27

Response to Comments on the DEIS

1. Introduction

This document summarizes and responds to comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Queens Future project published on September 20, 2024.

City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) requires a public hearing as part of the environmental review process. Oral and written comments were received during the meeting held by the New York City Planning Commission on January 8, 2025. Written comments were accepted from issuance of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) through the close of the public comment period, which ended on January 31, 2025, which ended on January 31, 2025 at 5 PM. **Appendix H** contains the written comments received on the DEIS. Where relevant and appropriate, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been modified to incorporate and address substantive public comment on the DEIS.

Section 2 of this document lists the elected officials, organizations, and individuals that provided relevant comments on the DEIS. **Section 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.

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

Organizations and Interested Public

1. Flushing for Equitable Development and Urban Planning (FED-UP) Coalition, written statement dated January 7, 2025 (FED-UP Coalition)
2. NYC H20, written statement dated January 8, 2025 (NYC H20)
3. Michael De Valera, Community Board 3, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (De Valera)
4. Sidra Ahmad, written statement dated January 8, 2025 (Ahmad)
5. Jenna Capeci, written statement dated January 10, 2025 (Capeci)
6. Bridget Elise, written statement dated January 7, 2025 (Elise)
7. Kara Fan, spoken testimony and written statement dated January 8, 2025 (Fan)
8. Rachel Knopf, written statement dated January 9, 2025 (Knopf)
9. Elizabeth Llerena, written statement dated January 7, 2025 (Llerena)
10. Arianne Mayer, written statement dated January 9, 2025 (Mayer)
11. Sue Silverman, written statement dated January 9, 2025 (Silverman)
12. Jorge Morales, 89th Street Tenants Unidos Association, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Morales)
13. Katie Walls, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Walls)
14. Rebecca Pryor, Guardians of Flushing Bay, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Pryor)
15. Dara Illowsky, Save the Sound, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Illowsky)
16. Catherine Servino, Coastal Preservation Network, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Servino)
17. Margaret Flanagan, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Flanagan)
18. Cody Herman, Queens Community Board 7, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Herman)
19. Meryl Greenbaum, written statement dated January 11, 2025 (Greenbaum)
20. Alyssia Huang, written statement dated January 13, 2025 (A. Huang)
21. Crystal Huang, written statement dated January 21, 2025 (C. Huang)
22. Kyosin Kang, written statement dated January 12, 2025 (Kang)
23. Nora Lawrence, written statement dated January 10, 2025 (Lawrence)
24. Viola Zheng, written statement dated January 11, 2025 (Zheng)
25. Joshua Blum, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Blum)
26. Karen Craddock, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Craddock)
27. Kirsten Cruzen, written statement dated January 26, 2025 (Cruzen)
28. Laura Fenton, written statement dated January 26, 2025 (Fenton)

29. Carolyn Lau, written statement dated January 26, 2025 (Lau)
30. Karen Lichtig, written statement dated January 25, 2025 (Lichtig)
31. Bright Limm, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Limm)
32. Kiki Lin, Living Faith Community Development Corporation, written statement dated January 11, 2025 (LFCDC)
33. Xavier Niz, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Niz)
34. Gina Petruccelli, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Petruccelli)
35. Claudia Schellenberg, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Schellenberg)
36. Jacqueline Wu, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Wu)
37. Mai Tran, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Tran)
38. Megan Taylor, written statement dated January 20, 2025 (Taylor)
39. Denise Song, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Song)
40. Paul Caviano, written statements dated January 24, 2025 and January 31, 2025 (Caviano)
41. Emily Chan, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Chan)
42. Margaret Samu, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Samu)
43. Aimee Rosato, written statement dated January 21, 2025
44. Susan Lynn Cole, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Cole)
45. Christina Cuevas, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Cuevas)
46. Fabrice Rochelemagne, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Rochelemagne)
47. Joseph Datko, written statement dated January 21, 2025 (Datko)
48. Robert Dennis, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Dennis)
49. Kirsten Sorton, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Sorton)
50. Sarah Dinan, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Dinan)
51. Christopher Stone, written statement dated January 25, 2025 (Stone)
52. Mary Hawkins, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Hawkins)
53. Ammar Karim, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Karim)
54. Lindsey Kriaris, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Kriaris)
55. Stephanie Perez, written statement dated Friday, January 24, 2025 (Perez)
56. Christine Toner, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Toner)
57. Mary Whaling, written statement dated January 25, 2025 (Whaling)
58. Kevin Lu, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Lu)
59. Justin Yanqui, written statement dated January 25, 2025 (Yanqui)
60. Erica Low, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Low)
61. Dan Young, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Young)
62. Christina Chin, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Chin)
63. Alison Diviney, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Diviney)
64. Rachel Goldenberg, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Goldenburg)
65. Justine Guan, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Guan)

66. John Leonard, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Leonard)
67. Mona Le Roy, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Le Roy)
68. Richard Ma, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Ma)
69. Jennifer McTaggart, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (McTaggart)
70. Richard Polgar, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Polgar)
71. David Shen, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Shen)
72. Noelle Yang, Living Faith Community Development Corporation, written statement dated January 21, 2025 (Yang)
73. Nathan Blackwell, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Blackwell)
74. Yan Shan Yu, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (YS. Yu)
75. M Lee, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Lee)
76. Jessie Yang, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (J. Yang)
77. Renee Polgar, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Renee Polgar)
78. Julianna Lee Marino, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Marino)
79. Donavan Finn, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 23, 2025 (Finn)
80. Jo Ann Yoo, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 21, 2025 (Yoo)
81. Alan Sherman, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Sherman)
82. Seth Bornstein, Queens Economic Development Corporation, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Queens Economic Development Corporation)
83. Nicole Bailey, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Bailey)
84. Kenneth Cohen, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Cohen)
85. Yoselin Genao-Estrella, Neighborhood Housing Services of Queens, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Neighborhood Housing Services of Queens)
86. Jonathan Forgash, Queens Together, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Queens Together)
87. Diane Song Yu, Flushing Business Improvement District, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Flushing Business Improvement District)
88. Joe Lam, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Lam)
89. Bianca Ng, Flushing Bay, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Ng)
90. John Shin, Korean Community Services of Metropolitan New York (KCS), spoken testimony delivered January 8. 2025 and written statement dated January 30, 2025 (KCS)
91. Reginal Pegues, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Pegues)
92. Elizabeth Bian, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Bian)

93. Tom Grech, Queens Chamber of Commerce, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Queens Chamber of Commerce)
94. Furhana Husani, Waterfront Alliance, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Waterfront Alliance)
95. Brian Chen, Chief Strategy Officer at the Chinese-American Planning Council spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 17, 2025 (Chinese-American Planning Council)
96. Liang Ming, Glow Cultural Center, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 17, 2025 (Glow Cultural Center)
97. Isaac Carmignani, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Carmignani)
98. Jeffrey Lin, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Lin)
99. Robert Dorsky, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Dorskyi)
100. Olga Reyes, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Reyes)
101. Ted Teng, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Teng)
102. Ahyoung Kim, Asian-American Federation, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 17, 2025 (Asian-American Federation
103. Danny Dromm, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Dromm)
104. Bishop Mitchell Taylor, Urban Upbound, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 14, 2025 (Urban Upbound)
105. Joe Diaz, Elmhurst Youth and Adult Activities, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Elmhurst Youth and Adult Activities)
106. Mo Chan, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Chan)
107. Bryan Lee, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 21, 2025 (B. Lee)
108. Karen Wang, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (K. Wang)
109. Carolina Bustamante, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Bustamante)
110. Hilda Bustamante, written statement dated January 20, 2025 (H. Bustamante)
111. Eduardo Valentin, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 (Valentin)
112. Johanna Flores, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Flores)
113. Christopher Ho, written statement dated January 27, 2025 (Ho)
114. Joseph Kessler, written statement dated January 25, 2025 (Kessler)
115. Nuala Naranjo, written statement dated January 26, 2025 (Naranjo)
116. Hyun T Lee., Korean American Association of Queens, written statement dates January 23, 2025 (H. Lee)
117. Henry Wan, written statement dated January 23, 2025 (Wan)
118. Sam Boykin, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Boykin)
119. Larry Gallegos, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (Gallegos)

120. Anna Lee, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (A. Lee)
121. Paul Lin, written statement dated January 28, 2025 (P. Lin)
122. Costa Constantinides, Variety Boys and Girls Club of Queens, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Variety Boys and Girls Club of Queens)
123. Aida Mejia, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Mejia)
124. Kai Shum, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Shum)
125. Tammy Rose Scott, spoken testimony delivered January 8, 2025 and written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Scott)
126. Chon Ao Ieong, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Ieong)
127. Gretchen Begley, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Begley)
128. Haley Beom, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Beom)
129. Claire Beresford, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Beresford)
130. Bill Bruno, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Bruno)
131. Blyss Buitrago, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Buitrago)
132. Edward Butler, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Butler)
133. Paul Caviano, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Caviano)
134. Judy Chase, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Chase)
135. Eric Cimino, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Cimino)
136. Kahena Coles, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Coles)
137. Sharone David, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (David)
138. Jill Diamant, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Diamant)
139. Walter Ditman, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Ditman)
140. Jeehae Fischer, Korean American Family Service Center (KAFSC), written statement dated January 31, 2025 (KAFSC)
141. Chandra Gomes, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Gomes)
142. Miles Grant, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Grant)
143. Elizabeth Guzman, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Guzman)
144. Kelly Helfet, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Helfet)
145. Molly Helfet, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (M. Helfet)
146. Alexandra Herzan, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Herzan)
147. Marcus Janke, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Janke)
148. Michelle Johnson, Empire Dragons NYC, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Empire Dragons NYC)
149. Melissa Zavala, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Zavala)
150. John Kelly, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Kelly)
151. Sam Jung, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Jung)
152. Michelle Lau-Burke, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Lau-Burke)
153. Kevin Lee, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (K. Lee)
154. Reverend Patrick Young, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Rev. Young)

155. Henry Lo, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Lo)
156. Katherine Maloy, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Maloy)
157. Lee Maniace, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Maniace)
158. Stephanie Matamoros, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Matamoros)
159. Eddie McWilliams, Cement and Concrete Workers District Council LECET, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Cement and Concrete Workers District Council LECET)
160. Cam Neader, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Neader)
161. Linda Ng, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Ng)
162. Janai Pellot, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Pellot)
163. Lizbeth Ramirez, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Ramirez)
164. Suzanne Rothman, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Rothman)
165. Memo Salazar, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Salazar)
166. Kim Savarino, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Savarino)
167. Rachana Shah, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Shah)
168. Neva Sharon, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Sharon)
169. Rachel Shey, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Shey)
170. Matthew Walsh, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Walsh)
171. Aretha Wareham, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Wareham)
172. Linda Liang, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Liang)
173. Rachel Brown, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Brown)
174. Coles Gregory, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Gregory)
175. Jenny Dubnau, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Dubnau)
176. Lewis Estevez, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Estevez)
177. Gloria Gong, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Gong)
178. Tommy Jee, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Jee)
179. Taeeun Kim, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Kim)
180. Janet Levoff, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Levoff)
181. Scott Lichtenstein, written statement dated January 30, 2025 (Lichtenstein)
182. Rebecca Lieb, written statement dated January 24, 2025 (Lieb)
183. Shanel Thomas, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (Thomas)
184. Bella Wang, written statement dated January 29, 2025 (Wang)
185. Robert LoScalzo, written statement dated January 31, 2025 (LoScalzo)
186. 1,755 letters of support were received as referenced in the section "Comments Received in Support of the Proposed Project"

Additional comments were received after 5 PM on January 31, 2025. These comments were duplicative of other comments noted in **Section 3**.

3. Comments and Responses on the DEIS

Comments Relating to Process

C.1 **The public hearing is scheduled immediately following major winter holidays and is scheduled for 10 a.m. on a weekday. As community organizers and advocates, we know that this is a highly difficult time of year and time of day to engage our communities in submitting comments about a project of this scale, scope, and complexity. We are certain that the timing of the public hearing alone will hamper participation from working families. The limited comment period does not provide enough time for community-based organizations to connect with impacted neighbors in the languages that they speak. In order to allow for a robust community engagement process that prioritizes the surrounding Environmental Justice communities directly impacted by this project, we believe it is imperative to give the public more time to draft written comments following the January 8 public hearing and comment session. (FED-UP Coalition, Save the Sound)**

Response: On January 17 and 22, 2025, the New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination (MOEC) extended the DEIS comment period from January 21, 2025, until 5 PM on January 31, 2025 in response to this request.

C.2 **We should be doing far more outreach and getting more people's opinions (Fan). I don't think the community voice has been represented well at these events and there is a real concern about the things this project is promising to the community. (Diviney) I also want to register my frustration with the way some speakers have portrayed community support for this project. Since community board members are not elected, their opinions cannot be said to represent those of the community at large. When an elected representative surveyed community members, broad disapproval of this project across Queens was revealed. (Megan) Community board hearings on the project were not representative in their procedure, with the applicants and those under their influence given disproportionate time and resources to make their case at the expense of those critical of the project. Please consider the supporting statements made at the 8 January hearing with this in mind. (Datko)**

Response: Comment noted. The comment is outside the scope of the EIS. As part of its own project development process, the Applicant completed almost three years of engagement and conversation with community stakeholders. As part of the public review process, a total of fourteen (14) public meetings were held during the formal 60-day Community Board review period during the months of October and November 2024. The meetings included robust public participation with a broad array of perspectives shared at each meeting. Specifically, as part of the ULURP process, public hearings on the land use application were held as follows:

- October 23, 2024, Community Board 7 (public meeting)
- October 24, 2024, Community Board 9 (public hearing)
- October 28, 2024, Community Board 8 (public meeting)
- October 29, 2024, Community Board 6 (public hearing)
- October 30, 2024, Community Board 7 (public meeting)
- November 4, 2024, Community Board 3 (public meeting)
- November 12, 2024, Community Board 9 (public meeting)
- November 13, 2024, Community Board 6 (public meeting)

- November 13, 2024, Community Board 8 (public hearing)
- November 14, 2024, Community Board 4 (public meeting)
- November 18, 2024, Community Board 7 (public hearing)
- November 20, 2024, Community Board 4 (public hearing)
- November 21, 2024, Community Board 3 (public hearing)
- December 10, 2024, Community Board 4 (public meeting)

Comments Relating to Project Description

C.3 **The proposed land use action will enable the taking and privatization of 78 acres of public land without any plan for parkland replacement, allowing the developers to build a tax-free redevelopment and prioritizing profit over people. (Pryor, Greenbaum, Song, Rochelemagne, Lu, Low, YS. Yu, Yang, NYC H20, Capeci, Knopf, Lawrence, Mayer, Silverman, Lawrence, Blum, LFCDC, Niz, Petruccelli, Sorton, Taylor, Whaling, Blackwell, A. Huang, C. Huang, Kang, Cruzen, Rosato, Dennis, McTaggart, Lee, Marino, Bruno, Butler, Flanagan, Janke, Zavala, Salazar, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh) We are very concerned about the city giving away an unprecedentedly large tract of public land, that is supposed to be our public land. (Luger, Walls, Servino, Salazar, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Lieb) I am concerned about turning this public land into something owned and handled by a private entity. (Fan) This project should be modified to not alienate parkland. (Guardians of Flushing Bay, YS. Yu)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description** of the Draft EIS (DEIS) and Final EIS (FEIS), the Development Site is comprised of approximately 78 acres. The majority of the Development Site is part of Flushing Meadows Corona Park. A 1.1-acre portion on the northwest corner of the Development Site is located within the boundary of the Grand Central Parkway and a 0.44-acre portion on the northeast corner is located within the mapped boundary of Northern Boulevard. Approximately 53 of the 78 acres consists of asphalt surface parking lots; the remaining acres include roadways and other circulation areas. The Proposed Actions include the demapping of approximately 25 acres of parkland corresponding to Area of Development A, which would be leased to the Applicant, and a relocated ramp to the westbound Grand Central Parkway. A map detailing the location and extent of the demapping of approximately 25 acres of parkland is shown in **Figure 1-7** in the DEIS and FEIS. The Proposed Actions also include mapping of approximately 0.8 acres of parkland corresponding to park improvements within the existing boundary of Grand Central Parkway. The other areas in the Development Site currently mapped as parkland would remain as such. The Proposed Project would also include public park space—at least 20 acres (with approximately 25 acres currently planned) of the Development Site would be improved with landscaping and other amenities for public recreation. The entire Development Site would remain City-owned land, and the park space would be operated as a public park pursuant to an agreement with NYC Parks.

As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description** State legislation enacted in 1961 authorized the City to enter into agreements with private parties for the use of a stadium and parking lots on the Development Site and the current site of Citi Field. As authorized by the legislation, Ballpark, LLC leases the Development Site and operates the parking lots. The current lease agreement with the City runs through 2105. Absent the Proposed Project, it is assumed that the Development Site would continue operating under existing conditions; it would remain as a paved parking area for Citi Field under a lease to Ballpark, LLC.

C.4 **The Proposed Project is not the best use of our land resource. The land should be used for other uses such as housing, commerce, or a community center. (Kang, Wang) Queens needs additional affordable housing, not a casino. (Dennis) Community resources should be better allocated. (Morales). Just because the land has historically been a swamp or parking lot and hasn't been used to benefit the residents as intended does not justify transforming it into a casino. (Walls, Servino) The community needs more resources and affordable housing, parking garages or access to healthy waterfront. (Elise) I would much prefer to see this space turned into a public greenspace. (Diviney) A casino is not what is needed. Parklands are essential for the community. Flushing needs parks and drainage not casinos and asphalt. (Craddock) This public land should instead be developed in a way that supports the personal and economic health of our community. (Luger)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description** of the DEIS and FEIS, the Queens Future Project is an opportunity to transform the underutilized parking lots into a unique mixed-use recreational, commercial, and entertainment hub. The proposed new public park space, transit and highway improvements, and other public amenities proposed as part of the Queens Future Project are made possible with the creation of the mixed-use recreational and entertainment hub. As noted in **Table 1-2** in **Chapter 1, Project Description** the proposed gaming facility would comprise 9.6% of the floor area and 3.4% of the total development. The Project would contain at least 20 acres (25 are currently planned) of public park space, while also containing a mix of uses that would generate approximately 23,000 construction and permanent jobs.

C.5 **The DEIS's Purpose and Need is too narrowly focused on economic development, which causes other viable alternatives like the Phoenix Meadows project to be excluded from consideration. The purpose and need fails to discuss that the site is parkland and that the purpose of parkland is not necessarily economic development, but rather space to benefit local and NYC-wide residents. The Purpose and Need in the forthcoming FEIS should be expanded and adjusted to more accurately frame the allowed and desired uses on the site. (Empire Dragons NYC)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, the current lease agreement with the City runs through 2105. Therefore, absent the Proposed Project (in the No-Action Condition), the Development Site would remain as a paved parking area for Citi Field under the current lease agreement. As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, new public park space, transit and highway improvements, and other public amenities proposed as part of the Queens Future Project are made possible with the creation of the mixed-use recreational and entertainment hub. The Purpose and Need was developed following sustained community engagement and conversation regarding goals for the Development Site.

See also response to **Comment C.40**.

C.6 **Casinos will only benefit a handful and be a detriment to many. (Wu, Tran) The Guardians of the Flushing Bay believe the impacts are so great that we recommend the Commission oppose the project or vote no unless modified. (Guardians of Flushing Bay) We cannot agree to a project if we don't understand the extent of its potential impacts. (Cuevas, Dennis, Karim, Kriaris, Blum, Chin, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Shen) I am nervous about the negative impacts of a casino close to our homes. (Diviney)**

Response: As set forth in the FEIS, of the 19 technical areas studies in the EIS, the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in only two areas, both transportation-related (operational and construction period). As stated in **Chapter 21, Mitigation,** some of the impacts can be fully mitigated, partially mitigated and some will remain unmitigable.

Comments Relating to EIS Analyses

Analytical Framework

C.7 **The DEIS only mentioned the neighborhood of Flushing in reference to where construction workers will park on game days. The impacts of this project on the Flushing neighborhood were not studied in the DEIS. (Herman) Do a complete impact analysis that considers all the surrounding neighborhoods and their people. (Wu, Tran, Renee Polgar)**

Response: The DEIS and FEIS were prepared in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which provides guidance on the appropriate size of the study area for each technical area of study. The study areas for the DEIS and FEIS were established in the Draft and Final Scope of Work and set in coordination with the lead agency and multiple city agencies, including the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP), the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), and NYC Parks. The study area examined for the operational transportation analyses includes 11 intersections in Downtown Flushing. This study area was expanded to 24 intersections in Downtown Flushing for the Construction analysis for both non-gameday and gameday construction scenarios.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

C.8 **The Proposed Project lacks a climate resilient design, should have stronger climate resilience measures, and does not align with the city's climate resilience goals. Rather than investing in climate resilience solutions on valuable public parkland, the project proposes a 3.7 million square foot redevelopment with 20+ story buildings in the middle of multiple environmental justice communities. The Proposed Project should prioritize climate resilience. (Ahmad, Blackwell, Blum, Capeci, Caviano, Chan, Chin, Cole, Cuevas, Cruzen, Dennis, Dinan, Diviney, Guan, Greenbaum, Goldenburg, Fenton, Kang, Karim, Knopf, Kriaris, Lau, Lawrence, Lee, Leonard, Le Roy, Lichtig, Limm, Lu, Ma, Mayer, McTaggart, Niz, Petruccelli, Samu, Silverman, Shen, Sorton, Stone, Taylor, Toner, Whaling, Yang, Yanqui, Young, Butler, Beresford, Buitrago, Caviano, Cimino, David, Diamant, Ditman, Grant, Guzman, Helfet, M. Helfet, Herzan, Janke, Empire Dragons NYC, Kelly, Lau-Burke, Zavala, K. Lee, Maloy, Maniace, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Salazar, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Lieb)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would be consistent with New York City's Waterfront Revitalization Program and would facilitate development in an appropriate area within the City's Coastal Zone. As described in **Chapter 2, Land use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, the Proposed Project supports the goal of OneNYC to promote resilient communities, buildings, infrastructure, and waterfronts by introducing vegetation to the Development Site, solar reflective surfaces to mitigate heat, and stormwater and inland flood management mechanisms.

C.9 **The Proposed Project is one of the most forward-thinking, climate-resilient, public-private partnerships currently in New York City, and we urge the city to approve it. It will bring solutions to the most climate-threatened of all New York City parks. (Waterfront Alliance)**

Response: Comment noted.

C.10 **We demand that the FEIS substantially study the land use, policy, and economic ramifications for New Yorkers caused by the proposed Queens Future Development. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Stone, Toner, Yanqui, Young, Begley, Beresford, Buitrago, Caviano, Cimino, David, Diamant, Ditman, Grant, Helfet, M. Helfet, Herzan, Empire Dragons NYC, Kelly, Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Flanagan, Estevez, Levoff) We call on your agency to require the applicants to issue a supplemental DEIS that compares zoning, land use, and public policy impacts of the project to all project alternatives, not only the No-Action alternative. (Flanagan)**

Response: **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, of the DEIS and FEIS, assesses the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy. The analysis presented concludes that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy. **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, of the DEIS and FEIS, assesses the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions, which includes population, housing, and economic activity. The analysis presented concludes that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions. As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, the Proposed Project is projected to provide approximately 7,400 new, full-time equivalent jobs to support the commercial, open space, and entertainment uses on site. Additionally, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 17,000 full-time equivalent construction jobs over the approximately five-year construction period.

See **Comment C.39** below for a discussion on the process of selecting alternatives for consideration in the DEIS and FEIS.

C.11 **On page B-4 of the WRP appendix is the following statement: "A majority of the Development Site has a Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of 12 feet North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). The BFE in the northernmost portion of the Development Site is 13 ft NAVD88, as established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 2007 effective Flood Insurance Rate Map. The design flood elevation (DFE) is 15 ft NAVD88, according to regulations set forth in the NYC Building Code (2022) Amendment regarding flood-resistant construction, as well as sea-level rise recommendations by the NYC Climate Resiliency Design Guidelines (2020). However, the first occupiable floor within the Areas of Development buildings would be designed to an elevation of 20 feet NAVD88, which is 12 feet above site elevation, to incorporate possible future revisions to the base flood elevation by FEMA or the City. The uses located in the Areas of Development that are located at or below the design flood elevation would contain parking and loading, as well as a bus lounge, restrooms, some areas associated with the live music venue, storage, lobbies, elevators, and water tanks. Given the location of these uses, the Applicant would employ wet floodproofing measures and would comply with all flood load provisions and code requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would promote this policy." This represents an expansion of the facilities proposed to sit below the DFE relative to the same section included in the Final Scope of Work from September 2024 (note that this shorter list still appears on page B-9 of the WRP appendix of the Draft EIS, displaying a lack of consistency in the current documentation). (Datko) It would appear that even before geologic effects are considered, the project is sinking.**

Some facilities the applicant has expanded upon sit below the design flood elevation. (Megan, Rosato) This type of project should not be put on a piece of land that is sinking based off NASA studies or next to a park. (Herman; Guzman). The dependence on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map and NOAA surveying as the technical basis for project evaluation is a vulnerability. Given the overall policy commitments of the incoming U.S. Executive administration, the already-delayed updates to the Flood Insurance Rate Map may never be realized during the build phase and early life of this project, and future refinements to sea level projections may similarly not be forthcoming from Federal agencies. Nominal compliance with the requirements of the Climate Resiliency Design Guidelines, the City Building Code, and the Waterfront Revitalization Plan may not be sufficiently prudent if those requirements are too outdated. Without binding guarantees from the applicant to take responsibility for the site that scale with climate reality, this project should not proceed. (Datko)

Response: The Final Scope of Work, DEIS and FEIS describe how the EIS evaluates the Proposed Project's compliance with the Waterfront Revitalization Program, including Policy 6.2, which requires consideration of the latest sea level rise (SLR) projections into the planning and design of projects in the coastal zone. **Chapter 1, Project Description** of the FEIS has been revised to note that the uses located in the Areas of Development A and B that are located at or below the design flood elevation would be primarily parking and loading. Pages B-14 through B-16 of **Appendix B** further detail the proposed uses in Areas of Development A, B, C, and D as well as the proposed open space in relation to the design and base flood elevations. As detailed in **Appendix B**, Policy 6.2 of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) is "Integrate consideration of the latest New York City projections of climate change and sea level rise (as published *in New York City Panel on Climate Change 2015 Report, Chapter 2: Sea Level Rise and Coastal Storms*) into the planning and design of projects in the city's Coastal Zone." Based on the assessment on pages B-10 through B-20, the Proposed Actions would promote Policy 6.2.

C.12 **The Proposed Project will exacerbate flood impacts. (Hawkins) The EIS fails to consider how construction will lead to flooding elsewhere in areas that already experience damaging flooding. (Gomes) Assess the impact of local flooding in the context of NYC Panel on Climate Change Predictions. (Flanagan)**

Response: Since the Development Site is located within the 1% annual chance flood hazard area, the potential effects of climate change have been considered and are presented in **Appendix B, Waterfront Revitalization Program Consistency Assessment**. The assessment considers the effects of climate change of rising sea levels, storm surge, and coastal flooding resulting on the Proposed Actions. **Appendix B** assesses the Proposed Project's consistency with Policy 6.2 of the City's WRP in consideration of the latest New York City projections of climate change and sea level rise. Based on the assessment on pages B-10 through B-20, the Proposed Actions would promote Policy 6.2.

See response to **Comment C.25**, below, for a discussion of how stormwater would be managed at the Development Site. As described in **Chapter 20, Construction**, stormwater collected onsite would be controlled and discharged to the NYCDEP sewer system, in accordance with NYCDEP requirements. Potential indirect impacts to Flushing Bay would be avoided through implementation of stormwater controls in accordance with all conditions of an approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as required by NYCDEP and NYSDEC. The purpose of a SWPPP is to ensure that stormwater discharges generated by construction activities, and those from the completed project, do not degrade water quality within area wetlands and surface waters. Therefore, a SWPPP

covers temporary activities created by construction, as well as permanent, post-construction practices to be implemented.

The SWPPP design for the Proposed Project would avoid or minimize the potential for sediment generated during construction to be carried by stormwater to existing stormwater infrastructure, thereby preventing water quality impacts to Flushing Bay. Erosion and sediment controls to be implemented under the SWPPP include inlet protection to be installed within catch basins, compost filter socks, silt fencing and/or straw bales to be installed along the construction site perimeter, and stabilized construction exits with tracking pads that would be installed to remove sediments from tires where construction vehicles exit the site. Additional erosion and sediment controls, such as sedimentation basins, swales, mulching, stockpile stabilization, and others, would be utilized as necessary to prevent adverse impacts to Flushing Bay and other natural resources within and surrounding the Project Area.

Socioeconomic Conditions

C.13 **The EIS should include a more robust residential and commercial displacement study that encompasses all of the community boards included in the ULURP process: Flushing, East Elmhurst, Jackson Heights, Elmhurst, and the majority of Corona. (NYC H20, Flanagan, Capeci, Knopf, Lawrence, Mayer, Silverman, Greenbaum, A. Huang, C. Huang, Kang, Zheng, Blum, Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, LFCDC, Niz, Petruccelli, Tran, Taylor, Song, Rosato, Rochelemagne, Sorton, Kriaris, Stone, Whalin, Lu, Low, Yanqui, Young, Lee, Yang, Caviano, Chan, Samu, Cole, Cuevas, Karim, Shen, Chin, McTaggart, Dennis, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Ma, Blackwell, Pryor, Walls, Dinan, Marino, Begley, Beresford, Bruno, Buitrago, Butler, Cimino, David, Diamant, Ditman, Gomes, Grant, Helfet, M. Helfet, Herzan, Janke, Kelly, Lau-Burke, Zavala, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Salazar, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, J. Yang, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Lieb, Estevez, Levoff)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions** of the FEIS, the *CEQR Technical Manual* states that the socioeconomic study area boundaries are similar to those of the land use study area. As discussed in **Chapter 2, Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**, a quarter-mile area surrounding the Development Site was used for the land use study area. Therefore, the study area for the indirect business displacement assessment is a quarter mile surrounding the Development Site. The study area includes Flushing Meadow Corona Park, Willets Point, and Corona. As further described in the "Study Area Definition" section of **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, the *CEQR Technical Manual* states that a quarter-mile socioeconomic study area is appropriate unless the project could increase the population by more than five percent as compared with the population expected to reside in a quarter-mile study area in the future No-Action condition. The Project Site is located in Queens Census Tract 383.02; the remaining census tracts in the quarter-mile study area are Queens Census Tracts 383.01, 399.01, and 399.02. The quarter-mile population has an existing population of 5,160. Development of the Willets Point area would occur in the No-Action condition, which would increase the No-Action population to 11,532. As discussed in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions**, the With-Action population would be 11,768, a 2 percent increase over the No-Action condition. Therefore, a quarter-mile study area is appropriate. The FEIS concluded that no significant adverse impacts with respect to indirect displacement of businesses or residents would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

C.14 **This project will push and price out the working-class communities of color (primarily Asian and Latino) that have long made Flushing a vibrant area, continuing decades of gentrification in Queens and New York City more broadly. (Ahmad) The project will result in increasing property taxes and rents from yet another massive development, displacing tenants, community organizations, and small businesses, with a disproportionate harm to the restaurant sector, which is the biggest provider of jobs in Flushing. (Luger) A project is not climate resilient if it displaces the communities it's meant to protect (Cuevas, Dennis, Karim, Kriaris, Blum, Chin, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Shen, Whaling; Bruno; Begley; Butler, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Lieb)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 3, Socioeconomic Conditions** of the FEIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in any direct residential or business displacement and would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential or business displacement.

Community Facilities

C.15 **The applicant has offered that these 70 acres will be patrolled by private security to help, but there's no enforcement role there. These issues will burden our city agencies like NYPD and homeless services. (Flanagan)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 4, Community Facilities** of the FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to police protection as defined by CEQR. As further described in **Chapter 4, Community Facilities,** the Applicant would employ onsite security precautions and private security officers throughout the Development Site, with responsibility for the interior of the destination entertainment uses as well as the external public park spaces. These measures are intended to reduce the demand on local police services. The Applicant also intends to coordinate directly with NYPD regarding onsite security and safety measures. An assessment of the Proposed Project potential impact on homeless services is beyond the scope of environmental review.

C.16 **The neighborhood surrounding the Proposed Project lack sufficient classroom seats. (Gomes)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 4, Community Facilities** of the FEIS, a detailed analysis of indirect effects on public schools would be warranted if the Proposed Actions would introduce 50 or more combined elementary and intermediate school students or 150 or more high school students, based on School Construction Authority (SCA) projected public school ratios. The Proposed Project would not introduce additional residents, and any non-residential population (hotel guests, visitors, workers) introduced by the Proposed Project would not increase demand for public school seats. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts would occur due to indirect effects on public schools, and no further analysis is warranted.

Open Space

C.17 **There is a growing demand for more green space in the neighborhood. (Walls, Servino) We need more public open space. Through parkland alienation legislation, New Yorkers would lose more than 78 acres of parkland in perpetuity. (Llerena, Le Roy, Flanagan) This borough has the least amount of green space in NYC. Having large green spaces that are undeveloped are important for Queens residents. A large casino and parking will decrease the access to open space and nature that all residents need and instead increase access to more expensive and commercial facilities, which won't be accessible to all. (Mayer, Maniace) We don't need**

more casinos, hotels and restaurants, we need parks. (Polgar) Flushing needs parks and drainage not casinos and asphalt. (Craddock)

We demand that the proposal prioritize its role within a public park, including a design that is park-forward and that substantially benefits the World's Fair Marina and Flushing Meadows Corona Park. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Dennis, Dinan, Stone, Toner, Kriaris, Yanqui, Young, Diviney, Guan, Leonard, J. Yang, Marino, Begley, Beresford, Buitrago, Caviano, Cimino, David, Diamant, Ditman, Gomes, Grant, Helfet, M. Helfet, Herzan, Empire Dragons NYC, Kelly, Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Estevez, Levoff)

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, the Proposed Project would include at least 20 acres of public park space (with at least 25 acres currently planned), as found acceptable to Parks, that includes both active and passive recreation uses. Although mapped as parkland, the surface parking lots leased to the Mets do not provide any usable park space for enjoyment by the general public. The Proposed Project would therefore result in a net increase in usable public open space. Additionally, as described in **Chapter 5, Open Space** of the FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact to open space resources in the study area.

C.18 **The Proposed Project should provide acre-for-acre replacement of parkland. There is a net decrease in mapped parkland. Include a modified condition to replace acre-for-acre parkland as recommended by New York State. (Flanagan, Ahmad)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, although mapped as parkland, the Development Site contains surface parking lots that are leased to the Mets. The site is not available to the general public—except for Citi Field, United States Tennis Association, and Flushing Meadows Corona Park events and commuter parking—and is not otherwise used for recreational purposes. The Proposed Project would include at least 20 acres of public park space (with at least 25 acres currently planned), as found acceptable to Parks, and would therefore result in a net increase in usable public open space.

Shadows

C.19 **The Proposed Project will increase shadows. (Flanagan)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 6, Shadows** of the FEIS, incremental shadows cast by the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts per CEQR guidelines.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

C.20 **The Proposed Project will transform the open sight line and further cut people off from the waterfront. The proposed traffic circulation pattern all but eliminates any inviting pedestrian connection under the highway to the marina. There is no reciprocity with the street at the pedestrian level, except at the entry points to each project. (Flanagan)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 8, Urban Design and Visual Resources** of the FEIS, significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources would not occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. Overall, the proposed public park open spaces, as well as the roadway, transit, sidewalk, and accessibility improvements, would create improved pedestrian connections to existing parks as well as improved circulation for pedestrians from Citi Field to parking areas and transit stations during events. The Proposed Actions would also improve pedestrian connections to the new mixed-use neighborhood that will be developed in the No-Action condition as part of the Willets Point Phase 1

and Phase 2 developments. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would improve visual corridors to the Flushing Bay waterfront and other visual resources within the study area.

C.21 **The Proposed Project will create a wind tunnel in the center of the project. Queens Future fails to study the impact of wind on the site. (Flanagan)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 8, Urban Design and Visual Resources**, a pedestrian wind condition analysis is not warranted for the Proposed Actions per the criteria listed in Section 230 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies wind as a concern when channelized wind pressure from between multiple, tall buildings and/or downwashed wind pressure from parallel tall buildings causes winds that affect pedestrian comfort and safety. The Project Area is not located in a high wind location, such as directly along the waterfront, and would not create a uniform street wall that would result in channelization or downwash effects. Therefore, a pedestrian wind condition analysis is not warranted.

Natural Resources

C.22 **Although the EIS recognizes that shadows and wind tunnels will be caused by the construction, no wildlife experts were consulted to predict how the change in the environment will change both the flora and fauna living in the affected areas, both marine and land as even minor changes in temperature and sun can devastate wildlife communities. (Gomes)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 9, Natural Resources** in the DEIS and FEIS, there are no indirect effects to natural resources due to shadows, stormwater generation, and sanitary flows that would result in significant adverse impacts. During construction, impacts will be avoided through best management practices and adherence to all conditions of an NYSDEC-approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Furthermore, as compared to existing conditions, habitat replacement under the Proposed Project would result in an overall expansion of vegetated habitats and a reduction in unvegetated/impervious surfaces, thereby improving habitat conditions and resulting in a net ecological benefit for the Project Area over time. As the quality and quantity of vegetated habitats and trees would increase significantly as compared to existing conditions, habitat conditions for resident wildlife in the post-construction Project Area would improve.

Hazardous Materials

C.23 **The EIS concludes, without scientific examination, that there are no hazardous materials on site, citing unspecified studies from 2009 and 2017. It proposes constructing residential housing. Without an independent scientific review, future residents may be exposed to undiscovered hazards. (Gomes)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 10, Hazardous Materials** in the DEIS and FEIS, several Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) and subsurface investigations have been conducted at the Development Site and indicate that soil, groundwater, and soil vapor contamination is present. To address existing contamination, an (E)-Designation would be placed on the Development Site to ensure that supplemental testing for and remediation of hazardous materials are completed prior to future development.

Under the (E)-Designation, the New York City Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) would be authorized to require supplemental subsurface remedial investigation (RI) to further characterize specific areas of ground disturbance on the Development Site for contaminants relating to soil, groundwater, and soil vapor conditions. Subsurface contaminants would subsequently be addressed

through the development and implementation of an OER-approved Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) and Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP). By implementing the OER-approved RAWP and CHASP, no potential exposure or significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be expected to occur during or after construction of the Proposed Project.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

C.24 **Save the Sound is very concerned about the failure to address several issues raised in Fed Up's comments on the Draft Scope of Work, including the exacerbation of project impacts from the effects of climate change and cumulative impacts with other reasonably foreseeable development, particularly given that this area of sewer infrastructure is already easily overwhelmed. Furthermore, the DEIS excludes necessary information to allow the public and decision-makers to evaluate project impacts on sewer infrastructure or the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures. We believe that before this project can move forward, Queens Future should have to present some kind of assurance that should mitigation be necessary for these flow impacts, NYCDEP plans to actually do it. (Illowsky, Flanagan) The project's increased projected sewage flow is not meaningfully studied in the context of climate change, cumulative impacts from other nearby local development projects (e.g., Special Flushing Waterfront District, Special Willets Point District), and existing challenges already coming from the Bowery Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant. We demand that the FEIS include a meaningful study and specificity around how increased sewage flow will be managed within the context laid out above. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Cole, Stone, Dennis, Dinan, Toner, Yanqui, Young, Diviney, Guan, Leonard, Ma, J. Yang, Marino, Begley, Beresford, Buitrago, Caviano, Cimino, David, Diamant, Ditman, Gomes, Grant, Helfet, M. Helfet, Herzan, Empire Dragons NYC, Kelly, Zavala, Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Estevez, Levoff, Flanagan) By postponing the assessment of the hydraulic capacity of the 24-inch sewer and capacity of the 37th Avenue pump station, Queens Future fails to give the public an opportunity to review and comment on their findings. (Flanagan)**

Response: See response to **Comment C.12** for a discussion of how the Proposed Project was assessed in the context of climate change.

As described in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure** of the DEIS and FEIS, the projected increase in sanitary sewage from the Proposed Project would not cause the Bowery Bay Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility to exceed its operational capacity or State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitted capacity. The analysis of potential water, sewer and stormwater impacts in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure** of the DEIS and FEIS considers future development in the study area in the No-Action condition, including the Willets Point Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments. As described in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure,** of the FEIS, since the publication of the DEIS, NYCDEP has further coordinated with the Applicant regarding the sanitary sewer infrastructure, and it has been determined that the Proposed Project would not require modifications to the existing 24-inch sewer. A Drainage Proposal Plan for the Willets Point Project Phase 2 Development was approved by NYCDEP; the Approved Drainage Plan included flows from the Willets Point Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Developments, and flows from a previously proposed but now cancelled infrastructure project. This infrastructure project had a projected flow of 1.75 cfs that will never be realized but was accounted for within the Approved Drainage Plan and NYCDEP's assessment of the capacity of the 24-inch sewer under the Grand Central Parkway and 37th Avenue Pump Station. Because the flow from the Proposed Project is 1.43 cfs, less than the 1.75 cfs from the cancelled

infrastructure project, the flow from the Proposed Project would not exceed the flow within the previously Approved Drainage Plan.

NYCDEP prepared a hydraulic analysis of the 24-inch sewer and the hydraulic model demonstrates that the 24-inch sewer is under surcharge conditions (a surcharge condition means that the flow in the pipe exceeds its free-flow capacity; the excess flow is accommodated by the pipe acting as a pressure conduit, similar to a water main) in the No-Action condition (with the approved flows from the Willets Point Phase 1 and Phase 2 Developments and canceled infrastructure project); the surcharge condition would continue in the With-Action condition. However, because of the decrease in flow from the Proposed Project, as compared to the flows in the NYCDEP Approved Drainage Plan noted above, the Proposed Project would decrease the surcharge condition relative to the surcharge under the NYCDEP approved Drainage Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require modifications to the existing 24-inch sewer.

In the No-Action condition, NYCDEP is undertaking a FEMA resiliency project for the 37th Avenue Pump Station (preliminary design anticipated to be completed in 12-14 months) which would evaluate a resiliency upgrade or replacement. If the Proposed Project is granted a gaming license by the NYS Gaming Commission, NYCDEP would evaluate the design for the Proposed Project as it relates to potential recommendations for a resiliency upgrade or replacement of the 37th Avenue pump station. As concluded in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure,** the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse wastewater impacts.

As described in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure** of FEIS, the Applicant coordinated with NYCDEP regarding the local water distribution system to the Queens Future Project. To provide redundancy and resiliency, the Proposed Project would include the construction of a new 20-inch watermain (or an alternative proposed by the Applicant that is acceptable to NYCDEP). The Applicant will coordinate with NYCDEP, and other city agencies as appropriate, on the specifics of the new water infrastructure, including routing and connections (anticipated to be either to existing mains on Roosevelt Avenue or Shea Road), to the water distribution system that are acceptable to NYCDEP.

C.25 **Combined sewer overflows in Flushing Bay are beyond crisis levels. The Proposed Project increases flow to an overwhelmed sewer system, exacerbating pollution in nearby waterways. (Polgar; Pryor, Tran, Taylor, Song, Rochelemagne, Servino) The EIS fails to consider the impacts that discharging untreated wastewater into Flushing Bay, during and after construction, will have on the ecosystem and wildlife living there. (Gomes) We recommend strongly that there be clarity around the impacts to Flushing Bay, especially in terms of the climate change predictions for increased rainfall and in the context of increased development. It is not acceptable that the applicant has essentially said we will figure this out later and let you know after the ULURP process has passed. It is critical that we know this information now. (Pryor)**

Response: See response to **Comment C.25** for a discussion of sewer flows. In terms of stormwater contribution to combine sewer overflow, as described in **Chapter 20, Construction**, stormwater collected onsite would be controlled and discharged to the NYCDEP sewer system, in accordance with NYCDEP requirements. Potential indirect impacts to Flushing Bay would be avoided through implementation of stormwater controls in accordance with all conditions of an approved SWPPP, as required by NYCDEP and NYSDEC (see response to **Comment C.12** for more details on the SWPPP). As described in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure** in the DEIS and FEIS, stormwater runoff from the Proposed Project was assessed for each of the four storm sewer systems that serve the Flushing Bay. The With-Action Flow Volume Calculation Matrix was reviewed by NYCDEP and it

was determined that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse stormwater impacts. As described in **Chapter 9, Natural Resources** in the DEIS and FEIS, indirect effects to Flushing Bay (located approximately 120 feet (ft) to the north of the Project Area) due to shadows, stormwater generation, and sanitary flows would not result in significant adverse effects to this natural resource. Potential adverse impacts to Flushing Bay and other natural resources during construction will be avoided through best management practices and adherence to all conditions of an NYSDEC-approved SWPPP.

C.26 **The project doesn't capture 100 percent of stormwater that falls on site despite being in the middle of multiple environmental justice communities that experience increased flooding. (Capeci, Knopf, Lawrence, Mayer, Silverman, Greenbaum, Lawrence, Blum, Niz, Petruccelli, Caviano, Chan, Samu, Cole, Cuevas, Sorton, Karim, Shen, Chin, McTaggart, Kang, Taylor, Dennis, Karim, Samu, Kriaris, Whaling, Lu, Chin, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Ma, Blackwell, Lee, Pryor, Tran, Taylor, Song, Rochelemagne, Dennis, Dinan, Kriaris, Low, Diviney; Ahmad; Begley; Beresford; Buitrago; Butler; Cimino; David; Diamant; Ditman; Grant; Guzman; Helfet; M. Helfet; Herzan; Janke; Empire Dragons NYC; Kelly; Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Estevez, Levoff, Lieb) The applicants should be responsible for absorbing 100 percent of the stormwater in this floodplain area. (Walls, Lu, YS. Yu) The project is not aligned with the city's Unified Stormwater Rule. (Capeci, Knopf, Lawrence, Mayer, Silverman, Greenbaum, Lawrence, Blum, Niz, Petruccelli, Caviano, Chan, Samu, Cole, Cuevas, Sorton, Karim, Shen, Chin, McTaggart, Kang, Taylor, Dennis, Karim, Samu, Kriaris, Whaling, Lu, Chin, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Ma, Blackwell, Lee, Pryor, Tran, Taylor, Song, Rochelemagne; Butler; Guzman; Janke; Flanagan, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Lieb)**

Response: Comment noted. As described in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure** in the DEIS and FEIS, stormwater best management practices (BMPs) would be required in accordance with the NYCDEP Unified Stormwater Rule (USWR) guidelines, which includes requirements for bringing the Development Site into compliance with the allowable stormwater release rate. To achieve the release rate, stormwater can be managed by utilizing one or a combination of detention techniques. Green technologies and subsurface detention can be implemented to retain stormwater or to release stormwater with slowed discharge rates to control peak runoff rates. The EIS analyses of stormwater is based on the With-Action Flow Volume Matrix calculations, reviewed by NYCDEP, which conservatively do not reflect the use of any such stormwater source control BMPs to reduce stormwater runoff volumes to the sewer system. Even with these conservative assumptions, it was concluded that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse stormwater impacts. The specific BMPs to be implemented at the site will be reviewed by NYCDEP at the time of an application for a sewer connection permit.

Solid Waste and Sanitation

C.27 **This would only create more waste and not improve the neighborhood. (Elise)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 12, Solid Waste and Sanitation,** of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services.

Transportation

C.28 **The proposed casino will cause issues with traffic on nearby roadways, which are at capacity. The EIS should include a traffic study. The Proposed Project increases parking, which will increase traffic and pollution in the neighborhood. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Dennis, Dinan, Stone, Toner, Kriaris, Yanqui, Young, Diviney, Guan, Leonard, Capeci, Knopf, Lawrence, Mayer, Silverman, Greenbaum, Blum, Niz, Petruccelli, Caviano, Chan, Samu, Cole, Cuevas, Sorton, Karim, Shen, Chin, McTaggart, Kang, Taylor, Whaling, Lu, Goldenburg, Le Roy, Ma, Blackwell, Lee, Ahmad, Lu; Dennis, Dinan, Kriaris, Low, McTaggart, Morales, Fenton, Lu, Renee Polgar; Begley; Beresford; Butler; Cimino; David; Diamant; Ditman; Grant; Helfet; M. Helfet; Herzan; Janke; Empire Dragons NYC; Kelly; Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Liang, Brown, Dubnau, Estevez, Levoff, Lieb)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 14, Transportation,** of the DEIS and FEIS, a traffic study was conducted in accordance with CEQR methodology in coordination with the lead agency, NYCDOT, New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), and other agency stakeholders.

The traffic study was comprehensive, encompassing nine peak hours, 50 intersections, and 76 highway segments. As part of CEQR methodology, the traffic study accounts for project-generated trips and the effect of background development trips in and traversing through the study area (e.g., new traffic due to other developments in Flushing and the Willets Point Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments).

A parking assessment was also conducted as part of the traffic study, as described in **Chapter 14, Transportation**. The parking assessment concluded that all project-generated parking demand would be fully met by the parking capacity being supplied on the Development Site; parking on neighborhood streets would not be affected. In addition, all existing Mets parking would be fully accommodated within the new parking structures within the Development Site. Furthermore, the locations of the new parking facilities within the Development Site have been developed to provide as direct access from the regional highway system as possible, in order to minimize the potential for traffic impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.

C.29 **Many roads are in bad shape, no bike lanes (Renee Polgar)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would include many improvements to the surrounding roadway network and bicycle facilities. Improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle network would include separated pedestrian/bike bridges to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety; crosswalk improvements; implementation of sidewalks along Shea Road and widening of sidewalks along Roosevelt Avenue; a widened crosswalk under the Mets – Willets Point No. 7 subway station; and bicycle lanes along Roosevelt Avenue, Shea Road, and Boat Basin place, with dedicated bike phasing at traffic signals.

Roadway improvements to improve vehicular access and safety would include modifications of ramps connecting Shea Road and Grand Central Parkway; reconfiguration of ramps to the Whitestone Expressway; safety enhancements along 126th Street/Seaver Way at Northern Boulevard and 34th Avenue; and signalization of key intersections along Shea Road and Roosevelt Avenue. As described in **Chapter 14, Transportation,** following publication of the Final EIS, the Applicant expects to advance further design of the proposed roadway improvements at a higher level of detail, which will be coordinated with and reviewed by NYCDOT.

C.30 **The DEIS and other documents don't contain any long-term analysis of the traffic when both the Queens Future project and the Willets Point Soccer Stadium with the new homes exist. There are numbers that could be looked at in the DEIS to really see what intersections will be totally unmitigable. In an appendix, Table E2, which looks at non-game day weekends, midday at peak hour, there's an intersection on Roosevelt Avenue at 114th Street that has a control delay that increases from 78.3 units in the no-build condition to over 500 units in the build condition. This is noted as unmitigable. The level of service falls to an F, a fail. The table does not define what a control delay is or note the time unit, but presumably, if it's in seconds, there's a 502-second delay at Roosevelt and 114th Street in the middle of the day on a weekend, on a non-game day, due to this project. For more details, you can look into Appendix E to see all the unmitigated traffic impacts. (Herman) The EIS of this indicates that up to a third of the intersections studied will suffer a "significant adverse impact" from the additional car traffic, something that is also suggested by the fact that the parking capacity will increase by 85%. This is also substantiated by documentation unearthed by the periodical Hellgate that the majority of visitors will come by car. (Bruno) We call on your agency to require the applicants to issue a supplemental DEIS or issue a revised DEIS where the applicants study a scaled down project Alternative with a reduced development footprint to prevent the unavoidable significant adverse impacts on traffic, buses, and pedestrians. (Flanagan)**

Response: The DEIS and FEIS included a traffic study in accordance with CEQR methodology in coordination with the lead agency, NYCDOT, NYSDOT and other agency stakeholders.

The traffic study was comprehensive, encompassing nine peak hours, 50 intersections and 76 highway segments. As part of CEQR methodology, the Queens Future traffic study takes into account the marginal effect of project-generated trips, as well as the effect of background development trips in and traversing through the study area. The background development trips incorporated into the No-Action transportation analysis included all project generated trips for the Willets Point Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments, the inclusion of which was extensively coordinated directly with the team that prepared the Final Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSSEIS) to the 2008 Willets Point Development Plan Final Generic EIS as published on February 23, 2024, the lead agency, and NYCDOT. NYCDOT and NYCDCP also provided extensive input on the incorporation of traffic due to other background projects, which was incorporated into the EIS analysis.

In addition, the incremental traffic resulting from the Queens Future project was incorporated in the Willets Point Phase 3 No-Action transportation analyses disclosed in the Willets Point FSSEIS. Baseball and soccer games would not occur simultaneously as baseball and soccer games will not be scheduled at the same time, which is reflected in both the Queens Future EIS analysis and the Willets Point Phase 2 Development Project FSSEIS.

As stated in **Chapter 14, Transportation,** of the DEIS and FEIS, the operations of the intersection analysis locations were evaluated using Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies which evaluate level of service (LOS) based on average stop control delay. Average stop control delay can be defined as the amount of time, in seconds per vehicle, in which a vehicle is stopped at a signalized or unsignalized intersection. This definition can also be found as a footnote in the traffic level of service tables found in **Appendices D, E,** and **F**. Of the 50 intersections and 77 highway segments analyzed across nine separate peak hours, 24 intersections and 51 highway segments would experience significant impacts during at least one peak hour that could not be fully or partially mitigated. The details of which intersections have movements with mitigated, partially mitigated, or unmitigated impacts can be found in **Chapter 21, Mitigation** of the DEIS and FEIS.

The assessment of potential significant impacts of the Proposed Project is based on CEQR methodology, which considers changes in delay and LOS compared to the No-Action condition. In the example provided, **Table E-2** of the DEIS and FEIS, **Appendix E** refers to the non-gameday weekday midday peak hour, which shows a No-Action condition delay of 78.3 seconds along the eastbound approach of Roosevelt Avenue; this results in a LOS E in the No-Action. LOS E describes operations that are generally indicative of poor progression, long cycle lengths and high v/c ratios. Under the With-Action condition, this delay would increase to over 500 seconds. Based on CEQR methodology, this delay increase would result in an impact that could not be mitigated.

A sensitivity analysis was conducted at this location, as described in **Chapter 22, Alternatives,** of the DEIS and FEIS. Impacts at this location would result from a minimal increase in vehicle trips because of prevailing background traffic conditions. Even a minimal increase in traffic and pedestrians above No-Action condition levels would be expected to result in traffic impacts that could not be mitigated. Importantly, the sensitivity analysis indicates that certain intersections operate with little to no capacity buffer—meaning that even a minimal increase in traffic or pedestrian volumes above the No-Action condition levels (one or two additional vehicles) can push these intersections into a state where HCM-reported delays increase dramatically. However, CEQR methodology is intentionally conservative and does not account for fluctuations or adaptive driver behaviors (such as diverting routes or shifting travel times), which may lead to these large delay increases being overstated. Furthermore, this sensitivity analysis indicates that any development on the site could be expected to result in an impact at this location, because even minimal additional vehicles would trigger traffic impacts according to CEQR methodology.

In addition, the Proposed Project would implement both a Traffic Monitoring Plan and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. Coordinating with NYCDOT, the Proposed Project would implement a comprehensive traffic monitoring program starting in the project's opening year that would allow for the detailed measurement of actual transportation conditions on non-gamedays and gamedays and allow for adjustments to signal timing and other measures, as needed. In addition, the Proposed Project would execute a comprehensive TDM plan which would be implemented from the opening of the development and coordinated with the Mets. This would include a combination of transportation demand measures and operational strategies informed by the traffic monitoring plan, with the goal of reducing the volume of project-generated vehicular traffic overall and redistributing traffic away from peak arrival and departure hours on gamedays, and from critical highway segments to the extent possible. Details of both the Traffic Monitoring Plan and the TDM measures can be found in **Chapter 21, Mitigation**.

C.31 The project will increase the demand on public transportation, which is already beyond capacity. (Ahmad, Lu, Gomes)

Response: As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would include improvements to the Mets – Willets Point No. 7 subway station. These improvements would include enhancing the connection between the Development Site north of Roosevelt Avenue and the Passerelle structure south of the station. Modifications would be made to the subway structure to implement vertical circulation and ADA accessible elements and expand key corridors and turnstile elements. The main mezzanine area would be permanently outside of the fare zone allowing for a direct connection between Flushing Meadows Corona Park and the Development Site to the north.

As detailed in **Chapter 14, Transportation**, of the DEIS and FEIS, a detailed subway station analysis was conducted at the Mets – Willets Point No. 7 subway station. In addition, a subway line-haul

analysis was conducted for the No. 7 line, and bus line-haul analyses were conducted for the Q19, Q48, and Q66 bus routes. Based on CEQR methodology, it was determined that with the proposed transit improvements, no significant adverse impacts to the station would result from the Proposed Project. In addition, the increase in passengers generated by the Proposed Project would not result in significant subway line-haul impacts.

Impacts to the Q48 bus in the eastbound and westbound directions are described in **Chapter 14, Transportation,** of the DEIS and FEIS. As stated in **Chapter 21, Mitigation**, of the DEIS and FEIS, these impacts would be mitigated under New York City Transit (NYCT)'s ongoing passenger monitoring plan, which is generated to develop and respond to specific known needs with capital and/or operational improvements on a five-year cycle. As a result, it is anticipated that NYCT would increase service along the Q48 to address these impacts.

Air Quality

C.32 **The EIS doesn't closely look at pollution from cars, delivery trucks, and related traffic that the project will bring. (M Lee) Metropolitan Park requires 13k parking spaces, which undercuts public transportation and will increase traffic and pollution in the neighborhood. (Ahmad) The project, which is situated in the middle of communities who suffer from some of the highest rates of air toxicity in the nation, doubles the amount of on-site parking and increases traffic pollution. (Cruzen, Cole, Dennis, Dinan, Diviney, Guan, Leonard, McTaggart, J. Yang, Marino, Flanagan) There is almost double the amount of parking spots in this plan than currently at Citifield. This destination will massively increase car traffic and the air pollution that comes with it, mitigating any possible benefits offered. Instead of massive traffic headaches just when the Mets are playing, we - the people in the community - will have to experience this all year round. (Rosato)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 15, Air Quality** of the DEIS and FEIS, the air quality analysis was conducted under *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines supported by the most current New York State (NYS) DAR 10 and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommendations and regulations. Potential air quality impacts from cars, delivery trucks and related traffic are addressed as part of the air quality analysis, which includes an assessment of the potential impacts of emissions from mobile sources introduced by the Proposed Project, including vehicular traffic.

Additionally, as described in **Chapter 15, Air Quality** of the DEIS and FEIS, a parking assessment was conducted as part of the traffic study, as described in **Chapter 14, Transportation**. The parking assessment concluded that all project generated parking demand would be fully met by the parking capacity being supplied on the Development Site; parking on neighborhood streets would not be affected. In addition, all existing Mets parking would be fully accommodated within the new parking structures within the Development Site. The air quality analysis of mobile sources reflects the transportation analysis and was conducted in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* air quality appendix guidelines to estimate emissions from vehicles within the proposed parking facility and on adjacent roadways. Two garage analyses were conducted, one at the entrance of the podium garage and one near the first level mechanical exhaust location. As the results show, all concentrations generated by the garage traffic are below both the NAAQS and the City's de minimis criteria; therefore, no significant adverse air quality impacts are expected from the Proposed Project's parking facilities. As discussed in detail in **Chapter 15, Air Quality** of the FEIS, no significant adverse air quality impacts are anticipated from the Proposed Project's mobile sources. In addition, as described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, of the DEIS and FEIS, the proposed project would include improvements to the Mets – Willets Point No. 7 subway station. These improvements would include

enhancing the connection between the Development Site north of Roosevelt Avenue and the Passerelle structure south of the station. Modifications would be made to the subway structure to implement vertical circulation and ADA accessible elements and expand key corridors and turnstile elements. The main mezzanine area would be permanently outside of the fare zone allowing for a direct connection between Flushing Meadows Corona Park and the Development Site to the north. These enhancements would encourage visitors to the site to use transit rather than drive; however, as detailed in **Chapter 21, Mitigation**, the analysis conservatively did not take a credit for any shifts in mode choice to transit, and instead examines the potential impacts to traffic without assuming any shift.

In addition, the Proposed Project would implement both a Traffic Monitoring Plan and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. Coordinating with NYCDOT, the Proposed Project would implement a comprehensive traffic monitoring program starting in the project's opening year that would allow for the detailed measurement of actual transportation conditions on non-gamedays and gamedays and allow for adjustments to signal timing and other measures, as needed. In addition, the Proposed Project would execute a comprehensive TDM plan which would be implemented from the opening of the development and coordinated with the Mets. This would include a combination of transportation demand measures and operational strategies informed by the traffic monitoring plan, with the goal of reducing the volume of project-generated vehicular traffic overall and redistributing traffic away from peak arrival and departure hours on gamedays, and from critical highway segments to the extent possible. Details of both the Traffic Monitoring Plan and the TDM measures can be found in **Chapter 21, Mitigation**.

Noise

C.33 **The proposed casino will cause issues with noise in the neighboring community. (Morales)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 17, Noise,** of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to existing noise receptors within the study area.

Public Health

C.34 **Enabling the use of this land for a casino will support gambling, which will compromise public health in already vulnerable communities (Pryor, Luger, Llerena, Greenbaum, A. Huang, C. Huang, Zheng, Rosato, Diviney; Lee, J. Yang, Morales, Le Roy, LoSclazo). The EIS should consider public health impacts of a casino. (Flanagan) With the existence of Resorts World Casino and the ubiquity of mobile gambling, the borough does not need another casino to facilitate addiction. (Ahmad) The proposed casino would exacerbate the issue of problem gambling, a public health crisis which disproportionately affects communities of color. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Cole, Dennis, Stone, Dinan, Toner, Yanqui, Young, Leonard, McTaggart, Marino; Begley; Beresford; Buitrago; Caviano; Cimino; David; Diamant; Ditman; Grant; Helfet; M. Helfet; Herzan; Empire Dragons NYC; Kelly; Lau-Burke, Zavala, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, J. Yang, Estevez, Levoff, LoScalzo)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 18, Public Health** of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts as defined by CEQR. The Proposed Project would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, noise, or construction. As described in the Final Scope of Work, a discussion of problem gambling was included in **Chapter 18, Public Health** in response to

comments on the Draft Scope of Work. In addition, as described in **Chapter 18, Public Health**, it is expected that appropriate measures to address concerns regarding problem gambling will be addressed by all applicants as part of the gaming license Request for Applications (RFA) process overseen by the New York State Gaming Commission (the Commission). The RFA states in this regard that, "No applicant shall be eligible to receive a gaming license unless the applicant meets the following criteria and clearly states as part of an application that the applicant shall: …demonstrate to the commission how the applicant proposes to address problem gambling concerns…" The Proposed Project would include access to support services concerning problem gambling, including project-specific partnerships in addition to the services mentioned in **Chapter 18**.

C.35 **We demand that the FEIS assess public health impacts in the context of their impact on low-income communities and communities of color, especially those who already bear the brunt of environmental burdens as is the case in Flushing, East Elmhurst, and Corona. (Cruzen, Fenton, Lau, Lichtig, Limm, Cole, Dennis, Stone, Dinan, Toner, Yanqui, Young, Leonard, McTaggart, Marino; Begley; Beresford; Buitrago; Caviano; Cimino; David; Diamant; Ditman; Grant; Helfet; M. Helfet; Herzan; Empire Dragons NYC; Kelly; Lau-Burke, Zavala, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, J. Yang, Estevez, Levoff)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 18, Public Health** of the DEIS and FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts as defined by CEQR. The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas related to public health including air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, or noise. As discussed in **Chapter 11, Water and Sewer Infrastructure**, there would be no significant adverse impacts to water and sewer infrastructure and therefore no potential for an adverse impact to public health as a result of water quality impacts (see **Comments C.25** and **C.25**). As discussed in **Chapter 15, Air Quality**, the Proposed Actions would not generate any significant adverse air quality impacts, there is no potential for public health impacts related to air quality (see **Comment C.32**). As discussed in **Chapter 10, Hazardous Materials**, there would be no significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials and therefore no potential for an adverse impact to public health as a result of hazardous materials impacts (see **Comment C.25**). As discussed in **Chapter 17, Noise** the Proposed Actions are not anticipated to cause excessively high chronic noise exposure and therefore, are not expected to result in a significant adverse public health impact related to operational noise (see **Comment C.33**).

C.36 **Crime and human trafficking are likely to worsen with the addition of a casino and hotel complex. (Rosato, Lee)**

Response: As discussed in **Chapter 4, Community Facilities**, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to police protection as defined by CEQR. An assessment of the Proposed Project's potential impact on crime and human trafficking is beyond the scope of environmental review.

Neighborhood Character

C.37 **The neighborhood character assessment should take into account the quality-of-life issues that accompany drug use, petty theft, homelessness, and public drunkenness. (Flanagan) The proposed casino will cause issues with lighting in the neighboring community. (Morales)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 19, Neighborhood Character** of the FEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character as defined by CEQR. An assessment of the topics noted in the comments is beyond the scope of environmental review.

C.38 **The Proposed Project is not contextually aligned with the surrounding neighborhoods and would negatively impact neighborhood character. (Herman, J. Yang, Walls, Dennis, Dinan, Kriaris, Low, Diviney, McTaggart; Begley; Beresford; Buitrago; Caviano; Cimino; David; Diamant; Ditman; Grant; Helfet; M. Helfet; Herzan; Empire Dragons NYC; Kelly; Lau-Burke, K. Lee, Maloy, Matamoros, Ng, Pellot, Rothman, Savarino, Shah, Sharon, Shey, Walsh, Estevez, Levoff)**

Response: As described in **Chapter 19, Neighborhood Character**, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character as defined by CEQR. The Proposed Project as a whole would represent an improvement in neighborhood character, as it would enable the transformation of underutilized parking lots into a unique mixed-use recreational, commercial, and entertainment hub with extensive public park space, landscaping, and other amenities for public recreation, that would be compatible and consistent with the surrounding land uses. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would incorporate improvements to the surrounding transportation network, pedestrian, and bike infrastructure, which would have beneficial effects on transportation conditions and the overall pedestrian experience in the study area.

Alternatives

C.39 **Another alternative that does not result in significant adverse impacts and meets the Purpose and Need must be included in the forthcoming FEIS. (Empire Dragons NYC) We call on your agency to require that the applicants study and select the best alternative to meet the project goals and minimize the adverse impact of the project. To do so, the applicants should consider a wider array of Project Alternatives that include a reduced development footprint. We also request that the alternatives study be revised so that 1. The DEIS assesses the differences in impact between Alternative 2 and the proposed project, focusing on Alternative 2's core tenets outlined above and 2. Alternative 3's analysis assesses the differing impacts on pedestrian transportation, community facilities and services, and open space between Alternative 3 and the Proposed Project. (Flanagan)**

Response: As set forth in the FEIS, of the 19 technical areas studied in the EIS, the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts in only two areas, both transportation-related (operational and construction period). As described in **Chapter 22, Alternatives**, alternatives were selected for consideration in the DEIS and FEIS are generally those which are feasible and have the potential to reduce, eliminate, or avoid adverse impacts of a proposed action while meeting some or all of the goals and objectives of this action. No alternatives were found to reduce, eliminate, or avoid the significant adverse transportation impacts of the Proposed Actions that were found to be feasible and also meet the purposes and need for the Proposed Actions.

C.40 **FED UP coalition's Phoenix Meadows Vision Plan proposes including 100% stormwater capture, over 50 acres of public parkland, no net gain of parking spaces, connectivity to local neighborhoods, and adequate space for local food vendors. The proposed development ignores these critical demands. (Pryor) The proposed project should convert the parking lot into a multi-tiered parking structure and dedicate the remaining area to genuine parkland, rather than developing it into a commercial complex of hotels, buildings, and food courts focused on profit (Walls, Servino). Queens Future's inclusion of the Phoenix Meadows Vision Plan as an alternative in the DEIS is nothing more than a gesture, dismissing the alternative as not adhering to the project's prebaked selection criteria without substantially assessing the alternative's core tenets. These tenets include: a) Capture 100% of stormwater that falls on site (70 million gallons) b) Capture six tons of oxygen per year c) Result in no net gain of parking**

d) Construct a public park on top of any build structure, and e) Exclude the construction of a casino as the economic engine. (Flanagan) For the Final Environmental Impact Statement to be considered legally complete, it must seriously consider the alternative Phoenix Meadows proposed by the FED UP Coalition. (Maniace)

Response: The Phoenix Meadows Alternative was evaluated in **Chapter 22, Alternatives** of the FEIS. As described in **Chapter 22**, the Phoenix Meadows Alternative examines future conditions where a parkland restoration project would be undertaken to redevelop the mapped unimproved parkland on the Development Site—currently used as surface parking for Citi Field under a 1961 lease agreement with the City—into approximately 50 acres of new open space, while retaining the existing number of parking spaces.

The assessment in **Chapter 22** notes that like the Proposed Project, the Phoenix Meadows Alternative could have significant adverse impacts related to transportation (traffic, buses, pedestrians); and construction (traffic and pedestrians). As described in the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impact Alternative, based on a sensitivity analysis conducted at the intersection of Roosevelt Avenue and 114th Street, the addition of just two incremental vehicles at critical movements during non-gameday weekday PM peak hour would create a significant adverse impact that could not be fully mitigated. Therefore, any development increment on the Development Site larger than the No-Action condition would be expected to result in unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts.

The Phoenix Meadows Alternative, like the Proposed Actions, proposes to replace the 7,423 existing surface parking spaces on site in structured garages. Without available information regarding the connections of the parking garages to the highway network, routing patterns, and garage sizes, it is possible that additional transportation impacts could occur under the Phoenix Meadows Alternative that would be avoided with the Proposed Project through its project design and without having detailed design plans for the Phoenix Meadows Alternative, it is possible that the Alternative could also result in significant adverse impacts to buses and pedestrians. Similarly, without having detailed design and construction plans, it is possible that the Phoenix Meadows Alternative could result in significant adverse construction impacts related to traffic and pedestrians. In summary, both the Proposed Project and the Phoenix Meadows Alternative would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to traffic, buses, and pedestrians during the operational period, and construction period impacts related to traffic and pedestrians.

The Phoenix Meadows Alternative would not include a substantial commercial component and therefore, would fail to realize the tourism and economic development goals of the Proposed Project. The Phoenix Meadows Alternative does not identify any mechanism to achieve either the development associated with this Alternative (three parking decks and two pedestrian bridges) or the many infrastructure improvements associated with the Proposed Project, which include at least 20 acres of public park space (with at least 25 acres currently planned), an ADA-accessible renovated subway station, replacement of all the existing number of parking spaces, a Taste of Queens food hall and community space, bike and pedestrian infrastructure and streetscape improvements, and highway improvements that are made possible with the creation of the regional mixed-use recreational and entertainment hub that would be realized under the Proposed Actions. For these reasons, the Phoenix Meadows Alternative would not meet the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project and is not considered a reasonable alternative.

Miscellaneous

C.41 **There remain significant un-addressed issues raised in the review of the Scope of Work through 2024. Of the 123 written public comments on the Scope of Work, most were critical of the project, and most were dismissed out of hand by the Applicant. (Datko)**

Response: As described in the Final Scope of Work, Appendix B, Response to Comments on the Draft Scope of Work, Section 3 of Appendix B contains a summary of relevant comments and a response to each. Consistent with CEQR practice, 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 Draft Scope of Work. Where more than one commenter expressed similar views, those comments have been grouped and addressed together.

C.42 **Proponents of Queens Future say that it will create jobs. We have seen over and over that these development projects never create as many jobs, bring in as much revenue, or allocate as many affordable housing units as they promise they will. They just function as massive handouts to corporations and developers. (Ahmad)**

Response: Comment noted. This comment is outside the scope of the EIS. As described in **Chapter 1, Project Description**, the Proposed Project is projected to provide approximately 7,400 new, full-time equivalent jobs to support the commercial, open space, and entertainment uses on site. Additionally, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 17,000 full-time equivalent construction jobs over the approximately five-year construction period.

The Proposed Project does not include any housing.

C.43 **If this project does move forward, we believe there needs to be a lock-tight and transparent community benefits agreement. (Guardians of Flushing Bay) Consider a modification that requires the community benefit fund to be an annual contribution that is higher than it is now. (Flanagan) Queens Future has promised several things, including money for local groups, the enforcement of that isn't credible. There will be no community benefits agreement (CBA), a contract with a local group or groups which could be used to compel performance. Instead, the undertakings will be part of the gaming license application. That means that the state gaming commission, an organization that doesn't know us but who the casino people have extensively lobbied, is tasked with protecting our interests. Further, the sanction the commission has is to deny or suspend the license. To believe that works, you'd have to believe they'd shut down what is supposedly the economic engine of the project because wasn't given to a certain group. (Bruno)**

Response: Comment noted. This comment is outside the scope of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to a substantial community benefits package valued, shaped by its almost three years of engagement and conversation with community stakeholders. The community benefits package will be further described in the Applicant's RFA proposal for a downstate gaming license and become a required element of its gaming license in the event of license award.

C.44 **Casinos in urban areas have a max life of 10 years. We shouldn't be making short-term investments that only benefit those that are putting the money into it. (Fan) The lifespan of any given sports stadium is significantly less than the life estimate of this project of 99 years. Why should we expect that this project would survive that long? What happens when the whole project goes out of business? Or its primary financial backer changes his mind? (Taylor)**

Response: Comment noted. This comment is outside the scope of the EIS.

C.45 **The claim that the proposed development is financially unviable without the casino has never been substantiated in any document provided to the public. Further, a casino here will have to compete with likely two other new casinos, increased online gaming, and existing competition in NJ and Connecticut. If it folds, it will be like a mall that loses its anchor tenant, an impending ghost town. (Bruno)**

Response: Comment noted. This comment is outside the scope of the EIS. The Applicant's Request for Applications proposal for a downstate gaming license will be reviewed by the New York State Gaming Commission, and will include a market analysis.

Comments Received in Support of the Proposed Project

The following organizations and members of the interested public submitted testimony in support of the Proposed Action: Donavan Finn; Michael de Valera, Community Board 3; Jo Ann Yoo; Alan Sherman; Seth Bornstein, Queens Economic Development Corporation; Nicole Bailey; Kenneth Cohen, Queens Community Board 8; Yoselin Genao-Estrella, Neighborhood Housing Services of Queens; Jonathan Forgash, Queens Together; Dianne Song Yu, Flushing Business Improvement District; Joe Lam; Bianca Ng, Flushing Bay; John Shin, KCS; Reginal Pegues; Elizabeth Bian; Tom Grech, Queens Chamber of Commerce; Waterfront Alliance; Brian Chen, Chief Strategy Officer at the Chinese-American Planning Council; Liang Ming, Glow Cultural Center; Isaac Carmignani; Jeffrey Lin; Robert Dorsky; Olga Reyes; Ted Teng; Ahyoung Kim, Asian-American Federation; Danny Dromm; Bishop Mitchell Taylor, Urban Upbound; Joe Diaz, Elmhurst Youth and Adult Activities; Mo Chan; Bryan Lee; Tammy Lee; Karen Wang; Carolina Bustamante; Hilda Bustamante; Eduardo Valentin; Johanna Flores; Christopher Ho; Joseph Kessler; Nuala Naranjo; Hyun T Lee., Korean American Association of Queens; Henry Wan; Sam Boykin; Larry Gallegos; Anna Lee; Paul Lin; Costa Constantinides, Variety Boys and Girls Club of Queens; Aida Mejia; Kai Shum; Tammy Rose Scott; Chon Ao Ieong; Haley Beom; Judy Chase; Kahena Coles; Jeehae Fischer, Korean American Family Service Center (KAFSC); Sam Jung; Reverend Partick Young; Henry Lo; Eddie McWilliams, Cement and Concrete Workers District Council LECET; Cam Neader; Lizbeth Ramirez; Aretha Wareham; Coles Gregory; Gloria Gong; Tommy Jee; Taeeun Kim, Scott Lichtenstein; Shanel Thomas, Sandy Abbruzzese, Luis Abinder, Javier Abinder, Christopher Abrams, Victor Abreu, Marquis Acero, Silvia Acevedo, Suleyma Acevedo, Paulina Acevedo, Marcelo Acevedo, Einstein Acuna, Halima Afatar, Shadi Afshar, Sal Aglialoro, Claudio Agnes, Valentina Agnes, Arthur Aguayo, Nestor Agudelo, Blanca Aguilar, Nelson Aguilar, Stephanie Aiuto, Farida Akhtar, Mohammad Alam, Antonio Alban, Samuel Aldave, Ed Aldebot, Jason Alexander, Donald Alexander, Charles Aliaga, Ericka Alicea, Joseph Aliperti, Raymond Almestica, Kelvin Almonte, Regina Alston, Andres Alvarado, Reinaldo Alvarez, Tina Alvarez, Abel Alvarez, Md Alvee, Luis Alzate, Gloria Alzate, Laurence Amandola, Karlos Amaro, Dorothy Ambrosino, Blanca Anaya, Brian Anderson, Rocio Artinano, Joseph Ascolesi, Yuliani Astudillo, Richard Auriemmo, Jake Avella, Ram Ayala, Jorge Baca, Thomas Bachynsky, Diana Badia, Karen Baez, Kelvin Bai, Calvin Bailey, Nicole Bailey, Jeimy Bailon, Maria Baires, Gerard Baker, Amanda Baksh, Freya Balroop, William Bannon, Harry Barax, Hennessy Barcia, Jimmy Bardsley, Jacqueline Barjon, Christian Barona, Claudia Barrera Benites, Pedro Bartolomei, Sheila Batkiewicz, Cristian Batres, Bill Baumann, Brandon Beaman, Corey Bearak, Pearline Beatty, Jeffrey Beaumont, Marc Beck, Daron Benbenisti, Charles Bencivengo, Olivan Benites, Elias Benzant, Ed Benzinger, Haley Beom, Michael Bergin Jr, Daniel Bergstrand, Dov Berkowitz, Dee Bernstein, Howard Birnbaum, John Bisbano, Celia Blackman, Keith Blacknick, Mauricio Blandino, Israel Blandon, Jeffrey A. Blumenthal, Christopher Bodie, James Bonavita, Louis Bondanza, Jorge Bonfante, Kevin Bonilla, Beatriz Borja, Mary Botchey, Hugh Boyle, Joao Brandao, Jayson Braswell, Donald Brathwaite, Carolyn Bratton, Carolyn Bratton, Simone Braun, Habriela Bravo, Florence Breunig, Dylan Brickman, Felix Brignoni,

Christopher Britton, Melissa Brodman, Karen Brown, Thomas Brown, Ron Bruning, Keith Brunner, Michael Bua, Mark Buceta, Douglas Buckland, Patrick Buckley, Bryson Burel, Jim Burke, Alison Burrell, James Burt, Elise Burton, David Bustamante, Hilda Bustamante, Valerie Butirago, Estefania Caballero, Jorge Caban, Andrew Caesar, Erika Calderon, Nick Calise, Rufina Calixto Maldonado, Anthony Callegari, Margarita Camacho, Joseph Camastro, Destiny Camilo, Pietro Campanella, Michael Campbell, Carolina Campos, Juan Campos, Nidia Campoverde, Joseph Canino, Theresa Canning Zast, Flor Maria Cano Zambrano, Chris Capaccio, Viviana Cardona, Marshann Carnegie, Thomas J Carola Jr, Richard Carr, Lady Carranza, Caroline Carreño, Karla Carrera, Louis Carrera, Maria Carrion, Alexander Caruso, David Case, Madeline Case, Cynthia Castellon, Jessica Castillo, Julio Castillo, Rafaell Castillo, Linda Castro, Venecia Castro, Denise Castro, Julian Castro, Richard Cebillo, Lucas Cegueda, Christian Celeste, Linda Celis, Maria Celis, Lili Cen, Rosselli Cerron, Dr. Gina Cespedes, Gabriela Chacon, Michael Chambers, Kown Chan, Diana lai Chan, Jessica Chan, Kenny Chan, Sandy Chan, Wing hing Chan, Prodip Chandra, Yun Chang, Richard Charria, Sa Chau, Nancy Chavez, Hui Chen, Hongchao Chen, Xia Chen, Lan Chen, Meiyu Chen, Hongchan Chen, Yvonne Chen, Mu f Chen, Lerong Chen, Chatles Chen, Zhong yuan Chen, Jie Chen, Feng Chen, Song quan Chen, Shuzhen Chen, Lei Chen, Tom Chen, Man W. Cheng, Kaily Cheng, Kyle Cheng, Kwun Cheng, Kan Cheng, Kok wai Cheong, Hon Yee Chew, Andrew Chidester, Dean Chidester, Mike Chidester, Jeanette Chiu, Samantha Chiu, Jinbo Choi, Shan Choudhury, Md Zainul Choudhury, Ping Lau Chow, Nabeez Chowdhury, Mohammad Chowdhury, Feifan Chu, Nancy Chusin, Francesca Cini, Carlos Cintron, Orlando Cintron, Sal Cioffi, John Clausman, Jose Clavijo, Walter E Clayton Jr, James Coffey, John Coffey, Kenneth Cohen, Shamain Colclough, Winston Cole, Western Cole, Thajuana Cole, Gregory Coles, Maricel Collarga, Mary Collaso, Vinent Colon, Jorge Comba, Vinny Condon, Emma Confesor, Costa Constantinides, Alex Constantopes, Marlene Contero, Heladio Contreras, Carlos Contreras, William Conway, Brian Cooper, Len Copicotto, Lydia Cora, Thomas Corcoran, Tamahr Cordy, Jasmine Correas, Sonia Cortes, Hector Cortez, Rubenia Cortez, Matthew Cox, Eddie Cramsie, Ray Crawford, Emaline Creamer, Joseph Crean, Manuela Cruz, Freddie Cruz, Angelo Cucuzza, Ingrid Cuello, Ricardo Cuenca, Jose Cueto, Meihong Cui, Rayonn Cummings, Mike Cummings, Vincent Cupola, Leticia Curup, Steven D'Amato, Vinicius daCunha, Karen Daitchman, Curtis Dalton, Mike Daly, Chelsea Daniel, Matthew Daniele, Thomas Darcy, Tsomo Dasel, Carlos Dasilva, Barbara Davis, Caleen Davis, Toya Davis, Irene Dawson, Yeniree Daza, Douglas De la cruz, Byron De Leon, Wendy De Paz, Davon Deas, Susan Decan, Michael Defeo, Evan Deitch, Yanis Delgado, Maikeliz Delgado, Carmen Delprete, Anthony Deluca, Voula Demakos, Eli Deng, Goupan Deng, Luna Deng, Fang Deng, Ryan Dennison, Srikant Desai, Benjamin Deutsch, Marc Deutscher, Michael DeValera, Godfrey Devera, Ariel Devosa, Harsimar Dhillon, Tom Diamond, David Diamond, Gilad Diamond, Joewyn Diaz, Jose Diaz, Ramon Diaz, Hector Diaz, Rafael Diaz, Tenzin Dickey, Eric Diez, Josefina Difo, Jason DiGiacomo, Frederick Dillon, Maria Dimakos, Megan Diprima, Damon DiSimone, Steven Dluginski, Meiling Dong, Zhandong Dong, Jinming Dong, Bill Donofrio, Patrick Donohue, Kathia Dorado, Robert Dorsky, Karla Dos Santos, Patrick Doyle, Robert Driscoll, Leticia Driuzzi, Daniel Dromm, J Duboula, Cyrus Dugger, Gary Dunaier, Rhoda Dunn, Ronald Dunn, Caletha Dunston, Johnnie Dunston, Shaun Dunston, Michelle Dunston, Christine Duplessis, Daniela Duran, Sharna Durham, Cynthia Durham, John Dushaj, Manjola Dushaj, Susan Dushaj, Tomo Dushaj, D. Alexandra Dyer, Matthew Easton, Carly Ecker, Casey Marie Ecker, Linda Lee Ecker, Barry Edison, Kayode Edmonds, Turk Edward's, Mary Eiben, Norman P Elbogen, Stefanos Eleftheriadis, Danielle Ellman, John Emmerich, Christopher Entenmann, Shelby Epps, Robert Erikson, Chris Erikson Jr, Clela Errington, Frances Escano, Jova Escobar, Sandra Escobar, Hector Escobar, Antonio Escobar, Enrique Espaillat, Francisco Espinal, Fanny Espinoza, Sonita Espinoza, Bob Esposito, Juan Estrella, Marcelo Eugenio, Nelson Eusebio, Jacob Evans, Anna Evtyugina, David geovanny Fajardo mora, Chris Falco, Adriana Falcon, Brian Fallon, Brian Falvey, Gen Gen Fang, Michael Fanto, Eric Farbman, Emoly Farhan, Aisha Farooq, Steven Faulkner,

Steven Favilla, Elio Fazio, Zachary Feldman, Ethel Felix, Katy Feng, Scott Ferguson, Jarvis Fern, Giselly Fernandez, Aidelyn Fernandez, Jayley Fernandez, Jerry Fernandez, Maria Fernandez, Michael Fernandez, Yaina Fernandez, George Fernandez, Vinny Ferraro, Apolinar Ferreira, Marisol Ferreira, Robert Ferreiro, Alec Ferreiro, Josefina Ferreras, Julio Ferreras, John Ferry, Maria Fierro, Juan Fierro, Jude Fievre, Jose Figeroa, Michael V. Fina, Donovan Finn, Gerald Finn, Emily Fishman, Jeannette Fishman, Joshua Fishman, Steve Fishman, Sonia Fistel, Douglas Fitzgerald, Kevin Flanagan, Johanna Flores, Juan Flores, Charles Fonck, Kok wah Fong, Mariela Forero, Jonathan Forgash, Ken Forsberg, Emily Forster, Jheraldin Franco, Melissa Franco, Andrés Franco, Sherley Francois, Gabriel Francois, Andrew Frank, Cielo Frascatore, Martin Freiman, Samantha Freire, Claudia Friedman, Jesse Friedman, Marcia Fuentes, Simon Fuerst, Matthew Gainsfield, Heather Galaher, Thomas Galgano, Fiona Gallagher, Ray Gallagher, Fausto Gallegos, Larry Gallegos, Brian Gallery, Thomas Gallery, Mishel Gamarra, Joseph Gambino, Jorge Gamez, Ming Gao, Huiqin Gao, Linqin Gao, Yunxian Gao, Thomas Garavuso, Alexander Garcia, Juan Garcia, Lilia Garcia, Thiare Garcia, Michael Garcia, Alejandro Garcia, Carmeneza Garcia, Saul Garcia, Jose Garcia, Hector Garcia, Natalia Garcia, Gerard Garofalo, Saray Garzon, Luz Gaviria, Matt Geisperger, Michelle Gerlich, Babin Ghatane, K Gibbons, Michael Giffes, Eric Gimenez, John Girschick, Joe Giulintano, Donald Glasson, Kenneth Glennon, Kevin Glennon, Sean Glennon, Brian Glennon, Brendan Glennon, Steffanie Godoy, Ayelet Goldberg, Hope Goldberg, Nathan Goldberg, Michael Goldman, Robert Goldsmith, Ana Gomes, Andrea Gomez, Mayra Gomez, Francisco Gomez, Joseph Gomez, Annia Gomez, Risbeli Gómez, Angelica Gomez Gaviria, Gloria Gong, Pedro Gonzales, Diana Gonzales, Jessica Gonzales, Jose Gonzales, Pedro Gonzales, Charles Gonzalez, Fernando Gonzalez, Jose Gonzalez, Gessy Gonzalez, Lyanne Gonzalez, Anne Gonzalez, Karina Gonzalez, Jenny González, Leonor Gordillo, Francia Gordillo, Rogellio Gordillo, Beatriz Gordillo, Loycent Gordon, Kefton Goring, Ryan Graham, Patrick Grantz, Joseph Grappone, Tom Grech, Malcolm Green, Josh Green, David Green, Jevon Greenaway, Mordechai Greenfield, Quashawn Grey, Joseph Grigas, Anthony Grillo, Carlos Grisales, Michael Gross, Nathaniel Grove, Matthew Gruber, Josselyn Guaitarilla, Jose Guaman, Yi Fuang Guan, Xiao Ping Guan, Plinio Guerra, Dina Vanessa Guerrero, Allyson Guevara, Jeremy Guevara, Jeffrey Guevara, Oscar Guevara vasquez, Gerard Guichard, David Gulha, Tashi Gurung, Birendra Gurung, Maria Gutierrez, Milton Gutierrez, Jackson Guzman, Jacklyn Guzman, Kevin Guzman, Jessie Guzman, Marvin Guzman, Steve Guzowski, Julia H, Rebecca H, Terry Hack, Alex Hackworth, Mona Hamday, Steven Hammen, John Hanks, Tom Haran, Felicia Haŕan, Jack Harcourt, Karen Hargrove, Isaura Haro, Rodney Harris, Jake Hartstein, Nahid Hasan, Rakib Hashim, William Hayes, Lynette Haynesworth, Keq He, Scott Hedquist, Fleetwood Henry, Francisco Hernandez, Victoria Hernandez, Maria Hernandez, Karen Hernandez, Nancy Hernandez, Adan Hernandez, Ana Herrera, Michelle Herrera, Alfredo Herrero, Danielle Hersch, Veronica Hicks, Melanie Hicks, William Higgins, Robert Hildenbrand, James Hiner, Daniel Hinton, Ted Hirsch, Ronald Ho, Martin Hochenberger, Andrew Hock, Talley Hohlfeld, Gerleen Holden, Harry Hollis, Lee Holodney, Brian Honeyman, Susan Hong, James Hong, Jungmin Hong, Haloon Hoofah, Larinda Hooks, Noah Hova, Chung Hui Hsiao, Tza Hui Hsiao, Jessica Hsieh, Billy Hsu, Brandon Hsu, Jimmy Hsu, Bryan Hsu, Yong Bin Hu, Kathy Hu, Sam Hu, Li Hui Huang, Ying Huang, Cici Huang, Sheng Chang Huang, Ron Hudock, Lourdes Huerta, Sharon Huerta, John Hughes, Ka Yi Hung, Ryan Hunt, Michael Hurwitz, Ehsan Hussain, Patrick Hussey, Darby Hyde, Edgar Ibarguen , Denis Ibric, Anthony Incandela, Benjamin Inga, Jenny Inguil, Joseph Ippolito, Carlos Iquinllo, Carl Isaac, Syed Islam, Sergio Jachero, Yazmyne Jackson, Sue Jadoo, Jay Jaffe, Johan Jaffritz, Tony James, Jarran James, Jason James, Monica Janeth, Theresa Janousek, Jaime Jara, Danny Jara, Anita Jara, Teresa Jaramillo, Fritz Jean-pierre, Shane Jennings, Lema Jenny, Elise Jensen, Victor Jeres, Stanley Jeudy, Dian guang Jiang, Suling Jiang, Xu Jiang, Luis Jimenez, Marisol Jimenez, Xiaolei Jin, Yonafa Jogo, Christopher Johanning, Deij Johnson, Enzo Johnson, Iris Johnson, Rodney Johnson, Debra Jones, Derric Jones, Oliver Jordan, Patrick Joy, Leonila Juan, Wilson Juanotuña, Nicole Juarez, Margarita Juarez, Leni Juca, Tim Julian, Bill

Jung, Pascale Jutard, John Juva, Fati Kaby, Kara Kaiser, Robert Kalanz, Mustafa Kang, Emily Kaplan, Charles Kass, Aaron Katz, James Kazmierczak, Varun Kejeriwal, Nadine Kela-Murphy, Shantell Kelly, Kevin Kelly, Ian Kelly, William Kelly, John Kelly, James Kelly, Daniel Kennedy, Herman Kepler, Kenneth Keshecki, Joseph Kessler, Robert Keyes, Vivienne Keys, Saudia Khan, Kulprapatsorn Khongsinthaweesuk, Rich Kiley, Ahyoung Kim, Young Hwan Kim, Jiyun Kim, Paul Kim, Eric Kincaid, Kurt Klappert, Karen Klein, David Klich, Efrata Kline-Salamon, Karen Kochner, Jessica Kong, Omar Korban, Jeannette Koster, George Kourtalis, John Krebs, Betty Krieger, Elizabeth Kupcha, Sow Cheng Kwan, Henry Kwong, Nicole Labades, Mark Lacari, Maryanne Laffin, Sean Lally, Sukying Lam, Joe Lam, Stephen Lampa Jr, Cesar Landi, John Lane, Angelica Lange, Hua Laing Lao, Patrick Lascala, Craig Lastres, Maria Lastres, Lewis Latimer, Wing yu maxie Lau, Jack Lau, Andy Lau, Yee bo Lau, Aaron Laub, Lucio Laureano, Kevin Law, Kathy Lawlor, Donough Lawlor, John Leach, James Lebeux, Eric LeBlanc, Marta Lebreton, Rebecca Lee, Shannon Lee, Cici Lee, Jason Lee, Hyun T Lee, Jenny Lee, Anthony Lee, Bryan Lee, Oi kum Lee, Yoon Jae Lee, Pamela Lekocaj, Maria Lema, Victor Leon, Alexander Leonard, Robert Leonard, Chris Leong, S Leto, May Leung, Glenn Levine, Mayra Lewin, Julien Lhermitte, Alexis Li, Charlene Li, Jose Li, Tong Li, Jackson Li, YoYo Li, Lucy LI, Jimmy LI, Bowei Li, Stephanie Li, Zaiqin Li, Yu Ying Li, Yinna Li, Jason Liang, Jie ming Liang, Yin Hao Liang, Bruce Liao, Steven Licardi, Scott Lichtenstein, Yanny Lie, Abram Lieberman, Sharon Lightbourn, Lenny Lillians, Paul Lim, Ylng Lin, Joy Lin, Dian wei Lin, Xiangyi Lin, Katie Lin, Jessie Lin, Ken Lin, Howard Lin, Maverick Lin, Susan Lin, Hong Xin Lin, Wei Lin, Bell Lin, Lilly Lin, Xiang Er Lin, Xiu Yan Lin, Emily Lin, Zhaosen Lin, XiuYan Lin, Steven Lin, Pinde Lin, QIONG Ping Lin, Allen Lin, Alba Linano, Moishe Lipschutz, Meshulam Lisker, Scott Litts, Mingxing Liu, Moe Liu, Steven Liu, Lulu Liu, Alex Liu, Chang Liu, Amelia Liu, Jin Liu, Xiaomeng Liu, Liqin Liu, Gustavo Llanos, Fernando Llivi, Henry Lo, Jonathan Lobl, Olorus Loja, Angel Loja, Osorus Loja, Geoffrey Loomis, Fabio Lopes, Paul Lopes, Frank Lopez, Cindy Lopez, Clara Lopez, Kevin Lopez, Maria Lopez, Silvio Lopez, Elizabeth Lopez, Emilly Lopez, Lina Lopez, Dennis Lopez, Francisco Lopez, Brandy Lopez, Jaribel Lora, Meilin Louie, Lala Love, Ariella Lowy, Edward Lowy, Isaac Lowy, Rachel Lowy, Shuli Lowy, Edwin Lozada, Andy Lu, Daisy Lu, Jimmy Lu, James Lubin, Maria Lucero, David Lugo, Roberto Lujan, Somsak Luksanpol , Augusto Luna, Angelo Luongo, Patrick Lyons, John Lyons, F M, Paula M., Sean MacGilvray, Martin Machover, Tyshaun Mack, Rob MacKay, Desmond Mackesy, Philip Macys, Matthew Madia, Joseph Magel, Mary Maggio Fischer, Dorothy Magnani, Glenn Magpantay, James Mahoney, Don Majeski, James Makin, Alvaro Maldonado, Andre Maloy, Bernard Mandelbaum, Narcisa Mandieta, Nick Manniello, Mary Manso, Cruz Manuel bautista, Areli Manzanales, Christopher Marchetta, Veronica Marcial, Li Marcos, Marcelo Mariano, Margarita Mariano Mariano, Indhira Marichal, Abel Marin, Francisco Marin, Tomas Marin, Stephen Mark, Pashka Marku, Alex Marmol, Peter Marra, Joseph Marraffino, Jeremiah Mars, Paul Marshallis, Sean Martin, Travis Martin, Ryan Martin, Deborah Martin-Avila, Carolina Martinez, Denni Martinez, Julio Martinez, Yessica Leany Martinez, Sergio Martinez, Alexis Martinez, Manurl Martinez, Ed Martinez, Vida Martinez, Isrrael Martinez, Steven Martone, Justin Marziliano, Christopher Mason, Davis Mata, Sergio Mata-Cisneros, Kimberly Mateo, Enilda Mateo, Josephine Mateo, Jake Mathison, Junior Matos, Thomas Mayo-Smith, Angel Maysonet, Adam Mayweather, Brian McAleer, Thomas McBride, Stephanie McCabe, Thomas McCann, Sam McCarren, Patrick McCarrick, Shirley Mcclean, Burton McClerklin, Mike McDermott, Jewell McDonald, Linda McDonald, Robert McDonald, James McGee, Edward McGlone, Karli McGraw, craig McIsaac, Joseph McKenna, Thomas McKeon, Nigel McKnight, James McLean, Trevor McLeod, John McMonagle, Ryan McNaughton, David McNeil, Jordan McPherson, James Mcspedon, William McVeigh, Eddie McWilliams, Kait Meblynn, Jose Medina, Pilar Medina, YaYa Mei, King Mei, Aida Mejia, Gloria Mejia, Melisa Mejia, Leonela Melgarejo, Yeison Melo, Hamlet Melo, Jennifer Meltzer, Rory Mencin, Roberto Mendez, Gabriela Mendez, Paulina Mendez, Jesus Mendez, Wagner Mendoza, Ricardo Mendoza, Cesar Mendoza, Charles Mercado, Anthony w Mercado, Deion Mercedes, Stephen Merenes, Jack

Meyer, Jonny Meyers, Fernando Meza, Gaetano Mezzasalma, Diane Miller, Kristopher Miller, Tim Minter, Roberto Miranda, Mercedes Miranda, Denise Mitchell, Jejae Mizrahi, Benjamin Mobley, Juan pablo Molina, Jonathan Molina, Galdino Molinero, Steven Moller, Shan Mon, Leah Mondezie, Elisia Montalvo, Monica Montanez, Carmen Montejo, Fernando Montejo, Julio Montero, Richie Montero, Luciano Montes, Victor Montesinos, Sue Mookram, Kevin Moquin, Bernardina Morales, Cesar Morales, Natasha Morales, Victor Morales, Juan Morales, Julio Morales, Dionis Morales, Leslie Morales, Yasely Moran, Christian Moran, Vincent Moran, Clara Morell, Eduardo Moreno, Rosa moreno Moreno, Darlene Morgan, Jose Morillo, Richard Moritz, Michael Morris, Steven Moskowitz, Marc Mosteirin, Michael Moy, Stalin Moya, Marie Moynihan, Ray Muchow, Patrick Mullaney, Frank Munoz, Tim Munroe, Noor Muyeed, E Nacinovich, Lalaaaa Nadej, Victor Namias, Todd Napoletano, Tom Napolitano, Steven Napolitano, Luis Naranjo, Paul Nardelli, Jemn Natividad, Luis Navarro, Luis Felipe Navarro, Jim Nedelka, Maurice Nesbitt, Douglas Neu, Charles Neumann, Alvi Nezam, Vinny Ng, Jordan Ng, Diona Ng, Helene Ng, Chao Q Nicholson, Hector Nike, Michael Nolan, Sindy Nolasco, Nico Notaro, Frank Novielli, Dany Nueva, Alberto Nunez, Michelle Nussbaum, Michael Nuttall, Peter O'Connor, Patrick O'Doherty, Matthew O'Keeffe, Kenneth O'Mara, George Obrador, Gerry O'callaghan, David Ocasio, Christopher Ocasio, Jospeh Ochoa, Brian Ochoa, Isabella Ochoa, Karol Ochoa, Chris OConnor, Virginia OConnor, Samuel O'Grady, Robert Ojeda, Margaret Olsen, Olaf Olsen, John Olsen, Bryan Olthaus, Frank O'Mara, William O'Meara, Aretha OQuinn, Marie OQuinn, Michelle Ordonez, Daniel Leonardo Orellana Ayavaca, Jeff Orlick, Juan Ortega, Geraldo Ortiz, Kerly Ortiz, Ashlay Ortiz, Alex Otero, Avi Outmezguine, Jannet P, Maya P, Jessica P Sharma, Francisco Padilla, John Padula, Ted Pafundi, Chris Paladino, Paldon Paldon, Stephen Pallay, Sarah Palmer, Jorge Palmieri, Ralph Palmieri, Kevin Palominio, Vincent Pan, MeiGen Pan, Panagis Papadatos, John-Luke Papadopoulos, John Papandrea, Greg Pappas, John Parente, Mike Pares, Joshua Paretz, Nayan Parikh, Rohan Parikh, Arjun Parikh, Tae Park, Jungun Park, Claudia Parra, Sophi Pascall, Jose Pasos, Michael Patti, Belgica Paucar, Jason Paul, Jasmine Paula, Bradley Pawelko, Reggie Pegues, Claudette Pegus, jenny Peleaz, Simon Pelman, Shimi Pelman, Devorah Pelman, Jonathan Pelman, Rico Pelo, Carla Marie Pena-Feancois, Jenny Peñafiel, Johan Penalo, Hirael peralta Peralta, Jaime Peralta, Maria Perez, Reina Perez, Ruth Perez, Jessica Perez, John Perez, Ingrid Perez, Steve Perez, Carlos Perez, Jennifer Perez, Ruddy Perez, Diannery Perez, Paul Perez, Jake Perillo, Andrew Permaul, Al Perna, Maryuri Pernia, Manuel Perrito, Angela Perry, Cordelia Persen, Fake Person, Faker Person, Erik Petersen, Amy Peterson, Wendy Petties, Tova Pfeffer, Sandra Phermon, Anthony Pietromonico, Rosangela Pimenta, Alexandra Pimiento, Haydee Pinedo, Ashley Pintado, Miguel Pinto, Tom Pip, Mary Pisido, Alexandros Pitsironis, Krzysztof Piziak, Maria Pizzaro, Dan Plonski, Madeline Plotnick, Jill Poklemba, Rev.John Polidoro, Kayla Pop, Claudia Porcoro-Ion, Richard Poulos, John Pounds, Joan Povolny , Timothy Powers, Bill Powers, Carmen Prince, Ovington Prophete, Andrea Pryor, Gill Purdei, Rita Qin, Chenqing Qiu, Jiyao Qu, Stephanie Queiroz, Ed Quigley, Lesly Quigua, Ilene Quince, Jack Quince, Alberto Quintero, Marc Quitsch, Igor Rachenko, Giancarlo Rachiele, Valeria Rada, Radhames Radhames, Aisha Raffo, Gene Rainey, Oliver Raino, Patcharin Rakkusol, Esteban Ramales, Urcilla Ramautar, George Ramierez, Jorge Ramirez, Jesus Ramirez, Isabel Ramirez, Liz Ramirez, Roberto Ramirez, Edwin Ramirez, Luis Ramirez, Rosie Ramirez, Ignacio Ramírez, Irshaad Ramjohn, Kelly Ramon, Adrian Ramos, Juan Ramos, Andrew Ramos, Sita Ramsundar, Robert Randazzo, Joseph Rando, Jaycee Razon, Karen Reeves, Dany Regalado, William Reid, Kathleen Reilly, Joe Reilly, Roberto Reinoso, Evelyn Rendon, Mark Rennie, Maria Reyes, Olga Reyes, Alejandra Reyes, Joan Reyes, Alexander Reyes, Soledad Reyes, Erin Reynolds, Manuel Reynoso, Khueo Rez, John Rhatigan, Charlton Rhee, Jennifer Richards, John Richardson, Claudio Richetti, Jose Luis Rico, Jordan Riggs, C Rinaldi, Christopher Rios, Zachary Ris, Bryn Ritchie, Nuria Rius, James Rivas, Lucero Rivera, Inez Rivera, Rabiya Rizvi, Umair Rizvi, David Robinson, Silvia Rocha, Gary Rodgers, Arnaldo Rodrigiez, Ana Rodriguez, James Rodriguez, Nelson Rodriguez, Jenipher Rodriguez,

Maria Rodriguez, Adalgisa Rodriguez, Anthony Rodriguez, Dashley Rodriguez, Lucila Rodriguez, Ernie Rogers, Nicholaus Rojas, Pedro Rojas, Rufino Rojas, Nicole Rojas, Wendy Rojas, Blanca carolina Rojas, Brandon Rojas, Carlos Rojas, Harry Roldan, Allison Rolon, Carlos Romero, Yherlyn Romero, Robert Romero, Alexandro Romero, Jennifer Romero, Juan Romero, Vicente Romero Pareja, Ana Rondinelli, Michael Rooney, Mark Rooney, Alberto Rosa, Barrera Rosa, Luis Rosa, Noel Rosario, Gilberto Rosario, Tammy Rose, Chesky Rosenberg, Scott Rosenberg, Dennis Rosenfeld, Arlene Ross, Ronald Ross, Tasmeem Ruba, Sam Ruben, James Ruffino, Francesca Ruiz, Mildred Ruiz, Jazmin Ruotolo, Brian Rutter, Robert Rutter, Leroy Ryan s, Jose Sa saquinaula, Marissa Saengsuwan, Sombat Saengsuwan, Ram Saha, Richie Salmon, Erica Sampson, Jonathan Sampson, Luis Sanango, Leticia Sanchez, Melissa Sanchez, Emily Sanchez, John Sanchez, Joseph Sanchez, Serafin Sanchez, Dave Sands, Steve Sanicola, Sekou Sanoe, Carmen Santiago, Rosario Santiago, Myra Santos, Pablo Santos, Frank Sanzo, Cornelio Saquipulla, Fidel Sarmiento, Justin Savignano, Sandra Sayago, Ashley Scaracci, John Schaefer, Kevin Scharf, John Schenone, Andrew Schwartz, David Schwartz, Daniel Scorcia, Aaliyah Scott, Ronald Scott, Michael Seales, Pagasa See , George Seeger, Rónán Selby-Curran, Frank Sepulveda, Yaakov and Atara Serle, Scott Serpe, Carl Serrano, Celida Serrano, Paulina Serrano, Peter Serro, Kenneth Sexton, Dante Sgambati, Malikah Khadijah Shabazz , Bernie Shafran, Jacob Shafran, Malini Shah, Raja Shakya, Sandy Sharma, Rajesh Sharma, Karan Sharma, Avida Sharma, Feel Shea, Alan Sherman, Jonathan Sherman, Chris Sherman, Vishalakshi Shetty, Jagdish Shetty, Nidhi Shetty, Vishalakshi Shetty, Yun Lue Shi, Xie Ling Shi, Gyanda Shivnarain, Shomakhmud Shoumarov, Kai Shum, Don Sibblies, Ronald Sibblies, Neal Siegel, Nicholas Signore, Addul Sikder, Michael Silversmith, Max Simanowitz, James Simko, Steven Simmons, Aubrey Simon, Giacomo Simone, Jose Gregorio Simoza, Wesley Sin, Harresh Singh, Alvin Singletary, John Skinner, Philip Slattery, Derek Slaughter, Robert Smith, Davon Smith, Tau Smith, Maria Socastro, Henry Soderlund, Steven Sokolof , Fernando Solquero, Gavin Somersel, Sonia Sone, Jay Soto, John Spiller, Patricia Sprios, Stan Stade, George Stein, Eatmybutt Stevecohen, Brizar Steven, Dudley Stewart, Laura Stewart, Steve Strauss, Sal Strocchia, Amy Su, Gerardo Suarez, Leticia Suarez, Jennifer Suarez, Felix Suero, Yuriy Sukhorukov, Alisha Sukhram, Daniel Sullivan, Veruskka Summers, Kwangok Sung, Saeeda Lesley Superville-Dunston, Lady Tagua, David Tai, Abunaser Tajuddin, Edward Takatsch, Shazidur Talukder, Yuet Kam Tam, Maria Tambriz, Nishcal Tamrakar, Alarize Tan, Yongjian Tan, Vera Tan, Jinwen Tang, Henry Tarazona, Louis Tavares, Jackie Taveras, Alejandro Taveras, Jared Taylor, James Taylor, Jose Tejada, Cynthia Tellez, Monica Tenecela, Claudine Teng, Ted Teng, Yalan Teng, David Thai, Robert Thom, Marcia Thomas, Sandra Thomas, Shanel Thomas Henry, Benjamin Thompson, Edison Tian, Michael Tierney, Kat Tighe, Mery Tineo, Segundo Tipan, Linda Tirino, Wilmer Tixilema, Joseph Tolento, Erick Torija, Kevin Torija, Alvaro Torres, Aida Torres, Fernando Torres, Maria Torres, Karen Torres, Neyka Torres, Katy Tovar, Aldo Triay, Hamid Trii, Tsewang Tsewang, Amy Tsin, Wailing Tsui, Evelyn Tuapa, Elna Tullock, Sau Tung, Carson Tung, Daniel Tuohy, Mathew Turner, Clarence E. Tyner 3rd, Rebecca Tzak, Ray Ubaldo, Martha Ugsha, Cheryl Untrojb, Mario Urgilez, Nicolas Uscategui, Carlos Ususga, Mary Vaccaro, Vincent Vaccaro, Clara Valencia, David Valencia, Paula Valencia, Nathalia Valencia, Giovanni Valente, Louie Valentino, Miguel Vaquiz, Lucinda Vasquez, Maria Kristine Vasquez, Michael Vastarelli, Daisy Vazquez, Naldo Vazquez, Isiah Vega, Juan Velasco, Sergio Velasco, Manuel Velasquez, Luis Velasquez, Oscar Velasquez, Samuel Velasquez, Angel Velastegui, Arely Velazquez, Olga Velesaca, Jose Velez, Hector Ventura, Jorge Vera, Angel Vera, William Verderber, Ivanna Verdesoto, Rich Vicars, Jason Vilbig, Michael Villalta, Antonio Villani, German Villatoro, Derek Visconti, Diego Vizcarra, Judy Vladimir, John Vodicka, Michael Volkl, Azi Wachstock, Ilan Wachstock, Kenneth Wachstock, Mira Wachstock, Dariusz Walendziuk, Tamika Walker, William Wallace, David Wallace, Joseph Walsh, Michael Walsh, Joe Walsh, Henry Wan, Saiyu Wang, Paul Wang, Zhong wen Wang, ZhenZhao Wang, Amy Wang, Yongqiang Wang, Lianxiang Wang, Tsering Wangmo, Nitikarn Wanichjindaphat, Toi Washington-Simon, Ulrike Wayne, Joseph Weathers, Jacob Weinberg, Michele

Weiss, Daniel Werter, Peter Whang, Martin Whelan, Che Williams, Dante Williams, Marva Williams, John Williams, Alethia Williams, Maria Williamson, Alethia Willians, Aaron Wilson, Nathaniel Wilson, Brooke Wisniewski, Paul Wisotsky, Thomas Witters, Jacob Witz, Wendy Wo, David Wolleben, Chelsea Wong, Ema Wong, Iris Wong, Joyce Wong, Ricky Wong, Wai Lin Wong, 王Mo Yung慕容 Wong王wong Wong, Stella Woo, Kayleigh Woodham, Tony Woods, Shu Ying Wu, Becky Wu, Lili Wu, Guan Hua Wu, Milena Wu, Luen Wu, Yanyan Wu, Cayden Wu, Jenny Wu, N Wyands, Wenji Xie, Xiuqi Xie, Wennu Xie, Jamie Xu, Rita Yan, Siu Yan, Edwin Yan, Fausto Yanez, Dannel Yang, Ye Bin Yang, Clarice Yao, Sinkok Yee, Yee Wah Yee, Sam Yeung, Moses Yi, Caroline Ying, Lois Yong, Ting You, Aron Youne, Joshua Youner, Patrick Young, Farhan Yousuf, Mohammed Yousuf, Silvia Yumbato, Jessica Yunga, Ivan Zaba, Mohammad Zahid, Victor Zapata, Jon Zast, Ming Zhang, Chongwei Zhang, Jinxiu Zhang, Xinglong Zhang, Jinhui Zhang, Xiuzhi Zhang, Michelle Zhao, Jieyu Zhao, Xin Zhen, Mia Zheng, Ruby Zheng, Tina Zheng, Jin Zheng, Sam Zheng, Haiyan Zheng, Fang Zheng, Damao Zheng, Jianhui Zheng, Xiaolun Zhong, Zengyong Zhou, Rong Zhou, Ada Zhou, YI Zhou, Jimmy Zhou, Kasey Zhu, Yuyan Zhu, Shenggang Zhu, Wanyi Zhu, Sube Zia, Eleni Zorbas, Maria Zori, Chang you Zou, Wende Zou, Xia Zou, Jian feng Zou, Gregory Zouvelos, John Zozzaro, Martha Zuniga, Luis Zuniga, Dylan Zurita, Renee Zwerman.