Chapter 24:

Alternatives

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter assesses the following alternatives to the Proposed Actions and development program:

- The No Action Alternative, in which the Proposed Actions are not approved and the four development parcels are not developed;
- An As-of-Right Alternative, in which the development parcels are improved with commercial uses and public parking in accordance with the current provisions of the New York City Zoning Resolution;
- A 12 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) All-Residential Alternative, in which the four parcels are developed under the proposed rezoning with a high-density complex of residential, retail, and community facility buildings, and publicly accessible open space; and
- A Community Board 6 Alternative. This alternative is based on a development scenario that reflects the 197-c application that has been filed by Manhattan Community Board 6. It reflects a rezoning scenario in which the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels are rezoned to C1-9 and a Special East River Access District is established in the area bounded by West 34th and 41st Streets, First Avenue, and the pierhead line in the East River.

The Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) analyzed several alternative development scenarios, including: a No Action Alternative; an As-of-Right Alternative; a Limited Disposition Alternative, in which Con Edison would have retained the Waterside parcel; a Lesser Density Alternative, with development proceeding at an FAR of 6.0; and an Adaptive Reuse Alternative, in which the Waterside No. 1 and Waterside No. 2 power plant structures would have been retained and adapted for either office, residential, or cultural institution use. Given that all of the development parcels have been sold to East River Realty Company LLC (ERRC) by Con Edison, and that the remediation and demolition of the Waterside generating facilities has occurred irrespective of the Proposed Actions and has been substantially completed, the Limited Disposition and Adaptive Reuse Alternatives are no longer applicable to the analysis of the Proposed Actions in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and therefore will not be considered. As in the FGEIS, this SEIS analyzes a No Action Alternative and an As-of-Right Alternative. The Community Board 6 Alternative—which has a base FAR of 6.0 and elective floor area bonuses of 2.0 FAR for the provision of publicly accessible open space improvements and 2.0 FAR for the provision of affordable housing for a total possible FAR of 10.0—also serves as a lesser density alternative.

B. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative assumes that the Proposed Actions are not approved and the development parcels are not developed. The Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would be fully remediated, but they would remain vacant. The 616 First Avenue parcel would also remain vacant, while the 685 First Avenue parcel would continue to serve as surface parking. This alternative is discussed and analyzed as the Future Without the Proposed Actions in technical Chapters 2 through 21 of this SEIS. This analysis compares conditions under the No Action Alternative with conditions that could result from the Proposed Actions.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Unlike the Proposed Actions, which would permit the high-density development of new residential, commercial, community facility, and retail uses, and publicly accessible open space on the four development parcels, the No Action Alternative would result in no development. The currently vacant Waterside, 708 First Avenue, and 616 First Avenue sites would remain vacant, and the 685 First Avenue site would continue to serve as a paved, surface parking lot. These sites would contrast with the surrounding moderate- to high-density, mixed-use neighborhoods and with the predominant land use trend in the study area of large-scale residential and office development. Although the No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy, it would not provide compatible mixed-use development and it would not be in keeping with existing trends towards eliminating obsolete manufacturing zoning districts, promoting high-density residential neighborhoods on Manhattan's far east side north of East 34th Street, and supporting high-density mixed-use development near the United Nations.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

As with the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse direct and indirect displacement impacts would result under this alternative. However, the No Action Alternative would not contribute to existing development trends in the area that have extended commercial development eastward and have created large residential buildings on both the avenues and streets in the Murray Hill, Kips Bay, and Midtown East neighborhoods. Further, the No Action Alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, would not provide for the creation of dwelling units or permanent jobs on the development parcels, and there would be no significant benefits to the area's residential, business, and institutional communities through economic growth and job creation.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Under the No Action Alternative, the increased demand for certain community facilities due to the Proposed Action would not occur. In addition, with no residential development, the No Action Alternative would not result in the significant adverse impacts to public elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 that would result from the proposed development program under the Proposed Actions. It would also not result in the significant adverse impacts to public day care centers that could potentially result from the Affordable Housing Scenario of the proposed development program. Like the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not directly displace police, fire, public education, public day care, library, or health care facilities. Overall, no significant adverse community facility impacts would result from the No Action Alternative.

OPEN SPACE

Like the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to open space resources. However, the No Action Alternative would not create the 4.84 acres of publicly accessible open space that would be created under the Proposed Actions. Without the new publicly accessible open space, the No Action Alternative would not result in the improvements in all worker and residential open space ratios that would occur with the Proposed Actions. In the No Action Alternative, the passive open space ratio for the ¼-mile study area would decline over existing conditions due to background development. In the ½-mile study area, there would be a decrease in the active open space ratio, and the amount of open space in the area would continue to fall below the City's open space guidelines. Table 24-1 shows the open space ratios for both study areas with the No Action Alternative.

Table 24-1

Open Space Ratios: No Action Alternative

	0	on opt	ace ma	105.110	110010		matrive
	Total	Open Space Acreage		Open Space Ratios Per 1,000 People			
	Population	Total	Active	Passive	Total	Active	Passive
1⁄4-Mile Study Area							
Workers	39,472	N/A	N/A	8.19	N/A	N/A	0.207
Combined Workers and Residents	70,568	N/A	N/A	8.19	N/A	N/A	0.116
	1/2-Mile Stud	ly Area					
Residents	72,102	24.46	5.50	18.96	0.339	0.076	0.263
Combined Workers and Residents	<u>294,102</u>	N/A	N/A	18.96	N/A	N/A	0.064
Notes:							

N/A = not applicable. Per *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, workers typically use only passive spaces, so within the ¼-mile area only passive open space ratios are calculated. Within the ½-mile area, both active and total park space ratios are calculated.

SHADOWS

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no new construction on the development parcels. Therefore, unlike the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not result in any new shadows or in significant adverse shadows impacts on the Tudor City open spaces or the Manhattan Place Plaza on the December analysis day.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Like the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse physical, visual, or contextual impacts to historic resources. Since there would be no new construction on the 685 First Avenue and Waterside parcels, there would be no need to implement construction protection plans for Windsor Tower or the former Kips Bay Brewery to avoid inadvertent construction damage to those two resources. In addition, some blocked northerly views along First Avenue of Windsor Tower and the U.N. Secretariat building would not occur, as they would under the proposed development program.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the urban design and visual resources of the study area; however, this alternative would not have the beneficial effects of the Proposed Actions due to redevelopment of the vacant development parcels with a major new complex of buildings, and creation of publicly accessible open spaces and new views to the East River waterfront. There would be no change to the urban design of the development parcels, and the vacant 708 First Avenue, Waterside, and 616 First Avenue parcels and the parking lot on the 685 First Avenue site would continue to contrast with the surrounding moderate- to high-density mixed-use neighborhood. The presence of the three vacant parcels and the parking lot would not support or enhance the urban design or visual character of the area.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Unlike conditions with the Proposed Actions, the character of the development parcels and the immediately surrounding area would remain substantially unchanged under the No Action Alternative, and the four undeveloped parcels would stand out from the neighborhood, which is developed with moderate- to high-density residential, commercial, and institutional buildings. This alternative would not develop the three vacant sites and the parking lot with new publicly accessible open space and high-density residential and office buildings with ground-floor retail. Unlike the Proposed Actions, the No Action alternative would not improve the streetscape, provide retail uses along First Avenue, introduce publicly accessible open space, or create new views to the East River waterfront. Therefore, while avoiding some localized impacts related to neighborhood character (e.g., traffic and pedestrian impacts), the No Action alternative would not result in the benefits to neighborhood character that would be achieved with the Proposed Actions. Overall, the No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Neither the Proposed Actions nor the No Action Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on terrestrial resources, floodplains and wetlands, aquatic resources, water quality, or endangered, threatened, or special concern species.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result under the No Action Alternative, as the development parcels will have been fully remediated.

INFRASTRUCTURE

As with the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse impacts to infrastructure would occur under the No Action Alternative. With this alternative, there would be no new demand for City water supply and sewer services from the development parcels. In the No Action Alternative, stormwater would flow into the existing combined sewers in the area to discharge stormwater into the East River and the amount of runoff would be expected to remain the same as under existing conditions. The reduction in combined sewer overflow (CSO) events projected to occur in the future with the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

With the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Actions' increase in solid waste would not occur. The No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the solid waste handling and disposal systems that serve New York City.

ENERGY

With the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Actions' demand for energy would not occur. Like the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts on energy systems.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Conditions under the No Action Alternative on the local street network would be better than those under the Proposed Actions. However, independent of the Proposed Actions, traffic service levels at many locations in the study areas would experience congested conditions. In the overall traffic study area, in the AM peak hour, <u>34</u> of the <u>86</u> analysis locations analyzed would operate at overall LOS E or F under the No Action Alternative compared to <u>47 of the 88</u> locations (which include two additional locations analyzed for Build conditions) under the Proposed Actions. In the midday peak hour, <u>22</u> of the <u>86</u> intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F under the No Action Alternative, compared to <u>29 of the 88</u> intersections under the Proposed Actions. In the PM peak hour, 45 of the <u>86</u> intersections would operate at overall LOS E or F under the No Action Alternative, compared to <u>55 of the 88</u> intersections under the Proposed Actions. In the Saturday peak hour, <u>8</u> of the <u>86</u> analysis locations analyzed would operate at overall LOS E or F under the No Action Alternative, compared to <u>55 of the 88</u> intersections under the Proposed Actions. In the Saturday peak hour, <u>8</u> of the <u>86</u> analysis locations analyzed would operate at overall LOS E or F under the No Action Alternative, compared to <u>13 of the 88</u> intersections under the Proposed Actions.

Unlike the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse traffic impacts in the primary study area or in the Queensboro Bridge, West Side, and Queens Plaza study areas, on the FDR Drive, or the mainline of the Queens-Midtown Tunnel. Therefore, none of the traffic mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Actions would need to be implemented under the No Action Alternative.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to the four development parcels and, as a result, no increases in transit or pedestrian activity would occur. Therefore, this alternative would not result in the significant adverse impacts on the PL9 stairway at Grand Central Station, on the M16/M34 and M42 bus routes, and at three pedestrian locations that would occur under the Proposed Actions.

AIR QUALITY

Like the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on air quality from mobile, stationary, or industrial sources of pollution. Predicted PM_{10} and CO concentrations would be lower than the applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Since the development parcels would not be developed in this alternative, there would be no project-generated mobile source, parking ventilation, or boiler emissions and therefore no incremental $PM_{2.5}$ impacts.

NOISE

As under the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse off-site noise impacts are expected to occur under the No Action Alternative. Since none of the four development parcels would be developed under this alternative, there would be no noise impacts at any new buildings on the development parcels. Noise levels in the No Action Alternative would be modestly greater than in the existing condition, but the changes would be insignificant.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Unlike the Proposed Actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in any development within the coastal zone. In addition, this alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, would not further the goal of encouraging commercial and residential development within appropriate coastal zone areas, provide new views to the East River waterfront, or create publicly accessible open space.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Since there would be no development under the No Action Alternative, the significant adverse traffic and noise impacts associated with construction of the proposed development program would not occur. However, the substantial economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs under the Proposed Actions would not occur under this alternative.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The No Action Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse public health impacts. Since it involves no development, this alternative would not result in any of the air or noise emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project.

FUTURE CONDITIONS WITH THE UNDC PROJECT

As in the future conditions without construction of the UNDC project, the development parcels would remain vacant under the No Action Alternative. There would be no new significant adverse impacts to the technical areas described above, and the No Action Alternative would continue to provide no benefits to the study areas.

C. AS-OF-RIGHT ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE AS-OF-RIGHT ALTERNATIVE

This As-of-Right Alternative was assessed in the FGEIS as the As-of-Right Development Program. In the As-of-Right Alternative, the development parcels would be improved in accordance with the current provisions of the New York City Zoning Resolution applicable to the parcels. The program analyzed for this alternative, which totals 1,124,540 gross-square-feet (gsf) of new development, represents a reasonable worst-case development scenario of new uses and public parking spaces that can be achieved on the parcels without any discretionary public actions. Development under this alternative is assumed to consist of approximately 723,800 gsf of office use, 111,240 gsf of local retail and restaurant uses, 225,000 gsf of below-grade destination retail uses, and 16,500 gsf of medical office uses provided in three buildings, and four at-grade public parking lots containing 450 spaces and two below-grade accessory parking garages with 160 total

spaces. The As-of-Right Alternative would not include any publicly accessible open space. In addition, the 685 First Avenue parcel would continue to serve as a paved surface parking lot under this alternative, because new development on the parcel would require modification of a New York City Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) special permit. See Figure 24-1 for a site plan of the As-of-Right Alternative, and Figures 24-2 and 24-3 for axonometric views of the reasonable worst-case development under this alternative.

Table 24-2 and the following descriptions outline the reasonable worst-case development scenario assumed in this alternative for each parcel under existing zoning controls:

Table 24-2Summary of As-of-Right Alternative

Site	Residential (gsf)	Community Facility gsf)	Commercial Office (gsf)	Retail (gsf)	Below-Grade Space ³ (gsf)	Total (gsf)	Parking Spaces	Open Space (gsf)
616 First Avenue	0	16,500	239,800	23,690	18,000	297,990	150 public, 60 accessory	0
685 First Avenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
700 First Avenue (Waterside)	0	0	0	227,570 ¹	30,000	826,550	300 public, 100 accessory	0
708 First Avenue	0	0	484,000	84,980 ²	1		-	
TOTAL	0	16,500	723,800	336,240	48,000	1,124,540	450 public, 160 accessory	0
Notes: 1 Retail at 700 Fi 2 Retail at 708 F 3 Below-grade s	irst Avenue inclu irst Avenue inclu pace calculatior	udes 181,220 gs udes 43,780 gsf า includes area d	f of below-grade of below-grade levoted to parkir	space. space. Ig and other s	service requireme	nts, but does no	ot include the belo [,]	w-grade retail

space associated with 700 and 708 First Avenue. Source: East River Realty Company, LLC

- The 708 First Avenue parcel would be developed with a 15-story (256-foot-tall) office building containing 484,000 gsf of office space and 41,200 gsf of ground-floor retail space. The building would be constructed to the property lines on First Avenue and part of East 41st Street, and it would be massed with a one-story portion on those streets. The main bulk of the building would be set back approximately 40 feet from First Avenue and 50 feet from East 41st Street. A 100-space public parking lot would be located at the eastern side of the parcel with a curb cut on East 41st Street. In a shared cellar space with the Waterside parcel, the development on the 708 First Avenue parcel would contain 100 accessory parking spaces and 43,780 gsf of below-grade destination retail uses. This program assumes an asof-right zoning lot merger and floor area transfer from the Waterside parcel.
- The Waterside parcel would be developed with a one- and two-story building containing 46,350 gsf of retail uses. It would be built to the property line on First Avenue, and there would be 181,220 gsf of below-grade retail uses in the shared cellar space. Two public parking lots would contain a total of 200 spaces. One lot would be located on the eastern side of the parcel adjacent to the public parking lot on the 708 First Avenue parcel, and the second lot would front on East 38th Street. The curb cut for the two parking lots would be located on East 38th Street at the parcel's eastern end, and the ramp to the below-grade parking garage on the 708 First Avenue parcel would be located to the south of the retail building, approximately in line with East 39th Street.
- The 616 First Avenue parcel would be developed with a 15-story (256-foot-tall) office building containing 239,800 gsf of office space, 23,690 gsf of ground-floor retail space, and 16,500 gsf of medical office space. This site would also accommodate 60 spaces of below-grade accessory parking and a 150-space, at-grade public parking lot. The building would be



As-of-Right Alternative Site Plan Figure 24-1



As-of-Right Alternative Axonometric View Northwest Figure 24-2



As-of-Right Alternative Axonometric View Southwest Figure 24-3 located in the center of the site. The public parking lot would surround the building and front on First Avenue, East 36th and 35th Streets, and the FDR Drive service road. Access to the below-grade parking garage would be located toward the eastern end of the parcel on East 35th Street.

• As mentioned above, there is no as-of-right development potential for the 685 First Avenue parcel, because of the conditions in the Special Permit. Any development other than a parking lot requires that the BSA approve an amendment to the Special Permit. Therefore, the As-of-Right Alternative assumes retention of existing uses and no new development on the 685 First Avenue parcel.

Although retail and entertainment uses are permitted on the 708 First Avenue and Waterside parcels under the existing M3-2 zoning, certain stores, like department stores and supermarkets, are not permitted in excess of 10,000 square feet without a Special Permit. Therefore, the retail program for these parcels assumes a combination of several independent stores, each less than 10,000 square feet, that together draw customers from a larger-than-local area, or stores or restaurants in combination with an entertainment use, such as a movie theater.

AS-OF-RIGHT ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy. However, this alternative would result in different land use patterns and densities, and the alternative, which lacks residential use, would not be as compatible with the study area as that under the Proposed Actions.

Land Use

At approximately one million square feet, development under the As-of-Right Alternative would be substantially less dense than development under the Proposed Actions. The majority of the development program would be commercial uses, in contrast to the largely residential development program under the Proposed Actions. Because this alternative would not include any residential development, would not provide any publicly accessible open space, and would include four at-grade public parking lots, it would not be as compatible with land uses in the study area as would be the Proposed Actions. Further, this alternative would not have the beneficial effects provided by the Proposed Actions through the provision of ground-floor retail along First Avenue on each parcel and the creation of publicly accessible open space.

Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would include the development of an office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel, which would be compatible with the mixed-use area surrounding the United Nations. However, this alternative would also include an office building on the 616 First Avenue parcel. That office use would differ from the southern portion of the primary study area where land uses are more residential, with some medical uses, and which is farther away from the mixed-use area near the United Nations.

The destination retail and entertainment uses on the 708 First Avenue and Waterside parcels would be new to the primary study area and would not be as compatible as the local retail, residential, and publicly accessible open space uses of the development program under the Proposed Actions. The destination retail uses could include stores that do not require a special permit (e.g., hardware stores such as a Home Depot), movie theaters, and a concentration of smaller stores (less than 10,000 square feet) and restaurants. Currently, ground-floor retail uses

in the area are neighborhood services such as restaurants and dry cleaners, and the only similar large concentration of destination retail uses in the study area is in a retail strip on Second Avenue between East 30th and 33rd Streets that includes a movie theater complex. The As-of-Right Alternative would place approximately three times as much destination retail on the 708 First Avenue and Waterside parcels as found in that strip. These types of uses and the substantial amount of them—particularly if they included a "big box" store such as a Home Depot—would differ from the study area trend towards high density residential neighborhoods with a mixed-use area near the United Nations.

Zoning and Public Policy

The As-of-Right Alternative would not alter existing zoning on the development parcels. Without a zoning change, the existing M1-5 and M3-2 manufacturing districts would remain in place. The density of development and range of manufacturing and heavy commercial uses permitted under the existing M districts are not consistent with the surrounding commercial and residential zoning in the primary and secondary study areas. In addition, the permitted uses on the development parcels under those districts are less consistent with surrounding existing uses than would be the uses permitted under the Proposed Actions. Therefore, maintaining the existing manufacturing districts and redeveloping under their regulations would not foster the orderly growth and enhancement of residential uses in the study area and would be inconsistent with zoning in the primary and secondary study areas.

Public Policy

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not directly advance the goals set forth in the Comprehensive Manhattan Waterfront Plan or the New York City Bicycle Master Plan. However, neither the As-of-Right Alternative nor the Proposed Actions would result in development that would preclude the city from fulfilling these goals in the future. Because it does not include residential development and would not create any new publicly accessible open space or views toward the East River, the As-of-Right Alternative would be less consistent with the goals of the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program than would the Proposed Actions.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result, either directly or indirectly, in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts.

Direct Residential, Business, and Institutional Development

The As-of-Right Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not directly displace any residential population, businesses, or institutions.

Indirect Residential Displacement

The As-of-Right Alternative would not include any residential development, and, therefore, it would not introduce a new residential population that could affect market conditions. Overall, the As-of-Right Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not be expected to result in indirect residential displacement.

Indirect Business and Institutional Displacement

As with the Proposed Actions, development under the As-of-Right Alternative would not be expected to introduce or accelerate trends of changing socioeconomic conditions that would precipitate indirect displacement of businesses or institutions. This alternative would introduce commercial office, retail, medical office, and parking uses to the study area, none of which would be new. In addition, these uses would not be of such a scale that they would add to the concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to alter existing patterns. The amount of commercial office would be less than included in the development program under the Proposed Actions. While the 225,000 gsf of destination retail uses would be greater than the existing amount of such similar uses in the study area, they would not be a new economic activity, nor would they add to the concentration of a retail sector of the local economy enough to alter or accelerate an ongoing trend to alter existing economic patterns.

This alternative would not directly displace uses that directly support businesses in the area or bring people to the area that form a customer base for a local business. In addition, it would not indirectly displace residents, workers, or visitors who form the customer base of existing businesses in the area. To the contrary, the new commercial office population would provide support to local businesses.

Effects on a Specific Industry

Because the As-of-Right Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not directly or indirectly displace businesses, it would not adversely affect business conditions in any industry or any category of business within or outside of the study area. This alternative would also not indirectly reduce employment or impact the economic viability in an industry or category of business. Therefore, like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on a specific industry.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Overall, no significant adverse community facility impacts would result from this alternative. Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not directly displace police, fire, public education, public day care, library, or health care facilities. Access to and from the study area's fire stations will not be directly affected by the As-of-Right Alternative, and FDNY response times are not expected to be significantly affected by the projected increases in traffic generated by this alternative. This alternative, like the proposed development program, would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a police precinct house, but like the proposed development program it could necessitate the assignment of additional personnel, resources, and equipment to the study area. As under the Proposed Actions, a commitment of resources would be based on demonstrated need and would not be made until a detailed development plan and operational statistics for the alternative, if realized, became available.

Because the As-of-Right Alternative would not include any residential development, it would not result in the significant adverse impacts to public elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 that would occur under the Proposed Actions. It would also not result in the significant adverse impacts to public day care centers that could potentially result from the Affordable Housing Scenario.

OPEN SPACE

The As-of-Right Alternative would add a new commercial population to the area; however it would not add a new residential population. In addition, this alternative would not create any new publicly accessible open spaces on the development parcels, as compared to the Proposed Actions, which would create 4.84 acres of publicly accessible open space. Unlike the Proposed

Table 24-3

Actions, this alternative would not improve open space conditions within the ¹/₄-mile and ¹/₂-mile study areas, and it would result in a significant adverse impact to open space resources within the ¹/₄-mile study area. If the As-of-Right Alternative were to be developed, the PSC Order¹ would require the alternative to provide publicly accessible open space either on the development parcels or elsewhere in the study area in an amount sufficient to offset the demand generated by the new commercial population.

¹/4-Mile Study Area

Open Space Study Area Population. As shown in Table 24-3, approximately 3,545 workers would be added to the area under the As-of-Right Alternative. This amount is slightly more than half the amount that would be added under the Proposed Actions (6,985 workers). No residents would be added to the area.

	Tuble 24 5
Projected Typical Permanent Employment from Operation of the	As-of-Right
	Alternative

Category	Gross Square Feet	Employment (Full-Time Equivalent)		
Office	723,800	2,895		
Retail – General	111,240	278		
Retail – Destination	225,000	300		
Community Facility/Medical	16,500	37		
Parking	610 spaces	35 (estimated)		
Total 3,545				
Notes:				
Factors: Office 1 employee per 250 gsf: general retail 1 employee per 400 gsf: destination retail 1				

Factors: Office, 1 employee per 250 gsf; general retail, 1 employee per 400 gsf; destination retail, 1 employee per 750 gsf; community facility/medical, 1 employee per 450 gsf; parking is estimated for purposes of this analysis.

Open Space Resources. Unlike under the Proposed Actions, no publicly accessible open spaces would be created on the development parcels in the As-of-Right Alternative. Therefore, the amount of passive open space would remain at its No Action level of 8.19 acres. Since the As-of-Right Alternative would not have a residential component, only passive open space is assessed in the ¹/₄-mile analysis.

Analysis of the Adequacy of Open Space Resources. Unlike the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not improve the worker passive open space ratio and the combined ratio of passive open space per 1,000 total residents and workers. Because the As-of-Right Alternative would increase the worker population but would not increase the total amount of publicly accessible passive open space, the worker passive open space ratio would decrease from 0.207 acres per 1,000 workers to 0.190 acres (see Table 24-4). This decrease in itself would not be considered a significant adverse impact, because the amount of passive open space for workers

¹ As described more fully in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Public Service Commission (PSC) approved the disposition of the development parcels to ERRC in the PSC Order, which is found in Appendix A of this SEIS. The PSC Order requires that in the event ERRC decides to proceed under the As-of-Right Alternative (the As-of-Right Scenario in the FGEIS), ERRC shall implement mitigation measures for all significant open space, urban design, neighborhood character, traffic, transit and pedestrian, air quality, and noise impacts identified in the FGEIS arising from the As-of-Right development program.

in the ¹/₄-mile study area would still exceed the City's planning guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers. However, the As-of-Right Alternative would cause the combined ratio of passive open space per 1,000 total residents and workers to decrease from 0.120 in the No Action condition to 0.111. Given that the ¹/₄-mile study area would fall short of the calculated combined ratio of 0.303 in the No Action condition, the greater than 5 percent decrease in the combined ratio would be considered a significant adverse impact.

Table 24-4

Comparison of Open Space Impacts: As-of-Right Alternative and Proposed Development Program (¼-Mile Study Area)

				8	
Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	As-of-Right Alternative Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to As-of- Right Alternative	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program	Percentage Point Difference: As-of-Right Alternative and Proposed Development Program
Passive Open Space, Workers Only	0.207	0.190	-8.24	25.98	-34.22
Passive Open Space, Combined Workers and Residents	0.120	0.111	-4.78	24.49	-29.27

¹/₂-Mile Study Area

Open Space Study Area Population. Under the As-of-Right Alternative, the worker population in the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area would increase by 3,545 to <u>225,989</u>. Since no new residents would be added under the As-of-Right Alternative within the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area, the residential population would still equal the No Action level of <u>72,102</u>.

Open Space Resources. Unlike the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not create any new publicly accessible open space. Therefore, the amounts of total active and passive open space would not change from their No Action levels. Total open space in the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area would still be 24.46 acres, total active space would remain at 5.50 acres, and total passive space would hold at 18.96 acres.

Analysis of the Adequacy of Open Space Resources. Unlike the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not improve the total residential open space ratio, the residential active open space ratio, the residential passive open space ratio, or the combined worker/residential passive open space ratio over No Action levels (see Table 24-5). Although no significant adverse impacts would result from the As-of-Right Alternative, because those open space ratios would be virtually identical to those under the No Action condition, this alternative would not have the beneficial effects on open space ratios that would occur under the Proposed Actions.

Table 24-5

Comparison of Open Space Impacts: As-of-Right Alternative and Proposed Development Program (½-Mile Study Area)

Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	As-of-Right Alternative Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to As- of-Right Alternative	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program
Total Open Space Ratio, Residents Only	0.3 <u>39</u>	0.3 <u>39</u>	0.00	<u>9.9</u>
Active Open Space, Residents Only	0.07 <u>6</u>	0.07 <u>6</u>	0.00	<u>6.5</u>
Passive Open Space, Residents Only	0.26 <u>3</u>	0.26 <u>3</u>	0.00	<u>10.9</u>
Passive Open Space, Combined Residents and Workers	0.06 <u>4</u>	0.06 <u>3</u>	-1.19	<u>15.6</u>

SHADOWS

In this alternative, the buildings on the 708 and 616 First Avenue parcels would each be limited to a maximum height of 256 feet, and they would consequently cast smaller shadow increments on nearby open spaces in comparison to the taller buildings constructed under the Proposed Actions (see Figures 24-4 through 24-15). While incremental shadow from the building on the 708 First Avenue parcel would reach the southern Tudor City open spaces in December—like the shadow cast by the building on that parcel in the proposed development program—only a small area would be affected for a total duration of less than an hour in the morning (8:51 AM to 9:30 AM). During this period, there would continue to be a sunlit area on the northern Tudor City Green. In addition, there would be no building on the 685 First Avenue parcel to cast incremental shadow on the Tudor City open spaces. Given these factors, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in the significant adverse impact on the Tudor City open spaces (on the December analysis day) that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

In the As-of-Right alternative, the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel would cast incremental shadow on Manhattan Place Plaza in the morning and afternoon on the December analysis day. However, the single building developed under this alternative would cast less incremental shadow on the plaza, in both the morning and the afternoon, than would the two buildings developed under the proposed development program. Because areas of the plaza would remain in sunlight for portions of this analysis day, the significant adverse impact that would occur under the proposed development program would not occur under the As-of-Right Alternative.

There would be no significant adverse impacts on any other open space resources under either the As-of-Right Alternative or the Proposed Actions.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has determined that the development parcels are not sensitive for archaeological resources. Therefore, the As-of-Right Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not disturb any potential archaeological resources.

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not have significant adverse physical, visual, or contextual impacts on architectural resources. Since there would be no new construction on the 685 First Avenue parcel, there would be no need to implement construction protection plans for Windsor Tower to avoid inadvertent construction damage to that resource. Similarly, the implementation of a construction protection plan for the former Kips Bay Brewery would not be warranted in this alternative. Construction of the retail building on the Waterside parcel would not occur close enough (within 90 feet) to the former Kips Bay Brewery to cause inadvertent construction-related damage to that resource. It is not expected that construction of the parking lot on the southern portion of the Waterside parcel would result in construction-period ground-borne vibrations or the use of heavy machinery that could result in physical damage to the former brewery, which is located across a 60-foot-wide street.

The 15-story building on the northwest corner of the 708 First Avenue parcel would partially block some views of the United Nations Secretariat Building, as would the office building constructed in the same location under the Proposed Actions. Since the 685 First Avenue parcel would remain undeveloped, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in some blocked northward views of Windsor Tower that would occur under the Proposed Actions. Those blocked views, however, are not considered to be significant adverse impacts.



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative March 21 - 9:45 AM EDT Figure 24 - 4



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative March 21 - 11:00 AM EDT Figure 24 - 5



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative March 21 - 3:45 PM EDT Figure 24 - 6



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative May 6 - 9:45 AM EDT Figure 24 - 7



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative May 6 - 1:00 PM EDT Figure 24 - 8



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative May 6 - 4:30 PM EDT Figure 24 - 9



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative June 21 - 11:00 AM EDT Figure 24 - 10



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative June 21 - 1:00 PM EDT Figure 24 - 11



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative June 21 - 3:30 PM EDT Figure 24 - 12



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative December 21 - 11:15 AM EST Figure 24 - 13



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative December 21 - 12:45 PM EST Figure 24 - 14



Shadows: As-of-Right Alternative December 21 - 1:30 PM EST Figure 24 - 15

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to the urban design or visual resources of the study area.

Urban Design

The As-of-Right Alternative would be constructed on existing blocks, like the development program under the Proposed Actions. Therefore, there would be no changes to the street pattern, block shapes, street hierarchy, and natural features of the study area, and the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in any significant impacts to these urban design characteristics.

Effects on building arrangements, bulk, use, and type would be notably different under the Asof-Right Alternative, as compared to the Proposed Actions. Only three buildings, as compared to seven under the Proposed Actions, would be constructed in the As-of-Right Alternative, and there would be no buildings on the 685 First Avenue parcel or on the southern portion of the Waterside parcel. Constructed under existing zoning regulations, the three buildings of this alternative would have no coordinated relationship to each other in terms of site location, height, and massing. Two of them would front on First Avenue, while the other would be set well back from the avenue. Rather than seven slender high-rise buildings arranged around a substantial amount of publicly accessible open space, there would be two mid-rise, bulky buildings and a squat low-rise building sited adjacent to several surface parking lots.

In this alternative, the 256-foot-tall office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel would have a similar use and type to the office building constructed on that parcel under the Proposed Actions, but it would be substantially shorter and less bulky. In addition, it would have a longer street frontage on First Avenue and would not be surrounded by publicly accessible open space. On the Waterside parcel between the alignments of East 40th and 39th Streets, there would be a short and squat retail building with a long street frontage instead of a tall and slender residential building. On the remainder of the Waterside parcel, there would be paved surface parking lots instead of a large publicly accessible open space and two more tall and slender residential buildings. In the As-of-Right Alternative, the 616 First Avenue parcel would be developed with a 256-foot tall office building located in the middle of the block, surrounded by a surface parking lot. In comparison, the parcel would be developed under the Proposed Actions with a taller, but slimmer, residential building placed along First Avenue, a central open space, and a tall and slender residential building with a 123-foot-tall community facility component adjacent to the FDR Drive service road. While the Asof-Right Alternative would have different effects on the building use, bulk, height, setbacks, and density characteristics of the study area than would the development program under the Proposed Actions, it would not have significant adverse impacts on those urban design features.

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on the streetscape of the study area, although it would not have the same beneficial effects that would occur under the Proposed Actions. This alternative would have less retail frontage along First Avenue and, instead of publicly accessible open space on the four parcels that would add greenery to the area, there would be several surface parking lots.

Visual Resources

Like the Proposed Actions, it is not expected that construction of the As-of-Right Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on visual resources; it would not block any significant view corridors or views of visual resources, limit access to any resource, change the study area's urban design features so that a visual resource is no longer dominant in the area, or

change the study area's urban design features so that the context of a visual resource is adversely altered. While the 15-story building on the northwest corner of the 708 First Avenue parcel would partially block some views of the United Nations Secretariat building, as would the office building constructed under the Proposed Actions, those blocked views are not considered to be significant adverse impacts.

The As-of-Right Alternative would not result in some of the visual improvements to the study area that would occur with the proposed development program. This alternative would not create any new landscaped open spaces that would be amenities to the study area. In addition, this alternative would not create new views to the East River. There would be river views from the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels, but those views, instead of being from landscaped open spaces that extend to the eastern edges of the parcels, would be from surface parking lots that the public would not be expected to visit except when parking cars.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

In the As-of-Right alternative, the existing character of three of the development parcels would change from vacant lots to a primarily commercial, mid-density development with surface parking. In comparison to the proposed mixed-use development, this alternative would be less compatible with the mixed-use character of the surrounding area and it would occur at a lower density than surrounding uses. Unlike the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not include any residential buildings, publicly accessible open space, or ground-floor retail along First Avenue on the southern portion of the Waterside parcel or on the 616 and 685 First Avenue parcels. It would also not create any new public views through the Waterside parcel to the East River. Without residential uses, this alternative would not foster the orderly growth and enhancement of residential uses in the study area. In addition, the 225,000 square feet of destination retail would be a new, large concentration of that use in the study area, where retail establishments, especially along First Avenue, tend to be local neighborhood services. Therefore, while avoiding some localized traffic and pedestrian impacts that would occur under the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in fewer benefits to neighborhood character than would be achieved with the Proposed Actions. Overall, the As-of-Right Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Neither the Proposed Actions nor the As-of-Right Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on terrestrial resources, floodplains and wetlands, aquatic resources, water quality, or endangered, threatened, or special concern species.

As would occur with development under the Proposed Actions, the implementation of erosion and sediment control measures and stormwater management measures as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction would minimize potential impacts to the combined sewer system, as well as potential water quality impacts to the East River associated with stormwater runoff. This alternative is expected to discharge stormwater to the existing combined sewer system through new on-site pipes, and no new outfalls are expected to be built. The stormwater flows from the redeveloped parcels, like with the proposed development program, are not expected to have a significant adverse impact on the New York City stormwater system or the water quality of the East River. <u>However, it is possible that this</u> <u>alternative would not implement the infrastructure improvements planned for the proposed</u> <u>development program, which are projected to reduce CSO events in the future with the Proposed</u> <u>Actions.</u>

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result under the As-of-Right Alternative. The development parcels would be fully remediated prior to development, as they would prior to construction of the proposed development program. As under the Proposed Actions, a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)-approved Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan (to protect workers and the public) would be in effect during all construction activities involving subsurface disturbance.

INFRASTRUCTURE

This alternative would generate less demand for City water supply and sewer services than the Proposed Actions. Like the Proposed Actions, the increased demand of this alternative would not overburden the city's water supply or the local conveyance system, and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated. Similarly, the amount of wastewater, which would be less than produced under the Proposed Actions, is not expected to adversely affect the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant's capacity or its treatment efficiency.

In this alternative, stormwater would flow into the existing combined sewers in the area to discharge into the East River. With this alternative, stormwater flows would increase from No Action levels but these increased flows would be minimal compared to the flows in the East River <u>and like the Proposed Actions</u> would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality within the East River. <u>However, the As-of-Right Alternative may not include the Proposed Actions</u>' infrastructure improvements which would result in more sanitary flow directed to the regulators, interceptor sewers and WPCP and a reduction of CSO events.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services. This alternative, which is substantially less dense than the proposed development program, would generate less solid waste as compared to the Proposed Actions. In this alternative, private carters would handle all of the generated solid waste, as there would be no residential waste to be collected and disposed of by the Department of Sanitation. Therefore, there would be no added demand on municipal solid waste handling services. The disposal of medical waste would be subject to NYSDEC and New York State Department of Health regulations. Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would comply with the City's recycling program.

ENERGY

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would not cause a significant adverse energy impact. It would result in a smaller increase in energy consumption compared to the increases from the substantially larger development program under the Proposed Actions. This alternative would generate a demand of approximately 79,702 million BTUs per year, compared to 733,241 million BTUs per year for the proposed development program. The additional energy demand of this alternative would not be expected to overburden the energy generation, transmission, and distribution system of the Con Edison service area. In addition, the buildings constructed under this

alternative, like those that would be constructed under the Proposed Actions, would comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Construction Code Act.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Traffic

A comparison of the volume of vehicular traffic that would be generated under the Proposed Actions and the As-of-Right Alternative is presented in Table 24-6.

2014 Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison—As-of-Right Alternative					
Peak Hour Proposed Actions		As-of-Right Alternative			
AM In	858	230			
AM Out	636	67			
AM Total	1,494	297			
Midday In	<u>381</u>	<u>231</u>			
Midday Out	<u>391</u>	216			
Midday Total	<u>772</u>	<u>447</u>			
PM In	522	187			
PM Out	834	376			
PM Total	1,356	563			
Sat MD In	580	643			
Sat MD Out	517	585			
Sat MD Total	1,097	1,228			

		Table 24-6
2014 Vehicle Trip Gen	eration Comparison—A	As-of-Right Alternative
Peak Hour	Proposed Actions	As-of-Right Alternative

The As-of-Right Alternative would generate vehicular traffic volumes well below those under the Proposed Actions—as shown in Table 24-6—especially in the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the Saturday midday peak hour. During the Saturday midday peak hour, total vehicle trips would exceed those under the Proposed Actions by about 10 to 15 percent. This is primarily due to the increase in the retail component of the As-of-Right Alternative, which would generate additional Saturday trips over those for the Proposed Actions. Table 24-7 presents a comparison of the number of significant traffic impacts during each peak period for the Primary Study Area and the two Manhattan Secondary Study Areas-the Queensboro Bridge traffic study area and the West Side traffic study area. Figures 24-16 through 24-21 illustrate the impacts at all analysis locations in each of these study areas.

Overall, the total number of locations that would be significantly impacted under the As-of-Right Alternative would decrease during weekday conditions and increase by two locations during the Saturday midday peak hour.

In the Saturday midday peak hour, there would be two additional significant impacts as compared to the Proposed Actions at the OMT Entrance Street and 39th Street, and Second Avenue and 34th Street. If the As-of-Right Alternative were to be developed, mitigation would be required as directed in the PSC Order (dated May 20, 2004, which placed conditions with respect to the sale of property by Con Edison), and impacts at these locations could be mitigated via the same types of traffic capacity improvements described in Chapter 23, "Mitigation."



IG

AM Peak Hour Figure 24-16



Primary Traffic Study Area Midday Peak Hour Figure 24-17



Figure 24-18




- Mitigated Impact
- Partially Mitigated Impact
- Unmitigated Impact
- Unsignalized Intersection ÷

Traffic Mitigation Overview: As-of-Right Development Alternative Queensboro Bridge Secondary Study Area Figure 24-20



- Mitigated Impact
- Partially Mitigated Impact
- Unmitigated Impact
- + Unsignalized Intersection

Traffic Mitigation Overview: As-of-Right Development Alternative West Side Secondary Study Area Figure 24-21

Autority of intersections with Significant Traine inpacts								
Comparison of As-of-Right Alternative vs. the Proposed Actions								
Peak Hour	Number of Analyzed Intersections	Proposed Actions Intersections with Significant Impacts	As-of-Right Alternative Intersections with Significant Impacts					
Number of Signalized (& Unsignalized) Intersections								
	Pr	imary Study Area						
AM	61 (6)	<u>40</u> (3)	<u>20</u> (2)					
Midday	61 (6)	<u>20</u> (1)	<u>15</u> (1)					
PM	61 (6)	<u>40 (3)</u>	<u>31</u> (2)					
Saturday MD	61 (6)	<u>13</u> (1)	<u>15</u> (1)					
Queensboro Bridge Traffic Study Area								
AM	12 (1)	5	<u>3</u>					
Midday	13	<u>7</u>	<u>Z</u>					
PM	13	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>					
Saturday MD	13	<u>2</u>	2					
	West S	ide Traffic Study Area						
AM	8	<u>7</u>	<u>Z</u>					
Midday	8	7	6					
PM	8	8	8					
Saturday MD	8	6	6					
Total – All Manhattan Study Areas								
AM	81 (7)	<u>52</u> (3)	<u>30</u> (2)					
Midday	82 (6)	<u>34</u> (1)	<u>28</u> (1)					
PM	82 (6)	<u>54 (3)</u>	<u>43</u> (2)					
Saturday MD	82 (6)	<u>21</u> (1)	<u>23</u> (1)					

Table 24-7Number of Intersections with Significant Traffic ImpactsComparison of As-of-Right Alternative vs. the Proposed Actions

Under the As-of-Right Alternative, there would be <u>11</u> unmitigated impacts in the AM peak <u>hour</u>, <u>eight</u> unmitigated impacts in the midday peak hour, <u>eight unmitigated impacts in the PM peak</u> <u>hour</u>, and <u>six</u> unmitigated impacts during the Saturday midday peak hour, compared to <u>17</u> unmitigated impacts in the AM, <u>nine</u> in the midday, and <u>14</u> in the PM peak hours, and <u>four</u> unmitigated impacts in the Saturday peak hour under the Proposed Actions.

Parking

The amount of off-street parking that would be provided under the As-of-Right Alternative would be sufficient to accommodate its parking demand. The As-of-Right Alternative would provide for a total of 610 parking spaces with a maximum occupancy of <u>81</u> percent. There would be 150 public and 60 accessory spaces at 616 First Avenue, and 300 public and 100 accessory spaces at the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels.

FDR Drive Analysis

There would be no significant traffic impacts in the AM, midday, PM or Saturday midday peak hours under the As-of-Right Alternative, compared to one significant impact in the PM peak hour under the proposed project.

Portals Analysis for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and Queensboro Bridge

The following analysis discusses weekday peak hour conditions for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and the Queensboro Bridge under the As-of-Right Alternative. Because weekday peak hours would be considered the critical conditions for these facilities, analyses were not done for Saturday conditions.

Queens-Midtown Tunnel. Under the As-of-Right Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes would be lower than under the Proposed Actions and there would be <u>one</u> significant <u>impact</u>; under the Proposed Action there would be <u>three</u> movements with significant impacts.

Queensboro Bridge. Under the As-of-Right Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes at the Queensboro Bridge would be less than volumes under the Proposed Actions. Just as under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant impacts with the As-of-Right Alternative.

Queens Plaza Area. The volume of traffic generated by the As-of-Right Alternative through intersections on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge would be lower than for the Proposed Actions in the weekday peak hours and higher than the Proposed Actions in the Saturday midday peak hour, as shown in Table 24-8.

Table 24-8 Vehicle Trips Generated by the As-of-Right Alternative vs. the Proposed Actions in the Oueens Plaza Area

	As-of-Right Alternative Trips to Queens	As-of-Right Alternative Trips to Manhattan	Proposed Actions Trips to Queens	Proposed Actions Trips to Manhattan
Weekday AM Peak Hour	<u>15</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>145</u>
Weekday Midday Peak Hour	<u>43</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>
Weekday PM Peak Hour	67	<u>34</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>79</u>
Saturday Midday Peak hour	<u>100</u>	<u>108</u>	67	<u>74</u>

Even with the reduced volumes generated by the As-of-Right Alternative in <u>three</u> of the four peak hours, it can be expected that this alternative—due to existing and No Build congestion in this area—would still generate significant traffic impacts on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge for which standard traffic improvements would not be sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts. Additional <u>impacts</u> could occur during the Saturday midday peak hour at Bridge Plaza North and Crescent Street <u>and Queens Boulevard at Jackson and Skillman Avenues</u> when compared to the Proposed Actions. <u>However, the significant impacts under the As-of-Right</u> <u>Alternative would not require mitigation measures more stringent than the proposed project.</u> A comprehensive areawide traffic improvement plan would be needed to mitigate those impacts, as described for the Proposed Actions as well.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in significant adverse bus, subway, and pedestrian impacts. However, it would not result in the significant adverse impact to the PL9 stairway at Grand Central Terminal in the AM peak hour or the M16/M34 bus route that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

Subways

As described in Chapter 16, "Transit and Pedestrians," the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on the operation of the PL9 stairway at Grand Central Terminal in the AM and PM peak hours, which could be fully mitigated with a widening of 15 inches. The As-of-Right Alternative would generate 72 percent fewer subway trips in the AM peak hour and 26 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hour as compared to the Proposed Actions. Because it would generate substantially less subway trips than the proposed development program, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact on the PL9 stairway in the AM peak period, but it would result in an impact in the PM peak.

Buses

The As-of-Right Alternative would generate 76 and 32 percent fewer bus trips in the AM and PM peak hours than the Proposed Actions. Although the As-of-Right Alternative may increase demand for service on the M16/M34 route, the additional riders would likely not result in the overcrowding of buses and, unlike the Proposed Actions, a significant adverse impact would not occur. The M42 route, however, will be at capacity in the No Action condition; therefore the projected increase in ridership under the As-of-Right Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on the M42 bus route, as under the Proposed Actions. In this alternative as with the Proposed Actions, the impact on the M42 bus route would be mitigated with additional service, as directed by the PSC Order for development of the As-of-Right Alternative.

Pedestrian Circulation

The As-of-Right Alternative would generate 79 percent and 8 percent fewer pedestrian trips than the Proposed Actions in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. As described in Chapter 16, "Transit and Pedestrians," the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse crosswalk impacts at two locations (East 42nd Street and Lexington Avenue and East 42nd Street and Third Avenue) in the AM peak period. <u>As shown in Table 24-9, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact at either location.</u>

		AM		<u>Midday</u>		<u>PM</u>	
Location	<u>Crosswalk</u>	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS
Lexington Avenue at E.	North	<u>14.0</u>	E				
42nd Street	East						
	<u>South</u>						
	West						
Third Avenue at E. 42nd	North	5.9	E				
Street	East						
	South 8						
	West						
Note: SFP = square feet	per pedestrian; *c	lenotes signif	icant advers	e impact			

 Table 14-9

 2014 As of Right Alternative Crosswalk Level of Service Analysis

AIR QUALITY

Mobile Sources and Parking Facilities

Since project-generated traffic for this alternative would generally be similar or substantially lower at all the receptor locations and parking facilities, predicted air quality concentrations would not exceed those with the Proposed Actions. Although Saturday midday trip generation for the As-of-Right Alternative would be somewhat higher than the Proposed Actions, these levels would still be lower than the peak levels (weekday AM) analyzed for the Proposed Actions. Overall daily traffic increments and totals would be lower for the As-of-Right Alternative, and since no significant adverse impacts were predicted for the Proposed Actions, none would be expected for the As-of-Right Alternative.

Industrial Sources

Since the industrial source screening is performed based on the site boundary (not specific building locations), the analysis would be the same as that performed for the Proposed Actions. Based on the results of the industrial screening for the development parcels, industrial sources would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality at the development parcels.

Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Systems (HVAC)

Pursuant to the PSC Order, should the As-of-Right Alternative be realized, the applicant would be required to locate air intakes so as to avoid any significant adverse air impacts resulting from PM_{10} , NO_2 , or SO_2 emissions from the HVAC systems and would analyze $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from the HVAC systems in the context of the alternative's specific project design. In the event that the predicted emissions would result in predicted significant adverse impacts based on the applicable criteria, the design of the alternative would be modified to appropriately mitigate the impacts identified. As specified in the PSC Order, acceptable mitigation measures include the relocation of stacks, the relocation of air intakes, to the extent technically feasible, the location of vents at the top of the tallest buildings in the development, and the use of natural gas or steam for heating and cooling. With these measures in place, the HVAC systems for the As-of-Right Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality.

Queens Midtown Tunnel Ventilation Building

Based on the analysis of the predicted dispersion of exhaust from the Queens Midtown Tunnel ventilation system, the maximum predicted 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration from the tunnel ventilation on the façade of the building at 708 First Avenue would be 2.2 µg/m³. Since this location is on an office building, which would not have operable windows and at which 24-hour exposure would not be expected, and since 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from the tunnel ventilation exceeding 2.0 µg/m³ could occur at this location on a small area (i.e., a few windows at most) only once per year, if at all, this would not be a significant adverse impact on air quality. Nonetheless, in order to ensure the best possible indoor air quality for the building developed on the 708 First Avenue parcel under the As-of-Right Alternative, it would be recommended to locate the fresh air intakes for the building on the southern façade of the building or on the southern side of the roof.

NOISE

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts from increased traffic. However, similar to the Proposed Actions, the commercial buildings constructed under the As-of-Right Alternative would require double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation sufficient to provide <u>between 30 and 40</u> dBA of attenuation to avoid high interior noise levels that would be considered significant adverse noise impacts.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Like the Proposed Actions, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in development within the coastal zone, and it would conform to the policies of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program. However, with no residential development, it would not, to the extent of the Proposed Actions, further the goal of encouraging commercial and residential development within an appropriate coastal zone area. In addition, the creation of surface parking lots rather than substantial amounts of new publicly accessible open space would have less of an enlivening effect on this stretch of land near the waterfront. Further, this alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, would not incorporate new, publicly accessible open spaces and pedestrian routes on the development parcels that would enhance views of the East River.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

The As-of-Right Alternative would result in new commercial development on the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels. Construction activities associated with this alternative would be smaller in scale and shorter in duration than what would be undertaken for the Proposed Actions. However, there would still be the potential for some significant adverse traffic and noise impacts. As described above, construction protection plans for Windsor Tower and the former Kips Bay Brewery would not be required with this alternative. Without the implementation of the proposed project's emissions reduction program to substantially reduce PM emissions, the potential for construction-related air quality impacts would exist with this alternative. In addition, the economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs would be smaller in scale than with the Proposed Actions.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The As-of-Right Alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, could result in significant adverse public health impacts to air quality during construction, if the alternative were not to implement the proposed project's emissions reduction program to substantially reduce PM emissions. Unlike under the Proposed Actions, boiler emissions from buildings developed under this alternative would not result in exceedances of the $PM_{2.5}$ interim guidance thresholds. However, as described in Chapter 21, "Public Health," those exceedances would not result in significant adverse air quality or public health impacts.

FUTURE CONDITIONS WITH THE UNDC PROJECT

As in the Proposed Actions' future conditions with the UNDC project, construction of the 950,000-square-foot UNDC building on the block north of the 708 First Avenue parcel would not alter the findings above for the As-of-Right Alternative related to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; shadows; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; natural resources; hazardous materials; infrastructure (water supply, wastewater, and stormwater); solid waste and sanitation services; energy; noise; parking; air quality (mobile and industrial sources); waterfront revitalization program; construction; and public health.

With the UNDC building as a background condition, the As-of-Right Alternative would extend the mixed-use area around the United Nations south to East 35th Street and it would continue to be less compatible with land uses in the study area than would be the Proposed Actions. In respect to open space, the UNDC project would remove an open space and add a new worker population, and the significant adverse open space impact that would occur in the ¹/₄-mile study with the As-of-Right Alternative would be exacerbated. In terms of transit and pedestrians, the As-of-Right Alternative could result in new significant adverse transit impacts from the cumulative increases in transit and pedestrian trips if the UNDC project were to be constructed. More detailed discussions of air quality (HVAC) and traffic are located below.

AIR QUALITY (HVAC)

As described above, the HVAC systems for the As-of-Right Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality. Since the UNDC building would be taller than any development under the As-of-Right Alternative, the operation of the UNDC HVAC systems would not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on any of the buildings constructed under the alternative.

TRAFFIC

Quantitative traffic analyses for the As-of-Right Alternative were not performed with the UNDC project, but a comparison of traffic volumes and impacts relative to the Proposed Actions was conducted <u>in the Draft SEIS</u>. The <u>Draft SEIS</u> analysis of the Proposed Actions' future condition with the UNDC project concludes that significant adverse traffic impacts would occur at 65 intersections in the three Manhattan study areas in the AM peak hour compared to 64 intersections without the UNDC project, 30 intersections in the midday peak hour compared to 28 intersections without the UNDC project, 57 intersections in the PM peak hour with or without the UNDC project out of 88 study intersections. Since AM, midday, and PM peak hour traffic volumes generated by the As-of-Right Alternative would be lower than generated by the Proposed Actions, the same or fewer increases in the number of additional significant impacts— and the same or less stringent mitigation measures required to mitigate them—would result under the As-of-Right Alternative if the UNDC project was included as a background condition<u>a</u> according to the Draft SEIS.

Although there would be a modest increase in traffic volumes generated by the As-of-Right Alternative during the Saturday peak hour when compared to the Proposed Actions, the additional Saturday midday hourly vehicle trips generated by the UNDC project would be dispersed throughout a large study area. The additional UNDC trips would concentrate primarily on First Avenue at East 42nd and 41st Streets, which would be impacted and mitigated under both the Proposed Actions with the UNDC project and the As-of-Right Alternative without the UNDC project. Therefore, additional significant impacts in the Saturday midday peak hour under the As-of-Right Alternative with the UNDC project are not projected when compared to the Proposed Actions' future condition with the UNDC project, according to the Draft SEIS.

D. 12 FAR ALL-RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE 12 FAR ALL-RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE

The 12 FAR All-Residential Alternative assumes the proposed rezoning and a similar amount of overall development, but replaces the proposed 47-story commercial office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel with two residential towers connected by a one-story retail building. On the Waterside, 685 First Avenue, and 616 First Avenue parcels, the program for the All-Residential Alternative is the same as the proposed development program. (Table 24-<u>10</u> details the All-Residential Alternative program, Figure 24-22 presents the alternative's site plan, and Figures 24-23 through 24-25 present axonometric renderings of development under this



All Residential Alternative Site Plan Figure 24-22



All-Residential Alternative Axonometric View Northwest Figure 24-23





All-Residential Alternative Axonometric View Southwest Figure 24-24



All-Residential Alternative Axonometric View West Figure 24-25 alternative.) In addition, the amount of publicly accessible open space provided in this alternative would be the same as that provided by the proposed development program. This alternative would include most of the same discretionary actions for implementation as the proposed development program (including designation of the 616 First Avenue parcel as a General Large-Scale Development [GLSD] and designation of the Waterside, 685 First Avenue parcel, and the 708 First Avenue parcel as a GLSD), except that the two buildings developed on the 708 First Avenue parcel under this alternative would not require special permits to modify height and setback regulations within a GLSD. Those two buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel would meet the applicable tower regulations; they would have a 40 percent lot coverage with tower placement at the required setback locations.

Table 24-<u>10</u>Summary of All-Residential Alternative

Site	Residential (gsf)	Community Facility gsf)	Commercial Office (gsf)	Retail (gsf)	Below-Grade Space ² (gsf)	Total (gsf)	Parking Spaces	Open Space (gsf)
616 First Avenue	748,574	119,936	0	2,071	137,540	1,008,121	294 public	34,507
685 First Avenue	967,376	0	0	6,352	32,365	1,006,093	110 accessory	7,605
700 First Avenue	2,037,657	0	0	58,074 ¹	470,125	4,021,857	651 public, 499	168,659
(Waterside)							accessory	
708 First Avenue	1,444,794	0	0	11,207				
TOTAL	5,198,401	119,936	0	77,704	640,030	6,036,071	945 public, 609 accessory	210,771

Notes:

1 Retail at 700 First Avenue includes 36,279 gsf of below-grade space.

2 Below-grade space calculation includes area devoted to parking and other service requirements, but does not include the below-grade retail space associated with 700 and 708 First Avenue.

Source: East River Realty Company, LLC

The All-Residential Alternative contains no commercial office space, and the difference in overall density between this alternative and the slightly larger proposed development program is 81,106 gsf. The All-Residential Alternative contains 5,198,401 million gsf of residential space (5,800 units), 77,704 gsf of local retail and restaurant uses (which would include an approximately 36,000-gsf below-grade supermarket), 119,936 gsf of community facility use at 616 First Avenue, and 1,554 below-grade parking spaces (945 public and 609 accessory). Like the Proposed Actions, the All Residential Alternative includes approximately 210,771 square feet (4.84 acres) of publicly accessible open space. While the publicly accessible open space on the 708 First Avenue parcel would have a slightly different plan than that provided in the proposed development program, due to the variation in footprints between the two residential buildings in this alternative and the office building in the proposed development program, the total amount of publicly accessible open space on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels and the programming of that space would be the same in this alternative as under the Proposed Actions. Figure 24-22 shows that the boundary of the proposed open space on the 708 First Avenue parcel is somewhat different from that under the Proposed Actions (see Figure 1-5 in Chapter 1, "Project Description); this variation is due to the placement of the two residential buildings on the parcel in compliance with the applicable tower regulations.

As compared to the proposed development program, this alternative has 1,634 more residential units (with an affordable housing scenario, it would result in 327 more low- to moderate-income dwelling units than the Affordable Housing Scenario for the proposed development program), the same amount of community facility space, 6,537 more square feet of retail, the same amount and type of parking, and the same amount (4.84 acres) of publicly accessible open space. As

mentioned above, the open space would have the same function and programming under this alternative, and the development on the 685 First Avenue, Waterside, and 616 First Avenue parcels would be the same as under the Proposed Actions, but the 708 First Avenue parcel would be developed with two slender residential towers connected by a one-story wing that would front on First Avenue and the eastern prolongation of East 40th Street.

On the 708 First Avenue parcel, one 66-story (699-foot-tall) residential building would be located at the northwest corner. The second 61-story (664-foot-tall) residential building would be located to the southeast.¹ Both residential towers would have floorplates of 11,424 square feet, identical to that of the residential building on the southwest corner of the Waterside parcel; they would, therefore, have similar massings and footprints to the residential buildings located on the other development parcels. The taller of the two buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel would be taller than the 688-foot-tall office building in the proposed development program by 11 feet. The two residential buildings in this alternative have a total footprint (of 22,848 square feet) that is smaller than the footprint of the office building (which is 35,755 square feet). They are designed with heights that achieve the 12 FAR that would be provided in the office building under the Proposed Actions.

12 FAR ALL-RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy. This alternative assumes the proposed rezoning and special permits, but replaces the Proposed Actions' commercial office building with two residential buildings. Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would be compatible with the land uses, densities, and existing zoning regulations in the surrounding area.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not result, either directly or indirectly, in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts due to residential or business displacement, nor would this alternative adversely affect a specific industry.

Although this alternative includes 1,634 more dwelling units than the proposed development program, the population added to the study area by this alternative continues to fall entirely within the envelope of development previously analyzed in the FGEIS. The FGEIS's 12 FAR Residential Development Program assumed the parcels would be redeveloped with 6,131 dwelling units. Therefore, the findings in the FGEIS with respect to the potential impacts of the new population apply to the All-Residential Alternative, as they also apply to the proposed development program.

The somewhat larger new population added to the area by this alternative would have the same socioeconomic character as the population added to the area by the proposed development program and would not be significantly different from the socioeconomic character of the study area's existing population. Further, the high rents and sales prices expected with this alternative

¹ As with the proposed development program, building heights for the All-Residential Alternative are measured above the lowest average curb level. Building heights measured from the elevation of the ground-floor lobbies are somewhat shorter.

would be the same as expected with the proposed development program, and would reflect, rather than alter, the existing conditions and trends within the surrounding neighborhood.

Affordable Housing Scenario

If this alternative were to include affordable housing, it would introduce a more economically diverse residential population compared to the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, which would have 327 fewer dwelling units for low- to moderate-income households. However, neither scenario would introduce a population that is substantially different from the socioeconomic character of the study area's existing population. The study area already has a considerable higher median and mean income compared to Manhattan and New York City as a whole.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not directly displace police, fire, public education, public day care, library, or health care facilities.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to fire protection and emergency services. All development would be constructed in accordance with applicable fire and safety codes, and in the future with this alternative FDNY would evaluate the need for personnel and equipment and make necessary adjustments to adequately serve the area. In addition, access to and from the study area's fire stations will not be directly affected by the All-Residential Alternative, and FDNY response times are not expected to be significantly affected by the projected increases in traffic generated by this alternative. In addition, response times have decreased citywide and are expected to decrease further despite the increasingly congested traffic conditions.

Police Protection

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to police protection services. This alternative, like the proposed development program, would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a precinct house. While this alternative would contribute to congested conditions at many study area locations, NYPD vehicles, when responding to emergencies, are not bound by standard traffic controls. Therefore, NYPD vehicles would be able to access the development parcels and surrounding area as they do other areas throughout New York City, including the most congested areas of Midtown and Downtown Manhattan. In addition, response times have fluctuated annually since 2002, despite consistently congested traffic conditions. Therefore, incremental traffic volumes projected to occur with this alternative are not expected to significantly affect police response times. This alternative, like the proposed development program, could necessitate the assignment of additional personnel, resources, and equipment to the study area, but a commitment of resources would be based on demonstrated need.

Public Schools

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4, and it would require similar measures as the Proposed Actions to mitigate this impact. Based on the projected public school pupil ratios from Table 3C-2 in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the All-Residential Alternative would generate approximately 580 public elementary school students (163 more than generated by the

proposed development program) and 116 public intermediate school students (33 more than generated by the proposed development program). In addition, the All-Residential Alternative would generate approximately 174 high school students (49 more than generated by the proposed development program), and this number, unlike the number of students generated under the Proposed Actions, exceeds the CEQR threshold of 150 high school students and thus requires further analysis.

In this alternative, as with the Proposed Actions, both the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would experience a greater than 5 percent increase in the utilization rate as compared to No Action condition and therefore a significant adverse impact would occur. As shown in Table 24-<u>11</u>, the projected 580 elementary school students introduced into Planning Zone 4 by this alternative would increase the total enrollment to <u>2,901</u>, resulting in a utilization rate of <u>160</u> percent and a deficit of <u>1,088</u> seats. In comparison, the proposed development program would result in a utilization rate of <u>151</u> percent and a deficit of <u>925</u> seats. In this alternative, elementary schools in CSD 2 as a whole would operate at <u>114</u> percent of capacity, with a total enrollment of <u>20,042</u> and a shortfall of <u>2,343</u> seats. Under the Proposed Actions, the utilization rate would be <u>113</u> percent with a deficit of <u>2,343</u> seats. Under both this alternative and the Proposed Actions, elementary schools in the CSD would not experience a significant adverse impact because the utilization rate would increase by less than 5 percent.

Table 24-<u>11</u>

2014 Future With the All-Residential Alternative/Market Rate Development: Projected Enrollment in Public Schools

Planning Zone 4/ CSD 2	2014 Projected Enrollment	All-Residential Alternative Students	Total Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (percent)
Elementary Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	2, <u>321</u>	580	2, <u>901</u>	<u>1,813</u>	<u>-1,088</u>	<u>160</u>
CSD 2 Totals	19,4 <u>62</u>	580	<u>20,042</u>	<u>17,536</u>	<u>-2,506</u>	<u>114</u>
Intermediate Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	1,7 <u>87</u>	116	1, <u>903</u>	1,561	-3 <u>42</u>	12 <u>2</u>
CSD 2 Totals	10,48 <u>9</u>	116	10, <u>605</u>	10,672	<u>67</u>	99

With the All-Residential Alternative, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would also experience overcrowding, as they would with the Proposed Actions, and would operate at <u>122</u> percent capacity (see Table 24-<u>11</u>). Intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would have a collective shortfall of <u>342</u> seats, and there would be a significant adverse impact, because the intermediate schools would experience a 5 percent or greater increase in the utilization rate. In comparison, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 under the Proposed Actions would have a collective shortfall of <u>309</u> seats (and a utilization rate of <u>120</u> percent). In CSD 2 as a whole, intermediate schools would have a surplus of <u>67</u> intermediate school seats under this alternative, while under the Proposed Actions CSD 2 as a whole would have <u>100</u> intermediate school seats available. Under both this alternative and the Proposed Actions, the intermediate schools in CSD 2 would operate at 99 percent, and therefore there would not be a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in CSD 2.

The All-Residential Alternative would generate 174 high school students. High school students can usually elect to attend schools outside of their neighborhood, depending on admissions criteria and space availability. The public high schools nearest the development parcels include: the Coalition for Social Change (220 West 58th Street, at the corner of West 58th Street and Seventh Avenue); Baruch College Campus High School (17 Lexington Avenue, at the corner of West 58th Lexington and 23rd Street); Landmark High School (220 West 58th, at the corner of West 58th)

Street and Seventh Avenue); Ballet Tech/NYC Public School for Dance (890 Broadway, on Broadway between 19th and 20th Streets): Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis High School for International Careers (120 West 46th Street, near the corner of Sixth Avenue and West 46th Street); Repertory Company High School for Theatre Arts (123 West 43rd Street, near the corner or West 43rd Street and Sixth Avenue); Norman Thomas High School (111 East 33rd Street, on East 33rd Street between Lexington and Park Avenues); and Art & Design High School (1075 Second Avenue, on Second Avenue between East 56th and East 57th Streets). These schools have an existing surplus of 425 seats and are operating at 94 percent utilization. Manhattan's public high schools are operating at 92 percent capacity with space for 4,208 students. Under No Build conditions, it is expected that 113 students will be introduced from new residential development within the study area. Considering projected enrollment from the Department of Education and the Department of City Planning and new residential development, it is expected that high schools within Manhattan will be operating at 96 percent capacity with a surplus of 2.274 seats. By 2014, with the additional 174 students generated by the All-Residential Alternative, the high schools in Manhattan would continue to operate with a surplus of seats (2,100) at 96 percent capacity. Therefore, the All-Residential Alternative would not be expected to result in a significant adverse impact to high schools.

Potential measures to mitigate the significant adverse impacts to elementary and middle schools with the All-Residential Alternative would be similar to those described for the Proposed Actions in Chapter 23, "Mitigation." These measures could include shifting the boundaries of school catchments areas, creating new satellite facilities in less crowded schools, and/or building new school facilities on- or off-site. As with the proposed development program, the All-Residential Alternative includes 119,936 gross square feet of on-site community facility space that could accommodate a new school on the development parcels. Similar to the Proposed Actions, if a school were provided at the 616 First Avenue parcel under this alternative, it would be operational by September 2012, resulting in a potential unmitigated significant adverse public school impact for approximately two school years (from the time the 685 First Avenue residential building is occupied until the school is available.)

Libraries

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact to local library services. With 5,800 market-rate housing units, this alternative would add an estimated 9,164 new residents to the study area, resulting in a population increase of approximately 6.1 percent over No Actions conditions (1.7 percent points more than the 4.4 percent increase under the Proposed Actions). Although this increase in population is greater than 5 percent, the threshold identified by CEQR as a potentially significant increase, the population of the study area would continue to be well served by the large number of volumes in the study area libraries. In this alternative, the volumes-to-resident ratio would be approximately <u>11.9</u> to 1, compared to 12.7 to 1 in the No Action condition and compared to 12.<u>1</u> with the Proposed Actions.

Outpatient Health Care Facilities

Like the proposed development program, the All-Residential Alternative, assuming all marketrate units, would not result in significant adverse impacts to outpatient health care facilities.

Day Care Centers

Like the proposed development program, the All-Residential Alternative, assuming all marketrate units, would not result in significant adverse impacts to public day care centers.

Affordable Housing Scenario

An affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would include the development of 5,800 dwelling units on the development parcels. Of those, 1,160 would be low- to moderate-income units, and the remaining 4,640 units would be market-rate apartments or condominiums.

Public Schools. Based on the CEQR Technical Manual methodology, an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would generate approximately 603 public elementary school students and 128 intermediate school students that, respectively, would be 170 and 36 more than would be generated by the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. This scenario, like the proposed development program, would exacerbate the existing shortfall of seats at both the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 as well as the elementary schools in CSD 2 as a whole. Both the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would experience a greater than 5 percent increase in utilization rate compared to No Action conditions, and this increase could result in a significant adverse impact, as could result under the Proposed Actions. While both scenarios would exacerbate the shortfall of seats at the district level, the utilization rate would increase by less than 5 percent. Therefore, no significant adverse impact on elementary schools in CSD 2 is expected under the Affordable Housing Scenarios of both the All-Residential Alternative and the Proposed Actions, The intermediate schools in CSD 2 as a whole are expected to operate with a surplus of available seats under both scenarios. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to intermediate schools at the district level as a whole is expected under either scenario. In addition, an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would generate approximately 197 high school students (55 more than the 142 students that would be generated by the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions). Because this number exceeds the CEQR threshold of 150 high school students, an affordable housing scenario for this alternative, unlike the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, could result in a significant adverse impact on high schools.

In this scenario, the 603 elementary school students would increase total enrollment to 2,924 in Planning Zone 4, and the planning zone would operate at <u>161</u> percent of capacity with a shortfall of <u>1,111</u> seats (see Table 24-11). In comparison, the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions would result in a utilization rate of <u>152</u> percent and a deficit of <u>941</u> seats. Both scenarios are expected to result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the planning zone. Elementary schools in CSD 2 as a whole would operate at <u>114</u> percent capacity with a total enrollment of <u>20,065</u> and a deficit of <u>2,529</u> seats under the All-Residential Alternative with affordable housing. In comparison, the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions would result in a utilization rate of <u>113</u> percent and a deficit of <u>2,359</u>. Although in both scenarios, elementary schools in the CSD would be operating over capacity, neither would result in a 5 percent or greater increase in the utilization rate over the No Build conditions. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is expected as a result of either scenario.

In an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would operate at <u>123</u> percent of capacity, with a shortage of <u>354</u> seats (see Table 24-<u>12</u>). In comparison, under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would operate at 120 percent of capacity, with a shortage of <u>318</u> seats. It is expected that both scenarios would result in a significant adverse impact to intermediate schools in the planning zone. Intermediate schools in CSD 2 overall, under the affordable housing scenarios of both the All-Residential Alternative and the

Table 24-<u>12</u> 2014 Future With the All-Residential Alternative/Affordable Housing Scenario: Projected Enrollment in Public Schools

Planning Zone 4/ CSD 2	2014 Projected Enrollment	All-Residential Alternative Students	Total Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (percent)
Elementary Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	2, <u>321</u>	603	2, <u>924</u>	<u>1,813</u>	<u>-1,111</u>	<u>161</u>
CSD 2 Totals	19,4 <u>62</u>	603	20,0 <u>65</u>	<u>17,536</u>	<u>-2,529</u>	<u>114</u>
Intermediate Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	1,7 <u>87</u>	128	1,9 <u>15</u>	1,561	-3 <u>54</u>	12 <u>3</u>
CSD 2 Totals	10,48 <u>9</u>	128	10,6 <u>17</u>	10,672	<u>55</u>	99

Proposed Actions, would operate with a surplus of 55 and 91 seats, respectively. Intermediate schools in CSD 2 overall would be at 99 percent of capacity under affordable housing scenarios for the both the All-Residential Alternative and the Proposed Actions. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of either scenario.

In this scenario, 197 high school students would be introduced to the area, and the high schools in Manhattan would continue to operate at 96 percent capacity. In this case, there would be 2.077 available seats. Therefore, an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would not be expected to result in a significant adverse impact to high schools.

Libraries. Under an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative that includes 1,160 low- to moderate-income units, the alternative would add approximately 10,231 residents to the study area, resulting in a population increase of approximately 6.8 percent, compared to 4.9 percent under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. While this increase in population would be greater than 5 percent, the volumes-to-resident ratio would be 11.8 to 1, compared to 12.6 in the No Action condition and 12.1 with the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, and the study area population would continue to be well served by the study area libraries. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts.

Outpatient Health Care Facilities. As with the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, there would not be a significant adverse impact to outpatient health care facilities with an All-Residential Alternative that includes 1,160 new low- to moderate-income units. These units would introduce approximately 2,900 new low- to moderate-income residents to the study area, and based on the national average of 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income persons, this new population could add an estimated 1,131 annual visits to study area emergency rooms. In comparison, the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions could add an estimated 819 annual emergency room visits. Given the hundreds of thousands of such visits in the study area currently, the additional low- to moderate-income population under an affordable housing scenario for this alternative would generate a minimal change in demand over the No Action conditions.

Day Care Centers. If the All-Residential Alternative were to introduce approximately 1,160 new low- to moderate-income units to the study area, this alternative, like the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, could result in a significant adverse impact to public day care centers. The 1,160 low- to moderate-income units would generate an estimated 139 children under the age of 12 potentially eligible for publicly funded day care, compared to 100 children under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. The additional 139 children potentially eligible for public day care could exacerbate the potential shortfall of available slots in the No Action condition, and there could be a shortage of up to <u>209</u> slots in publicly funded

child care programs in the study area, compared to a potential shortage of up to $\underline{170}$ slots under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. Therefore, an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would likely result in an increase in demand for publicly funded day care greater than 5 percent of the study area capacity

As described in Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," it is not likely that all of the children under the age of 12 that could be introduced to the area by low- to moderate-income units under an affordable housing scenario for this alternative would make use of publicly funded day care facilities within the one-mile study area. Families in the study area could make use of private alternatives to publicly funded day care facilities or facilities outside the study area. Similar to the Affordable Housing Scenario under the Proposed Actions, the demand for day care under an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative could be alleviated by increasing the availability of family day care alternatives and vouchers for private group day care <u>and/or</u> <u>developing new public day care facilities</u>.

As a city agency, the Administration for Children's Services (ACS) does not provide new day care facilities, although they are working to improve public/private partnerships to facilitate the development of new day care centers. In addition, ACS continually evaluates day care facility utilization and makes adjustments in capacity due to changes in demand. Similar to the potential significant adverse impact identified under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, the project sponsor would work with ACS to develop measures to provide additional capacity if needed when a portion of the affordable units is completed pursuant to a restrictive declaration. Absent the implementation of any needed mitigation measures, this alternative could have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on day care facilities.

OPEN SPACE

Similar to the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to open space resources in the ¼-mile and ½-mile study areas (see Table 24-13). Compared to the proposed development program, the All-Residential Alternative would introduce a larger residential population (9,048 residents compared to the proposed development program's 6,499 residents), a smaller worker population (936 workers, compared to the proposed development program's 6,985 workers), and the same amount of publicly accessible open space (4.84 acres). In total, the All-Residential Alternative would introduce 9,984 residents and workers, 3,500 fewer individuals than the populations introduced under the proposed development program.

Because worker and residential populations tend to use open space resources in a different manner, under the All-Residential Alternative there would be larger improvements to open space ratios that consider worker populations compared to the proposed development program. However, with the larger total residential population, the residential open space ratios would not improve as significantly under this alternative compared to the proposed development program. Overall, neither the All-Residential Alternative nor the proposed development program would result in significant adverse open space impacts; both would improve worker and residential open space ratios to differing extents.

	Table 24- <u>13</u>
Comparison of Open Space	ce Impacts: All-Residential Alternative
	and Proposed Development Program

Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	All-Residential Alternative Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to All- Residential Alternative	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program
	1/4-Mile Stu	udy Area		
Passive Open Space, Workers Only	0.207	0.301	44.8	26.0
Passive Open Space, Combined Workers and Residents	0.116	0.151	29.9	24. <u>5</u>
	½-Mile Stu	udy Area		
Total Open Space Ratio, Residents Only	0.3 <u>39</u>	0.36 <u>1</u>	6. <u>4</u>	<u>9.9</u>
Active Open Space, Residents Only	0.07 <u>6</u>	0.079	3. <u>2</u>	<u>6.5</u>
Passive Open Space, Residents Only	0.26 <u>3</u>	0.28 <u>2</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>10.9</u>
Passive Open Space, Combined Residents and Workers	0.06 <u>4</u>	0.075	16. <u>9</u>	<u>15.6</u>

Affordable Housing Scenario

Under an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative, 1,160 of the alternative's 5,800 dwelling units would be reserved for low- to moderate-income households. Compared to the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, the affordable housing scenario for this alternative would introduce a larger residential population (10,138 residents compared to the proposed development program's 7,282 residents), a smaller worker population (936 workers, compared to the proposed development program's 6,985 workers), and the same amount of publicly accessible open space (4.84 acres). In total, an affordable housing scenario under this alternative would introduce 11,074 residents and workers, or 3,193 fewer persons than introduced under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. This scenario, like the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to open space resources in the ¹/₄-mile and ¹/₂-mile study areas.

As shown in Table 24-<u>14</u>, the relationship between improvements to the various open space ratios when comparing an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative with the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions would be similar to the same relationships between the programs of the alternative and the Proposed Actions that contain all market-rate units. The open space amenities provided by an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would provide the study areas with the same qualitative benefits as the All-Residential Alternative (which, in turn, would be the same as the proposed development program), and would not be affected by the slightly higher percentage of children and teenagers generated by the dwelling units for low- to moderate-income households.

Overall, an affordable housing scenario for the All-Residential Alternative would improve both worker and residential open space ratios and would not result in significant adverse impacts to open space.

		Development Program Affordable Housing Scenarios					
Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	All-Residential Alternative Affordable Housing Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to All-Residential Alternative Affordable Housing	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program Affordable Housing			
Passive Open Space, Workers Only	<u>0.207</u>	0.301	44.8	<u>26.0</u>			
Passive Open Space, Combined Workers and Residents	<u>0.116</u>	0.149	28. <u>2</u>	23.3			
Total Open Space Ratio, Residents Only	<u>0.339</u>	0.35 <u>6</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>8.8</u>			
Active Open Space, Residents Only	<u>0.076</u>	0.078	1. <u>8</u>	<u>5.3</u>			
Passive Open Space, Residents Only	<u>0.263</u>	0.2 <u>79</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>9.9</u>			
Passive Open Space, Combined Residents and Workers	<u>0.064</u>	0.075	16. <u>5</u>	<u>15.6</u>			

Table 24-<u>14</u> Comparison of Open Space Impacts: All-Residential Alternative and Proposed Development Program Affordable Housing Scenarios

SHADOWS

The All-Residential Alternative would result in the same significant adverse impacts to the Tudor City open spaces and Manhattan Place Plaza that would occur under the Proposed Actions. There would be no significant adverse impacts on any other open space resources under either the All-Residential Alternative or the Proposed Actions.

As described above, development in the All-Residential Alternative differs from the proposed development program under the Proposed Actions only at the 708 First Avenue parcel, where there would be two buildings rather than one. Development on the other three parcels would be identical to that under the Proposed Actions. Incremental shadows from the All-Residential Alternative would differ only marginally from those of the Proposed Actions, since the building heights and locations are very similar (see Figures 24-26 through 24-37). Therefore, the All-Residential Alternative would result in the same significant adverse impacts on the Tudor City open spaces and on the Manhattan Place Plaza that would occur under the Proposed Actions.

Similar to the 688-foot-tall office building constructed on the 708 First Avenue parcel under the Proposed Actions, the two 699- and 664-foot-tall residential buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel in the All-Residential Alternative would cast incremental shadow on the Tudor City open spaces on the March, May and December analysis days. The duration and extent of the incremental shadow on these days would be similar to that under the Proposed Actions. On the December 21 analysis day under the All-Residential Alternative, there would be less incremental shadow on the northern Tudor City open spaces between 10:00 AM and 10:15 AM and at 11:15 AM; otherwise the extent and duration of incremental shadow cast under this alternative in December would be the same as under the Proposed Actions, Therefore, the All-Residential Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would cause a significant adverse impact on the Tudor City open spaces on the December analysis day (see Figures 24-35 through 24-37). This impact could only be partially mitigated by improvements to the affected Tudor City open spaces themselves, as under the Proposed Actions.

Development on the 616 First Avenue parcel would be the same under the All-Residential Alternative as under the Proposed Actions, and this alternative would, therefore, result in the same significant adverse impact on Manhattan Place Plaza on the December analysis day. As



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative March 21 - 9:45 AM EDT Figure 24 - 26



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative March 21 - 11:00 AM EDT Figure 24 - 27



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative March 21 - 3:45 PM EDT Figure 24 - 28



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative May 6 - 9:45 AM EDT Figure 24 - 29



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative May 6 - 1:00 PM EDT Figure 24 - 30



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative May 6 - 4:30 PM EDT Figure 24 - 31



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative June 21 - 11:00 AM EDT Figure 24 - 32



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative June 21 - 1:00 PM EDT Figure 24 - 33



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative June 21 - 3:30 PM EDT Figure 24 - 34



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative December 21 - 11:15 AM EST Figure 24 - 35



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative December 21 - 12:45 PM EST Figure 24 - 36



Shadows: All-Residential Alternative December 21 - 1:30 PM EST Figure 24 - 37 under the Proposed Actions, it is expected that this significant adverse impact could only be partially mitigated.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on historic resources. This alternative would require the same construction protection plans as required by the Proposed Actions to avoid inadvertent construction-related impacts on Windsor Tower and the former Kips Bay Brewery. Effects on northward views along First Avenue of Windsor Tower and the United Nations Secretariat Building would be the same with this alternative as with the development program under the Proposed Actions.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Effects on the urban design and visual resources of the study area would be largely the same with the All-Residential Alternative as with the Proposed Actions and, similarly, there would not be significant adverse impacts. Replacement of the large commercial office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel with two residential buildings would not have a substantial difference in effect on the mixed-use character of the area. The heights of the two residential buildings in this alternative would be similar to the height of the proposed commercial office building and would, therefore, have the same overall effect on adjacent view corridors and on the skyline as seen from the surrounding streets and from the Queens waterfront. This alternative would also create the same new views to the East River waterfront through the 708 First Avenue and Waterside parcels and from the new publicly accessible open spaces on those parcels. Overall, this alternative would have the same beneficial effects on the area's urban design character as would occur under the Proposed Actions through the development of vacant lots and a parking lot with a high-density mixed-use development, the creation of over four acres of publicly accessible open space, provision of ground-floor retail along First Avenue, and the creation of new views to the East River Waterfront.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Unlike the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not include office use as part of the development program, but that use is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. Overall, effects on neighborhood character would be largely the same with the All-Residential Alternative as with the Proposed Actions, and there would be no significant adverse impacts.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Neither the Proposed Actions nor the All-Residential Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on terrestrial resources, floodplains and wetlands, aquatic resources, water quality, or endangered, threatened, or special concern species. There would be no difference in effects between this alternative and the proposed development program.

As with development under the Proposed Actions, implementation of erosion and sediment control measures and stormwater management measures as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction and operation of this alternative would minimize potential impacts to the combined sewer system, as well as potential water quality impacts to the East River associated with stormwater runoff.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result under the All-Residential Alternative. The development parcels would be fully remediated prior to development, as they would be prior to construction of the proposed development program. As under the Proposed Actions, site management plans for each parcel would be prepared for NYSDEC approval; these plans would include requirements for handling any soil and groundwater disturbed during construction, requirements for capping materials, stormwater pollution prevention plans, and health and safety plans. The NYSDEC-approved Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan (to protect workers and the public) would be in effect during all construction activities involving subsurface disturbance. In addition, a restrictive declaration for this alternative would be recorded with NYCDEP, as under the Proposed Actions. These measures would ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts on public health, workers' safety, or the environment as a result of potential hazardous materials exposed by or encountered during construction of this alternative.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply

Based on the generation rates presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the All-Residential Alternative would generate an estimated demand of about 1.45 million gallons per day (gpd) of water for consumption and air cooling purposes. This demand would be 22,086 gpd less than would be generated by the proposed development program under the Proposed Actions. The 1.45 million gpd demand would represent approximately 0.12 percent of the 1.2 billion gpd of water consumed in New York City, or 0.35 percent of the 420 million gpd consumed in Manhattan. Similar to the Proposed Actions, this demand would not be expected to overburden the city's water supply or the local conveyance system, and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated. Like the proposed development program, this alternative would also comply with the water conservation measures of the city as mandated by Local Law 29 of 1989.

Wastewater

Conservatively assuming that all water consumed at the development parcels in this alternative, other than that used for air conditioning, enters the sewer system, the All-Residential Alternative would generate approximately 1,046,975 gpd of sewage, which would be 133,356 gpd more than generated by the proposed development program. This amount of wastewater would represent approximately 0.33 percent (compared to 0.30 percent under the Proposed Actions) of the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant's permitted capacity and, like the Proposed Actions, is not expected to adversely affect the plant's capacity or treatment efficiency. Likewise, this alternative is not expected to overburden the local or interceptor conveyance systems.

Stormwater

Like the proposed development program, this alternative is expected to use the existing combined sewers <u>and two existing storm sewers</u> to discharge stormwater into the East River, and flows from the development parcels would be conveyed through new pipes to the existing sewers. No new outfalls are expected to be built as part of the All-Residential Alternative. <u>However, as with the Proposed Actions, if either or both of the existing storm sewers are found to be in substandard condition, stormwater from the 700/708 First Avenue parcels would be detained on-site and discharged to adjacent storm or combined sewers. Also like the Proposed</u>
Actions, this alternative would require an upgrade to the existing 18-inch combined sewer on First Avenue between East 38th Street and East 39th Street, and on-site stormwater detention on the 616 and 685 First Avenue parcels. As with the Proposed Actions, these measures would result in a net reduction in combined flows to the combined sewer system when compared to existing conditions, and stormwater flows from the All-Residential Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality within the East River.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

With no commercial office component, the All-Residential Alternative would generate less solid waste than would be generated under the Proposed Actions and, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste handling and disposal methods or recycling in the City.

Overall, this alternative would generate solid waste at a rate of approximately 129 tons per week (5 tons less than the 134 tons per week generated by the proposed development program). Of this amount, about 119 tons per week would be handled by DSNY, which is more than the 86 tons under the Proposed Actions, and private carters would handle about 10 tons per week, which is less than the 48 tons under the Proposed Actions. The 129 tons generated by this alternative represents a relatively small increase in New York City's waste stream. Given that a truck can haul about 10 tons of solid waste, this alternative would require approximately 13 truck trips per week, one-half trip less than would be required by the proposed development program. As under the Proposed Actions, the City's solid waste handling and disposal systems are expected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional municipal waste generated by the All-Residential Alternative. In addition, this alternative, like the proposed development program, would comply with the City's recycling program.

ENERGY

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would not cause a significant adverse energy impact, as it would result in a similar increase in energy consumption. This alternative would generate a demand of approximately 824,446 million BTUs per year, compared to 733,241 million BTUs per year for the proposed development program. The buildings constructed under this alternative, like those that would be constructed under the Proposed Actions, would comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Construction Code.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Traffic

A comparison of the volume of vehicular traffic that would be generated under the Proposed Actions and the All-Residential Alternative is presented in Table 24-<u>15</u>.

The All-Residential Alternative would generate vehicular traffic volumes that would be less than the Proposed Actions in the <u>weekday</u> peak hours by about 10 to 20 percent. Traffic volumes would be higher than under the Proposed Actions by about 10 percent during the Saturday midday.

T 11 04 15

2014 Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison—All-Residential Alternative								
Peak Hour Proposed Actions All-Residential Alterna								
AM In	858	561						
AM Out	636	730						
AM Total	1,494	1,291						
Midday In	<u>381</u>	325						
Midday Out	<u>391</u>	333						
Midday Total	<u>772</u>	658						
PM In	522	587						
PM Out	834	486						
PM Total	1,356	1,073						
Sat MD In	580	635						
Sat MD Out	517	566						
Sat MD Total	1,097	1,201						

		Table 24- <u>15</u>
4 Vehicle Trip Gene	ration Comparison—All	-Residential Alternative
Peak Hour	Proposed Actions	All-Residential Alternative

Despite generally similar traffic volumes under the All-Residential Alternative as compared to the Proposed Actions (higher in one peak period; lower in the others), there would be changes in the number of significant adverse impacts as compared to the Proposed Actions. Table 24-16 presents a comparison of the number of significant impacts during each peak period for the Primary Study Area and the two Secondary Study Areas-the Queensboro Bridge traffic study area and the West Side traffic study area. Figures 24-38 through 24-43 illustrate the impacts at all analysis locations in each of the study areas.

Table 24-<u>16</u>

Number of Intersections with Significant Traffic Impacts **Comparison of All-Residential Alternative vs. Proposed Actions**

		Proposed Actions	All-Residential						
Dook Hour	Number of Analyzed	Intersections with	Alternative Intersections						
Peak nour	Intersections	Significant impacts	with Significant impacts						
	Number of Signalized (& Unsignalized) Intersections								
Primary Study Area									
AM	61 (6)	<u>40</u> (3)	<u>38</u> (3)						
Midday	61 (6)	<u>20</u> (1)	<u>19</u> (1)						
PM	61 (6)	<u>40 (3)</u>	<u>39</u> (2)						
Saturday MD	61 (6)	<u>13</u> (1)	<u>14</u> (1)						
	Queensboro B	ridge Traffic Study Area							
AM	12 (1)	5	5						
Midday	13	7	7						
PM	13	6	6						
Saturday MD	13	2	2						
	West Side	e Traffic Study Area							
AM	8	Z	Z						
Midday	8	7	7						
PM	8	8	8						
Saturday MD	8	6	6						
Total—All Manhattan Study Areas									
AM	81 (7)	<u>52</u> (3)	<u>50</u> (3)						
Midday	82 (6)	<u>34</u> (1)	<u>33</u> (1)						
PM	82 (6)	<u>54 (3)</u>	<u>53</u> (2)						
Saturday MD	82 (6)	<u>21</u> (1)	<u>22</u> (1)						



Figure 24-38





Figure 24-40



Figure 24-41



- Partially Mitigated Impact
- Unmitigated Impact
- + Unsignalized Intersection

Traffic Mitigation Overview: All Residential Development Alternative Queensboro Bridge Secondary Study Area Figure 24-42



- Mitigated Impact
- Partially Mitigated Impact
- Unmitigated Impact
- + Unsignalized Intersection

Traffic Mitigation Overview: All Residential Development Alternative West Side Secondary Study Area Figure 24-43 Overall, the total number of locations that would be significantly impacted under the All-Residential Alternative would decrease in the AM <u>and PM peak hours</u> by <u>two</u>, <u>decrease</u> by one in the midday peak hour, and increase by one in the Saturday midday peak hour compared to the Proposed Actions.

Within the Primary Study Area in the AM <u>and PM</u> peak hour<u>s</u>, the total number of impacted locations under the All-Residential Alternative would be <u>two</u> less than under the Proposed Actions. In the midday peak hour, <u>the total number of impacted</u> locations under the All-Residential Alternative <u>would be one less than under the proposed project</u>.

In the Saturday peak hour, there would be one additional impact at <u>the QMT Entrance Street</u> and East <u>39th</u> Street.

Within the Queensboro Bridge <u>and</u> West Side traffic study <u>areas</u>, the same number of significant impacts would occur <u>during all peak hours</u>. Impacts at these locations could be mitigated via the same types of traffic capacity improvements described in Chapter 23, "Mitigation."

Under the All-Residential Alternative, there would be <u>15</u> unmitigated impacts in the <u>AM</u> peak <u>hour</u>, <u>nine</u> unmitigated impacts in the midday peak hour, <u>14 unmitigated impacts in the PM peak</u> <u>hour</u>, and <u>six</u> unmitigated <u>impacts</u> during the Saturday midday peak hour. This compares to the Proposed Actions where there would be <u>17</u> unmitigated impacts in the AM, <u>nine</u> in the midday, and <u>14</u> in the PM peak hours, and <u>four</u> unmitigated impacts during the Saturday midday peak hour.

Parking

The amount of off-street parking that would be provided under the All-Residential Alternative would be sufficient to accommodate the total parking demands of the alternative. The All-Residential Alternative would provide for a total of 1,554 parking spaces with an estimated maximum occupancy of 97 percent. At 616 First Avenue, 294 public spaces would be provided, at 685 First Avenue, 110 accessory spaces would be provided, and at 700/708 First Avenue, 651 public and 499 accessory spaces would be provided.

FDR Drive Analysis

No significant traffic impacts would result in the AM, midday, PM, or Saturday midday peak hours under the All-Residential Alternative, compared to one significant impact in the PM peak hour under the proposed project.

Portals Analysis for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and Queensboro Bridge

The following analyses discuss weekday peak hour conditions for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and the Queensboro Bridge under the All-Residential Alternative. Because weekday peak hours would be considered the critical conditions for these facilities, analyses were not done for Saturday conditions.

Queens-Midtown Tunnel. Under the All-Residential Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes at the Queens-Midtown Tunnel would be less than volumes under the Proposed Actions. There would be <u>three</u> significantly impacted movements under the All-Residential Alternative, as under the Proposed Actions. The significant impacts would occur during the AM peak hour for the outbound direction (to Queens) and PM peak hour for the inbound <u>and outbound directions</u>. The AM peak hour inbound direction, which would be significantly impacted under the Proposed Actions, would not be significantly impacted under the All-Residential Alternative.

Table 24-17

Queensboro Bridge. Under the All-Residential Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes at the Queensboro Bridge would be less than under the Proposed Actions. Just as under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant impacts with the All-Residential Alternative.

Queens Plaza Area. The volume of traffic generated by the All-Residential Alternative through intersections on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge would be lower than for the Proposed Actions in the weekday peak hours and higher than the Proposed Actions in the Saturday midday peak hour, as shown in Table 24-<u>17</u>.

	All-Residential Alternative Trips to Queens	All-Residential Alternative Trips to Manhattan	Proposed Actions Trips to Queens	Proposed Actions Trips to Manhattan	
Weekday AM Peak Hour	<u>108</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>145</u>	
Weekday Midday Peak Hour	52	51	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>	
Weekday PM Peak Hour	<u>74</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>79</u>	
Saturday Midday Peak hour	<u>88</u>	97	67	<u>74</u>	

Vehicle Trips Generated by the All-Residential Alter	rnative
vs. the Proposed Actions in the Queens Plaz	a Area

Even with the reduced volumes generated by the All-Residential Alternative in <u>three</u> of the four peak hours, due to existing and No Build congestion in this area it is expected that this alternative would still generate significant traffic impacts on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge for which standard traffic improvements would not be sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts. Additional <u>impacts</u> could occur during the Saturday midday peak hour at Bridge Plaza North and Crescent Street <u>and Queens Boulevard at Jackson and Skillman Avenues</u> when compared to the Proposed Actions. <u>However, the significant impacts under the All-Residential Alternative would not require mitigation measures more stringent than the proposed project. A comprehensive area-wide traffic improvement plan would be needed to mitigate these impacts, as described for the Proposed Actions as well.</u>

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would result in significant adverse bus and pedestrian impacts. However, it would not result in the significant adverse impacts to the PL9 subway stairway at Grand Central Terminal or the M16/M34 bus route that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

Subways

The All-Residential Alternative would generate 50 percent fewer subway trips in the AM peak hour and 43 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hour as compared to the Proposed Actions. Because it would generate substantially less subway trips, it would not result in the significant adverse impact on the PL9 stairway in the AM and PM peak periods that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

Buses

The All-Residential Alternative would generate 38 and 30 percent fewer bus trips in the AM and PM peak hours than would be generated with the Proposed Actions. Although the All-

Residential Alternative may increase demand for service on the M16/M34 route, the additional riders would likely not result in the overcrowding of buses and, unlike under the Proposed Actions, a significant adverse impact would not occur. The M42 route, however, will be at capacity in the No Action condition; therefore the projected increase in ridership under the All-Residential Alternative would result, like under the Proposed Actions, in a significant adverse impact on the M42 bus route. As with the Proposed Actions, the impact on the M42 bus route under this alternative could be mitigated with additional service.

Pedestrian Circulation

Compared to the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would generate 31 percent fewer pedestrians trips in the AM peak hour and 22 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hour. As described in Chapter 16, "Transit and Pedestrians," the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse crosswalk impacts at East 42nd Street and Lexington Avenue and East 42nd Street and Third Avenue. As shown in Table 24-18, the All Residential Alternative would also result in significant adverse impacts for the north crosswalk at Third Avenue and East 42nd Street and the north crosswalk at Lexington Avenue and East 42nd Street in the AM peak period. Like the Proposed Actions, the mitigation of these impacts includes crosswalk widenings and signal timing adjustments.

						<u>Table</u>	24-18			
2014 All Residential Alternative Crosswalk Level of Service										
						Ar	<u>nalysis</u>			
		<u>A</u>	M	Midday		PM				
Location	Crosswalk	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS			
Lexington Avenue at E.	<u>North</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>E*</u>							
42nd Street	East									
	<u>South</u>									
	West									
Third Avenue at E. 42nd	<u>North</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>F*</u>							
<u>Street</u>	<u>East</u>									
	<u>South</u>									
	West									
Note: SFP = square feet per pedestrian; *denotes significant adverse impact										

AIR QUALITY

Mobile Sources and Parking Facilities

Since project-generated traffic for this alternative would generally be similar to or lower at all the receptor locations and parking facilities, predicted air quality concentrations would not exceed those with the Proposed Actions. Although Saturday midday trip generation for the All-Residential Alternative would be somewhat higher than the Proposed Actions, these levels would still be lower than the Proposed Actions peak levels (weekday AM) which were analyzed. Overall daily traffic increments and totals would be lower for the All-Residential Alternative. Therefore, since no significant adverse impacts were predicted for the Proposed Actions, none would be expected for the All-Residential Alternative.

Industrial Sources

Since the industrial source screening is performed based on the site boundary (not specific building locations), the analysis would be the same as that performed for the Proposed Actions. Based on the results of the industrial screening for the sites, industrial sources would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality at the development parcels.

Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Systems (HVAC)

Overall, the building heights and locations for the All-Residential Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Actions. The restrictions identified in the analysis of the Proposed Actions (see Chapter 17, "Air Quality") would be applicable to this alternative. Therefore, the results of the detailed dispersion analysis performed for the Proposed Actions would apply to this alternative as well. The two residential buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel would be similar in height or taller than the building on the neighboring Waterside parcel. An HVAC screening analysis was performed, which confirmed that there would be no significant impacts on the 708 First Avenue buildings from WS1-2, like the Proposed Actions. Emissions from the commercial building on the 708 First Avenue parcel under the Proposed Actions were not predicted to have a significant adverse impact on air quality at the neighboring buildings. The emissions from the two residential buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel in the All-Residential Alternative, which would originate from stacks of a similar height to the proposed commercial building but would each have less emissions than the 708 First Avenue parcel under the Proposed Actions, would also not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on other buildings. However, since the buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel would not be of equal height, an HVAC screening analysis was performed. The analysis determined that there is a potential for significant adverse impacts on the taller of the two buildings that would be located on the 708 First Avenue parcel from the second, shorter building. Therefore, in the event that fossil-fuel fired HVAC systems are installed in each of the towers on the parcel, measures such as cleaner burning fuel, use of a taller HVAC stack, or providing a sufficient stack set-back distance would need to be employed to avoid a significant adverse impact.

If fuel oil or natural gas were to be used for boiler systems, $PM_{2.5}$ concentration increments at other locations could exceed the interim guidance threshold level of 2 µg/m³, as presented in Chapter 17, "Air Quality" for the Proposed Actions. However, as with the Proposed Actions, these exceedances would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts due to their limited duration, frequency, and extent at locations of continual exposure.

Queens Midtown Tunnel Ventilation Building

Based on the analysis of the predicted dispersion of exhaust from the Queens-Midtown Tunnel Ventilation system, no significant adverse impacts on air quality would be expected. This is due to the location of the residential buildings on the 708 First Avenue parcel, which are further away from the tunnel ventilation structure than the 708 First Avenue development analyzed for the Proposed Actions.

NOISE

Like under the Proposed Actions, traffic generated by the All-Residential Alternative would not result in significant adverse noise impacts. However, similar to the Proposed Actions, buildings constructed under the All-Residential Alternative would require double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation sufficient to provide between 30 and 40 dBA of attenuation (with the higher value required at facades of buildings facing heavily trafficked roadways such as the FDR

Drive and First Avenue) to avoid high interior noise levels that would be considered significant adverse noise impacts. A mechanism, such as a restrictive declaration or E designation, requiring specific attenuation values (as described in Chapter 18, "Noise") would be needed on each of the development parcels. On the 708 First Avenue parcel, the All-Residential Alternative would require 35 dBA of attenuation, rather than the 30 dBA attenuation required for the Proposed Actions, since there would be residential buildings at this location with the All-Residential Alternative rather than a commercial building.

Under this alternative, as under the Proposed Actions, noise levels within the new open spaces created on-site would exceed the noise level for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet as contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines. These high predicted noise levels would result principally from the noise generated by traffic on the nearby streets and roadways, and there are no practical and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce noise levels below the guideline. However, the noise levels in the new open spaces would be comparable to noise levels in other open space areas that are also located adjacent to heavily trafficked roadways, and the relatively low noise level guideline is typically not achieved in parks and open space areas in New York City. Consequently, noise levels in the open spaces, would not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

In addition, the mechanical systems for the buildings developed under this alternative would be located principally at rooftops and would be designed, as would the proposed development program's mechanical systems, to avoid producing levels that would exceed the allowable noise levels specified in the City of New York Noise Codes, and therefore would avoid causing any significant adverse noise impacts.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Like the Proposed Actions, the All-Residential Alternative would conform to the policies of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program. Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would further the goal of encouraging commercial and residential development within an appropriate coastal zone area, enliven this stretch of land near the waterfront through the creation of publicly accessible open space and ground-floor retail along First Avenue, and incorporate new, publicly accessible open spaces and pedestrian routes on the development parcels that would enhance views of the East River.

CONSTRUCTION

The scale and duration of construction activities associated with this alternative would be similar to those associated with the Proposed Actions. Therefore, the significant adverse construction-related traffic and noise impacts that would occur with the proposed development program would occur with the All-Residential Alternative. Construction protection plans for Windsor Tower and the former Kips Bay Brewery would be required to protect those resources from inadvertent construction damage as under the Proposed Actions. The All-Residential Alternative, like the proposed development program, would implement an emissions reduction program that would substantially reduce PM emissions so that there would not be a significant adverse impact from $PM_{2.5}$ due to construction of this alternative, if realized. Economic benefits attributable to construction of this alternative would be similar to those associated with the Proposed Actions.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The All-Residential Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse public health impacts. As under the Proposed Actions, the operation of this alternative's boilers could potentially exceed the $PM_{2.5}$ interim guidance threshold levels at certain floors of the buildings constructed on the development parcels. However, these exceedances, as under the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality or public health, as described in Chapter 17, "Air Quality" and Chapter 20, "Public Health."

FUTURE CONDITIONS WITH THE UNDC PROJECT

As in the Proposed Actions' future conditions with the UNDC project, construction of the 950,000-square-foot UNDC building on the block north of the 708 First Avenue parcel would not alter the findings above for the All-Residential Alternative related to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; shadows; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; natural resources; hazardous materials; infrastructure (water supply, wastewater, and stormwater); solid waste and sanitation services; energy; noise; parking; air quality (mobile and industrial sources); waterfront revitalization program; construction; and public health.

Similar to the Proposed Actions' future conditions with the UNDC project, the UNDC building would reinforce the area's mixed-use character, and the All-Residential Alternative would continue to be compatible with the land uses, densities, and existing zoning regulations in the area. The UNDC project would add a tall building to the study area that would block some northward views of the Secretariat building along First Avenue that would otherwise have been blocked by the buildings of the All-Residential Alternative. The UNDC building would also prevent the buildings in the All-Residential Alternative from casting incremental shadows on Ralph J. Bunche Park and Trygve Lie Plaza.

In respect to open space, if the UNDC project were part of the background condition and did not provide replacement open space for the loss of Robert Moses Playground, open space ratios under the All-Residential Alternative would be less than in the future without the UNDC building as a background project. However, under the All-Residential Alternative with the UNDC project as a background condition, both active and passive open space ratios would improve as they would under the Proposed Actions, whether or not the UNDC project included mitigation for its open space impacts. In respect to transit, the All-Residential Alternative could result in new significant adverse impacts from the cumulative increases in transit and pedestrian trips. More detailed discussions of air quality (HVAC) and traffic are located below.

AIR QUALITY (HVAC)

Stationary source impacts associated with the proposed UNDC project were analyzed for its potential affect on air quality on the All-Residential Alternative. The analysis used the building height information described in this chapter for the development on the 708 First Avenue parcel. Based on the HVAC screening methodology in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis was performed utilizing an approximate development size of 950,000 square feet and the distance from the proposed UNDC building to the nearest development site, which is 708 First Avenue at approximately 70 feet. The results determined that emissions from fossil fuel-fired HVAC systems associated with the proposed UNDC project would have the potential for significant adverse air quality impacts at elevated receptors on the 708 First Avenue parcel whether they use

fuel oil or natural gas. Therefore, a refined air quality analysis was undertaken utilizing the EPA AERMOD dispersion model (see Chapter 19, "Air Quality" for a discussion of this model).

The refined air quality analysis was conducted using fuel oil and natural gas. The primary pollutant of concern when burning natural gas is nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and when burning oil, sulfur dioxide (SO₂). The results of the analysis determined that utilizing either No. 4 or No. 2 oil, maximum concentrations of SO₂ (including background monitored concentrations), would be above the 3-hour and 24-hour NAAQS. When utilizing natural gas, maximum concentration of NO₂ including background monitored concentrations, would be less than the NAAQS. Therefore, to preclude the potential for significant adverse air quality impacts on the proposed development program from the UNDC building's HVAC emissions, the proposed UNDC project would need to consider the use of natural gas or utility steam for building heat and hot water. However, the use of fuel oil could be feasible based on more detailed building and mechanical design information that would be developed were the proposed UNDC project to be developed.

TRAFFIC

Quantitative traffic analyses for the All-Residential Alternative were not performed with the UNDC project, but a comparison of traffic volumes and impacts relative to the Proposed Actions' mass conducted in the Draft SEIS. The Draft SEIS analysis of the Proposed Actions' future condition with the UNDC project concludes that significant adverse traffic impacts would occur at 65 intersections in the three Manhattan study areas in the AM peak hour compared to 64 intersections without the UNDC project, 30 intersections in the midday peak hour compared to 28 intersections without the UNDC project, 57 intersections in the PM peak hour with or without the UNDC project out of 88 study intersections. Since AM, midday, and PM peak hour traffic volumes generated by the All-Residential Alternative would be the same or lower than generated by the Proposed Actions, the same or fewer increases in the number of additional significant impacts—and the same or less stringent mitigation measures required to mitigate them—would result under the All-Residential Alternative if the UNDC project were included as a background condition, according to the Draft SEIS.

Although there would be a modest increase in traffic volumes generated by the All-Residential Alternative during the Saturday peak hour when compared to the Proposed Actions, the additional Saturday midday hourly vehicle trips generated by the UNDC project would be dispersed throughout a large study area. The additional UNDC trips would concentrate primarily on First Avenue at East 42nd and 41st Streets, which would be impacted and partially mitigated under the Proposed Actions with the UNDC project and the All-Residential Alternative without the UNDC project. Therefore, additional significant impacts in the Saturday midday peak hour under the All-Residential Alternative with the UNDC project are not projected when compared to the Proposed Actions with the UNDC project, according to the Draft SEIS.

E. COMMUNITY BOARD 6 ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNITY BOARD 6 ALTERNATIVE

OVERVIEW

The Community Board 6 Alternative is a development scenario based on the 197-c application that has been filed by Manhattan Community Board 6 (CB6). Under this alternative, the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels would be rezoned to C1-9, and a Special East River Access District would be established in the area bounded by East 34th Street to the south, East 41st Street to the north, First Avenue to the west, and the East River pierhead line to the east. The special district would permit floor area bonuses for the provision of open space and affordable housing, and it would contain requirements related to use, building heights, treatment of the eastward prolongations of East 39th and East 40th Streets east of First Avenue, open space improvements, and accessory parking limits. Development under this alternative would adhere to tower-on-a-base requirements, as well as a 400-foot height limitation set forth in the CB6 197-c application. In accordance with the CB6 197-c application, this alternative assumes development on the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels at a base FAR of 6.0 and elective floor area bonuses of 2.0 FAR for the provision of publicly accessible open space improvements and 2.0 FAR for the provision of low- to moderate-income housing, for a total possible FAR of 10.0.

The 685 First Avenue parcel is not part of the CB6 197-c application. In order to compare the impacts of potential development under the CB6 197-c application to that of the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative assumes a 9.34 FAR development (that includes the existing Con Edison substation) at 685 First Avenue in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Resolution currently applicable to that parcel. Following the applicable zoning regulations, that amount of development is the maximum that can be generated on the site, and the resulting building would have a tower-on-abase form and would be 492 feet tall. In comparison, the proposed development program includes a 12 FAR development on the 685 First Avenue parcel with a slender tower that does not conform to the applicable height and setback regulations or the tower requirements. This alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would require modification of a BSA special permit to allow new development on the 685 First Avenue parcel.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CB6 ALTERNATIVE

Both ERRC's goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions and those of CB6' 197-c application are to provide zoning to permit the high-density mixed-use redevelopment of the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels. However, there are substantial differences between the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions and the CB6 197-c application. As noted above, the CB6 197-c application does not include the 685 First Avenue parcel. The goals and objectives of the CB6 197-c application are as follows:

• Redevelop the three development parcels with residential uses and ground-floor retail, with no high-density office uses. A stated goal of the CB6 197-c application is to maintain the area around the development parcels as residential, and the proposed C1-9 zoning for the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels would not permit the construction of high-density office uses, while it would allow the construction of high-density residential towers. In comparison, ERRC proposes the development of a mix of high-density uses, with an office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel near the mixed-use

area around the United Nations. This mix of uses, which includes an amount of residential space similar to that provided under the CB6 Alternative, is intended by ERRC to provide both jobs and accommodate growth in office-based economic sectors and to accommodate a portion of the city's current and future housing needs.

- *Provide residential units for low- to moderate-income households on the three development parcels.* While a similar amount of residential space would be developed under both the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions, the proposed Special East River Access District includes elective floor area bonuses of 2.0 FAR to encourage the provision of affordable housing units. In comparison, the proposed development program would include only market rate dwelling units.
- Limit the heights of new buildings constructed on the development parcels to 400 feet. In deference to the United Nations Secretariat building, which is 503-feet-tall, the Special East River Access District includes a height limit for buildings constructed on the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue development parcels. (The CB6 197-c application does not include a height limitation for the 685 First Avenue parcel, which is not part of the application. The development scenario for the 685 First Avenue parcel under this alternative follows the applicable, existing zoning regulations and the resulting building would be 492 feet tall.) As described below, the buildings that would be constructed in this alternative would have tower-on-a-base forms in accordance with the zoning proposed for the parcels. The buildings would be shorter than the buildings of the proposed development program but they would have larger footprints with more lot coverage. The buildings that would be constructed under the Proposed Actions would be taller than 400 feet and most would be taller than the Secretariat building. However, the Proposed Actions include a special permit to modify height and setback regulations in order to distribute bulk across the parcels in tall but slender buildings with small footprints. These smaller footprints would permit the provision of publicly accessible open spaces on the development parcels.
- Create publicly accessible open space, waterfront access, and view corridors to the East • *River.* Both the CB6 197-c plan and the Proposed Actions share the basic goal of creating new open space and view corridors to the East River. To achieve the goals of creating new open space and waterfront access from the development parcels, the proposed Special East River Access District includes both mandatory and elective open space improvements. The mandatory improvements are treating the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets as vehicular streets through the Waterside parcel with one objective of creating view corridors toward the waterfront, widening the sidewalk on the southern side of East 36th Street between First Avenue and the FDR Drive Service Road, and providing on-site landscaped overlooks along the eastern edges of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels. The elective open space improvements include constructing: an extension of the East River Esplanade between Glick Park and East 41st Street; pedestrian bridges that would connect the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets with the esplanade; a pedestrian bridge over East 41st Street between the 708 First Avenue parcel and Robert Moses Playground; a landscaped deck over the FDR Drive between East 38th and 41st Streets that would be continuous with the on-site overlook and that has stair connections to the esplanade; a pedestrian crossing at East 36th Street under the FDR Drive to the esplanade; and a ferry landing near East 42nd Street. One of the goals of ERRC's Proposed Actions is also the creation of new publicly accessible open space and views through the Waterside parcel toward the waterfront. Under the proposed development program, however, the substantial amount of publicly accessible open space would be provided on the development parcels

themselves. Under the Proposed Actions, the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets would not be treated as vehicular streets, but they would be pedestrian ways that would create view corridors toward the waterfront. While the Proposed Actions would not create new connections to the waterfront, the proposed development program would not preclude such connections in the future.

- *Treat the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets through the Waterside parcel as vehicular streets.* The proposed Special East River Access District would require that the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets be treated as streets for zoning purposes (although they would not be mapped). These alignments would:
 - 1) Provide paved, 60-foot-wide roadways, having the appearance of streets;
 - 2) Allow general vehicular access; and
 - 3) Generate no floor area.

Under the Proposed Actions, the alignments would generate floor area for the proposed development, and would be characterized by the following:

- 1) 60-foot-wide pedestrian ways, with landscaping and crushed gravel;
- 2) The appearance of pedestrian walkways, not city streets open to traffic; and
- 3) Access for emergency vehicles only (aside from a portion of the East 39th Street alignment closest to First Avenue that would allow for general vehicular access to a retail location and a residential building).

CB6 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The development program for the CB6 Alternative is shown in Table 24-<u>19</u>, and the difference in overall density between this alternative and the larger proposed development program is 2,140,685 gsf. The CB6 Alternative consists of approximately 3,583,802 zoning square feet of residential space, which is similar to the 3,541,399 zoning square feet of residential space in the proposed development program, and it would provide 4,216 residential units, or 50 more units than the proposed development program. This alternative also consists of 105,803 gsf of local retail and restaurant uses (34,636 square feet more than the 71,167 gsf of retail in the proposed development program) and 426 accessory parking spaces (183 fewer accessory parking spaces than the 609 spaces in the proposed development program). Unlike the proposed development program, the CB6 Alternative includes low- to moderate-income residential units, and does not include any commercial office space, community facility space, or public parking.

Table 24-<u>19</u> Summary of CB6 Alternative

Summary of OD0 micrimative								
Site	Residential (gsf)	Community Facility gsf)	Commercial Office (gsf)	Retail (gsf)	Below-Grade Space (gsf)	Total (gsf)	Parking Spaces	Open Space (gsf)
616 First Avenue	695,398	0	0	19,750	27,000	742,148	78 accessory	3,831
685 First Avenue	691,613	0	0	26,803	31,350	749,766	85 accessory	0
700 First Avenue (Waterside)	1,497,588	0	0	39,500	91,900	2,484,578	263 accessory	33,683
708 First Avenue	835,840	0	0	19,750				
TOTAL	3,720,439 ¹	0	0	105,803	150,250	3,976,492	426 accessory	167,336 ²
Note: 1 For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that 1 dwelling unit $= 850$ zoning square feet (zsf). The program of the CB6 Alternative includes								

For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that 1 dwelling unit = 850 zoning square feet (zsf). The program of the CB6 Alternative includes 3,583,802 zsf of residential use.

Open space total includes 129,822 square feet of off-site open space.

Source: East River Realty Company, LLC

The CB6 Alternative includes approximately 37,514 square feet (0.86 acres) of publicly accessible on-site open space as a 33,683-square-foot (0.77 acres) overlook along the eastern edges of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels and as a 3,831-square-foot (0.09-acre) widened sidewalk on the south side of East 36th Street between First Avenue and the FDR Drive Service Road, 104,016 square feet (2.39 acres) of publicly accessible off-site open space on a deck over the FDR Drive, 22,206 square feet (0.51 acres) of publicly accessible off-site open space on a deck over the FDR Drive, 22,206 square feet (0.51 acres) of publicly accessible off-site open space in a new continuation of the East River Esplanade between East 38th and 41st Streets, and 3,600 square feet (0.08 acres) of publicly accessible off-site open space in the form of a pedestrian bridge over East 41st Street between the 708 First Avenue parcel and Robert Moses Playground. In total, the CB6 Alternative includes 3.84 acres of publicly accessible open space, 1.0 acre less than the 4.84 acres in the proposed development program, with a majority of the open space provided off-site.

The construction of the alternative's 2.98 acres of off-site open space on a deck over the FDR drive and as an extension of the esplanade and a pedestrian bridge over East 41st Street is contingent upon additional approvals and actions by state and local agencies that are not part of the Proposed Actions and are beyond the control of the project applicant. Construction of the deck over the FDR Drive is contingent upon reconfiguration of the FDR Drive by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). Studies by NYSDOT have been underway for several years, but plans for the rehabilitation or reconstruction of the FDR Drive in this area do not include provision for reconfiguring the 42nd Street northbound ramp to allow for construction of this deck. Further, there is no funding in place for such a reconfiguration or for construction of a deck over the FDR Drive in this location. Therefore, it is uncertain whether the publicly accessible open space on the deck could be completed by 2014 or, in fact, ever built. Similarly, construction of the esplanade depends upon public approval for use of City-owned land and would likely include approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and NYSDEC for in-water construction actions. It is, therefore, possible that the esplanade would not be constructed by 2014, or at all. Without the deck and esplanade, the maximum allowable development on the Waterside, 616 First Avenue, and 708 First Avenue development parcels would be limited to 8.0 FAR.

The development program for each parcel under the CB6 Alternative is described below. See Figure 24-44 for a site plan of the development program and Figures 24-45 through 24-47 for axonometric renderings of the development under this alternative. The axonometric renderings show the massing and heights of the buildings that would be developed under this alternative and place them in context with surrounding existing buildings, whose heights are also shown. These three axonometric renderings are similar in view to the axonometric renderings of the proposed development program shown in Figures 1-11 through 1-13 in Chapter 1, "Project Description." In addition, Figures 24-48 through 24-53 provide illustrative views on First Avenue of the bulk envelopes of the development program under this alternative; these views also show illustrative retail storefronts at the ground floors of the buildings. They do not, however, present illustrative treatments of façade materials and fenestration. In Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," see Figures 8-25, 8-26, and 8-30 through 8-33 for similar illustrative views on First Avenue of the development program under the Proposed Actions.

616 First Avenue Parcel

The 616 First Avenue parcel would be developed with a 742,148-gsf residential building. Developed under current zoning, the building footprint would fill the site, except on the north



CB6 Alternative Site Plan Figure 24-44



CB6 Alternative **Axonometric View Northwest** Figure 24-45



CB6 Alternative **Axonometric View Southwest** Figure 24-46

8.9.07



CB6 Alternative Axonometric View West Figure 24-47



View east from First Avenue at East 39th Street

CB6 Alternative Alignment of East 39th Street Figure 24-48

FIRST AVENUE PROPERTIES REZONING



CB6 Alternative View Northeast at First Avenue and East 38th Street Figure 24-49



CB6 Alternative View South on First Avenue from East 42nd Street Figure 24-50

FIRST AVENUE PROPERTIES REZONING

8.14.07



CB6 Alternative View North on First Avenue from East 36th Street Figure 24-51



ILLUSTRATIVE BULK ENVELOPE RENDERING

CB6 Alternative View South on First Avenue from East 41st Street Figure 24-52



CB6 Alternative View North on First Avenue at East 39th Street Figure 24-53

8.14.07

side where the sidewalk along East 36th Street would be widened by 11 feet in accordance with the provisions of the alternative's special district. The building would be massed with two towers seventy-six feet apart above a six-story base with a one-story portion on the building's east side. The tower on First Avenue would be 23 stories (260 feet tall), and the eastern tower would be 36 stories (382 feet tall).¹ The building would contain approximately 19,750 square feet of ground-floor retail along First Avenue and 78 accessory parking spaces in a below-grade garage with mid-block entrances on East 35th and East 36th Streets. Unlike the proposed development program, the 616 First Avenue parcel would not include a publicly accessible public plaza. The only open space on the site would be the area of the widened sidewalk on East 36th Street.

Waterside and 708 First Avenue Parcels

The Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would be developed with three residential buildings with ground-floor retail along First Avenue and a publicly accessible overlook along the eastern edge of the parcels. In accordance with the regulations of the alternative's special district, the prolongations of East 39th and East 40th Streets east of First Avenue would be treated as streets in this alternative, although they would not be remapped as city streets. These prolongations, which have a total footprint of 47,034 square feet, would be considered streets for zoning purposes and would not generate the allowable 470,340 square feet of floor area for development on the Waterside parcel. Under the 12 FAR proposed development program, the prolongations generate a total of 564,408 square feet of floor area on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels. In this alternative, the prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets would be paved, 60-foot-wide (at a minimum) roadways that would allow for general vehicular and pedestrian access through the site, but they would not connect with the FDR Drive service road, as the eastern end of the parcel would be elevated, like under the Proposed Actions. Under this alternative, the connector road between the East 39th and 40th Street prolongations would be for pedestrians and emergency vehicle access only. Curb cuts to a below-grade parking garage would be located on the prolongation of East 40th Street and on East 38th and 41st Streets. As with the proposed development program, the western edge of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would meet the grade of First Avenue, while the eastern edge would be elevated above the FDR Drive service road.

Each of the three residential buildings on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would have a similar footprint and massing. Like the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel, the three buildings would be massed with two towers above a mid-rise base with a one-story eastern section. They would be constructed to the property lines on First Avenue, and would have large footprints that would approximate the size and shape of the three former blocks that were located between East 38th and 41st Streets, First Avenue, and the FDR Drive before the superblock was created for the former Waterside facility. The three residential buildings, where they abut the street-like prolongations, would be built out to the flanking sidewalks. Similarly, the northern and southern buildings would be built to the property lines on East 41st and 38th Streets, respectively. The southern building would be 753,845 gsf. Above a seven-story base, its two towers would be approximately 66 feet apart. The tower on First Avenue would be 22 stories (258 feet tall) and the eastern tower would be 35 stories (400 feet tall). The central and northern

¹ As with the proposed development program and the All-Residential Alternative, building heights for the CB6 Alternative are measured above the lowest average curb level. Building heights measured from the elevation of the ground-floor lobbies are somewhat shorter.

buildings on the Waterside/708 First Avenue parcel would have a similar massing. Located between the two street-like prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets, the central building would be 842,243 gsf. The First Avenue tower would be 24 stories (275 feet tall) and the east tower would be 36 stories (400 feet tall), and they would be set 110 feet apart above a seven-story base. The northern building would be 888,590 gsf with a 25-story (290-foot-tall) First Avenue tower, a 7-story base, and a 37-story (400-foot-tall) east tower. The two towers would be located 143 feet apart.

As mentioned above, a 0.77-acre publicly accessible overlook would be constructed along the eastern edge of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels. It would abut the one-story eastern portions of the three residential buildings, and due to the curve of the site adjacent to the FDR Drive Service road, the overlook would vary in width. There would be stairs down to East 38th and 41st Streets, and a pedestrian bridge would be built from the overlook across East 41st Street to Robert Moses Playground. Construction of that pedestrian bridge would likely be subject to approval by NYCDOT, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation. The paved connecting driveway between the prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets would run across the central portion of the overlook.

The primary publicly accessible open space created under the CB6 Alternative would be located on a deck constructed above the FDR Drive. The deck would be connected to the overlook on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels and would extend from East 38th Street to East 41st Street. In accordance with the regulations of the alternative's special district, the deck would be 120 feet wide and would be landscaped. There would be stair connections to the new esplanade that would be constructed under this alternative between East 38th and 41st Streets. Construction of the deck is contingent upon NYSDOT shortening or lowering the FDR Drive 42nd Street northbound ramp. At this time it is not possible to perform a full assessment of the CB6 Alternative with respect to potential impacts on air quality, noise, and traffic from decking over the FDR Drive. Such an assessment could only be conducted when there is a more detailed proposal for the design of the deck in terms of reconfiguration of the exit ramp, ventilation, and design and extent of enclosure of the deck structure. Such an analysis would be required in conjunction with the CEQR review of a specific application for this plan, and would require coordination and separate approvals from NYSDOT.

685 First Avenue Parcel

The 685 First Avenue parcel is not included within the CB6 197-c application, but for purposes of comparison to the Proposed Actions, this alternative assumes that the site would be developed with a 749,766 gsf residential building with ground-floor retail along First Avenue. Developed in accordance with existing zoning, the building would be massed with two closely spaced towers above an 8-story base. On First Avenue, the building would be 46 stories (492 feet tall). Adjacent to the existing Con Edison substation, the building would rise with a series of setbacks to a height of 25 stories (265 feet). Unlike the building constructed on this site under the proposed development program, this building would have a footprint that fills the site and there would be no on-site publicly accessible open space. The building would not set back from East 40th Street. On East 39th and East 40th Streets, mid-block curb cuts would provide access to a below-grade accessory parking garage.

COMMUNITY BOARD 6 ALTERNATIVE COMPARED WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

Land Use

Like the proposed development program, the CB6 Alternative would be compatible with the land uses and densities in the surrounding area, would be consistent with the area's mixed-use character, and would not have significant adverse impacts on land use. This alternative would not include commercial office space and would be less dense than the proposed development program, but the Proposed Actions would be compatible with current land use patterns, which include high-density residential uses north of East 34th Street on the far east side of Manhattan and high-density mixed-use development near the United Nations. While the CB6 Alternative would provide more ground-floor retail frontage along First Avenue, the proposed development program would provide both retail frontage and publicly accessible open space on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels.

Zoning

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on zoning. In comparison to the Proposed Actions (which would rezone the 685 First Avenue parcel from C1-9 to C5-2, the 616 First Avenue parcel from M1-5 and M3-2 to C4-6, and the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels from M3-2 to C5-2), the CB6 alternative would rezone the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels to C1-9. In addition, it would establish the Special East River Zoning District in which the base allowable FAR for the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels would be 6.0. In this alternative, there would be no change to the existing zoning governing the 685 First Avenue parcel. The maximum allowable FAR on the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels would be 10.0, with floor area bonuses of 2.0 FAR each for open space improvements and the provision of inclusionary housing. While the special district would limit the overall density of development on the three parcels compared to the Proposed Actions, neither this alternative nor the higher-density proposed development program would have significant adverse zoning impacts. Under the Proposed Actions, the C5-2 district at the 685 First Avenue parcel would be adjacent to an existing C5-2 district and the high-density residential development allowable on the 616 First Avenue parcel under the C4-6 district would be consistent with the development permitted in the C1-9 district adjacent to the parcel.

This alternative would result in the creation of publicly accessible open space that differs from the open space provided by the proposed development program. In accordance with the regulations of the district, the mandatory on-site open space created on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would be located at the eastern edge of the parcels in the form of an overlook. This publicly accessible on-site open space would be substantially smaller than the onsite open space provided under the Proposed Actions. With the open space located at the sites' eastern edges, this alternative would include large-footprint buildings with mid-rise bases and closely spaced, setback towers that are 400-feet-tall or shorter. In comparison, the Proposed Actions would permit the dispersion of bulk across the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels in mostly slender but substantially taller buildings with small footprints and the creation of a large on-site publicly accessible open space that would front on First Avenue and extend to the eastern edge of the parcels.

Additional mandatory requirements of the special district relate to retail continuity along First Avenue, treatment of the eastern prolongations of East 39th and East 40th Streets as paved streets through the Waterside parcel, limits on the amount of accessory parking, and limits on building heights. While the CB6 Alternative would provide more First Avenue retail frontage on the 616 First Avenue, Waterside, and 708 First Avenue parcels, the proposed development program also would provide ground-floor retail along the First Avenue frontages of those sites. Similarly, the proposed development program would create pedestrian paths through the Waterside site along the prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets, although they would not have the physical form of 60-foot-wide paved streets.

Finally, the Special East River Zoning District includes an inclusionary housing floor area bonus and this alternative assumes a reasonable worst-case development scenario in which the residential development includes 685 low- to moderate-income units. Therefore, this alternative would result in a more economically diverse residential population than would the proposed development program.

Public Policy

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would not result, either directly or indirectly, in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts due to residential or business displacement, nor would this alternative adversely affect a specific industry.

The larger number of dwelling units provided by the CB6 Alternative would not result in socioeconomic impacts different from those expected to occur with the proposed development program. The alternative would include only 50 more dwelling units than the proposed development program, and would house an estimated 7,221 residents.¹ The unit count and population added to the study area by this alternative falls within the envelope of development previously analyzed in the FGEIS. Therefore, the findings in the FGEIS with respect to the potential impacts of the new population apply to the CB6 Alternative, as they also apply to the proposed development program.

The CB6 Alternative would provide approximately 685 low-to-moderate income dwelling units, and the remaining 3,531 units would be market-rate. The provision of 685 low-to-moderate income dwelling units under the CB6 Alternative would introduce a more economically diverse residential population compared to the proposed development program, which does not include an affordable housing component. However, neither the CB6 Alternative nor the proposed development program would introduce a population that is significantly different from the socioeconomic character of the study area's existing population. The study area already has a considerably higher median and mean income compared to Manhattan and New York City as a whole.

¹ As with the Affordable Housing Scenario under the Proposed Actions, for purposes of analysis the household size for the 3,531 market-rate units in this alternative is estimated to be 1.56 persons per unit, and the household size for the 685 low- to moderate-income units is an estimated 2.5 persons per unit.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not directly displace police, fire, public education, public day care, library, or health care facilities.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to fire protection and emergency services. All development would be constructed in accordance with applicable fire and safety codes, and in the future with this alternative FDNY would evaluate the need for personnel and equipment and make necessary adjustments to adequately serve the area. In addition, access to and from the study area's fire stations will not be directly affected by the CB6 Alternative, and FDNY response times are not expected to be significantly affected by the projected increases in traffic generated by this alternative. In addition, response times have decreased citywide and are expected to decrease further despite the increasingly congested traffic conditions.

Police Protection

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to police protection services. This alternative, like the proposed development program, would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a precinct house. While this alternative would contribute to congested conditions at many study area locations, NYPD vehicles when responding to emergencies are not bound by standard traffic controls. Therefore, NYPD vehicles would be able to access the development parcels and surrounding area as they do other areas throughout New York City, including the most congested areas of Midtown and Downtown Manhattan. In addition, response times have fluctuated annually since 2002, despite consistently congested traffic conditions. Therefore, incremental traffic volumes projected to occur with this alternative are not expected to significantly affect police response times. This alternative, like the proposed development program, could necessitate the assignment of additional personnel, resources, and equipment to the study area, but a commitment of resources would be based on demonstrated need and would not be made until a detailed development plan and operational statistics for the alternative, if realized, became available.

Public Schools

As under the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would result in a significant adverse impact on the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4. Based on the projected public school pupil ratios from Table 3C-2 in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the CB6 Alternative would generate an estimated <u>435</u> public elementary school students (<u>18</u> more students than generated by the proposed development program) and <u>91</u> public intermediate school students (<u>8</u> more than generated by the proposed development program). In addition, the CB6 Alternative would generate approximately <u>140</u> high school students (<u>15</u> more than generated by the proposed development program), but this number, which is below the CEQR threshold of 150 high schools students, would not result in an <u>potential</u> significant adverse impacts <u>requiring further</u> <u>analysis</u>.

In this alternative, as with the Proposed Actions, both the elementary and intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would experience a greater than 5 percent increase in the utilization rate as compared to No Action conditions. As shown in Table 24- $\underline{20}$, the projected $\underline{435}$ elementary school students introduced into Planning Zone 4 by this alternative would increase the total projected enrollment to $\underline{2,756}$, resulting in a utilization rate of $\underline{152}$ percent and a deficit of $\underline{943}$

seats. In comparison, the proposed development program would result in a utilization rate of <u>151</u> percent and a deficit of <u>925</u> seats. A significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the planning zone is expected to occur under both scenarios. In both this alternative and under the Proposed Actions, elementary schools in CSD 2 as a whole would operate with a shortfall of seats, <u>(2,361 and 2,343</u> seats, respectively). Under both this alternative and the Proposed Actions, the utilization rate of elementary schools in the CSD as a whole would be <u>113</u> percent. Neither scenario is expected to result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the CSD.

Table 24-202014 Future With the CB6 Alternative:Projected Enrollment in Public Schools

Planning Zone 4/ CSD 2	2014 Projected Enrollment	CB6 Alternative Program Students	Total Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (percent)
Elementary Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	2, <u>321</u>	43 <u>5</u>	2,7 <u>56</u>	<u>1,813</u>	<u>-943</u>	<u>152</u>
CSD 2 Totals	19,4 <u>62</u>	43 <u>5</u>	19,8 <u>97</u>	<u>17,536</u>	<u>-2,361</u>	<u>113</u>
Intermediate Schools						
Planning Zone 4 Totals	1,7 <u>87</u>	9 <u>1</u>	1,87 <u>9</u>	1,561	-31 <u>8</u>	120
CSD 2 Totals	10,48 <u>9</u>	9 <u>1</u>	10,5 <u>80</u>	10,672	9 <u>2</u>	99

With the CB6 Alternative, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 would experience overcrowding, as they would with the Proposed Actions. Intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 <u>under both</u> <u>scenarios</u> would operate at 120 percent utilization. The CB6 Alternative <u>would have a shortfall of</u> <u>318 intermediate school seats</u>. In comparison, intermediate schools in Planning Zone 4 under the Proposed Actions would operate with a shortfall of <u>309</u> seats. It is expected that both scenarios would result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in the planning zone. Under both this alternative and the Proposed Actions, intermediate schools in the CSD as a whole would operate at 99 percent. In the CSD, the CB6 Alternative would have a surplus of <u>92</u> intermediate seats and the Proposed Actions would have a surplus of <u>100</u> seats. Therefore, neither scenario would result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate school in CSD 2 as a whole.

The CB6 Alternative would generate only $\underline{3}$ more public school student than the Affordable Housing Scenario under the Proposed Actions ($\underline{2}$ more elementary school students and 1 additional intermediate school student). Therefore, the scale of the significant adverse school impacts would be the same as described under the Proposed Actions' Affordable Housing Scenario.

Potential measures to mitigate the significant adverse public school impact would be similar to those described for the Proposed Actions in Chapter 23, "Mitigation," and could include shifting the boundaries of school catchments areas, creating new satellite facilities in less crowded schools, and/or building new school facilities on-site or off-site. Similar to the Proposed Actions, if a school were provided at the 616 First Avenue parcel under this alternative, it would be operational by September 2012, resulting in a potential unmitigated significant adverse public school impact for approximately two school years (from the time the 685 First Avenue residential building is occupied until the school is available.)

Libraries

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not result in a significant adverse impact to local library services. With 4,216 housing units, this alternative would add an estimated 7,291 new residents to the study area, resulting in a population increase of approximately 4.8 percent over No Action conditions (0.4 percentage points more than the 4.4 percent increase under the Proposed Actions). Although this increase in population is nearly 5 percent, the threshold identified by CEQR as a potentially significant increase in this context, the population of the study area would continue to be well served by the large number of volumes in the study area libraries. In this alternative, the volumes-to-resident ratio would be 12.1 to 1, compared to 12.7 to 1 in the No Action condition and compared to 12.1 with the Proposed Actions. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts.

Outpatient Health Care Facilities

As with the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant adverse impact to outpatient health care facilities with the CB6 Alternative. The alternative would introduce an estimated 1,712 new low- to moderate-income residents to the study area, and based on the national average of 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income persons, this new population could add an estimated 671 annual visits to study area emergency rooms. In comparison, the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions could add an estimated 819 annual emergency room visits. Given the hundreds of thousands of such visits in the study area currently, the additional low- to moderate-income population under this alternative would generate a minimal change in demand over the No Action conditions.

Day Care Centers

Unlike the proposed development program, but similar to the Affordable Housing Scenario under the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative could result in significant adverse impacts to public day care centers. The CB6 Alternative would introduce approximately 685 new low- to moderate-income units to the study area, which would generate an estimated 82 children under the age of 12 potentially eligible for publicly funded day care, compared to none under the proposed development program and 100 children under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions. The additional 82 children potentially eligible for public day care could exacerbate the potential shortfall of available slots in the No Action condition, and there could be a shortage of up to <u>152</u> slots in publicly funded child care programs in the study area. Therefore, the CB6 Alternative would likely result in an increase in demand for publicly funded day care greater than 5 percent of the study area capacity Similar to the potential significant adverse impact identified under the Affordable Housing Scenario of the Proposed Actions, the could work with ACS to develop measures to provide additional capacity if needed when the project is completed. Absent the implementation of any needed mitigation measures, this alternative could have a significant adverse impact on day care facilities.

As described in Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," it is not likely that all of the children under the age of 12 that could be introduced to the area by the low- to moderate-income units in this alternative would make use of publicly funded day care facilities within the one-mile study area. Families in the study area could make use of private alternatives to publicly funded day care facilities or facilities outside the study area. As a city agency, ACS does not provide new day care facilities, although they are working to improve public/private partnerships to facilitate the development of new day care centers. In addition, ACS continually evaluates day care facility utilization and makes adjustments in capacity due to changes in demand. As discussed in Chapter 23, "Mitigation," the demand for day
care could be offset by increasing availability of family day care alternatives and vouchers for private group day care <u>and/or developing new public day care facilities.</u>

OPEN SPACE

Unlike the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative could result in significant adverse impacts to open space resources within the ¹/₄-mile and ¹/₂-mile study areas. The CB6 Alternative would generate an estimated 7,221 residents and 430 workers by 2014, and would include approximately 37,514 square feet (0.86 acres) of on-site publicly accessible open space. As described in the CB6 197-c application, the on-site open space would consist of approximately 3,831 square feet as part of a sidewalk widening at the 616 First Avenue parcel, and 33,683 square feet of on-site overlooks on the 700 and 708 First Avenue parcels. The overlooks would include lighting, paving, seating, and plantings. The portion of the on-site overlook between East 38th Street and the alignment of East 39th Street would include a ramp and stairs between the alignments of East 39th Atreet, while the overlook between the alignments of East 39th Atreets would include a ramp and stairs between the alignment of East 40th Street and East 41st Street would include a ramp and stairs between its northern edge and the south sidewalk of East 41st Street. The alternative's publicly accessible onsite open space would be 173,257 square feet (3.98) acres less than the 210,771 square feet (4.84 acres) of publicly accessible on-site open space anticipated under the Proposed Actions.

In addition to the 37,514 square feet of on-site open space, the CB6 Alternative includes approximately 129,822 square feet (2.98 acres) of publicly accessible off-site open space, consisting of: 104,016 square feet of open space on a deck over the FDR Drive (between East 38th and 41st Streets); 22,206 square feet of open space as part of an esplanade east of the FDR Drive (also between East 38th and 41st Streets); and a 3,600-square-foot pedestrian bridge spanning the eastern end of East 41st Street (between the 708 First Avenue parcel and Robert Moses Playground). The deck would be a landscaped pedestrian platform spanning the FDR Drive, approximately 120 feet wide, providing open space that is continuous with the adjacent on-site overlooks and pedestrian bridges. The esplanade would connect with Glick Park on its southern edge, and similar to Glick Park, would contain lighting, seating, and plantings.

In total, the CB6 Alternative includes 167,336 square feet (3.84 acres) of publicly accessible open space, of which only 37,514 square feet (0.86 acres) would be located on property controlled by the applicant. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that 50 percent of the space on the on-site overlook and off-site deck and esplanade would provide opportunity for active recreation, while the remaining space (including all of the sidewalk widening and the pedestrian bridge) would serve for passive recreation. Therefore, the analysis of the CB6 Alternative assumes that there are approximately 1.84 acres of open space allocated to active recreation and 2.0 acres of open space allocated to passive recreation. There is no private open space under the CB6 Alternative.

The deck over the FDR Drive as envisioned in the CB6 Alternative could not be constructed under existing conditions due to the presence of the FDR Drive's elevated northbound exit ramp to East 42nd Street. The future feasibility of a deck over the FDR Drive ultimately depends upon planning decisions related to the reconfiguration of the FDR Drive. NYSDOT has conducted preliminary studies of several alternative FDR Drive reconfiguration plans, only some of which would allow for a deck from the development parcels over the FDR Drive. It is therefore uncertain whether the deck over the FDR Drive as envisioned in this alternative would be constructed by 2014 or, in fact, ever built. It is also unclear whether the new esplanade space envisioned in the CB6 Alternative could be achieved

by 2014. Improvements to that property along the East River would require public approval for use of City-owned land, and could include State and Federal approvals due to the potential for construction-related impacts on the East River.

If the deck over the FDR Drive and the new esplanade are not developed by 2014, the CB6 Alternative would not achieve the 2.0 FAR bonus that would be available under the provisions of the alternative's special district. Therefore, for purposes of analysis the alternative's potential effects on open space resources are evaluated under two scenarios: 1) a scenario in which the deck over the FDR Drive and esplanade are not constructed by 2014, and the 616 First Avenue, Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels are built out at 8.0 FAR; and 2) a scenario in which both the deck and esplanade are constructed by 2014, allowing for the alternative's 10 FAR program. Both scenarios include the provision of the 3,600-square-foot pedestrian bridge spanning East 41st Street; while this pedestrian bridge would also require City approvals, it is reasonable to assume that it could be constructed by 2014.

Build Scenario Without the Deck and Esplanade

Under this scenario (in which the deck over the FDR Drive and the new esplanade are not developed by 2014) the CB6 Alternative would result in significant adverse open space impacts. As shown in Table 24-19, within the ¹/₄-mile study area the worker open space ratio would improve over No Action conditions by almost 5 percent, compared to a nearly 26 percent increase with the Proposed Actions. Under this alternative the combined worker and residential open space ratio within the ¹/₄-mile study area would decline by almost 3 percent, compared to a 24.5 percent improvement to the combined ratio under the Proposed Actions. Given already low combined worker and residential open space ratio, the reduction in the ratio under this alternative could be considered a significant adverse impact on open space resources within the ¹/₄-mile study area.

Within the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area, the CB6 Alternative under this scenario would reduce open space ratios by up to 5.4 percent, with the exception of the combined worker and residential ratio, which would increase by approximately 0.3 percent (see Table 24-<u>21</u>). The reductions in open space ratios within the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area would be a significant adverse impact under this alternative, whereas the Proposed Actions would significantly improve all open space ratios within the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile study area. Mitigation for the significant adverse open space impacts under this alternative could include the provision of new public open space elsewhere in the study area of a type needed to serve the needs of the added population, and/or improvement of existing open spaces in the study area to increase their utility, safety, and capacity to meet identified needs in the study area.

 Table 24-<u>21</u>

 Comparison of Open Space Impacts: CB6 Alternative and

 Proposed Development Program (Without Deck and Esplanade)

Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	CB6 Alternative Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to CB6 Alternative	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program
1/4-1	Mile Study Area			
Passive Open Space, Workers Only	0.207	0.218	4.9	26.0
Passive Open Space, Combined Workers and Residents	0.116	0.113	<u>-3.0</u>	<u>24.5</u>
1/2*	-Mile Study Area			
Total Open Space Ratio, Residents Only	0.339	0.32 <u>4</u>	-4.5	9.8
Active Open Space, Residents Only	<u>0.076</u>	0.07 <u>5</u>	<u>-1.2</u>	6.4
Passive Open Space, Residents Only	0.263	0.2 <u>49</u>	-5.4	10.8
Passive Open Space, Combined Residents and Workers	0.064	0.065	0. <u>3</u>	15. <u>5</u>

Build Scenario With the Deck and Esplanade

If both the deck over the FDR Drive and the esplanade were to be developed by 2014, the alternative would be similar to the Proposed Actions in that it would improve all open space ratios within the study areas, and no significant adverse open space impacts would result. As shown in Table 24-<u>22</u>, the improvements to the open space ratios would generally be smaller than those anticipated under the Proposed Actions. Similar to the Proposed Actions, the open space envisioned under the CB6 Alternative, if realized, would offer substantial new open spaces in excess of one acre, which are lacking in the primary and secondary study areas. In addition, while both the Proposed Actions and this alternative would provide new views of the East River, under this alternative a deck over the FDR Drive, if realized, would also provide pedestrian access from the development parcels to the East River Esplanade, and the esplanade itself would be improved with a new segment north of Glick Park.

Table 24-<u>22</u>

() In Deen und Esplandae) und Freposed Development Fregram							
Population	No Action Condition Open Space Ratio	CB6 Alternative Open Space Ratio	Percent Change: No Action to CB6 Alternative	Percent Change: No Action to Proposed Development Program			
	¼-Mile S	tudy Area					
Passive Open Space, Workers Only	0.207	<u>0.256</u>	23. <u>2</u>	<u>26.0</u>			
Passive Open Space, Combined Workers and Residents	0.116	<u>0.130</u>	12.3	<u>24.5</u>			
	½-Mile Study Area						
Total Open Space Ratio, Residents Only	<u>0.339</u>	<u>0.357</u>	<u>5.2</u>	9.8			
Active Open Space, Residents Only	0.076	0.092	21.2	6.4			
Passive Open Space, Residents Only	<u>0.263</u>	0.264	<u>0.5</u>	10.8			
Passive Open Space, Combined Residents and Workers	0.064	0.069	<u>7.8</u>	15. <u>5</u>			

Comparison of Open Space Impacts: CB6 Alternative (With Deck and Esplanade) and Proposed Development Program

SHADOWS

As compared to the proposed development program, this alternative, which would have shorter buildings, would not result in the significant adverse shadow impacts on the Tudor City open spaces on the December analysis day. However, this alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would result in a significant adverse impact on the Manhattan Place Plaza on the December analysis day that could only be partially mitigated. See Figures 24-54 through 24-65 for the incremental shadows of the CB6 Alternative compared to those of the Proposed Actions.

The buildings on the 685 and 708 First Avenue parcels would cast shadows on the Tudor City open spaces on the December analysis day, but these shadows would be smaller in area and of shorter duration than those of the Proposed Actions, and would not be expected to cause a significant adverse impact. The building on the 708 First Avenue parcel would cast incremental shadow on the southern Tudor City open spaces in December from the start of the analysis day until 10:00 AM. This incremental shadow would move across the northern Tudor City open spaces from 10:00 AM to 10:45 AM. Shadow from the building on the 685 First Avenue parcel would enter the southern open spaces at 11:30 AM and the northern open spaces at 12:00 PM, and exit both at around 1:15 PM (see Figures 24-63 to 24-65). Under the CB6 Alternative in December, incremental shadow would remove all remaining sunlight from the Tudor City open



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative March 21 - 9:45 AM EDT _G Figure 24 - 54



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative March 21 - 11:00 AM EDT G Figure 24 - 55



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative March 21 - 3:45 PM EDT G Figure 24 - 56



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative May 6 - 9:45 AM EDT G Figure 24 - 57



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative May 6 - 1:00 PM EDT Figure 24 - 58



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative May 6 - 4:30 PM EDT NG Figure 24 - 59



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative June 21 - 11:00 AM EDT _{IG} Figure 24 - 60



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative June 21 - 1:00 PM EDT G Figure 24 - 61



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative June 21 - 3:30 PM EDT Figure 24 - 62



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative December 21 - 11:15 AM EST Figure 24 - 63



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative December 21 - 12:45 PM EST _G Figure 24 - 64



Shadows: Community Board 6 Alternative December 21 - 1:30 PM EST G Figure 24 - 65 spaces for only a 15 minute period at about 10:15 AM; whereas under the Proposed Actions, incremental shadow would remove remaining sunlight from the Tudor City open spaces for a substantial portion of the December analysis day. Therefore, the CB6 alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, would not cause a significant adverse shadow impact on the Tudor City open spaces. During the other three analysis days, this alternative would not cast incremental shadow on the Tudor City open spaces.

Also on the December analysis day, incremental shadow from the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel would enter Manhattan Place Plaza at 9:00 AM and cover large portions of it from 10:30 AM until the end of the analysis day. Under the CB6 Alternative, the plaza would be nearly or completely shaded by a combination of existing and incremental shadow from 11:30 AM until the end of the day, and this would constitute a significant adverse impact as under the Proposed Actions. There would be no significant adverse shadow impact to the Manhattan Place Plaza on the March, May and June analysis days as under the Proposed Actions. On the March analysis day, shadow from the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel would enter the western edge of the plaza at 11:30 AM, as existing shadow from the Manhattan Place building shrinks toward the northern edge. Between 12:45 PM and 1:15 PM the incremental shadow would cover virtually the entire plaza. For the rest of the March 21 analysis day, afternoon incremental shadow would cover portions of the plaza, leaving other portions in sunlight. In May and June this plaza would get incremental shadow from mid-day to late afternoon but the coverage area would be small.

On the March, May and June analysis days, St. Vartan Park would experience incremental shadow from the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel from early morning to around midday, similarly to the Proposed Actions; but due to the shorter height of the building, the shadow's coverage area would be smaller than under the Proposed Actions. Incremental shadow under this alternative would extend across more than half of the park at its greatest extent in March (at around 9:45 AM; see Figure 24-54) and would cover less than half of the park in May and June. In December only a very small portion of the park would get incremental shadow, which would exit at 10:00 AM. As under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant adverse shadow impact to St. Vartan Park.

For the most part, on the March, May and June analysis days, the buildings on the 708 and 685 First Avenue parcels would cast less incremental shadow on Robert Moses Playground during mid-day and early afternoon than would the proposed development program, and approximately the same amount of incremental shadow in the mid and late afternoon. In December incremental shadow would be virtually the same. As under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant adverse shadow impact on Robert Moses Playground.

Incremental shadow from the 616 First Avenue building would enter Glick Esplanade approximately an hour later in the afternoon during the spring, summer and fall than would be the case under the Proposed Actions. Under the CB6 Alternative, incremental shadow on the Corinthian Plaza, Trygve Lie Plaza, Ralph J. Bunche Park, Rivergate, and U.N. Park would range from slightly less to substantially less throughout the year as compared to under the Proposed Actions. Under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant adverse shadow impacts to these open spaces.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on historic resources. This alternative would require the same construction protection plans as

required by the Proposed Actions to avoid inadvertent construction-related impacts on Windsor Tower and the former Kips Bay Brewery. Effects on northward views along First Avenue of Windsor Tower and the United Nations Secretariat Building would be the same with this alternative as with the development program under the Proposed Actions. Built to the property lines on First Avenue, the building on the 708 First Avenue parcel (which has a 290-foot-tall tower on First Avenue and a second 400-foot-tall tower to the east) would block northward views of the Secretariat, and the 492-foot-tall building on the 685 First Avenue parcel would partially block northward views of Windsor Tower (see Figure 24-53).

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The CB6 Alternative would develop the four development parcels with residential buildings that have large footprints, are built out to the property lines, and are massed with two towers set above a mid-rise base. Except for the building on the 685 First Avenue parcel that would be 492 feet tall, each of the buildings would be shorter than 400 feet. A small amount of publicly accessible open space would be provided on the development parcels; the majority of new open space would be located on a deck over the FDR Drive. In comparison, all of the buildings in the proposed development program would be taller than 400 feet: the two residential buildings on the 616 First Avenue parcel would 433 and 506 feet tall; the three residential buildings on the Waterside parcel would be 705, 650, and 606 feet tall; the office building on the 708 First Avenue parcel would be 688 feet tall; and the residential building on the 685 First Avenue parcel would be 721 feet tall. The substantially taller height of the buildings in the proposed development program is a response to their smaller footprints that permit these more slender buildings to be distributed across the development parcels. The buildings on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would be set around a major open space, and they would be set back five feet from First Avenue to create widened landscaped sidewalks.

Urban Design

Like the Proposed Actions, it is not expected that the CB6 Alternative would have significant adverse impacts on the urban design of the study area.

Street Pattern, Block Shapes, and Street Hierarchy. Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would maintain the existing street pattern, block shapes, and street hierarchy of the study area and would not have significant adverse impacts on those urban design features. By treating the eastern prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets as 60-foot-wide paved roadways, the CB6 Alternative would reference the original block and street pattern between First Avenue and the FDR Drive and East 38th and 41st Streets. The Proposed Actions would also reference that original block and street pattern by providing view corridors along the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets as they would under the alternative.

Building Arrangements. Building arrangements in the CB6 Alternative would be different from the building arrangement of the proposed development program, but this alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not have a significant adverse impact on this urban design feature. Whereas the seven freestanding buildings of the proposed development program would be set back from most of the adjacent streets and set within plazas and open spaces, the five buildings constructed in the CB6 Alternative would have large footprints and would be built to the property lines, except the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel, which would set back from East 36th Street to create a widened sidewalk. This arrangement of buildings with tower-on-abase forms would not allow for much on-site open space; the only on-site open space would be

the overlook on the east edge of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels. Under this alternative, the building on the 616 First Avenue parcel would have a lot coverage of 93 percent, the three buildings on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels would have an overall lot coverage of 70 percent, and the building on the 685 First Avenue parcel would have a lot coverage of 100 percent. In comparison, the buildings of the proposed development program would have a lot coverage of 50 percent on the 616 First Avenue parcel, 30 percent on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels.

Building Bulk, Use, and Type. Building use and type would be largely similar under the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions. Both would develop the parcels with high-rise residential buildings with ground-floor retail. Under the Proposed Actions, development would also include a large commercial office building and a low-rise community facility structure, but those building uses and types would be in keeping with the mixed-use study area. Building bulk would differ between the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions.

Total development on each parcel under the CB6 Alternative would be less than under the Proposed Actions. Although the lot coverage on each parcel would be greater, the buildings constructed under this alternative would be shorter than those of the proposed development program. On the east side of First Avenue, the three residential buildings constructed under this alternative would have large footprints measuring approximately 300 feet by 190 feet, but they would all be no taller than 400 feet. The building on the 685 First Avenue parcel would have a footprint of 196 feet by 208 feet. These footprints would be larger than those of the residential buildings in the proposed development program (which range from 157 feet by 60 feet to 168 feet by 84) and similar in size to the footprints of the larger structures in the study area—the Corinthian has a 200-foot by 300-foot footprint and the Rivergate has a footprint measuring 200 feet by 250 feet-and to the office building that would be constructed under the Proposed Actions, which would have a footprint of 320 feet by 130 feet. Since the buildings in this alternative would each have a large floorplate and a mid-rise base with two towers above, they would appear shorter but bulkier to the pedestrian than the more slender, but taller buildings in the proposed development program (see Figures 24-48 through 24-53 for illustrative bulk envelope renderings of the CB6 Alternative and Figures 8-25, 8-26, and 8-30 through 8-33 in Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources" for comparative illustrative views of the proposed development program). As seen from the East River and Queens waterfront, these buildings, which would have their long sides placed parallel to the waterfront, would present a more regular arrangement of tall buildings along the Manhattan waterfront than would the buildings constructed under the Proposed Actions (see Figure 24-47 and Figure 8-20 in Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources"). Overall, neither the CB6 Alternative nor the Proposed Actions would have significant adverse impacts related to building use, bulk, height, setbacks, and density, because each would be in keeping with the urban design of the study area, which is characterized by a mix of predominately mid- to high-rise residential and commercial buildings that exhibit a wide array of massing and bulk.

Streetscape. The CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions would have similar effects on the study area streetscape and neither would have significant adverse impacts on this urban design feature. Both the alternative and the proposed development program would enliven the streetscape by providing ground-floor retail along First Avenue. This alternative would provide more retail frontage on each parcel, while the proposed development program would mix ground-floor retail with publicly accessible open spaces. The proposed development program would include widened and landscaped sidewalks along the east side of First Avenue, while the only widened sidewalk that would be included in this alternative would be on the south side of

East 36th Street between First Avenue and the FDR Drive service road. In addition, the CB6 Alternative, unlike the Proposed Actions, would not provide any publicly accessible open space that fronts on First Avenue. Since all of the open space provided under this alternative would be provided on the eastern edge of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels, on a deck over the FDR Drive, and on a continuation of the waterfront esplanade, these open spaces would not improve the streetscape of First Avenue. Other elements of this alternative—the street-like treatments of the prolongations of East 39th and 40th Streets and the placement of curb cuts—would affect the streetscape similarly to comparable elements of the proposed development program.

Visual Resources

Like the Proposed Actions, it is not expected that the CB6 Alternative would have significant adverse impacts on the visual resources of the study area. Neither this alternative nor the Proposed Actions would block any significant view corridors or views of visual resources, limit access to any resource, change the study area's urban design features so that a visual resource is no longer dominant in the area, or change the study area's urban design features so that the context of a visual resource is adversely affected.

Constructed on existing blocks, neither this alternative nor the Proposed Actions would block views along the First Avenue and East 35th, 36th, 38th, and 41st Street view corridors that border the development parcels. In addition, both would create new 60-foot-wide view corridors through the Waterside parcel along the alignments of East 39th and 40th Streets (see Figures 24-48 and 8-25). These view corridors would create new views toward the East River. However, the proposed development program would provide more expansive views through the Waterside parcel from First Avenue, because much of the site would be developed with a large open space. In comparison, the East 39th and 40th Street view corridors in the alternative would be framed with buildings that fill most of the site. Both the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions would create publicly accessible open space along the eastern edge of the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels that would provide new views to the East River, but this alternative, if realized, would bring viewers across the FDR Drive on a landscaped deck to a new waterfront esplanade.

Neither the CB6 Alternative nor the Proposed Actions would adversely affect the Secretariat building, which is a visual resource. Under both the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions, development on the 708 First Avenue parcel would block some northerly views toward the Secretariat building from locations on First Avenue between East 39th and 41st Streets, but that similarly obstructed view would not be a significant adverse impact as other, better views of the Secretariat would remain available within the study area. With the exception of the building on the 685 First Avenue parcel, all of the structures that would be developed under this alternative would be shorter than 400 feet in deference to the height of the Secretariat building. In comparison, the proposed development program contains buildings that are taller than the visual resource. However, as described in Chapter 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the tall buildings of the proposed development program would not change the study area's context so that the Secretariat is no longer dominant in the area or change the area's urban design features so that the resource's context is adversely altered.

Overall, both the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions would redevelop the development parcels with tall buildings that would add new features to the skyline as seen from within the Manhattan portion of the ¹/₂-mile urban design study area and from Gantry Plaza State Park in

Queens. Further, neither would block significant view corridors or views of visual resources and both would create new views to the East River.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not have a significant adverse neighborhood character impact. Effects on land use, historic resources, and noise-environmental areas that partly compose an area's neighborhood character—would be largely the same with the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions. Although this alternative would not include office use as part of the development program, the commercial office use in the proposed development program is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. The CB6 alternative would generate less traffic and pedestrian volume in the study area and fewer significant adverse impacts, but it would still result in significant adverse impacts, and those that would result from the Proposed Actions would not create significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. The greatest differences in neighborhood character changes under the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions would be to the study area's socioeconomic condition and urban design character. In terms of socioeconomic conditions, this alternative, which would include low- to moderate-income housing, would result in a more economically diverse residential population. In terms of urban design, the CB6 Alternative would create a high-rise residential development of tower-on-a-base buildings with waterfront open space, while the Proposed Actions would create a high-rise mixed-use development of slender towers set back from the adjacent streets within plazas and open spaces. The CB6 alternative would develop the four parcels with shorter but bulkier buildings and little on-site open space, with the majority of open space under the alternative located on a deck over the FDR Drive and in an extension of the East River Esplanade. Both the alternative and the proposed development program would include a substantial amount of publicly accessible open space, but the alternative would locate most of it off-site and to the east of the development parcels. In comparison, the Proposed Actions would include a large open space on the Waterside parcel that fronts on First Avenue and extends to the eastern edge of the site. There would be no connections to the waterfront created under the Proposed Actions, though the potential for future connections would exist. While changes to the study area's neighborhood character would be different under the CB6 Alternative and the Proposed Actions, there would not be a significant adverse neighborhood character impact under either.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Neither the Proposed Actions nor the CB6 Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on terrestrial resources or endangered, threatened, or special concern species. However, unlike the Proposed Actions, the potential for this alternative to result in significant adverse impacts to floodplains and wetlands, aquatic resources, and water quality cannot be ruled out due to the alternative's inclusion of esplanade improvements along the East River.

Under this alternative, the area along the East River currently used by Con Edison for parking would be converted to a public esplanade. This improvement would likely require structural rehabilitation of the existing platform to support the new uses (i.e., landscaping, seating, and paved pedestrian pathways). Rehabilitation of the existing structure would likely require inwater work—strengthening the existing piles or constructing new ones—and this in turn would result in potential impacts to natural resources. These potential impacts would be evaluated through the preparation of wetland, water quality, and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) analyses. These analyses, along with any mitigation measures that are required to compensate for

project-related impacts, would be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and NYSDEC, in support of the water quality and wetland permits and certifications that would be required for project approval.

As with development under the Proposed Actions, implementation of erosion and sediment control measures and stormwater management measures as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction and operation of this alternative would minimize potential impacts to the combined sewer system, as well as potential water quality impacts to the East River associated with stormwater runoff.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Similar to the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result due to on-site activities under the CB6 Alternative. The development parcels would be fully remediated prior to development, as they would be prior to construction of the proposed development program. As under the Proposed Actions, site management plans for each parcel would be prepared for NYSDEC approval; these plans would include requirements for handling any soil and groundwater disturbed during construction, requirements for capping materials, stormwater pollution prevention plans, and health and safety plans. The NYSDEC-approved Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan (to protect workers and the public) would be in effect during all construction activities involving subsurface disturbance. In addition, a restrictive declaration for this alternative would be recorded with NYCDEP, as under the Proposed Actions. These measures would ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts on public health, workers' safety, or the environment as a result of potential hazardous materials exposed by or encountered during construction of the CB6 Alternative.

As part of an old industrial waterfront, the area proposed as an esplanade along the East River waterfront (between East 38th and 41st Streets) has the potential to host hazardous materials. While the extent of potential contamination is unknown, it is reasonable to assume that environmental conditions identified at the site would be remediated prior to initiating operation of the esplanade and providing public access to the area. Potential impacts during construction and development activities would be avoided by implementing the health and safety plan and site management plan mentioned above. Such plans would insure that the construction workers, the surrounding community, and the environment are not adversely affected by environmental conditions exposed by or encountered during the construction activities. With the proposed measures in place, the health and safety of construction workers and the public would be protected from potential adverse environmental conditions identified in the area.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply

Based on the generation rates presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the CB6 Alternative would generate an estimated demand of about 1.22 million gallons per day (gpd) of water for consumption and air cooling purposes. This demand would be approximately 258,000 gpd less than would be generated by the proposed development program under the Proposed Actions, due primarily to the absence of commercial office space under this alternative. The 1.22 million gpd demand would represent approximately 0.10 percent (compared to 0.12 percent under the Proposed Actions) of the 1.2 billion gpd of water consumed in New York City, or 0.29 percent (compared to 0.35 percent under the Proposed Actions) of the 420 million gpd consumed in Manhattan. As a result, it is not expected that this added demand, like the demand under the

Proposed Actions, would overburden the city's water supply or the local conveyance system, and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated. Like the proposed development program, this alternative would also comply with the water conservation measures of the city as mandated by Local Law 29 of 1989.

Wastewater

Conservatively assuming that all water consumed at the development parcels in this alternative, other than that used for air conditioning, enters the sewer system, the CB6 Alternative would generate an estimated 826,739 gpd of sewage, which would be 86,880 gpd less than the estimated sewage generated by the proposed development program. This amount of wastewater would represent approximately 0.27 percent (compared to 0.30 percent under the Proposed Actions) of the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant's permitted capacity and, like the Proposed Actions, is not expected to adversely affect the plant's capacity or treatment efficiency. Likewise, this alternative is not expected to overburden the local or interceptor conveyance systems.

Stormwater

Like the proposed development program, this alternative is expected to use the existing combined sewers to discharge stormwater into the East River, and flows from the development parcels would be conveyed through new pipes to the existing sewers. No new outfalls are expected to be built as part of the CB6 Alternative.

With this alternative, increases in stormwater flows would be minimal compared to the flows in the East River. As under the Proposed Actions, the stormwater flows from the CB6 Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality within the East River.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

With no commercial office component, the CB6 Alternative would generate less solid waste than would be generated under the Proposed Actions and, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste handling and disposal methods or recycling in the City.

Overall, this alternative would generate solid waste at a rate of approximately 96 tons per week (38 tons less than the 134 tons per week generated by the proposed development program). Of this amount, about 85 tons per week would be handled by DSNY, which is only 1 ton less than under the Proposed Actions, while private carters would handle about 10.5 tons per week, which is less than the 48 tons under the Proposed Actions. The 96 tons generated by this alternative represents a relatively small increase in New York City's waste stream. Given that a truck can haul about 10 tons of solid waste, this alternative would require approximately 10 truck trips per week, 3 less than would be required by the proposed development program. As under the Proposed Actions, the City's solid waste handling and disposal systems are expected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional municipal waste generated by the CB6 Alternative. In addition, this alternative, like the proposed development program, would comply with the City's recycling program.

ENERGY

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would not cause a significant adverse energy impact, as it would result in a similar increase in energy consumption. This alternative would generate a demand of approximately 600,547 million BTUs per year, compared to 733,241 million BTUs per year for the proposed development program. The buildings constructed under

this alternative, like those that would be constructed under the Proposed Actions, would comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Construction Code.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Traffic

A comparison of the volume of vehicular traffic that would be generated under the Proposed Actions and the CB6 Alternative is presented in Table 24-23.

		$1 \text{ abit } 2 \text{$			
2014 Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison—CB6 Alterna					
Peak Hour	Proposed Actions	CB6 Alternative			
AM In	858	243			
AM Out	636	422			
AM Total	1,494	665			
Midday In	<u>381</u>	216			
Midday Out	<u>391</u>	216			
Midday Total	772	432			
PM In	522	395			
PM Out	834	275			
PM Total	1,356	670			
Sat MD In	580	448			
Sat MD Out	517	407			
Sat MD Total	1,097	855			

		1 able 24- <u>23</u>		
2014 Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison—CB6 Alternativ				
Peak Hour	Proposed Actions	CB6 Alternative		

The CB6 Alternative would generate vehicular traffic volumes that would be less than the Proposed Actions in all time periods-about 50 percent lower in the weekday, AM, midday, and PM peak hours, and about 20 percent lower in the Saturday midday peak hour.

Even with lower traffic volumes under the CB6 Alternative, as compared to the Proposed Actions, there would be a similar number of significant adverse impacts during the weekday peak hours, and the same number of significant impacts under the CB6 Alternative as compared to the Proposed Actions in the Saturday midday peak hour. Table 24-24 presents a comparison of the number of significant impacts during each peak period for the Primary Study Area and the two Secondary Study Areas-the Queensboro Bridge traffic study area and the West Side traffic study area. Figures 24-66 through 24-71 illustrate the impacts at all analysis locations in each of the study areas.

Overall, the total number of locations that would be significantly impacted under the CB6 Alternative would decrease in the AM peak hour by 10, by five in the midday peak hour, and by 11 in the PM peak hour, while remaining the same in the Saturday midday peak hour compared to the Proposed Actions.

Within the Primary Study Area in the AM peak hour, the total number of significantly impacted locations under the CB6 Alternative would be 10 less than under the Proposed Actions. In the midday peak hour, there would be two fewer significant impacts, and in the PM peak hour there would be <u>nine</u> fewer significant impacts, as compared to the Proposed Actions. During the Saturday midday peak hour, there would be the same number of significant impacts as the Proposed Actions.





Primary Traffic Study Area Midday Peak Hour Figure 24-67





FIRST AVENUE PROPERTIES REZONING

Primary Traffic Study Area Saturday Midday Peak Hour Figure 24-69



- Unmitigated Impact
- + Unsignalized Intersection

Traffic Mitigation Overview: CB6 Alternative Queensboro Bridge Secondary Study Area Figure 24-70



- Mitigated Impact
- Partially Mitigated Impact
- Unmitigated Impact
- + Unsignalized Intersection

Traffic Mitigation Overview: CB6 Alternative West Side Secondary Study Area Figure 24-71

Comparison of CB6 Alternative vs. Proposed Actions							
Peak Hour	Number of Analyzed Intersections	Proposed Actions Intersections with Significant Impacts	CB6 Alternative Intersections with Significant Impacts				
	Number of Signalized (& Unsignalized) Intersections						
	Prim	ary Study Area					
AM	61 (6)	<u>40</u> (3)	<u>30</u> (3)				
Midday	61 (6)	<u>20</u> (1)	<u>18</u> (1)				
PM	61 (6)	<u>40 (3)</u>	<u>32</u> (2)				
Saturday MD	61 (6)	<u>13</u> (1)	<u>13</u> (1)				
	Queensboro B	Bridge Traffic Study Area					
AM	12 (1)	5	<u>5</u>				
Midday	13	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>				
PM	13	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>				
Saturday MD	13	2	2				
	West Side	e Traffic Study Area					
AM	8	<u>Z</u>	<u>Z</u>				
Midday	8	7	7				
PM	8	8	<u>8</u>				
Saturday MD	8	6	6				
Total—All Manhattan Study Areas							
AM	81 (7)	<u>52</u> (3)	42 (3)				
Midday	82 (6)	<u>34</u> (1)	<u>29</u> (1)				
PM	82 (6)	<u>54 (3)</u>	<u>44</u> (2)				
Saturday MD	82 (6)	21 (1)	21 (1)				

Table 24-24Number of Intersections with Significant Traffic ImpactsComparison of CB6 Alternative vs. Proposed Actions

Within the Queensboro Bridge traffic study area during the AM and <u>Saturday midday</u> peak hours, there would be <u>the same number of significant impacts</u> under the CB6 Alternative <u>compared to</u> the Proposed Actions. During the midday peak <u>hour</u> in the Queensboro Bridge study area, <u>there would be three fewer</u> significant <u>impacts</u>. In the PM peak hour, there would be <u>two fewer significant impacts in the Queensboro Bridge traffic study area under the CB6</u> <u>Alternative when compared to the proposed project</u>. In the West Side study area, the same number of significant impacts would occur <u>during all peak hours</u>. Impacts at these locations can be mitigated via the same types of traffic capacity improvements described in Chapter 23, "Mitigation."

Under the CB6 Alternative, there would be <u>13</u> unmitigated impacts in the AM peak hour, <u>seven</u> unmitigated impacts in the midday peak hour, <u>nine</u> unmitigated impacts in the PM peak hour, and <u>five</u> unmitigated <u>impacts</u> during the Saturday midday peak hour, compared to <u>17</u> unmitigated impacts in the AM, <u>nine</u> in the midday, and <u>14</u> in the PM peak hours, and <u>four</u> unmitigated impacts in the Saturday midday peak hour under the Proposed Actions.

Parking

Unlike the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative does not include any public parking spaces. The amount of off-street accessory parking that would be provided under the CB6 Alternative, which would be less than under the Proposed Actions, would be sufficient to accommodate the weekday peak hour parking demands of the alternative, but not the total overnight demand for spaces. The CB6 Alternative would provide 78 accessory parking spaces at 616 First Avenue, 85

accessory spaces at 685 First Avenue, and 263 accessory spaces at Waterside and 708 First Avenue. At 4,216 dwelling units and an average auto ownership of one auto per four dwelling units, the CB6 Alternative would need to provide 1,054 parking spaces to satisfy overnight parking demands. There would be a shortfall of 628 spaces, which could be accommodated within one-quarter mile of the site according to off-street parking projections contained in Chapter 13, "Traffic and Parking" (1,500 to 1,800 spaces would be unoccupied after 6 PM and before 8 AM on a typical weekday). Daytime parking occupancy on site would range from about 80 percent occupied in the PM to about 5 to 25 percent in the midday.

FDR Drive Analysis

No significant traffic impacts would result under the CB6 Alternative in the AM, midday, PM, or Saturday midday peak hours, <u>compared to one significant impact in the PM peak hour under</u> <u>the proposed project</u>. Construction of this alternative would include decking over the FDR Drive between East 38th and 41st Streets to provide 2.39 acres of open space. Decking over the FDR Drive would cause increased difficulties in managing traffic on the FDR Drive during the construction period and would also necessitate reconfiguration of the roadway (i.e., shortening the length of the northbound exit ramp "flyover" to 42nd Street). Depending on maintenance and protection of traffic plans that would be developed by NYSDOT for this major reconstruction, it is possible that temporary traffic diversions onto the local street networks would occur. In the event that this alternative is selected, a separate environmental review would be deck over the FDR Drive.

Portals Analysis for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and Queensboro Bridge

The following analyses discuss weekday peak hour conditions for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel and the Queensboro Bridge under the CB6 Alternative. Because weekday peak hours would be considered the critical conditions for these facilities, analyses were not done for Saturday conditions.

Queens-Midtown Tunnel. Under the CB6 Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes at the Queens-Midtown Tunnel would be less than volumes under the Proposed Actions. There would be two significantly impacted movements under the CB6 Alternative, as compared to <u>three</u> significant impacts under the Proposed Actions. The two significant impacts would occur during the AM <u>and PM</u> peak <u>hours</u> for the outbound direction. The AM peak hour inbound direction, which would be significantly impacted under the Proposed Actions, would not be significantly impacted under the CB6 Alternative.

Queensboro Bridge. Under the CB6 Alternative, <u>weekday</u> traffic volumes at the Queensboro Bridge would be less than the Proposed Actions. Just as under the Proposed Actions, there would be no significant impacts under the CB6 Alternative.

Queens Plaza Area. The volume of traffic generated by the CB6 Alternative through intersections on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge would be lower than for the Proposed Actions in the weekday AM<u>, midday</u>, and PM peak hours, and generally comparable to the Proposed Actions in the Saturday midday peak hour, as shown in Table 24-<u>25</u>.

	vs. the Proposed Actions in the Queens Plaza Area							
	CB6CB6PropoAlternativeAlternativeProposedActioTrips toTrips toActions TripsTripsQueensManhattanto QueensManhat							
Weekday AM Peak Hour	<u>67</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>145</u>				
Weekday Midday Peak Hour	38	38	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>				
Weekday PM Peak Hour	<u>45</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>79</u>				
Saturday Midday Peak hour	<u>69</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>74</u>				

Table 24-25Vehicle Trips Generated by the CB6 Alternativevs. the Proposed Actions in the Queens Plaza Area

Even with the reduced volumes generated by the CB6 Alternative, it can be expected that this alternative—due to existing and No Build congestion in this area—would still generate significant traffic impacts on the Queens side of the Queensboro Bridge for which standard traffic improvements would not be sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts. A comprehensive area-wide traffic improvement plan would be needed, as described for the Proposed Actions as well.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would result in significant adverse bus and pedestrian impacts. However, it would not result in the significant adverse impacts to the PL9 subway stairway at Grand Central Terminal or the M16/M34 bus route that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

Subways

The CB6 Alternative would generate 76 percent fewer subway trips in the AM peak hour and 64 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hour as compared to the Proposed Actions. Because it would generate substantially less subway trips, it would not result in the significant adverse impact on the PL9 stairway in the AM and PM peak periods that would occur with the Proposed Actions.

Buses

The CB6 Alternative would generate 75 and 45 percent fewer bus trips in the AM and PM peak hours than would be generated with the Proposed Actions. Although the CB6 Alternative may increase demand for service on the M16/M34 route, the additional riders would likely not result in the overcrowding of buses and, unlike under the Proposed Actions, a significant adverse impact would not occur. The M42 route, however, will be at capacity in the No Action condition; therefore the projected increase in ridership under the CB6 Alternative would result, like under the Proposed Actions, in a significant adverse impact on the M42 bus route. Like with the Proposed Actions, the impact on the M42 bus route under this alternative could be mitigated with additional service.

Pedestrian Circulation

Compared to the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would generate substantially fewer pedestrian trips than the Proposed Actions in the AM, midday, and PM peak hours. As described in Chapter 16, "Transit and Pedestrians," the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse crosswalk impacts at East 42nd Street and Lexington Avenue <u>and</u> East 42nd Street and Third Avenue. <u>As shown in Table 24-26, the CB6 Alternative would not result in significant</u>

adverse pedestrian impacts, but it would increase congestion at locations with substandard operations in the No Build condition.

<u>2014 CB6 A</u>	<u>lternative</u>	Cross	walk l	<u>Level o</u>	<u>f Serv</u>	<u>ice Analysis</u>	
	<u>Crosswalk</u>	walk <u>AM</u>		Midday		<u>PM</u>	
<u>Location</u>	<u>Width</u> <u>(ft.)</u>	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS	<u>SFP</u>	LOS
Lexington Avenue at E.	20.6	<u>14.0</u>	E				
42nd Street	<u>12.2</u>						
	<u>20.5</u>						
	<u>17.8</u>						
Third Avenue at E. 42nd	<u>19.6</u>	<u>5.9</u>	E				
<u>Street</u>	<u>16.9</u>						
	<u>22.0</u>						
	14.1						
Note: SFP = square feet pe	er pedestriar	; *denot	es signi	ficant ad	verse in	npact	

			<u>1 a D</u>	<u>ie 24-20</u>
2014 CB6 Alter	rnative Crossy	valk Level of	Service A	Analysis

Table 24.26

AIR QUALITY

Mobile Sources and Parking Facilities

There would be no significant adverse air quality impacts from mobile sources or parking facilities under the Proposed Actions, and since project-generated traffic for this alternative would be lower at all the receptor locations and parking facilities, predicted air quality impacts would be lower than with the Proposed Actions. Therefore, like with the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse impacts would be expected with the CB6 Alternative.

Deck Over the FDR Drive. The CB6 Alternative would construct a deck over the FDR Drive between East 38th and 41st Streets, which would function as an open space. This deck would potentially lead to an increase in concentrations of CO and PM, mainly in areas immediately adjacent to the portals (if the deck is enclosed in the form of a tunnel) or alongside the deck if it is open towards the water. Since this alternative would also build a pedestrian esplanade alongside the deck near the water, these increases would occur at sensitive locations. Such construction may necessitate mechanical ventilation or venting upward through the deck. However, these venting measures would involve substantial additional project costs. In the event that this alternative is selected, a separate environmental review would be required in which a detailed analysis of the effects of the deck over the FDR Drive on air quality would occur.

Industrial Sources

Since the industrial source screening is performed based on the site boundary (not specific building locations), the analysis performed for the Proposed Actions would be the same for any other scenario on the same site. Based on the results of the industrial screening for the sites, industrial sources would not have a significant adverse impact on air quality at the development parcels.

Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Systems (HVAC)

Generally, the CB6 Alternative consists of two towers-on-a-base design on each parcel, where one of the towers is much higher than the other. Other than at 685 First Avenue, the taller tower would

not front on First Avenue. If these buildings were to each have a single central HVAC system, the exhaust would vent from a stack on the taller building, and since most of the buildings are of similar design they would be identical in height and would not cause air quality impacts on each other. However if each building were to have its own HVAC system, the taller building would potentially be impacted by the shorter building on the same development parcel. In addition, the tower on the 685 First Avenue parcel would be much taller than the buildings across First Avenue on the Waterside and 708 First Avenue parcels and, therefore, would potentially be impacted by the building on the 708 First Avenue parcel, should the systems of those two buildings run on fuel oil.

A screening analysis was performed to assess air quality impacts associated with emissions from the CB6 Alternative HVAC systems. The methodology described in the *CEQR Technical Manual* was used for the analysis, which considered impacts on sensitive uses (see Chapter 17, Air Quality," for a description of the methodology). The analysis used the building height information described in this chapter.

Each of the development parcels was evaluated to assess impacts on existing buildings and on the other development parcels (i.e., project-on-project impacts). In addition, other proposed residential developments (i.e., No Build developments) were reviewed for analysis as potential receptor sites. The analysis was performed assuming both natural gas and No. 4 fuel oil as the HVAC systems' fuel types. The primary pollutant of concern when burning natural gas is nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and when burning oil, sulfur dioxide (SO_2).

As shown in Table 24-<u>27</u>, the initial *CEQR Technical Manual* screening method was undertaken for all sites assuming No. 4 and No. 2 fuel oil and natural gas as the type of fuel to be used in the HVAC systems. In all cases, the HVAC stack was assumed to be placed at the edge of the roof closest to the nearest building. The screening analysis determined that at most of the development parcels, utilizing either fuel would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts. However, for certain receptor sites, potential significant adverse air quality impacts were identified, as shown in the table.

Table 24-<u>27</u> CB6 Alternative - HVAC Analysis Results

			Scrooning Analysis			AFRMOD Analysis		
Source	Nearest Receptor	Distance (ft)	No. 4 Fuel Oil	No. 2 Fuel Oil	Natural Gas	No. 4 Fuel	No. 2 Fuel	Natural Gas
685 First Avenue	Existing Building	349	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	_	_
616 Tower 1	616 Tower 2	77	Fail	Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail	Pass
616 First Avenue (combined)	Existing Building	375	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	_	_
Waterside 1, Tower 1	Waterside 1, Tower 2	66	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail	Pass
	Waterside 2, Tower 1	100	Fail	Pass	Pass	Fail	_	_
Waterside 1 (combined)	685 First Avenue	279	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	—	—
Waterside 2, Tower 1	708 Tower 1	94	Fail	Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail	Pass
	Waterside 2, Tower 2	111	Fail	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail	Pass
Waterside 2 (combined)	685 First Avenue	286	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	_	_
708 Tower 1	708 Tower 2	144	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	_	—
708 First Avenue (combined)	685 First Avenue	333	Pass	Pass	Pass	_	_	_

The screening analysis determined that the distance to the nearest receptor of a similar or greater height was less than the allowable distance using No. 4 fuel oil, and in some cases using No. 2 fuel oil or even natural gas as the fuel type, for 616 First Avenue, Tower 1; Waterside 1, Tower 1; and Waterside 2, Tower 1. Therefore, for these sites, a refined air quality analysis was

undertaken utilizing the EPA AERMOD dispersion model. As shown in Table 24-24, the AERMOD analysis determined that each of the proposed development parcels would still result in a potential exceedance of the NAAQS when using No. 4 or No. 2 fuel oil, while the use of natural gas would result in predicted concentrations below the NAAQS.

Various other options exist that would avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts, including the use of utility steam heat for 616 First Avenue, Tower 1; Waterside 1, Tower 1; and Waterside 2, Tower 1, and/or installing higher stacks or boosting the exhaust on these buildings so as to ensure that the plume would clear the height of neighboring buildings. In addition, potential adverse impacts would be avoided from 616 First Avenue, Waterside 1, and Waterside 2 by requiring all HVAC systems for these development parcels to be placed on the taller tower on the same parcel.

Queens Midtown Tunnel Ventilation Building

Based on the analysis of the predicted dispersion of exhaust from the Queens Midtown Tunnel ventilation system, the maximum predicted 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration from the tunnel ventilation on the façade of the building at 708 First Avenue would be $2.2 \ \mu g/m^3$. Since 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from the tunnel ventilation exceeding $2.0 \ \mu g/m^3$ could occur at this location on a small area (i.e., a few windows at most) only once per year, if at all, this would not be a significant adverse impact on air quality.

NOISE

Like under the Proposed Actions, traffic generated by the CB6 Alternative would not result in significant adverse noise impacts. However, similar to the Proposed Actions, buildings constructed under the CB6 Alternative would require double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation sufficient to provide between 30 and 40 dBA of attenuation (with the higher value required at facades of buildings facing heavily trafficked roadways such as the FDR Drive and First Avenue) to avoid high interior noise levels that would be considered significant adverse noise impacts. A mechanism, such as <u>an</u> E designation, requiring specific attenuation values (as described in Chapter 18, "Noise") would be needed on each of the development parcels.

Under this alternative, noise levels within the new on-site overlook, the open space on the deck, and the esplanade would exceed the noise level for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet as contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines. These high predicted noise levels would result principally from the noise generated by traffic on the nearby streets and roadways, and there are no practical and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce noise levels below the guideline. However, the noise levels in the new open spaces would be comparable to noise levels in other open space areas that are also located adjacent to heavily trafficked roadways, and the relatively low noise level guideline is typically not achieved in parks and open space areas in New York City. Consequently, noise levels in the open spaces, would not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

In addition, it is expected that the mechanical systems for the buildings developed under this alternative would be located principally at rooftops and would be designed, as would the proposed development program's mechanical systems, to avoid producing levels that would exceed the allowable noise levels specified in the City of New York Noise Codes, and would be designed to avoid causing any significant adverse noise impacts.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Like the Proposed Actions, the CB6 Alternative would conform to the policies of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program. Like the Proposed Actions, this alternative would further the goal of encouraging residential development within an appropriate coastal zone area, enliven this stretch of land near the waterfront through the creation of publicly accessible open space and ground-floor retail along First Avenue, and incorporate new, publicly accessible open spaces and access routes on the development parcels that would enhance views of the East River.

The CB6 Alternative, however, would go further in implementing the policies of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program by constructing a deck over the FDR Drive that would provide pedestrian access to a new extension of the East River Esplanade between East 38th and 41st Streets. The deck and esplanade would provide waterfront access. However, it should be noted that there are no assurances that the deck and esplanade could be constructed. In addition, the proposed development program could provide new access points to the East River esplanade depending on the location of future public walkways.

CONSTRUCTION

Although the CB6 Alternative would result in a residential development that is less dense than the proposed development program, the potential for significant adverse construction-related traffic and noise impacts would still exist. Specifically, there would be traffic impacts at local intersections. With respect to noise, impacts would be largely the same as those of the proposed project and significant adverse impacts would still occur at adjacent residential buildings. As under the Proposed Actions, construction protection plans for Windsor Tower and the former Kips Bay Brewery would be required to protect those resources from inadvertent construction damage. In the event that this alternative is selected, a separate environmental review would be required in which a detailed analysis of potential impacts of constructing the deck over the FDR Drive would occur. It is expected that construction of the deck would require a traffic management plan. The CB6 Alternative, like the proposed development program, would implement an emissions reduction program that would substantially reduce PM emissions so that there would not be a significant adverse impact from PM_{2.5} due to construction of this alternative, if realized. Since economic benefits attributable to construction expenditures and construction jobs are a direct function of the cost of construction, the smaller CB6 Alternative would have lesser economic benefits during construction, as compared to the Proposed Actions.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The CB6 Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, would not result in significant adverse public health impacts related to noise or hazardous materials. As under the Proposed Actions, the operation of this alternative's boilers could potentially exceed the $PM_{2.5}$ interim guidance threshold levels. As described above, design and operational options exist that would avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts. However, in the event that this alternative would result in significant adverse air quality impacts and the incorporation of mitigation measures does not yield a program that would successfully reduce the extent, duration, and magnitude of impacts to an insignificant level, then an unmitigated significant adverse impact to public health could occur, unlike under the Proposed Actions.
FUTURE CONDITIONS WITH THE UNDC PROJECT

As in the Proposed Actions' future conditions with the UNDC project, construction of the 950,000-square-foot UNDC building on the block north of the 708 First Avenue parcel would not alter the findings above for the CB6 Alternative related to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; shadows; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; natural resources; hazardous materials; infrastructure (water supply, wastewater, and stormwater); solid waste and sanitation services; energy; noise; parking; air quality (mobile and industrial sources); waterfront revitalization program; construction; and public health.

Similar to the Proposed Actions' future conditions with the UNDC project, the UNDC building would reinforce the area's mixed-use character, and the CB6 Alternative would continue to be compatible with the land uses, densities, and existing zoning regulations in the area. The UNDC project would add a 500-foot-tall building to the study area that would be taller than the buildings of the CB6 Alternative. The UNDC building would block some northward views of the Secretariat building along First Avenue that would otherwise have been blocked by the buildings of this alternative.

In respect to open space, if the UNDC project were part of the background condition and did not provide replacement open space for the loss of Robert Moses Playground, open space ratios would be less than in the future without the UNDC building as a background project. If the deck is constructed under the CB6 Alternative, both active and passive open space ratios would improve with the alternative as they would under the Proposed Actions, whether or not the UNDC project included mitigation for its open space impacts. If the deck is not constructed under the CB6 Alternative, the significant adverse open space impacts that would occur with the alternative would be more pronounced if the UNDC project did not include mitigation for its open space impacts. In terms of transit and pedestrians, the CB6 Alternative could result in new significant adverse transit impacts from the cumulative increases in transit and pedestrian trips if the UNDC project were to be constructed. More detailed discussions of air quality (HVAC) and traffic are located below.

AIR QUALITY (STATIONARY SOURCES)

Stationary source impacts associated with the proposed UNDC project were analyzed for its potential effects on air quality on the CB6 Alternative. Due to the tower heights of the building on the 708 First Avenue development parcel, an analysis was performed using the HVAC screening methodology in the *CEQR Technical Manual* to assess potential impacts on the UNDC project. The results determined that emissions from fossil fuel-fired HVAC systems associated from 708 First Avenue would have the potential for significant adverse air quality impacts at elevated air intake locations on the UNDC building whether fuel oil or natural gas is used. Therefore, a refined air quality analysis was conducted using the AERMOD model, which predicted that the 708 First Avenue development parcel would still result in a potential exceedance of the NAAQS when using No. 4 or No. 2 fuel oil, while the use of natural gas would result in predicted concentrations below the NAAQS.

TRAFFIC

Quantitative traffic analyses for the CB6 Alternative were not performed with the UNDC project, but a comparison of traffic volumes and impacts relative to the Proposed Actions was conducted in the Draft SEIS. The Draft SEIS Proposed Actions' future conditions with the

UNDC project conclude that significant adverse impacts would occur at 65 intersections in the three Manhattan study areas in the AM peak hour compared to 64 intersections without the UNDC project, 30 intersections in the midday peak hour compared to 28 intersections without the UNDC project, 57 intersections in the PM peak hour with or without the UNDC project, and 22 intersections in the Saturday midday peak hour with or without the UNDC project out of 88 study intersections. Therefore, since peak hour traffic volumes generated by the CB6 Alternative would be lower than generated by the Proposed Actions, the same or fewer increases in the number of additional significant impacts—and the same or less stringent mitigation measures required to mitigate them—would result under CB6 Alternative conditions with the UNDC project, according to the Draft SEIS.