



21

Response to Comments on the DEIS

21.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes and responds to substantive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the GO Broome Street Development project published on August 23, 2019. City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) requires a public hearing on the DEIS as part of the environmental review process. Oral and written comments were received during the public hearing held by the New York City Department of City Planning on December 4, 2019. Written comments were accepted from publication of the DEIS through the close of the public comment period, which ended at 5:00 PM on December 16, 2019. Appendix 5 contains the written comments received on the DEIS.

Section 21.2 lists the elected officials, organizations, and individuals that provided relevant comments on the DEIS. Section 21.3 contains a summary of these relevant comments and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Comments are organized by subject matter and generally parallel the chapter structure of the DEIS. Where more than one commenter expressed similar views, those comments have been grouped and addressed together. Pursuant to SEQR and CEQR regulations, the lead agency must respond to substantive comments on the DEIS. Therefore, this document provides responses to comments related to the environmental review.

21.2 List of Elected Officials, Organizations, and Individuals who Commented on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Elected Officials

1. Manhattan Borough President Gale A. Brewer, recommendation dated November 18, 2019 (Brewer)

Community Board

2. Alysha Lewis-Coleman, Board Chair, and Jacky Wong, Chair of Land Use, Zoning, Public, and Private Housing for Manhattan Community Board 3, resolution dated September 2019 (Manhattan CB3)

Organizations and Businesses

3. Katelyn Andrews, Live on NY, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Live on NY)
4. Jane T. Eng, President and Executive Director of the Charles B. Wang Community Health Center, written statement dated December 2, 2019 (Charles B. Wang Community Health Center)
5. Wellington Z. Chen, Chinatown Partnership Local Development Corporation, written statement (Chinatown Partnership LDC)
6. Wai Wah Chin, President of the Chinese American Citizens Alliance of Greater New York, written statement dated December 4, 2019 (Chinese American Citizens Alliance of Greater New York)
7. Yin Yeung Chu, President of the Hong Ning HDFC Tenant Association, written statement dated (Hong Ning TA)
8. Barbara Davis, Chief Operating Officer of the Actors Fund, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (The Actors Fund)
9. Monique Flores, on behalf of Jen Vallone, University Settlement, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (University Settlement)
10. Donald Hong, President of 384 Grand Street HDFC, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (384 Grand Street HDFC)
11. Angela Howard, Vice President for Real Estate and Facilities for Covenant House International, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Covenant House International)
12. Michael Keller, Executive Director of the YMCA of Greater New York, written statement dated November 27, 2019 (YMCA)
13. Charles Lai, Executive Director of the Chung Pak Local Development Corporation, written testimony (Chung Pak LDC)
14. Kevin Moran, Breaking Ground, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Breaking Ground) – brought letter from CEO
15. John Napisa, Association for a Better New York, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (ABNY)
16. Jessica Ortiz, 32BJ, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (32BJ)

17. Elsa Pereira, Grand Street Settlement, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Grand Street Settlement)
18. Hong Shing Lee, Executive Director of Chinatown Manpower Project, Inc., written statement (CMP)
19. Scott Short, CEO of Riseboro Community Partnership, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Riseboro)
20. Alan van Capelle, CEO and President of the Educational Alliance, written statement dated December 2019 (Educational Alliance)
21. Lillian Wu, Program Director of the Smith Senior Service Unit at Hamilton Madison House, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Hamilton Madison House)

General Public

22. Ellen Ackerman, written statement dated November 26, 2019 (Ackerman)
23. Nora Breen, written statement and spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Breen)
24. Junhao Chen, written statement 2019 (Chen)
25. Glenn Cummings, written statement dated December 4, 2019 (Cummings)
26. William Ferns, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Ferns)
27. Rich Gasparre, written statement dated September 23, 2019 (Gasparre)
28. Kate Horsfield, written statement dated September 15, 2019 (Horsfield)
29. Jerry Kolber, written statement dated November 25, 2019 and spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Kolber)
30. Samuel Moskowitz, written statement dated December 3, 2019 (Moskowitz, Samuel)
31. Sid Moskowitz, written statement dated December 3, 2019 (Moskowitz, Sid)
32. Jennifer Perciballi, written statement dated November 25, 2019 (Perciballi)
33. Stacie Pranata, written statement (Pranata)
34. Judith Prigal, written statements dated November 23, 2019 and November 25, 2019 and spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Prigal)
35. Marion Riedel, spoke statement dated December 4, 2019 (Riedel)
36. Michelle Rosenberg, written statement dated October 4, 2019 (Rosenberg)
37. Kami Scott, written statements dated September 21, 2019 and November 25, 2019 (Scott)
38. Carrie Smith, written statement dated November 11, 2019 (Smith)
39. Elisa Testa, written statement dated December 4, 2019 (Testa)
40. Alison Spielman, written statement dated November 25, 2019 (Spielman)
41. Nadine Woloshin, written statement dated September 23, 2019 (Woloshin)
42. Adam Xu, written statement dated (Xu)
43. Yu Zhu Zheng, spoken statement dated December 4, 2019 (Zheng)

21.3 Comments and Responses on the DEIS

Project Description

Process

- c.1 My main concern is, as you mentioned, Essex Crossing took years. A lot of public input. This has been pretty rushed through. (Ferns) This project has been very rushed, unlike the Essex Crossing process. (Riedel)**

Response: Pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) regulations, multiple opportunities for public input on the project were made available. A Public Scoping meeting was noticed and held on February 26, 2019. Comments on the Draft Scope of Work were accepted at the meeting and through March 11, 2019. In addition, a hearing on the DEIS was noticed and held on December 4, 2019. For the DEIS hearing, the public notice was published in the City Record and in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Environmental News Bulletin on November 20, 2019 and was also placed in three local newspapers: the *New York Post* on November 18, 2019, *Sing Tao* on November 18, 2019, and *El Diario* on November 19, 2019. Written comments on the DEIS were accepted at the hearing and through December 14, 2019.

In addition to the scoping meeting and DEIS hearing, the applicants sought to not only meet the statutory disclosure obligations but also collaborate with the community prior to the formal ULURP process. The applicants issued a press release, established an informational website, and met with numerous community groups to inform them of the proposed development prior to ULURP. The applicants also met with the Manhattan Community Board 3 Land Use, Zoning, Public and Private Housing Committee and elected officials throughout 2018 and 2019. The applicants voluntarily presented the proposed project at a joint meeting of the CB3 Land Use Committee and the Economic Development Committee on January 10, 2018. The presentation was subsequently provided to the CB3 Land Use Committee and posted on the CB3 website for public review. The applicants also presented the project to the CB3 Land Use Committee on June 18, 2019, prior to project certification, in an effort to provide an opportunity for unofficial extended public review.

- c.2 What has Block 351, Lot 1 have to do with this project? (Breen)**

Response: As described in section 1.2, "Project Area," within Chapter 1, "Project Description," of the EIS, Block 351, Lot 1 is part of the proposed actions because it is located in the same large-scale development as Block 346. As noted in that section, no changes are proposed to Block 351 as part of the land use action. The proposed actions would not result in any change to the NYCHA development located on Block 351, and it will continue as in existing conditions.

Affordability

- c.3 Release the income band break downs of MIH units in the Suffolk Building prior to approval. (Brewer) To maximize rent, the CPC and Gotham have arranged to base their affordable rent calculations on regional community averages that are in no way representative of the Lower East Side. (Gasparre) The average AMI, the last time I looked for our neighborhood is \$37,560. New York City is \$93,900... I’m pretty sure that even with the percentages that the developers are talking about, we’re not talking about a lot of affordable housing for the people who live in our zip code, many of whom have been pushed out because of the development. (Riedel) The GO Broome Street Development should build at least overall 50% affordable units and designate additional units for families with moderate and middle incomes. (Manhattan CB3)**

Response: The project approvals set a minimum affordable set-aside to comply with MIH requirements; this set-aside is reflected in the EIS. As defined in the zoning resolution, affordability requirements for the MIH program are based on the area median income (AMI) defined by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the New York City regional area. In 2019, the area median income (AMI) for the New York City region was \$96,100 for a three-person family. The below table shows different AMI levels by household size.

New York City AMI by Household Size¹

Family Size	30% of AMI	40% of AMI	50% of AMI	60% of AMI	80% of AMI	100% of AMI	120% of AMI	130% of AMI	165% of AMI
1	\$22,410	\$29,880	\$37,350	\$44,820	\$59,760	\$74,700	\$89,640	\$97,110	\$123,255
2	\$25,620	\$34,160	\$42,700	\$51,240	\$68,320	\$85,400	\$102,480	\$111,020	\$140,910
3	\$28,830	\$38,440	\$48,050	\$57,660	\$76,880	\$96,100	\$115,320	\$124,930	\$158,565
4	\$32,010	\$42,680	\$53,350	\$64,020	\$85,360	\$106,700	\$128,040	\$138,710	\$176,055
5	\$34,590	\$46,120	\$57,650	\$69,180	\$92,240	\$115,300	\$138,360	\$149,890	\$190,245
6	\$37,140	\$49,520	\$61,900	\$74,280	\$99,040	\$123,800	\$148,560	\$160,940	\$204,270
7	\$39,720	\$52,960	\$66,200	\$79,440	\$105,920	\$132,400	\$158,800	\$172,120	\$218,460
8	\$42,270	\$56,360	\$70,450	\$84,540	\$112,720	\$140,900	\$169,080	\$183,170	\$232,485

Forty-three percent of the residential units in the proposed project are proposed to be permanently affordable at an average of 53 percent of AMI. The proposed project would include 208 units of permanently affordable housing, of which 93 units would be created pursuant to the City’s Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program and 115 units would be created pursuant to the City’s Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors (AIRS) program. Participants in both citywide programs are required to establish affordability levels using New York City’s AMI.

The AIRS units would be located in the Norfolk Building and rented to households earning between 30 and 80 percent of AMI. See below table for the number of AIRS units that would be rented to households at different AMI levels.

¹ <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hpd/services-and-information/area-median-income.page>

AIRS Distribution for the Norfolk Building

Percent of AMI	Income	Number of Units	Percent of Units in Building
30%	Up to \$22,410-\$25,620	5	7%
40%	Up to \$29,880-\$34,160	29	25%
50%	Up to \$37,350-\$42,700	29	25%
60%	Up to \$44,820-\$51,240	29	25%
80%	Up to \$59,760-\$68,320	23	20%

Assumption: Studio and one-bedroom residences

The MIH units would be located in the Suffolk Building and rented to households earning 40, 50, and 100 percent of AMI. The below table shows the number of MIH units that would be rented to households at different AMI levels.

MIH Distribution for the Suffolk Building

Percent of AMI	Income	Number of Units	Percent of Units in Building
40%	Up to \$29,880-\$46,120	37	10%
50%	Up to \$37,350-\$57,650	37	10%
100%	Up to \$59,760-\$115,300	19	5%

Assumption: Studio to three-bedroom residences

In comparison to the Citywide AMI information, the following table provides information specific to Community Board 3.

American FactFinder Median Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2017 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars), 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, NYC-Manhattan Community District 3—Chinatown & Lower East Side PUMA, New York

Family Size	Family Income
2-person families	\$41,152
3-person families	\$47,978
4-person families	\$42,357
5-person families	\$41,014
6-person families	\$50,385 ²
7-person families	\$48,347

According to the information above, affordable housing proposed for both the Norfolk and Suffolk buildings would be affordable to households earning incomes at or below the median household income in Manhattan Community Board 3. Overall, the proposed mix of affordable housing—including housing affordable to households earning very low, low, and moderate-incomes—and market-rate housing would result in a mixed-use development for households earning a range of incomes.

² The reported number for 6-person families is not statistically significant.

- c.4 This project would add more multi-million-dollar apartments to a neighborhood already overwhelmed with high-rise luxury developments like: The Rollins, Essex Crossing, 242 Broome, and the nearby mega-tower One Manhattan Square. This neighborhood, the historic locus of a vibrant immigrant community, has been ravaged by developers treating the area as a playground for the rich. This community does not need more million-dollar units; what it needs is truly affordable housing for low and no-income residents... I demand that the DCP reject this application and give New Yorkers what they truly need: public housing for no- and low-income residents. (Smith) Most of the new(er) buildings in Manhattan—which I can see from my apartment on Grand Street which faces north—are for the wealthy. There are MORE THAN ENOUGH apartments in this city for them. (Scott)**

Response: As discussed in response to Comment C.3, the proposed project is planned to include rental units for very low, low, moderate, and market-rate income earners; it is not intended to include for-sale condominiums. Of the 488 units proposed at Projected Development Site 1, approximately 93 units would be MIH units and 115 units would be AIRS units, meaning approximately 43% of the all units in the proposed development would be permanently affordable. As discussed in the EIS, the project would support the goals of the Housing New York plan, which lists activating underutilized parcels to maintain the current pace of new construction of affordable housing as one of its main goals and which identifies the need for affordable and affordable senior housing (see Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy." See also response to Comment C.7.

- c.5 CPC claims the city should make Suffolk Street a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Zone because it is building "affordable housing." However, more than half of the low-income units for a family of four allow more than \$50,000 annual income; 20% of the "affordable" family units are available for people making more than \$115,000 per year; and seniors must make between \$22,410 and \$68,320 to qualify. Not only is the CPC low-income housing unaffordable for most people who are truly low income, it also only accounts for 43% of all the rental units that will be built. (Woloshin)**

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," of the EIS, the GO Broome Street Development exceeds the requirements of MIH Option 1, which stipulates that 25% of the residential units be permanently affordable at an average of 60% of AMI (with a required 10% of the residential units at an average of 40% of AMI). As discussed in response to Comment C.3, the proposed project achieves deeper affordability: for the 43% of units in the proposed development that would be permanently affordable, on average, the affordable units will be rented to households earning 53% of AMI.

The applicant notes that it received support for including units at 100% AMI from Community Board 3 in an effort to provide units for both low and moderate/middle income residents.

- c.6 Deepen affordability of the AIRS and MIH units by making a majority of units affordable to households in the 30%-50% AMI range. (Brewer)**

Response: As currently contemplated, nearly 60% of the Norfolk Building's units are in the 30% to 50% AMI range (see response to Comment C.3). The applicant states that it will, to the best of its ability, explore the inclusion of deeper affordability, including units at the 30% AMI level.

c.7 The project results in zero public benefit outside the community the CPC serves. (Breen) Twenty stories is plenty high. (Breen) The zoning rules exist for a reason... and there is no proof given by the developer that he can't create a project with the same or similar "community benefits" at the lower building height. If Essex Crossing can provide 50% affordable units at 20 stories, why can't 60 Norfolk? (Rosenberg)

Response: As discussed in section 1.5, "Project Purpose and Need" of Chapter 1, "Project Description," of the EIS, the proposed project would have multiple community benefits: a new headquarters for the CPC, new space for BHH, and substantial permanently affordable housing. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," of the EIS, the proposed project is expected to improve urban design and visual resources conditions at the site by replacing an underutilized private accessory parking lot and a vacant area where the remains of the former fire-damaged BHH synagogue once stood with two new buildings, both with active ground floor uses along the Broome, Norfolk, and Suffolk Street frontages. As discussed in Chapter 7 of the EIS, the project would also activate and enliven the existing streetscape and improve the pedestrian experience along the street.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the applicant believes the proposed project would support the community by providing community facility space for CPC. The proposed development would provide CPC with approximately 40,000 gsf of community facility space enabling CPC to house its new headquarters and maintain its identity in the Lower East Side Community, consolidating many of its operations under one roof. Additionally, CPC would have a separate entrance to its facilities on Suffolk Street, thereby establishing a permanent and highly visible presence in the neighborhood it serves. CPC provides services to more than 60,000 individuals and families from across the Lower East Side and New York City.

Additional to those community benefits provided by CPC, space at the ground-floor of the Norfolk Building would be used by BHH as a congregation and cultural heritage center allowing BHH to maintain its presence and identity in the Lower East Side, providing programming that includes classes and lectures to the public and synagogue congregants on a weekly basis and special holidays.

Also as discussed in Chapter 1, the proposed development would benefit the public by unlocking the development potential of long underutilized private property—namely the parking lot on Block 346, Lot 75—and creating affordable homes in the process. As described in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the creation of affordable homes would be consistent with the Housing New York plan, which lists activating underutilized parcels to maintain the current pace of new construction of affordable housing as one of its main goals. Overall, the proposed development would be consistent with City policy by introducing new, permanently affordable housing within the neighborhood, including critically needed affordable housing for seniors.

The proposed project differs from the Essex Crossing development. That project, which was planned and approved prior to the implementation of the City's adoption of the MIH and Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA) text amendment,³ is a large-scale mixed-use development project with approximately 1.9 million square feet over nine sites, constructed on land that was formerly public land. As described in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and

³ The ZQA text amendment established the AIRS program.

Public Policy,” of the EIS, once complete, Essex Crossing will total over 1,000 new residences (a mix of for-sale condominiums and rental units), 450,000 square feet of retail (including destination retail), and 400,000 square feet of office space. While 50% of the units at Essex Crossing are affordable, the average AMI of the affordable units is approximately 80 percent of AMI. The Essex Crossing development (Sites 1 through 6) contains buildings of varying heights, including those that would rise to heights of 290 and 315 feet (including a mechanical bulkhead) on Sites 4 and 2, respectively.⁴

The proposed project would be located on a single site of privately-owned land and is planned to include rental units for very low, low, moderate, and market-rate income earners; it would not include for-sale condominiums. Of the 488 units proposed at Projected Development Site 1, approximately 93 units would be MIH units and 115 units are planned to be AIRS units. As discussed in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” of the EIS, the GO Broome Street Development plans to exceed the requirements of MIH Option 1, which stipulates that 25% of the residential units be permanently affordable at an average of 60% of AMI (with a required 10% of the residential units at an average of 40% AMI). The proposed project achieves deeper affordability than at Essex Crossing: for the 43% of units in the proposed development that would be permanently affordable, on average, the affordable units will be rented to households earning 53% of AMI. See response to Comment C.3 for additional detail on the project’s proposed affordability. In terms of the proposed project’s proposed height, the EIS considered the project’s height in various technical areas, including shadows (Chapter 6) and urban design (Chapter 7). As detailed in those chapters, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse shadows or urban design impacts. The urban design analysis concluded that the project would be consistent with the Essex Crossing developments located across the street from the projected development sites.

c.8 Set aside at least 30% of the units in the AIRS building (Norfolk Building), for formerly homeless seniors earning 30% AMI or less. (Brewer)

Response: Under the City’s AIRS program, seniors are eligible for an AIRS unit if their household income is 80% of AMI or below. As discussed in response to Comment C.3, the applicant intends to provide units for seniors at a range of incomes below 80% (at 30%, 40%, 50%, 60% and 80%) of AMI.

The applicant states that to the extent they can provide very low income seniors with access to more housing, Gotham will pursue the required avenues to achieve this.

Proposed Uses

c.9 40,000 square feet for Chinese-American Planning Council (enough for 40 2BR apartments!) seems extremely excessive for a building with a relatively small footprint. (Spielman)

Response: As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” The Chinatown Planning Council Housing Development Fund Company, Inc. (CPC) is a co-applicant for the proposed project. CPC provides services to more than 60,000 individuals and families from across the Lower East Side and New York City. The proposed project would include approximately 40,000 sf

⁴ See Figure 7-3 of Chapter 7, “Urban Design and Visual Resources,” of the EIS.

for CPC's new headquarters, which would be located in the base of the Suffolk Building and is sized to enable CPC to consolidate many of its central operations under one roof. The applicant states that without the development of this facility, CPC would continue leasing small spaces across Lower Manhattan, resulting in a large operating cost burden and ongoing uncertainty regarding the lease renewal of those spaces. Consolidation of CPC's spaces in a new headquarters ensures the long-term viability and its continued services to the community. As further discussed in Chapter 1, the new headquarters would allow CPC to maintain its identity in the Lower East Side Community and its location in the base of the Suffolk Building and its separate entrance on Suffolk Street would establish a permanent and highly visible presence in the neighborhood it serves. Services would include child care resources, community health services, work force training, legal services, and adult literacy programs. As discussed in Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the Suffolk Building's base, where the CPC headquarters would be located, has been designed to maintain a street wall built at the street line with a height of approximately 85-feet along Broome Street, consistent with the Essex Crossing planning objectives for this corridor.

- c.10 Our neighborhood already has a good share of affordable senior housing, including a dedicated Essex Crossing building and another one being built on Essex Street. (Prigal) Our neighborhood already has more than its fair share of affordable senior housing in TWO dedicated buildings. (Spielman) The apartments of two of the Essex Crossing buildings, one open, one soon to open are totally for senior citizens. (Scott) The Gotham organization can still have apartments dedicated to seniors even in a smaller development. Using this argument for the variance is, in my opinion, unethical. (Scott)**

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," in section 1.5, "Project Purpose and Need," according to Mayor de Blasio's affordable housing plan, Housing New York (as supplemented by Housing New York 2.0), the population of City residents who are at least 65 years old is projected to increase by 40 percent between 2010 and 2040, and there is an anticipated housing need for more than 400,000 additional seniors in the coming years, with approximately 63,300 of those seniors projected in Manhattan. These seniors are more likely to be low-income, rent-burdened, and living on a fixed income as compared to other City residents. As proposed, the project would include 115 permanently affordable units in the Norfolk Building for seniors to help meet this need. As currently contemplated, the applicant plans for the senior housing units to be made available for seniors with incomes at 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, and 80% AMI.

- c.11 Ensure that the ground-floor commercial properties of the Proposed Development remain for the sole use by small format retailers. (Brewer) Given the tendency of new developments such as Essex Crossing to bring in upscale/boutique shops, Gotham has conspicuously not mentioned any plans or intentions to bring in affordable basic shops, such as laundries, jewelers, or hardware stores. (Gasparre)**

Response: The proposed project would include approximately 18,788 gsf of small-format retail space facing Broome Street on Projected Development Site 1. Based on the depth and size of the retail space, the applicant intends to target convenience retail as well as potential uses such as fast casual food, café or restaurant use, or fitness uses. The applicants further state they are committed to not circumvent zoning loopholes and that the absence of any

loading docks provided within the proposed development is representative of their intention to avoid the establishment of big box retailers within this new project.

The EIS describes the retail as “neighborhood retail” and it is analyzed as such in the various technical areas, including in Chapter 9, “Transportation.” As discussed in Chapter 7, “Urban Design and Visual Resources,” the proposed retail uses along the Broome Street frontage would activate this street in a manner consistent with the City’s planning goals.

Community Facilities

c.12 This new development wants to add almost 500 new apartments (over 1,000 more people), more than half of all the new units in all of Essex Crossing. We are a community that is already underserved by adequate schools. (Rosenberg)

Response: An analysis of the proposed project’s potential to affect public schools was undertaken as part of the Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) published on January 24, 2019. The schools analysis conservatively assumed that all 488 new units would include families with school-aged children although, with the proposed project, 115 of those units are intended for seniors. The analysis used Projected Public School Ratio data released by the SCA as part of the documents used in drafting the DOE/SCA FY2020-2024 Capital Plan Proposed November 2018. It utilizes the 2012-2016 American Community Survey – Public Use Microdata Sample and is available at SCA’s website under Capital Plan Reports & Data. Based on these data, multipliers for Primary and Intermediate Schools were refined from those in the CEQR Technical Manual to reflect how many pupils are generated by new housing at the school district level (multipliers for High Schools were maintained at the borough level). As a result of the new SCA data, the thresholds for determining when public schools analyses are warranted changed from those in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

For elementary and intermediate schools, in School District 2 in Manhattan if a project is anticipated to introduce more than 725 incremental residential units, an analysis is warranted. For high schools in Manhattan, the new threshold is 7,126 incremental residential units. DCP as lead agency, in consultation with the Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination (MOEC) determined that the 2012-2016 American Community Survey – Public Use Microdata Sample data should be used as the basis for determining the need for a public schools CEQR analysis, in order to present a reasonable and accurate environmental assessment.

As noted in the EAS, the proposed development, as stated by the applicant, would introduce 115 units intended for seniors. These units are not expected to generate pupils. However, for purposes of presenting a conservative analysis, it is assumed that these 115 units would include families with school-aged children, in addition to 373 “non-senior” residential units already considered in the environmental analyses. This would add up to a total increment of 488 residential units. Using the updated Projected Public School Ratios, the 488 incremental residential units would fall below the thresholds that trigger public elementary, intermediate, and high school analyses. Therefore, the proposed project does not warrant any further analysis of indirect effects on public school capacity related to elementary, intermediate or high schools, and the proposed project does not have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts related to schools.

Open Space

- c.13 Open spaces are important for our physical and mental health, and those are spaces are disappearing. (Scott) CPC wants to consolidate all outdoor space into interior "residents only" spaces—not very neighborly! (Woloshin) More open space is needed among the new buildings, according to the current zoning regulations. It will remove a few small but beautiful parks, a necessity these days for people to relax in. (Scott) The Gotham design builds out to the edge of the lot in order to accommodate interior courtyards and space that would inevitably be used only by the residents of the building. (The notion that enclosed space is somehow "public" is one of the classic canards of NYC development, as shown by NYU's development to the north of Bleecker Street.) (Gasparre)**

Response: The proposed project, which would be developed on privately-owned land, would not remove any existing publicly-accessible open space. The existing open space on the project block is for use by residents of the Hong Ning building and is not publicly-accessible. With the proposed project, residents of the Hong Ning Building will continue to have access to outdoor open space.

As detailed in Chapter 4, "Open Space," the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space ratios. Under the With-Action condition, the total open space ratio for the residential population would decrease by 1.21 percent compared to the No-Action condition open space ratio: 0.575 to 0.568 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below the guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents and below the citywide median of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The active and passive open space ratios would also decrease slightly by 1.28 percent for the active open space ratio and 1.08 percent for the passive open space ratio (from 0.392 to 0.387 and 0.183 to 0.181 per 1,000 residents, respectively). The proposed development would not result in a greater than 5 percent decrease in the open space ratio. Further, the proposed development would include landscaped interior courtyard space to be utilized by the CPC, the Hong Ning senior housing building, and the Jewish Heritage and Cultural Center. Residents of the Suffolk Building would utilize open space located on setbacks and the building's rooftop, and residents of the Norfolk Building would have their own outdoor space on their respective rooftop. Further, community gardens within the study area, the 57-acre regional East River Park, a portion of which sits just outside the study area boundary, Delancey Street Plaza, First Park, and McKinley Playground would provide additional resources for study area residents. Therefore, the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to open space.

- c.14 Convert the strip of area between the Hong Ning building and the 5-story commercial building into a publicly accessible green space. (Brewer)**

Response: See response to Comment C.13 and to Chapter 4, "Open Space," of the EIS. The space along Grand Street between the existing Hong Ning building and the 5-story commercial building at 384 Grand Street is private property, portions owned by both an affiliate of CPC and 384 Grand Street HDFC. The applicant states that making that area publicly accessible between two existing and two new buildings to be constructed would be a security concern, a concern that existing tenants raised during applicant outreach to the community in connection with the proposed project.

c.15 The GO Broome Street Development should commit to enhance trees and open space within the project site and on surrounding sidewalks. (Manhattan CB3)

Response: See response to Comment C.13. The applicant states that the project is committed to preserving and providing access to open space for the residents, which will promote physical activity and social interaction with features such as walking paths, seating options, native plantings and recreation facilities. All setback roofs as well as the courtyard at grade are landscaped for use by tenants, providing significant open space. The GO Broome project will provide street trees on all frontages, to the maximum extent possible, following DOT and Parks Department guidelines.

Shadows

c.16 The neighborhood is becoming darker, under the shadow of the huge, 30-story towers. We live in the shadows while the super-rich enjoy the sun and views from their penthouses. (Smith)

Response: An analysis of the potential for the project to result in significant adverse impacts from the introduction of new shadow to the neighborhood was included in the DEIS in Chapter 5, "Shadows." The analysis considers the maximum building envelope for the proposed project, including the project's bulkhead zone. As detailed in Chapter 5, "Shadows," the proposed project, which will include permanently affordable housing rented to households earning an average of 53 percent of AMI, would result in shadows increments on The Park, an open space resource located on Site 5 of the Essex Crossing development. However, the shadow increments would not result in significant adverse impacts. From its inception, the site identified and selected for the privately-owned and publicly-accessible Park on Site 5 was planned to be largely in shadow during most of the fall, winter, and early spring analysis days. For those open space users who want afternoon sun, there is a nearby park (Seward Park) that would be in sunshine during the afternoon periods and offers similar amenities to those at The Park. In addition, an assessment of whether there would be sufficient sunlight during the growing season, as to maintain the viability of The Park's vegetation, found that there is a small section of The Park that may receive less than four hours of direct sunlight on two of the analysis days. However, consistent with the original plan for The Park as a space that would be largely in shadow during most of the fall, winter, and early spring, the species planted in this area of The Park would tolerate partial shade conditions; therefore, the proposed development is not expected to have a significant adverse shadows impact on vegetation. Overall, the proposed development would not result in significant adverse shadows impacts.

c.17 At a stated height of 310 feet – which will really be more like 330 feet after the elevator silo is installed above the top floor – the proposed development would block off light at street level and sight lines in several directions. (Gasparre) This project would mean four additional new buildings with others quite possibly on the way right behind them. A terrible idea for those of us who appreciate light and air for things like, you know, breathing...! (Spielman)

Response: The proposed project would consist of the Norfolk and Suffolk Buildings on Projected Development Site 1 (two buildings) and a small commercial addition on Projected

Development Site 2 (an addition). As discussed in response to comment C.16, the potential for the project to result in shadows impacts on sun sensitive resources, such as open space, was considered in the DEIS in Chapter 5, "Shadows." The analysis considered the maximum building envelope for the project, which includes an allowance for a mechanical bulkhead area, and concluded that the project would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

In addition, the DEIS considered the potential for the proposed project to block significant view corridors in Chapter 6, "Urban Design and Visual Resources." As detailed in that chapter, the proposed project is expected to improve urban design and visual resources conditions at the site by replacing an underutilized accessory parking lot and a vacant area where the remains of the formerly fire-damaged BHH synagogue once stood with two new buildings, both with active ground floor uses along the Norfolk Street and Suffolk Street frontages. As stated in the EIS on pages 7-21 and 7-22, the project would activate the existing streetscape and improve the pedestrian experience along the street.

The EIS also considered the project's potential to affect air quality (Chapter 10) and public health (Chapter 13) and concluded that the project would not result in significant adverse air quality or public health impacts.

See also responses to Comments C.19 and C.20 for further discussion of the building height.

Historic Resources

- c.18 The historic synagogue's facade currently still stands but has been deemed structurally unstable. There are many ways to save a structurally unstable façade and an independent consultant was not retained to look into it. Only "the footprint" of the building will be saved, a small cluster of bricks that have zero historical interest. I assume this is the easiest and cheapest way to follow through on their requirement to preserve some of the historic building. But it reads as yet another way for the developers to maximize their profits and disavow their responsibility to the community. (Rosenberg)**

Response: At the time the DEIS was published, a portion of Projected Development Site 1 (Lot 37) was occupied by the remnants of the former BHH synagogue at portions of the buildings' former perimeter walls. Following the fire in May 2017, LPC approved BHH's remnant removal plans in an effort to stabilize the former structure. All recommendations for removal were made by the engineer of record for the site and approved by both the NYC Department of Buildings and LPC. A structural collapse in October 2019 necessitated removal of all remaining building elements as directed by the engineer in consultation with the City.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the DEIS noted that remnants of the former BHH synagogue were intended to be incorporated into the development. Now, given site conditions, artifacts salvaged from the site, including masonry detailing and ceremonial objects, are intended to be displayed in the cultural heritage center.

The applicant has been coordinating with LPC throughout project planning to determine how the remnants of the former BHH synagogue can be incorporated into the development.

Given current site conditions, the project intends to display artifacts salvaged from the site, including masonry detailing and ceremonial objects, in the cultural heritage center.

The FEIS has been updated throughout to reflect the changed condition at Lot 37.

As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the proposed project includes space for use by BHH. BHH will use the space to open a Jewish Heritage and Cultural Center that will be accessible to the public and that will provide a small library and facilities for graduates and post graduate students to study Jewish heritage and customs practiced by the members of the former synagogue. Part of the space will also be used as a synagogue for regular synagogue services.

- c.19 When I see the changes that have taken place in the neighborhood, I feel outraged. This is a neighborhood of great historic and cultural significance. I wish we had protected the LES by creating a historic district like the one in Park Slope. I know that ship has sailed, but I hope it's not too late to make sure that CPC's project respects the neighborhood (Woloshin)**

Response: Comment noted. Chapter 6, "Historic Resources," considers the proposed project's potential effects on historic and cultural resources, including its potential effects on the Lower East Side Historic District. As detailed in that chapter, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on historic resources.

Land Use and Zoning

- c.20 This project could set a precedent for allowing more rezoning throughout Manhattan; zoning rules are created to protect the community. (Perciballi) Allowing a zoning variance for a building in the middle of an active development area creates a new precedent and raises the average building height of the area. The exception quickly becomes the norm and the next building (perhaps one of the many currently under construction across the street) will now be able to use the example at 60 Norfolk to argue for their own zoning variance. (Rosenberg) This unique, diverse community is a very special place for many reasons. Allowing these zoning changes will set a precedent that will forever change that. The developers should respect the community they intend to build in instead of proposing a structure that doesn't meet existing regulations. (Ackerman)**

Response: Any development on the site requires an amendment of the large-scale plan, and therefore, there is no development that could occur at the site without approval of the City Planning Commission. The EIS studied the potential for the proposed actions, including the rezoning action, to result in significant adverse impacts. As discussed in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the proposed actions, including the rezoning action, would not result in significant adverse zoning impacts, nor would the project be inconsistent with public policies. The GO Broome Street Development would be subject to a maximum permitted building envelope that has been designed to address the unique site conditions on the project block and result in a built form that will be contextual with the surrounding neighborhood. The EIS analyzed this permitted building envelope in Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," and found that the proposed development on both Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 would be consistent with the neighborhood's ongoing transition

from longstanding underutilized surface parking lots into denser, mixed-use neighborhood with newly constructed buildings of varying heights.

- c.21 A change to R9-1 would be the only such zoning in downtown Manhattan. Please do not let a developer change the present zoning, which was put in place to protect our neighborhood from overdevelopment. (Prigal, Spielman, Ackerman) There’s a good reason Zone R9 does not currently exist in lower Manhattan. It is the highest density zoning allowed in NYC, typically reserved for major avenues. (Woloshin) This development should not have its zoning changed from R8 to R9-1. (Perciballi) The proposal is requesting an increase of 250% of the current allowable zoning. Under the current R-8 zoning, the allowable building size is 195,018 sf; With the zoning change to R-9 (unprecedented in Lower Manhattan), the allowable size would be about 290,000 sf. GO Broome is asking for more than 172,000 sf in waivers—almost as much as the current zoning allowance, making the building about 460,000 square feet. (Cummings) The size is more than double than that allowed under zoning. What is the point of zoning if anyone can just more than double the size of the building to be constructed under the “law?” (Moskowitz, Samuel, Sid) I am not against the development. I’m against the development with the zoning change and with all the variances that are being requested. (Riedel) I think there is a reason why our neighborhood is zoned as an R8. And that has to do with some of the things that have already been raised. We have small, narrow, one-way streets... I don’t think that this was really within the original plans of the zoning to have this big scale. (Ferns)**

Response: The proposed development is not seeking any floor area waivers; the proposed project is seeking a rezoning from R8 to R9-1 based on a planning rationale with respect to the appropriateness of the R9-1 zoning district for this block. As discussed above, any development on the site requires an amendment of the large-scale plan, and therefore, there is no development that could occur without approval of the City Planning Commission. In Chapter 2, “Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy,” the EIS considered the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy and found that there would be no significant adverse impacts to these areas (see response to Comment C.20). The additional height and density allowed by the R9-1 district would help ameliorate the constrained footprint of the Development Site’s zoning lot (owing to the presence of the Hong Ning building on Block 346, Lot 1 and the existing 384 Grand Street building on Lot 95), thereby facilitating the density necessary to provide the amount of affordable housing, senior housing, and community facility uses to be included in the Proposed Development.

The proposed actions would not double the amount of floor area allowed at the site. The following table summarizes the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) in the R8 and R9-1 zoning districts. The maximum Residential FAR in an R9-1 zone is 7.52, however a 9.00 Residential FAR (as indicated in the table) becomes available because of the MIH designation that would be required in connection with the proposed rezoning.

Parcel 2A FAR Summary (Lots 1+37+75+95)

Use	Far Permitted	
	R8	R9-1/C2-5
Community Facility	6.50	10.00

Commercial	0.00	2.00
Residential	6.02	9.00
AIRS	7.20	
Total	7.20	10.00

The floor area permitted by the R9-1 zoning district would not be unique to the area. There is an R10 equivalent zoning district (C6-4) located outside the land use study area examined in the EIS but within approximately 2,000 feet of the Development Site to the south, and within Community District 3. The equivalent FAR at that location is 12.

Overall, the proposed actions would promote the creation of a mixed-use, mixed-income community anchored by affordable housing. As noted above, the GO Broome Street Development would be subject to a maximum permitted building envelope that has been designed to address the unique site conditions on the project block and result in a built form that will be contextual with the surrounding neighborhood.

For the comment related to the area’s one-way streets, see response to Comment C.27.

- c.22 Why is there no drawing for a building within the current zoning laws? (Breen) The proposed GO Broome Street Development variance is wholly inappropriate. Eliminating the setback and sky exposure plane requirements for this enormous project will have a variety of negative impacts on the area. (Moskowitz, Samuel, Sid) Please apply a standard that more closely conforms to existing guidelines in order to preserve the integrity and quality of life in this community. (Moskowitz, Sid) The developer needed so many zoning changes and special permits to not only build higher, but also bulkier, with fewer setbacks and closer to other buildings on the same block. The Suffolk building abuts two narrow streets but the applicant wants special permits to build closer to the streets, with fewer setbacks. (Perciballi, Prigal) CPC wants to create additional density by reducing the setback to the curb on Suffolk from 15 to 10 feet and reducing the space between buildings by more than 75% of what is required (Woloshin)**

Response: Chapter 16, “Alternatives,” of the EIS includes an examination of alternatives to the project, consistent with the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Chapter 16 includes a No Action Alternative, which is mandated by CEQR and the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The No Action Alternative is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part. As described in Chapter 16, due to the existing large-scale development plan, absent the proposed actions, the site would remain in its existing condition, as any development would require an amendment of the large-scale plan and CPC discretionary review. Therefore, the EIS does not contain a description of a development under existing zoning since there is no as-of-right development allowed at the site.

The proposed project would maintain existing sidewalk and street dimensions and would be built to the streetwall. As noted above, the GO Broome Street Development would be subject to a maximum permitted building envelope that has been designed to address the unique site conditions on the project block and result in a built form that will be contextual with the surrounding neighborhood. Specifically, the reduced setback on Suffolk Street is needed to provide a viable building depth on a site that has an existing building (the Hong Ning building on Block 346, Lot 1) which is significantly recessed from the Norfolk street line,

and to maintain an acceptable distance between legally required windows. The Proposed Development would be developed under the City's Quality Housing program, and as such, there is no sky exposure plane requirement. The City's Quality Housing program is set forth in the New York City Zoning Resolution and was established to foster the provision of multifamily housing and certain community facilities that are compatible with existing neighborhood scale and character, provide on-site amenity spaces to meet the needs of its residents, and are designed to promote the security and safety of its residents.

The proposed Suffolk and Norfolk building massing responds directly to the existing and soon to be completed surrounding context with the goal of limiting the effect of the proposed project on the surrounding neighborhood. The building podium along Broome Street is set at a height of 85 feet to match the base height of the Essex Crossing development while the Norfolk and Suffolk high rise portions are oriented in the north south direction, all to both limit shadow to the Broome Street corridor below and maintain a contextual relationship of building bases. Additionally, the Norfolk Building massing seeks to relate to the existing Hong Ning building, acting as an intermediary step between the Suffolk high rise and the lower Hong Ning building to remain. The analyses presented in the EIS (see Chapters 5, "Shadows," and Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," analyze the maximum building envelope that would be allowed at the site. However, as shown in Figures 1-4, 1-5, and 1-6 of the FEIS, the proposed buildings would not fill this volume. Instead, for example, at the top of the Suffolk Building, steps would be introduced into the massing to create a relationship to the mixed-use high-rise buildings to the south. See also response to Comment C.23.

Urban Design

- c.23 This proposed building will be taller than any Essex Crossing building height. (Perciballi) The new building will be taller than the tallest Essex Crossing buildings. This will change the HISTORIC nature and aesthetics of our neighborhood. (Scott) According to the DEIS: "Overall, the proposed project would be in keeping with the new tall, multi-family elevator buildings being constructed as part of Essex Crossing." However, GO Broome would include a 30-story building, while Essex Crossing's tallest building is 24 stories—inconsistent with land uses, zoning, and public policy in the area. (Moskowitz, Samuel) GO Broome is asking for a height of 310 feet, which is too much. (Cummings)**

Response: The Suffolk Building would rise to a height of 310 feet with an additional allowance for building mechanical space up to a height of 340 feet. The Essex Crossing buildings, which contain a different mix of uses than the Proposed Development, are being developed with a range of heights, including buildings of 290 feet on Site 4 and 315 feet on Site 2, accounting for building mechanical space.

As noted above, the Essex Crossing buildings will contain over 1,000 new residences, 450,000 square feet of retail (including destination retail), and 400,000 square feet of office space. As such, the Essex Crossing buildings include a substantial amount of large-format retail in the podium bases of their buildings (e.g., movie theater, office use), which results in taller floor-to-floor heights in the base. The proposed Suffolk and Norfolk Buildings have been designed in the context of the Essex Crossing development with the proposed project's building

podium along Broome Street rising to a height of 85 feet to match the base height of the Essex Crossing development; however, unlike Essex Crossing, the applicant intends to include small-format retail as opposed to large-format retail.

The EIS analyzed the potential for the proposed project, with a height of 310 feet and allowance for building mechanical space up to a height of 340 feet, to result in significant adverse impacts in a range of technical areas. As detailed in the EIS, the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, historic resources, urban design, shadows, or neighborhood character.

- c.24 This building will be in the midst of Essex Crossing and does not fit in with those buildings, which were carefully planned to be in harmony with each other. (Prigal) Why are they not following the Essex Crossing model of following zoning and bulk that has been well established as best for the neighborhood? Why does THIS building need to be allowed to build over 100 higher, and closer to the curb, and with less setback than any other? it does NOT. Reject the rezone, and let them build in accordance with surrounding existing buildings. (Kolber) The project will result in buildings way out of size and proportion for our Lower East Side neighborhood. (Scott)**

Response: The Essex Crossing development required a number of discretionary actions, including zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, and special permits (among other actions). The GO Broome Street Development project also requires discretionary actions. As discussed above, the GO Broome Street Development would be subject to a maximum permitted building envelope that has been designed to address the unique site conditions on the project block and result in a built form that will be contextual with the surrounding neighborhood, particularly the Essex Crossing development. As discussed in Chapter 7, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the proposed project's retail uses along the Broome Street frontage would activate this street in a manner consistent with the City's planning goals as expressed in the Essex Crossing development. Additionally, the proposed development has been designed to maintain a street wall built at the street line with a height of approximately 85-feet along Broome Street, consistent with the Essex Crossing planning objectives for this corridor. The proposed project maintains existing sidewalk and street dimensions, and like the Essex Crossing buildings, would be built to the streetwall. As stated in response to Comment C.23 and as analyzed in Chapter 7, the Suffolk Building would rise to a height of 310 feet with an additional allowance for building mechanical space up to a height of 340 feet. The Essex Crossing buildings are being developed with a range of heights, including buildings of 290 feet on Site 4 and 315 feet on Site 2, accounting for building mechanical space.

Neighborhood Character

- c.25 Our neighborhood has already been transformed from a quiet area of the city, but by allowing buildings taller and larger than those of Essex Crossing is changing us into the likes of an inner-city development, that is, crowded. Too crowded. (Scott) This neighborhood has yet to see the impact of all the SPURA buildings once SPURA apartments are filled (which are not at capacity yet). (Perciballi) I STRONGLY OPPOSE GO Broome Street Development. This neighborhood is already growing with the Essex**

Crossing project. The proposed project would more than overwhelm this neighborhood. The streets surrounding the project are very narrow. This can be dangerous and unhealthy. (Scott) [The excess height requested by CPC and Gotham would aggravate neighborhood congestion, which is already significant even before the completion of the bulk of Essex Crossing. (Gasparre) The proposed development will put at least an additional 1,500 people (roughly 500 units x 3 people/unit average) on that block, compared to a current density of probably less than 100. (Gasparre)

Response: The new population introduced by the project was estimated in the EAS. As detailed there, the proposed project is expected to introduce approximately 1,015 people to the site assuming 488 units times an average household size of 2.08 (2012-2016 ACS data for Manhattan Community District 3). This estimate overstates the total population as it treats the 115 senior housing units as non-senior units.

The EIS examined the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse impacts from both the building's form and from the new activity at the site generated by pedestrians and vehicular traffic. In addition, the EIS considered the project's potential to adversely affect neighborhood character (see Chapter 14, "Neighborhood Character"), which includes an assessment of how the effects in the areas of land use, urban design and visual resources, historic resources, socioeconomic conditions, transportation, and noise combine to affect neighborhood character. As detailed in that chapter, the proposed project would not adversely affect the defining features of the neighborhood nor would not result in significant adverse impacts in the following technical areas that contribute to neighborhood character: land use, urban design, historic resources, socioeconomic conditions, or noise. In terms of transportation of transportation, Chapter 14 notes that while significant traffic impacts are expected from the projected development on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2, the projected development would generate only a modest amount of vehicle trips.

As discussed in Chapter 14, the proposed project would be in keeping with the new high-rise, multi-family elevator buildings being constructed as part of Essex Crossing and the increasing levels of activity associated with these developments.

See also responses to Comments C.20 and C.23.

c.26 The Seward Park neighborhood has already absorbed a reasonable amount of large-scale developments, which are replacing the unique and historic feel of our streetscape with a sterile corporate façade. (Gasparre)

Response: See response to C21. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 6, "Urban Design and Visual Resources," the proposed project is expected to improve urban design and visual resources conditions at the site by replacing an underutilized private accessory parking lot and a vacant area where the remains of the former fire-damaged BHH synagogue once stood with two new buildings, both with active ground floor uses along the Norfolk Street and Suffolk Street frontages. The proposed project would not displace any uses. As discussed in the EIS, the project would activate and enliven the existing streetscape and improve the pedestrian experience along the street. The project would also include space for both CPC and BHH, allowing both to maintain their presence and identity in the Lower East Side community. In addition, the applicant believes that the quality of the design and materials would respect the historic fabric of the surrounding area. See also response to Comment C.7.

Transportation

- c.27 **We have excessive traffic problems and pollution, and some of the most dangerous intersections and subway stations in Manhattan are less than a block from 60 Norfolk. (Rosenberg) This development will further bring traffic congestion and truck traffic and pollution to a neighborhood trying to absorb so much new construction. (Prigal) Community Board 3 expressed concerns about traffic, safety and congestion problems after construction. (Perciballi) More negative impact on traffic, safety and congestion during operations—this on top of what members of the community have already been (and still are) having to live with given the Essex Crossing project (still ongoing). (Spielman) As it is, our traffic, our foot traffic, the pedestrian, the subways are not really keeping up with what’s happening in the building... I invite you all to try to cross Grand Street at Clinton and see what crossing is like. I’m quite sure we’re going to have problems there and if we have more construction and more development, we’re going to see more of those. (Reidel)**

Response: The EIS considers the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse transportation impacts, which includes an examination of the potential for impacts from increases in vehicular traffic, pedestrian volumes, and subway riders attributable to the project. In Chapter 9, “Transportation,” the EIS identified the potential for significant adverse impacts because of increases in traffic and pedestrian volumes. As discussed in the EIS, the traffic impacts would result despite the project’s modest increase in vehicle trips because of existing congestion at area intersections and substantial increases in background vehicle traffic as a result of planned developments in the area, such as the Essex Crossing developments.⁵ In addition, roadway capacity for vehicles has been reduced in the area because of background roadway improvements that have included bike lanes (i.e., bike lanes have been introduced in roadway area previously devoted to vehicular transport) and that prioritized pedestrian safety (i.e., sidewalks have been widened and/or bulb-outs have been implemented, again in areas of roadway previously devoted to vehicular transport).

Traffic. Traffic volumes increases attributable to the proposed project within the project vicinity would be modest. Overall, the proposed project would generate a total of 51 vehicles per hour (vph) (15 “ins” and 36 “outs”) during the weekday AM peak hour, 39 vph (20 “ins” and 19 “outs”) in the weekday midday peak hour, 62 vph (35 “ins” and 27 “outs”) in the weekday PM peak hour, and 50 vph (25 “ins” and 25 “outs”) in the Saturday midday peak hour. This volume increase does not typically necessitate traffic levels of service analyses; however, because the Seward Park Mixed Use Development FEIS Technical Memorandum 3 (2015) identified a number of unmitigated traffic impacts within the immediate proximity of the project block, per consultation with New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP), six intersections were identified for analysis. Of the six intersections analyzed, the proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at two intersections during the weekday AM and Saturday midday peak hours, one intersection during the weekday midday peak hour, and three intersections during the weekday PM peak hour. These impacts could be mitigated, with the exception of two locations within the study area that could not be fully mitigated with standard traffic capacity improvement measures. As

⁵ As noted in Chapter 9, “Transportation,” of the EIS, the Seward Park Mixed Use Development FEIS Technical Memorandum 3 (2015) identified a number of unmitigated traffic impacts, including within the immediate proximity of the GO Broome Street Development project block.

discussed above, these impacts would result despite the project's modest increase in vehicle trips because of existing congestion at area intersections, substantial increases in background vehicle traffic as a result of planned developments in the area, and a reduction in roadway capacity for vehicles.

Subways. The EIS also considered the potential for the project to adversely affect subway station elements at the Delancey Street-Essex Street Station (served by the F, M, J, and Z subway routes). Four subway station elements that would be primarily used by project-generated subway riders, including the surface stairway (S4 stairway) and escalator (E328) located along the east side of Essex Street south of Delancey Street, and two connecting fare arrays (N526 and N26A), were analyzed. The subway station analysis concluded that significant transit impacts would not be expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Safety. An analysis of safety at nine area intersections was undertaken in the EIS. One of the nine intersections analyzed in the study area, Delancey Street at Essex Street, is considered a high-crash location by the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. A safety initiative, the Delancey Street Protected Bike Lanes and Safety Improvements project, was implemented within the study area in fall 2018 by DOT. This project aimed to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety along the corridor by filling in the gap in the bike network along Delancey Street through the removal of one eastbound Delancey Street travel lane to create bike lanes and extend the median areas (via paint) to increase the pedestrian areas along Delancey Street. These changes are expected to decrease the amount of total crashes and pedestrian injuries along Delancey Street, including at the high-crash location with Essex Street.

- c.28 If even 10% of these people have cars, there will be 100 extra cars to park on the already narrow and overcrowded streets. Despite removing parking space for the trucks currently parking on the lot, neither CPC nor Gotham even attempted to address the traffic and parking issue in their presentation for the proposed development. (Gasparre) The proposed project would remove required accessory off-street parking. (Testa)**

Response: The EIS includes an analysis of Transportation in Chapter 9, which considers the potential for significant adverse impacts from vehicular traffic at area intersections and the potential parking demand for the project. See response to Comment 23 for a discussion of the project's potential to affect transportation.

As detailed in Chapter 9, the parking analysis found that the peak weekday and Saturday project-generated parking demand of approximately 108 spaces would be expected to occur during nighttime or overnight hours with project residents parking overnight. Since parking is not required as part of the project, and the proposed project would not provide parking on-site, a survey of existing off-street parking facilities within ¼-mile of the project sites was performed. The survey indicated that the project-generated parking demand could be accommodated by parking spaces available in the three nearby off-street parking facilities. The EIS parking analysis assumes that vehicle ownership rates for the 115 senior housing units would be the same as the market-rate units; this is a conservative assumption.

The accessory parking spaces to be removed are not actively used by the senior residents of the Hong Ning building, the majority of which do not drive or own a vehicle, as evidenced by

the fact that the parking lot has been underutilized since the construction of the building in 1982. Furthermore, the loss of the parking lot would not have an adverse impact on residents, businesses, or community facilities in the surrounding area because the parking lot has never been available for public parking.

c.29 Advance sidewalk design for pedestrian accessibility, safety and protection against traffic. (Brewer)

Response: The applicant states that it is committed to streetscape design that provides for pedestrian accessibility, safety, and protection against traffic. As part of the project, the applicant is proposing a full sidewalk reconstruction along all frontages of the development site. Sidewalk cross-slopes have been carefully coordinated on all frontages to provide a minimum 5-foot-wide section of sidewalk with a cross slope of 2% or less, for adherence to ADA standards. All sidewalks will have street tree pits designed to maintain a minimum 5'-0" clear pedestrian path, per DOT requirements. The applicant is proposing street trees along the three project frontages, encouraging pedestrians to walk on the building-side of the sidewalk, improving pedestrian safety. Sidewalks corners at intersections will incorporate ramps that include the required detectable warning field and will be constructed in accordance with NYC DOT and ADA requirements.

See response to Comment C.28 for more detail on the EIS safety analysis at area intersections.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

c.30 The design of the Community at Broome buildings should integrate modern sustainable measures that reduce the carbon foot print these buildings create; in addition to sustainability standards required by Law, the developers should strive for net zero carbon emissions through intentionally designing for and utilizing any renewable energy and sustainable construction incentives and methods. (Manhattan CB3)

Response: An analysis of the project's consistency whether Citywide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goal is provided in Chapter 11, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," of the EIS. As detailed in that chapter, the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable City GHG emissions reduction and climate change goals, and there would be no significant adverse GHG emission or climate change impacts as a result of the proposed actions. The applicant states that the GO Broome project will incorporate numerous sustainable features, allowing the project to exceed code requirements. These include: green roofs; reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions by providing efficient lighting design (largely LED); reducing heat island effect with landscaping, cool roof, and light-colored envelope design; including a high-performance envelope; providing highly efficient HVAC systems including condensing boilers and promoting an active lifestyle that reduces dependency on motorized systems. Additionally, the project is being designed to enable compliance with NYC Local Laws going into effect in the near future, namely: Local Law 33 of 2018 (energy grades for buildings); Local Laws 92 and 94 of 2019 (mandatory sustainable roof requirements); Local Law 97 of 2019 (limit GHG emissions from buildings).

The Norfolk Senior building will be certified under the Enterprise Green Communities program (similar to LEED), and will achieve the Zone Green criteria for a highly-insulated envelope. Energy modeling of the Suffolk building façade, mechanical, electrical, and lighting systems will be completed and documented and subject to NYC DOB review for compliance with energy code requirements.

Additionally, the Suffolk building will conform to the green standards of the Enterprise Green Communities criteria 2015. While not undergoing the certification process the building will be designed to meet the green features of the program.

Construction

c.31 Release a construction timeline that shows completion of the Proposed Development that coincides with or ends sooner than the end of construction slated for the nearby Essex Street Crossing developments. (Brewer)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 15, "Construction," construction of the proposed project would consist of the construction of the Norfolk and Suffolk buildings on Projected Development Site 1, which would be coordinated such that they overlap and would take approximately 30 months overall to complete. The Norfolk Building, which is smaller than the Suffolk Building, is projected to be complete within 24 months. Construction of the commercial addition on Projected Development Site 2 would take less than two years. Section 15.5, "Consideration of Nearby Construction Projects," of Chapter 15, "Construction," of the DEIS presented information on the timeframe for construction of the proposed development and for the Essex Crossing buildings that are not yet complete. The FEIS has been updated to reflect progress made at the Essex Crossing sites since publication of the DEIS. As discussed in the EIS, the potential for construction of the Norfolk and Suffolk Buildings to overlap with other construction is minimal. As construction begins at Projected Development Site 1, it is expected that construction will be concluding at 180 Broome Street and 202 Broome Street. Construction of Grand Street Guild, if approved, is not expected to begin until the latter stages of Norfolk and Suffolk Building construction.

c.32 This neighborhood has been plagued with ridiculous amounts of construction, obstructing roadways and creating unsafe conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, polluting the air with debris and toxic chemicals, and causing noise pollution. (Smith) Community Board 3 expressed concerns about traffic, safety, and congestion problems during construction (Perciballi) More negative impact on traffic, safety and congestion during construction—this on top of what members of the community have already been (and still are) having to live with given the Essex Crossing project (still ongoing). (Spielman) The proposed construction will result in new construction in the already sprawling Essex Crossing construction zone, which myself and my community have already been living within. (Spielman) Our streets are eroding due to massive construction. (Breen) Include in the release of the FEIS, a report of mitigation efforts to curb the construction emissions of noise, dust, and hazardous materials from the Proposed Development. (Brewer).

Response: Construction at both Projected Development Sites would be subject to government regulations and oversight and would employ a site safety manager to oversee

safety consistent with a Site Safety Plan that would be submitted to DOB for review and approval at each stage of development.

Chapter 15, "Construction," and Chapter 17, "Mitigation," of the EIS provide details on the measures to be employed to reduce air and noise emissions during project construction; these measures will be recorded in a Restrictive Declaration for the project. Chapter 8, "Hazardous Materials," outlines the project commitments to ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts from hazardous materials.

In terms of construction traffic, as discussed above and in Chapter 17, "Mitigation," and Chapter 18, "Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts," of the EIS, because of existing congestion at area intersections and substantial increases in background vehicle traffic as a result of planned developments in the area, such as the Essex Crossing developments, even a modest increase in vehicular trips, such as those during project construction, would result in significant adverse traffic impacts. Of the three analyzed intersections, one location would not experience a significant adverse impact, impacts at another location could be mitigated with a signal timing change, and at one location (the northbound approach at the intersection of Grand Street and Clinton Street) during the PM construction peak hour, the impact could not be mitigated and is therefore considered unavoidable (see Chapter 18).

In terms of reducing air emissions, Chapter 15 includes a section called "Emissions Reduction Program" that provides details on measures that would be employed during construction reduce air emissions (these measures are a combination of measures that are mandated by law and are common practice in large-scale New York City construction projects). Measures include implementation of a fugitive dust control plan, the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel, reduction in the use of equipment that uses diesel fuel (to the extent practical), restrictions on vehicle idling, and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. As further detailed in Chapter 15, the project is committed to a series of diesel emission control measures consisting of the use of diesel-powered construction equipment (engines 75-600 HP range) newer than model year 2011 with any piece of equipment older than model year 2011 (Tier 4 emission standard) assumed to be retrofitted with Diesel Particulate Filter. Based on the results of the quantitative construction air quality analysis, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on air quality during construction of Projected Development Site 1.

In terms of reducing noise, Chapters 15 identifies controls to reduce noise at the source as well as path noise controls. Among other measures, the applicant has committed to lower noise emission limits for specific pieces of equipment (i.e., the tower crane) and to employ a perimeter noise barrier of 12 feet in height. Additional noise mitigation measures, including acoustic enclosures on compressors and generators and shrouds around pile drivers, would be implemented as feasible and reasonable. The DEIS identified the potential for significant adverse construction noise impacts. Between publication of the Draft and Final EIS, additional analysis was undertaken to identify additional measures to reduce noise during construction. With the implementation of these additional measures, there would not be a noise impact during construction (see Chapter 17).

As detailed in Chapter 8, to avoid the potential for significant adverse impacts relating to hazardous materials on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2, under the proposed actions, confirmed contamination on identified on Projected Development Site 1 as part of a

Remedial Investigation Report for the site, as well as any potential contamination for the remaining uninvestigated portions of Potential Development Site 1 (Lot 37) and Projected Development Site 2 would be further identified and investigated as required by an (E) designation for hazardous materials (E-548). Any potential remedial action that may be required would also be administered as part of the (E) designation protocol under the regulatory oversight of the New York City Office of Environmental Remediation (OER). Alternatively, the applicant may also explore a potential enrollment into the NYSDEC Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP), which would provide a pathway to further characterize, investigate and remediate the Projected Development Sites under regulatory oversight provided by NYSDEC. The BCP is also considered an accepted pathway for site investigation and remediation that satisfies the requirements of OER's (E) Designation program. In addition, regulatory requirements pertaining to building materials containing ACM, LBP and PCBs would be addressed under prevailing regulations as part of standard demolition and redevelopment practices on Projected Development Sites 1 and 2. Given these conditions, the With-Action condition would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials for Projected Development Sites 1 and 2.

See also responses to the previous and following comments for a discussion of the overall timeframe for construction and for additional detail about managing construction at the site.

- c.33 There must be regular coordinating meetings between the New York City Department of Transportation, the NYPD 7th Precinct, the GO Broome development and property management teams, the development and property management teams at Essex Crossing and Grand Street Guild, adjoining private development, the Community Board, and other relevant stakeholders to address traffic management, staging, and parking concerns during both the construction and operation period of the project. (Manhattan CB3)**

Response: See response to Comment C.32. GO Broome development and property management teams are committed to meeting regularly with NYCDOT, NYPD 7th Precinct, the development and property management teams of Essex Crossing and Grand Street Guild, any additional teams involved in private development on adjacent sites, and the Community Board to ensure traffic management, staging, and parking concerns are addressed during the construction and operational period of the project.

Alternatives

- c.34 The GO Broome Street Development should study scenarios to lower the overall building height and bulk. At minimum locate all mechanical and other services elsewhere on the site. (Manhattan CB3)**

Response: The EIS includes a Lower Density Alternative, the Lot 95 Exemption Alternative in Chapter 16, "Alternatives," of the EIS. Alternatives are considered which could reduce or eliminate significant adverse impacts identified in the EIS, to determine if they would meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project. An alternative which lowers building height would not reduce or eliminate identified significant adverse impacts and is therefore not included in the EIS.

The applicant states that the proposed Suffolk and Norfolk building massing responds directly to the existing and soon to be completed surrounding context with the goal of limiting the impact of the proposed project on the surrounding neighborhood. The building podium along Broome Street is set at a height of 85 feet to match the base height of the Essex Crossing development while the Norfolk and Suffolk high rise portions are oriented in the north south direction, all to both limit shadow to the Broome Street corridor below and maintain a contextual relationship of building bases. Additionally, the Norfolk Building massing seeks to relate to the existing Hong Ning building, acting as an intermediary step between the Suffolk Building high rise and the lower Hong Ning building to remain. At the top of the Suffolk Building, steps are introduced into the massing to further limit shadows below and create a relationship to the towers in the park existing to the south. Introducing greater bulk at lower levels would decrease light to the streets below. Relocating major pieces of equipment, such as the fire tank, is not permissible by code. Relocating other pieces of equipment (i.e. cooling tower, exhaust fans) to lower building roofs would have a detrimental effect of eliminating outdoor recreation space for the tenants and creating noise and air quality issues for tenants and neighbors.

Comments Not on the DEIS

Comments Received in Support of the Proposed Action

The following organizations and members of the interested public submitted testimony: 32BJ; 384 Grand Street HDFC; the Actors Fund; Association for a Better New York; Breaking Ground; Charles B. Wang Community Health Center; Chinatown Manpower Project, Inc.; Chinatown Partnership Local Development Corporation; the Chinese American Citizens Alliance of Greater New York; Chung Pak Local Development Corporation; Covenant House International; Educational Alliance; Hamilton Madison House; the Hong Ning HDFC Tenant Association; Live on NY; Riseboro Community Partnership; University Settlement; the YMCA of Greater New York; Junhao Chen; Stacie Pranata; Adam Xu; and Yu Zhu Zheng; Chinese Child Care Providers; Hala Kandil; Jacky Chai; Jason Lin; Jenny Ho; Jersey Liu; Lily Tang.

Miscellaneous

The following comments were made during public review but do not address areas of environmental concern. The applicant has provided responses to those comments that substantially pertain to aspects of the proposed development.

c.35 Increase the number of MIH units to 50% of all units in the Suffolk Building. (Brewer)

Response. The proposed project will comply with the requirements of the City's MIH program. See response to Comments C.3, C.4, C.5, and C.6.

c.36 The GO Broome Street Development should attract former site tenants from all SPURA sites. (Manhattan CB3)

Response: Identifying specific site tenants for the proposed project is beyond the scope of the environmental review. The applicants state they are committed to marketing of available affordable, moderate, and market rate units, to the extent this preference is legal under NYC HPD marketing compliance requirements, to former site tenants from all SPURA sites.

c.37 The GO Broome Street Development should ensure any costs for amenities to affordable units be consistent with percentage of reduced rent for those affordable tenants. (Manhattan CB3)

Response: Cost related to residential amenities for the proposed project is beyond the scope of the environmental review. The applicant states that residents of the affordable housing units in the Suffolk Building will be provided access to amenity spaces at a discounted membership rate. The discounted rate will be consistent with the percentage rent reduction of those tenants.

c.38 Reevaluate the number of studio units and conduct a study on the percentages of seniors at the 30 to 50% AMI levels who live alone. (Brewer)

Response: The unit mix is outside the scope of the environmental review. The applicant states that under separate cover, it will provide a market analysis to Manhattan Borough President

c.39 Adhere to affirmative fair housing and equal housing opportunities when marketing the AIRS and MIH units and ensure that all required units are ADA compliant. (Brewer)

Response: The applicant states that Gotham, working with an administrative agent for the Suffolk Building housing units marketing plan and working with CPC and the administrative agent for the Norfolk Building senior affordable housing units, will submit a marketing plan for review and approval by HPD. The marketing plan would include, for example, ensuring that the hardest to reach populations are addressed and notified through publication and various media outlets, and units for those who are disabled, specifically the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS), will be marketed via outreach through organizations such as US spinal, etc.

That applicant states that it has assembled a project team committed to the adherence of accessibility requirements. The architect is well experienced in the design of large multifamily buildings in New York City and is retained to design and document their design in compliance with Fair Housing requirements and ADA compliance. Additionally, an accessibility consultant has been retained to review design documents to ensure planning complies with Fair Housing Act Accessibility Guidelines, the 2010 ADA Standards, the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) and all applicable New York City and federal accessibility requirements. Design documents will require NYC HPD BLDS approval and DOB approval prior to approval and permit. Both the architect and accessibility consultant are required to maintain oversight of the construction and provide necessary reporting to ensure compliance with approved documents.

- c.40 Ensure any future decisions to convert the usage of the BHH Synagogue ground-floor space to a commercial space are confirmed and approved by Community Board 3. (Brewer)**

Response: Identification of specific tenants within a proposed development is outside the scope of environmental review. Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," provides a summary of what would be permitted as a result of the proposed actions.

- c.41 Gotham is subject of a major lawsuit over its failure in multiple projects to follow NY human rights law for the disabled. This lawsuit should be resolved before NY state gifts community resources to them. (Kolber, Perciballi, Spielman) I have submitted information as to the lawsuit Gotham is involved with (for unfair practices as well as health and human safety violations) (Breen)**

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comment C.29.

- c.42 There's already been one very preventable fatality on this supposedly well-regulated construction site. How many more such deaths need to happen before we wake up? (Spielman) The project sponsors already had a death due to collapse of a structure deemed not structurally stable, within their site, months prior to the incident. (Testa)**

Response: The applicant is committed to safety. See responses to Comments C.24, C.26, C.27, as well as Chapter 17, "Construction," of the EIS.

- c.43 The site became available after a tragic fire that destroyed a historic structure and created very dangerous conditions for the immediate neighbors, including the Hong Ning senior home next door and NYCHA building across the street. No news outlet reported on any serious injuries at Hong Ning senior housing possibly because the operator of the senior housing is a partner in the development. The Seward Park Coops, where my family lives, is further away but the smoke was still at dangerous levels. Everyone believes that the fire was deliberate for the purpose of making this lot available for development. The congregation of the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol synagogue had long been attempting to get special permission to demolish the historic building and negotiations were already underway with the current developers prior to the arson. Although the intention of this criminal activity is unsubstantiated, we know this is an issue in NYC and beyond. Not addressing this leads to validating this illegal and dangerous practice and encourages other owners of unprofitable buildings to do the same. Landlords from across the city will take note of how the city dealt with this situation now and in the future and may use this as a roadmap on how to get away with arson. (Rosenberg) The sponsors of this project are attempting to benefit from a suspiciously convenient and unresolved arson which many suspect was commissioned by them. (Testa)**

Response: Comment noted.

- c.44 Why has almost one million dollars been transferred from Gotham to "GoBroomeLLC" for lobbying efforts? Nearly \$700,000 of this remains "unspent" according to state records so we are naturally curious as to the nature of this million dollar lobbying effort when existing zoning would be perfectly acceptable for retail, affordable housing, and CPC headquarters. This will of course be an issue if this becomes a press story, and everyone from Margaret Chin, Gale Brewer, CB3, and the City Planning**

Commission are listed in the NY State Ethics database as having been recipients of this generous lobbying effort. (Kolber)

Response: The applicant notes that where lobbying activities relate to legislative acts, such as a proposal for a rezoning, Land Use Attorneys and Government Relations Consultants are required by law to register with the state. All filings are publicly available online and the statements made herein by the commentator are inaccurate and falsely suggestive.

c.45 The project sponsors have misled the public about the number and quality of affordable housing and community spaces. They should not be rewarded for their borderline criminality. (Testa)

Response: Between the Norfolk Building senior housing units and the Suffolk Building MIH units, 43% of all residential units in the proposed development are proposed to be permanently affordable at an average of 53% of AMI and would be affordable to very low, low, moderate, and market-rate income earners. See response to Comments C.1 and C.3 for additional details.

c.46 A profitability evaluation from Gotham would be interesting. (Breen)

Response: Comment noted. This is outside the scope of an environmental review.

c.47 The developers do not address any of these issues and instead offer “community benefits” that appeal specifically to the local City Council Member’s interests. It’s well documented that Margaret Chin has a close relationship to Chinese American Planning Council (a partner in the development) and is a champion of senior housing in general. These “community benefits” appear designed to appeal to her, not to the actual neighbors of this development. Many of my neighbors who oppose this development are seniors, so it’s ironic that the Community Board and our City Council representative refuses to listen to what the seniors in the area actually want. To us, the community that was left out of the conversation, this looks like old fashioned corruption. (Rosenberg)

Response: See responses to Comments C.1 and C.7. The applicant notes that outreach related to the project has been extensive and that pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) regulations, multiple opportunities for public input on the project were made available. A Public Scoping meeting was noticed and held on February 26, 2019. Comments on the Draft Scope of Work were accepted at the meeting and through March 11, 2019. In addition, a hearing on the DEIS was noticed and held on December 4, 2019.

In addition to the scoping meeting and DEIS hearing, the applicants sought to not only meet the statutory disclosure obligations but also collaborate with the community prior to the formal ULURP process. The applicants issued a press release, established an informational website, and met with numerous community groups to inform them of the proposed development prior to ULURP. The applicants also met with the Manhattan Community Board 3 Land Use, Zoning, Public and Private Housing Committee and elected officials throughout 2018 and 2019. The applicants voluntarily presented the proposed project at a joint meeting of the CB3 Land Use Committee and the Economic Development Committee on January 10, 2018. The presentation was subsequently provided to the CB3 Land Use Committee and

posted on the CB3 website for public review. The applicants also presented the project to the CB3 Land Use Committee on June 18, 2019, prior to project certification, in an effort to provide an opportunity for unofficial extended public review.

In addition, the applicant notes that senior housing is much needed in New York City. According to Mayor de Blasio's affordable housing plan, Housing New York (as supplemented by Housing New York 2.0), the population of City residents who are at least 65 years old is projected to increase by 40 percent between 2010 and 2040, and there is an anticipated housing need for more than 400,000 additional seniors in the coming years. These seniors are more likely to be low-income, rent-burdened, and living on a fixed income as compared to other City residents. As proposed, the project would include 115 permanently affordable units in the Norfolk Building for seniors to help meet this need. As currently contemplated, the applicant plans for the senior housing units to be made available for seniors with incomes at 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, and 70% AMI.

The applicant further notes that residents of the Hong Ning senior housing building are supportive of the proposed project.

- c.48 We OPPOSE the developer Gotham using the CPC as a trojan horse to convince the city to allow an incredibly bulky and dense building, using affordable housing as a cover for what is really developer greed. (Kolber) Gotham Corporation is partnering with NFP organizations and making use of tax abatement laws to build profitable developments on (in this case) free or cheap land. The implications are frightening. Every NFP needs help, with tax income from developers (as it is written) the governments could contribute more. Instead, just as in the private sector, where billionaires make tax-deductible charitable contributions while receiving tax breaks from the government and call themselves altruistic, denying the rest of us the tax income for infrastructure and public services such as schools. We leave it to a few to decide where this money goes. This benefits the few and not the many. This is a land grab. (Breen)**

Response: See responses to Comments C.8 for a discussion of CPC, Comment C.13 for a discussion of schools, Comments C.22, C.23, C.24, and C.25 for a discussion of the project's urban design and consistency with neighborhood character.

- c.49 I am very concerned about the health aspects of the ESCR project, an issue that seems to be mostly obscured and buried in the language of the ESCR proposal. I am extremely doubtful that digging up a known area of environmental contaminants from the original landfill of the park plus bringing in 900 thousand tons of new landfill over 3.5+ years will not have a negative effect on the health of the community. I believe this claim deserves a much closer look. I feel that a professional environmental health consultant not employed by the city should review the plan to guarantee that those of us who are elderly and/or have lung disease as I do can live comfortably in the vicinity of the project without fear that our air is contaminated and causing unknown harm. (Horsfield)**

Response: This comment is specific to the East Side Coastal Resiliency project and not the GO Broome Street Development project. Refer to response to Comment C.41 for a discussion of the hazardous material analysis related to the GO Broome Street Development project.