A. INTRODUCTION

The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines community facilities as public or publicly funded facilities including schools, hospitals, libraries, day care centers, and fire and police protection services. This chapter examines the potential effects of the development of the proposed project, as described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," on the capacity and provision of services by those community facilities. Direct effects may occur when a particular action physically alters or displaces a community facility. Indirect effects result from increases in population, which creates additional demand on service delivery. As there are no direct effects to existing community facilities resulting from the proposed action, this analysis concentrates on the potential for indirect effects.

The demand for community facilities and services is directly related to the type and size of the new population generated by development resulting from the proposed action. As the proposed project would introduce 900 dwelling units (DUs) to the area, a detailed assessment of community facilities such as public schools, day care centers, libraries and hospitals is warranted. Detailed assessment of potential impacts on police or fire service delivery is conducted only if a proposed action would affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a station house. The proposed action would include the development of approximately 36,000 gsf for a NYPD Mounted Unit Facility, however as the proposed action would not physically affect any existing fire or police station house, a detailed impact analysis of police and fire services is not warranted.

A screening assessment for community facilities and services is provided in the following section. As discussed below, the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to community facilities.

B. SCREENING ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a preliminary analysis was conducted to determine if the proposed action would exceed the established thresholds for community facilities and if more detailed analyses would therefore be necessary. CEQR Guidelines dictate various study area boundaries for each category of community facility, and these study areas are discussed in further detail in each community facility section of this chapter. Table 4-1 below illustrates the different thresholds for analysis for different types of community facilities.

Table 4-1
Preliminary Screening Analysis Criteria

Community Facility	Threshold
Public Schools	More than 50 elementary/middle school or 150 high school students
Libraries	Greater than 5 percent increase in ratio of residential units to libraries in borough
Health care facilities (outpatient)	More than 600 low- to moderate-income units
Day care centers (publicly funded)	More than 50 eligible children based on number of low- to moderate-income units by borough
Fire Protection	Direct effect only
Police Protection	Direct effect only

Source: 2001 CEQR Technical Manual

Public Education Facilities

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis of public schools is required if a proposed action would introduce more than 50 elementary and/or intermediate school students or 150 high school students (Table 4-1). Since the proposed action would generate a significant number of new residential units, an analysis of public schools has been undertaken. The proposed 900 new dwelling units (DUs) would be comprised of 720 market rate DUs and 180 low/moderate/middle income DUs.

As Table 4-6 illustrates, 144 elementary and middle school students, and 54 high school students, would be introduced to the study area as part of the proposed action. With 114 elementary and intermediate school students, the proposed project exceeds the CEQR thresholds, and further analysis of the proposed action's potential effects on elementary and intermediate schools in the study area is required. Since the proposed action is expected to generate fewer than 150 high school students, an analysis of public high schools is not required.

Libraries

The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines neighborhood library branches service areas based on the distance that residents would travel to use library services, which is typically not more than three-quarters of a mile (also referred to as a library catchment area). Figure 4-1 shows the three branches of the New York Public Library within the three quarter-mile study area surrounding the project site. The Columbus branch is located a few blocks southwest of the project site, at 742 Tenth Avenue, (between W. 50th and W. 51st Streets), the Library for the Performing Arts is located at 40 Lincoln Center Plaza, (on the southeast corner of Amsterdam Avenue and W. 65th Street) and the Riverside Library is located across the street, on the northeast corner of Amsterdam Avenue and W. 65th Street. A fourth branch, the Donnell Library Center, is located just outside of the study area, and is not included in the analysis, but

is worth showing due to its proximity to the project site (Figure 4-1). The Donnell Library Center building temporarily closed in 2008 and the building is being demolished. This facility is expected to reopen in 2011 in ground floor and below-grade space in a new commercial building to be developed on the same site.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that an analysis of libraries would be required if a proposed action would result in more than a five percent increase in the ratio of residential units to libraries per borough. According to Table 3C-3 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the introduction of 901 residential units in Manhattan would represent a 5 percent increase in dwelling units per library branch in the borough. The proposed action would result in approximately 900 new DUs, which does not exceed the threshold for detailed analysis. However, since the difference between the threshold and proposed project is only one DU, for conservative analysis purposes, further analysis is provided.

Health Care Facilities

A detailed analysis of health care facilities is required for large projects introducing a sizable number of new low-or moderate-income residents who may rely on nearby emergency and/or other outpatient clinic services. An assessment of health care facilities is typically conducted if a proposed action would generate more than 600 low-to moderate-income units. The proposed action is expected to introduce 180 new low/moderate/middle income DUs to the area (Table 4-2). As the proposed action does not meet the thresholds for analysis of public health care facilities, significant adverse impacts to public health care facilities and services are not expected to occur, and a detailed analysis is not warranted. For information purposes, hospitals located within one mile of the project site are shown on Figure 4-2.

Public Day Care Centers

A detailed analysis of publicly-funded day care centers is required when a proposed action would produce substantial numbers of subsidized, low-to moderate-income family housing units and generate more than 50 eligible children. The *CEQR Technical Manual* notes that families eligible for subsidized child care include those households with a gross income that falls between 225 percent and 275 percent of national poverty thresholds, depending on family size. Eligible families must also have an approved "reason for care," such as involvement in a child welfare case or participation in a "welfare-to-work program.

Table 4-2, Estimated Number of New Children Eligible for Publicly Funded Day Care for Year 2011 With the Proposed Action

	Low-Mod-Middle Income DUs (2)	Multiplier per DU		Generated Children		
		Children ≤ age 6	Children 6 - 12	Children ≤ age 6	Children 6 - 12	Total Children
Proposed Project	180	**0.21**	**0.13**	**38**	**23**	**61**

(1) Using Income Level "Low-Mod" from Fall 2008 update of CEQR Technical Manual, Table 3C-4

The proposed project includes 180 affordable residential units. Based on the CEQR multipliers for estimating the number of children eligible for publicly funded day care (Fall 2008 update of *CEQR Technical Manual*, Table 3C-4), the proposed project would generate 61 eligible children, more than the CEQR threshold of 50 or more children (see Table 4-2). A detailed analysis is warranted and is provided later in this chapter.

At the time the DEIS was issued, the fall 2008 multipliers were pending but had not been officially adopted. Under the previous multiplier rates in effect at that time, a detailed day care analysis was not warranted. The DEIS indicated that if new rates were adopted between the DEIS and the FEIS and a detailed analysis would be warranted it would be provided. Additionally, the DEIS disclosed that the possibility of significant adverse day care impacts could not precluded as new rates and updated data were pending.

Fire Protection

Detailed assessment of project impacts on fire service delivery is conducted only if a proposed action would affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a station house. As shown in Figure 4-2, the closest fire protection facilities to the project site are the New York City Fire Department's (FDNY) Rescue Company 1, at 530 W. 43rd Street (between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues), and Engine 40/Ladder 35 is located at 131 Amsterdam Avenue (between W. 65th and W. 66th Streets), and Engine 34/Ladder 21 at 440 W. 38th Street (between Ninth and Tenth Avenues).

The proposed action would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, any existing fire stations. The various components of the proposed project and its associated RWCDS would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire and safety codes. In addition, all new development that would occur as a result of the proposed action would be expected to comply with all applicable FDNY guidelines and requirements, such as providing access for fire apparatuses, sufficient turn-around areas at dead end streets, and providing a sufficient number of new hydrants.

As such, no significant adverse impacts to fire protection services are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

Police Protection

Detailed assessment of project impacts on police service delivery is conducted only if a proposed action would affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a station house. The proposed action would include the development of approximately 28,000 gsf for a NYPD Mounted Unit Facility. As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the NYPD Mounted Unit facility would include horse stables, offices, and related facilities on the ground floor on the mid-block portion of the site on W. 53rd Street.

Two police stations are currently located within a one-mile radius from the project site. As shown in Figure 4-2, the NYPD Midtown North (18th) Police Precinct is located at 306 W. 54th Street, between Eighth and Ninth Avenues. The Midtown North (18th) Precinct serves a large portion of the Midtown area, including the Theater District, the Diamond District and the neighborhood of Clinton, an area of approximately 1.13 square miles, roughly bounded by W. 59th and 60th Streets and Central Park to the north, the Hudson River to the west, Lexington Avenue to the east and W. 43rd and 45th Streets to the south. Also shown in Figure 4-2 is the NYPD Midtown South (14th) Police Precinct, located at 357 W. 35th Street, between Eighth and Ninth Avenues. The Midtown South (14th) Precinct serves the southern portion of the Midtown area, including the Garment District, the predominantly Korean entertainment area, the Manhattan Mall, and is generally bounded by W. 45th Street to the north, Ninth Avenue to the west, Lexington and Madison Avenues to the east, and W. 29th Street to the south.

The proposed action would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, any existing police station. The NYPD Mounted Unit facility, developed as part of the proposed action, would be utilized primarily for patrol horse stables, and would not have a direct effect on the existing police protection services in the area. As such, no significant adverse impacts to police protection services are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

METHODOLOGY

This schools analysis is prepared using existing conditions data from the 2006-2007 school year, the most recent year for which enrollment data were available at the time the analysis was prepared. The analysis employs a Build analysis year of 2011. In the future without the proposed action, the analysis assumes the project site would be vacant and this would serve as the baseline of comparison for determining the effects of the proposed project, which is defined in Chapter 1, "Project Description." Enrollment projections from the NYC Department of Education, together with estimated population increases from new developments completed between 2007 and 2011 (due to the use of 2006-2007 enrollment data), are used to estimate 2011 No-Build school enrollment.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Elementary and intermediate schools in New York City (NYC) are located in geographically defined school districts. As shown in Figure 4-3, the project site is located within the boundaries of Community School District 2 (CSD 2).

More specifically, the project site is located within a sub-area of CSD 2, shown as school planning zone 3. CSD 2's school planning zone 3 encompasses the area south of W. 59th Street, west of Broadway, north of W. 14th Street, to the Hudson River (Figure 4-3).

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for an analysis of elementary and intermediate schools generally coincides with the region of the Community School District serving the site of the proposed action. However, since the project site is located along the boundary between CSD 2 and CSD 3 to the north, schools within a study area of a half-mile radius from the project area will also be analyzed.

It also should be noted that some NYC public elementary schools provide pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) programs; however, these programs are discretionary and not compulsory. For the purposes of the most conservative analysis, existing capacity and enrollment numbers as well as projected enrollment numbers including Pre-K levels have been included in this analysis. As per CEQR guidelines, private and parochial schools are not included in schools analysis.

Elementary and Intermediate Schools within CSD 2

Analyzed schools located in CSD 2 can be generally defined by one of four categories: elementary, intermediate, secondary and K-8 schools. Elementary schools are defined as pre-kindergarten or kindergarten through 5th grades, intermediate schools are 6th through 8th grades, secondary schools are 6th through 12th grades and K-8 schools are pre-kindergarten or kindergarten through 8th grades. Some schools containing grades 9 through 12 have also been included in this analysis.

As shown in Figure 4-3, P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs, at 440 W. 53rd Street, located one block southeast of the project site, teaches students from pre-kindergarten level through 8th grade, and would be the zoned school for all elementary and intermediate action-generated students in the portion of the project area located in CSD 2.

In addition, two other elementary schools and one secondary school are located within a half-mile radius of the rezoning area, within CSD 2: P.S. 51 Elias Howe School, located on W. 45th Street, between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues, and P.S. 212 Midtown West and the Professional Performing Arts High School, both located in the same building on W. 48th Street, between Eighth and Ninth Avenues. Beyond the half-mile radius, two additional elementary schools, two intermediate schools, and two other high schools are located in Zone 3 of CSD 2.

It should be noted that P.S. 191 has been included in this quantitative analysis, although it is part of CSD 3, as it is located within a half-mile radius of the project site.

Elementary/K-8 School Utilization

For utilization analyses purposes, elementary and K-8 schools have been combined. Capacity and enrollment information for elementary and intermediate schools in the study area, Zone 3 and CSD 2 as a whole, is provided in Table 4-3.

As shown in Table 4-3, two of the four public elementary/K-8 schools in the study area currently operate below target capacity; in the study area, the average utilization rate is 91 percent with a surplus of 152 seats. For the elementary/K-8 schools in Zone 3, the utilization rate is lower than the study area, with a utilization rate of 83 percent and a surplus of 474

seats. For CSD 2 as a whole, the utilization rate for elementary and PS/IS schools is over target capacity at 102 percent, with a shortage of 320 seats.

Table 4-3
Existing CSD 2 Public Elementary/K-8 School Enrollment, Capacity and Utilization 2006-2007 School Year

Elementary and PS/IS Schools*							
Study Area (Half-mile Radius)							
Map No.	**School Name**	**Address**	**Grades**	**Enrollment**	**Target Capacity**	**Seats Available**	**Utilization %**
1	P.S. 191 (CSD 3)	210 West 61st St	PK-5	502	572	70	88%
2	P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs * PS component	440 W 53rd St	K-8	336	482	146	70%
3	P.S. 51 Elias Howe School	520 W 45th St	Elementary	328	276	-52	119%
4	P.S. 212 Midtown West	328 W 48th St	Elementary	354	342	-12	104%
Total for Study Area (including P.S. 191)				1,520	1,672	152	91%
Other Elementary Schools in Zone 3							
5	P.S. 11 William T. Harris	320 W 21st St	Elementary	493	557	64	89%
6	P.S. 33 Chelsea Prep	281 9th Ave	Elementary	330	588	258	56%
Total for Elementary Schools in Zone 3 (including P.S. 191)				2,343	2,817	474	83%
Total CSD 2 Elementary (PK-5)				14,822	14,502	-320	102%
Intermediate Schools*							
Intermediate Schools in Zone 3							
2	P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs IS component	440 W 53rd St	K-8	214	307	93	70%
5	M.S. 260 Clinton School of Writers and Artists (located in same building as P.S. 11)	320 W 21st St	6-8	246	255	9	96%
7	NYC Lab MS for Collaborative Studies	333 W 17th St	6-8	589	625	36	94%
Total for Intermediate Schools in Zone 3				589	625	36	94%
Total for CSD 2 Intermediate (6-8)				6,246	7,309	1,063	85%

Sources: 2006-2007 Enrollment, Capacity and Utilization Report-Classic Edition, NYC Department of Education & School Construction Authority. These figures include Pre-K enrollment in these buildings. Target Capacity assumes reduced class size of 20 children per class for grades K-3.

Note: Elementary school enrollment and capacity figures include the PS component of PS/IS schools. The total enrollment and capacity figures for CSD 2, Zone 3; and CSD 2 also include the PS component of PS/IS schools. PS/IS schools are identified with an asterisk (*). Intermediate school enrollment and capacity figures include the IS component of PS/IS schools. The total enrollment and capacity figures for CSD 2 include the IS component of PS/IS schools. There are no IS/HS in the study area or in CSD 2's Zone 3. Calculations for P.S. 191 enrollment and capacity not included in CSD 2 totals in Table 4-3, but are included in Table 4-5 below.

It should be noted that P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs, the K-8 school that is closest to the project site, and therefore most likely to absorb new elementary and intermediate school children generated from the proposed action, has the lowest utilization rate of the schools within a half-mile radius. P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs currently operates at a 70 percent capacity, with a surplus of 239 elementary and intermediate school seats.

Intermediate/Secondary School Utilization

There are no intermediate/secondary schools within the half-mile radius surrounding the project site. P.S. 111 Adolph S. Ochs, a K-8 school, enrolls students in grades 6 through 8; the intermediate school component is included in the intermediate school analysis.

As shown in Table 4-3, the intermediate/secondary schools in Zone 3 of CSD 2 are operating below target capacity at 94 percent utilization with approximately 36 available seats. For all of CSD 2 intermediate/secondary schools, enrollment is at 85 percent of target capacity, with 1,063 seats available (Table 4-3).

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION

Without the proposed action, future utilization of public elementary and intermediate schools serving the development site and study area would be affected by changes in enrollment mainly due to aging of the existing student body and new arrivals born in the area or moving to it; and changes in capacity, or number of available seats, in the schools as a result of planned construction of new schools or building additions.

Several school projects are expected to be built within CSD 2 in the future without the proposed action. The Beekman School, a new 630-seat Kindergarten through grade 8 school in Lower Manhattan, is under construction. Additional capacity for P.S. 234 in Lower Manhattan is being added in a 143-seat annex in a neighboring residential building that is under construction. Although none of these seats are located within Zone 3, these sited projects, which are both under construction, would add 773 additional seats to CSD 2's overall capacity. According to the DOE/SCA Five-Year Capital Plan Amendment Fiscal Years 2005-2009 (November 2007), several other school projects are expected to be designed and/or developed. Design money has been allocated for a 110-seat addition for P.S. 51, with the construction funding expected in the 2010-2014 Five Year Capital Plan. Design money has also been allocated for a new 630-seat school facility in the Hudson Yards Rezoning Area. This project's construction funding would also be expected in the 2010-2014 Five Year Capital Plan. These two projects were planned as mitigation for the Hudson Yards/Special West Chelsea rezoning actions. Two Education Construction Fund projects are also expected to be developed, including a new intermediate school facility at the site of the former P.S. 151 (currently under construction) and a replacement project for P.S. 59 that would add some new capacity to that school. P.S. 59 moved to a leased space at the Manhattan Eye, Ear and Throat Hospital (MEETH) in September 2008; this leased space will allow some additional capacity during the interim period while the new facility is built. The leased space will have approximately 500 seats; the replacement space will have approximately 700 seats. A new PS/IS school facility has been approved for Lower Manhattan at Battery Park City's Site 2B. When built, this space will accommodate 952 seats. Finally, the plan has allocated funding for a 501-seat leased space; the site is yet to be determined.

Together, it is anticipated that these new projects would provide an additional 3,890 elementary/intermediate school seats, either fully funded in the 2005-2009 Plan or partially funded in the 2005-2009 Plan with completion expected in the 2010-2014 Capital Plan (including seats identified as mitigation for the Hudson Yards/Special West Chelsea rezoning). School seats that have not been sited, are not under construction or have finalized construction contracts, or will be provided for in a future capital plan, are not included in the quantitative analysis. However, the proposed seats would help alleviate the projected shortage

of seats in CSD 2. Schools included in the quantitative analysis would increase the existing capacity of CSD 2 by approximately 941 elementary and intermediate seats by 2011.

Estimates of future enrollments are derived from DOE enrollment projections series (Actual 2006, Projected 2007 to 2015). These enrollment projections include Pre-K enrollments. The enrollment projections are based actual enrollments for 2006; birth data is factored into the projections as well. DOE projects enrollments by school district 10 years out. In the future without the proposed action, DOE projections show that demand for both public elementary and intermediate schools is expected to increase approximately 7.7 percent to 15,957 elementary students and approximately 2.7 percent to 6,412 intermediate students by 2011.

As a whole, CSD 2 is projected to experience an approximate 5.2 percent enrollment increase to 22,369 elementary and intermediate students by 2011.

Additionally, significant new residential development has been planned in the project study area by the Build year of 2011 (see Table 4-4a). These residential developments would include a combination of low-income and market rate units and are further described in Table 2-4 of Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy." As shown in Table 4-4a, these No-Build developments are expected to increase the housing stock in the study area by up to 2,523 DUs in the future without the proposed action, of which 535 would be low/moderate/middle-income units and 1,988 would be market-rate units. (Dwelling units planned for low-moderate income senior citizens (Encore West, 85 DUs and Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion project, 148 DUs for seniors), are not reflected in these totals since they are not expected to generate public school pupils.)

The number of students estimated to be generated under the Future without the Proposed Action in Manhattan were calculated based on the CEQR Technical Manual ratios (0.12 elementary school students per DU, 0.04 for intermediate school students per DU, and 0.06 for high school students per DU) and are shown in Table 4-4b. New housing units developed in the future without the proposed action would generate 303 elementary level students and 101 intermediate level students, for a total of 404 new elementary/intermediate students in the study area.

In the future without the proposed action, DOE projects total CSD 2 enrollment, including pre-kindergarten, to be approximately 22,369 students by 2011. Factoring in the 404 new students generated from anticipated residential development in the study area, CSD 2 enrollment is expected to increase to a total of approximately 22,773 students in 2011 Future without the Proposed Action.

As shown in Table 4-5, the elementary schools in the study area would be operating over capacity (112 percent) with a shortage of 193 seats. Zone 3 would be operating at 98 percent utilization with 66 seats available in 2011. Intermediate/secondary schools in Zone 3 would be operating at 99 percent utilization with 9 seats available. Collectively, elementary schools within CSD 2 would be operating at 107 percent capacity, with a shortage of 1,006 seats in the future without the proposed action, and intermediate schools within CSD 2 would be operating at 87 percent utilization, with 985 available seats. CSD 2 as a whole would operate

at approximately 100 percent capacity, with a shortfall of 21 seats, in 2011 without the proposed action.

Table 4-4a
Residential Developments in Study Area: 2011 Future Without the Proposed Action

No.	Project Name/Location	Total DUs	Market Rate DUs	Low/Moderate/ Middle Income DUs	Year
1	Encore West*	85*	0	85*	2007
2	The Old School & The Flats	86	0	86	2007
3	The Hit Factory Condominium	27	27	0	2007
4	540 W. 50th St.	29	29	0	2007
5	10 West End Ave.	179	179	0	2007
6	Archstone Clinton	633	508	125	2008
7	501-505 W. 51st Street Phase I	12	0	12	2008
8	Element	198	198	0	2008
9	Centro 505	109	109	0	2009
10	405 W. 53rd St.	85	85	0	2009
11	Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion*	342	122	220	2009
12	462 W. 58th St.	67	67	0	2009
13	501-505 W. 51st Street Phase II	10	0	10	2009
14	Real Estate Industrials, Inc. Project	148	118	30	2009
15	Helena II	450	450	0	2010
16	533-541 W. 52nd St.	100	0	100	2011
17	530-548 W. 53rd St.	100	0	100	2011
18	460 W. 54th St.	96	96	0	2011
Total DUs in 2011 Future with No Action		**2,523***	**1,988**	**535***	
Estimated Residents Resulting from Developments[1]		**Total Residents**	**Market Rate Residents**	**Low/Moderate/ Middle Income Residents**	**Year**
		4,598*	**3,260**	**1,338***	2011

Sources: See Table 2-4
(1) Market rate household size: 1.64, from Manhattan Community District 4 - 2000 average; Low/ Moderate/Middle Income household size: 2.5, from Hudson Yards EIS & W. Chelsea EIS rates for below-market rate units.
** Encore West is listed for informational purposes only; it is a senior citizen residential development and assumed to generate no public school pupils. Based on project plans, 148 of the affordable housing units for the Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion project are expected to be senior citizen units. The low/moderate/middle income residential total does not include the Encore West DUs or the 148 senior citizen DUs at the Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion..*

Table 4-4b
Estimated Number of New School-aged Children for Year 2011: Without the Proposed Action

	Total Units [1]	Projected Elementary Students	Projected Intermediate Students	Total Students Generated
	2,523*	**303**	**101**	**404**

(1) Based on No-Build developments as shown in Table 4-8a
(2) Based on Fall 2008 CEQR Technical Manual, Table 3C-2: Manhattan (0.12 – Elementary, 0.04 – Intermediate, 0.06 – High School).
** As per note above, does not include senior housing at Encore West or Harborview Terrace Expansion Project.*

Table 4-5
Estimated Public School Utilization, Capacity and Enrollment Figures for Year 2011: Future Without the Proposed Action

	2011 Projected Enrollment (w/ Pre-K)*	New Students Generated by No-Build Developments	Future Without Proposed Action Projected Enrollment	Projected Capacity**	Seats Available	Utilization (%)
Elementary/K-8 Schools						
Study Area	1,562	303	1,865	1,672	-193	112%
Zone 3	2,448	303	2,751	2,817	66	98%
Total CSD 2	15,957	303	16,260	15,254	-1,006	107%
Intermediate/Secondary Schools						
Zone 3	1,077	101	1,178	1,187	9	99%
CSD 2	6,412	101	6,513	7,498	985	87%
Total CSD 2	**22,369**	404	**22,773**	**22,752**	**-21**	**100%**

** Projected enrollment for the Study Area and Zone 3 was calculated by applying the CSD 2 elementary percent change from 2006-2011 (7.7%) to the 2006-207 enrollment for the listed CSD 2 schools in Table 4-3, and the CSD 3 elementary percent change from 2006-2011 (-7.2%) to P.S. 191. For intermediate schools, the CSD 2 percent change (2.7%) was applied to the 2006-2007 enrollment for the listed schools to estimated projected enrollment in 2011.*
*** Projected CSD 2 Elementary Capacity includes P.S. 234 Annex (143 seats), Beekman School (441 seats - 70% of total 630 seats); P.S. 59 at MEETH addition (168 seats). Projected CSD 2 Intermediate Capacity includes Beekman School (189 seats - 30% of total 630 seats)*

FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a proposed action would cause an increase of five percent or more in a deficiency of available seats in the affected schools of the study area, a significant impact may result. Based on the updated CEQR pupil generation rates promulgated in Fall 2008, the reasonable worst-case development scenario (900 DUs) would generate approximately 198 school-aged children of which 108 would be elementary students and 36 would be middle school students (See Table 4-6).

Table 4-6
Estimated Number of New School-aged Children as a Result of the Proposed Action

	Total Units Introduced as Result of Proposed Action	Projected Elementary Students	Projected Intermediate Students	Projected High School Students	Total Students Generated
Total	**900**	**108**	**36**	**54**	**198**

(1) Based on Fall 2008 CEQR Technical Manual, Table 3C-2: Manhattan (0.12 – Elementary, 0.04 – Intermediate, 0.06 – High School).

Table 4-7 shows the changes to school capacity and utilization rates in the study area and CSD 2 as a result of the proposed action. The additional 108 elementary school children would bring the total number of elementary students within the study area to 1,973 and increase utilization to 118 percent, with a shortage of 301 seats. Elementary capacity would increase to approximately 101 percent, with a shortage of 42 seats in Zone 3, and increase to 107 percent capacity with a shortage of 1,114 seats in CSD 2 as a whole. The additional projected 36 intermediate students would also increase the total intermediate utilization of Zone 3 to 102 percent, with a shortage of 27 seats and increase the total intermediate

utilization of CSD 2 to 87 percent, with 949 seats available. There would be a total shortage of approximately 165 elementary and intermediate seats in CSD 2 in the future with the proposed action, and the district would operate at 101 percent of capacity.

Table 4-7
Estimated Public School Utilization, Capacity and Enrollment Figures for Year 2011: Future With the Proposed Action

	No- Build 2011 Projected Enrollment (with Pre-K)	New Students Generated by Proposed Action	Future With Proposed Action Enrollment	Program Capacity	Seats Available	Utilization (%)	% Percent Increase from No-Build
Elementary Schools							
Study Area	1,865	108	1,973	1,672	-301	118%	6%
Zone 3	2,751	108	2,859	2,817	-42	101%	3%
Total CSD 2	16,260	108	16,368	15,254	-1,114	107%	0%
Intermediate Schools							
Zone 3	1,178	36	1,214	1,187	-27	102%	3%
Total CSD 2	6,513	36	6,549	7,498	949	87%	0%
Total CSD 2	**22,773**	**144**	**22,917**	**22,752**	**-165**	**101%**	**1%**

ASSESSMENT

The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that if the impact assessment finds that the proposed action would cause an increase of 5 percent or more in deficiency of available seats in the affected schools (generally those within the study area or "region"), a significant impact may result warranting consideration of mitigation.

With the proposed action, the demand for elementary school seats within a half-mile radius of the project site would increase compared to No-Build conditions from 112 to 118 percent of capacity. This would represent an approximately 6-percentage point increase in the deficiency of available seats. In Zone 3 as a whole, utilization would increase from 98 percent to 101 percent, a 3 percentage point increase. Similarly, for intermediate schools in Zone 3 as a whole, utilization would increase from 99 percent to 102 percent, also a 3-percentage point increase.

Reflecting the relatively small number of students generated by the proposed project as compared to the entire community school district, the utilization rate for elementary and intermediate schools would remain at 107 and 87 percent respectively under Build conditions, in CSD 2 as a whole.

In accordance with CEQR guidelines, since the proposed action would cause a 6.46 percent increase in the deficiency of available elementary school seats within a half-mile radius of the project site, it would result in a significant adverse elementary schools impact in the study area.

In order for the applicant to avoid a significant adverse impact, the project would have to be reduced to 675 units, which would generate 81 elementary students. An increase of 81

elementary students in the study area would exacerbate the existing shortfall by 4.9% and would be below the CEQR threshold that would be considered a significant adverse impact. With the FEIS' assumption of 900 units, the project would generate 108 elementary students. The difference between the CEQR threshold for significance and the proposed action results in a shortfall of 27 students.

Possible mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact are discussed in Chapter 19, "Mitigation."

D. LIBRARIES

METHODOLOGY

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, generally, if a proposed action would increase the study area population by five percent or more over no action levels, and this increase would impair the delivery of library services in the study area, a significant impact could occur, warranting consideration of mitigation.

This libraries analysis is prepared using an existing conditions analysis year of 2008. The analysis employs a Build analysis year of 2011. In the future without the proposed action, the analysis assumes that the project site would be vacant and this serves as the baseline for comparing the effects of the proposed project on libraries. The analysis identifies the study area population under existing, No-Build, and Build conditions. The number of library holdings available in study area libraries is also identified and used to calculate a holdings per resident ratio. This ratio is compared with the system-wide ratio for the New York Public Library (NYPL) system. The analysis also considers the percentage increase in the study area population and compares it to impact threshold identified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Potential impacts on libraries may result from an increased user population. A noticeable change in service delivery is likely to occur if a project introduces a large residential population (i.e. greater than a five percent increase in housing units served). As noted earlier, and defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* if a proposed action would increase the average number of residential units served by local library branches in Manhattan by more than 5 percent (901 dwelling units), the proposed project may cause significant impacts on library services and further analysis of the impact of the proposed action is warranted. It should be noted that this 5 percent (901 DUs) was taken from the most recent edition of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, published in 2001. While there has been an increase in total residential units in the borough of Manhattan since 2001, which would consequently increase the five percent of residential units to total more than 901 DUs, for the most conservative analysis, the 901 DUs threshold has been used.

As shown in Figure 4-1, there are three public libraries within the library analysis study area, an approximate three-quarter mile radius from the project site.

The recent residential developments in the study area since 2000 have increased the population of the study area. These developments were previously noted in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," and Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," and would generate approximately 2,226 new DUs (1,601 market rate and 625 low/moderate/middle income) and approximately 4,180 new residents. In addition, to account for other developments and general trends, a 0.5 percent per year background growth rate is applied to the study area's 2000 census population of 88,041, which adds approximately 3,584 residents. Accordingly, the existing 2008 population of the library study area, including developments completed since 2000, is approximately 95,815 residents.

Library Facilities

As noted earlier, the *CEQR Technical Manual* defines neighborhood library branches service areas based on the distance that residents would travel to use library services, which is typically not more than three-quarters of a mile. The New York Public Library (NYPL) system includes 85 neighborhood branches and four research libraries located in Manhattan, the Bronx, and on Staten Island, housing approximately 53 million volumes. (Queens and Brooklyn have separate library systems.) Libraries provide books, information services, written documents, audio/visual references, and educational services to their surrounding communities. Besides the three branch libraries, Columbus Library, Riverside Library and the Library for the Performing Arts, located within the project site three-quarter mile radius, the Donnell Library Center, at 20 W. 53rd Street (between Fifth and Sixth Avenues) is located just outside radius. However, the Donnell Library Center does not include the project site in its three-quarter mile catchment area and is not included in further analysis. In addition, it should be noted that residents could go to any NYPL branch and order books from any of the other branches.

Columbus Library

The Columbus Library Branch ("Columbus Branch") is the closest public library to the project site and has a branch collection of 32,840 holdings[1], with an annual circulation of 56,625.[2] Columbus Branch is located in Clinton at 742 Tenth Avenue (between W. 50th and W. 51st Streets), approximately three blocks southeast of the project site in Manhattan Community District 4. It has circulating books in English and Spanish; books on tape, audiocassette, and videocassette collections, story hours and special programs for children; crafts, drama and music programs for young adults; reference collections, including a Clinton/Hell's Kitchen history file; personal computers and Internet access; and lectures, tours, films and music for adults. Facilities are open six days a week and closed on Sundays.

The Columbus Branch opened in 1909, but has since been rehabilitated in the 1960s, leaving only one floor operating from the 1970s to 2004. After the most recent renovation, the library

1 *Holdings data cited for branches in this chapter are dated January 2008 and provided by DCP, HEIP. Holdings include books, DVDs, CD-roms, and videotapes.*

[2] *Circulation statistics for branches in this chapter are from Fiscal Year July 2005 – June 2006; source: Columbus Branch Library staff.*

reopened in 2005 with major changes that included a complete redesign and reconfiguration of the interior public service areas, restoration of the second floor as a dedicated children's reading room, including a separate story hour room, and a new elevator serving all floors. The Columbus Branch is fully wheelchair-accessible.

Given its location, it is expected that the Columbus Branch would be the primary library facility serving residents generated by the proposed action.

Riverside Library

The Riverside Branch Library ("Riverside Branch") is located in Manhattan Community District 7, at 127 Amsterdam Avenue (at W. 65th Street), just north of Lincoln Center.

This library branch has approximately 61,715 holdings, with a total annual circulation of 271,468. Like Columbus, the Riverside Branch is open six days a week (currently Monday through Saturday). It offers a variety of programs for children and adults including workshops, live performances, books and cassettes for children, as well as books-on-tape and book discussion groups for adults. The library also has free public Internet access and public computers.

Riverside became a branch of the NYPL in 1905 at 190 Amsterdam Avenue, in a building constructed with funds from Andrew Carnegie. The branch was replaced with a modern building in 1969 at the same site and in 1992, re-opened in a new building at its current location at 127 Amsterdam Avenue. The main floor features extensive collections for adults and teenagers. The Children's Room on the second floor combines materials from the Riverside Branch with the specialized children's collections formerly housed at The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts.

This facility is expected to serve as a secondary facility for most residents generated by the proposed action, as residents of the proposed mixed-use development would live closer to the Columbus Branch than the Riverside Branch. However, the assessment of the proposed action's demand for library services would still include the Riverside Branch Library as it is within the library catchment area.

New York Public Library for the Performing Arts

The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts ("LPA") is a Central Library of the NYPL, housed in the Dorothy and Lewis B. Cullman Center in Lincoln Center. The LPA offers a combination of circulating and non-circulating reference and research materials on music, dance, theatre, recorded sound, and other performing arts, particularly non-book materials such as historic recordings, videotapes, autograph manuscripts, correspondence, sheet music, stage designs, press clippings, programs, posters and photographs. Materials and programs are available free of charge, including exhibitions, seminars, and performances. The LPA offers 205,078 holdings, with at total annual circulation of 480,688. Approximately 9 million resource items, including musical scores, artistic papers, and other performing arts

literature are also available for at the library non-circulation research purposes.[3] The library also contains public computers, Internet access and is wheelchair-accessible.

Subdivisions of LPA include the Jerome Robbins Dance Division; Rodgers and Hammerstein Archives of Recorded Sound; The Billy Rose Theatre Collection; and The Music Division. All of these components are also wheelchair-accessible and open five days a week, closed on Sundays and Mondays, as is the main LPA.

This facility is also not expected to serve as a primary facility for most residents generated by the proposed action, since Columbus Branch is in closer proximity, similar to the reasons given for the Riverside Branch. In addition, LPA is a more specialized library, containing performing arts materials, and would likely be used less for general reference purposes. Therefore, the assessment of the proposed action's demand for library services does not focus on the LPA.

Holdings per Resident

The Columbus, Riverside, and LPA branches have combined holdings of 299,633 items. With an existing 2008 population of 95,815 residents, the study area has 3.13 volumes per resident. By comparison, the NYPL branch library system has a total holdings collection of approximately 7,601,853 and the total population of the three boroughs it serves is approximately 3,313,573. As a result, the system has a volumes-to-resident ratio of 2.3 to 1.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION

In the future without the proposed action through 2011, no major renovations are expected to occur at the any of the libraries within the project site study area. As the Columbus branch was recently re-opened in 2005, there are not likely to be any new additions to the building or collections by 2011. Lincoln Center is currently undergoing renovations that would include refurbished theaters, expanded public spaces, expansion of the Juilliard School, new fountain, and a two-level arrival point, however, the LPA would not be affected or altered due to these developments.

As previously noted in this chapter, there is a significant amount of new residential development expected to occur by 2011 that would change the population within the library catchment area. This would include the No-Action developments summarized in Table 4-4a.[4] Developments completed from 2008 to 2011 would result in 2,350 new dwelling units, including 148 senior citizen units not included in the schools analysis. As a result of these No-Action developments, the residential population in the study area is expected to increase by approximately 4,043 new residents. All of these new residents would be located within the library catchment area. In addition, due to general increases accounted for by applying a 0.5 percent per year background growth to the 2008 existing population, there is expected to be

[3] *Source: PHA phone survey with Library for the Performing Arts staff, April 18, 2007.*

[4] Table 4-4a includes projects completed in 2007 that are considered No-Build projects only for the school analysis. Those 5 developments are already accounted for in the existing 2008 population for the library study area cited above.

an additional population increase of 1,444 residents by 2011. As a result, there is expected to be a total increase of 5,487 residents. Some residents living in the 462 W. 58th Street developments in the future without the proposed action may also utilize the Riverside Library Branch, as it is located about the same distance from these No-Build developments as the Columbus Branch. The 5,487 new residents would represent an increase in population of approximately 5.7 percent over the existing population of 95,815 in the library catchment area, raising the study area population to 101,302 under 2011 No-Build conditions.

Holdings per Resident

For analysis purposes, the number of volumes in the study area libraries is assumed to remain the same in 2011, with 299,633 volumes. With a 2011 No-Build population of 101, 302 residents, the study area holdings per resident ratio is expected to decrease from 3.13 volumes per resident to 2.96 volumes per resident.

FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION

As previously noted, the proposed action would result in a net increase of 900 DUs to the study area, 720 at market rate and 180 low/moderate/middle income units. These 900 units are expected to generate an estimated 1,631 new residents to the study area by 2011 as a result of the proposed action (see Table 4-8). This estimate of new residents is calculated by multiplying the number of market rate units by 1.64 persons, which is the average household size for Manhattan Community District 4. For low-moderate income units, standard planning assumptions were used to calculate the average household size, by multiplying the number of units is by 2.5 persons.

Table 4-8
New Residents Introduced to Study Area in the Future: 2011 With Proposed Action

Proposed DUs	Market Rate	Low/Moderate/ Middle Income
900	720	180
New Residents Generated as part of Proposed Action	1,181	450
Total New Residents in Study Area	**1,631**	

** Proposed DUs are 80% Market Rate, 20% Low/Moderate/Middle Income units; residential calculations use 1.64 persons per market rate unit and 2.5 persons per low/moderate/middle income unit.*

The approximately 1,631 new residents expected to be generated by the proposed action would comprise an increase of approximately 1.6 percent to the study area population by 2011 over the No-Build condition, less than the CEQR threshold for impact significance.

Holdings per Resident

The approximately 1,631 new residents expected to be generated by the proposed action would increase the study area population to 102,933 residents. With 299,633 holdings at study area libraries, the holdings per resident ratio would decrease from 2.96 under No-Build conditions to 2.91 under Build conditions.

Assessment

The holdings per resident ratio for the study area libraries with the proposed action would be 2.91 to 1, and would remain above the system-wide ratio of 2.3 to 1 for the NYPL branch libraries. Accordingly, the proposed action is therefore not expected to have any adverse impacts on library services within the study area.

E. PUBLIC DAY CARE

The *CEQR Technical Manual* requires a detailed analysis of day care centers when a proposed action would produce substantial numbers of subsidized, low-to-moderate income family housing units that could generate a sufficient number of eligible children to affect the availability of slots at public day care centers. Typically, proposed actions that generate 50 or more eligible children require further analysis. Table 3C-4 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, updated in fall 2008, calculates by borough the estimated number of affordable (low or low-to moderate-income) housing units that could yield at least 50 children eligible for publicly financed child care. According to the table, 148 affordable housing units in Manhattan would yield more than 50 children eligible for public day care. Impacts are identified if an action would result in demand for slots in publicly funded day care centers greater than remaining capacity, and the increase in demand would be five percent or more over the collective capacity of the day care centers in the future without the proposed action.

With 900 units, of which approximately 180 units would be affordable housing units (low-to-moderate income for analysis purposes), the proposed project would generate up to approximately 38 children under the age of six and 23 children aged 6-12, for a combined total of 61 children eligible for publicly funded day care. As this value exceeds the CEQR threshold, a detailed assessment is provided below.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Publicly funded day care for the children of income-eligible households in New York City is sponsored and financially supported by the Division of Child Care and Head Start, within the New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS), and Head Start, federally funded early childhood education and family support programs. ACS contracts with hundreds of private, non-profit organizations to provide Child Care and Head Start programs in communities across the City that are licensed by the New York City Department of Health

(DOHMH). ACS also issues vouchers to eligible families to provide financial assistance in accessing care from formal and informal providers in the City.

To receive subsidized child care services, a family must meet specific financial and social eligibility criteria that are determined by federal, state, and local regulations. Eligibility is determined by a child's age, (0-13) and a family's gross income, with consideration of family size. To meet the social eligibility for publicly funded day care, a family must also have an approved "reason for care," such as involvement in a child welfare case or participation in a "welfare-to-work" program.

ACS supports subsidized child care in several types of facilities including center-based group day care, Head Start, family and group family child care, and informal child care. Key characteristics of these services include:

* Group Day Care: delivered for children in child care centers contracted by ACS, licensed by the NYC Department of Health (DOHMH), and staffed by certified teachers.
* Head Start: a federally funded child care program that has, since its inception, provided parents with part-day child care services. In New York City, Head Start programs administrated by ACS serve more than 17,000 preschool-age children (ages 3 to 5) from low-income families.
* Group Family Child Care: in which up to 7 to 12 children are placed under the care of a registered or licensed provider and an assistant in a home setting, and are licensed by DOHMH.

  Family Child Care: in which family child care providers, who are professionals, provide care for three to seven children in their residences, and are licensed by DOHMH.
* Informal Child Care: is usually provided by a relative or neighbor for a maximum of two children.

Since there are no locational requirements for enrollment in day care centers, and some parents/guardians choose a day care center close to their employment rather than their residence, the service areas of these facilities can be quite large and not subject to strict delineation to identify a study area. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the locations of publicly funded group day care centers within a mile or so of the project site should be shown since, as discussed in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the center(s) closest to the project site are more likely to be subject to increased demand.

Figure 4-4 shows publicly funded day care and Head Start facilities within a one-mile radius of the proposed rezoning area, and Table 4-9 indicates the capacity and enrollment for each facility for pre-school children, as well as the available slots where applicable. As shown in Table 4-9 and Figure 4-4, there are presently three publicly funded or partially publicly funded day care facilities as well as one Head Start facility within a one-mile radius of the project site. The four day care and Head Start facilities within the study area have a combined total capacity of approximately 345 slots, with a current enrollment of 285, and a utilization rate of approximately 83 percent, resulting in 60 available slots (see Table 4-9)

Table 4-9, Public Day Care Centers & Head Start Facilities in 1-Mile Radius Study Area

#	Program Name	Program Address	Budget Capacity	Enroll-ment	Available Slots	Percent Utilized
	DAY CARE CENTERS					
1	YWCA Polly Dodge Center	538 W. 55th St.	83	86	-3	104%
2	Hartley House FDC	413 W. 46th St.	147	120	27	82%
3	Lincoln Sq. Neighborhood/M.B. Fitzgerald	243 W. 64th St.	68	49	19	72%
	HEAD START CENTERS					
4	Bank Street	410 W. 40th St.	47	30	17	64%
		Totals	**345**	**285**	**60**	83%

Facility number (#) keyed to Figure 4-4
Source: Data provided by NYC ACS (October 2008 and January 2009)
Note: Budget Capacity, Enrollment, and Available Slots do not include school age children.

As noted above, in addition to group day care centers, there are many family and group family child care providers in New York City. The majority of them are registered with a child care network, which provides access to training and support services. In 2007, the Manhattan Family Day Care Networks had a collective capacity of 2,244 slots (see Table 4-10).

Table 4-10, Manhattan Family Day Care Networks

Network Name	Network Address	Capacity/ Slots	Zip Codes Served
Career Bridge Family Day Care	1854 Amsterdam Ave	100	10031, 32, 33
CHAMA Child Development Family Day	218 West 147th Street	60	10030, 39
East Harlem Council Family Day Care	2253 Third Avenue	138	10027, 29, 34, 35, 37, 10128
Emmanuel Family Day Care	737 East 6th Street	50	10002, 03, 09
Graham Windham Family Day Care	540 Atlantic Avenue	130	10026, 27, 29. 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40
Hamilton Madison Family Day Care	60 Catherine Street	118	10002, 13, 38
Hartley House Family Day Care	413 West 46th Street	213	10019, 23, 24, 25, 36
Hudson Guild Family Day Care	441 West 26th Street	47	10001, 11
Neighborhood Children's Center	1833 Lexington Avenue	42	10029, 35
New York Foundling Family Day Care	1029 East 163rd Street	250	10029, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40
Northern Manhattan Improvement Corp	76 Wadsworth Avenue	30	10032, 33, 34, 40
RENA Family Day Care	639 Edgecombe Avenue	214	10031, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40
Salem Family Day Care	211 West 129th Street	62	10027, 29, 31, 35
Sheltering Arms Family Day Care	2493 Seventh Avenue	479	10016, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40
Union Settlement Family Day Care	237 East 104th Street	95	10029, 35
University Settlement Family Child Care	184 Eldridge Street	216	10002, 03, 38
	Total	2,244	

Source: http://www.dc37.net/about/services/pdfs/ACSFamilyDayCareZipcodeList7_2007.pdf

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION

In the 2011 future without the proposed project, approximately 449 affordable housing units (assumed to be low-to-moderate income units for analysis purposes) are anticipated to be developed in the study area. Based on the fall 2008 update of *CEQR Technical Manual* Table 3C-4, these affordable units would generate 94 children under the age of 6 eligible for publicly funded day care services. Refer to Table 4-11. As such, demand for publicly financed day care and Head Start slots in the study area would increase as result of these new developments under No-Build conditions and demand would exceed the current the current budget capacity by 34 slots. As such, demand would represent 110 percent of capacity. For analysis purposes, there are no anticipated changes in study area capacity. Refer to Table 4-12.

Table 4-11, No-Build Development-Generated Day Care Slots

# (1)	Project Name/ Location	Low-Mod-Middle Income DUs (2)	Multiplier per DU		Generated Children			
			Children < age 6	Children 6 - 12	Children < age 6	Children 6 - 12		Total Children
1	Archstone Clinton	125	-	-	-	-	-	
2	501-505 W. 51 St. Phase I	12	-	-	-	-	-	
7	Harborview Terrace Houses Expansion (2)	72	-	-	-	-	-	
10	501-505 W. 51 St. Phase II	10	-	-	-	-	-	
11	REI/Red Cross Project	30	-	-	-	-	-	
18	533-41 W. 52nd St.	100	-	-	-	-	-	
19	530-548 W. 53rd St.	100	-	-	-	-	-	
-	**Total, No-Build Affordable Units**	**449**	**0.21**	**0.13**	**94**	**58**		**152**

(1) Refer to Chapter 2, Table 2-4 for key of No-Build Sites (see also Table 4-4a)

(2) Based on project plans, Harborview Terrace Houses project is expected to include 220 affordable housing DUs of which 148 DUs would be senior citizen units not included in this table.

Table 4-12, No-Build Conditions

-	Budget Capacity	Enrollment	Available Slots	Percent Utilized
Existing Conditions (from Table 4-9)	345	285	60	83%
No-Build Increment (from Table 4-11)	0	94	-	-
No-Build Conditions	345	379	-34	110%

Note: Budget Capacity, Enrollment, and Available Slots do not include school age children.
The analysis does not include application of a background growth rate.

Based on the fall 2008 update of *CEQR Technical Manual* Table 3C-4, the addition of 449 affordable DUs would also generate 58 children aged 6-12 eligible for publicly subsidized care. Because these children are expected to be attending school during most of the day, their need would be for after-school care. Eligible children who qualify for ACS vouchers or other programming for after school care could be served by Family Child Care Networks or school-age slots in ACS contracted day care facilities, the City's Department of Youth and Community Development's (DYCD) Out of School Time programs, and/or DOE approved after school programs.

FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION

As discussed above, the *CEQR Technical Manual* requires a detailed analysis of day care centers when a proposed action would produce substantial numbers of subsidized, low-to-moderate income family housing units that may therefore generate a sufficient number of eligible children to affect the availability of slots at public day care centers. By 2011, as a result of the proposed action, up to approximately 180 affordable housing units would be added to the study area, which are expected to be eligible for subsidized day care. Based on the fall 2008 update of *CEQR Technical Manual* Table 3C-4, these affordable units would generate 38 children under the age of 6 eligible for publicly funded day care services. Refer to Table 4-2. As such, demand for publicly financed day care and Head Start slots in the study area would increase as result of the proposed action. The proposed action would not increase the capacity of publicly funded day care.

Under 2011 Build conditions, with the 38 pre-school age children eligible for public day care, study area demand would exceed the current the current budget capacity by 72 slots. As such, demand would represent 121 percent of capacity. Refer to Table 4-13.

Table 4-13, Build Conditions

	Budget Capacity	Enrollment	Available Slots	Percent Utilized
No-Build Conditions (from Table 4-12)	345	379	-34	110%
Build Increment (from Table 4-2)	0	38		
Build Conditions	345	417	-72	121%

Note: Budget Capacity, Enrollment, and Available Slots does not include school age children.

The addition of 180 affordable (low and low-and moderate-income) DUs would also generate 23 children aged 6-12 eligible for publicly subsidized care. As noted in the No-Action condition, because these children are expected to be attending school during most of the day, their need would be for after-school care and as such, are not included in the public day care analysis.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact could result if a proposed action results in: 1) a demand for slots greater than remaining capacity of day care centers, and 2) that demand constitutes an increase of 5 percent or more of the collective

capacity of the day care centers serving the study area over the No-Action condition. The proposed action would add approximately 38 children eligible for subsidized day care to the study area, causing a shortage of 72 slots, and would cause an 11 percent increase in demand over the existing capacity of day care facilities in the study area. Therefore, the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded day care facilities warranting consideration of mitigation.

This potential increase in demand could be offset by a number of factors. Private day care facilities and day care centers outside of the study area (e.g., closer to parent's place of work) are not included in this analysis. Some of the increased day care demand would likely be offset by parents who choose to take their children to day care centers outside of the study area (e.g., closer to work). Some of the Family Day Care Networks serve children residing in the study area and could potentially absorb some of the demand.

Possible mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact include adding capacity to existing facilities if determined feasible through consultation with the ACS or providing a new day care facility within or near the development parcel. The applicant consulted the ACS regarding potential mitigation measures to address the identified impact. Possible mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact are discussed in Chapter 19, "Mitigation."

F. CONCLUSION

The proposed action was assessed for the effects of its projected development on community facilities and services. A screening analysis found that the proposed action exceeds thresholds for detailed analysis of elementary and intermediate schools, and was near the threshold for detailed analysis of public libraries. The proposed action did not exceed the threshold for a detailed analysis for hospitals and health facilities, fire protection services or police protection services.

Based on a detailed analysis of public elementary and intermediate schools and public libraries within the project site study areas for the respective facilities, no significant adverse impacts for intermediate schools or public libraries were found as a result of the proposed action by 2011. While additional demand was found for both intermediate schools and libraries, the existing facilities and anticipated future developments would be able to adequately absorb the new intermediate school children and residents generated in the future Build Condition. However, a significant adverse impact was found for elementary schools within the study area. The DEIS identified the potential for significant adverse day care impacts but did not quantify the effects of the proposed project as new generation ratios for calculating the number of day care eligible children per dwelling unit were pending at the time of the release of the DEIS. Following issuance of the DEIS, the daycare analysis was updated using new CEQR ratios and the analysis resulted in a significant adverse impact. Chapter 19, "Mitigation," discusses possible mitigation measures for the elementary schools and daycare significant adverse impacts.