Conditions

	No-Action Alternative			Preferred Alternative			Preferred Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
Sidewalk	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Construction AM Peak Hour										
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	81.9	C	1.5	15.3	E *	3.0	33.2	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	42.6	C	1.0	17.3	E *	1.0	17.3	E *	- Unmitigatable.
Construction PM Peak Hour										
North sidewalk along W 25 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	5.0	46.5	C	5.0	31.4	D *	5.0	31.4	D *	- Unmitigatable.
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	22.9	E	1.5	7.7	F *	3.0	19.7	E *	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	13.1	E	1.0	6.7	F *	1.0	6.7	F *	- Unmitigatable.

Note:
***** Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.

Crosswalks

Out of the two crosswalks analyzed, one is expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Preferred Alternative in the PM construction peak hour during the peak construction period. Based on NYCDOT's guidance, widening the north crosswalk at 8th Avenue and W. 25th Street is not feasible as there is only approximately eight feet of space on the pedestrian island between the travel lanes and bike lanes. Therefore, significant adverse impacts at one crosswalk would remain unmitigated in the PM construction peak hour as shown in **Table 31**.

Table 31: 2034 (Q1) Preferred Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Crosswalk Conditions

		No-Action Alternative			Preferred Alternative			Preferred Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
Intersection	Crosswalk	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Construction PM Peak Hour											
8 Ave & W 25 St	North	12.0	24.9	C	12.0	18.6	D *	12.0	18.6	D *	- Unmitigated.

Note:

* Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.

Proposed Schedule on Pedestrian Mitigation Measures

Subject to the approval of NYCDOT, the pedestrian mitigation measures described in **Table 30** would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse sidewalk impacts resulting from the peak construction period of the Preferred Alternative in the first quarter of 2034. Construction of the Preferred Alternative would occur in five stages over 16 years, with an anticipated start date in the third quarter of 2025. As the peak construction period of the Preferred Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. The actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Alternative 3 – Non-Rezoning Alternative

Traffic

In the second quarter 2037 peak construction period, construction traffic in combination with operational traffic from completed development on projected development sites under the Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at eight study area intersections during one or both analyzed construction peak hours; specifically, one intersection in the AM construction peak hour and seven intersections in the PM construction peak hour.

As demonstrated below, all of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing and curbside parking regulations. The types of mitigation measures proposed herein are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. **Table 32** summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for each of the intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the AM and PM construction peak hours. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to final review and approval by NYCDOT. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Proposed Schedule on Traffic Mitigation Measures

Subject to the approval of NYCDOT, the mitigation measures summarized in **Table 32** would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse traffic impacts resulting from the peak construction period of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in the second quarter of 2037. Construction of the Non-Rezoning Alternative would occur in five stages over 16 years, with an anticipated start date in the third quarter of 2025. As the peak construction period of the Non-Rezoning Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2037. The

actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Table 32: 2037 (Q2) Non-Rezoning Alternative Proposed Construction Traffic Mitigation Measures

Intersection	Signal Phase	No-Action Alternative Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)		Proposed Signal Timing (Seconds) (1)		Recommended Mitigation
		AM	PM	AM	PM	
W.29th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	37	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	NB	30	30	30	29	
	NB/NBL	17	17	17	17	
W.25th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	37	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	43	
W.23th St (E-W) & 10th Ave (NB)	EB/WB	30	30	30	31	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to EB/WB in PM.
	EB/EB-L	11	11	11	11	
	PED	7	7	7	7	- Eliminate parking on the west curb of the NB approach in the PM construction peak hour.
	NB	42	42	42	41	
W.19th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB) See note (2)	EB	21	21	21	21	- Transfer 1s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	WB	23	23	23	24	
	NB	39	39	39	38	
	Ped	7	7	7	7	
W.17th St (WB) & 10th Ave (NB)	WB	36	36	36	38	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	10	10	10	10	
	NB	44	44	44	42	
W.29th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	38	38	38	40	- Transfer 2s of green time from NB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	45	45	45	43	
W.23rd St (EB-WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	EB/WB	31	31	30	31	- Transfer 1s of green time from EB/WB to SB/SBL in AM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	32	32	32	32	
	SB/SBL	20	20	21	20	
W.19th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	33	33	36	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	NB	50	50	50	47	
W.17th St (WB) & 9th Ave (SB)	WB	33	33	33	34	- Transfer 1s of green time from SB to WB in PM.
	PED	7	7	7	7	
	SB	50	50	50	49	

Notes :

(1) Signal timings shown indicate green plus yellow (including all red) for each phase.

(2) An impact at W. 19th St/10th Ave was created by the mitigation measures for W. 19th St/9th Ave. Therefore, mitigation measures are proposed for W. 19th St/10th Ave.

All proposed signal timing mitigations reflect adjustments to the walk timings.

Pedestrians

In the second quarter 2037 peak construction period, the Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at two sidewalks in both of the construction peak hours.

Sidewalks

Of the four sidewalks analyzed, two are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Non-Rezoning Alternative during the peak construction period. **Table 33** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, in the peak construction period, the Non-Rezoning Alternative's significant adverse impacts to one sidewalk would be mitigated during both the AM and PM construction peak hours. Practicable mitigation measures could not be identified for significant adverse impacts at one sidewalk during the same peak hours, and these impacts would therefore remain unmitigated.

With the relocation of a trash bin and traffic sign located on the western half of the north sidewalk along W. 17th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues, the significant adverse impact would be fully mitigated during all analyzed peak hours. The Non-Rezoning Alternative would result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact at this sidewalk if the proposed mitigation measure is deemed infeasible and no alternate mitigation measure is identified.

Table 33: 2037 (Q2) Non-Rezoning Alternative Action-With-Mitigation Sidewalk Conditions

	No-Action Alternative			Non-Rezoning Alternative			Non-Rezoning Alternative Action-with-Mitigation			
Sidewalk	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Construction AM Peak Hour										
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	81.9	C	1.5	18.1	E *	3.0	38.5	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	42.6	C	1.0	20.2	E *	1.0	20.2	E *	- Unmitigatable.
Construction PM Peak Hour										
North sidewalk along W 17 St btw 9 Ave & 10 Ave	1.5	22.9	E	1.5	10.9	F *	3.0	25.3	D	- Relocation of one traffic sign.
North sidewalk along W 16 St btw 8 Ave & 9 Ave	1.0	13.0	E	1.0	7.9	F *	1.0	7.9	F *	- Unmitigatable.

Note:
* Denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CTM* criteria.

Proposed Schedule on Pedestrian Mitigation Measures

Subject to the approval of NYCDOT, the pedestrian mitigation measures described in **Table 33** would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse sidewalk impacts resulting from the peak construction period of the Non-Rezoning Alternative in the second quarter of 2037. Construction of the Non-Rezoning Alternative would occur in five stages over 16 years, with an anticipated start date in the third quarter of 2025. As the peak construction period of the Non-Rezoning Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2037. The actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Alternative 4 – Midblock Bulk Alternative

Traffic

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to seven intersections in one or both of the analyzed peak hours during the peak construction period. As the Midblock Bulk Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips in each of the construction peak hours than the Preferred Alternative, it is anticipated that it would not result in any new significant adverse traffic impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative. The rearrangement of bulk between the Midblock Bulk Alternative and Preferred Alternative may result in small change in the directional distribution of action-generated trips at some intersections. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse traffic impacts during construction may also be proposed for the Midblock Bulk Alternative and would improve the traffic conditions of the impacted locations under the Midblock Bulk Alternative. Similar to the Preferred Alternative, as the peak construction period of the Midblock Bulk Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. As such, implementation of some or all of the mitigation measures developed for peak construction period for the Preferred Alternative would be considered at impacted intersections in proximity to the Project Site at an earlier point in time.

Pedestrians

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to three sidewalks and one crosswalk in one or both of the analyzed construction peak hours during the peak construction period. As the Midblock Bulk Alternative would generate fewer pedestrian trips in each of the construction peak hours than the Preferred Alternative, it is expected that it would not result in any new significant adverse pedestrian impacts during construction as compared to the Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse pedestrian impacts may also be proposed for the Midblock Bulk Alternative and would improve the sidewalk conditions of the impacted pedestrian locations under the Midblock Bulk Alternative. Similar to the Preferred Alternative, as the peak construction period of the Midblock Bulk Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse pedestrian impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. The actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Alternative 7 – COY Alternative

Traffic

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to seven intersections in one or both of the analyzed peak hours during the peak construction period. As the COY Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips in each of the construction peak hours than the Preferred Alternative, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse traffic impacts than the Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred

Alternative's significant adverse traffic impacts during construction may similarly be proposed for the COY Alternative and would likewise improve the traffic conditions of the impacted locations under this alternative. Similar to the Preferred Alternative, as the peak construction period of the COY Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. As such, implementation of some or all of the mitigation measures developed for peak construction period for the Preferred Alternative would be considered at impacted intersections in proximity to the Project Sites at an earlier point in time.

Pedestrians

The Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to three sidewalks and one crosswalk in one or both of the analyzed construction peak hours during the peak construction period. As the COY Alternative would generate fewer pedestrian trips in each of the construction peak hour than the Preferred Alternative, it is anticipated that the COY Alternative would result in similar or fewer significant adverse pedestrian impacts during construction than the Preferred Alternative. The measures proposed for the Preferred Alternative's significant adverse pedestrian impacts may similarly be proposed for the COY Alternative and would likewise improve the sidewalk and crosswalk conditions of the impacted pedestrian locations under this alternative. Similar to the Preferred Alternative, as the peak construction period of the Midblock Bulk Alternative would be expected to occur within the 16-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse pedestrian impacts could occur between 2025 and the peak construction period in 2034. The actual implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will be determined in consultation with NYCDOT upon field survey of the build conditions.

Construction Noise

Construction under the four feasible alternatives would result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at various receptors. Significant adverse impacts that cannot be fully mitigated through reasonably practicable measures are considered unavoidable adverse impacts**.**

Noise Reduction Measures

Construction activities for the four alternatives would be required to follow the requirements of the NYC Noise Control Code for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the NYC Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls.

In addition, during construction of the Proposed Project, the following source and path control measures above and beyond New York City regulations would be implemented as Project Components Related to the Environment (PCREs) to minimize noise emissions to the maximum extent practicable.

- Certain equipment such as compressors, generators, and cranes, would be required to meet the mandated noise levels to be used for construction of the Proposed Project (lower levels than those specified in the NYC Construction Noise Code)

- In lieu of a generator, power would be drawn from the existing Con Edison grid, subject to Con Edison approval and power availability
- Noise barriers would be 12 feet tall and cantilevered towards the work area instead of the 8 feet tall required by code
- Throughout the construction period, concrete operations would be located within the construction barrier (i.e., A structure enclosed on three sides and with a roof constructed) while pouring or being washed out
- The construction barrier would be attenuated using sound blankets
- Where logistics allow, noisy equipment, such as cranes, concrete pumps, concrete trucks, and delivery trucks, would be located away from and shielded from sensitive receptor locations

In addition to these source and path-control measures, between the DEIS and FEIS, the feasibility and practicability of receptor control measures and/or other potential noise control measures and mitigation for construction noise impacts on nearby buildings were evaluated. No additional measures were determined to be feasible, practicable, and effective to mitigate the predicted significant adverse construction noise impacts. For the Proposed Project under any of the alternatives, the measures described above will be obligations of the PACT Partner that will be memorialized in legally binding documents.

It should be noted that even with the noise reduction measures, interior noise levels during construction would still exceed the acceptable thresholds for residential or community facility uses under the four alternatives. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project under any of these alternatives would result in an unavoidable significant adverse noise impact.

I. REHABILITATION AND INFILL ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

The Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative involves the rehabilitation and renovation of the existing buildings on the Project Sites as well as the development of three new buildings. This alternative would result in similar impacts to historic and cultural resources. The new building could potentially result in significant adverse shadows on portions of Chelsea Park to the north in a manner similar to but less than under the Preferred Alternative. Unlike the four feasible alternatives, the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative would not result in any significant adverse transportation or construction impacts as compared to the No-Action Alternative. As discussed above in **Section D, "Project Alternatives,"** the Rehabilitation and Infill Alternative was determined to be infeasible and to not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project.

J. INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Indirect Effects

The potential for the Proposed Project under the four feasible alternatives to result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect effects has been studied in accordance with applicable CEQR, SEQRA, and NEPA guidance. The analyses considered indirect effects that could occur if the

Proposed Project induced economic or demographic growth outside the Project Sites, due to demands generated by the population directly introduced by the Proposed Project or due to effects on the area's built environment through indirect or contextual changes. The Proposed Project would not result in any indirect effects impacts, as discussed in the individual technical analyses above.

Cumulative Effects

The Proposed Project, in combination with development projects expected to be completed independent of the Proposed Project (the No-Action developments), would result in changes in the future conditions of the respective study areas of the various technical analysis chapters. The analysis methodologies and the criteria for determining significant adverse impacts used in the EIS are generally based on cumulative effects. The Proposed Project would not result in any other cumulative impacts beyond those disclosed in the technical analysis chapters in the EIS. For all four feasible alternatives analyzed in detail, significant adverse impacts have been identified for several technical areas due to the addition of incremental effects associated with the Proposed Project to future baseline conditions under the No-Action Alternative. In other words, these impacts are attributable to the cumulative effects of both the Proposed Project and other known planned developments and conditions in the surrounding area. These affected areas include: shadows; transportation (traffic and pedestrian conditions); and construction (noise, traffic, and pedestrians).[13] Where significant adverse impacts have been identified, measures have been examined to avoid, mitigate, or minimize these impacts and are summarized in **Section H.**

Although the principal objective of environmental review is to determine if the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts and identify if such impacts can be mitigated, the EIS also indicates that the Proposed Project would have beneficial cumulative effects by improving the quality of life and housing stability for existing residents of the Project Sites with the replacement of the existing NYCHA DUs to Section 8 PBV DUs, expanded community facility spaces, and qualitative improvements to accessory open space, while also providing new commercial space and affordable and market-rate DUs to address the critical shortage of affordable housing and housing in general in New York City. The market-rate DUs would financially support the PACT portion and affordable housing components of the Proposed Project.

K. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

According to the 2021 *CTM*, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those that would occur if a proposed project or action is implemented regardless of the mitigation employed, or if mitigation is infeasible. As described in **Section H**, above, under operational conditions, the Proposed Project would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts in the technical areas of shadows, historic and cultural resources, and transportation (traffic and pedestrian). Under

[13] Under all four alternatives, the Proposed Project would also result in significant adverse historic and cultural resources impacts due to the demolition of the State and National Register eligible Elliott-Chelsea Houses. However, these impacts are not considered cumulative as they are only attributable to the Proposed Project.

construction conditions the Proposed Project will result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts related to noise and transportation (traffic and pedestrians).

L. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVEABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

This assessment summarizes the Proposed Project and its impacts on the loss of environmental (i.e., man-made and natural) resources, both in the immediate future and in the long term. Examples include the building materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the Proposed Project development by various mechanical and processing systems; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of project-generated development. These are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some other purpose would be highly unlikely.

The development under the Proposed Project also constitutes a long-term commitment of land resources, thereby rendering land use for other purposes highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. The land use changes that would result from the Proposed Project may also be considered a resource loss. However, the Project Sites are currently developed with a constructed environment of buildings, other structures, and landscaping. Additionally, the land use changes that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project would be consistent with City and State strategies and policies to directly address the affordable housing shortage by increasing New York City's affordable housing stock in areas well-served by public transportation and to address the overall City-wide housing shortage by generally increasing the supply of housing in New York City.

In addition, the public services provided in connection with the Proposed Project (e.g., police and fire protection, public education, open space, and other City resources) also constitute resource commitments that might otherwise be used for other programs or projects.

The commitments of resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Project, which include improving quality of life and housing stability for NYCHA FEC residents, addressing the City's housing shortage, providing financial support the PACT portion and new affordable housing components of the Proposed Project, and the addition of new commercial uses, additional community facility uses, and accessory open spaces to the Project Sites that would serve the new and existing residential population. The Proposed Project addresses the vital need of maintaining and improving existing affordable housing while creating new affordable and market-rate housing and providing a strong anchor for the ongoing development efforts in the Chelsea neighborhood.

M. CONCLUSIONS

Having carefully considered the environmental record noted above, the mitigation measures and PCREs as required herein and that will be incorporated into legally binding documents, the written and oral comments offered by other agencies and the public on this record, and the written responses to the comments, NYCHA and HPD have determined that where practicable, mitigation

and PCREs have been identified to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.

On the basis of the careful evaluation and weighing of environmental impacts with social, economic and other considerations as presented, and the mitigation measures and PCREs proposed in the Fulton and Elliott-Chelsea Houses Redevelopment Project FEIS, as well as the written and oral comments offered by the public and public agencies, HPD and NYCHA certify in accordance with 24 CFR Part 58 and 6 NYCRR Part 617 the following:

- The requirements of 24 CFR Part 58 and 6 NYCRR Part 617 have been met as the DEIS and FEIS were duly prepared under NEPA, and the FEIS is sufficient to make findings under 6 NYCRR Part 617.11 as permitted by 6 NYCRR Part 617.15;
- Consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations, from among the feasible alternatives available, the Preferred Alternative is the alterative that best addresses the purpose and need for the Proposed Project;
- By incorporation of mitigation measures and PCREs that were identified as practicable into legally binding documents that will ensure such measures and PCREs are implemented during design, construction, and operations, the Preferred Alternative avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable;
- Alternatives were evaluated and decisions were made in the best overall public interest based upon a balanced consideration of (i) the need to improve the quality of life and housing stability for existing FEC residents, while facilitating the construction of additional critically needed permanent affordable housing units, as well as market-rate housing that would financially support the PACT and affordable housing components of the Proposed Project; (ii) the development of commercial space and additional community facility space for the residents and the surrounding community; (iii) the arrangement of building bulk across the Project Sites; and (iv) the relative speed of construction of replacement housing for existing residents of the Fulton and Elliott Chelsea Houses; and
- Compliance with all applicable environmental requirements are reflected in the environmental review record required under NEPA and SEQRA.

Signatories:

New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD)

Anthony Howard
Director of Environmental Planning

Dated: July 28, 2025

New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)

Shaan Mavani
Chief Asset and Capital Management Officer (CACMO)

July 28, 2025