



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Amanda M. Burden, FAICP, *Director*
Department of City Planning

April 10, 2009

**NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF
THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Fordham University Lincoln Center Master Plan

Project Identification

CEQR No. 05DCP020M
ULURP Nos. C 050260 ZSM, C 050269 ZSM
C 050271 ZSM, C 090173 ZSM
N 090170 ZRM, N 090171 ZAM
N 090172 ZAM

SEQRA Classification: Type I

Lead Agency

City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street, Room 1W
New York, New York 10007

Contact Person

Robert Dobruskin, AICP, Director (212) 720-3423
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). A public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was held on Wednesday, March 4th, 2009. Comments were requested on the DEIS and were received and considered by the Lead Agency until Monday, March 16th, 2009. This FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS and additional analysis conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS. The proposed action is classified as a SEQRA Type I action.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Fordham University has developed a Master Plan to provide about 2.35 million square feet of additional gross floor area at its Lincoln Center campus on the Upper West Side of Manhattan. The campus occupies a

Robert Dobruskin, AICP, *Director*
James P. Merani, RA, *Deputy Director*
22 Reade Street, New York, N.Y. 10007-1216 Room 4E , (212) 720-3420
FAX (212) 720-3495
rdobrus@planning.nyc.gov

superblock bounded by Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues and West 60th and West 62nd Streets immediately south of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. The proposed campus development would include 1,607,460 gross square feet of additional academic and dormitory space. The Master Plan would also provide for about 736,504 gross square feet of new residential space (in two buildings on the northwest and southwest corners of the superblock to be built by private developers). In addition, accessory parking totaling approximately 470 spaces would be provided in below-grade parking garages. Entrances to the parking garages would be on West 61st and West 62nd Streets, while service entries for Fordham would be on West 60th, West 61st, and West 62nd Streets. Development is expected to occur in two phases with Phase I complete by 2014 and Phase II (full development) complete by 2032. Table S-1 shows the maximum floor areas and the potential uses by site under an Illustrative Plan.

**Table S-1
 Illustrative Plan and Maximum Floor Areas and Proposed Uses by Site**

Site(s)	Illustrative Plan Floor Area (zsf)	Maximum Floor Area by Site (zsf) ¹	Proposed Uses
Phase I			
3 and 3a	456,158 total, of which: 291,184 residential 164,974 community facility	477,605 total, of which: 291,184 residential 186,421 community facility	Academic, Dormitory and Residential
4	409,889	409,889	Residential
5 and 5a	396,649	428,380	Academic, Dormitory
Phase II			
1	270,582	292,229	Academic and Dormitory
2	483,886	522,597	Academic and Dormitory
6	244,917	282,120	Academic and Dormitory
7	113,011	122,051	Academic
Note: ¹ zsf=zoning square feet; In no case would the sum of the floor areas of all sites exceed the total permitted floor area for the zoning lot.			

While the proposed development would be as-of-right with regard to use and floor area, it would require special permits from the City Planning Commission (CPC) pursuant to Zoning Resolution (ZR) Section 82-33 to waive height, setback, and minimum distance between buildings, courts, and minimum distance between legally required windows and walls and/or lot lines; special permits from the CPC pursuant to ZR Section 13-561 and ZR Section 82-50 to permit accessory parking garages for community facility and residential uses within the Special Lincoln Square District. Fordham is also requesting a text change in the provisions of ZR Section 82-50 that would clarify the intention of the ZR regarding curb cuts on wide streets for off-street loading berths and would therefore facilitate the authorizations to be obtained pursuant to ZR Section 13-553 for all curb cuts on wide streets accessing loading berths. Authorizations are sought (i) to permit a curb cut on a wide street for the two parking garages sharing one entrance on West 62nd Street, and (ii) pursuant to the amended ZR Section 82-50(b) to permit a curb cut for a loading berth on a wide street (West 62nd Street) within the Special Lincoln Square District. Since development of the garage beneath Site 3 could be delayed by the city's Third Water Tunnel project, an extension of the period normally allowed for the automatic lapse of the special permit for accessory parking is also being requested.

Fordham is also seeking approval by DASNY for the authorization of the expenditure of proceeds from the State of New York Personal Income Tax Revenue Bond (Education Resolution) program. The bond proceeds will be used to finance the development of the academic buildings in the Master Plan.

Approval of the proposed actions is subject to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR).

PROJECT SITE

Fordham's Lincoln Center campus measures 302,048 square feet and is occupied by three buildings and a one-story connecting podium. The existing buildings are the Law School, the Leon Lowenstein Center (Lowenstein Center), and McMahan Hall. The Lowenstein Center houses the Graduate Schools of Business Administration, Social Service, and Education, as well as the Manhattan branch of Fordham College. McMahan Hall is a dormitory for graduate and undergraduate students. Together, these buildings have a total of 791,075 square feet of zoning floor area.

Fordham shares its superblock with a 36-story apartment building (The Alfred Condominium) and a public parking garage. Uses on the blocks surrounding the Fordham campus include the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts on the north; the Amsterdam Houses, a large public housing project, and P.S. 191, to the west; John Jay College, the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, and a mixed-use tower to the south; and residential towers along Columbus Avenue to the east.

BACKGROUND HISTORY

The institution that would become Fordham University was founded by Archbishop John Hughes in 1841 and entrusted to the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) in 1846. It was incorporated by an act of the New York State Legislature as St. John's College, Fordham, on April 10, 1846, and became Fordham University in 1907. In 1968, Fordham's governance structure became a non-sectarian board dominated by laypeople. Fordham's central mission is "to offer the men and women who attend it an education of quality in the Jesuit tradition of intellectual excellence, moral values, religious concerns, the humanistic component in every academic discipline, and active engagement in the contemporary world."

Fordham was involved in the planning process for the Lincoln Square Urban Renewal Plan (LSURP). Originally approved on November 6, 1957, the LSURP was amended on five occasions (most recently on December 21, 1989) and expired on November 25, 1997. The 1989 amendment was in contemplation of Fordham's intended disposition of Lot 35 to a private developer for the construction of a building in excess of 40 stories. The amendment authorized residential use of Lot 35. Due to market conditions, the private developer elected not to go forward with the project and the disposition never occurred.

On December 24, 1957 a disposition agreement was executed transferring the entire campus superblock, with the exception of Lot 30 (then a school site, now The Alfred), to Fordham. The disposition agreement subjected Fordham to restrictions on use and development drawn from the LSURP. However, those restrictions expired on January 27, 2006, and are no longer in force.

In addition to its Lincoln Center campus, Fordham has its main Rose Hill campus in the Bronx, as well as a leased facility in Harrison, NY, and a biological field station in Armonk, NY.

Since the Scoping Meeting in September 2007, Fordham has refined various elements of the Master Plan. These refinements have altered the landscaped interim public plaza on Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street, the two entrance stairways to the campus (one from Columbus Avenue and one from West 62nd Street), the heights and setbacks of buildings along both Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street, and the opening of the streetwall between two sites on West 62nd Street. Further, the proposed locations of the

envelopes for the Law School and the Library sites were modified to set back above the level of the ground floor from the side lot line that Fordham shares with The Alfred.

Additional modifications to the proposed action are under consideration by CPC. These changes would reduce bulk with smaller maximum building envelopes and lower building heights for most of the buildings expected to be built under the proposed Master Plan. There would be less floor area, fewer parking spaces by the removal of a garage, and certain other design changes. These modifications are described and analyzed below in “Modifications to the Proposed Action.”

PURPOSE AND NEED

EXISTING CAMPUS AND OPERATIONS

The three existing buildings on campus are connected by a one-story podium, which occupies much of the center of the superblock. In addition to providing internal circulation, the podium houses the campus libraries, a fine arts complex, bookstore, activities space, a University theater and design shops, and some mechanical infrastructure.

The main entrance to the campus is at the southeast corner near the intersection of Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street. There is a vehicular entrance mid-block on Columbus Avenue leading to a 35-car parking lot and loading facilities. A second vehicular entrance is located approximately 275 feet east of Amsterdam Avenue on West 60th Street; this entrance leads to loading docks.

A landscaped plaza with lawn, seating, lighting, and monumental sculptures sits atop the podium. Pedestrian access to the plaza is provided by a stair and elevator near the corner of Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street and by a stair on the mid-block of West 62nd Street. This open space is made available for public use from 10 AM to 6 PM daily. There is a smaller landscaped garden on the campus west of the stair from West 62nd street to the podium. In addition, there are several tennis courts and a basketball court at the southwest corner of the campus.

As Table S-2 shows, the 2006 enrollment on the Lincoln Center campus totaled 7,962 students with 4,503 full-time, and 3,459 part-time. The largest schools were Fordham College, with 1,755 students and the Law School with 1,639 students. There are a total of 1,273 members of the faculty and staff.

Table S-2

Fordham University Lincoln Center Campus: Student, Faculty, and Staff Populations

	2006 Enrollment:			Phase One Anticipated Growth:				Full Development Anticipated Growth:			
	Full Time	Part Time	Total	Full Time	Part Time	Total	+/- from 2006	Full Time	Part Time	Total	+/- from 2006
Law School	1,244	395	1,639	1,350	350	1,700	61	1,350	350	1,700	61
Graduate School of Business Administration (GBA)	563	849	1,412	558	862	1,420	8	600	1,500	2,100	688
Graduate School of Social Services (GSS)	740	454	1,194	706	464	1,170	-24	725	505	1,230	36
Graduate School of Education (GED)	167	1,002	1,169	163	1,118	1,281	112	235	1,565	1,800	631
Fordham College Lincoln Center (FCLC)	1,731	24	1,755	3,178	20	3,198	1,443	3,101	20	3,121	1,366
Fordham College of Liberal Studies (FCLS)	58	416	474	55	366	421	-53	50	700	750	276
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences (GSAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	125	200	200
Other ¹	0	319	319	0	319	319	0	0	319	319	0
Total Student Population:	4,503	3,459	7,962	6,010	3,499	9,509	1,547	6,136	5,084	11,220	3,258
Faculty and Staff:	720	553	1,273	962	560	1,521	248	982	813	1,795	522

Campus Total Population:	5,223	4,012	9,235	6,972	4,059	11,030	1,795	7,118	5,897	13,015	3,780
Note:	¹ Includes non-matriculated students in several programs.										
Source:	Fordham University										

NEED FOR EXPANSION

The proposed Fordham University Lincoln Center Master Plan is designed to accommodate both the existing activities on the Lincoln Center campus (which are not adequately housed in existing buildings) and the anticipated expansion of the University’s programs over the next 25 years. The Master Plan creates an opportunity for Fordham to meet the increasing needs of New Yorkers who wish to take advantage of the University’s educational programs, while simultaneously accommodating Fordham’s students from across the country and around the globe.

All of the schools housed on the Lincoln Center campus have grown substantially since the construction of their existing facilities. The campus buildings were initially intended to serve approximately 3,500 students. Even after an expansion of the Law School building in 1984, the total campus design capacity was approximately 4,000 students. In 2006, 7,962 students were enrolled in Fordham’s Lincoln Center programs. Whether to accommodate the increased number of students or to provide space that meets current academic standards, all of the schools on this campus require additional space. These needs have pushed some administrative functions as well as some academic functions off campus; Fordham now rents over 150,000 square feet nearby in Manhattan to house administrative and academic space, and graduate housing.

The proposed expansion would accommodate a growth in Fordham’s student enrollment from 7,962 to 11,220, and a growth in its faculty and staff from 1,273 to 1,795. Furthermore, the University wishes to expand the opportunities for students to live on the Lincoln Center campus and would seek to approximately triple the number of dormitory beds on campus.

NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

Approval of the proposed action would allow Fordham to develop a Master Plan for its Lincoln Center campus that is consistent with both the objectives of the Special Lincoln Square District and the urban design context of the existing campus and surrounding area.

The proposed Master Plan would provide additional academic and dormitory space, respond to the needs of its individual schools, and meet the needs of its student body in a rational, planned manner. The overarching goals of the Master Plan are as follows:

- To enhance Fordham University’s identity at its Lincoln Center campus;
- To create a complementary family of campus buildings;
- To create a grand, iconic entrance for Fordham’s Lincoln Center campus on Columbus Avenue;
- To ultimately provide each individual school with a recognizable physical identity, while acknowledging that many campus buildings may initially be required to serve multiple uses or user groups;
- To orient academic uses toward Columbus Avenue, and to orient the private residential uses toward Amsterdam Avenue to the extent possible;
- To create a design that responds to the contextual elements of the surrounding area, including the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and the two major avenues to the east and west of the campus;

- To create a memorable central open space at the level of the existing plaza that is available for use by the public and maintains adequate security;
- To increase efficiency by creating a comprehensive service system beneath the plaza level that includes access from the streets rather than the avenues; and
- To arrange campus floor area in a manner that preserves the feel and the character of a university campus.

PROPOSED MASTER PLAN

PROGRAM

The proposed Master Plan would allow Fordham to expand the academic and dormitory floor area on its Lincoln Center campus from 827,706 gross square feet (gsf) to 3,171,775 gsf. The overall floor area for academic uses would increase from 545,199 gsf to 1,646,421 gsf (see Table S-3.) This expansion would allow Fordham to accommodate the schools and educational programs listed in Table S-2 and create a new student center, central plaza and large campus entrances on Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street. The dormitory floor area on campus would increase from 282,507 gsf to 788,850 gsf, which would raise the number of beds from 850 to approximately 2,300. The addition of these beds would nearly triple the number of students who would live on the Lincoln Center campus and would not need to commute to class. In addition, the Master Plan would increase Fordham’s accessory parking from 35 spaces to 265 spaces.

Table S-3

Fordham University Lincoln Center Master Comparison Table

	Existing Floor Area	No Action		Phase I		Full Development		
		Proposed Floor Area	Change from Existing	Proposed Floor Area	Change from No Action	Proposed Floor Area	Change from Phase I	Change from No Action
FLOOR AREA:¹								
Academic	545,199	545,199	0	927,866	382,667	1,646,421	718,555	1,101,222
Dormitory	282,507	282,507	0	493,377	210,870	788,850	295,473	506,343
Residential	0	736,504	736,504	736,504	0	736,504	0	0
Total (Exc. Pkg.)	827,706	1,564,210	736,504	2,157,747	593,537	3,171,775	1,014,028	1,607,460
DORMITORY BEDS:	Beds	Beds		Beds		Beds		
	850	850	0	1,545	695	2,300	755	1,450
PARKING SPACES:	Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces		Parking Spaces		Parking Spaces		
Fordham Accessory	35	35	0	155	120	265	110	230
North Residential	0	0	0	68	68	68	0	68
South Residential	0	0	0	137	137	137	0	137
East Residential	0	0	0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Total	35	35	0	360	325	470	110	435
RESIDENTIAL UNITS:²	Units	Units		Units		Units		
North Residential	0	273		512		512		
South Residential	0	237		364		364		
East Residential ³	0	366		N.A.		N.A.		
Total Units	0	876		876		876		

Notes:

¹ All floor areas listed in gross square feet (gsf). Calculations based on Site 3/3a Option 1.

² Based on approximately 800 zsf per unit. Total residential development is the same in all conditions.

³ No Action condition only.

The proposed Master Plan calls for Fordham to lease or otherwise convey portions of its Lincoln Center campus for the development of two private residential apartment buildings. The funds derived from these transactions would create an endowment for the construction of buildings for Fordham's academic program. Under the Master Plan, the residential buildings would be developed along Amsterdam Avenue, at the corners of West 60th and West 62nd Streets. The building at the West 60th Street would include below-grade accessory parking for 137 cars, while the building at West 62nd Street would include below-grade accessory parking for 68 cars.

SITE PLAN

The proposed Master Plan adheres to the overarching goals identified above. It would create a wide, iconic entrance to the campus along Columbus Avenue. A 60-foot-wide space leading to the upper-level central campus would be flanked by two buildings to the north and south, and would contain stairways, planted areas, and landscaping.

To the north and west would be the graduate Schools of Business and Social Services along Columbus Avenue, and the Graduate School of Education along West 62nd Street. Active uses at the ground-floor street level may include the University Art Gallery, a café, and the University Bookstore. These buildings would also include dormitory space above.

The Law School would occupy the midblock along West 62nd Street. This building would also contain dormitory space. Active ground-floor uses may include a café, student dining area, the entrance to a new University theater, and the Assembly/Moot Court. Along 62nd Street, there would be a 77-foot space between the buildings of the Law School and the Graduate School of Education. This space would include a second stairway entrance to the campus that would be centered on the north/south walkway of Lincoln Center that lies between Damrosch Park and the David H. Koch New York State Theater. The stairway would include landscaping, as well as seating.

South of the Law School, a new building at the center of the campus (Site 7) would contain expansion space for the Quinn Library and may include a new University theater. This building would overlook the new campus central plaza, which would be reconfigured to complement the new buildings.

A residential apartment building would face Amsterdam Avenue at the corner of West 62nd Street (Site 4). The southwest portion of the superblock fronting Amsterdam Avenue would be built in one of two possible configurations: with a stand-alone dormitory at West 61st Street (Site 3a) and a stand-alone residential building at West 60th Street (Site 3), or with a single building combining the residential program, dormitory, and new student center (Sites 3 and 3a).

While no new buildings would be constructed on the West 60th Street frontage, a new entry as well as new windows would be created to enliven the existing blank street wall at the Lowenstein Center.

MAXIMUM AND ILLUSTRATIVE BUILDING HEIGHTS

If all of the building sites encompassed by the Master Plan were developed to the maximum building envelope designated for each, the resulting development would exceed the maximum total floor area permitted on the zoning lot; thus, the envelopes depicted do not represent the intended condition of the completed campus as a whole. The Master Plan also contemplates that the build-out would comply with the bulk-packing rules in effect in the Special Lincoln Square District, requiring 60 percent of the permitted floor area on the zoning lot to be located below 150 feet in height. The bulk-packing and floor area constraints

mean that some of the buildings contemplated by the Plan would be smaller than the maximum envelopes shown. An illustrative design show one possible variation on the distribution of the allowable floor area satisfying both constraints. These illustrations more accurately reflect what full development of the campus would look like under the Master Plan than does the aggregation of the approved building envelopes. In any case, development on each individual site cannot exceed the maximum floor area shown in Table S-1, and the total new development on the project site cannot exceed 2,375,093 zsf.

The tallest academic buildings would front Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues, rather than the midblocks of West 60th and West 62nd Streets. The two buildings on Columbus Avenue would frame the main entrance to the campus, which would be in line with the termination of West 61st Street. The building south of the main entrance (Site 2) would be 34 stories¹ (approximately 439 feet Illustrative, 470 feet maximum). The building north of the main entrance (Site 1) would be 27 stories (approximately 354 feet Illustrative, 382 feet maximum). The residential building at the corner of Amsterdam Avenue and West 62nd Street (Site 4) would be 55 stories (approximately 651 feet Illustrative and 661 feet maximum). The sites on Amsterdam Avenue between West 60th and West 61st Streets would be developed with one of two options: a single 52-story building (approximately 600 feet Illustrative and maximum) with dormitory and student center uses at the lower floors and residential condominiums in the tower above; or a 22-story (approximately 278 feet Illustrative, 293 feet maximum) student center and dormitory at the corner of West 61st Street (Site 3a), and a 50-story (approximately 558 feet Illustrative, 573 feet maximum) residential building at the corner of West 60th Street (Site 3), and a 10-story wing between the two towers (Site 3a).

The midblock buildings on West 62nd Street would be shorter than those on Columbus or Amsterdam Avenues. Nearest Columbus Avenue on West 62nd Street (Site 6) would be a 20-story (approximately 274 feet Illustrative, 342 feet maximum) dormitory and academic building. To its west, Sites 5 and 5a would include the Law School building and dormitories. This would include both a tower component and a lower base. The tower would be 22 stories tall (approximately 300 feet Illustrative, 319 feet maximum) and the base would be 9 stories tall (approximately 147 feet Illustrative and 155 feet maximum). South of the Law School, towards the center of the superblock (Site 7), would include a nine-story (approximately 133 feet Illustrative, 161.5 feet maximum) building containing the Quinn Library expansion, shared academic space, and potentially space for the University Theater. This structure and its four-story east wing would be in line with the grand campus entrance from Columbus Avenue, and would overlook the academic quadrangle.

ENTRANCES AND GROUND-LEVEL ACTIVITY

The main entry to the campus plaza would be the wide, iconic stairway on Columbus Avenue at the termination of West 61st Street. The buildings fronting Columbus Avenue on either side of the stairway would have additional ground-level entrances. A second wide stairway would rise to the plaza from West 62nd Street and be aligned with the north-south walkway on the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts campus to the north.

All new buildings on Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues would have transparent street walls as required by the Special Lincoln Square District and be programmed with active uses to enliven the streetscape. Though not required, this design principle would be applied to the frontage of the academic buildings on West 62nd Street, which would be constructed with windows overlooking the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and Damrosch Park. In addition, new windows and entrances would be added to the current blank façade of

¹ Numbers of stories for all buildings in this paragraph derived from Illustrative Plan.

Lowenstein Center on West 60th Street. The residential building at Amsterdam Avenue and West 62nd Street is expected to have its pedestrian entry on West 62nd Street. The residential/dormitory development at Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street would likely have its dormitory entrance on Amsterdam Avenue, and its residential entrance on West 60th Street. The existing pedestrian entrance to McMahan Hall and the existing campus service entrance would remain in their current locations on West 60th Street.

PARKING AND LOADING

Fordham also proposes an expansion of the accessory parking provided on the campus by the creation of three new accessory parking garages. The first parking facility, Garage A, would be located under Site 4 and would contain 68 parking spaces to serve the residents of the new residential building to be constructed on Site 4. Garage B, containing 265 parking spaces, would replace and expand the parking now located along the campus's Columbus Avenue frontage and would serve the Fordham's faculty and administration. Both Garages A and B would be accessed through a single curb cut on West 62nd Street, leading to a split ramp accessing each garage independently. Construction of Garage B would occur in two phases. In the first phase, 155 spaces would be provided under Site 5, with the balance to be added upon completion of the final building on the campus on Site 6, after demolition of the Law School building. Parking Garage C, to be located under Sites 3 and 3a for the benefit of the residents of the residential building on Site 3, would provide 137 attended parking spaces. The garage would be accessed from a new curb cut on the south side of West 61st Street.

A new service entrance accessing three additional loading docks for the campus would be located on West 62nd Street, at least 163 feet east of the intersection of West 62nd Street and Amsterdam Avenue. A new loading dock with one berth to service the new dormitory on the Amsterdam Avenue side of the campus would be added adjacent to the entrance to Garage B.

PHASE I

The initial phase of construction would create a new Law School, new dormitory space, and approximately 155 accessory parking spaces for the University's use. At the same time, private development of a new residential condominium with a maximum of 512 dwelling units² and 68 accessory parking spaces would proceed at West 62nd Street and Amsterdam Avenue. The remainder of the initial phase of construction would commence upon the city's completion of the access shaft for the Third Water Tunnel on West 60th Street and would result in additional dormitory space, a student center, and the second private residential development, which would contain a maximum of 364 dwelling units¹ and 137 accessory parking spaces.

Because of the central location of the existing Law School building and the Law School's immediate need for space, it is a key element of the initial development of the Master Plan. An additional dormitory is also an immediate need. The funding provided through the development of the two residential buildings dictates that their construction be included in the first phase of the Master Plan.

All major construction during Phase I would occur along Amsterdam Avenue and on West 62nd Street from the midblock west. The existing Law School building would remain in place and be used as temporary

²The number of units is based on a worst-case assumption of approximately 790 gsf/unit. It is anticipated that units will be larger and hence fewer.

expansion/swing space for the expansion of other Fordham programs until it is demolished at a later stage of the overall site development.

To enhance its presence on Columbus Avenue during the interim stages of its Master Plan, Fordham would create a landscaped area along the sidewalk between West 60th Street and the former West 61st Street east of the raised campus plaza. This landscaped area would be open to the public. The ground-level entrance to Lowenstein Center would be strengthened by the creation of an interim transparent lobby and security desk near the corner of West 60th Street and Columbus Avenue. This lobby and security desk would add light to the sidewalk at night. Until the existing Law School building is demolished as part of Phase II, an interim stairway would be provided from West 62nd Street to the campus plaza level. This stairway would run between the existing Law School and the new Law School/dormitory on Sites 5/5a. The interim stairway would include a small landscaped area and seating at its base and at the level of the first landing. As part of Phase II implementation, this interim stair would be replaced with the wider permanent stair described for Phase II.

Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would be completed by 2014.

PHASE II

Phase II development would create new space for the Schools of Business, Social Services, and Education, an expansion of the Quinn Library, a new theater, additional dormitory facilities, and an additional 110 accessory parking spaces for the University's use.

All major construction during Phase II would occur along Columbus Avenue and on West 62nd Street from the midblock east. The current Law School building would be used as temporary expansion/swing space until it would be demolished to allow for the development of the new academic and dormitory building on Site 6. The interim landscaped area and entrance to Lowenstein Center would also be demolished during Phase II, to allow for the development of the new academic and dormitory building on Site 2.

Phase II of the proposed Master Plan is expected to be completed by 2032.

PROJECT APPROVALS

LAND USE

While the proposed development would be as-of-right with regard to use and floor area, it would require the following discretionary approvals from CPC:

- Special permit pursuant to Section 82-33 of the Zoning Resolution to modify regulations governing height and setback, minimum distance between buildings, courts, and minimum distance between legally required windows and walls/lot lines for a development in the Special Lincoln Square District.
- Special permit pursuant to Section 13-561 to allow an accessory parking garage with 68 spaces (Garage A).
- Special permit pursuant to Section 13-561 to allow an accessory parking garage with 137 spaces (Garage C). Pursuant to Section 11-42(c), additional time to complete the garage is also requested.
- Special permit pursuant to Section 13-561 to allow an accessory parking garage with 265 spaces (Garage B).

- Zoning text amendment to Section 82-50 (Off-Street Parking and Off-Street Loading Regulations, Special Lincoln Square District) to clarify the intention of the Zoning Resolution regarding curb cuts on wide streets for off-street loading berths.
- Authorization pursuant to Section 13-553 to allow a curb cut on a wide street (West 62nd Street) to provide access to an accessory parking garage.
- Authorization pursuant to Sections 82-50(b) (as amended) and 13-553 to allow a curb cut on a wide street (West 62nd Street) to provide access to an off-street loading berth.

Each of these is described in greater detail below.

CPC SPECIAL PERMITS PURSUANT TO ZR SECTION 82-33

CPC Special Permits are sought pursuant to Section 82-33 to waive height, setback, and minimum distance requirements (including minimum distance between buildings and minimum distance between windows and walls or lot lines), and inner and outer court regulations for the buildings proposed to be developed. The waivers are being requested to facilitate a good design for the entire campus and provide design flexibility for the specific buildings proposed to be developed, to accommodate the University's program requirements.

Each of Fordham's requests under Section 82-33 is intended to facilitate a good design of the entire campus that is consistent with the provisions of the special district zoning and the urban design context of the university, while unifying the various schools around a memorable common open space. As part of its findings for approval of the requested special permit pursuant to Section 82-33, CPC must, among other things, determine that the modifications facilitate good design. Specific applications of the Special Permit under Section 82-33 are being sought for the following program elements:

Academic/Dormitory Building at the Northeast Corner of the Campus (Site 1)

The envelope provided for this structure has a four-story base rising to a height of 85 feet above mean curb level and setting back a distance of 10 feet on Columbus Avenue and 15 feet on 62nd Street. The building rises again without setback to a height of 242 feet 6 inches, where it sets back an additional 20 feet along Columbus and rises to its final height of 382.52 feet. It is presently anticipated that the top floors of the building, above the second setback, will contain dormitory space, while the floors below that level will contain academic space, support and administrative offices. The maximum width of the portions of the building envelope facing Columbus Avenue above the base will be less than 170 feet. The building fails to comply with Section 33-432, which requires a 15-foot setback on Columbus Avenue at the lesser of 85 feet above curb level or six stories and requires further setbacks under a sky exposure plane that slopes over the lot in a ratio of 5.6 to 1. The waiver sought as to this envelope under Section 82-33 would permit modification of these height and setback regulations.

Academic/Dormitory Building at the Southeast Corner of the Campus (Site 2)

The proposed envelope for this site sets back above an 85-foot-high, four-story base for a distance of 10 feet along Columbus Avenue, then rises to a height of 324.27 before setting back an additional 20 feet, and rising to its full height of 469.84. On West 60th Street, the envelope of the principal tower component of this site rises to a height of 175.95 feet, sets back a distance of 10 feet, and then rises without setback to the envelope's full height. This envelope penetrates the sky exposure plane above 85 feet on West 60th Street. A shorter component of this building fails to set back at the lesser of six stories or 85 feet before rising to its maximum height of 173 feet 4 inches. Fordham expects the portions of the building constructed on this site to

contain dormitories above the second setback with academic, support and administrative space below. The reduced setbacks reflect Fordham's effort both to pack bulk below 150 feet and to minimize the incursion of building bulk into the interior plaza area. The proposed envelope fails to comply with the height and setback regulations of Section 33-432 which require a 15-foot setback on each of West 60th Street and Columbus Avenue at the lesser of 85 feet above curb level or 6 stories and require further setbacks under a sky exposure plane that slopes over the lot in a ratio of 5.6 to 1. When construction on Site 2 occurs, the interim plaza improvements along Columbus Avenue would be removed and the new grand entry at the center of this street frontage would be constructed.

Apartment Building/Dormitory/Student Center at the Southwest Corner (Sites 3 and 3a)

As described above, these sites may be developed either as: two towers (one dormitory and one private residential development) joined by a lower-rise dormitory wing and, perhaps, a student center (Option 1); or a single stacked structure, with dormitories and student center on the lower floors and a residential tower above (Option 2). In either case, the residential component of the development would have a maximum zoning floor area of 291,184 square feet, and setback waivers would be required along Amsterdam Avenue, since, under either scenario, neither the dormitory nor the residential tower would set back 15 feet at 85 feet, and each would rise straight to its anticipated full height from the property line, encroaching beyond the sky exposure plane contrary to Section 33-432.

In the worst case scenario for Option 1, that maximum height would be, in the case of the proposed residential tower, 572.71 feet and, in the case of the student center/dormitory tower, 293 feet along Amsterdam Avenue, so that substantial portions of both towers along the Avenue above 85 feet would encroach beyond the 5.6:1 sky exposure plane. The 11-story wing joining the towers would achieve a height of 179.03 feet without setting back, also penetrating the sky exposure plane. Also, if this option is selected and the residential tower were to be constructed on the corner of West 60th Street, the envelope along West 60th Street would violate the same mandatory setback requirements of Section 23-632 and would penetrate the sky exposure plane. The dormitory tower would also penetrate the sky exposure plane along West 61st Street, a narrow street, where a setback of 20 feet is required at the lesser of six stories or 85 feet and the relevant sky exposure plane rises a vertical distance of 2.7 feet for every one foot of horizontal distance.

Accordingly, for Option 1, waivers are sought pursuant to Section 82-33 to modify the height and setback requirements of Section 23-632 for the residential building and Section 33-432 for the community facility building.

If Option 2 is selected, the development would incorporate larger components of the overall student housing program for the campus on top of the student center, adding materially to the height of the base on which the residential tower would be built. Thus, the overall height advanced by the combination of buildings would be somewhat higher than Option 1. The encroachment above the sky exposure plane on West 61st Street would be lessened, since the dormitory/student center component would only achieve a height of 187 feet, while the encroachments on West 60th Street and Amsterdam Avenue would be increased as a result of the somewhat taller building.

Setbacks of 15 feet above the lesser of six stories or a height of 85 feet are required in the envelopes for the buildings on each of West 60th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, with further setbacks under a sky exposure plane rising at a rate of 5.6 feet of vertical distance to 1 foot of horizontal distance. A 20-foot setback at the lesser of six stories or 85 feet is required on the West 61st Street façade of the proposed dormitory with a less steep sky exposure plane of 2.7:1. For Option 2, waiver is required pursuant to Section 82-33 to permit

modification of the height and setback regulations of: (a) Section 23-632 for the residential portion of the building and (b) Section 33-432 for the community facility portion of the building.

In addition to height and setback waivers, Sites 3 and 3a would require additional bulk modifications. If Option 1 is selected, the approved envelope of the proposed residential building erected on Site 3 would not comply with Section 23-711 because it would be separated from the existing McMahon Hall dormitory by a distance of only 20 feet or less, where a minimum of 50 feet would be required. This condition also creates an outer court that is non-complying with the requirements of Section 23-841, which require that the width of an outer court less than 30 feet wide be at least one and one-third the depth of the outer court. In this instance, the width of the court would be only 20 feet with a depth of 132 feet 6 inches, so that the width would be only 15 percent the court depth. This condition would also violate the requirements of Section 24-632 as to Site 3a, regarding so-called “wide outer court recesses.” Further, one of the recesses at the rear of the court would be only 15 feet 2 inches in width to 14 feet 8 inches in depth, which does not comply with the requirements of Section 24-633 regarding the minimum required dimensions of outer court recesses or with Section 24-652, regarding the minimum distance between community facility buildings.

Waivers of the requirements of Sections 23-711, 23-841, 24-632, 24-633 and 24-652 would therefore be required for Option 1, pursuant to Section 82-33.

If Option 2 is selected, there would be a non-complying inner court between the residential component of the building, the new dormitory/student center and McMahon. Zoning requires that a minimum distance of 20 feet be maintained between the windows of a community facility building and the wall of an adjacent building and, further, that any such wall be no closer to a window than a distance equal to 1/3 of the total height of the wall above the sill level of the window, to a maximum of 40 feet (Section 24-652). The proposed inner court would contain an inner court recess that complies at its lowest levels but fails to comply as the new building on Site 3a rises in height. The inner court regulations also establish a width to depth ratio for inner court recesses in residential buildings pursuant to Section 23-852, requiring the width of such recesses to be twice their depth. In this case, the recess would be approximately 1.3 times the depth of the recess. The court regulations further require certain minimum distances between legally required walls and walls in inner courts. Pursuant to Section 23-863, such distance is one-half the height of the wall above the sill level of the window to a maximum of 60 feet. The proposed design would fail to provide this distance.

Waivers of the requirements of Sections 23-852, 23-863 and 24-652 will be required for Option 2, pursuant to Section 82-33.

Apartment Building at the Northwest Corner of the Superblock (Site 4)

This Site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of West 62nd Street. The proposed new building would rise without setback to a height of 661.04 feet on both Amsterdam Avenue and West 62nd Street, including a 40-foot-high mechanical enclosure that would be an element of the proposed building’s design. The proposed building, as designed, would not comply with regulations regarding height, setback, required minimum distance between legally required windows and a lot line and minimum distance between buildings on zoning lots and inner and outer court regulations, as follows:

North Façade: The northern street wall, facing West 62nd Street would not provide the required 15-foot setback above 85 feet and would not comply with the sky exposure plane. A waiver pursuant to Section 82-33 of the height and setback requirements of Section 23-632 is therefore requested.

West Façade: The proposed building would not comply with the street wall requirements of Section 23-632, as there would be no 15-foot setback provided at 85 feet, and the proposed building envelope would not comply with the sky exposure plane. A waiver pursuant to Section 82-33 of the height and setback requirements of Section 23-632 is therefore requested. Also, the building would include a small, non-complying outer court, having a width of 6 feet and a depth of 26 feet; for this condition, a waiver pursuant to Section 82-33 of the requirement for a minimum 30-foot outer court width prescribed by Section 23-841 is requested.

East Façade: The proposed building's east wall would abut the western edge of the building envelope of Site 5A, and would then be set back 18 feet from a point approximately 30 feet above curb level. The minimum required distance between buildings on a single zoning lot would not be met, a requirement that varies according to the height of a building and the presence of legally required windows in facing building walls. In the case of this building, however, the wall to window condition would require a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 50 feet where only 18 feet is provided. A waiver, pursuant to Section 82-33, of the requirements of Section 23-711 is therefore requested.

South Façade: The proposed building would incorporate a small inner court along this façade, having dimensions of 5 inches in width and up to 48 feet and 6 inches in depth and designed with legally required windows on its southern façade. The contract vendee of this site has obtained a light and air easement with the owner of the lot immediately to the south (Lot 30), to ensure that no new construction could block these windows. Several waivers are required for this condition pursuant to Section 82-33: waiver of the requirements of Section 23-861, regarding minimum distance between legally required windows and walls or lot lines; and waiver of the requirements of Section 23-851 prescribing a minimum dimension of 30 feet and minimum area of 1,200 square feet for inner courts.

Academic/Dormitory Building (Site 5a)

Fordham proposes to use this site for the academic program of the Law School. The envelope for this site would rise straight from the street to a height of 155 feet, failing to set back 15 feet at the lesser of six stories or 85 feet and penetrating the sky exposure plane contrary to Section 33-432. The waiver requested pursuant to Section 82-33 would modify the height and setback regulations of Section 33-432.

Academic/Dormitory Building (Site 5)

This site, which is located in the mid-block of West 62nd Street, would include the Law School and dormitories at the upper levels of the building. The proposed envelope has a four-story base that rises to a height of 70.55 feet, sets back a distance of 15 feet and rises without further setback to a total height of 318.75 feet. The proposed envelope sets back 15 feet below 85 feet, but fails to continue setting back above 85 feet and penetrates the sky exposure plane at a height of 169 feet along West 62nd Street contrary to Section 33-432. The waiver requested, pursuant to Section 82-33, would permit modification of the height and setback regulations of Section 33-432 for new community facility buildings.

Academic/Dormitory Buildings (Site 6)

Also located in the mid-block of West 62nd Street, this site would contain both academic space and one of the proposed new dormitories. It may also house an entrance to a new University theater to be constructed on Site 7. The site would be developed in two sections, one of which would extend the floor plates of the academic floors of Site 1. The envelope for this site contemplates a four-story base rising to a height of 85 feet, setting back 15 feet and rising without setback to a height of 342 feet, penetrating the sky exposure plane at a height

of 169 feet, contrary to Section 33-432. A portion of the envelope would provide a public entry to the campus from the north, so this portion would have no base and would not penetrate the sky exposure plane. The new entry has been designed with grand proportions—an opening 77 feet wide with a landscaped landing at plaza level overlooking the theater entrance. The waiver requested with respect to this site pursuant to Section 82-33 would modify the height and setback regulations of Section 33-432.

Academic/Library Building (Site 7)

This site is expected to house an enlargement of the Quinn Library and, perhaps, a new theater for Fordham's performing arts program. A portion of the site runs along the side lot line of the Alfred, while the balance fronts on the cul-de-sac, a mapped street (West 61st Street). The envelope for this portion of the site would rise to a height of 161.5 feet without setting back 20 feet at the lesser of six stories or 85 feet and penetrating the sky exposure plane, contrary to Section 33-432. The waiver requested pursuant to Section 82-33 will modify the height and setback regulations of Section 33-432.

SPECIAL PERMIT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-561—GARAGE A

This garage would provide accessory parking containing 68 spaces for the residential building on Site 4. It would be accessed through a new curb cut on West 62nd Street. The garage would be located not less than 110 feet east of the intersection of West 62nd Street and Amsterdam Avenue, would be accessed through a curb cut of 31 feet in width (including splays), with a ramp width of not less than 23 feet, not including the pedestrian sidewalk. The curb cut and ramp would also serve Fordham (see description of Garage B, below). A total of 10 reservoir spaces would be provided and the garage would be operated as an attended parking facility. The total of 68 parking spaces would represent less than half of the dwelling units anticipated in the proposed building.

SPECIAL PERMIT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-561—GARAGE C

Garage C would serve as an accessory parking garage for the residential occupants of Site 3/3a. The garage would contain a maximum of 137 attended parking spaces on three subsurface levels and would be accessed from West 61st Street via a ramp that is 30 feet in width with a 37-foot curb cut (including splays). The curb cut for the parking facility would be separated from a curb cut for a new loading dock to serve the student center on Site 3a by a minimum distance of 5 feet. The ramp for the parking garage would accommodate the required 10 reservoir spaces.

As previously noted, no new accessory parking spaces are permitted in the Special Lincoln Square District without a special permit pursuant to Section 13-561. The 137 attended parking spaces sought represents 35 percent of the maximum number of dwelling units Fordham contemplates could be accommodated in the new residential building. Since it is anticipated that this portion of the project may not have reached the stage of substantial completion at the end of four years, additional time to complete the garage pursuant to Section 11-42(c) is requested.

SPECIAL PERMIT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-561—GARAGE B

This garage would provide accessory parking for faculty, staff and administration. Fordham's research shows that the probable demand for parking at the campus would require a total of 265 spaces through construction of Phase II. A total of 265 parking spaces would be provided in two phases: 155 spaces in the first phase and 110 in the second. This garage would share a curb cut and entry ramp with Garage A but have its own 13

reservoir spaces. Like Garage A, this garage would be operated as an attended facility. Pursuant to Section 82-50, new accessory parking spaces are not permitted in the Special Lincoln Square District without a special permit obtained pursuant to Section 13-561.

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO ZR SECTION 82-50

As currently written, the zoning text governing curb cuts in the Special Lincoln Square District produces anomalies. Curb cuts for accessory parking garages are not permitted as-of-right on wide streets in Manhattan Community Boards 1 through 8, though, as discussed below, they may be authorized by CPC. Curb cuts are evidently not permitted on wide streets for required loading berths in the Special Lincoln Square District (though there is no direct textual prohibition of them), because, as currently written, Section 82-50(b) requires an authorization to have a curb cut on a wide street in the Special District for such required loading berths. No prohibition appears in the text on the placement of permitted loading berths on wide streets. The proposed text change would rectify this anomaly.

The proposed amended section would read as follows (underlined text is new; text with a strikethrough is to be omitted.):

82-50 OFF-STREET PARKING AND OFF-STREET LOADING REGULATIONS

The regulations of Article I, Chapter 3 (Comprehensive Off-Street Parking Regulations in Community Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the Borough of Manhattan and a portion of Community Districts 1 and 2 in the Borough of Queens) and the applicable underlying district regulations of Article III, Chapter 6, relating to Off-Street Loading Regulations, shall apply in the #Special Lincoln Square District# except as otherwise provided in this Section. In addition, the entrances and exits to all off-street loading berths shall not be located on a #wide street# except by authorization as set forth in this Section.

a) #Accessory# off-street parking spaces

#Accessory# off-street parking spaces are permitted only by special permit of the City Planning Commission pursuant to Section 13-561 (Accessory off-street parking spaces).

b) Curb cuts

The City Planning Commission may authorize curb cuts within 50 feet of the intersection of any two #street lines#, or on #wide streets# where such curb cuts are needed ~~exclusively~~ for ~~required~~ off-street loading berths, provided the location of such curb cuts meets the findings in Section 13-553 ~~and the loading berths are arranged so as to permit head-in and head-out truck movements to and from the #zoning lot#.~~

c) Waiver of loading berth requirements

The City Planning Commission may authorize a waiver of the required off-street loading berths where the location of the required curb cuts would:

- (1) be hazardous to traffic safety;
create or contribute to serious traffic congestion or
- (2) unduly inhibit vehicular and pedestrian movement; or
- (3) interfere with the efficient functioning of bus lanes, specially
designated streets or public transit facilities.

The Commission shall refer these applications to the Department of Transportation for its comments.

The proposed text clarification to ZR Section 82-50 would continue to facilitate the CPC authorization of curb cuts for loading berths on wide streets in the Special Lincoln Square District. The findings for authorizations to be obtained for all such curb cuts in the Special Lincoln Square District would be made under ZR Section 15-553. The Special District regulations were substantially revised in 1994, which included ZR Section 82-50. The intent of the 1994 change for ZR Section 82-50 was to “permit loading docks pursuant to underlying regulations, and establish a CPC authorization for curb cuts in instances when they could not be accommodated on a narrow street, 50 feet from the intersection of a wide street.” This formulation recognizes no differences between the treatment of required and permitted loading berths and assumes that the authorization established would apply equally to both. Thus, the change proposed by the text amendment above would seem to be consistent with the 1994 intention for this section of the Zoning Resolution. Since ZR Section 82-50 may only be utilized by CPC authorization, the potential for environmental impacts for specific sites would be assessed and disclosed to the public under and pursuant to a separate environmental review.

CURB CUT AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-553

This Authorization would allow a curb cut on a wide street (West 62nd Street) to provide access to an accessory parking garage. The regulations governing accessory parking in Manhattan Community Boards 1 through 8 do not permit curb cuts for accessory parking garages on wide streets [Section 13-142(b)]. Because West 62nd Street is a wide street, the curb cut that would be required to access Garages A and B is not permitted as of right. Accordingly, an authorization to permit the curb cut is requested pursuant to Section 13-553.

CURB CUT AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 82-50(B) (AS AMENDED) AND 13-553

This Authorization would allow a curb cut on a wide street (West 62nd Street) to provide access to an off-street loading berth. The existing campus is serviced for delivering and loading purposes by a set of three loading berths accessed by a curb cut on West 60th Street, located at the east end of McMahan Hall, that, in turn, accesses the existing internal corridor system built into the podium. With the more-than doubling of the amount of academic floor area on the campus, the Master Plan calls for the addition of a new loading bay accommodating three additional berths, to be accessed on West 62nd Street, in the western portion of the proposed Law School façade. These berths would also be connected to the underground corridor system. Under the zoning text as it will be amended by this application, an authorization pursuant to Section 82-50(b) and 13-553 to permit the curb cut for these loading berths is required because West 62nd Street is a wide street.

RESTRICTIVE DECLARATION

It is anticipated that a Restrictive Declaration would provide standards for the design and operation of the interim plaza on Columbus Avenue and the interim stair on West 62nd Street to be created in Phase I of the project. Further, the Restrictive Declaration would provide a procedure for obtaining approval of the design standards for the permanent staircases providing access to the main campus plaza.

A Restrictive Declaration will also establish standards for practices and measures to be implemented during construction to mitigate noise and air quality standards and will provide for an independent monitor and mechanisms to enforce the standards.

FUNDING

The above approvals from CPC would be for the proposed campus Master Plan. Fordham is also seeking funding from the Dormitory Authority of New York State (DASNY). Therefore, DASNY is acting as an interested agency in the environmental review of the proposed Master Plan.

UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE

The proposed action is also subject to the city's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), mandated by Sections 197-c and 197-d of the New York City Charter, is a process specifically designed to allow public review of proposed projects at four levels: Community Board, Borough President, CPC, and City Council. The procedure sets time limits for review at each stage to ensure a maximum total review period of approximately seven months. The process begins with certification by CPC that the ULURP application is complete.

The application is then referred to the relevant Community Board. In this case it is Manhattan Community Board 7. The Community Board has up to 60 days to review and discuss the proposal, hold a public hearing, and adopt an advisory resolution regarding the actions. Once this is complete, the Borough President and the Borough Board have up to 30 days to review the actions if they choose. CPC then has up to 60 days to review the application, during which time a public hearing is held. Following the hearing, CPC may approve or reject the application. As described above, a jointly-held ULURP/DEIS hearing took place on March 4, 2009. Substantive public comments made at the DEIS public hearing have been incorporated into this Final EIS.

If CPC approves the project, it forwards the application to the City Council, which has 50 days to consider the proposed project. The City Council vote is final, unless the Mayor chooses to veto the Council's decision. The City Council can override the mayoral veto by a two-thirds vote.

FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

As set forth in its Positive Declaration, the lead agency has determined that the proposed action may result in one or more significant adverse environmental impacts and thus requires the preparation of an EIS. The EIS has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

For each technical area of the EIS, the analysis includes a description of existing conditions, an assessment of conditions in the "Future without the Proposed Action," and an assessment of future conditions in which Fordham's proposed Master Plan would be completed. Because the proposed Master Plan would be built in phases, this EIS analyzes future conditions in two "Build years:" 2014 (Phase I) and 2032 (Phase II). For each of these build years, identification and evaluation of potential impacts that would result from the proposed action is

based on the change from the future without the proposed action (i.e., the “No Build” condition) to the future with the proposed action.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

As described above, the proposed action would require a number of special permits and authorizations from CPC. The academic, dormitory, and apartment buildings that would occur under the proposed action would be in keeping with and supportive of existing land uses and ongoing land use trends in the primary and secondary study areas. The floor area and uses (academic, dormitory, and residential) that are proposed are in keeping with the zoning for the site. The special permits being sought are mostly related to height, setback, and minimum distance between buildings; they are being sought to facilitate good design for the entire campus and to provide flexibility for specific buildings. In order to grant the requested special permits relating to bulk, the CPC must make findings regarding site design, design flexibility, and consistency with the purposes of the District.

Additional special permits are being requested for accessory parking. All of the special permits are specific to this site and do not affect zoning in the area. In order to grant the special permits related to accessory parking, the CPC must make findings related to the need for parking, insufficiency of existing parking, effects on vehicular and pedestrian movement, and adequacy of reservoir space.

The No Action condition would introduce new residential use to the project site. Neither Phase I nor Phase II development of the proposed Master Plan would change the types of land use on the project site when compared with the No Action Scenario. The proposed action would not affect zoning regulations in the area surrounding the project site, and would have no effect on any public policy relating to land use that applies to the project site or the surrounding area. Overall, the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic analysis concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on socioeconomic conditions in the study area. The proposed action would not directly displace any residential population or displace businesses or institutions. Students added to the study area residential population would not cause indirect residential displacement, since temporary residents living in university housing typically do not have a substantial effect on broader residential housing markets, and average rental rates and sales prices in the study area are already substantially higher than the citywide and borough averages. Indirect business displacement would not occur as a result of the proposed action since the project would increase study area employment by two percent and the new activities and jobs would be in industry sectors that already have a strong presence in the study area. Finally, the proposed action would not have any adverse effects on specific industries. Overall, the implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not cause any significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

A preliminary screening analysis of community facilities found that the proposed action falls below the *CEQR* thresholds for detailed analysis. Therefore, the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities.

OPEN SPACE

Under existing conditions and in the future without and with the proposed action, passive open space ratios for non-residents exceed the city's open space planning guidelines. However, similar to conditions in many areas in Manhattan, the open space ratios for active and total open space, as well as passive ratios for the combined resident and non-resident population, are below (less than) DCP guidelines. These guidelines are considered benchmarks that indicate how well-served an area is by open space, and ratios that are below DCP guidelines generally indicate less access to open space. However, the *CEQR Technical Manual* recognizes that these guidelines are goals that are not feasible for many areas of the city, and they are not considered specific impact thresholds. In addition, open space shortfalls in the quantitative analysis would be offset by the availability of significant open spaces—such as Central Park, Riverside Park, and Hudson River Park—just outside the study area. Based on the open space analysis, the proposed action would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space and recreational facilities.

SHADOWS

In 2014, the Phase I development would cast between five and seven hours of new shadow on Damrosch Park throughout the year. However, the extent of the new shadow would be small for much of this period, primarily affecting areas near the southern edge of the park or areas on the western side of the space around the bandshell. Most of the vegetation and seating areas are on the eastern side of the park and would continue to get sun for much of the day during the spring, summer and fall, and for a portion of the day in winter. The London plane trees in the long planter along the West 62nd Street sidewalk would receive less direct sunlight, but the majority of these trees would continue to receive six hours or more of direct sun through the late spring and summer, so it is likely their overall viability would not be substantially affected. Therefore, Damrosch Park would not experience a significant adverse impact with the Phase I development.

The playground at P.S. 191, located directly across Amsterdam Avenue from the Fordham campus, would receive between three hours and 45 minutes and five hours of incremental shadow from Phase I development in the morning during the spring, summer and fall months, a fairly substantial duration of new shadow. For much of this duration, the incremental shadow would be limited in size, and sunlight would continue to reach parts of the open space. Additionally, there would be times during periods of incremental shadow when sunlight would reach other portions of the space that would otherwise be shaded by the buildings of the no action scenario. Because the playground is paved and used almost entirely for active recreation, the new shadows would not have as much effect as they would on vegetated open space used for passive recreation. While the incremental shadows could reduce the attractiveness of the playground for its users and cause an adverse impact, the impact would not be considered significant because the playground is used for active recreation.

No other sun-sensitive resources would receive substantial new shadow as a result of the proposed action, and no significant adverse impacts would occur in 2014.

With the completion of Phase II development in 2032, incremental shadows from the proposed action would not be large enough or last long enough to cause significant adverse impacts to most sun-sensitive resources in the area, including St. Luke's-Roosevelt Hospital Entrance Plaza, West 59th Street Recreation Center, Amsterdam Houses Playground, West End Towers Park, Samuel N. Bennerson Playground, James Felt Plaza, Martin Luther King Jr. High School Plaza, Alice Tully Hall/Julliard Plaza, Richard Tucker Park, the Broadway Malls, Dante Park, the Regent Plaza, the Beaumont Plaza, and Central Park.

Phase II development would add areas of new shadow to Damrosch Park on the March 21/September 21 and the December 21 analysis days. The additional areas of incremental shadow would fall in the late morning and early afternoon from Sites 1 and 6, affecting primarily the seating areas and vegetation on the eastern side of the park. The additional development in Phase II would not impact Damrosch Park on the May 6/August 6 or June 21 analysis days. Overall, the full 2032 buildout of the proposed action would substantially reduce sunlight to Damrosch Park in the fall, winter and early spring, resulting in a significant adverse impact to this space. The health of the London plane trees and maples of the park might also be affected in the spring. The most critical time for these trees to receive sunlight is during the most active growth periods in the spring and summer. As these shade trees begin to leaf out in April, the limited period of available sunlight during the early to mid-spring may adversely affect the health and lifespan of these trees. There is no way of predicting with full certainty the severity of this impact, but the loss of direct sunlight would place additional stress on trees already suffering from restricted root zones (in the case of the maples) and other stresses typical of trees in dense urban settings, as evidenced by prominent browning of the edges of the leaves visible on a fall 2008 site visit. Representatives of the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and Fordham University have been meeting and are continuing to discuss potential mitigation measures for the significant adverse shadow impact on Damrosch Park that is projected with full development of Phase II.

In 2032 with the full buildout, incremental shadow would fall on various sections of Lincoln Center Plaza throughout the year, with durations ranging from three to four hours depending on season. These durations would be attributed in large part to proposed buildings on the eastern end of the Fordham campus casting new shadow on the planned seating and landscaped area (the "Grove") between the David H. Koch New York State (Koch) Theater and Columbus Avenue. Phase II development would add approximately four hours of new shadow on this part of the Lincoln Center open space in the spring, summer and fall, and nearly two hours in the winter, and would therefore cause a significant adverse impact to this space. The main plaza area around the fountain and the north plaza west of Avery Fisher Hall would receive between one and two hours of new shadow in the spring, summer, and fall seasons, generally in the late afternoon, and less than an hour in December. While the incremental shadow from the proposed action would reduce the amount of sunlight during these periods on the main and north plazas, the duration and extent would not be substantial enough to cause a significant adverse impact to these spaces. Representatives of Lincoln Center have advised that they do not wish to address the issue of plant sensitivity at the Grove at this time, because of the long period of time that will elapse until construction of Phase II. If Fordham, DPR, and Lincoln Center do not ultimately reach agreement on implementation of mitigation measures, the increase in shadows would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on Damrosch Park and the Grove. See "Mitigation," and "Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts," below, for additional discussion of these impacts.

Between 7:05 AM and 8:45 AM on June 21, incremental shadow would fall across some of the clerestory windows on the north façade of the Church of Saint Paul the Apostle located immediately south of the Fordham campus across West 60th Street. The total duration of incremental shadow would be an hour and 40 minutes. For about 40 minutes of this period, incremental shadow would remove the remaining sunlight from the windows. Considering that services may be occurring at this time of day, the project-generated shadow

would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on the north windows of the church on the June 21 analysis day. On the May 6/August 6 analysis day the impact would not be significant—only 18 minutes of incremental shadow. Further, on the other two analysis days there would not be any incremental shadow. See “Mitigation,” and “Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts,” below, for additional discussion of these impacts.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

It is not expected that the proposed action would have significant adverse impacts on any of the architectural resources located in the study area. There are no properties on the project site that are architecturally significant, and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has determined that the site is not sensitive for archaeological resources. The proposed action would not block significant views of any resource, significantly alter the visual setting of any resource, or introduce incompatible contextual elements to any resource’s setting. During construction, a Construction Protection Plan would be implemented to protect resources, e.g., the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, which are located within 90 feet of proposed construction activities.

While full development of the proposed Master Plan would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on components of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts Historic District, specifically Damrosch Park and the “Grove” (a new landscape feature that is not a part of the original plan for Lincoln Center), these shadow impacts would result from adverse effects to vegetation that is not part of a historic landscape and does not contribute to the visual prominence or context of the architectural resource. Therefore, this would not be considered a significant adverse impact on historic resources.

As described above in “Shadows,” the proposed action would have an unavoidable significant adverse shadow impact on the stained glass windows of St. Paul the Apostle Church. See “Mitigation,” and “Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts,” below, for additional discussion of this impact.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

It is not expected that the proposed action would have significant adverse impacts on the urban design and visual resources of the study area. As described above under “Background History,” since the Scoping Meeting in September 2007, Fordham has refined various elements of the Master Plan’s urban design as a result of public comments on the proposed action.

If all of the building sites encompassed by the proposed Site Plan were developed to the maximum building envelope designated for each, the resulting development would exceed the maximum total floor area permitted on the zoning lot; thus, the maximum envelopes depicted do not represent the intended condition of the completed campus as a whole. The Master Plan also contemplates that the build-out would comply with the bulk-packing rules in effect in the Special Lincoln Square District, requiring 60 percent of the permitted floor area on the zoning lot be located below 150 feet in height. The floor area and bulk packing constraints mean that some of the buildings contemplated by the Plan would be smaller than the maximum envelopes shown. This document presents an illustrative design that shows one possible variation on the distribution of the allowable floor area satisfying both constraints. This illustration more accurately reflects what full development of the campus would look like under the Master Plan than does the aggregation of the approved building envelopes.

With the proposed action, the proposed buildings would be constructed on an existing superblock. Therefore, the proposed action would not alter the block form and street pattern or the street hierarchy of the project site or the study area. The building bulk would be greater than some buildings in the area, but in keeping with many of the larger more modern buildings including low buildings and slender towers on bases having large footprints, similar to Lincoln Center and buildings that line Columbus Avenue, Amsterdam Avenue, and Broadway. The building uses and types would be similar to what is found in the area. Although Fordham's academic and dormitory buildings would be taller than most other institutional uses in the area they would still be comparable in terms of height to numerous tall residential and mixed-use buildings in the study area. In completing the street wall around the campus with openings between buildings, development with the proposed action would be similar to building arrangements in the study area. Streetscape elements would be altered by development on a vacant lot and on tennis and basketball courts as well as on lawn, plaza, and terrace areas. However, the proposed development would provide transparency at the ground level, thereby enlivening the sidewalks. It would also provide two new, wide-entrance stairways to the podium level plaza at the heart of the campus. In the interim between development of Phase I and completion of Phase II, an interim plaza would be provided to enhance the Columbus Avenue frontage and an interim landscaped stairway would enhance the West 62nd Street frontage and improve access to the podium level plaza.

The proposed development would not block significant views of any visual resources or obstruct important views and view corridors. The proposed action's special permits, which include waivers of certain height, setback, and minimum distance requirements of the Zoning Resolution, would facilitate good design of the campus, consistent with the urban environment in which it sits and with the Special Lincoln Square District of which it is a part. As part of its findings for approval of the requested Special Permit pursuant to Section 82-33, CPC must, among other things, determine that the modifications facilitate good design.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Development of the proposed Master Plan would not result in any significant adverse impacts to land use, socioeconomic conditions, historic resources, urban design and visual resources, pedestrian activity, or noise due to normal operation of the completed buildings. Phase II development would result in a number of significant traffic impacts and in two significant adverse pedestrian impacts, but these impacts could be mitigated, and would not be expected to cause significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. Furthermore, no significant adverse impacts would result to neighborhood character due to the cumulative effect of moderate changes in the above impact categories. Overall, no significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character would result from the proposed action in 2032.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment identified potential historical and present sources of contamination on- and off-site: on-site sources included spills from hydraulic oil tanks, potential historical fuel oil tanks, a historical print shop, and a historical Armory Drill Room; off-site (but on the same block) sources included a historical hospital, a historical laboratory, and a transformer vault; and off site (and not on the same block) sources included a historical hospital with two laboratories, a historical auto repair shop, a historical filling station, and historical garages with buried gasoline tanks.

The Phase II Site Investigation of Sites 4, 5, and 5a included the collection and analysis of soil samples. Elevated concentrations of some semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) and metals typical of urban fill

were detected in the soil. None of the four composite soil samples collected to characterize the soil for disposal purposes were identified as hazardous waste.

To avoid significant adverse hazardous materials impacts, remedial measures would be undertaken during excavation required for the first phase of construction and during excavation and demolition required for the second phase of construction.

For proposed soil disturbance areas where a Phase II Subsurface Investigation has not been conducted, a Phase II (including the collection of soil and groundwater samples) would be conducted prior to any soil disturbance to determine whether contamination is present. Where applicable, the scope of the Phase II would be biased toward potential sources of contamination, such as tanks or historical uses of concern. Further, the scope would be reviewed and approved by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) prior to its implementation.

All subsurface soil disturbances would be performed in accordance with a Remedial Action Plan (RAP)/Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP). The RAP would provide for the appropriate handling, stockpiling, testing, transportation and disposal of these materials in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations. The CHASP would ensure that all such work is done in a manner protective of both human health and the environment. The RAP/CHASP for Sites 4, 5 and 5a has been submitted to DEP for review and approval. Similarly, RAPs/CHASPs for other areas to be disturbed would be submitted to DEP for review and approval prior to commencing subsurface disturbance. These measures would be implemented in accordance with a DEP approved Restrictive Declaration, which is a type of legal agreement and institutional control, for the project site.

With these measures in place, significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be avoided during and post construction.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The proposed action would not exceed any of the CEQR thresholds for a detailed analysis of infrastructure systems; therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts on infrastructure.

The proposed action has the potential to increase the amount of land with impervious surfaces and decrease the amount with pervious surfaces, which would increase the volume of runoff. However, before any new building can be connected to the sewer system, DEP must issue a sewer connection permit. As part of the sewer permitting processes, DEP does not allow increases in the intensity of stormwater flows into its system. The proposed actions would not lead to an increase in runoff into the combined sewer system.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

The proposed action would not exceed any of the CEQR thresholds for a detailed analysis of solid waste and sanitation services; therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts on solid waste and sanitation services.

ENERGY

The proposed action would not exceed CEQR thresholds for a detailed analysis of energy supply systems; therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts on energy.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Analysis results show that the proposed action would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at two intersections (Amsterdam Avenue at West 60th Street and Ninth Avenue at West 57th Street) during the midday peak hour in 2014; at one intersection (Columbus Avenue at West 60th Street) during the PM peak hour in 2014; at one intersection (Amsterdam Avenue at West 60th Street) during the AM peak hour in 2032; two intersections (Amsterdam Avenue at West 60th Street and Ninth Avenue at West 57th Street) during the midday peak hour in 2032; four intersections (Ninth and Tenth Avenues at West 57th Street and Columbus Avenue at West 60th and 62nd Streets) during the PM peak hour in 2032; and three intersections (Ninth and Tenth Avenues at West 57th Street and Broadway/Columbus Avenue/West 65th Street) during the pre-theater peak hour in 2032. Since the proposed action would provide a considerable number of on-site parking spaces to accommodate both the project-generated demand and Fordham faculty and staff who currently park off-site, there would not be any significant parking impacts. In any event, there is existing capacity within ¼ mile to accommodate the project-generated demand, if necessary.

To mitigate these impacts, low-cost and readily implementable measures were explored, and with their implementation, the proposed action would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts on traffic. These measures are presented in more detail below in “Mitigation.”

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

The proposed action would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts on the north crosswalk at Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street during the PM and evening pre-theater peak hours in 2032. With the implementation of a signal timing shift, the proposed action would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts on pedestrians.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed action would have no significant adverse impacts or affect the surrounding community or adjacent buildings with regard to air emissions from building heating systems and/or parking facilities (stationary sources).

The proposed action would not exceed CEQR thresholds for air quality impacts from mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips generated by the project); therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts from mobile sources.

NOISE

The analysis concluded that project-generated traffic would not be expected to produce significant increases in noise levels at any location near and/or adjacent to the project site. In addition, with the design measures Fordham would incorporate as new buildings are developed, noise levels within the proposed buildings would comply with all applicable requirements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction would occur in two phases. Phase I (scheduled to be complete in 2014) would create new buildings on Sites 3, 3a, 4, and 5/5a. Phase II (scheduled to be complete in 2032) would involve building on Sites 1, 2, 6, and 7.

In the future without the proposed action, Fordham would lease or otherwise convey portions of its site on Amsterdam Avenue and along West 62nd Street for private residential development to increase Fordham's endowment. The three resulting residential buildings would be built as-of-right and would not be dependent on any land use approvals. Construction of these buildings would likely produce impacts similar to those anticipated for Phase I construction. However, the avoidance and mitigation measures required with the proposed action would not be required with the as-of-right construction.

Construction of the buildings in the Master Plan is not expected to cause significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; community facilities; shadows; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; or transit and pedestrians. For the analysis areas listed below, further evaluation of conditions during construction were warranted:

- **Historic Resources.** A Construction Protection Plan would be developed and submitted to LPC for review and approval. The Construction Protection Plan would protect off-site historic buildings that are located within 90 feet of the construction.
- **Hazardous Materials.** To avoid adverse impacts, remedial measures would be undertaken during excavation required for the first phase of construction and during excavation and demolition required for the second phase of construction. These measures would include development and implementation of a Remedial Action Plan (incorporating an environmental Health and Safety Plan. These plans would be submitted to New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for approval, and their implementation would prevent contaminated materials from adversely affecting workers, passer-bys, and residents.
- **Traffic.** The analysis concluded that one significant adverse traffic impact would be expected from peak 2011 construction in Phase I during the early afternoon peak traffic hour. In 2021, significant adverse impacts at one intersection and six intersections could occur during the early afternoon and afternoon peak traffic hours, respectively. In 2031, significant adverse impacts at three intersections and six intersections could occur during the early afternoon and afternoon peak traffic hours, respectively. These impacts can be mitigated with either an early implementation of mitigation measures for operational traffic impacts or by applying variations of these measures, such as different signal timing shifts. The need for these variations on proposed mitigation measures to address the projected construction traffic impacts in 2011, 2021, and 2031 would be determined by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) during those years.
- **Air Quality.** No significant adverse impacts on air quality are expected from construction equipment and trucks. In order to prevent significant adverse impacts, all measures required for New York City-sponsored projects under Local Law 77 of 2005 would be implemented. A Restrictive Declaration would be prepared as part of the approval and would bind Fordham University to all construction mitigation measures. In addition, early electrification and special placement of construction equipment are required.
- **Noise.** During Phase I construction, significant adverse noise impacts are expected at four locations and during Phase II, significant adverse noise impacts are not expected to occur. During Phase 1, construction activities would be expected to result in significant noise impacts at the following locations:
 - The north façade of The Alfred at locations that have a direct line-of-sight to construction sites, from the 10th floor to the top residential floor during the years 2009 through 2010;

- The east façade of The Alfred at locations that have a direct line-of-sight to construction sites, from the third floor to the 30th floor during the years 2009 through 2010;
- The north façade of The Alfred at locations that have a direct line-of-sight to construction sites, from the third floor to the top residential floor during the years 2009 through 2010; and
- The north façade of The Alfred at locations that have a direct line-of-sight to the construction sites, from the third floor to the top residential floor during the years 2009 through 2010 and from the third floor through the 25th floor during the years 2009 through 2011.

During Phase 2, construction activities would not be expected to result in significant noise impacts at any sensitive receptor locations:

Construction activities at the other receptor sites in the study area would at times produce noise levels which would be noisy and intrusive, but due to their limited duration, they would not produce significant noise impacts.

The only residential location where significant noise impacts are predicted to occur is at the Alfred, which has double-glazed windows and central air conditioning (i.e., alternative ventilation). Consequently, even during warm weather conditions, interior noise levels would be approximately 30-35 dBA less than exterior noise levels. The double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation at this residential structure would provide a significant amount of sound attenuation, and would result in interior noise levels during much of the time that are below 45 dBA L_{10} (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria). However, at the terraces on all four façades of The Alfred, the highest $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels would range from approximately 76 to 82 dBA during some peak periods of construction activity. Even though this residence has double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation (i.e., central air conditioning) which would reduce interior noise levels by approximately 30-35 dBA, during some limited daytime time periods construction activities would result in interior noise levels that would be above the 45 dBA L_{10} noise level recommended by CEQR for residences and result in significant adverse noise impacts.

In addition, while noise levels at the residential terraces at The Alfred currently exceed the CEQR acceptable range (55 dBA L_{10}) for an outdoor area requiring serenity and quiet, during the weekday daytime time periods identified above when construction activities are predicted to significantly increase noise levels, construction activities would exacerbate these exceedances and result in significant adverse noise impacts at the terraces at The Alfred.

Consequently, the proposed Master Plan would have unmitigated significant noise impacts at the locations specified above for limited periods of time.

- **Public Health.** Construction contracts would include provisions for a rodent (mouse and rat) control program implemented by the contractor and approved by the appropriate agencies.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The public health analysis assessed the potential health concerns during the construction and operation of the proposed action in regards to air quality, noise, hazardous materials, and rodent control. As detailed below, this analysis found that the proposed Master Plan would not result in any significant adverse impacts to public health.

- **Air Quality.** The operation of the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse impact to air quality from stationary source or mobile source emissions. Furthermore, no significant adverse impacts on air quality are expected from construction equipment and trucks. To prevent significant adverse impacts during construction, all measures required for New York City-sponsored projects under Local Law 77 of 2005 would be implemented. In addition, early electrification and special placement of construction equipment are required. Therefore, no significant public health impacts are expected from the construction of the proposed Master Plan.
- **Noise.** As described above, operation of the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to noise levels in the surrounding area. Although the proposed action would result in undesirable noise effects during construction at certain discrete locations, these predicted noise levels would be of limited duration, and the predicted overall changes in noise levels would not be large enough to significantly affect public health. Based upon the limited durations of these noise levels, the noise produced by construction activities would not result in a significant adverse public health impact. Therefore, no significant adverse health impacts from noise are expected from construction of the proposed action.
- **Hazardous Materials.** To avoid adverse impacts, remedial measures would be undertaken during excavation required for the first phase of construction and during excavation and demolition required for the second phase of construction. With these measures in place, no significant adverse impacts from hazardous material on public health would be expected from construction activities related to the proposed action.
- **Rodent Control.** Construction contracts would include provisions for a rodent (mouse and rat) control program, with the contractor carrying out a maintenance program. Coordination would be maintained with appropriate public agencies and only EPA- and NYSDEC-registered rodenticides would be permitted.

MITIGATION

The proposed action may result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of shadows, traffic, pedestrians, and construction. Possible mitigation for these impacts is discussed below.

SHADOWS

Shadows cast from the project's maximum building envelopes would result in significant adverse shadow impacts. However, changes to the maximum building envelopes with the contemplated modifications would further reduce shadows during the periods when significant adverse impacts were identified, as follows:

- **St. Paul the Apostle Church.** The proposed modifications would not eliminate the significant adverse impact. Provision of alternative lighting would be a potential mitigation measure. However, this does not seem to be a practical mitigation measure in the context of the church complex as a whole. In the absence of mitigation, this would remain an unavoidable adverse impact. See "Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts," below, for additional discussion of this impact.
- **Damrosch Park.** The reductions in height and volume would reduce the incremental shadow but not eliminate the significant adverse impact. Representatives of DPR and Fordham University have been meeting and are continuing to discuss potential mitigation measures for the significant adverse shadow impact on Damrosch Park that is projected with full development of Phase II.

- The Grove. The contemplated modifications to proposed action would reduce the extent of the shadow falling on the Grove at certain times because the heights of the lower setbacks have been reduced, but it would not necessarily eliminate the significant adverse impact. Any plant materials adversely affected by shadows from the buildings on Sites 1 and 6 (after they are built in the second phase of campus development) could be replaced with more shade-tolerant species. Representatives of Lincoln Center have advised that they do not wish to address the issue of plant sensitivity at the Grove at this time, because of the long period of time that will elapse until construction of Phase II.

If Fordham, DPR, and Lincoln Center do not ultimately reach agreement on implementation of mitigation measures, the increase in shadows would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on Damrosch Park and the Grove. See “Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts,” below, for additional discussion of this impact.

TRAFFIC

The proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts at three and six intersections during various analysis peak hours in 2014 and 2032, respectively. To mitigate these impacts, low-cost and readily implementable measures were explored (see Table S-4). With these mitigation measures in place, the proposed action would not result in unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts.

Operating conditions with the above measures in place and comparisons to the future 2014 and 2032 No Build and Build conditions are presented in Tables S-5 and S-6.

MITIGATION OF IMPACTS—2014

Midday Peak Hour

Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the northbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street: Parking is currently permitted on both sides of the southbound approach during the midday peak hour. The impact identified for the southbound approach could be mitigated by daylighting the west curb lane for 100 feet to create an exclusive right turn lane. This mitigation, when combined with the AM daylighting proposed in the *West 61st Street Rezoning FEIS (December 2006)* and the 4 PM to 7 PM No Standing regulations on Ninth Avenue would result in only 2 hours a day for legal parking along the west curb. It is therefore recommended that NYCDOT remove the first 5 existing parking meters along the west curb of Ninth Avenue north of West 57th Street and impose No Standing 7 AM to 8 PM regulations, except for Sunday. To minimize the loss of meter parking spaces, it is also recommended that NYCDOT consider installing muni-meter parking to govern short-term parking for the remaining approximately 150 feet of the block for days and hours that are not currently restricted.

PM Peak Hour

Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

MITIGATION OF IMPACTS—2032

AM Peak Hour

Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the northbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

**Table S-4
 Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Build Year	Intersection	Mitigation Measure			
		AM Peak Hour	Midday Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Pre-Theater Peak Hour
2014	Amsterdam Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from NB to EB/WB	Not required	Not required
	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100feet to create exclusive right-turn lane	Not required	Not required
	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Not required
2032	Tenth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from NB to EB/WB	Daylight north curb lane on westbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane
	Amsterdam Avenue & West 60th Street	Shift 1 second of green time from NB to EB/WB	Shift 2 seconds of green time from NB to EB/WB	Not required	Not required
	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane and shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB
	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Not required
	Columbus Avenue & West 62nd Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Not required
	Broadway/Columbus Avenue & West 65th Street	Not required	Not required	Not required	Extend No Standing 7 AM-7 PM regulation to 8 PM along the west curb of the SB Columbus Avenue approach.

Table S-5
Comparison of 2014 No Build, Build, and Mitigated Build Conditions Level of Service Analysis

Peak Hour	Intersection/ Approach	No Build				Build			Mitigated Build				
		Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	
Midday	Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	LT	0.82	45.2	D	0.86	50.2	D+	LT	0.83	45.2	D	
	Westbound	R	0.66	35.0	C	0.66	35.4	D	R	0.64	33.2	C	
	Northbound	TR	0.59	10.6	B	0.60	10.7	B	TR	0.61	11.5	B	
	Intersection			18.4	B		19.5	B			19.1	B	
	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	T	0.81	41.7	D	0.81	41.7	D	T	0.81	41.7	D	
		R	0.79	62.5	E	0.79	62.5	E	R	0.79	62.5	E	
	Westbound	DefL	1.04	79.9	E	1.04	79.9	E	DefL	1.04	79.9	E	
		T	1.20	127.1	F	1.20	128.4	F	T	1.20	128.4	F	
Southbound	LTR	1.21	128.3	F	1.22	133.5	F+	LT	1.00	51.2	D		
	R							R	1.00	91.8	F		
Intersection			107.7	F		110.7	F			70.8	E		
PM	Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	R	0.98	77.1	E	1.00	82.1	F+	R	0.97	72.1	E	
	Westbound	L	0.66	35.5	D	0.65	34.8	C	L	0.63	32.8	C	
		LT	0.67	34.0	C	0.66	33.6	C	LT	0.64	31.9	C	
	Southbound	TR	0.73	11.7	B	0.74	11.9	B	TR	0.76	12.9	B	
Intersection			22.5	C		23.1	C			22.5	C		

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = Defacto Left Turn; + Significant Traffic Impact.

Table S-6
Comparison of 2032 No Build, Build, and Mitigated Build Conditions Level of Service Analysis

Peak Hour	Intersection/ Approach	No Build				Build			Mitigated Build				
		Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	
AM	Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	LT	1.06	93.5	F	1.10	105.7	F+	LT	1.06	92.5	F	
	Westbound	R	0.88	56.4	E	0.90	59.6	E	R	0.87	52.5	D	
	Northbound	T	0.57	10.3	B	0.58	10.4	B	T	0.59	11.2	B	
		R	0.57	19.0	B	0.58	19.3	B	R	0.60	20.6	C	
Intersection			30.1	C		32.8	C			30.4	C		
Midday	Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	LT	0.85	48.5	D	0.90	56.3	E+	LT	0.84	45.0	D	
	Westbound	R	0.72	39.0	D	0.74	40.3	D	R	0.68	34.4	C	
	Northbound	TR	0.64	11.1	B	0.65	11.3	B	TR	0.68	13.2	B	
	Intersection			19.7	B		21.3	C			20.3	C	
	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	T	0.87	46.9	D	0.87	46.9	D	T	0.87	46.9	D	
		R	0.85	71.3	E	0.85	71.3	E	R	0.85	71.3	E	
	Westbound	DefL	1.17	125.4	F	1.17	125.4	F	DefL	1.17	125.4	F	
		T	1.27	155.9	F	1.27	158.6	F	T	1.27	158.6	F	
Southbound	LTR	1.30	166.8	F	1.31	173.8	F+	LT	1.08	74.9	E		
	R							R	1.07	114.2	F		
Intersection			138.4	F		142.7	F			94.1	F		

Table S-6 (cont'd)
Comparison of 2032 No Build, Build, and Mitigated Build Conditions Level of Service Analysis

Peak Hour	Intersection/ Approach	No Build				Build			Mitigated Build			
		Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS
PM	Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street											
	Eastbound	DefL	1.44	281.1	F	1.48	296.2	F	DefL	1.48	295.7	F
		T	0.90	47.8	D	0.90	47.8	D	T	0.88	43.6	D
	Westbound	TR	1.07	75.6	E	1.08	81.0	F+	TR	1.05	69.9	E
	Northbound	L	0.58	21.4	C	0.58	21.4	C	L	0.60	22.6	C
		TR	0.85	19.7	B	0.86	19.9	B	TR	0.88	21.7	C
	Intersection			45.2	D		47.4	D			45.0	D
	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street											
	Eastbound	T	0.89	50.4	D	0.89	50.4	D	T	0.85	45.2	D
		R	0.75	58.6	E	0.75	58.6	E	R	0.71	53.4	D
	Westbound	DefL	1.00	70.8	E	1.00	70.8	E	DefL	0.98	63.1	E
		T	1.25	147.6	F	1.26	150.6	F+	T	1.23	137.9	F
	Southbound	L	0.68	35.9	D	0.70	37.0	D	L	0.73	40.2	D
		T	0.92	36.5	D	0.94	38.0	D	T	0.97	43.7	D
		R	0.67	36.6	D	0.70	38.6	D	R	0.73	41.9	D
	Intersection			65.2	E		66.5	E			65.2	E
	Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street											
	Eastbound	R	1.05	95.6	F	1.08	104.6	F+	R	1.04	91.8	F
	Westbound	L	0.71	38.4	D	0.71	38.0	D	L	0.68	35.5	D
		LT	0.72	36.6	D	0.73	36.8	D	LT	0.70	34.5	C
	Southbound	TR	0.79	12.9	B	0.81	13.3	B	TR	0.82	14.6	B
	Intersection			25.7	C		27.0	C			26.1	C
	Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street											
	Eastbound	R	0.67	35.0	C	0.85	48.5	D+	R	0.81	43.3	D
Westbound	LT	0.47	27.6	C	0.47	27.6	C	LT	0.45	26.3	C	
Southbound	TR	0.81	13.4	B	0.82	13.6	B	TR	0.84	14.9	B	
Intersection			16.2	B		18.2	B			18.7	B	
Pre-Theater	Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street											
	Eastbound	DefL	1.46	291.7	F	1.48	296.7	F	LT	1.05	79.9	E
		T	0.99	67.1	E	0.99	67.1	E				
	Westbound	TR	1.16	111.0	F	1.17	116.4	F+	T	0.71	26.9	C
									R	0.92	58.7	E
	Northbound	LTR	1.01	38.5	D	1.01	39.5	D	LTR	1.01	39.5	D
	Intersection			68.3	E		70.6	E			44.2	D
	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street											
	Eastbound	T	0.89	50.4	D	0.89	50.4	D	T	0.85	45.2	D
		R	0.96	95.8	F	0.96	95.8	F	R	0.92	83.3	F
	Westbound	DefL	0.94	57.6	E	0.94	57.6	E	DefL	0.92	51.2	D
		T	1.24	144.3	F	1.25	149.0	F+	T	1.22	136.8	F
	Southbound	LTR	1.20	124.2	F	1.21	129.7	F+	LT	1.01	52.7	D
									R	1.07	109.0	F
	Intersection			110.3	F		114.3	F			73.5	E
	Broadway, Columbus Avenue* and West 65th Street											
	Eastbound	TR	0.84	44.2	D	0.85	44.3	D	TR	0.85	44.3	D
		R	0.61	42.5	D	0.61	42.5	D	R	0.61	42.5	D
	Northbound	TR	1.01	65.3	E	1.01	64.7	E	TR	1.01	64.7	E
	Southbound	T	1.17	119.0	F	1.17	120.1	F	T	1.17	120.1	F
	Southbound*	L	0.72	42.7	D	0.72	42.7	D	L	0.72	42.7	D
		T	1.22	138.7	F	1.23	141.7	F+	T	1.17	115.7	F
	Intersection			98.8	F		100.1	F			91.8	F

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = Defacto Left Turn; + Significant Traffic Impact.

MITIGATION OF IMPACTS—2032 (continued)

Midday Peak Hour

Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting two seconds of green time from the northbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street: Parking is currently permitted on both sides of the southbound approach during the midday peak hour. The impact identified for the southbound approach could be mitigated by daylighting the west curb lane for 100 feet to create an exclusive right turn lane. As noted above in the discussion of 2014 mitigation measures, it is recommended that NYCDOT impose No Standing 7 AM to 8 PM regulations at this location to minimize motorist confusion and facilitate enforcement. Furthermore, the number of parking spaces loss from the daylighting mitigation could be minimized via the installation of uni-meter parking.

PM Peak Hour

Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street: Impacts on the westbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the northbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street: Impacts on the westbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street: Impacts on the eastbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase.

Pre-Theater Peak Hour

Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street: Parking is currently permitted on the north side of the westbound approach during the pre-theater peak hour. The impact identified for the westbound approach could be mitigated by daylighting the north curb lane for 100 feet to create an exclusive right turn lane.

Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street: Impacts on the westbound approach could be mitigated by shifting one second of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase. Parking is currently permitted on both sides of the southbound approach during the pre-theater peak hour. The impact identified for the southbound approach could be mitigated by daylighting the west curb lane for 100 feet to create an exclusive right turn lane.

Broadway/Columbus Avenue and West 65th Street: Impacts on the southbound Columbus Avenue approach could be mitigated by eliminating parking on the west curb of Columbus Avenue. This would necessitate extending the existing No Standing 7 AM–7 PM regulation by one hour to 8 PM.

MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE MODIFIED PROJECT

As described below in “Modifications to the Proposed Action,” due to the modified project’s lower auto share—which would result in lower incremental traffic volumes and vehicle delays than the proposed action—impacts with the modified project are expected to be lower in magnitude or eliminated, with the exception of one movement in the 2032 AM peak hour. Measures similar to those recommended above for the

proposed action would be required to mitigate the impacts projected for the modified project, as summarized below in “Modifications to the Proposed Action.”

PEDESTRIANS

The proposed action would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts in the 2032 Build condition at the north crosswalk of Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street during the PM and pre-theater peak periods. With the implementation of the measures discussed below, the proposed action would not result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

Columbus Avenue and 60th Street—The north crosswalk at this intersection would deteriorate within LOS E with a reduction in average pedestrian space from 11.8 square feet per pedestrian (SFP) to 10.7 SFP during the PM peak period and from 12.7 SFP to 11.5 SFP during the pre-theater evening peak period. These impacts could be mitigated by shifting 3 seconds of green time from the southbound phase to the eastbound/westbound phase to allow for more time to cross Columbus Avenue.

CONSTRUCTION

- **Historic Resources During Construction.** A Construction Protection Plan would be implemented to protect resources such as the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, which are located within 90 feet of the proposed construction activities. The plan would be developed in consultation with and approved by New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (SHPO) and LPC, and would conform with applicable City and state guidelines.
- **Construction Traffic.** During Phase I construction in 2011, significant adverse traffic impacts were identified at one study area intersection during the 3–4 PM analysis hour. During Phase II construction on Site 1 in 2021, significant adverse traffic impacts were identified at one study area intersection during the 3–4 PM analysis hour and five study area intersections during the 5–6 PM analysis hour. During Phase II construction on Site 6 in 2031, significant adverse traffic impacts were identified at two study area intersections during the 3–4 PM analysis hour and five study area intersections during the 5–6 PM analysis hour. All projected impacts in 2011, 2021, and 2031 could be mitigated with either an early implementation of the Build condition mitigation strategies described above, or variations of these strategies, such as different signal timing shifts. The need for these variations on proposed mitigation measures to address the projected construction traffic impacts in 2011, 2021, and 2031 would be determined by NYCDOT during those years. For the modified project, the same significant adverse traffic impacts during construction are expected. Measures similar to those recommended for the proposed action would be required to mitigate the construction traffic impacts projected for the modified project, as summarized below in “Modifications to the Proposed Action.”
- **Construction Air Quality.** To prevent potential significant adverse impacts on air quality from construction equipment and truck emissions, the following measures would be employed: diesel equipment reduction; use of clean, ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD); best available tailpipe emissions reduction technologies; use of Tier 2 or newer equipment; locating large emissions sources and activities away from sensitive uses (residential, schools); and any other appropriate measures, including restriction of on-site vehicle idle time to three minutes. Overall, these measures would be expected to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions to a greater degree than the measures required by local law.

- **Construction Noise.** Measures would be implemented to mitigate to the extent possible noise from construction. The only residential location where significant noise impacts are predicted to occur is at The Alfred, which has double-glazed windows and central air conditioning (i.e. alternative ventilation). Consequently, even during warm weather conditions, interior noise levels would be approximately 30-35 dBA less than exterior noise levels. The double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation at this residential structure would provide a significant amount of sound attenuation, and would result in interior noise levels during much of the time that are below 45 dBA L_{10} (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria). However, at the terraces on all four façades of The Alfred, the highest $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels would range from approximately 76 to 82 dBA during some peak periods of construction activity. Even though this residence has double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation (i.e., central air conditioning) which would reduce interior noise levels by approximately 30-35 dBA, during some limited daytime time periods construction activities would result in interior noise levels that would be above the 45 dBA L_{10} noise level recommended by CEQR for residences and result in significant adverse noise impacts.

In addition, while noise levels at the residential terraces at The Alfred currently exceed the CEQR acceptable range (55 dBA L_{10}) for an outdoor area requiring serenity and quiet, during the weekday daytime time periods identified above when construction activities are predicted to significantly increase noise levels, construction activities would exacerbate these exceedances and result in significant adverse noise impacts at the terraces at The Alfred.

Consequently, the proposed action would have unmitigated significant noise impacts at the locations specified above for limited periods of time.

ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

The three alternatives analyzed are a No Action Alternative, in which the proposed actions are not approved; an As-of-Right Alternative, in which the campus is fully developed in conformance with its existing zoning and without the need for any land use actions; and a No Unmitigated Impact Alternative, which explores modifications to the proposed actions that would mitigate noise impacts during construction.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative provides a baseline against which impacts of the proposed action may be compared. It assumes that the proposed action, special permits from CPC to waive height, setback, and minimum distance requirements and to allow accessory parking on Fordham University's Lincoln Center campus, would not be approved. Without these special permits, Fordham would lease or otherwise convey portions of its site to private developers for the development of three new residential buildings. The resulting residential buildings on the site would be built as-of-right under the site's existing zoning and would not receive financing from DASNY.

The three residential buildings constructed in the No Action Alternative would be located along Amsterdam Avenue and West 62nd Street. The total floor area of the three buildings would be approximately 736,504 gross square feet. The three residential buildings in the No Build condition would provide the same floor area, number of units (up to 876 dwelling units), and ground-floor retail (along Amsterdam Avenue) as the two residential buildings in the proposed Master Plan. However, they would not provide any parking, and would

not require special permits from CPC. These buildings would be constructed and occupied by the 2014 Phase I build year.

No new educational or dormitory space would be provided on the Lincoln Center campus in the No Action Alternative.

Similar to the proposed Master Plan, the No Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts on: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomics; community facilities; open space; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; infrastructure; solid waste; energy; transit; and noise. However, the No Action Alternative would not be supportive of the educational and cultural institutions in the Lincoln Center area, and Fordham University would not fulfill its potential as an educational institution at this location in Manhattan.

In certain areas, the No Action Alternative would differ from the proposed action:

- **Historic Resources.** Unlike the proposed Master Plan, the No Action Alternative could have significant adverse impacts on architectural resources during construction. Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts is located within 90 feet of construction activities, and there would be no requirement for it to be protected by a Construction Protection Plan.
- **Shadows.** This alternative would cast shadows on P.S. 191, but similar to the proposed action these shadows would not be considered significant adverse impacts. The No Action Alternative would cast less shadow on Damrosch Park than the proposed action and would not have the significant adverse impact identified with the proposed action. This alternative would also avoid the significant adverse impacts on the Church of St. Paul the Apostle and on the Grove at the southeast corner of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.
- **Hazardous Materials.** With construction of the three residential buildings, there would be soil disturbance, potentially increasing the pathways for human exposure to any subsurface hazardous materials present on those lots. Although none of these sites has a known significant presence of hazardous materials, certain measures would not be required to be conducted in accordance with the procedures that would occur with the proposed action. However, legal requirements (including NYSDEC regulations) would need to be followed for off-site disposal of soil/fill and if petroleum tanks and/or spills are identified. As such, with the No Action Alternative, the amount of soil disturbance would be less, but controls would potentially not be as stringent as under the proposed action.
- **Traffic.** With the No Action Alternative, the projected increases in traffic associated with additional students, faculty, and staff of the proposed action would not occur. As a result, this alternative would eliminate the significant adverse traffic impacts and need for mitigation projected with the proposed action.
- **Pedestrians.** With the No Action Alternative, the projected increases in pedestrian trips associated with additional students, faculty, and staff of the proposed action would not occur. As a result, this alternative would eliminate the significant adverse pedestrian impacts and need for mitigation projected with the proposed action.
- **Air Quality.** Given the lower heights of the buildings in the No Action Alternative, it is possible that the No Action Alternative could result in a direct effect on nearby residential buildings that have operable windows at elevations close to the lower stack heights of the new buildings. Additional analyses would need to be performed to determine if any sensitive receptors would be impacted by

the lower stack heights in this alternative. However, because the No Action Alternative would be constructed as-of-right and would not require environmental review, no such analyses would be required.

- **Construction.** Under the No Action Alternative, construction would be of shorter duration than under the proposed action. All construction would take place in Phase I and the work associated with Fordham's academic and dormitory buildings in Phase I and Phase II campus development would not occur. The one significant adverse impact from construction traffic during Phase I of the proposed action would not occur under the No Action Alternative. The one and six significant adverse impacts from construction traffic during the early and afternoon peak hours, respectively, that are expected in 2021 with the proposed action would not occur. Likewise, the three and six significant adverse impacts from construction traffic during the early and afternoon peak hours, respectively, that are expected in 2031 would not occur. It is possible that additional significant adverse impacts to air quality from construction equipment and trucks could occur under the No Action Alternative because construction would presumably abide by less stringent emission and noise reduction measures than those described in this document. Likewise, the number of expected significant adverse noise impacts during construction with this alternative could increase because the contractor would not have to abide by the noise reduction measures that would be adopted under the proposed action. No significant adverse noise impacts would occur during the Phase II time period, because no construction would be undertaken during that time period under the No Action Alternative.
- **Public Health.** There would be less construction-related activity with the No Action Alternative, but the contractor would not have to abide by the strict emission and noise reduction measures described for the proposed action. Therefore, it is possible that significant adverse impacts related to air quality, noise, and soil disturbance could occur during construction under the No Action Alternative.

As-of-Right Alternative

Unlike the No Action Alternative, the As-of-Right Alternative would develop the full floor area available on the Fordham campus. Similar to the proposed action, it would total 1,607,460 square feet more than the No Action Alternative. It would have six more buildings than the No Action Alternative and would be built in two phases rather than one. It would provide the same academic and dormitory space as the proposed action, none of which would be provided with the No Action Alternative. While Fordham does not intend to build in this manner, the As-of-Right Alternative shows hypothetically what could be built on the campus under existing zoning.

The As-of-Right Alternative assumes that Fordham would develop the full allowable floor area under the applicable C4-7 zoning for its campus, without the need for any special permits from the CPC. The zoning floor area to be developed would be the same as the proposed action. The main difference would be the forms of the buildings in the As-of-Right Alternative, which would have to conform to the applicable bulk requirements of the zoning regulations. Further, this alternative would not provide any accessory parking.

The primary difference in configuration between the As-of-Right Alternative and the proposed action is that the alternative would result in a taller building in the center of the campus and shorter buildings around the perimeter. It would have three private residential buildings rather than two with the proposed action. The two buildings on the northwest and southwest corners of the project site along Amsterdam Avenue would be much shorter than with the proposed action. The third residential building would be 39 stories tall and located

midblock on West 62nd Street adjacent to the east side of The Alfred. East of the residential building would be a new Fordham building with both dormitory and classroom space.

Phase II development of the As-of-Right Alternative would create buildings along the eastern portion of the West 62nd Street frontage and along Columbus Avenue. These buildings would all have a six-story base uniformly built to the sidewalk line except for a small indentation on the West 62nd Street façade and a larger indentation on Columbus Avenue in line with West 61st Street.

The As-of-Right Alternative would result in a continuous streetwall from the midblock on West 62nd Street that would wrap around Columbus Avenue and continue west along West 60th Street where it would meet the existing podium. There would be no connection, either physical or visual, between Fordham's central internal open space and the sidewalks on these streets.

While this alternative would be as-of-right under the Zoning Resolution, individual academic and dormitory buildings would be subject to review under SEQRA for financing from DASNY.

For many of the analysis areas—land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomics; community facilities; open space; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; infrastructure; solid waste; energy; traffic; transit; and noise—the As-of-Right Alternative would be similar to the proposed Master Plan and would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

In certain areas, the As-of-Right Alternative would differ from the proposed action:

- **Historic Resources.** The As-of-Right Alternative would not be required to implement a Construction Protection Plan to protect resources that are located within 90 feet of proposed construction activities, such as the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and the Church of St. Paul the Apostle.
- **Shadows.** Similar to the proposed action, the As-of-Right Alternative would not have a significant adverse impact on the P.S. 191 playground. Also similar to the proposed action, this alternative would have significant adverse impacts on Damrosch Park in the fall, winter and spring; on the Grove in Lincoln Center during the spring, summer, and fall; and on the Church of St. Paul the Apostle in the summer. However, under the As-of-Right Alternative, there would be no potential implementation of any mitigation measures, as may occur with the proposed action.
- **Hazardous Materials.** With this alternative, certain measures would not be required to be conducted in accordance with the procedures that would occur with the proposed action. However, legal requirements (including NYSDEC regulations) would need to be followed for off-site disposal of soil/fill and if petroleum tanks and/or spills are identified. As such, with the No Action Alternative, the amount of soil disturbance would be less, but controls would potentially not be as stringent as under the proposed action.
- **Pedestrians.** As with the proposed action, the As-of-Right Alternative would have significant adverse pedestrian impacts on the north crosswalk at Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street during the PM and pre-theater peak periods in 2032.
- **Air Quality.** Additional analyses would need to be performed to determine if any sensitive receptors would be impacted by the lower stack heights in this alternative. However, because this alternative would be constructed as-of-right and would not require environmental review, no such analyses would be required.
- **Construction.** Because construction would be as-of-right, it could occur without the measures to reduce impacts which would be incorporated into the proposed action. Therefore, construction

activities under the As-of-Right alternative would be more likely to result in significant adverse impacts than with the proposed action.

- **Public Health.** Construction-related activity with the As-of-Right Alternative would be similar to that with the proposed action. However, the contractor would not have to abide by the strict emission and noise reduction measures described in this document. Therefore, it is possible that significant adverse impacts related to air quality, noise, and soil disturbance could occur during construction under the As-of-Right Alternative.

No Unmitigated Impact Alternative

There is no feasible alternative that would meet the goals of the proposed action while avoiding significant adverse construction noise impacts and shadow impacts to parts of Lincoln Center open space (Damrosch Park and the planned Grove) and the stained-glass windows of the Church of St. Paul the Apostle.

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

SHADOWS

The shadows analysis concluded that between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM on June 21, incremental shadow would fall across some of the windows on the north façade of the Church of Saint Paul the Apostle. The total duration of incremental shadow would be two hours. For about 45 minutes of this period no sunlight would fall on the windows due to a combination of incremental and existing shadow; for an additional 30 minutes of this period only one window would receive direct sunlight. The incremental shadow would therefore cause a significant adverse impact on the north windows of the church and apse on the June 21 analysis day. On the May 6/August 6 analysis day the impact would be less substantial—only 30 minutes of incremental shadow—and on the other two analysis days there would not be any incremental shadow. With the contemplated modifications to the proposed action, there would be a slight reduction in the extent of the shadow. However, the significant adverse impact would not be eliminated. Other potential mitigation measures would include artificial lighting of those windows in the summer when sunlight would otherwise reach these north-facing windows. Given the context of the church complex as a whole, this mitigation measure does not seem particularly practical. Therefore, in the absence of mitigation, this would remain an unavoidable adverse impact.

The shadows analysis also concluded that there would be significant adverse impacts on Damrosch Park and the Grove. The proposed action would add areas of new shadow to Damrosch Park on the March 21/September 21 and the December 21 analysis days. The additional areas of incremental shadow would fall in the late morning and early afternoon affecting primarily the seating areas and vegetation on the eastern side of the park. Overall, the full 2032 buildout of the proposed action would substantially reduce sunlight to Damrosch Park in the fall, winter and early spring, resulting in a significant adverse impact to this space. The health of the London plane trees and maples of the park might also be affected in the spring.

In 2032 with the full buildout, incremental shadow would fall on various sections of Lincoln Center Plaza throughout the year, with durations ranging from three to four hours depending on season. These durations would be attributed in large part to proposed buildings on the eastern end of the Fordham campus casting new shadow on the Grove. Phase II development would add approximately four hours of new shadow on this part of the Lincoln Center open space in the spring, summer and fall, and nearly two hours in the winter, and would therefore cause a significant adverse impact to this space.

Representatives of DPR and Fordham University have been meeting and are continuing to discuss potential mitigation measures for significant adverse shadow impact on Damrosch Park that is projected with full development of Phase II. Representatives of Lincoln Center have advised that they do not wish to address the issue of plant sensitivity at the Grove at this time, because of the long period of time that will elapse until construction of Phase II. If Fordham, DPR, and Lincoln Center do not ultimately reach agreement on implementation of mitigation measures, the increase in shadows would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on Damrosch Park and the Grove.

NOISE DURING CONSTRUCTION

The only residential location where significant impacts are predicted to occur is at The Alfred, which has double-glazed windows and central air conditioning (i.e., alternative ventilation). Consequently, even during warm weather conditions, interior noise levels would be approximately 30-35 dBA less than exterior noise levels. The double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation at this residential structure would provide a significant amount of sound attenuation, and would result in interior noise levels during much of the time that are below 45 dBA L_{10} (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria). However, at the terraces on all four façades of The Alfred, the highest $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels would range from approximately 76 to 82 dBA during some peak periods of construction activity. Even though this residence has double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation (i.e., central air conditioning) which would reduce interior noise levels by approximately 30-35 dBA, during some limited daytime time periods construction activities would result in interior noise levels that would be above the 45 dBA L_{10} noise level recommended by CEQR for residences and result in significant adverse noise impacts.

In addition, while noise levels at the residential terraces at The Alfred currently exceed the CEQR acceptable range (55 dBA L_{10}) for an outdoor area requiring serenity and quiet, during the weekday daytime time periods identified above when construction activities are predicted to significantly increase noise levels, construction activities would exacerbate these exceedances and result in significant adverse noise impacts at the terraces at The Alfred.

Consequently, the proposed action would have unmitigated significant noise impacts at the locations specified above for limited periods of time.

GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The new academic, dormitory, and residential uses introduced by the proposed action would contribute to growth in the city and state economies; however, they would not be expected to induce additional notable growth outside the project site. The area surrounding the project site has been fully developed for decades, and the level of development is controlled by zoning. As such, the proposed action would not “induce” new growth in the study areas.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Under the proposed project, both natural and man-made resources would be expended in the construction and implementation of the proposed Master Plan. These resources include the building materials used during construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various elements of the proposed action. These are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the proposed project would be highly unlikely. The proposed project would also result in increased energy consumption over the

No Build condition. This, however, is not considered significant energy consumption or a significant impact, and the project is also committed to implementing sustainability goals.

These commitments of land resources and materials are weighed against the public purpose and benefits of the proposed development, which would accommodate both the existing activities on the Lincoln Center campus (which are not adequately housed in existing buildings) and the anticipated expansion of the University's programs over the next 25 years. The Master Plan creates an opportunity for Fordham to meet the increasing needs of New Yorkers who wish to take advantage of its educational programs, while simultaneously accommodating Fordham's students from across the country and around the globe.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

This section describes the modifications to the proposed action (the "proposed modifications") being contemplated by CPC. These modifications would reduce the bulk with smaller maximum building envelopes and lower building heights for most of the buildings expected to be built under the proposed Master Plan. There would be less floor area, fewer parking spaces by the removal of a garage, and certain other design changes described below.

Baseline conditions for evaluating potential impacts—the future without the proposed action presented in the FEIS analyses for 2014 and 2032—are the same for both the proposed action and for the modified project.

Overall, the analysis concludes that the proposed action including potential modifications would reduce to some degree the significant adverse environmental impacts identified for the proposed action in the FEIS, including shadow impacts and traffic impacts. For traffic, while overall impacts would be reduced, one turning movement would experience a significant adverse impact that otherwise would not occur with the proposed action. As described below, for the other technical areas, the modified project would have the same impact conclusions as those with the proposed action.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

CPC issued a Notice of Completion for the DEIS on November 17, 2008, and circulated the DEIS for public review. Since the issuance of the DEIS, Fordham and its project team have continued to work on refinements to the Master Plan with Community Board 7, the Manhattan Borough President, City Council Member Gail Brewer, and the Department of City Planning to respond to comments voiced at the scoping meeting, various Community Board meetings, and the DEIS public hearing. In the context of discussions with the Borough President, Fordham agreed in writing to make certain modifications to its plan in response to community concerns, subject to review and approval by CPC and the City Council. The changes described below reflect the outcome of those discussions as well as the proposed further modifications now under consideration by CPC.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

While the site plan for the campus (including the number of proposed buildings, their use and locations) would generally remain as described in the DEIS and above, modifications contemplated by CPC would affect density and floor area, building heights and bulk, parking, ground-floor transparency, the width of sidewalks on Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street, the entrance stairs on Columbus Avenue and West

62nd Street, and requirements for ground-floor transparency. The following sections describe the proposed modifications in more detail.

DENSITY AND FLOOR AREA

The proposed modifications include actual and effective floor area reductions. Compared with the proposed project, additional below-grade space would be used for academic programs, academic and dormitory space would be reduced, building heights would be lowered and building bulk would be reduced.

A decrease of 63,172 zsf of floor area (67,205 gsf) would be achieved by constructing cellar level academic facilities on Sites 1, 2, 5, 5a, and 6. An additional reduction of 80,902 zsf (85,838 gsf) would be realized through reductions of floor area on Sites 1, 2 and 3/3a above grade that will not be replaced either below or above ground. For Site 3 under Option 2 (i.e., stacked option), this would include a reduction of 10,736 square feet of dormitory program area. Taken together, the use of cellar space and the reduction in program area would result in a floor area reduction of 144,074 zsf (153,043 gsf)³.

In addition, heights of the buildings on Amsterdam Avenue would be decreased by lowering floor-to-floor heights on Sites 3 and 4. The reductions of 20 feet in the case of Site 3 (stacked option) and 30 feet in the case of Site 4 are the equivalent of 2 and 3 stories, respectively, assuming a 10 foot floor-to-floor height.

With the actual reductions of 144,074 zsf in place, the overall size of the Master Plan with proposed modifications would be 2,876,406 zsf compared to 3,020,480 zsf with the proposed actions. The floor area reductions are summarized and the modified project is compared with the proposed action in Table S-7.

**Table S-7
 Reduced Floor Area with the Proposed Modifications**

Floor Area Reductions	Zsf	Gsf
Program reduction	80,902	85,838
Cellar Excavation	63,172	67,205
Total Actual Reductions	144,074	153,043
TOTAL ZSF		
Proposed Action	3,020,480	
With Proposed Modifications	2,876,406	
Notes: zsf-zoning square feet; gsf-gross square feet		
Sources: Cooper Robertson+Partners		

BUILDING HEIGHTS AND BULK

Under the proposed modifications, maximum building heights for those sites along Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues would be lower. Two reduced massing schemes are under consideration.

³ In order to ensure the implementation of the reductions, drawings illustrating applicable design controls will be part of the ULURP application set and some of these drawings may be attached to a restrictive declaration.

Along Columbus Avenue, there are two options for massing the tower portions: massing in two adjoining segments or massing as taller structures with narrower streetwalls. In either case, the heights would be reduced. Comparing the illustrative plans, the building on Site 1 would be reduced from 354 feet to either 314 or 334 feet, depending on the massing alternative chosen (see Table S-8). The building on Site 2 would be reduced from 439 feet (illustrative) to 365 or 405 feet, again depending on the massing alternative chosen.

Table S-8

Comparison of Illustrative Building Heights (in feet)

Condition	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3/3a Options		Site 4
			Two-tower	Stacked	
Proposed Project	354	439	558	600	651
Proposed Modifications Massing Option 1 (change)	314 (-40)	365 (-74)	518 (-40)	580 (-20)	620 (-31)
Proposed Modifications Massing Option 2 (change)	334 (-20)	405 (-34)	518 (-40)	580 (-20)	620 (-31)
Sources: Cooper Robertson+Partners					

As described above, two options for the proposed project are possible on Site 3/3a along Amsterdam Avenue—a two-tower configuration and a single-tower stacked configuration. With the proposed modifications, the two-tower configuration on Site 3/3a would be reduced from 558 to 518 feet (illustrative) and the single-tower stacked configuration would be reduced from 600 to 580 feet (illustrative). A mandatory 20-foot setback at a height of 130 feet would be introduced for the portion of Site 3a lying between the two towers on Amsterdam Avenue. For the stacked option, the base height would be reduced from 172 to 152 feet. For Site 4, also along Amsterdam Avenue, the height would be reduced from 651 to 620 feet.

The maximum building envelopes have been set separately for each of the two options on Sites 1 and 2 to reflect the reduced heights of the buildings as well as their setbacks. The Site 3/3a and Site 4 envelopes have also been revised to reflect the reduced heights of their respective buildings, and the Site 6 envelope has been reduced to provide the same amount of space between the envelope and illustrative building as the other Columbus Avenue sites. Also, the maximum building envelope for the Law School on Sites 5/5a has been tailored to follow more closely the building that has already been designed and is shown in the illustrative plans.

For the buildings along Columbus Avenue, the proposed modifications would include street frontage/bulk design guidelines contained in the drawings of the ULURP application. The guidelines would apply to upper portions of the buildings and would regulate maximum width, in order to prevent long unbroken stretches of façade, and would also establish minimum base height requirements for Sites 1 and 6. They would also regulate minimum differentials between the two Columbus Avenue buildings for total height and height of the upper setback. For the first massing scheme (two adjoining segments), minimum height differential between segments and minimum planar change would also be regulated.

PARKING

The proposed modifications include eliminating the parking garage beneath the Law School and Schools of Education and Social Service (Sites 5, 5a and 6). With the proposed action, this parking garage (Garage B) would provide 265 accessory parking spaces for Fordham faculty, staff and administration. Instead, with the

proposed modifications Fordham would use up to 50 percent of a maximum of 137 spaces in the Site 3/3a garage (Garage C). For both Garages A and C, the total parking would be limited to the lesser of the number of spaces proposed in the ULURP application for each garage or 35 percent of the total number of dwelling units constructed in each residential building.

SIDEWALKS

The project modifications would include increased sidewalk widths. Compared with the proposed project, sidewalks would be at least 10 feet wider along the building frontage of Site 2 (not including the stair opening) and along the portion of the frontage of Site 1 closest to the entry stair. The widened sidewalk in front of Site 2 would also be required to be planted at the street line with at least four street trees. Sidewalk widenings would also be provided along portions of the West 62nd Street frontage at the entrance to the stair, in front of the contemplated theater entrance and in front of the entrance to the Law School.

COLUMBUS AVENUE ENTRANCE STAIRWAY

The proposed modifications would open up views of and access to the main entry stair along Columbus Avenue for people approaching from both the south and north. This would be accomplished by reconfiguring the footprints of the buildings on Site 1 and Site 2. By pulling the street walls of these buildings away from the sidewalk on either side of the stair, and allowing stair and lower landing to extend north and south, the stair will become more visible and accessible for approaching pedestrians. In addition, the sidewalk areas north and south of the stair would be widened, and in the case of Site 2, this sidewalk widening extends to 60th Street, enabling additional street trees to be planted.

POTENTIAL CHANGES IN DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

The reductions in height and bulk will generally reduce the size of the height and setback waivers, but other waivers would generally remain the same. The Special Permit for parking Garage B would no longer be necessary as Garage B has been removed from the Master Plan.

Since only the Law School building has actually been designed, future input from the Community Board, elected officials and CPC is anticipated as Fordham develops architectural plans and prepares to build other individual buildings. Fordham has proposed a panel to be created by the Borough President and Councilmember to review and comment upon the design of each building in the Master Plan as it is designed. The review procedure would permit comment by community members during preparation of conceptual drawings as well as at the schematic stages and would provide early information on conceptual massing and materials. Substantial changes in these elements of a design would require Fordham to resubmit the design to the community. The review procedure would be incorporated in a restrictive declaration enforceable by the city.

ANALYSES

As described above, the proposed modifications would generally result in lower buildings, less floor area, and less parking. For each technical analysis area of the FEIS, the potential environmental effects of the proposed project including the proposed modifications were identified to determine whether there would be any new or different environmental effects not already identified in the FEIS. For the following technical areas, the modified project would have the same impact conclusions—i.e., no significant adverse impacts—as those with the proposed action: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community

facilities; open space; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; natural resources; hazardous materials; infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation service; energy; transit and pedestrians; air quality; noise; construction; and public health. The analyses determined there would be different environmental effects in the areas of shadows, traffic and parking, and construction traffic. These are detailed below.

SHADOWS

The proposed modifications would decrease the height and bulk of maximum building envelopes. This would result in a reduction in shadows on all sun-sensitive open space resources affected by project-generated shadow. Compared with the proposed action, the duration of incremental shadow generated by the modified project would remain the same for each resource, but the size of the incremental shadows would be smaller in every case, for most or all of the incremental shadow duration.

The shadows analysis of the proposed action concludes that it would result in significant adverse shadow impacts to Damrosch Park and to the Grove throughout the year. The modified project would result in the same significant adverse shadow impacts; however, the smaller extent of incremental shadow at certain times of day would reduce the degree of the impacts on both of these open spaces. The proposed action would also result in a significant adverse shadow impact to some of the clerestory windows along the north façade of St. Paul the Apostle Church on the morning of the June 21 analysis day. The modified project would cast the same incremental shadow on these windows, resulting in the same significant adverse shadow impact.

Representatives of DPR and Fordham University have been meeting and are continuing to discuss potential mitigation measures for the significant adverse shadow impact on Damrosch Park that is projected with full development of Phase II. Representatives of Lincoln Center have advised that they do not wish to address the issue of plant sensitivity at the Grove at this time, because of the long period of time that will elapse until construction of Phase II. If Fordham, DPR, and Lincoln Center do not ultimately reach agreement on implementation of mitigation measures, the increase in shadows would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on Damrosch Park and the Grove. For St. Paul the Apostle Church, provision of alternative lighting would be a potential mitigation measure. But in the absence of mitigation, this would remain an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

Figures based on the analysis were created to depict shadows cast by the full buildout of the modified project on the surrounding area at representative times of the year. The figures highlight the areas in surrounding open spaces that would experience a reduction in incremental shadow compared with the proposed action. In addition to providing snapshots of specific times of day and the reduced extent of incremental shadow at that time, the figures together provide an overall sense of the global effects on shadows of the reduction in height and bulk.

Figures show shadows at representative times on the March 21/September 21 analysis day. At 10:00 AM there would be no difference between shadows cast by the modified project and those cast by the proposed action; incremental shadows from Site 3/3a would fall all the way across a portion of the P.S. 191 playground, and all the way across a portion of the Amsterdam Houses playground with both the proposed and modified projects. Shadows depicted at 12:00 PM indicate the reduced extents of new shadow on Damrosch Park and Samuel N. Bennerson playground that would result from the proposed modifications, compared with the proposed project. At 2:00 PM, areas of Damrosch Park and the Grove would experience a reduction in incremental shadow at that time. At 4:30 PM, reductions in incremental shadow would occur on Lincoln Center plaza, Dante Park and the Broadway malls.

In the morning of June 21, open spaces west and northwest of the project site would experience reductions in the extent of incremental shadow with the modified project. For example at 10:00 AM, reduced extents are would occur on the West 59th Street Recreation Center and P.S. 191 playground. At 2:00 PM Damrosch Park and the Grove would experience slightly smaller areas of incremental shadow with the modified project. Late in the day, open spaces northeast and east of the project would experience reductions in extent of incremental shadow.

On December 21, small reductions in the extent of incremental shadow would occur on open spaces northwest, north and northeast of the project site with the proposed modifications.

In conclusion, compared to the proposed action, the modified project would have the same significant adverse impacts to Damrosch Park and the Grove, as well as to St. Paul the Apostle Church. However, due to the reduction in building massing, the effects on Damrosch Park and the Grove would be lessened. As noted above, representatives of DPR and Fordham have been meeting and are continuing to discuss potential mitigation measures for the significant adverse shadow impact on Damrosch Park and the Grove. If an agreement is not ultimately reached in implementation of mitigation measures, the increase in shadows would be considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact on these features. For St. Paul the Apostle Church, provision of alternative lighting would be a potential mitigation measure. But in the absence of mitigation, this would remain an unavoidable adverse impact.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Compared to the proposed action, the modified project would yield slightly less total program space than the proposed action but the same population increments over the future No Build conditions as the proposed action. The modified project would keep the 68-space garage A, eliminate Garage B (155 and 265 spaces in 2014 and 2032, respectively), and reallocate up to half of the spaces in 137-space garage C from accessory condominium parking to Fordham faculty and staff use. For the proposed action, the provision of discounted on-site parking for Fordham faculty and staff was expected to induce a percentage of those who currently take public transit to drive to campus. With the modified project, the reduction in parking would mean that there would not be adequate on-campus supply to fully incentivize a shift of faculty and staff travel from transit to auto. Hence, it was assumed that the faculty and staff auto share would remain at 15.3 percent instead of increasing to 24.2 percent as under the proposed action. As a result, compared to the proposed action, the modified project would, in general, result in lower incremental traffic volumes and vehicle delays at the study area intersections.

Table S-9 compares total university-based project increments in 2014 and 2032 for the proposed action and the modified project. The 2014 AM, midday, and pre-theater peak hour project-generated increments would be below 50 vehicle trips, the CEQR threshold for requiring a detailed traffic analysis. Hence, no significant adverse traffic impacts would be expected for these time periods.

Table S-9
Comparison of University-Based Vehicle Trip Increments

Build Year	Peak Hour	Proposed Action									Modified Project								
		Auto		Taxi		Delivery		Total			Auto		Taxi		Delivery		Total		
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	Total	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	Total
2014	AM	22	5	2	2	2	2	26	9	35	7	5	2	2	2	2	11	9	20
	MD	32	26	5	5	2	2	39	33	72	13	11	5	5	2	2	20	18	38
	PM	13	41	12	12	2	2	27	55	82	10	15	12	12	2	2	24	29	53
	PT	7	17	6	6	0	0	13	23	36	7	8	6	6	0	0	13	14	27
2032	AM	32	8	5	5	9	9	46	22	68	13	8	5	5	9	9	27	22	49*
	MD	43	36	9	9	7	7	59	52	111	22	18	9	9	7	7	38	34	72
	PM	25	59	23	23	5	5	53	87	140	22	28	23	23	5	5	50	56	106
	PT	20	33	14	14	0	0	34	42	81	19	23	14	14	0	0	33	37	70

Notes: * The 49 vehicle-trip increment, when converted to passenger car equivalents (PCE's), would exceed the 50 vehicle-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a detailed analysis.

As described above under “Traffic and Parking,” the proposed action would result in significant adverse traffic impacts in the 2014 midday and PM peak hours and in the 2032 AM, midday, PM, and pre-theater peak hours at the intersections listed below.

2014 MIDDAY PEAK HOUR

- Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street
- Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street

2014 PM PEAK HOUR

- Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street

2032 AM PEAK HOUR

- Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street

2032 MIDDAY PEAK HOUR

- Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street
- Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street

2032 PM PEAK HOUR

- Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street
- Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street
- Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street
- Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street

2032 PRE-THEATER PEAK HOUR

- Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street
- Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street
- Broadway/Columbus Avenue and West 65th Street

Due to the modified project's lower auto share—which would result in lower incremental traffic volumes and vehicle delays than the proposed action—impacts with the modified project are expected to be lower in magnitude or eliminated. The 2014 midday peak hour impacts identified under the proposed action would be eliminated due to increments below CEQR thresholds under the modified project. During the other time periods (2014 PM, and 2032 AM, midday, PM, and pre-theater peak hours), projected impacts would be reduced or eliminated. Unlike the proposed action, the modified project would not have significant adverse impacts at the following locations and times:

2014 MIDDAY PEAK HOUR

- Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street
- Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street

2032 MIDDAY PEAK HOUR

- Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street

2032 PM PEAK HOUR

- Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street
- Columbus Avenue and West 62nd Street

The number of intersections experiencing significant impacts would be lower with the modified project than with the proposed action—with 5 intersections experiencing significant impacts under the modified project versus 6 with the proposed action. There would also be fewer movements with significant adverse impacts under the modified project, with 10 impacted movements under the modified project versus 14 with the proposed action. However, at Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street in the 2032 AM peak hour (where an eastbound impact has been identified for the proposed action) there would also be a westbound right-turn impact with the modified project. This westbound impact would not occur under the proposed action.

The mitigation measures recommended for the proposed action would similarly mitigate the significant adverse impacts of the modified project. Table S-10 presents the No Build, Build, and mitigated Build levels of service analysis results at intersections where the modified project is expected to result in significant adverse traffic impacts and Table S-11 summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for the modified project.

The modified project would result in slightly higher area-wide off-street parking utilization levels in both 2014 and 2032 due to the higher faculty/staff and condominium parking demand that would be exerted onto off-street parking facilities in the area. However, although the modified project would yield a higher demand of the area's parking resources than would the proposed action, both would result in lower overall area parking utilization than the future without the proposed actions. Therefore, both the proposed action and the modified project would result in no significant adverse impacts to area parking facilities.

Table S-10

Comparison of No Build, Build, and

Mitigated Build Conditions Level of Service Analysis for the Modified Project

Build Year / Peak Hour	Intersection/ Approach	No Build				Build			Mitigated Build				
		Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec)	LOS	
2014 PM	Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	R	0.98	77.1	E	1.00	82.1	F+	R	0.97	72.1	E	
	Westbound	L	0.66	35.5	D	0.66	35.1	D	L	0.63	33.0	C	
		LT	0.67	34.0	C	0.66	33.6	C	LT	0.64	31.8	C	
	Southbound	TR	0.73	11.7	B	0.74	11.8	B	TR	0.75	12.8	B	
	Intersection			22.5	C		23.1	C			22.5	C	
2032 AM	Amsterdam Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	LT	1.06	93.5	F	1.08	98.5	F+	LT	1.04	85.4	F	
	Westbound	R	0.88	56.4	E	0.93	63.7	E+	R	0.89	55.7	E	
	Northbound	T	0.57	10.3	B	0.58	10.3	B	T	0.59	11.1	B	
		R	0.57	19.0	B	0.58	19.3	B	R	0.60	20.6	C	
	Intersection			30.1	C		32.0	C			29.6	C	
2032 Midday	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	T	0.87	46.9	D	0.87	46.9	D	T	0.87	46.9	D	
		R	0.85	71.3	E	0.85	71.3	E	R	0.85	71.3	E	
	Westbound	DefL	1.17	125.4	F	1.17	125.4	F	DefL	1.17	125.4	F	
		T	1.27	155.9	F	1.27	158.6	F	T	1.27	158.6	F	
Southbound	LTR	1.30	166.8	F	1.30	170.2	F+	LT	1.07	73.1	E		
		R	1.06	109.7	F			R	1.06	109.7	F		
	Intersection			138.4	F		140.8	F			93.1	F	
2032 PM	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	T	0.89	50.4	D	0.89	50.4	D	T	0.85	45.2	D	
		R	0.75	58.6	E	0.75	58.6	E	R	0.71	53.4	D	
	Westbound	DefL	1.00	70.8	E	1.00	70.8	E	DefL	0.98	63.1	E	
		T	1.25	147.6	F	1.26	150.0	F+	T	1.23	137.3	F	
	Southbound	L	0.68	35.9	D	0.71	37.2	D	L	0.73	40.4	D	
		T	0.92	36.5	D	0.93	37.4	D	T	0.96	42.8	D	
		R	0.67	36.6	D	0.69	37.6	D	R	0.71	40.6	D	
		Intersection			65.2	E		66.1	E			64.6	E
	Columbus Avenue and West 60th Street												
	Eastbound	R	1.05	95.6	F	1.08	104.6	F+	R	1.04	91.8	F	
	Westbound	L	0.71	38.4	D	0.72	38.7	D	L	0.69	36.1	D	
		LT	0.72	36.6	D	0.74	37.8	D	LT	0.72	35.4	D	
	Southbound	TR	0.79	12.9	B	0.80	13.2	B	TR	0.82	14.4	B	
		Intersection			25.7	C		27.1	C			26.2	C
2032 Pre-Theater	Tenth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	DefL	1.46	291.7	F	1.48	296.7	F	LT	1.05	79.9	E	
		T	0.99	67.1	E	0.99	67.1	E					
	Westbound	TR	1.16	111.0	F	1.17	115.0	F+	T	0.71	26.9	C	
									R	0.91	58.2	E	
	Northbound	LTR	1.01	38.5	D	1.01	39.4	D	LTR	1.01	39.4	D	
		Intersection			68.3	E		70.2	E			44.1	D
	Ninth Avenue and West 57th Street												
	Eastbound	T	0.89	50.4	D	0.89	50.4	D	T	0.85	45.2	D	
		R	0.96	95.8	F	0.96	95.8	F	R	0.92	83.3	F	
	Westbound	DefL	0.94	57.6	E	0.94	57.6	E	DefL	0.92	51.2	D	
		T	1.24	144.3	F	1.25	148.3	F+	T	1.22	136.2	F	
	Southbound	LTR	1.20	124.2	F	1.21	128.9	F+	LT	1.01	52.4	D	
									R	1.07	107.7	F	
		Intersection			110.3	F		113.7	F			73.2	E
	Broadway, Columbus Avenue* and West 65th Street												
	Eastbound	TR	0.84	44.2	D	0.85	44.3	D	TR	0.85	44.3	D	
		R	0.61	42.5	D	0.61	42.5	D	R	0.61	42.5	D	
Northbound	TR	1.01	65.3	E	1.01	64.7	E	TR	1.01	64.7	E		
Southbound	T	1.17	119.0	F	1.17	120.1	F	T	1.17	120.1	F		
Southbound*	L	0.72	42.7	D	0.72	42.7	D	L	0.72	42.7	D		
	T	1.22	138.7	F	1.23	141.7	F+	T	1.17	115.7	F		
	Intersection			98.8	F		100.1	F			91.8	F	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = Defacto Left Turn; + Significant Traffic Impact.

Table S-11
Recommended Mitigation Measures for the Modified Project

Build Year	Intersection	Mitigation Measure			
		AM Peak Hour	Midday Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Pre-Theater Peak Hour
2014	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Not required
2032	Tenth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Not required	Not required	Daylight north curb lane on westbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane
	Amsterdam Avenue & West 60th Street	Shift 1 second of green time from NB to EB/WB	Not required	Not required	Not required
	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane and shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB
	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from SB to EB/WB	Not required
	Broadway/Columbus Avenue & West 65th Street	Not required	Not required	Not required	Extend No Standing 7 AM–7 PM regulation to 8 PM along the west curb of the SB Columbus Avenue approach.

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

As with the proposed action, the modified project would result in one significant adverse traffic impact from peak 2011 construction in Phase I during the early afternoon peak traffic hour. In 2021, significant adverse traffic impacts at one intersection and five intersections could occur during the early afternoon and afternoon peak traffic hours, respectively. In 2031, significant adverse impacts at two intersections and five intersections could occur during the early afternoon and afternoon peak traffic hours, respectively.

Unlike the proposed action, however, the modified project would not require mitigation measures for the 2014 midday peak hour. It would also not require mitigation measures at a few intersections during the 2032 midday and PM peak hours that would otherwise be required with the proposed action. Therefore, mitigating the construction-related traffic impacts would require an early implementation of either mitigation measures recommended for the modified project or those previously identified under the proposed action. In addition, as with the proposed action, variations of these measures, such as the additional two or three-second shift in green time at two locations during the 2021 and 2031 construction analysis years, have been identified. The need for these variations on proposed mitigation measures would be determined by NYCDOT during those years. Table S-12 summarizes the mitigation measures recommended for the construction-related traffic impacts under the modified project.

Table S-12
Recommended Traffic Mitigation Measures for Construction of the Modified Project

Build Year	Intersection	Mitigation Measure		
		6-7 AM Peak Hour	3-4 PM Peak Hour	5-6 PM Peak Hour
2011	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane	Not required
2021	Tenth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from northbound to eastbound/westbound
	Amsterdam Avenue & West 62nd Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from northbound to westbound
	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane	Shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound
	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound
	Columbus Avenue & West 62nd Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound
2031	Tenth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 3 seconds of green time from northbound to eastbound/westbound
	Amsterdam Avenue & West 62nd Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound
	Ninth Avenue & West 57th Street	Not required	Daylight west curb lane on southbound approach for 100 feet to create exclusive right-turn lane; shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound	Shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound
	Columbus Avenue & West 60th Street	Not required	Shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound	Shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound
	Columbus Avenue & West 62nd Street	Not required	Not required	Shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to eastbound/westbound



Robert Dobruskin, AICP, Director
 Environmental Assessment and Review Division
 New York City Department of City Planning

New York City Department of City Planning

cc:

Amanda M. Burden, FAICP
City Planning Commissioners
The Hon. Scott M. Stringer
Helen Rosenthal, Chair, Community Board 7,
Manhattan
Penny Ryan, District Manager, Community
Board 7, Manhattan
Gail Benjamin, City Council
Robert Kulikowski, OEC
Terrell Estes, DEP
Jack D. Homkow, DASNY
Joshua Laird, DPR
Ruth Pierpont, NYSOPRHR
Naim Rasheed, DOT
Gina Santucci, LPC
Richard Barth
Glenn Friedman
Eddie Greenfield
Samuel Hornick

Edith Hsu-Chen
David Karnovsky
Eric Kober
Elizabeth Mackintosh
Diane McCarthy
Adam Meagher
Laurence Parnes
Phil Sperling
Sam Voyages
Thomas Wargo
Sarah Whitham
Adam Wolff
Wilbur Woods
Mehdi Amjadi
Pat Bussey
Mauricio Garcia
David Kucharsky
James Merani
Susan Wong