

## 4 Community Facilities and Services

### Introduction

This chapter assesses the possible effects of the Proposed Actions on community facilities and services. The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines community facilities as public or publicly funded facilities, including schools, libraries, childcare centers, health care facilities, and fire and police protection services.

A project can affect community facilities or services when it either physically displaces or alters them (a direct effect) or causes a change in populations that may affect services delivered (an indirect effect).

The Proposed Actions would have broad applicability and would affect a variety of areas; therefore, this analysis addresses community facilities by examining prototypical cases. Additionally, the proposed zoning text and map amendments are not expected to induce development or cause a significant change in the overall amount, type, or location of development. However, because the Proposed Actions may change or modify the land use actions necessary to facilitate development on a site (e.g., certifications, authorizations, and special permits), the Proposed Actions could increase the proportion of development sites proceeding as-of-right.

This analysis examines the potential for possible direct and indirect effects on existing community facilities and services that the City is obligated to provide to the public, based on defined measures of utilization for each service (e.g., enrollment/capacity for public education). The community facilities analysis assesses the ability of community facilities to provide services, both with and without the Proposed Actions, in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Whether a project would have a possible effect is based on the likelihood that it would create demand for services that exceeds the ability of existing facilities to provide those services. This potential for effects can result from displacement of an existing facility (thereby increasing demand at another facility) or by an increase in population. The assessment is based on a comparison of the development of the four prototypical analysis sites under the No Action scenario with the With Action scenario, as described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**.

## Principal Conclusions

The Proposed Actions are not anticipated to result in direct or indirect significant, adverse impacts related to community facilities. To determine the need for a community facilities and services assessment, a screening-level analysis was performed for the Proposed Actions that compares the development of prototypical analysis sites in the With Action scenario with prototypical analysis site development in the No Action scenario. The Proposed Actions do not warrant a detailed analysis for indirect effects on community facilities and services and would not directly displace an existing community facility or service.

## Methodology

This analysis addresses community facilities by examining prototypical analysis sites, as described in Appendix 2. The analysis presented in this chapter is not site-specific, and instead, considers the types of developments that could occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. In addition, the analysis addresses the range of conditions under which the Proposed Actions would occur, so that the full range of impacts can be identified.

These prototypical analysis sites have been developed and are described in detail in Appendix 2. One of the four prototypical analysis sites illustrating the effects of the Proposed Actions demonstrates a potential increase to the number of dwelling units:

- **Prototypical Analysis Site 3:** R1-1 District, Residential, 120<sub>±</sub> by 100-foot interior lot (one additional residential unit)

The Proposed Actions are not expected to induce development where it would not otherwise occur in the No Action scenario. However, to provide a conservative assessment, the screening analysis evaluates whether the increased density at this site would trigger a preliminary or more detailed assessment of impacts on hospitals, libraries, fire, or police services.

The potential for a clustering of effects as a result of the Proposed Actions is also considered to rule out the potential that multiple developments with small incremental increases in the number of dwelling units might occur within a study area, resulting in a new population that exceeds the thresholds outlined in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

## Screening Analysis

A screening-level analysis was performed to determine the need for a preliminary or more detailed community facilities and services assessment. As noted in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a community facilities analysis is needed if an action has the potential to result in either direct or indirect effects on community facilities. Detailed community

facilities analyses are most commonly associated with residential projects because demand for community services generally results from the introduction of new residents to an area. If an action would physically alter a community facility, whether by displacement of the facility or other physical change, this “direct” effect triggers the need to assess the service delivery of the facility and the potential effect that the physical change may have on that service delivery. New population to an area as a result of an action would use existing services, which may result in potential “indirect” effects on service delivery. Depending on the size, income characteristics, and age distribution of the new population, there may be effects on public schools or childcare centers.

### ***Direct Effects***

The Proposed Actions would not result in direct impacts on community facilities. The Proposed Actions would not displace or otherwise directly affect any public schools, libraries, childcare centers, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services facilities. Therefore, an analysis of direct effects is not warranted.

### ***Indirect Effects***

The analysis framework identified in **Chapter 1**, *Project Description*, and the thresholds presented in Table 6-1, *Community Facility Thresholds for Detailed Analysis*, in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, are used to evaluate whether a detailed analysis is necessary to determine potential impacts. If a proposal exceeds the threshold for a specific facility, a more detailed analysis is warranted. A preliminary screening analysis was conducted to determine if the Proposed Actions would exceed established 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds and warrant further analysis.

Table 6-1 in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines thresholds for detailed analysis as 50 or more elementary/middle school students (public schools), 20 or more children eligible for group childcare and Head Start centers, more than a 5 percent increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches, or the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood (for police/fire services and health care facilities). As shown in **Table 4-1**, under the With Action scenario, there would be an increase in residential units for prototypical analysis [site 3](#). However, the increase would not exceed the thresholds for detailed analysis of schools, childcare, or libraries. Because the increase in residential units would be negligible and no new neighborhood would be created, the thresholds for police/fire services and health care facilities also would not be exceeded, and no further analysis is warranted.

**Table 4-1. Community Facility Thresholds for Detailed Analysis**

Prototypical Analysis Site	Incremental Number of Residential Units	Geography	Minimum Number of Residential Units that Trigger Detailed Analyses			
			Public Elementary/ Intermediate	Public High School	Childcare (Publicly Funded)	Libraries (5% Increase in Units/Branch)
3	1	Bronx, <u>Community School District 10</u>	111	980	141	682

Source: Table 6-1, *CEQR Technical Manual*; 2018 Projected Public School Ratio (SCA)

\* This table has been updated for the FEIS.

The New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) recently released new projected public school ratios data as part of the documents used to draft the New York City Department of Education/SCA FY 2020–2024 Capital Plan Proposed November 2018. The new projected ratios data use the 2012–2016 American Community Survey – Public Use Microdata Sample and are available at the SCA’s website under Capital Plan Reports & Data. According to these data, multipliers for primary and intermediate schools have been refined to reflect how many pupils are generated by new housing at the community school district level (multipliers for high schools have been maintained at the borough level). As a result, the thresholds for determining when public school analyses are necessary have changed. In Bronx Community School District 10, the threshold for elementary and intermediate schools is 111 incremental residential units and 980 residential units for high schools. The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* has not been updated to reflect these new thresholds. However, DCP as lead agency in consultation with the Mayor’s Office of Environmental Conservation, has 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 school CEQR analysis to present a reasonable and accurate environmental assessment.

Significant clustering of development would have to occur to exceed thresholds that require analysis, and such clustering is unlikely given the small number of development sites in the affected zoning districts. Vacant and underutilized lots are distributed throughout the affected zoning districts, and development is not anticipated to occur in a concentrated location. The proposed zoning text and map amendments are not expected to induce development or cause a significant change in the overall amount, type, or location of development. The Proposed Actions

are also unlikely to change which lots are developed in the With-Action scenario compared to the No Action scenario.

Based on this screening, the Proposed Actions do not warrant a detailed analysis on the indirect effects on public schools, publicly funded childcare centers, libraries, health care facilities or police and fire service. Under the With Action scenario, one prototypical analysis site could see the development of additional residential units compared to the No Action scenario. This would occur because the Proposed Actions would remove the currently required CPC authorization for development of lots larger than 10,000 square feet and/or lots that need modified topography (site 8). However, the Proposed Actions would not result residential units that exceed the thresholds for detailed analysis.

### **Conclusion**

Because the Proposed Actions do not warrant a detailed analysis for indirect effects on community facilities and would not physically alter a community facility (or facilities), the Proposed Actions do not have the potential to result in significant, adverse impacts on community facilities and services, and no further analysis is warranted.

This page intentionally left blank.