

Las Raices
Final Scope of Work for an
Environmental Impact Statement
CEQR No. 20HPD002M

Prepared For:

Las Raices East Harlem, LLC.

Lead Agency:

New York City Department of Housing and Preservation

Prepared By:

Philip Habib & Associates

May 14, 2021

Las Raices

Final Scope of Work (FSOW)

Table of Contents

Final Scope of WorkFSOW

Transportation Planning Factors Memorandum Appendix A

Agency Correspondence Appendix B

Las Raices

FINAL SCOPE OF WORK FOR A TARGETED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CEQR NO. 20HPD002M
ULURP NO. [210428 PPM]

May 14, 2021

This document is the Final Scope of Work (Final Scope) for the Las Raices Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This Final Scope has been prepared to describe the proposed action, present the proposed framework for the EIS analysis, and discuss the procedures to be followed in the preparation of the DEIS. This Final Scope incorporates changes that were made subsequent to publication of the Draft Scope of Work (Draft Scope). Revisions of the Draft Scope have been incorporated into this Final Scope and are indicated by double-underlining new text and striking deleted text.

A. INTRODUCTION

This final scope of work outlines the technical areas to be analyzed in the preparation of a targeted Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Las Raices development. The New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) (the “Applicant”), on behalf of Las Raices East Harlem LLC (the “Project Sponsor”), is requesting the disposition of City-owned property to facilitate the development of new affordable housing in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan, Community District 11 (the “proposed action”).

The Project Sponsor is proposing to develop six tax lots with a total of four buildings containing a total of approximately 81 affordable dwelling units (DUs) (plus two superintendent’s units for a total of 83 units) and approximately 10,740 gsf of community facility space (the “Proposed Project”). The six tax lots and are grouped into four Development Sites in the East Harlem neighborhood. All six lots are City-owned and would be conveyed to the Project Sponsor as a result of the proposed action. Construction of the Proposed Project is expected to be completed in 2023.

This document provides a description of the Proposed Project and required discretionary land use actions, and includes task categories for all technical areas to be analyzed in the EIS. After reviewing an Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) dated February 17, 2021, HPD, acting as lead agency, determined that the proposed action could have the potential for significant adverse impacts in eight of the 20 impact categories (Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy; Open Space; Shadows; Transportation; Air Quality; Noise; Public Health; and Neighborhood Character) outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, a detailed assessment of likely effects in those will be prepared and disclosed in the Draft EIS (DEIS).

B. REQUIRED PUBLIC APPROVALS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

PROPOSED ACTION

As noted above, the proposed action includes the disposition of City-owned property to facilitate the development of new affordable housing in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan.

CITY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (CEQR) AND SCOPING

The Proposed Project is subject to environmental review pursuant to CEQR procedures. An EAS was completed on February 17, 2021. A Positive Declaration, issued on February 17, 2021, established that the Proposed Project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, thus warranting the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). HPD, as lead agency, has directed that an EIS be prepared.

The CEQR scoping process is intended to focus the EIS on those issues that are most pertinent to the Proposed Project. The process at the same time allows other agencies and the public a voice in framing the scope of the EIS. This scoping document sets forth the analyses and methodologies that will be utilized to prepare the EIS. During the period for scoping, those interested in reviewing the draft scope may do so and give their comments to the lead agency. The public, interested agencies, and elected officials, were invited to comment on the draft scope, either in writing or orally, at a public scoping meeting which was held on March 31, 2021 at 4:00 PM. In support of the City's efforts to contain the spread of COVID-19, HPD held the public scoping meeting remotely through video conferencing. The meeting was be live streamed and accessible via the New York City's online remote meeting portal- NYC Engage: www.nyc.gov/NYCEngage.

Comments received during the draft scope's public hearing, and written comments received through April 12, 2021 were considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into this Final Scope. This Final Scope incorporates all relevant comments made on the draft scope and revise the extent or methodologies of the studies, as appropriate, in response to comments made during scoping. The Draft EIS (DEIS) will be prepared in accordance with the Final Scope of Work for an EIS.

Once the lead agency is satisfied that the DEIS is complete, the document will be made available for public review and comment. Issuance of the Notice of Completion signals the start of the public review period for the EIS. During this time the public may review and comment on the DEIS, either in writing and/or at a public hearing that is convened for the purpose of receiving such comments. A public hearing will be held on the DEIS in conjunction with the City Planning Commission (CPC) hearing on the ULURP application to afford all interested parties the opportunity to submit oral and written comments. The record will remain open for 10 days after the public hearing to allow additional written comments on the DEIS. At the close of the public review period, a Final EIS (FEIS) will be prepared that will incorporate all substantive comments made on the DEIS, along with any revisions to the technical analysis necessary to respond to those comments. The FEIS will then be used by the decision makers to evaluate project impacts and proposed mitigation measures before deciding whether to approve the requested discretionary actions.

C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Site

The project area is comprised of six tax lots, which are grouped into four Development Sites in the East Harlem neighborhood (see **Figure 1a-1e** & **Table 1**). Development Site A (Block 1674, Lot 104) has a lot area of approximately 1,898 square feet (sf) and is currently vacant. Development Site A has approximately 25 feet of frontage along the north side of East 102nd Street between Second and First Avenues. Development Site A is zoned C1-5/R8A.

Development Site B (Block 1688, Lot 34) has a lot area of approximately 2,523 sf and is currently vacant. Development Site B has approximately 25 feet of frontage along the south side of East 117th Street between Second and First Avenues. Development Site B is zoned R7B.

Development Site C (Block 1815, Lots 5 and 6) has a lot area of approximately 4,827 sf. Development Site C, which is a portion of the Pleasant Village Community Garden, has approximately 47.84 feet of frontage along the north side of East 118th Street between Pleasant Avenue and a cul-de-sac where the street terminates. Development Site C is zoned R7B. Pleasant Village Community Garden also includes adjoining land with frontage on Pleasant Avenue; that adjoining community garden area is not part of the development site and would not be directly affected by the proposed action.

Development Site D (Block 1771, Lots 1 and 2) has a lot area of approximately 4,852 sf. Development Site D, which is a portion of the Jackie Robinson Community Garden, has approximately 50.92 feet of frontage along the east side of Park Avenue between East 122nd and East 123rd Streets and 91.94 feet of frontage on the north side of E. 122nd Street extending east from intersection with Park Avenue. Development Site D is zoned M1-6/R10 (MIH).

The community garden areas on Development Sites C and D operate under temporary license agreements on an interim basis until HPD is ready to move forward with their redevelopment.


Table 1: Project Site Existing Conditions

Development Site A					
Block	Lot	Address	Zoning District	Land Use	Lot Area (SF)
1674	104	303 East 102nd Street	C1-5/R8A	Vacant	1,898
Development Site B					
1688	34	338 East 117th Street	R7B	Vacant	2,523
Development Site C					
1815	5 & 6	505 East 118th Street	R7B	Community Garden	4,827
Development Site D					
1771	1 & 2	1761 Park Avenue	M1-6/R10 (MIH)	Community Garden	4,583
Total					13,831


Surrounding Area

As the Project Area consists of four separate Development Sites, existing land uses within 400 feet of each Development Site is discussed below and shown in **Figure 2a-2d**.


Project Location- Proposed Development Site A




Project Location- Proposed Development Site B




Project Location- Proposed Development Site C




Project Location- Proposed Development Site D




Project Location of all Development Sites



Land Use- Proposed Development Site A



Land Use- Proposed Development Site B



Land Use- Proposed Development Site C



Land Use- Proposed Development Site D



Development Site A

Development Site A (Block 1674, Lot 104) is a vacant lot owned by HPD. It is a rectangular-shaped interior lot with frontage on East 102nd Street. Predominant land uses within a 400-foot radius of Development Site A include residential, institutional, open space, commercial and some vacant land as well. The majority of residential buildings are mixed use and multi-family walk-up buildings. Notable uses include PS 38 Roberto Clemente Learning Complex and Blake Hobbs Playground, both located to the west of Development Site A and Hobbs Court, an affordable housing development, located directly east of Development Site A. The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)'s George Washington Houses are also located west and south west of the Development Site. In addition, NYCHA's Metro North Plaza buildings are located to the south and its East River Houses are located one block east of the site. The 103rd Street station for the New York City Transit (NYCT) 6 subway line is located 0.3 miles east from Development Site A and the 96th Street Station 4/5/6 line is located 0.5 miles southeast from the site. The M15 NYCT bus routes serves Development Site A along First and Second Avenues. There is also a Citi Bike Station located 0.1 miles north of Development Site A.

Development Site B

Development Site B (Block 1688, Lot 34) is a vacant lot owned by the NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS). It is a rectangular-shaped interior lot with frontage on East 117th Street. Predominant land uses within a 400-foot radius of Development Site B include residential, institutional, and some commercial uses as well. The majority of residential buildings are multi-family mixed-use buildings. Notable land uses include PS 155 William Paca School and PS 155 Playground located directly to the north of Development Site B across East 117th Street. NYCHA's Edward Corsi Houses are located to the west of the site. The 116th Street station for the New York City Transit (NYCT) 6 subway line is located 0.5 miles west of Development Site B. There are several NYCT bus routes serving Development Site B including the M116 (along East 116th Street) and M15 /M15-Select Bus Service (SBS) (along First and Second Avenues).

Development Site C

Development Site C (Block 1815, Lots 5 and 6) is a portion of the Pleasant Village Community Garden owned by HPD. It is a rectangular-shaped interior lot with frontage on East 118th Street. Predominant land uses within a 400-foot radius of Development Site C include residential, institutional, open space, and commercial uses. The majority of residential buildings are multi-family walk-up buildings and commercial and office buildings. Notable land uses include the East River Plaza shopping mall, located to the east and southeast of Development Site C. East River Plaza is a large shopping center with various retailers and its associated parking garage. There are no pedestrian entrances to the shopping center or vehicular entrances to the parking garage on East 118th Street. Both pedestrian and vehicular entrances can be found one block south on East 117th Street. PS 206, PS 112 and their associated playground is located one block north of the site. The 116th Street station for the New York City Transit (NYCT) 6 subway line is located 0.6 miles west of Development Site C. The M116 NYCT bus route (along East 116th Street) serves Development Site C. There is also a Citi Bike Station located one block north of Development Site C on the corner of Pleasant Avenue and East 120th Street.

Development Site D

Development Site D (Block 1771, Lots 1 and 2) is a portion of the Jackie Robinson Community Garden owned by NYC HPD. It is a rectangular-shaped corner lot with frontage on both Park Avenue and East

122nd Street. Predominant land uses within a 400-foot radius of Development Site D include residential, institutional, open space, and some commercial uses as well. The majority of residential buildings are multi-family walk-up buildings. The Henry J. Carter Specialty Hospital and Nursing Facility is located one block southwest of Development Site D. The elevated Metro-North rail line is located to the west of Development Site D. Marcus Garvey Park is located just outside the 400-foot Radius two blocks to the west. The 125th Street station for the New York City Transit (NYCT) 4/5/6 subway lines is located just outside the 400-foot radius of Development Sites D at the intersection of Lexington Avenue and East 125th Street. The Metro North 125th Street Station is also located just outside the 40-foot radius of Development Site D at the intersection of East 125th Street and Park Avenue. There are several NYCT bus routes serving Development Site D including the M1 (along Madison Avenue), M101 and M103 (along Lexington Avenue).

Zoning

As shown in **Figure 3a-3d**, Development Site A is zoned C1-5/R8A, Development Sites B and C are zoned R7B, and Development Site D is zoned M1-6/R10 (MIH). Each is described below.

Development Site A


Development Site A is zoned C1-5/R8A. R8A residential districts promote new contextual development in the City's established neighborhoods and allow a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 6.02. When a C1-5 commercial overlay is mapped in an R8A district, the ground floor of a building may be occupied by retail uses, such as shops and services, to maintain the vitality of the street and serve the local community.


Quality Housing bulk regulations, mandatory in R8A districts, produce roughly up to 12-to-14-story buildings set at or near the street line. The base height of a new building must be 60 to 85 feet before setback, rising to a maximum building height of 120 feet. Limitations on the base height and maximum building height of new buildings ensure compatibility with existing buildings on the street. Interior amenities for building residents pursuant to the Quality Housing Program are required. Off-street parking, is required for 12 percent of a building's dwelling units for income-restricted units, or can be waived if the zoning lot is 10,000 square feet or less or if 15 or fewer parking spaces are required. Additionally, Development Site A is located in the transit zone, in this zone, affordable housing developments can request a waiver from the CPC to reduce or eliminate parking requirements for sites. Accessory parking would not be provided for the proposed development, as the site would require less than 15 parking spaces.


The C1-5 district is mapped as a commercial overlay within the R8A residential district. Mapped along streets that serve local retail needs, they are found extensively throughout the city's lower- and medium-density areas and occasionally in higher-density districts. Typical retail uses include neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants and beauty parlors. In mixed buildings, commercial uses are limited to one or two floors and must always be located below the residential use. When mapped in R6 through R10 districts, the maximum commercial FAR is 2.0 for a C1-5 overlay.

Development Sites B and C


Development Sites B and C are zoned R7B, which is a contextual residential district where the Quality Housing bulk regulations are mandatory. These regulations produce high lot coverage, six- or seven-story apartment buildings rather than the typical neighborhood brownstones present in some areas. Designed







Zoning Map: Development Site D



to be compatible with older buildings found in more traditional neighborhoods, R7B districts are mapped in the East Village, Upper Manhattan, a section of Queens and Brooklyn.

The maximum permitted FAR in R7B districts is 3.0. The base height of a new building must be 40 to 65 feet before setback, rising to a maximum building height of 75 feet. To preserve the traditional streetscape, curb cuts are prohibited on zoning lots with frontages less than 40 feet. The front wall of a new building, on any lot up to 50 feet wide, must be as deep as one adjacent front wall but no deeper than the other. R7B buildings must have interior amenities for the residents pursuant to the Quality Housing Program. Off-street parking, is required for 25 percent of a building's dwelling units for income-restricted units, or can be waived if five or fewer spaces are required. As noted above the transit zone parking regulations are applicable to affordable housing developments. Accessory parking would not be provided, as both Site B and C would require less than five parking spaces each.

Development Site D

Development Site D is zoned M1-6/R10 and is in a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area (MIHA). MIHAs allows a higher permitted FAR than in non MIHAs but includes a requirement that a share of new housing be permanently affordable when land use actions create significant new housing potential, either as part of a City land use proposal or a private land use application. MIH consists of two main alternatives: Option 1: 25 percent of residential floor area must be affordable housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 60 percent of area median income (AMI), with 10 percent affordable to households within an income band of 40 percent of AMI; or Option 2: 30 percent of residential floor area must be affordable housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 80 percent of AMI. In combination with these two alternatives, two other options may be utilized. A "Deep Affordability Option" also may be utilized provided that 20 percent of residential floor area contains housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 40 percent of AMI. A "Workforce Option" may also be utilized provided that 30 percent of residential floor area contains housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 115 percent of AMI, with 5 percent of residential floor area kept affordable to households within an income band of 70 percent of AMI and another 5 percent of residential floor area affordable to households within an income band of 90 percent of AMI. Other restrictions apply to the Deep Affordability and Workforce Options. The CPC and ultimately the City Council determine the requirements applicable to each MIH- designated area. Development Site D includes Program Option 1 and the Deep Affordability Option.

Optional Quality Housing bulk regulations in R10 districts produce large, high lot coverage buildings set at or near the street line to maintain the traditional high street walls found along major streets and avenues. The base height of a new building must be 125 to 155 feet before setback, rising to a maximum building height of 215 feet. Interior amenities for building residents pursuant to the Quality Housing Program are required. Off-street parking is required for 12 percent of income-restricted dwelling units. As noted above the transit zone parking regulations are applicable to affordable housing developments. Accessory parking would not be provided, as the site would require less than 15 parking spaces.

The M1-6 district is mapped alongside the R10 residential district. M1 districts are often buffers between M2 or M3 districts and adjacent residential or commercial districts. M1 districts typically include light industrial uses, such as woodworking shops, repair shops, and wholesale service and storage facilities. M1 districts also permit offices, and most retail uses. No parking is required for the M1-6 district. M1-6/R10 districts permit residential and community facility uses within Use Groups 1-4, and commercial and manufacturing uses within Use Groups 6-15 and 17 at a maximum FAR of 10.0 in a mixed-use building.

Development Site D also falls in the Special East Harlem Corridors District (EHC). The EHC is intended to encourage and guide the development of East Harlem as a dynamic mixed-use neighborhood by permitting the expansion and development of residential, commercial, community facility and light manufacturing uses in appropriate areas. It also encourages the development of permanently affordable housing. The EHC includes minimum requirements for non-residential uses in certain areas, unique height and setback controls and ground floor requirements to improve walkability

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Project would create opportunities for new affordable housing development on vacant lots in an area where a strong demand for affordable housing exists. In addition, the Proposed Project would bring further redevelopment and improvement to the neighborhood.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As noted above, the proposed action includes the disposition of City-owned property to facilitate the development of new affordable housing in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan. All six lots are City-owned and would be conveyed to the Project Sponsor as a result of the proposed action. The proposed action would facilitate the development of 4 buildings containing approximately 83 dwelling units and 10,740 gsf of community facility space. The proposed development for each site is described in detail below and summarized in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Proposed Project

Development Site A									
Block	Lot	Address	Proposed Height (including mechanical bulkhead)	Number of Stories	Residential GSF	Total DUs	Comm unity Facilit y GSF	Mechanical GSF	Total Proposed GSF
1674	104	303 East 102nd Street	62'-8"	5	<u>5,471</u>	6	2,497	<u>1,008</u>	<u>8,976</u>
Development Site B									
Block	Lot	Address	Proposed Height	Stories	Residential GSF	Total DUs	Comm unity Facilit y GSF	Mechanical GSF	Total Proposed GSF
1688	34	338 East 117th Street	61'-6"	5	<u>7,571</u>	7	-	<u>735</u>	<u>8,306</u>
Development Site C									
Block	Lot	Address	Proposed Height	Stories	Residential GSF	Total DUs	Comm unity Facilit y GSF	Mechanical GSF	Total Proposed GSF
1815	5 & 6	505 East 118th Street	70'-2"	6	<u>16,208</u>	18	-	<u>1,102</u>	<u>17,310</u>
Development Site D									
Block	Lot	Address	Proposed Height	Stories	Residential GSF	Total DUs	Comm unity Facilit y GSF	Mechanical GSF	Total Proposed GSF
1771	1 & 2	1761 Park Avenue	142'	13	<u>44,598</u>	52	<u>8,243</u>	<u>2,829</u>	<u>55,670</u>
Total					<u>73,848</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>10,740</u>	<u>5,674</u>	<u>90,262</u>

Note: Mechanical space is not listed separately in the table but is included in the total gsf.

Development Site A

Development Site A would include a five-story (approximately 53'-8" to roof; 62'-8" to mechanical bulkhead/solar panels) residential and commercial building located at 303 East 102nd Street (see **Figure 4a**). The building at Development Site A would be approximately 8,976 gsf and include approximately 6 DUs, 2,497 gsf of community facility space, and a one level cellar for community facility and mechanical use. Development Site A would include a green roof, solar panels and a rainwater collection system. The rear yard of Development Site A would be available to building residents. The Proposed Project would be completed and occupied in spring 2023.

Development Site B

Development Site B would include a five-story (approximately 53'-2" feet to roof; 62'-2" to mechanical bulkhead/solar panels) residential building located at 338 East 117th Street. It would be approximately 8,306 gsf and include approximately 7 DUs (see **Figure 4b**). Development Site B would not include a cellar. The rear yard of Development Site B would be available to building residents. Development Site B would include a green roof, solar panels and a rainwater collection system. The Proposed Project would be completed and occupied in spring 2023.

Development Site C



Development Site C would include one six-story (approximately 62' to roof; 70'-2" to mechanical bulkhead/solar panels) residential building located at 505 East 118th Street. It would be approximately 17,310 gsf and would include approximately 18 DUs (see **Figure 4c**). Development Site C would not include a cellar. The rear yard of Development Site C and a rooftop terrace would be available to residents. Development Site C would include a green roof, solar panels and a rainwater collection system. The Proposed Project would be completed and occupied in spring 2023.



Development Site D



Development Site D would include one 13-story (approximately 134' to roof; 142' to mechanical bulkhead/solar panels) residential and commercial building located at 1791 Park Avenue. It would be approximately 55,670 gsf and would include approximately 52 DUs and 8,243 gsf of community facility space on the ground floor (see **Figure 4d**). Development Site D would include one level for mechanical equipment. Development Site D would include a green roof, solar panels and a rainwater collection system. There would be an outdoor green wall adjacent to the Jackie Robinson Community Garden and a rooftop terrace available to building residents. The Proposed Project would be completed and occupied in spring 2023.



D. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

In order to assess the potential effects of the Proposed Project, the "Future without the Proposed Action (No-Action condition)" and "Future with the Proposed Action (With-Action condition)" are analyzed for an analysis year, or "Build Year" of 2023. The future With-Action condition identifies the amount, type, and location of development that is expected to occur by 2023 as a result of the proposed action. The future No-Action condition identifies similar development projections for 2023 absent the proposed









action. The incremental difference between the With-Action and No-Action conditions serves as the basis for impact analyses.

Future without the Proposed Action (No-Action Condition)

In the 2023 future without the proposed action, it is expected that there would be no new development on the Development Sites and all six lots would remain as vacant or as portions of community gardens operating under temporary license agreements on an interim basis until HPD is ready to move forward with their redevelopment.

Future with the Proposed Action (With-Action Condition)

As discussed above under “The Proposed Action”, the proposed action would facilitate the development of four buildings that would include a total of approximately 81 affordable DUs (plus two superintendent’s units for a total of 83 units) and approximately 10,740 gsf of community facility space. The Proposed Project is expected to take approximately 21 months to construct and would be completed and fully occupied in 2023. The net increment of approximately 83 dwelling units and approximately 10,740 gsf of community facility space will represent the basis for environmental analyses in this EIS.

E. PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

Because the proposed action would affect various areas of environmental concern and were found to have the potential for significant adverse impacts pursuant to the EAS and Positive Declaration, an EIS will be prepared for the Proposed Actions that will analyze all technical areas of concern. The technical areas of concern include: Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy; Open Space; Shadows; Transportation; Air Quality; Noise; Public Health; and Neighborhood Character. The remaining CEQR impact categories have undergone analysis as part of an EAS for the proposed action. The EAS prepared for the proposed action contains analyses that conclude there is no potential for significant adverse impacts in the following areas: Socioeconomic Conditions; Community Facilities; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Natural Resources; Hazardous Materials; Water and Sewer Infrastructure; Solid Waste and Sanitation Services; Energy; Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change; and Construction Impacts.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared in conformance with all applicable laws and regulations, including SEQRA (Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law) and its implementing regulations found at 6 NYCRR Part 617, New York City Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for CEQR, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York.

The EIS will follow the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and will contain:

- A description of the proposed action, Proposed Project, and the Project Area’s environmental setting;
- A statement of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, including its short-and long-term effects and typical associated environmental effects;
- An identification of any significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed action is implemented;
- A discussion of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action;
- An identification of irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved in the proposed action should they be implemented; and

- A description of mitigation measures proposed to eliminate or minimize any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Each chapter of the EIS that requires a detailed analysis will include an analysis of the future With-Action condition compared to the future No-Action condition, as set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The technical analyses of the EIS will examine the potential impacts related to the completion of the proposed action by the 2023 Build Year. HPD, as lead agency, will coordinate the environmental review of the proposed action among the involved and interested agencies and the public.

TASK 1. Project Description

The first chapter of the EIS introduces the reader to the discretionary actions required to facilitate the Proposed Project, and sets the context in which to assess impacts. The chapter contains a description of the proposed action; Proposed Project; Project Area; a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed action; key planning considerations that have shaped the current proposal; a detailed description of any project-related improvements; and discussion of the approvals required, procedures to be followed, and the role of the EIS in the process.

This chapter is the key to understanding the Proposed Project and its impact, and gives the public and decision-makers a base from which to evaluate the Proposed Project against the future without the project. The section on approval procedures will explain the ULURP process, its timing, and hearings before the Community Board, the Manhattan Borough President's office, the CPC, and the New York City Council. The role of the EIS as a full-disclosure document to aid in decision-making will be identified and its relationship to ULURP and the public hearings described.

TASK 2. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

A land use analysis characterizes the uses and development trends in the area that may be affected by a proposed action, and determines whether a proposed action is either compatible with those conditions or whether it may affect them. Similarly, the analysis considers the action's compliance with, and effect on, the area's zoning and other applicable public policies. This chapter will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed action on land use, zoning, and public policy, pursuant to the methodologies presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The primary land use study area will consist of the Development Sites, where the potential effects of the proposed action would be directly experienced. The secondary land use study area would include the neighboring areas within a 400-foot radius from each Development Site, as shown in **Figure 2a-2d**, which could experience indirect impacts. The analysis will include the following subtasks:

- Provide a brief development history of the primary (i.e., Development Sites) and secondary study areas.
- Provide a description and map of land use patterns and trends in the study areas, including recent development activity.
- Describe and map existing zoning and recent zoning actions in the study areas.
- Describe public policies that apply to the study areas, including specific development projects and plans for public improvement, including: Harlem-East Harlem Urban Renewal Plan, the East Harlem Neighborhood Plan, the Statement of District Needs and Community Board Budget Requests for CB 11, the Manhattan Community Board 11 (CB 11) draft 197-a Plan area, Housing New York 2.0, One New York: The Plan for a Strong and Just City and the Waterfront Revitalization Program.

- Based on field surveys and prior studies, identify, describe, and graphically portray predominant land use patterns for the balance of the study areas. Describe recent land use trends in the study areas and identify major factors influencing land use trends.
- Prepare a list of future development projects in the study areas that are expected to be constructed by the 2023 analysis year and may influence future land use trends. Also, identify pending zoning actions or other public policy actions that could affect land use patterns and trends in the study areas. Based on these planned projects and initiatives, assess future land use and zoning conditions without the proposed action (No-Action condition).
- Describe proposed zoning changes and the potential land use changes resulting from the proposed action.
- Assess the potential impacts of the proposed action on land use, land use trends, zoning, and public policy.
- Describe the proposed action's potential effects related to issues of compatibility with surrounding land use, the consistency with zoning and other public policies, and the effect of the proposed action on ongoing development trends and conditions in the study areas.
- If necessary, mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential significant adverse land use, zoning, and/or public policy impacts will be identified.



TASK 3. Open space

If a project may add population to an area, demand for existing open space facilities would typically increase. Indirect effects may occur when the population generated by the proposed action would be sufficiently large to noticeably diminish the ability of an area's open space to serve the future population. For the majority of projects, an assessment is conducted if the proposed action would generate more than 200 residents or 500 employees, or a similar number of other uses. However, the need for an open space assessment may vary in certain areas of the City that are considered either underserved or well-served by open space; if a project is located in an underserved area, an open space assessment should be conducted if that project would generate more than 50 residents or 125 workers. The Project Area is not identified as underserved nor well-served in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and the Proposed Project does not exceed the residential analysis threshold of 200 residents. The lead agency, in consultation with the NYC Department of Parks and Recreation, has determined the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts related to open space and shadows on one open space resource due to project-generated incremental shadows. Although an indirect effects analysis is not required, due to the anticipated significant adverse impact an assessment of residential open space will be provided in the EIS.

The open space analysis will consider open space resources within a residential (half-mile radius) study area. The study area will generally comprise those census tracts that have 50 percent or more of their area located within the half-mile radius of the Project Area, as recommended in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The resultant open space study area is shown in **Figure 5**.

The detailed open space analysis in the EIS will include the following subtasks:

- Characteristics of the existing and future users will be determined. To determine the number of residents in the study area, the most recent available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates from the U.S. Census (expected to be 2015-2019) will be compiled for census tracts comprising the residential open space study area.
- Existing open spaces within the half-mile open space study area will be inventoried and mapped. The condition and usage of existing facilities will be described based on the inventory and field visits. Acreages of these facilities will be determined, and the total study area acreages will be calculated. The percentage of passive and active open space will also be calculated.



- Based on the inventory of facilities and study area populations, total, passive, and active open space ratios will be calculated for the residential population and compared to City guidance to assess adequacy. Open space ratios are expressed as the amount of passive open space acreage per 1,000 residential population.
- Expected changes in future levels of open space supply and demand in the 2023 analysis year will be assessed, based on other planned development projects within the open space study area. Any new open space or recreational facilities that are anticipated to be operational by the analysis year will also be accounted for. The open space ratios will be calculated for future No-Action conditions and compared with the exiting ratios to determine the change in future levels of adequacy.
- Effects on open space supply and demand resulting from the increased residential population associated with the Proposed Project will be assessed. Any new publicly accessible or accessory open space facilities included in the Proposed Project would also be taken into account. The assessment of the proposed action's impacts will be based on a comparison of the open space ratios for the future No-Action versus future With-Action conditions. In addition to the quantitative analysis, a qualitative analysis will be performed to determine if the changes resulting from the proposed action constitute a substantial change (positive or negative) or an adverse effect to open space conditions. The qualitative analysis will assess whether or not the study area is sufficiently served by passive open space, given the capacity, condition, and distribution of open space, and the profile of the study area population.

TASK 4. Shadows

A shadows analysis assesses whether new structures resulting from a proposed action would cast shadows on sunlight sensitive publicly accessible resources or other resources of concern, such as natural resources, and to assess the significance of their impact. This chapter will examine the proposed action's potential for significant and adverse shadow impacts pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. Generally, the potential for shadow impacts exists if an action would result in new structures or additions to buildings resulting in structures over 50 feet in height that could cast shadows on important natural features, publicly accessible open space, or on historic features that are dependent on sunlight. New construction or building additions resulting in incremental height changes of less than 50 feet can also potentially result in shadow impacts if they are located adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight sensitive resource.

The proposed action would result in development of buildings greater than 50 feet in height and therefore has the potential to result in shadow impacts. The EIS will assess the Proposed Project for potential shadowing effects on sunlight sensitive uses and disclose the range of shadow impacts, if any, which are likely to result from the proposed action. The shadows analysis in the EIS will include the following subtasks:

- A preliminary shadows screening assessment will be prepared to ascertain whether shadows may potentially reach any sunlight-sensitive resources at any time of year.
- A Tier 1 Screening Assessment will be conducted to determine the longest shadow study area for the proposed developments, which is defined as 4.3 times the height of a structure (the longest shadow that would occur on December 21, the winter solstice), pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*.
- A Tier 2 Screening Assessment will be conducted if any portion of a sunlight sensitive resource lies within the longest shadow study area. The Tier 2 assessment will determine the triangular area that cannot be shaded by the Proposed Project, which in New York City is the area that lies between -108 and +108 degrees from true north.

- If any portion of a sunlight sensitive resource is within the area that could be potentially shaded by the Proposed Project, a Tier 3 Screening Assessment will be conducted. The Tier 3 Screening Assessment will determine if shadows resulting from the Proposed Project can reach a sunlight sensitive resource through the use of three-dimensional computer modeling software with the capacity to accurately calculate shadow patterns. The model will include a three-dimensional representation of the sunlight sensitive resource(s), a three-dimensional representation of the Proposed Project, and a three-dimensional representation of the topographical information within the area to determine the extent and duration of new shadows that would be cast on sunlight sensitive resources as a result of the proposed action.
- If the screening analysis does not rule out the possibility that action-generated shadows would reach any sunlight sensitive resources, a detailed analysis of potential shadow impacts on publicly-accessible open spaces or sunlight sensitive historic resources resulting from the Proposed Project will be provided in the EIS. The detailed shadow analysis will establish a baseline condition (No-Action), which will be compared to the future condition resulting from the proposed action (With-Action) to illustrate the shadows cast by existing or future buildings and distinguish the additional (incremental) shadow cast by the Proposed Project. The detailed analysis will include the following tasks:
 - The analysis will be documented with graphics comparing shadows resulting from the No-Action condition with shadows resulting from the proposed action, with incremental shadow highlighted in a contrasting color.

A summary table listing the entry and exit times and total duration of incremental shadow on each applicable representative day for each affected resource will be provided. The significance of any shadow impacts on sunlight sensitive resources will be assessed by preparing an analysis for the resources of concern. Section 411 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* states a site plan and inventory of the features that constitute the open space or natural resource as well as a survey detailing existing conditions, quality, and levels of use of the open space are needed to determine the significance of the shadow cast in the future With-Action.

TASK 5. Transportation

The objective of a transportation analysis is to determine whether a proposed action may have a potential significant adverse impact on traffic operations and mobility, public transportation facilities and services, pedestrian elements and flow, the safety of all roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists), on- and off-street parking, or goods movement. The proposed action is expected to result in new residential and community facility uses on the Development Sites, which would generate additional vehicular travel and demand for parking, as well as additional subway and bus riders and pedestrian traffic. These new trips have the potential to affect the area's transportation systems.

A travel demand forecast was prepared for this net incremental development program to determine if the proposed action would exceed the analysis screening thresholds specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. This includes a two-tier screening process is used to determine whether quantified analyses of any technical areas of the transportation system are necessary. A Level 1 screening is typically necessary if a proposed project has the potential to exceed either 50 vehicle trips, 200 transit trips or 200 pedestrian trips during any given peak hour. If these thresholds are exceeded, a Level 2 screening assessment is required in order to ensure that there are not 50 vehicle trips, 50 bus trips, 200 subway/rail trips, or 200 pedestrian trips assigned to an individual transportation element (intersections, bus routes, subway stations, pedestrian facilities such as a crosswalk, etc.), during any analysis peak hour. The travel demand forecast assumptions and calculations are presented in **Appendix A**, "Transportation Planning Factors"

and **Tables 3a-3d** below presents a summary of the forecast of incremental trips generated by the proposed action by mode, for each development site discretely.

Table 3a, Site A: Summary of Incremental Peak Hour Travel Demand

	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Vehicle Trips	<u>+2</u>	<u>+4</u>	<u>+2</u>	<u>0</u>
Subway Trips	<u>+16</u>	<u>+16</u>	<u>+15</u>	<u>+14</u>
Bus Trips	<u>+2</u>	<u>+2</u>	<u>+2</u>	<u>+2</u>
Walk Trips¹	<u>+25</u>	<u>+25</u>	<u>+21</u>	<u>+21</u>

Notes:

1. Walk Trips include walk-only, vehicle, subway and bus trips.
2. Refer to Appendix A for details.

Table 3b, Site B: Summary of Incremental Peak Hour Travel Demand

	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Vehicle Trips	+1	0	+1	0
Subway Trips	+4	<u>+2</u>	+5	<u>+4</u>
Bus Trips	0	0	0	0
Walk Trips¹	+5	+2	+6	+5

Notes:

1. Walk Trips include walk-only, vehicle, subway and bus trips.
2. Refer to Appendix A for details.

Table 3c, Site C: Summary of Incremental Peak Hour Travel Demand

	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Vehicle Trips	+1	+0	+2	+2
Subway Trips	+10	<u>+3</u>	+8	<u>+8</u>
Bus Trips	+2	<u>+2</u>	+3	<u>+2</u>
Walk Trips¹	+15	+7	+16	+14

Notes:

1. Walk Trips include walk-only, vehicle, subway and bus trips.
2. Refer to Appendix A for details.

Table 3d, Site D: Summary of Incremental Peak Hour Travel Demand

	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Vehicle Trips	<u>+5</u>	<u>+4</u>	<u>+6</u>	<u>+6</u>
Subway Trips	<u>+71</u>	<u>+64</u>	<u>+65</u>	<u>+61</u>
Bus Trips	<u>+8</u>	<u>+6</u>	<u>+8</u>	<u>+6</u>
Walk Trips¹	<u>+108</u>	<u>+98</u>	<u>+99</u>	<u>+93</u>

Notes:

1. Walk Trips include walk-only, vehicle, subway and bus trips.
2. Refer to Appendix A for details.

As shown in the tables, based on the forecast the proposed action would fall well below the Level 1 screening thresholds for traffic, parking, transit, and pedestrians for all four sites. Please refer to Appendix A for more details.

This travel demand forecast was subject to review, including by the NYC Department of Transportation (DOT). The EIS will present the final travel demand forecast with a screening summary and either confirm the findings that detailed transportation analyses will not be warranted for the proposed action or will provide detailed analyses as warranted. DOT completed their review of the preliminary travel demand forecast and determined there was no need for additional transportation analysis (see Appendix B: Agency Correspondence). There were minor updates to the travel demand forecast in between the preliminary and final documents, including converting the retail space to community facility space and decreasing its area from 11,101 gsf to 10,740 gsf. This change did not have a substantial effect on the forecast other than to reduce the number of walk trips at Sites A and D; both the travel demand forecast and EIS analysis reflect these changes. Although detailed analyses are not, for conservative purposes, a screening analysis will be prepared to be consistent with the methodology guidance provided by the CEQR Technical Manual.

TASK 6. Air Quality

CEQR Technical Manual criteria require an air quality assessment for actions that can result in significant air quality impacts. There are mobile source impacts that could arise when an action increases or causes a redistribution of traffic, creates any other mobile sources of pollutants, or adds new uses near existing mobile sources. There are mobile source impacts that could be produced by parking facilities, parking lots, or garages. Per the screening assessment provided in the EAS, air quality mobility source analysis is screened out for the proposed action and as such will not be provided in the EIS. Stationary source impacts could occur with actions that (a) create new stationary sources or pollutants such as emission stacks from industrial plants, hospitals, or other large institutional uses, or a building's boilers, that can affect surrounding uses; or (b) when they add uses near existing or planned future emission stacks, and the new uses might be affected by the emissions from the stacks; or (c) when they add structures near such stacks and those structures can change the dispersion of emissions from stacks so that they begin to affect surrounding uses. The air quality studies for the Development Sites will include a stationary source analysis.

The stationary source air quality impact analysis will assess the effects of emissions (e.g., sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxides) from the proposed development's heat and hot water systems. As the proposed action would result in new heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems that would ventilate emissions into ambient air, per *CEQR Technical Manual* Chapter 17, "Air Quality," Section 220, an assessment of emissions is warranted for the proposed action. Therefore, an analysis to examine the potential for impacts from light industrial uses in the surrounding area on the proposed sensitive uses will be performed. In addition, emissions from large sources within 1,000 feet of the Project Area will be examined for their potential impact on the proposed developments.

Stationary Source Analyses

HVAC Analysis

The analysis process would be conducted, in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* procedures, as follows:

- The effects of emissions from stationary sources associated with the proposed action will be addressed. Analyses will be performed using the screening procedures from the *CEQR Technical Manual* to determine whether emissions from any substantial on-site HVAC facilities are significant. Impacts on existing or project sites with sensitive uses, such as residences or community facilities, will be determined as part of this task, and a cumulative analysis will be

performed to assess impacts on off-site sensitive receptor location. The analyses of the potential impacts will address the NAAQS, in particular, the 1-hour and annual standards for NO₂, and the 1-hour standard for SO₂ if the use of No.2 fuel oil is assumed, and the 24-hour PM_{2.5} and annual PM_{2.5} CEQR de minimis criteria. The NY DEC DAR-10 guidance will be followed for the assessments.

- If warranted, analyze the potential combined impacts from clusters of HVAC emissions (i.e., HVAC emissions from buildings resulting from the proposed action of approximately the same height or higher that are located in close proximity to one another) to significantly impact existing land uses and other buildings resulting from the proposed action. Clusters will be selected based on the heights of the buildings that comprise the cluster, proximity of the cluster buildings to each other, and the difference in stack heights no more than 10 to 15 feet with no city street in between.

Industrial Source Analysis

The analysis process would be conducted, in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* procedures, as follows:

- The industrial sources within 400 feet of a proposed development would be identified and assessed. Based on this information, a determination will be made of whether further analysis is necessary. In addition, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) permit records will be reviewed via CATS to identify permitted facilities within the study area. If permits are identified within the study area, DEP permit records will be requested and reviewed for each potential industrial source block/lot. Permits for emergency generators, gas stations, boilers and small drycleaners will be excluded from further consideration per DEP guidelines. Similarly, sites that are no longer in existence based on the field review will not be considered. Unpermitted sources identified in the field review will be considered for analysis.
- If analysis is necessary, the Table 17-3 in the CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17 will be used to estimate the short-term and long-term concentrations of Air Toxics at the potential receptor sites. Predicted worst-case impacts on the project will be compared with the short term guideline concentrations (SGC) and annual guideline concentrations (AGC) reported in the DEC's DAR-1 AGC/SGC Tables to determine the potential for significant impacts. In the event that violations of standards are predicted, the AERMOD will be conducted for the detail analysis. A health risk and hazardous index assessment will also be performed to determine any public health impacts from these emissions on future residents as per DEC DAR-1.

TASK 7. Noise

For the proposed action, there are two major areas of concern regarding noise: (1) the effect the proposed action would have on noise levels in the surrounding community; and (2) the level of building attenuation necessary to achieve interior noise levels that satisfy CEQR requirements.

The proposed action would generate vehicle trips, but given the background conditions and the anticipated project-generated traffic, it is not expected that project-generated traffic would be likely to result in significant adverse mobile-source noise impacts. However, a screening assessment will be performed to determine whether there are any locations where there is the potential for the proposed action to result in significant noise impacts (i.e., doubling of Noise Passenger Car Equivalents [PCEs]) due to action-generated traffic. A detailed analysis of potential noise impacts due to outdoor mechanical equipment is not required as the outdoor mechanical equipment for any future development facilitated by the proposed action would be required to meet applicable DOB regulations, which ensures that noise

levels from equipment are below *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria. The noise analysis will also examine the level of building attenuation necessary to meet CEQR interior noise level requirements.

The following tasks will be performed in compliance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance:

- Based on the traffic studies conducted for Task 11, Transportation, a screening analysis will be conducted to determine whether there are any locations where there is the potential for the proposed action to result in potential significant noise impacts (i.e., doubling Noise PCEs) due to action-generated traffic. If it is determined that Noise PCEs would double at any sensitive receptor, a detailed analysis would be conducted in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.
- Appropriate noise descriptors for building attenuation purposes would be selected. Based on CEQR criteria, the noise analysis will examine the L_{10} and the one-hour equivalent ($L_{eq(1)}$) noise levels.
- Existing noise levels will be measured at the Development Sites. Measurements will be made at receptor locations adjacent to the Development Sites. At each receptor site, 20-minute measurements will be performed during typical weekday AM, midday, and PM peak periods (coinciding with the traffic peak periods). Noise measurements will be recorded in conformance with *CEQR Technical Manual* procedures and will be measured in units of “A” weighted decibel scale (dBA), as well as one-third octave bands. The measured noise level descriptors will include equivalent noise level (L_{eq}), maximum level (L_{max}), minimum level (L_{min}), and statistical percentile levels such as L_1 , L_{10} , L_{50} , and L_{90} . A summary table of existing measured noise levels will be provided as part of the EIS.
- Following procedures outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual* for assessing mobile source noise impacts, future No-Action and With-Action noise levels will be estimated at the noise receptor locations based on acoustical fundamentals. All projections will be made with L_{eq} noise descriptor.
- The level of building attenuation necessary to satisfy CEQR requirements (a function of the exterior noise levels) will be determined based on the highest L_{10} noise level estimated at each monitoring site. The building attenuation requirements would be required through provisions contained in the Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) between HPD and the project sponsor. The EIS would include language describing the requirements that would apply.
- If the results of the screening analysis indicated that any sensitive receptor location would experience a doubling of traffic between the Future No-Action and Future With-Action conditions, a detailed mobile source noise analysis would be performed at that location in compliance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

If significant adverse impacts are identified, mitigation measures will be identified in conjunction with HPD as lead agency and any expert agencies, as appropriate.

TASK 8. Public Health

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, public health is the organized effort of society to protect and improve the health and well-being of the population through monitoring; assessment and surveillance; health promotion; prevention of disease, injury, disorder, disability and premature death; and reducing inequalities in health status. The goal of CEQR with respect to public health is to determine whether adverse impacts on public health may occur as a result of a proposed project, and if so, to identify measures to mitigate such effects.

According to the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a public health assessment may be warranted if an unmitigated significant adverse impact is identified in other CEQR analysis areas, such as air quality,

hazardous materials, or noise. If unmitigated significant adverse impacts are identified in any of these technical areas and the lead agency determines that a public health assessment is warranted, an analysis will be provided for the specific technical area or areas.

TASK 9. Neighborhood Character

Neighborhood character is established by numerous factors, including land use patterns, the scale of its development, the design of its buildings, the presence of notable landmarks, and a variety of other physical features that include traffic and pedestrian patterns, noise, etc. The proposed action has the potential to alter certain elements contributing to the affected area's neighborhood character. Therefore, a preliminary assessment of neighborhood character will be provided in the EIS to determine whether changes expected in other technical analysis areas—open space and shadows—may affect a defining feature of neighborhood character. The preliminary assessment will:

- Identify the defining features of the existing neighborhood character.
- Summarize changes in the character of the neighborhood that can be expected in the future With-Action condition and compare to the future No-Action condition.
- Evaluate whether the proposed action has the potential to affect these defining features, either through the potential for a significant adverse impact or a combination of moderate effects in the relevant technical areas.

If the preliminary assessment determines that the proposed action could affect the defining features of neighborhood character, a detailed analysis will be conducted in accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual guidance.

TASK 10 MITIGATION

Where significant adverse project impacts have been identified in any of the above tasks, measures to mitigate those impacts will be described. These measures will be developed and coordinated with the responsible City/State agencies as necessary. Where impacts cannot be mitigated, they will be described as unmitigated and unavoidable adverse impacts.

TASK 11. ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of an alternatives analysis in an EIS is to examine reasonable and practical options that avoid or reduce project-related significant adverse impacts while achieving the goals and objectives of the Proposed Project. The alternatives are usually defined once the full extent of the Proposed Project's impacts has been identified, however, they will include the No-Action Alternative, as required by SEQRA, and a No Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative. The alternatives analysis is primarily qualitative, except where significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Project have been identified. The level of analysis depends on an assessment of project impacts determined by the analysis connected with the appropriate tasks.

TASK 12. SUMMARY EIS CHAPTERS

In accordance with CEQR guidelines, the EIS will include the following three summary chapters, where appropriate to the Proposed Project:

- **Unavoidable Adverse Impacts** - which summarizes any significant adverse impacts that are unavoidable if the Proposed Project is implemented regardless of the mitigation employed (or if mitigation is not feasible).
- **Growth-Inducing Aspects** of the Proposed Project - which generally refer to “secondary” impacts of a proposed project that trigger further development.
- **Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources** - which summarizes the Proposed Project and its impacts in terms of the loss of environmental resources (loss of vegetation, use of fossil fuels and materials for construction, etc.), both in the immediate future and in the long term.

TASK 13. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The executive summary will utilize relevant material from the body of the EIS to describe the proposed project, the necessary approvals, study areas, environmental impacts predicted to occur, measures to mitigate those impacts, unmitigated and unavoidable impacts (if any), and alternatives to the proposed project. The executive summary will be written in sufficient detail to facilitate drafting of a Notice of Completion for the EIS by the lead agency.

APPENDIX A:
TPF TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

TO: New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development

FROM: Philip Habib & Associates

DATE: May 6, 2021

PROJECT: Las Raices EAS (#1979)

RE: Transportation Planning Factors Memorandum

INTRODUCTION


The applicant, the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) on behalf of Las Raices East Harlem LLC, the project sponsor, is seeking several discretionary actions that would facilitate the development of four new affordable housing developments (“the proposed project”) on four separate development sites in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan, Community District (CD) 11 (refer to **Figure 1**). The proposed project would be facilitated by disposition of City-owned property through the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (“the Proposed Actions”).

The proposed project would develop six tax lots grouped into four Development Sites (named A through D for identification purposes) with a total of four buildings containing a total of approximately 83 affordable dwelling units (DUs) and approximately 10,740 gsf of community facility space. For travel demand forecasting purposes, the community facility space is conservatively assumed to be occupied by medical office uses. All six lots (Site A: Block 1674, Lot 104; Site B: Block 1688, Lot 34, Site C: Block 1815, Lots 5 and 6, Site D: Block 1771, Lots 1 and 2) are City-owned and would be conveyed by HPD to the project sponsor as a result of the Proposed Actions. The proposed development is expected to be completed and operational in 2023. This memorandum summarizes the transportation planning factors to be used for the environmental assessment statement (EAS) analyses of traffic, transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions for the Proposed Development.

REASONABLE WORST CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO (RWCDs)

In order to assess the potential effects of the Proposed Development, a RWCDs for both the “future without the Proposed Actions” (No-Action) and the “future with the Proposed Actions” (With-Action) conditions is analyzed for an analysis year of 2023. In the future without the proposed actions, no new development would occur and the existing conditions at the Development Site would remain. Under existing conditions, Development Sites A and B are currently vacant, and would remain vacant under the No-Action condition. Development Sites C and D are currently occupied by portions of the Pleasant Village Community Garden and the Jackie Robinson Community Garden, respectively, which would remain under the No-Action condition. In the future under the With-Action conditions, the Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of 83 affordable DUs and approximately 10,740 gsf of community facility (medical office) space. As shown below in **Table 1**, by 2023, the incremental (net) change that would result from the Proposed

Project Location of all Development Sites



Development is a net increase of approximately 83 affordable DUs, and 10,740 gsf of community facility (medical office) space.

Table 1
Comparison of 2023 No-Action and 2023 With-Action Conditions

Development Site	Use	No-Action Scenario	With-Action Scenario	Increment
A (Block 1674, Lot 104)	Residential	0 DUs	6 DUs	+6 DUs
	Community Facility – Medical Office	0 gsf	2,497 gsf	+2,497 gsf
B (Block 1688, Lot 34)	Residential	0 DUs	7 DUs	+7 DUs
	Community Facility – Medical Office	0 gsf	0 gsf	0 gsf
C (Block 1815, Lots 5 and 6)	Residential	0 DUs	18 DUs	+18 DUs
	Community Facility – Medical Office	0 gsf	0 gsf	0 gsf
D (Block 1771, Lots 1 and 2)	Residential	0 DUs	52 DUs	+52 DUs
	Community Facility – Medical Office	0 gsf	8,243 gsf	+8,243 gsf
Total	Residential	0 DUs	83 DUs	+83 DUs
	Community Facility – Medical Office	0 gsf	10,740 gsf	+10,740 gsf

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FACTORS

In order to conduct a Level 1 Trip Generation Screening Assessment for the Proposed Development in 2023, a travel demand forecast was prepared a typical peak hour during the weekday AM, midday, and PM and Saturday midday periods for each Development Site (A – D) separately. The transportation planning factors shown below in **Tables 2A – 2D** were developed based on standard criteria as per the 2020 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, census data, and studies that have been used in previous CEQR documents for projects with similar uses. These include trip generation rates, temporal and directional distributions, mode choice factors, and vehicle occupancies for the With-Action increment of approximately 83 DUs and 10,740 gsf of community facility (medical office).

Residential

The forecast of travel demand for the residential use at each Development Site used a weekday trip generation rate of 8.075 person trips per DU, a Saturday trip generation rate of 9.6 trips per DU, and temporal distributions of 10 percent, 5 percent, 11 percent, and 8 percent for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, as per the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Truck trip generation rates were estimated based on the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*. The directional (in/out) splits and taxi vehicle occupancies were based on data from the *East Harlem Rezoning FEIS, 2017*. As discussed below, the residential modal splits and auto vehicle occupancies are based on census data, and therefore vary by site.

Site A

The residential modal splits were estimated to be 7.5 percent, 1.4 percent, 56.9 percent, 19.0 percent, and 15.2 percent mode shares for private auto, taxi, subway, bus, and walk-only modes, respectively, based on 2013 to 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 164. Similarly, the auto vehicle occupancy of 1.04 persons per auto was based on the same source.

Site B

The residential modal splits were estimated to be 16.8 percent, 0 percent, 70.0 percent, 7.1 percent, and 6.1 percent mode shares for private auto, taxi, subway, bus, and walk-only modes, respectively, based on 2013 to 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 188. Similarly, the auto vehicle occupancy of 1.13 persons per auto was based on the same source.

Site C

The residential modal splits were estimated to be 9.4 percent, 0.5 percent, 58.6 percent, 15.3 percent, and 16.2 percent mode shares for private auto, taxi, subway, bus, and walk-only modes, respectively, based on 2013 to 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 178. Similarly, the auto vehicle occupancy of 1.00 persons per auto was based on the same source.

Site D

The residential modal splits were estimated to be 4.3 percent, 0.6 percent, 65.9 percent, 11.5 percent, and 17.7 percent mode shares for private auto, taxi, subway, bus, and walk-only modes, respectively, based on 2013 to 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 196. Similarly, the auto vehicle occupancy of 1.16 persons per auto was based on the same source.

Medical Office

The forecast of travel demand for the medical office uses at Development Sites A and D used a weekday trip generation rate of 76 person trips per 1,000 sf, a Saturday trip generation rate of 39 person trips per 1,000 sf, and temporal distributions of 11 percent, 13 percent, 9 percent, and 17 percent for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, as per data provided by NYCDOT. The modal splits were estimated to be 1.0 percent, 5.0 percent, 60.0 percent, 5.0 percent, and 29.0 percent for private auto, taxi, subway, bus, and walk-only modes, respectively, based on data provided by NYCDOT. The directional splits and vehicle occupancies of 1.53 persons per auto/taxi were based on data provided by NYCDOT. Truck trip generation rates were estimated based on data from the *2016 East New York Rezoning Proposal FEIS*.

Table 2A
Site A - Transportation Planning Factors

Land Use:	<u>Residential</u>		<u>Medical Office</u>	
Size/Units:	6	DU	2,497	gsf
Person Trip Generation:	(1)		(4)	
Weekday	8.075		76.0	
Saturday	9.6		39.0	
	per DU		per 1,000 gsf	
Temporal Distribution:	(1)		(4)	
AM	10.0%		11.0%	
MD	5.0%		13.0%	
PM	11.0%		9.0%	
SatMD	8.0%		17.0%	
Modal Splits:	(2)		(4)	
	All Periods		All Periods	
Auto	7.5%		1.0%	
Taxi	1.4%		5.0%	
Subway	56.9%		60.0%	
Bus	19.0%		5.0%	
Walk/Other	15.2%		29.0%	
	100.0%		100.0%	
In/Out Splits:	(3)		(4)	
	In	Out	In	Out
AM	20%	80%	62%	38%
MD	51%	49%	47%	53%
PM	65%	35%	35%	65%
Sat MD	50%	50%	49%	51%
Vehicle Occupancy:	(2,3)		(4)	
Auto	1.04		1.53	
Taxi	1.40		1.53	
Truck Trip Generation:	(1)		(5)	
Weekday	0.06		0.29	
Saturday	0.02		0.29	
	per DU		per 1,000 sf	
Temporal Distribution	(1)		(5)	
AM	12.0%		3.0%	
MD	9.0%		11.0%	
PM	2.0%		1.0%	
Sat MD	9.0%		0.0%	
	In	Out	In	Out
AM/MD/PM/SMD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%

Notes:

- (1) Based on data from *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, 2020*.
- (2) Based on American Community Survey 2013-2017 Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 164.
- (3) Based on data from the *East Harlem Rezoning FEIS, 2017*.
- (4) Based on data provided by NYCDOT.
- (5) Based on data from the *East New York Rezoning Proposal FEIS, 2016*.

Table 2B

Site B - Transportation Planning Factors

Land Use:	<u>Residential</u>	
Size/Units:	7	DU
Person Trip Generation:	(1)	
Weekday	8.075	
Saturday	9.6	
	per DU	
Temporal Distribution:	(1)	
AM	10.0%	
MD	5.0%	
PM	11.0%	
SatMD	8.0%	
Modal Splits:	(2)	
	All Periods	
Auto	16.8%	
Taxi	0.0%	
Subway	70.0%	
Bus	7.1%	
Walk/Other	6.1%	
	100.0%	
In/Out Splits:	(3)	
	In	Out
AM	20%	80%
MD	51%	49%
PM	65%	35%
Sat MD	50%	50%
Vehicle Occupancy:	(2,3)	
Auto	1.13	
Taxi	1.40	
Truck Trip Generation:	(1)	
Weekday	0.06	
Saturday	0.02	
	per DU	
Temporal Distribution	(1)	
AM	12.0%	
MD	9.0%	
PM	2.0%	
Sat MD	9.0%	
	In	Out
AM/MD/PM/SMD	50.0%	50.0%

Notes:

- (1) Based on data from the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, 2020*.
(2) Based on American Community Survey 2013-2017 Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 188.
(3) Based on data from the *East Harlem Rezoning FEIS, 2017*.

Table 2C
Site C - Transportation Planning Factors

Land Use:	<u>Residential</u>	
Size/Units:	18	DU
Person Trip Generation:	(1)	
Weekday	8.075	
Saturday	9.6	
	per DU	
Temporal Distribution:	(1)	
AM	10.0%	
MD	5.0%	
PM	11.0%	
SatMD	8.0%	
Modal Splits:	(2)	
	All Periods	
Auto	9.4%	
Taxi	0.5%	
Subway	58.6%	
Bus	15.3%	
Walk/Other	16.2%	
	100.0%	
In/Out Splits:	(3)	
	In	Out
AM	20%	80%
MD	51%	49%
PM	65%	35%
Sat MD	50%	50%
Vehicle Occupancy:	(2,3)	
Auto	1.00	
Taxi	1.40	
Truck Trip Generation:	(1)	
Weekday	0.06	
Saturday	0.02	
	per DU	
Temporal Distribution	(1)	
AM	12.0%	
MD	9.0%	
PM	2.0%	
Sat MD	9.0%	
	In	Out
AM/MD/PM/SMD	50.0%	50.0%

Notes:

- (1) Based on data from the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, 2020*.
- (2) Based on American Community Survey 2013-2017 Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 178.
- (3) Based on data from the *East Harlem Rezoning FEIS, 2017*.

Table 2D
Site D - Transportation Planning Factors

Land Use:	<u>Residential</u>		<u>Medical Office</u>	
Size/Units:	52	DU	8,243	gsf
Person Trip Generation:	(1)		(4)	
Weekday	8.075		76.0	
Saturday	9.6		39.0	
	per DU		per 1,000 gsf	
Temporal Distribution:	(1)		(4)	
AM	10.0%		11.0%	
MD	5.0%		13.0%	
PM	11.0%		9.0%	
SatMD	8.0%		17.0%	
Modal Splits:	(2)		(4)	
	All Periods		All Periods	
Auto	4.3%		1.0%	
Taxi	0.6%		5.0%	
Subway	65.9%		60.0%	
Bus	11.5%		5.0%	
Walk/Other	17.7%		29.0%	
	100.0%		100.0%	
In/Out Splits:	(3)		(4)	
	In	Out	In	Out
AM	20%	80%	62%	38%
MD	51%	49%	47%	53%
PM	65%	35%	35%	65%
Sat MD	50%	50%	49%	51%
Vehicle Occupancy:	(2,3)		(4)	
Auto	1.16		1.53	
Taxi	1.40		1.53	
Truck Trip Generation:	(1)		(5)	
Weekday	0.06		0.29	
Saturday	0.02		0.29	
	per DU		per 1,000 sf	
Temporal Distribution	(1)		(5)	
AM	12.0%		3.0%	
MD	9.0%		11.0%	
PM	2.0%		1.0%	
Sat MD	9.0%		0.0%	
	In	Out	In	Out
AM/MD/PM/SMD	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%

Notes:

- (1) Based on data from the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, 2020*.
- (2) Based on American Community Survey 2013-2017 Means of Transportation to Work data for Manhattan Census Tract 196.
- (3) Based on data from the *East Harlem Rezoning FEIS, 2017*.
- (4) Based on data provided by NYCDOT.
- (5) Based on data from the *East New York Rezoning Proposal FEIS, 2016*.

TRIP GENERATION

According to the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a two-tier screening process is used to determine whether quantified analyses of any technical areas of the transportation system are necessary. A Level 1 screening is typically necessary if a proposed project has the potential to exceed either 50 vehicle trips, 200 transit trips or 200 pedestrian trips during any given peak hour. If these thresholds are exceeded, a Level 2 screening assessment is required in order to ensure that there are not 50 vehicle trips, 50 bus trips, 200 subway/rail trips, or 200 pedestrian trips assigned to an individual transportation element (intersections, bus routes, subway stations, etc.), during any analysis peak hour. Based on the planning factors shown in **Tables 2A – 2D**, travel demand forecasts (Level 1 screening) were prepared for each proposed Development Site, and are shown below in **Tables 3A – 3D**.

Level 1 Screening

Traffic

Site A

Based on the factors outlined in **Table 2A**, an incremental increase of approximately 2, 4, 2, and 0 vehicle trips (in and out combined) would be generated at Site A as a result of the proposed development program during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively (refer to **Table 3A**).

Site B

Based on the factors outlined in **Table 2B**, an incremental increase of approximately 1, 0, 1, and 0 vehicle trips (in and out combined) would be generated at Site B as a result of the proposed development program during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively (refer to **Table 3B**).

Site C

Based on the factors outlined in **Table 2C**, an incremental increase of approximately 1, 0, 2, and 2 vehicle trips (in and out combined) would be generated at Site C as a result of the proposed development program during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively (refer to **Table 3C**).

Site D

Based on the factors outlined in **Table 2D**, an incremental increase of approximately 5, 4, 6, and 6 vehicle trips (in and out combined) would be generated at Site C as a result of the proposed development program during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively (refer to **Table 3D**).

Overall

As the *CEQR Technical Manual* Level 1 screening threshold of 50 vehicle trips per peak hour is not exceeded during any of the four peak hour periods at any of the proposed development sites, significant adverse impacts would be unlikely and a Level 2 screening analysis is not warranted. As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a detailed parking assessment is not needed if the threshold for traffic analysis is not exceeded.

Table 3A
Site A - Travel Demand Forecast

Land Use:		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Medical Office</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Size/Units:		6	DU	2,497	gsf		
Peak Hour Person Trips:							
AM		5		21		26	
MD		2		25		27	
PM		5		17		22	
Sat MD		5		16		21	
Person Trips:							
AM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Subway	1	2	8	5	9	7
	Bus	0	1	1	0	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
	Total	1	4	14	7	15	11
MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Subway	1	1	7	7	8	8
	Bus	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
	Total	1	1	12	13	13	14
PM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Subway	3	1	4	7	7	8
	Bus	1	0	0	1	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
	Total	4	1	5	12	9	13
Sat MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Subway	1	1	6	6	7	7
	Bus	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
	Total	2	3	8	8	10	11
Vehicle Trips :							
AM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	1	1	1	1
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
MD	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	2	2	2	2
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
PM	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	1	1	1	1
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
Sat MD	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out

Table 3B
Site B - Travel Demand Forecast

Land Use:		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Size/Units:		7	DU		
Peak Hour Person Trips:					
AM		5		5	
MD		2		2	
PM		6		6	
Sat MD		5		5	
Person Trips:					
		In	Out	In	Out
AM	Auto	0	1	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	1	3	1	3
	Bus	0	0	0	0
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	4	1	4
		In	Out	In	Out
MD	Auto	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	1	1	1	1
	Bus	0	0	0	0
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	1	1	1
		In	Out	In	Out
PM	Auto	1	0	1	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	4	1	4	1
	Bus	0	0	0	0
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	5	1	5	1
		In	Out	In	Out
Sat MD	Auto	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	2	2	2	2
	Bus	0	0	0	0
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	2	3	2	3
Vehicle Trips :					
		In	Out	In	Out
AM	Auto (Total)	0	1	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	1	0	1
		In	Out	In	Out
MD	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	0	0
		In	Out	In	Out
PM	Auto (Total)	1	0	1	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	0	1	0
		In	Out	In	Out
Sat MD	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	0	0

Table 3C
Site C - Travel Demand Forecast

Land Use:		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Size/Units:		18	DU		
Peak Hour Person Trips:					
AM		15		15	
MD		7		7	
PM		16		16	
Sat MD		14		14	
Person Trips:					
AM		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	1	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	2	8	2	8
	Bus	0	2	0	2
	Walk/Other	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	Total	2	13	2	13
MD		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	2	1	2	1
	Bus	1	1	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	4	3	4	3
PM		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	1	1	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	5	3	5	3
	Bus	2	1	2	1
	Walk/Other	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	10	6	10	6
Sat MD		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	1	1	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Subway	4	4	4	4
	Bus	1	1	1	1
	Walk/Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	7	7	7	7
Vehicle Trips :					
AM		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	0	1	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	1	0	1
MD		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	0	0
PM		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	1	1	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	1	1	1
Sat MD		In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	1	1	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	0	0
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	0	0
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	1	1	1

Table 3D
Site D - Travel Demand Forecast

Land Use:		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Medical Office</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Size/Units:		52	DU	8,243	gsf		
Peak Hour Person Trips:							
	AM	42		69		111	
	MD	21		81		102	
	PM	46		56		102	
	Sat MD	40		55		95	
Person Trips:							
AM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	2	1	2	1
	Subway	6	23	26	16	32	39
	Bus	1	4	2	1	3	5
	Walk/Other	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>
	Total	8	34	43	26	51	60
MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Subway	7	8	23	26	30	34
	Bus	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Walk/Other	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>15</u>
	Total	10	11	38	43	48	54
PM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	1	2	1	2
	Subway	20	11	12	22	32	33
	Bus	3	2	1	2	4	4
	Walk/Other	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>
	Total	29	17	20	36	49	53
Sat MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Subway	13	13	17	18	30	31
	Bus	2	2	1	1	3	3
	Walk/Other	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
	Total	20	20	27	28	47	48
Vehicle Trips :							
AM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	1	2	2	2	3
MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	0	0	2	2	2	2
PM		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	1	2	2	3	3
Sat MD		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
	Auto (Total)	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Taxi	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Taxi Balanced	0	0	2	2	2	2
	Truck	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Total	1	1	2	2	3	3

Transit

According to the general thresholds used by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) specified in the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*, detailed transit analyses are generally not required if the proposed development is projected to result in fewer than 200 peak hour subway/rail or bus transit riders. If a proposed action would result in 50 or more bus passengers assigned to a single bus route (in one direction), or it would result in an increase of 200 or more passengers at a single subway station or on a single subway line, a detailed bus and/or subway analysis would be warranted. Transit analyses typically focus on the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours as it is during these periods that overall demand on the subway and bus system is usually highest.

Site A

As shown in **Table 3A**, the proposed development at Site A would generate an incremental increase of 16 and 15 subway trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM and PM peak periods, respectively. Similarly, the proposed development at Site A would generate an incremental increase of 2 and 2 bus trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Site B

As shown in **Table 3B**, the proposed development at Site B would generate an incremental increase of 4 and 5 subway trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM and PM peak periods, respectively. Similarly, the proposed development at Site B would not generate any incremental bus trips during the AM and PM peak hours.

Site C

As shown in **Table 3C**, the proposed development at Site C would generate an incremental increase of 10 and 8 subway trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM and PM peak periods, respectively. Similarly, the proposed development at Site C would generate an incremental increase of 2 and 3 bus trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Site D

As shown in **Table 3D**, the proposed development at Site D would generate an incremental increase of 71 and 65 subway trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM and PM peak periods, respectively. Similarly, the proposed development at Site C would generate an incremental increase of 8 and 8 bus trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Overall

Therefore, as the *CEQR Technical Manual* transit thresholds are not met at any of the proposed development sites, a detailed transit analysis would not be warranted, and no significant adverse impacts are expected.

Pedestrians

Site A

As shown in **Table 3A**, the proposed development at Site A would generate an incremental increase of 7, 7, 4, and 5 walk-only trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday midday

peak periods, respectively. In addition to the walk-only trips, the auto, subway, and bus trips also include walk portions of the trip. Therefore, the proposed project would generate a total of 25, 25, 21, and 21 walk trips in the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak periods respectively.

Site B

As shown in **Table 3B**, the proposed development at Site B would not generate incremental walk-only trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours and would generate 1 walk-only trip during the Saturday peak hour. In addition to the walk-only trips, the auto, subway, and bus trips also include walk portions of the trip. Therefore, the proposed project would generate a total of 5, 2, 6, and 5 walk trips in the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak periods respectively.

Site C

As shown in **Table 3C**, the proposed development at Site C would generate an incremental increase of 2, 2, 3, and 2 walk-only trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively. In addition to the walk-only trips, the auto, subway and bus trips also include walk portions of the trip. Therefore, the proposed project would generate a total of 15, 7, 16, and 14 walk trips in the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak periods respectively.

Site D

As shown in **Table 3D**, the proposed development at Site D would generate an incremental increase of 28, 28, 24, and 24 walk-only trips (in and out combined) during the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively. In addition to the walk-only trips, the auto, subway, and bus trips also include walk portions of the trip. Therefore, the proposed project would generate a total of 108, 98, 99, and 93 walk trips in the weekday AM, midday, PM and Saturday peak periods respectively.

Overall

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, detailed pedestrian analyses are not required if the proposed development is projected to result in less than 200 peak hour pedestrian trips. As discussed above, the total incremental walk trips do not exceed the CEQR threshold during any analyzed peak hour at any of the proposed development sites. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are expected and a detailed pedestrian analysis is not required.

CONCLUSIONS

A transportation forecast and assignment has been prepared for the proposed development of four new affordable housing developments containing a total of approximately 83 affordable DUs, and 10,740 gsf of community facility space. According to the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, if a proposed development is expected to result in fewer than 50 vehicle trips, 200 peak hour transit trips, and 200 peak hour pedestrian trips, further quantified analyses are warranted.

As shown in **Tables 3A – 3D**, each of the proposed developments would generate significantly less than *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 50 vehicle trips during each of the analysis peak hours. Similarly, the proposed developments would each generate less than 200 subway and bus trips during each of the analysis peak hours. Therefore, further quantified traffic and transit analyses are not warranted. As per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a detailed parking assessment is not needed if the threshold for traffic analysis is not exceeded.

Additionally, as shown in **Tables 3A – 3C**, each of the proposed developments would each generate significantly less than 200 pedestrian trips during each analysis peak hour. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are expected, and a detailed pedestrian analysis is not warranted.

APPENDIX B:
AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

Subject: FW: 20HPD002M- Las Raices - Positive Declaration

From: "Juliana, Matthew (HPD)" <JulianaM@hpd.nyc.gov>

Date: 3/3/2021, 3:01 PM

To: "Owring, Shahandeh (HPD)" <OwringS@hpd.nyc.gov>, Laura Davis <ldavis@phaeng.com>, "jreuben@phaeng.com" <jreuben@phaeng.com>

CC: "Auton, Melissa (HPD)" <AutonM@hpd.nyc.gov>, "Cortes, Felipe (HPD)" <CortesF@hpd.nyc.gov>, "Simmons, Veanda (HPD)" <simmonsv@hpd.nyc.gov>

Hi all- Please see below for Transportation signoff from DOT. Shay, could you save the below email?

Laura and Jeff, I know I owe you emails, my apologies.

Matt

From: Peter, Tyler <tpeter@dot.nyc.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 9:48 AM

To: Juliana, Matthew (HPD) <JulianaM@hpd.nyc.gov>

Cc: Samuelson, Michele <msamuelson@dot.nyc.gov>; Taylor, Jessica <jtaylor@dot.nyc.gov>; sahmed2@dot.nyc.gov

Subject: RE: 20HPD002M- Las Raices - Positive Declaration

Good Morning Mathew,

Our only comment is that Site A's trip generation rates are missing from the new submittal, but they appears to mirror the rates we reviewed last year.

Note that the end result of the transportation analysis is that Site A, B, & C do not go over the CEQR Level 1 thresholds. Site D, which only passed the Level 1 pedestrian threshold, does not go over the Level 2 pedestrian threshold. Therefore there is no need for additional transportation analysis for this project.

Sincerely,

Tyler Peter (he/him/they/them)

Office of Planning Analysis and CEQR

NYC DOT | Traffic Engineering & Planning

55 Water Street | New York, NY 10041

tpeter@dot.nyc.gov

From: Juliana, Matthew (HPD) [<mailto:JulianaM@hpd.nyc.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 4:22 PM

To: MN11 (CB) <MN11@cb.nyc.gov>; Simmons, Veanda (HPD) <simmonsv@hpd.nyc.gov>; Auton, Melissa (HPD) <AutonM@hpd.nyc.gov>; Cortes, Felipe (HPD) <CortesF@hpd.nyc.gov>; Goldberg, Arielle (HPD) <goldbear@hpd.nyc.gov>; Owring, Shahandeh (HPD) <OwringS@hpd.nyc.gov>; Jonathan Cruz <JCruz@mdgny.com>; Olga Abinader (DCP) <OABINAD@planning.nyc.gov>; Anthony Howard (DCP) <AHoward@planning.nyc.gov>; Humes, Emily (Parks) <Emily.Humes@parks.nyc.gov>; Cuff, David (Parks) <David.Cuff@parks.nyc.gov>; Alderson, Colleen (Parks) <Colleen.Alderson@parks.nyc.gov>; Estes, Terrell <terrelle@dep.nyc.gov>; Samuelson, Michele <msamuelson@dot.nyc.gov>; Gina Santucci (LPC) <GSantucci@lpc.nyc.gov>

Subject: 20HPD002M- Las Raices - Positive Declaration

Good afternoon,

Attached please find HPD's Positive Declaration and Notice of Public Scoping Hearing for the Las Raices proposal (CEQR No. 20HPD002M). The proposal involves a request by HPD on behalf of the project sponsor, Las Raices East Harlem LLC., for approval of disposition of city-owned property, a discretionary action subject to approval by the City

Planning Commission, as well as construction financing from HPD at a later date. These actions would facilitate the proposed new construction of 81 affordable dwelling units (plus two superintendent's units for a total of 83 dwelling units) across four Development Sites in the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan, Community District 11.

Please refer to the Positive Declaration for additional information. The Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS), Positive Declaration, Draft Scope of Work for the DEIS, and Notice of Public Scoping Hearing are available on HPD's Environmental Review webpage: <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/environmental-review.page>

Documents can also be accessed through MOEC's CEQR Access portal: <https://a002-ceqraccess.nyc.gov/ceqr/> please note there may be a delay before files are available.

Matthew Juliana, AICP | Director, Environmental Planning
Division of Building and Land Development Services
NYC Department of Housing Preservation & Development
100 Gold St, 7-A3c | New York, NY 10038
JulianaM@hpd.nyc.gov | Desk: 212-863-8575