

**A. INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), this chapter presents and analyzes alternatives to the proposed actions. As described in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, alternatives selected for consideration in an EIS are generally those which are feasible and have the potential to reduce or eliminate a proposed project's impacts considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor.

This chapter considers two alternatives to the proposed actions: the No Build Alternative, in which no new development is anticipated to occur on the project site; and the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative, which considers whether a reduction in the size of the proposed enlargement to the Hylan Plaza Shopping Center (the proposed project) would eliminate the potential for unmitigated significant adverse impacts.

**PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS**

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the proposed actions are necessary to facilitate new commercial development on the project site. It is the Applicant's opinion that the existing retail layout is inefficient and expanded retail uses on the project site would fulfill the surrounding community's demand for additional commercial goods and services, and promote the retention of sales and economic activity within Staten Island. Neither the No Build Alternative nor the No Unmitigated Significant Impacts Alternative would substantively meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives are summarized briefly below, followed by a more detailed chapter analysis.

***NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE***

The No Build Alternative assumes no discretionary actions would occur and that no new development would occur on the project site. This alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant adverse traffic impacts. However, in this alternative, there would be no redevelopment or enlargement of retail uses on the project site, which is already an existing commercial center accessible to major roadways, including Hylan Boulevard, and is located near eastern Staten Island's numerous residential neighborhoods. The No Build Alternative would not meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project, which include expanding retail uses and efficiency on the project site, which the Applicants believes would fulfill the surrounding community's demand for additional commercial goods and services, and would promote the retention of sales and economic activity within Staten Island.

***NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE***

The proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at intersections within the study area that could not be fully mitigated with practical traffic capacity improvement measures. A sensitivity analysis was performed at the three impacted locations that could not be fully mitigated to determine the magnitude of the proposed enlargement that would not produce

mitigatable significant traffic impacts within the traffic study area. Because of the existing congestion at a number of intersections, in particular at the intersection of Hylan Boulevard and New Dorp Lane, even a minimal increase in traffic could result in significant adverse traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated. It was estimated that the proposed enlargement would not be able to exceed 7,500 gross square feet (gsf) of destination retail space (approximately 10 percent of the proposed enlargement), and would not be able to accommodate a new supermarket or movie theater without generating significant traffic impacts. Given that any new development on the project site in excess of approximately 7,500 gsf could result in significant impacts in the area of transportation, there is no alternative that could be advanced to completely avoid such impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's goals and objectives.

## **B. NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE**

The No Build Alternative assumes that no new development would occur on the project site. Without the proposed approval of the group parking facility layout accessory to a commercial development and a reduction by up to 50 percent of the ZR Section 36-21 parking requirement, no new development could occur on the project site even though development on the site is below the maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR). Any development or enlargement on the project site, including changes to the parking site plan, would require an authorization pursuant to Zoning Resolution (ZR) Section 36-023 (which is a discretionary action and subject to environmental review) to assure that the layout of parking space is arranged and located in relation to the uses on the site so as to provide adequate ingress, egress, and circulation with respect to the abutting streets.

Under the No Build Alternative the conditions on the project site would remain unchanged from existing conditions, with exception of the now-vacant 60,000-gsf supermarket space formerly containing a Pathmark which would be re-tenanted by another grocery store use. FAR for the project site would continue to be 0.345. This condition has been described earlier in Chapter 1, "Project Description," as the "No Action Scenario" and has been used in other chapters of this EIS as the baseline against which impacts of the proposed project have been measured. This section compares the potential effects of the No Build Alternative to those of the proposed project.

### **NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

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

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

The project site is currently occupied by an existing shopping center consisting of local-and regional-serving retail stores arranged within one-story retail structures and fronted by surface parking. Under the No Build Alternative the project site would be expected to remain unchanged from existing conditions, with the exception of the now-vacant 60,000 gsf supermarket space which would be re-tenanted by another grocery store use. The project site would continue to contain 362,462 gsf of Use Group 6 and Use Group 10 retail uses, and 1,414 accessory parking spaces. The FAR on the project site would continue to be 0.345. In addition there are no major changes in land use anticipated in the study area by 2019 as outlined in Chapter 2: Land Use. By 2019 three new developments are anticipated within the 400-foot study area introducing

approximately 141,000 square feet of commercial space and approximately 570 parking spaces to the study area.

Under the No Build Alternative, as with the proposed project, the project site would remain entirely within a C4-1 commercial zoning district which allows commercial uses up to a maximum FAR of 1.0, residential uses of up to 1.25 FAR, and community facility uses of up to 2.0 FAR. C4-1 districts are generally mapped for outlying regional commercial centers and have high parking requirements. No changes to public policies affecting the project site or the study area are anticipated by 2019.

Neither the proposed project nor the No Build Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy. However, unlike the No Build Alternative, the proposed project would more efficiently utilize existing on-site parking, expand retail offerings at the project site, and generate economic development benefits for the Borough of Staten Island and the City of New York.

#### *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*

Unlike the future with proposed actions, there would be no construction on the project site in the No Build Alternative. Without demolition, excavation, and construction on the project site, there would be no potential for exposure to subsurface contaminants. As such, there would be no potential for human or environmental exposure and therefore no potential for significant adverse impacts. Legal requirements, including requirements for petroleum storage tank maintenance and managing ACM, LBP and PCBs, would continue to be applicable.

Unlike in the proposed project, potential contaminants identified by the Phase II Investigation would not be remediated through an ~~New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)~~ or New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation (OER)-approved Remedial Action Plan during the construction of the proposed project.

With a RAP, a Health and Safety Plan (HASP), and a Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) in place, the proposed project, like the No Build Alternative, would not cause any significant adverse impacts.

#### *TRANSPORTATION*

Under the No Build Alternative, it is expected that existing uses on the project site would remain, and the approximately 60,000-gsf vacant retail space at the project site would be re-tenanted with a supermarket use. Although the No Build Alternative would not result in any of the travel demand associated with the proposed project, traffic volumes in the study area would be expected to increase as a result of background growth and planned development. The overall levels of service would be expected to deteriorate in the No Build Alternative as compared to the existing conditions since traffic increases can be anticipated from the three planned nearby retail developments totaling approximately 41,000 square feet located just north of the main entrance of the proposed project along Hylan Boulevard. A fourth project, a 100,000-square-foot retail development north of the proposed project (450 New Dorp Lane), was identified in the DEIS but is not included as part of the FEIS analysis as it is not expected to be completed by the proposed project's 2019 Build Year. ~~four planned nearby projects totaling approximately 141,000 gsf of retail space. Background mitigation measures proposed in the 450 New Dorp Lane Project EIS would potentially result in improvement of the levels of service for certain movements despite the increase in background volume between the existing conditions and No Build Alternative.~~

## **The Boulevard at Hylan Plaza**

---

Under the No Build Alternative, the majority of traffic movements would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. The No Build Alternative would not result in the significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the proposed project, which would occur at a number of intersections. However, as described in Chapter 4, “Transportation,” in the future without the proposed project there would be the potential for unacceptable levels of service E or F during each peak hour at the following movements: eastbound left turns and shared through-right turn movement, westbound left turns, and southbound left turns at Hylan Boulevard and New Dorp Lane; westbound and southbound left turns at Hylan Boulevard and Ebbitts Street; eastbound left turns at Hylan Boulevard and Tysens Lane; and westbound left turns at Hylan Boulevard and Tysens Lane; ~~and southbound shared left and right turns at Ebbitts Street and the Plaza Driveway.~~

Although the No Build Alternative would not result in the significant adverse impacts from the proposed project, the No Build Alternative would not introduce new retail to the project site, which the Applicant believes would better meet consumer demand and generate economic and fiscal benefits for the Borough of Staten Island and the City of New York.

Neither the No Build Alternative nor the proposed project would result in any significant adverse impacts on transit, parking, or pedestrian spaces.

### *AIR QUALITY*

The No Build Alternative would not result in emissions from vehicle trips generated by the proposed project or the proposed parking facilities. The No Build Alternative also would not result in incremental emissions from new heat and hot water systems associated with the proposed project. However, with the proposed project, any incremental emissions from a relatively small number of mobile sources would be below the corresponding guidance thresholds and ambient air quality standards, and there would be no potential for significant adverse air quality impacts from heating and hot water systems for the proposed project. Therefore, neither the No Build Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

### *NOISE*

Like the proposed project, the No Build Alternative would not result in a perceptible increase in noise levels by 2019. By 2019 under the No Build Alternative, the maximum  $L_{eg(1)}$  noise levels would increase 1.6 dBA at most, which would be imperceptible. While existing noise conditions at two receptor sites are considered “Marginally Acceptable” and conditions at two other receptor sites are considered “Marginally Unacceptable” under the CEQR guidelines, the No Build Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in a significant adverse impact with respect to noise generation.

### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

Similar to the proposed project, the No Build Alternative would not change the character of the neighborhood surrounding the project site, and therefore would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. The character of the study area is primarily defined by its large concentration of destination retail uses in addition to residential uses and supporting private open spaces and community facility uses. Given that the study area already experiences high volumes of visitors due to its large concentration of destination retail uses, neither the proposed project, nor the No Build Alternative would affect the essential character of the neighborhood.

As described above, the proposed project has the potential to cause significant adverse traffic impacts at several intersections surrounding the project site that could be mitigated. Under the No Build Alternative, the potential traffic impacts would not be generated in the first place. However, similar to the proposed project, the site would experience high volumes of visitors due to the presence of the existing shopping center and other destination retail uses. The essential character of the study area would therefore be similar to conditions with the proposed project.

### **C. NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative demonstrates those measures that would have to be taken to eliminate all of the proposed project's potential unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. In other words, the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative considers the magnitude of development that could occur on the project site without resulting in unmitigated significant adverse impacts.

As detailed in Chapter 4, "Transportation," the proposed project would result in potential significant adverse traffic impacts at five intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, seven ~~six~~ intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and seven intersections in the Saturday midday peak hour. Mitigation measures were proposed at the impacted intersections and are detailed in Chapter 8, "Mitigation." Traffic impacts could not be fully mitigated at three intersections for one more or more peak hours analyzed. These intersections are: Hylan Boulevard and New Dorp Lane, which could not be fully mitigated during the ~~Saturday midday~~ weekday PM peak hour; Hylan Boulevard and Beach Avenue, which could not be fully mitigated during all peak hours analyzed; and Hylan Boulevard and Ebbitts Street, which could not be fully mitigated during ~~the weekday midday and PM~~ all peak hours analyzed. Therefore, this alternative considers whether modifications to the proposed project could be made that would eliminate these unmitigated potential significant adverse traffic impacts.

A sensitivity analysis was performed at the three impacted locations not fully mitigated to determine the magnitude of the proposed enlargement that would result in significant traffic impacts. The sensitivity analysis determined that because of the existing congestion at the intersections of Hylan Boulevard and New Dorp Lane during the weekday PM peak hour, an increase of approximately three vehicles in each direction of Hylan Boulevard could result in unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts at this location.

It was estimated that the proposed enlargement would not be able to exceed 7,500 gross square feet (gsf) of destination retail space (approximately 10 percent of the total proposed enlargement), and would not be able to accommodate a new supermarket or movie theater. Given that any new development on the project site at this size could result in unmitigated significant traffic impacts, there is no alternative that could be advanced to completely avoid such impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's goals and objectives. \*