

A. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, this chapter presents and analyzes alternatives to the proposed project. Alternatives selected for consideration in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are generally those which are feasible and have the potential to reduce, eliminate, or avoid adverse impacts of a proposed action while meeting some or all of the goals and objectives of the action.

In addition to a comparative impact analysis, the alternatives in this chapter are assessed to determine to what extent they would meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project, which are to improve quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable units in the Development Site.

This chapter considers three alternatives to the proposed project:

- A No Action Alternative, which is mandated by CEQR and SEQRA, and is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part. The No Action Alternative assumes that the Lambert Houses development remains in its current condition.
- A No School Alternative, which assumes that the 500-seat school proposed for Parcel 10 is not constructed. In the No School Alternative, an additional 55 units of housing would be developed on Parcel 10 instead. Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would be developed as they would be with the proposed project.
- A No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impact Alternative, which considers a project program that would eliminate the proposed project's unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of ~~public intermediate schools~~, shadows, and transportation.

B. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative assumes no discretionary actions would occur. The Development Site would remain in its existing condition and the proposed project would not be implemented. This condition is the "future without the proposed project" or the "No Action" condition, and it is used in other chapters of this EIS as the baseline against which impacts of the proposed project are measured. This section compares the potential effects of the No Action Alternative to those of the proposed project.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The effects of the No Action Alternative in comparison to those of the proposed project are summarized below.

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

In the No Action Alternative, the Development Site would remain as in existing conditions, which is currently underdeveloped relative to both the amount of floor area currently permitted by zoning and also the density of the surrounding neighborhood. The zoning in Parcels 1, 3 and 5 would remain R7-1 and Parcel 10 would remain R7-1/C1-4. None of the additional affordable housing, retail, or the possible school that would be introduced by the proposed project would be created under the No Action Alternative.

Unlike the proposed project, the public policy goals relating to the Development Site would not be met in the No Action Alternative. The major public policy goal in the City to preserve affordable residential units released as part of the *Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Housing Plan* (“*Housing New York*”) would not be advanced. The Development Site’s existing affordable housing would continue to be outdated and inefficient and the substantial amount of new affordable housing units would not be developed.

Neither the proposed project nor the No Action Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy. However, unlike the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would improve quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents by remedying several design and operational constraints currently present in the existing buildings; in addition, the proposed project would introduce a substantial number of new affordable housing units to the study area.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions. Neither the proposed project nor the No Action Alternative would result in any significant adverse impacts due to direct or indirect residential displacement. Under the proposed project, all of the proposed new residential units would be affordable; it is expected that the new units constructed with the proposed project, as well as the new population those units would introduce to the study area, as a whole would generally be similar to the existing income profile of the surrounding neighborhood. The No Action Alternative and the proposed project would also not have significant adverse effects on specific industries. Unlike the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would result in the direct displacement of most of the businesses currently operating within the Development Site, supporting an estimated 99 workers. However, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. Furthermore, unlike the No Action Alternative, the new uses introduced as a result of the proposed project would serve to enliven the Development Site and provide additional affordable housing and retail serving the surrounding area.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

With the No Action Alternative, in contrast to the proposed project, there would be no increase in the residential population to the Development Site. This alternative would not result in the significant adverse impacts predicted to occur as a result of the proposed project on intermediate schools within Community School District 12, Sub-District 2 (assuming the development of the proposed public elementary school).

In the No Action Alternative, the many new development projects recently completed or anticipated in the future would substantially increase demand for community facilities; public

elementary and intermediate schools would operate at or exceed full capacity. Elementary schools in the sub-district study area would operate over capacity (~~129~~124.0648 percent utilization) in the No Action Alternative with a deficit of ~~1,875~~616 seats. Intermediate schools in the sub-district would also operate over capacity (~~118~~163.7554 percent utilization) in the No Action Alternative with a deficit of ~~345~~1,186 seats.

As with the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts with regard to public high schools, child care facilities, library services, police services, fire protection, and emergency medical services. However, unlike the No Action Alternative, the proposed project includes the possibility of a new elementary public school on the Development Site.

OPEN SPACE

Under the No Action Alternative, in contrast to the proposed project, no changes to the open space located south of Parcel 10 are expected, no significant adverse shadows impact would occur on River Park (see below), and there would be no increase in the residential population to the Development Site or the study area. Under the No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, the total, active, and passive ratios in the study area would remain below City guideline levels. Although the proposed project would result in a decrease in the total, active, and passive open space ratios, these decreases would not exceed 5 percent, which is the CEQR threshold generally used for a more detailed open space analysis. The No Action Alternative would not result in improved open space amenities within the Development Site that would help meet some of the Lambert Houses resident open space needs. The proposed project would include approximately 240,000 square feet of open space enclosed in courtyards surrounded by the proposed new buildings, which would be available to all building residents. The Development Site open spaces are expected to be landscaped with a mix of shrubs and trees; it is anticipated that lawn and seating areas would be provided as well as children's play equipment. One proposed new building on Parcel 10 would also provide approximately 12,655 square feet of open space for residents on its rooftop. In addition, each courtyard block would have an indoor fitness room for residents to use. These benefits would not occur with the No Action Alternative.

SHADOWS

Under the No Action Alternative, the Development Site would remain unchanged, and therefore there would be no change with respect to shadows. While the proposed project would result in new shadows on several nearby resources, including Vidalia Park, West Farms Square Seating Area, West Farms Rapids Park, River Garden, West Farms Soldiers Cemetery, the New Tabernacle Baptist Church, and the Bronx River, these would be incremental shadows that would not result in any significant adverse impacts. Therefore, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse shadow impacts to either the vegetation, the users of these resources, or to the biota of the river. The No Action Alternative would not result in the project's potential unmitigated shadows impact on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, adjacent to Parcel 3 at 980 East 180th Street or to River Park.

HISTORIC

As there are no known or potential architectural resources within the Development Site, the No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not entail the demolition of any known or

potential architectural resources. Under the No Action Alternative, the potential shadows impact on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Church would not occur, and no construction would occur on the Development Site. Although there are four historic resources located within 90 feet of the Development Site, and thus would be within the area of potential construction-related project impacts, the proposed project would not have any direct, physical impacts on known or potential architectural resources in the study area, as a result of the implementation of a Construction Protection Plan (CPP). The CPP would be prepared and implemented prior to demolition and construction activities on the Development Site and project-related demolition and construction activities would be monitored as specified in the CPP. Therefore, as with the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources.

URBAN DESIGN

Like the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on the urban design, view corridors, or visual resources in the 400-foot study area. In comparison with the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would notably alter the visual character of the surrounding area, but this character is already changing through the buildings currently under construction and renovation. However, unlike the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in enhancements to the visual character of the Development Site and enhancements to the pedestrian experience of the neighborhood. The proposed project would reintroduce portions of the street grid on Bryant Avenue and East 180th Street as private thoroughfares, new view corridors would extend through these portions of the Development Site, creating a sense of openness within the Development Site and allowing east-west views across the entire site from Vyse Avenue to the Bronx River. Overall, compared to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not enhance the existing pedestrian experience in the Development Site and study area.

NATURAL RESOURCES

As with the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to groundwater, floodplains, water quality, aquatic biota, wetlands, terrestrial natural resources, and threatened, endangered, and special concern species within Development Site and study area. Protective measures, including erosion and sediment control and stormwater BMPs, as well as landscaping and planting within the Development Site would prevent adverse impacts to natural resources and improve conditions within the Development Site post construction. Therefore, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources within the Development Site and study area.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Unlike the proposed project, there would be no construction on the Development Site in the No Action Alternative. Former uses within (or near) the Development Site may have impacted subsurface conditions; and the existing residential and/or former commercial spaces may have used and stored oil for heating purposes and the structures may contain ACM, LBP, and/or PCB-containing materials. Demolition of the existing structures and excavation activities associated with new construction could disturb these hazardous materials and potentially increase pathways for human or environmental exposure. Impacts as a result of the proposed project would be avoided by performing a number of measures, as noted in Chapter 10, "Hazardous Materials."

With these measures, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

WATER AND SEWER

The No Action Alternative would not result in any increased demand on New York City's water supply and would not result in any change in wastewater and sanitary sewage generation. Although the proposed project would result in incremental increases in residential, retail, and school space on the Development Site's parcels, and would consume more water and generate more sewage, as well as alter the surface area coverage of the Development Site, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in any significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, wastewater, or stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

TRANSPORTATION

Under the No Action Alternative, it is expected that existing uses on the Development Site would remain. Although the No Action Alternative would not result in any of the travel demand associated with the proposed project (and would therefore not generate any new vehicular trips), traffic volumes in the study area would be expected to increase as a result of background growth and planned development in the study area. The majority of the approaches/lane-groups will operate at the same LOS as in the existing conditions; however, several approaches/lane-groups are expected to operate at deteriorated LOS when compared to the existing conditions, as noted in Chapter 12, "Transportation."

The No Action Alternative would not result in the significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the proposed project, which would occur at a number of intersections, nor would this alternative result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts. Some of the proposed project's traffic impacts could be mitigated with readily implementable traffic improvement measures, including signal timing and phasing changes, while some could be unmitigatable. Widening future crosswalks were identified to mitigate the projected pedestrian impacts.

AIR QUALITY

The No Action Alternative would not result in any changes, as the Development Site will continue in active use as in existing conditions. Therefore, the No Action Alternative, as with the proposed project, would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts on air quality from the proposed stationary sources. Under the proposed project, at certain project buildings restrictions would be required to ensure the proposed buildings would not result in any significant air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions. In addition, the No Action Alternative, as with the proposed project, would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial facilities. Therefore, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

GREENHOUSE GASES

Unlike the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in an increase in energy use, fuel consumption, or vehicle trips, and would therefore not result in the increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the proposed project. However, based on the commitment to energy efficiency and by virtue of location and nature, the proposed project would be consistent with City's PlaNYC GHG emissions reduction goals.

NOISE

Like the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not generate sufficient traffic to have the potential to cause a significant adverse noise impact. The proposed project's design measures would be expected to provide sufficient attenuation to achieve both CEQR and HUD interior noise level requirements. In order to ensure that the proposed project would achieve the necessary building attenuation requirements, "E" designations would be mapped for the Development Site parcels. In addition, the building mechanical system (i.e., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems) would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations (i.e., Subchapter 5, §24-227 of the New York City Noise Control Code and the New York City Department of Buildings Code) and to avoid producing levels that would result in any significant increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, as with the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in any significant increase in ambient noise levels.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. However, the No Action Alternative would not result in enhancements to the visual character of the Development Site and enhancements to the pedestrian experience of the neighborhood. The benefits to neighborhood character that would result from the proposed uses and design of the proposed project would not be realized under the No Action Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION

Under the No Action Alternative, no construction would occur on the Development Site. The buildings would remain in their current condition.

The No Action Alternative would not result in the additional vehicle trips or increased parking demand generated by the proposed project's construction activities. The No Action Alternative also would not result in any air pollutant emissions or increased noise levels that would be associated with the construction of the proposed project. As such, the No Action Alternative would not result in the significant adverse impacts to traffic during the construction period. As with the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse construction impacts with respect to vibration, air quality, historic and cultural resources, hazardous materials, open space, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, natural resources, and land use and neighborhood character.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in any disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. The No Action Alternative would not have an overall positive effect by improving the quality of life for current Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable units on the Development Site.

C. NO SCHOOL ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE NO SCHOOL ALTERNATIVE

The No School Alternative would result in the same development as the proposed project with the exception of Parcel 10. In the No School Alternative, if the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) were to decline to exercise the option to build a new public school on Parcel 10, a residential building with approximately 55 units would be constructed in its place. Overall, the No School Alternative would redevelop the Development Site with the following:

- A total of 1,720 residential units at the completion of the project, for an increment of 989 units over the No Action condition. The proposed residential units would all be affordable.
- Approximately 61,100 sf of retail, for an increment of 21,610 sf over the No Action condition.
- A reduction in the amount of parking at the site, for a total of 110 spaces.

This alternative would result in a different massing on Parcel 10.

NO SCHOOL ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Because the No School Alternative would be substantially similar to the proposed project and would result in an additional 55 units of housing rather than a school, this alternative is expected to have substantially similar effects as the proposed project in the areas of land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; historic and cultural resources; natural resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; greenhouse gas emissions; noise; neighborhood character; and construction.

The areas where this alternative would result in different effects are discussed in more detail: community facilities; open space; shadows, urban design, transportation, and air quality.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Potential Indirect Effects on Public Elementary, Intermediate, and High Schools

The No School Alternative would result in an additional 55 residential units for a total increment of 989 residential units. These units could introduce approximately 386 elementary students, 158 intermediate school students, and 188 high school students to Sub-district 2/CSD 12.

The total elementary school enrollment of Sub-district 2/CSD 12 would increase by 386 students to 8,718,622 (129.8135.54 percent utilization) with a deficit of 2,002,264 seats (see **Table 20-1**). The total intermediate school enrollment of Sub-district 2/CSD 12 would increase by 158 students to 3,205,364 (172.2427.03 percent utilization), resulting in a deficit of 1,344,503 seats. The total high school enrollment of the Bronx would increase by 188 students to 49,435,054 students (75.4990.17 percent utilization) with a surplus of 16,055,643 seats.

Table 20-1

**Estimated Public School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization:
No School Alternative**

Study Area	No Action Enrollment	Students Introduced by the Proposed Project	Total With Action Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization	Change in Utilization Compared with No Action
Elementary Schools							
Sub-district 2 of CSD 12	8,3328,236	386	8,718622	6,716364	-2,002264	129.8135.54%	5.756.07%
Intermediate Schools							
Sub-district 2 of CSD 12	3,0472,206	158	3,2052,364	1,861	-1,344503	172.2427.03%	8.49%
High Schools							
Bronx Borough	58,86649,247	188	49,43559,054	65,490	16,0556,436	75.4990.17%	0.29%
Sources: DOE Enrollment Projections (Actual 2014, Projected 2015-2024) by the Grier Partnership; DOE, Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2014-2015, DOE 2015-2019 Proposed Five-Year Capital Plan, March 2016; School Construction Authority.							

As compared with the proposed Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would result in higher changes in utilization compared with the future without the proposed project for elementary, intermediate, and high schools. The No School Alternative would result in an increase in the utilization rate of more than 5 percentage points for elementary and intermediate schools (5.756.07 percentage points and 8.49 percentage points, respectively); therefore, the No School Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on elementary and intermediate schools.

As discussed further in Chapter 21, "Mitigation," the potential for significant adverse impacts to elementary and intermediate schools under this alternative (and under the Proposed Actions) would be fully mitigated through the Department of Education's (DOE) commitment to monitoring enrollment at both the elementary and intermediate school level during the remaining years of the current Five-Year Capital Plan for Fiscal Years 2015-2019 and the two succeeding Five-Year Capital Plans for Fiscal Years 2020-2024 and Fiscal Years 2024-2029.

Potential Indirect Effects on Public Libraries

The No School Alternative would result in an additional 55 residential units for a total of 989 residential units. Using the average household size of 2.87, the No School Alternative would be expected to introduce approximately 2,838 residents to the study area. **Table 20-2** provides the population increase and the change in the holding-per-resident ratio for the catchment area. With this additional population, the West Farms Library would serve 77,786 residents (approximately a 3.79 percent increase).

Table 20-2

No School Alternative: Catchment Area Population

Library Name	Catchment Area Population – Future Without the Proposed Project	Population Increase due to the Proposed Project	Catchment Area Population with the Proposed Project	Population Increase	Holdings per Resident
West Farms Library	74,947	2,838	77,786	3.79%	0.49
Sources: NYPL; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, AKRF, Inc.					

As compared with the proposed Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would result in a slightly higher population increase of 3.79 percent. However, the catchment area population increases attributable to the No School Alternative are below the five percent

threshold cited in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, as with the Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public libraries.

Potential Indirect Effects on Child Care Centers

The No School Alternative would result in an additional 55 residential units for a total of 989 affordable residential units. To provide a conservative analysis, it is assumed that all of these units would meet the financial and social eligibility criteria for publicly-funded child care. Based on *CEQR Technical Manual* child care multipliers, the No School Alternative would result in approximately 137 children under the age of six who would be eligible for publicly-funded child care programs.

With the addition of these children, child care facilities in the 2-mile study area would operate at 100.71 percent utilization with a deficit of 31 slots (see **Table 20-3**). Total enrollment in the study area would increase to 4,400 children, compared with a capacity of 4,369 slots, which represents an increase in the utilization rate of 3.14 percent over the future without the proposed project.

Table 20-3
No School Alternative:
Estimated Public Child Care Facility Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization

	Enrollment	Capacity	Available Slots	Utilization Rate	Change in Utilization Compared Future Without the Proposed Project
Future Without the Proposed Project	4,263	4,369	106	97.57%	N/A
Future With the Proposed Project	4,400	4,369	-31	100.71%	3.14%
Source: ACS (June 2015).					

As compared with the proposed Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would result in a slightly higher change in utilization from the future without the proposed project. The increase with the No School Alternative would not exceed the 5 percentage point threshold; therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on child care facilities. Therefore, as with the proposed project, the No School Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on child care facilities.

OPEN SPACE

The No School Alternative would result in an additional 55 residential units for a total of 989 residential units. Using the average household size of 2.87, the No School Alternative would be expected to introduce approximately 2,838 residents to the study area. Altogether, the residential population in the study area would total 63,983. Assuming the same decrease in size of the seating area south of Parcel 10, as compared with the proposed Lambert Houses development, this open space would decrease from 0.10 acres to approximately 0.045 acres and the study area would provide 31.61 acres of total open space, composed of 15.26 acres of active recreational open space and 16.35 acres of passive recreational open space.

The introduction of 158 additional residents in the No School Alternative would represent a small increase compared to the total population of 63,983 residents in the study area. As shown in **Table 20-4**, under the No School Alternative, the total open space ratio would be 0.494 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below both the citywide median open space ratio of 1.500 and the City's planning goal of 2.500 acres per 1,000 residents. The active open space ratio would be 0.239

Lambert Houses

acres per 1,000 residents, which is below the City's guideline of 2.000 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents. The passive open space ratio would be 0.256 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below the City's guideline of 0.500 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents. As shown in **Table 20-5**, the decrease in the total, active, and passive open space ratios from the future without the proposed project would not exceed 5 percent, which is the CEQR threshold generally used for a more detailed open space analysis.

Table 20-4

No School Alternative: Adequacy of Open Space Resources

Residential Population	Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 People			City Open Space Guidelines		
	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive
63,983	31.61	15.26	16.35	0.494	0.239	0.256	2.500	2.000	0.500

Table 20-5

No School Alternative: Open Space Ratios Summary

Ratio	City Guideline	Open Space Ratios		Percent Change Future Without to Future With the Proposed Project
		Future Without the Proposed Project	Future With the Proposed Project	
Residential (½-Mile) Study Area				
Total/Residents	2.500	0.518	0.494	-4.633%
Active/Residents	2.000	0.250	0.239	-4.400%
Passive/Residents	0.500	0.268	0.256	-4.478%
Note: Ratios in acres per 1,000 people.				

As compared with the proposed Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would result in substantially the same open space ratios with the change from the future without the proposed project remaining below 5 percent. As with the proposed Lambert Houses development, the No School Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space ratios.

SHADOWS

The No School Alternative would result in the same development as the proposed project with the exception of Parcel 10, and thus the same effects on shadows for the majority of the project site and study area, including the effects on the Beck Memorial Church's east façade windows and River Park. The massing of the buildings on Parcel 10 in this alternative would differ from the proposed project only on the east side of the parcel and would be limited. Overall, shadows in the No School Alternative would be similar to shadows with the proposed project.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The No School Alternative would result in the same development as the proposed project with the exception of Parcel 10, and thus the same effects on urban design and visual resources for the majority of the project site and study area. The massing of the buildings on Parcel 10 in this alternative would differ from the proposed project only on the east side of the parcel, and are anticipated to be visible only from East Tremont Street. From East Tremont Street, one minor variation from the proposed project would be noticeable; specifically, the one-story portion of the building would extend out farther toward the street. This change would not result in a significant adverse impact to urban design and visual resources for the No School Alternative.

TRANSPORTATION

Based on the trip generation assumptions detailed in Chapter 12, “Transportation,” the No School Alternative would generate fewer trips (up to approximately 1,060 fewer person trips and up to approximately 105 fewer vehicle trips) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours and slightly more trips (up to approximately 20 more person trips and up to approximately 2 more vehicle trips) during the weekday midday peak hour, as compared with the proposed project (see **Table 20-6**).

Table 20-6
Net Trip Difference Between the No School Alternative and the Proposed Project

Peak Hour	In/Out	Person Trip							Vehicle Trip				
		Auto	Taxi	Subway	Bus	School Bus	Walk	Total	Auto	Taxi	School Bus	Delivery	Total
AM	In	-72	-2	-6	-14	-74	-645	-813	-58	-1	-4	0	-63
	Out	6	1	17	8	0	-278	-246	-36	-1	-4	0	-41
	Total	-66	-1	11	-6	-74	-923	-1,059	-94	-2	-8	0	-104
Midday	In	2	0	5	3	0	1	11	2	0	0	-1	1
	Out	2	0	5	3	0	1	11	2	0	0	-1	1
	Total	4	0	10	6	0	2	22	4	0	0	-2	2
PM	In	5	0	15	6	0	-279	-253	-37	-1	-4	0	-42
	Out	-70	-1	-3	-12	-74	-645	-805	-57	-1	-4	0	-62
	Total	-65	-1	12	-6	-74	-924	-1,058	-94	-2	-8	0	-104

For the weekday AM and PM peak hours, since the No School Alternative incremental trips would be of lower magnitudes than that the proposed project would generate, the potential traffic and pedestrian impacts would be within the envelope of significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts identified for the proposed project in Chapter 12, “Transportation.” With the lower magnitude of incremental trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, it is possible that significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts could occur at fewer locations and of lesser magnitudes than the proposed project. Some of these impacts could be mitigated with the same types of mitigation measures as with the proposed project.

For the weekday midday peak hour, with the additional trips distributed across various analysis locations within the transportation network, the individual intersections, subway stairs, and pedestrian elements would experience minimal increases in trips and would be of comparable magnitude in terms of overall trips as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, this alternative would likewise result in impacts of comparable magnitude during the weekday midday peak hour and similar mitigation measures would be needed to mitigate those impacts.

Impacts unmitigatable under the proposed project would also be unmitigatable under the No School Alternative. In addition, the parking shortfall identified for the proposed project would also occur under this alternative; however, as with the proposed project, the parking shortfall would not constitute a significant adverse parking impact due to the proposed project’s proximity to multiple transit options and the excess parking demand is expected to be accommodated by parking facilities outside of the ¼-mile parking study area (minimum of 670 out of more than 5,000 spaces available within ½-mile of the project site).

AIR QUALITY

The No School Alternative would result in the same development as the proposed project with the exception of Parcel 10. The No School Alternative would generate fewer trips than the proposed project and therefore, as with the proposed project, would not result in significant

adverse impacts from mobile source emissions. The massing of the buildings on Parcel 10 in this alternative would differ from the proposed project only on the east side of the parcel and would be limited. Therefore, the No School Alternative, as with the proposed project, would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts on air quality from the proposed stationary sources. Similar to the proposed project, under the No School Alternative, at certain project buildings restrictions would be required to ensure the proposed buildings would not result in any significant air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions. In addition, the No School Alternative, as with the proposed project, would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial facilities. Therefore, the No School Alternative would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

CONCLUSION

The No School Alternative would result in substantially similar effects as the proposed project with the exception of schools. This alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on both elementary and intermediate schools and would not provide any school seats to accommodate the project's increase in population.

D. NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE

INTRODUCTION

As discussed in Chapter 2122, "~~Mitigation~~Unavoidable Adverse Impacts," the proposed project could result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts on ~~community facilities (public elementary and intermediate schools)~~, shadows, and traffic. Therefore, alternatives were developed to explore modifications to the proposed project that would allow for the mitigation of these impacts.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

~~Absent provision of the school on Parcel 10, the proposed project would result in a significant adverse impact on public elementary schools. The proposed project is also projected to result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools. An assessment was undertaken to determine the number of units introduced by the proposed project that would result in an increase of less than five percentage points the CEQR threshold for a significant adverse impact in a sub-district study area where the utilization rate is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the No With Action condition. To avoid the elementary school impact, development at the Development Site would need to be reduced in size to approximately 85006 residential units, which would introduce approximately 33214 public elementary school children the maximum number of elementary students that can be introduced in the sub-district without exceeding the five percentage point threshold.~~

~~To avoid the intermediate school impact, development at the project site would need to be significantly reduced in size to 575 units, which would introduce approximately 92 public intermediate school students the maximum number of intermediate students that can be introduced in the sub-district without exceeding the five percentage point threshold.~~

~~Limiting the total number of new housing units to these numbers would substantially reduce the amount of new housing that would be created on the Development Site. Overall, this alternative would be less successful than the proposed project at improving the quality of life for current~~

~~Lambert Houses residents while increasing the number of affordable housing units on the Development Site.~~

SHADOWS

As discussed in Chapter 6, “Shadows,” and Chapter 21, “Mitigation,” the shadow study concluded that new project-generated shadows would be cast on the east façade windows of the Beck Memorial Presbyterian Church, adjacent to Parcel 3 at 980 East 180th Street, and that given the substantial extent and duration of incremental shadows, the proposed project could cause significant adverse shadow impacts to the windows, if they are uncovered by shutters and viewable from within a public space in the church interior. The shadow study also concluded that new project shadow would result in significant adverse impacts on River Park.

To avoid the potential impact to the adjacent church windows and to River Park, the buildings on Parcels 1, 3, and 5 would need to be substantially smaller than currently designed. The reduction in height necessary to eliminate the potential shadows impact would be substantial, and would result in the construction of fewer affordable housing units, and would thus not meet the goals of the project.

TRANSPORTATION

Of the unmitigatable significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the proposed project, those at the East Tremont Avenue and Boston Road/West Farm Road intersection were determined to be the most severe. Because the impacts at this intersection would involve multiple lane groups/movements, there are limited options available to mitigate every impact. To avoid these unmitigatable impacts, the proposed project would have to reduce in scope to a level such that a detailed traffic analysis could be screened out, thereby concluding that there would not be a potential for any significant adverse traffic impacts.

In examining the programmatic distribution of the proposed land uses, this alternative would likely involve no redevelopment of Site 10 and an overall modest increase in dwelling units among one or more of the other Development Sites. It is also assumed that this alternative would not result in the introduction of a school, expansion of the existing supermarket, and changes in local retail uses among the various Development Sites. As shown in **Table 20-7**, an increase of 360 dwelling units would correlate with incremental vehicle trips below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 50 peak hour vehicle trips to warrant any additional traffic analysis. This alternative would therefore not result in any of the significant adverse and unmitigatable impacts identified for the proposed project.

Table 20-7
Trip Generation Estimates for 360 Dwelling Units

Peak Hour	In/Out	Person Trip							Vehicle Trip					
		Auto	Taxi	Subway	Bus	School	Bus	Walk	Total	Auto	Taxi	School	Bus	Delivery
AM	In	7	0	19	13	0	4	43	6	1	0	1		8
	Out	37	2	109	74	0	25	247	34	1	0	1		36
	Total	44	2	128	87	0	29	290	40	2	0	2		44
Midday	In	11	1	32	22	0	7	73	10	2	0	1		13
	Out	11	1	32	22	0	7	73	10	2	0	1		13
	Total	22	2	64	44	0	14	146	20	4	0	2		26
PM	In	34	2	98	67	0	22	223	31	2	0	0		33
	Out	14	1	42	29	0	10	96	13	2	0	0		15
	Total	48	3	140	96	0	32	319	44	4	0	0		48

Lambert Houses

However, the parking shortfall identified for the proposed project would also occur under this alternative. As with the proposed project, the parking shortfall would not constitute a significant adverse parking impact due to the proposed project's proximity to multiple transit options and the excess parking demand is expected to be accommodated by parking facilities outside of the ¼-mile parking study area (minimum of 670 out of more than 5,000 spaces available within ½-mile of the project site). *