DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

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

October 18, 2013

NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF
THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
606 West 57th Street

Project Identification
CEQR No. 13DCP080M
ULURP Nos. 130336 ZMM, 130340 ZAM, 130339 ZSM, 130338 ZSM, and 130337 ZRM
SEQRA Classification: Type I

Lead Agency
City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street, Room1W
New York, New York 10007

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

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the DEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). A public hearing on the DEIS will be held at a later date to be announced, in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's citywide public hearing pursuant to ULURP. Advance notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. Written comments on the DEIS are requested and would be received and considered by the Lead Agency until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing.

INTRODUCTION

606 W. 57 LLC (the "applicant") proposes a rezoning of a portion (Lots 25, 29, 31, 36, 40, 44 and 55) of Manhattan block 1104, which is bounded by West 56th and West 57th Streets and Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues (the "affected area" or "project block"), along with related land use actions that include text amendments, a special permit and a zoning authorization. The affected area is located within the "Other Area" (Northern Subarea C1) in the Special Clinton District (described in more detail below) of Manhattan Community District 4. The proposed actions, which are described in detail below, would facilitate the development of a new, mixed use building of up to approximately 1.2 million gross square feet (gsf) on the parcels that are controlled by the applicant (the "proposed project site," or "development site 1").

The proposed actions are being requested to facilitate the applicant's proposed development, which consists of a mixed use building containing up to 1,189 residential apartments, ground-floor local retail uses up to 42,000 gsf, and up to 500 below-grade parking spaces (or an alternate garage configuration that would provide up to 395 spaces). Twenty percent of residential units (up to 238 units) would be affordable housing. These uses would be housed on the proposed project site, which consists of Block 1104 Lots 31, 40, 44, and 55 ("development site 1").

The proposed actions are also expected to result in redevelopment of one additional site that is not applicant-controlled (Block 1104 Lots 25 and 29—"development site 2") with an approximately 117,612 gsf hotel.

It is anticipated that development would be complete by 2017.

Development of the proposed project requires approvals from the City Planning Commission (CPC) for the following discretionary actions:

- Rezoning of a portion of the block bounded by West 56th Street, West 57th Street, Eleventh Avenue and Twelfth Avenue in Manhattan from the existing M2-3 and M1-5 districts to a C4-7 commercial district. The "rezoning area" includes Lots 25, 29, 31, 36, 40, 44 and 55 on Block 1104. It should be noted that Lots 31, 40, 44 and 55 are applicant owned ("development site 1"), while the applicant does not control the "outparcels" on Lots 25 and 29 ("development site 2") or lot 36.
- An amendment to Zoning Resolution (ZR) Appendix F to designate the rezoning area an Inclusionary Housing (IH)-designated area.
- A text amendment to ZR §96-34, applicable to the rezoning area in the "Other Area" (Northern Subarea C1) in the Special Clinton District, to provide that 20 percent of the residential floor area on the proposed project site be reserved for affordable housing to achieve the bonus which facilitates more than one floor of commercial uses, and to allow an automotive showroom with repairs, applicable to the rezoning area in the "Other Area" (Northern Subarea C1) in the Special Clinton District. A copy of the proposed zoning text is included as Appendix A.
- A special permit pursuant to ZR §13-45 for a public parking garage that would contain up to 500 spaces, or, depending on the ground floor uses, up to 395 spaces.
- Authorization pursuant to ZR §13-441 to permit a curb cut on a wide street in Manhattan Community District 4.

In addition, the applicant may apply for the New York State Housing Finance Agency's (HFA) "80/20" program to finance the affordable housing component.

These are discretionary actions that are subject to environmental review. The Department of City Planning (DCP), acting on behalf of CPC, is the lead agency for the environmental review. The environmental review will be coordinated with the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), which will be responsible for reviewing and approving the applicant's Inclusionary Housing Program Affordable Housing Plan, and may be coordinated with HFA.

The lead agency has determined that the proposed actions may potentially result in significant adverse environmental impacts, and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required[1]. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared in accordance with Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and New York City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Rules and Procedures adopted in 1991 (62 Rules of the City of New York, Chapter 5). The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* is generally used as a guide with respect to environmental analysis methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the proposed actions, unless otherwise stated.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS ON THE PROJECT BLOCK

Proposed Project Site (Development Site 1)

The proposed project site totals approximately 83,303 square feet of lot area and as previously mentioned consists of Block 1104, Lots 31, 40, 44 and 55. Lots 31 and 40 are currently developed with low-rise structures and open service areas (vehicle handling, pick-up and short-term storage) that are used by Lexus and Acura for auto sales and service. Lot 44 is a four-story parking garage with a licensed capacity of 1,000 spaces. Lot 55 includes a one-story auto repair shop.

Remainder of Rezoning Area

As stated above, there are three "outparcels" located within the affected area (Lots 25, 29 and 36) that are not controlled by the applicant. The two lots located at the southeast corner of the block (Lots 25 and 29—development site 2) are under common ownership, and total approximately 10,700 square feet; the two structures located on these lots effectively function as a single building which is used for office and support space, with a portion of the ground floor used as an automotive showroom. The third outparcel (Lot 36), located at the northeast corner of the block, is approximately 2,500 square feet and includes an existing 5-story office with a ground floor restaurant and bar.

REASONABLE WORST CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 1

Proposed Project Site (Development Site 1)

The proposed actions are being requested to facilitate the applicant's proposed project—considered in this EIS as part of Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) 1.

---

[1] It is possible that new impacts related to community facilities (day care) and transportation, including new unmitigated significant adverse impacts, and new mitigation may be identified between Draft and Final EIS.

Under RWCDS 1, development on the proposed project site (development site 1) would include a new mixed use building consisting of up to 1,189 residential apartments, ground-floor local retail uses up to 42,000 gsf, and a below-grade parking garage with up to 395 or 500 spaces. Twenty percent of residential units (approximately 238 units) would be affordable housing. Residential uses within the building would total approximately 987,250 gsf of space, with approximately 42,000 gsf for retail and 170,750 gsf for parking. It is assumed that all of the floor area available under the proposed zoning would be fully used.

The proposed project would include a residential lobby near the center of the project site and accessed along West 57th Street. The residential apartments would be located on the upper floors of the proposed building. The base of the building would include approximately 42,000 gsf of retail/commercial space, which would be accessed from the 11th Avenue and West 57th Street frontages. The proposed parking garage would include attended parking on three below-grade levels. Parking access and egress may be provided from both West 56th Street and West 57th Street, but alternately access and egress may be provided from West 57th Street only. West 56th Street would house a service area and loading dock.

From a design perspective, the proposed building is intended to include a number of distinct components or "building blocks". On the eastern half of the proposed project site would be two perpendicular towers, connected by a glass bridge. A "cube" would sit atop the two towers but be offset to create the appearance of a separate massing. At the top of the building there would be parapet enclosing mechanical equipment. A fourth building element would be a lower wing along West 57th Street, which itself would be distinguished from the rest of the building by another glass bridge.

Projected Development Site 2

It is assumed that the proposed actions would also result in the redevelopment of lots 25 and 29, which are in single ownership and collectively include 10,692 square feet. With an available commercial Floor-Area Ratio (FAR) of 10.0 under the proposed zoning, up to 106,920 square feet of floor area could be built on the site. While residential development is not considered to be feasible for this site, a hotel development would be possible and is therefore considered for all technical areas in this EIS. With an allowable FAR of 10.0 and accounting for mechanical and other zoning allowances, a new hotel building would have approximately 117,612 gsf. Assuming approximately 650 gsf per room, there would be approximately 181 hotel rooms.

REASONABLE WORST CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 2

Proposed Project Site (Development Site 1)

The proposed actions would permit a range of project characteristics, or development scenarios, to occur on development site 1 even though the actions are being sought in order to facilitate a specific development (identified under RWCDS 1). Therefore, an additional RWCDS analysis framework ("RWCDS 2") has been identified that considers an alternate mix of uses on the site. Since a Restrictive Declaration is expected to control building massing and design on development site 1, the proposed development analyzed under RWCDS 2 differs from RWCDS 1 in terms of the mix of land uses, but remains the same with regard to design and massing.

As with RWCDS 1, development site 1 would consist of a 1.2 million gsf mixed use building under RWCDS 2. However, RWCDS 2 could include approximately 848 residential units (of which 170 would be affordable) and could include up to 500 parking spaces, along with approximately 185,000 gsf of hotel (285 rooms), 35,000 gsf of local retail, 75,000 gsf of

destination retail, and 30,000 gsf of medical office space. Similar to RWCDS 1, under RWCDS 2 it is assumed that the floor area available under the proposed zoning would be fully maximized.

Projected Development Site 2

Development assumed to occur on development site 2 for analysis purposes would be the same under either RWCDS 1 or 2. As noted above, this would consist of a new hotel building with approximately 181 hotel rooms totaling approximately 117,612 gsf.

Table S-1, below, summarizes the total uses on the proposed project site under both analysis frameworks.

Table S-1
RWCDS 1 and RWCDS 2—Program Summary

Use	RWCDS 1		RWCDS 2	
	Description	GSF	Description	GSF
Development Site 1 (Proposed Project Site)				
Residential	1,189 Units	987,250	848 Units	704,250
Parking	395 or 500 Spaces	170,750	395 or 500 Spaces	170,750
Hotel	—	—	285 Rooms	185,000
Local Retail	—	42,000	—	35,000
Destination Retail	—	—	—	75,000
Medical Office	—	—	—	30,000
Development Site 1 Total GSF		**1,200,000**		**1,200,000**
Projected Development Site 2				
Hotel	181 Rooms	117,612	181 Rooms	117,612
Development Site 2 Total GSF		**117,612**		**117,612**

PROPOSED ACTIONS

CPC Actions

Development of the proposed actions requires approvals from the CPC for the following discretionary actions:

- Rezoning of a portion of the block bounded by West 56th Street, West 57th Street, Eleventh Avenue and Twelfth Avenue from the existing M2-3 and M1-5 districts to a C4-7 commercial district. As noted above, the rezoning area includes Lots 25, 29, 31, 36, 40, 44 and 55 on Manhattan Block 1104. The current M1-5 zoning on the west and southwest portion of the project block, which is occupied by a Department of Sanitation garage and storage facility, would remain unchanged. The portion of the block to be rezoned C4-7 in the future with the actions would have a maximum available FAR of 9.0 which would increase to 12.0 pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing (IH) program, described below.
- An amendment to Zoning Resolution (ZR) Appendix F to designate the rezoning area an IH-designated area. This proposed text amendment would allow the benefits of the Inclusionary Housing (IH) program to be incorporated into the proposed actions. Through the provision of affordable housing the applicant would be permitted to build up to 12.0 FAR, rather than base 9.0 FAR (without the bonus).

- A text amendment to ZR §96-34, applicable to the rezoning area in the "Other Area" (Northern Subarea C1) in the Special Clinton District. The proposed text amendment would provide that 20 percent of the residential floor area on the proposed project site be reserved for affordable housing in order to achieve the IH bonus. This bonus would facilitate more than one floor of commercial uses.
- In addition, ZR §96-34 would be amended to allow an automotive showroom with repairs, applicable to the rezoning area in the "Other Area" (Northern Subarea C1) in the Special Clinton District. This proposed text amendment would allow automobile showrooms and automobile repair to be located below floors occupied by dwelling units.
- A special permit pursuant to ZR §13-45 for a public parking garage containing up to 500 spaces, or, depending on the configuration of ground floor uses, up to 395 spaces. Pursuant to ZR §13-041(d), in C4-7 districts, the proposed parking garage requires a special permit from CPC.
- Authorization pursuant to ZR §13-441 to permit a curb cut on a wide street in Manhattan Community District 4. This authorization is being sought to accommodate ingress and egress from the proposed garage. An existing curb cut along West 57th Street would be extended by approximately 2 feet, 6 inches (currently along West 57th Street there are 6 existing curb cuts on the proposed project site, measuring between approximately 10 feet and 63 feet). The remaining five curb cuts would be eliminated.

Other Actions

HFA Financing

The applicant may apply for HFA's "80/20" program to finance the affordable housing component. HFA offers tax-exempt financing to multifamily rental developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are set aside for low-income residents (based on the local "Area Median Income," adjusted for family size).

(E) Designations

The proposed actions include the placement of (E) designations (E-324) to avoid significant adverse impacts related to these technical areas. An (E) designation is a mechanism that ensures no significant adverse impacts would result from a proposed action because of procedures that would be undertaken as part of the development of a rezoned site.

To reduce the potential for human or environmental exposure to contamination during and following construction of the proposed project, remediation and monitoring of active-status Spill No. 0708204 on the proposed project site would continue in accordance with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) requirements, including implementation of a NYSDEC-approved Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) dated February 2013. An (E) designation would be assigned to the site to ensure that remedial activities would be undertaken prior to its redevelopment and to ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

To ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts from the HVAC emissions, certain restrictions would be required. These restrictions would be mapped as (E) designations for the proposed project site and development site 2. As part of the (E) designation for the proposed project site, any new development must utilize only natural gas in any fossil fuel-fired heating and hot water equipment and any heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) must be located at least 450 feet above grade, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts. As

part of the (E) designation for development site 2, any new development must utilize only natural gas in any fossil fuel-fired heating and hot water equipment, and any heating and hot water equipment exhaust stack(s) must be located at least 323 feet above grade and no more than 44 feet away from the lot line facing 11th Avenue, and must be fitted with low NO_x burners with a maximum emission concentration of 30 ppm, to avoid any potential significant air quality impacts.

(E) designations for noise would be placed on both the project site and projected development site 2. The noise (E) designations would require future building façades to meet certain noise attenuation requirements (ranging from 28 dBA to 35 dBA) to avoid significant adverse noise impacts.

Restrictive Declaration

In connection with the proposed project, a Restrictive Declaration would be recorded at the time all land use-related actions required to authorize the proposed project's development are approved. The Restrictive Declaration would provide for the implementation of and include, among other components, certain massing restrictions, design elements, "Project Components Related to the Environment" (i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of the environmental impacts in this EIS) and mitigation measures, substantially consistent with the EIS.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The rezoning area is currently underdeveloped, and its designation for manufacturing uses reflects the former character of this part of Manhattan. The proposed actions would allow for development of a mixed-use building within a neighborhood currently following the citywide trend towards redevelopment of former manufacturing areas into vibrant mixed-use communities. The northern portion of the Clinton neighborhood is in the process of transitioning from a predominantly commercial and industrial area to a residential and commercial neighborhood. Redevelopment within the proposed rezoning area would complement the existing and ongoing revitalization trends within the area, contribute to the vitality of the streetscape and retail environment, and reinforce the character of 57th Street as a major mixed-use corridor running through the heart of Manhattan. The addition of ground floor retail would complement the planned retail directly across West 57th Street and contribute to the transformation of this portion of West 57th Street into a vibrant wide commercial street with retail uses on both sides.

By allowing for the construction of a new residential and commercial building, the proposed actions would contribute toward the preservation and strengthening the existing residential character of the community, while complementing the existing and ongoing revitalization of the area. The proposed actions would facilitate the development of new residential uses that work toward the goals of creating both affordable and market-rate housing in Manhattan and throughout the City—residential uses are not permitted in the current M2-3 and M1-5 manufacturing zones.

Other C4-7 zones exist near the proposed rezoning area, including a portion of the block directly to the north, the block bounded by West 59th Street and West 61st Street between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues, and a number of blocks both north and south of Lincoln Center between Ninth Avenue and Tenth Avenue. The block north of the rezoning area, which also includes a C6-2 district, is expected to be built with residential, retail, and community facility uses and already includes the Helena, with 597 residential units. The southernmost portion of the Riverside South Development between West 59th Street to West 61st Street is also zoned C4-7.

These blocks include residential uses with additional residential, commercial and community facility uses planned for the area between West 59th and 61st Street. Another new nearby residential building is currently being constructed at 770 Eleventh Avenue, between West 53rd Street and West 54th Street.

ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The *CEQR Technical Review Manual* serves as a general guide on the methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the potential effects of the proposed actions on the various environmental areas of analysis. In disclosing impacts, the EIS considers the proposed actions' potential for significant adverse impacts on the environmental setting. It is anticipated that the proposed actions would be in place and that redevelopment on development sites 1 and 2 would be complete by 2017. Consequently, the environmental setting is not the current environment, but the future environment. Therefore, the technical analyses and consideration of alternatives first assess "Existing Conditions" and then forecast these conditions to 2017 ("Future Without the Proposed Actions") for the purposes of determining potential impacts in the future with the proposed actions ("Probable Impacts of the Proposed Actions").

THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

It is assumed that in the future without the proposed actions (also referred to as the "No Action" condition); the affected area will remain in its existing condition. For each technical analysis in the EIS, the No Action condition also incorporates approved or planned development projects within the appropriate study area that are likely to be completed by the respective analysis years. Additional growth within the study area may occur as a result of a planned redevelopment project being undertaken by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) on the two blocks bounded by West 53rd Street, Tenth Avenue, West 51st Street, and Eleventh Avenue. This project includes the rehabilitation of a building located at 556-560 West 52nd Street and the construction of two new buildings located at 530-548 West 53rd Street and 525 West 52nd Street with affordable housing (including units intended for low-, moderate-, and medium-income households). These sites were previously identified as Site 7 within the expired Clinton Urban Renewal Area (URA), discussed above. This HPD project, which was identified as a potential background project just prior to certification of this DEIS, has not yet entered the public review process. It is discussed as a potential project where relevant in this EIS and for informational purposes. For certain technical areas of this EIS it is considered when that approach would result in a more conservative analysis. For others, the project may be included if more information becomes available after the issuance of the DEIS.

THE FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

For each of the technical areas of analysis identified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, conditions with the proposed actions are compared to the No Action condition. As described below, the EIS considers the potential impacts of the entire affected area and not just the site-specific redevelopment of the property under the applicant's control.

As previously noted, while the building program for the proposed actions (RWCDS 1, described above and summarized in **Table S-1**) reflects what is currently contemplated by the project sponsor, the proposed actions would not preclude a different mix uses from being developed under the proposed zoning. Thus, RWCDS 2 has been identified and analyzed. In addition, since portions of the affected area are not under the control of the applicant, consideration is given in

the EIS to the redevelopment potential of those parcels that are not under the control of the applicant.

The section below identifies and discusses the analysis framework analyzed in the EIS and considering for potential significant adverse impacts.

Proposed Project Site—Development Site 1

The Proposed Actions—RWCDS 1

With the proposed actions the redevelopment of development site 1 would include a mixed use building containing up to 1,189 residential apartments, ground-floor local retail uses up to 42,000 gsf, and either 395 or 500 below-grade parking spaces.

RWCDS 2

As described above, under RWCDS 2, development site 1 would include a new mixed use building containing 1.2 million gsf and including approximately 848 residential units (of which 170 would be affordable) and either 395 or 500 parking spaces, along with approximately 185,000 gsf of hotel (285 rooms), 35,000 gsf of local retail, 75,000 gsf of destination retail, and 30,000 gsf of medical office space. RWCDS 2 is analyzed in technical areas where this second analysis framework could result in greater significant adverse impacts compared to RWCDS 1. These technical areas include transportation, mobile source air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and water and sewer infrastructure.

RWCDS 1 and RWCDS 2 in the EIS

Each technical area in this EIS considers either RWCDS 1, RWCDS 2 or both. The analysis framework that has the greatest potential to result in significant adverse impacts is used to determine project impacts for a particular technical analysis area. For example, the traffic analysis considers RWCDS 2 since its development program has a greater potential to result in significant adverse traffic impacts (compared to RWCDS 1). As another example, the community facilities analysis considers RWCDS 1 for analysis purposes, since its development program is likely to generate more new residents that would utilize community facilities and services (such as schools) (when compared to RWCDS 2). For each technical area, the EIS identifies which analysis framework is considered to determine potential significant adverse impacts. In certain cases it may be appropriate to consider both scenarios.

The bulk and overall design of the building on development site 1 is substantially the same under RWCDS 1 and 2; therefore, for areas such as shadows, that depend on building bulk or design, no distinction is be made between the two analysis frameworks. Similarly, for site-specific analyses, such as hazardous materials, conditions are the same for either scenario and no distinction is made between RWCDS 1 or 2.

Remainder of Rezoning Area

As noted above, there are three "outparcels" within the rezoning area (Lots 25, 29 and 36) that are not controlled by the applicant.

Lots 25 and 29—Projected Development Site 2

As described above and shown in **Table S-2**, Lots 25 and 29 are considered for the purposes of this EIS (for both RWCDS 1 and 2) to be redeveloped as a hotel under the proposed actions. With an allowable FAR of 10.0 and accounting for mechanical and other zoning allowances, a new hotel building would have approximately 117,612 gsf, with approximately 181 hotel rooms.

Lot 36

At approximately 2,500 square feet and measuring approximately 25 feet from north to south, this site is limited in terms of the amount of development that can take place on it. It currently is developed with a building approximately 60 feet high. Because of setback requirements (10 feet at the 60 to 85 feet height, on a wide street), redevelopment of this site is not anticipated. In addition, it is not part of a larger potential assemblage of property (as there are no other adjoining potential development sites), and the building is in active use and is fully tenanted. Enlargement of the existing building is also not considered likely due to structural reasons. Therefore, this site is considered unlikely to be developed within the foreseeable future and its redevelopment or enlargement with the proposed actions is not considered in the EIS.

Summary of Conditions for Analysis in the EIS

Table S-4 presents a summary of the existing conditions, conditions in the future without the proposed actions, and conditions with the proposed actions that are assumed for analysis in this EIS. As noted above, in the No Action condition, it is assumed that the entire affected area would retain their existing uses. RWCDS 1 and 2 differ in the program and mix of uses identified to be developed on development site 1. Under both analysis frameworks (RWCDS 1 and 2), it is assumed that development site 2 would be developed with an approximately 117,612 gsf hotel.

Table S-2
Summary of Existing, No Action, and With Action Assumptions for Analysis

	Existing			No Action[1]			With Action—RWCDS 1			With Action—RWCDS 2		
	Development Site 1 (Lots 31, 40, 44, and 55)	Development Site 2 (Lots 25 and 29)	Remainder of Rezoning Area (Lot 36)	Development Site 1 (Lots 31, 40, 44, and 55)	Development Site 2 (Lots 25 and 29)	Remainder of Rezoning Area (Lot 36)	Development Site 1 (Lots 31, 40, 44, and 55)	Development Site 2 (Lots 25 and 29)	Remainder of Rezoning Area (Lot 36)	Development Site 1 (Lots 31, 40, 44, and 55)	Development Site 2 (Lots 25 and 29)	Remainder of Rezoning Area (Lot 36)
Residential												
Total dwelling units	0	0	0	0	0	0	±1,189	0	0	±848	0	0
Affordable units	0	0	0	0	0	0	20 Percent (238)	0	0	20 Percent (170)	0	0
Approximate GSF	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	±987,250	N/A	N/A	±704,250	N/A	N/A
Commercial												
Use	Auto Sales and Service	Office, Auto Sales and Service	Office, Food + Drink	Auto Sales and Service	Office, Auto Sales and Service	Office, Food + Drink	General Retail	Hotel (±181 rooms[3])	Office, Food + Drink	Retail, Hotel (± 285 rooms[3])	Hotel (±181 rooms[3])	Office, Food + Drink
No. of bldgs	3	2	1	3	2	1	1 (partial)	1 (partial)	1	1 (partial)	1 (partial)	1
Approximate GSF	±21,800 (Lot 31); ±39,000 (Lot 40); ±3,525 (Lot 55)	±16,200 (Lot 25); ±30,670 (Lot 29)	±10,801 Office; ±1,907 Food + Drink[2]	±21,800 (Lot 31); ±39,000 (Lot 40); ±3,525 (Lot 55)	±16,200 (Lot 25); ±30,670 (Lot 29)	±10,801 Office; ±1,907 Food + Drink	±42,000 retail	±117,612	±10,801 Office; ±1,907 Food + Drink	±185,000 Hotel, 110,000 Retail	±117,612	±10,801 Office; ±1,907 Food + Drink
Community Facility												
Type	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	Medical office	None	None
Approximate GSF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	±30,000	0	0
Parking Garages												
No. of spaces	1,000 (Lot 44)	0	0	1,000 (Lot 44)	0	0	395 or 500	0	0	395 or 500	0	0

Notes: [1] Absent the proposed actions, development site 1 and remainder of the rezoning area are assumed to remain in active use with existing development.
[2] Approximately 75 percent of the ground floor of Lot 36 is devoted to food and drink; the remaining space is used to access the offices on the upper floors.
[3] Assuming 1 hotel room per 650 gsf.
Sources: Dept. of City Planning, PLUTO/ZoLa; NYC Department of Finance; Arquitectonica Architects; AKRF, Inc, field surveys.

A. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

The proposed actions would result in a new development of approximately 1.2 million gsf on the proposed project site with residential, retail, hotel, and medical office uses. A parking garage would also be provided. The residential component would include affordable housing units developed pursuant to the IH Program. The proposed actions could also result in an approximately 117,612 gsf hotel on the outparcel located at the corner of West 56th Street and Eleventh Avenue (Lots 25 and 29). Development with the proposed actions would be compatible in use and scale with the surrounding area, and would continue the existing trend toward higher-density mixed-use development in the study area, particularly new residential units and ground level retail. The proposed actions rezoning the area from M2-3 and M1-5 to C4-7 would be compatible with zoning districts in the surrounding area and would represent an extension of the existing C4-7 district located immediately to the north of the proposed rezoning area. The rezoning would also continue the existing City-wide and local trend of modifying zoning to allow for residential use in many former manufacturing areas where zoning does not currently permit this use. The proposed actions and resulting new development would be compatible with City-wide public policy initiatives that aim toward increasing the supply of housing in the city, reclaiming underutilized industrial land, and expanding access to affordable housing, as well as the initiatives of the expired Special Clinton District to increase the supply of housing in the Clinton area. The proposed actions only apply to the rezoning area and would not affect land use, zoning, or public policy in the study area. Overall, the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

This analysis finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts. The following summarizes the conclusions for each of the five CEQR areas of socioeconomic concern enumerated above.

DIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

The proposed actions would not directly displace any residents, and therefore would not result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts due to direct residential displacement.

INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

A preliminary assessment finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement. The proposed actions would introduce a residential population whose average income would be higher than the overall average income in the ½-mile study area, but similar to the average income of the new population expected to reside in the study area in the future without the proposed actions. The Clinton and Lincoln Square neighborhoods began transitioning from industrial and commercial uses to residential and mixed-use in the 1980s. These trends continued in the following decades, with large developments such as the office and residential Worldwide Plaza development and Riverside South in the 1990s, and luxury residential development in the past decade. There is already an existing trend toward more costly housing throughout the ½-mile study area, and rents and sales prices for market rate housing are already above what is affordable to low- to middle-income households. This trend is expected to continue in the future without the proposed actions, with large planned residential developments such as the first Riverside Center buildings (1,710 units total) and the Durst development directly

north of the project site (863 units). Therefore, the proposed actions would not introduce a trend or accelerate an existing trend of changing socioeconomic conditions in a manner that would have the potential to substantially change the socioeconomic character of the neighborhood. In addition, the proposed actions would add 238 affordable housing units to the study area, which would help ensure housing opportunities for lower-income residents and would maintain a more diverse demographic composition within the study area.

DIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT

A preliminary assessment finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. The proposed actions would directly displace six businesses located on the project site, including one car dealership, two auto repair businesses, storage facilities for a bike rental business, a pedicab business and a public parking garage. The proposed actions could also directly displace four businesses located on outparcel sites, including a venture capital business, corporate offices for a grocery store business, corporate offices for an oil and natural gas refining company, and an audio and film production studio on out parcel sites. While these 10 potentially displaced businesses are valuable to the City's economy, supporting an estimated 185 jobs, the products and services they provide are not uniquely dependent on their location within the rezoning area, nor are the businesses the subject of regulations or publicly adopted plans aimed at preserving, enhancing, or otherwise protecting them in their current location. The employment associated with the potentially displaced businesses does not constitute a substantial portion of the ½-mile study area's employment base, and the goods and services offered by these uses can be found elsewhere within the ½-mile study area and within New York City as a whole. None of the potentially displaced businesses provide substantial direct support to other businesses in the study area; all of the potentially displaced businesses draw from a larger customer base than the study area. The 1,000 public parking spaces that would be displaced would be replaced by up to 500 parking spaces within the rezoning area, and the assessment in the EIS finds that there would be adequate parking capacity within the study area in the future with the proposed actions.

INDIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT

A preliminary assessment finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement. While the proposed actions would add a substantial amount of residential development to the project site, this would be in keeping with existing trend toward higher-density residential development in Midtown West. The retail added by the proposed actions would support the existing and project-generated populations, as well as the consumer demand that would be added to the study area in the future without the proposed actions. The hotel introduced by the proposed actions would also be in keeping with existing trends in the area. Any upward rent pressure experienced by businesses in the area as a result of residential and hotel development would be present in the future with or without the proposed actions.

ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC INDUSTRIES

A preliminary assessment finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on specific industries. The 10 businesses that could be directly displaced represent a small portion of the businesses and employment within their industries City-wide, and the goods and services provided by these businesses can be found elsewhere in the City. While the displacement of the pedicab business and the facilities used by the bicycle rental facility could

decrease the capacity of these individual businesses to serve their consumers, it would not reduce the overall capacity of the pedicab or bicycle rental industries in the City in a manner that would jeopardize the viability of these industries. Similarly, any potential indirect business displacement that could occur as a result of the proposed actions would be limited, and would not be expected to adversely affect conditions within any City industries.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Based on the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to public high schools, outpatient health care facilities, or police and fire services and detailed analyses are not warranted.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A detailed analysis of potential impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools was conducted. The rezoning area is located in Sub-District 3 of Community School District 2 (CSD 2), which includes all of Manhattan west of Broadway between West 14th Street and West 59th Street. Pursuant to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual,* the proposed actions are expected to introduce 143 new elementary school students and 48 intermediate school students. The public schools assessment analyzes the potential impacts of these additional students on elementary and intermediate schools within Sub-District 3 of CSD 2.

Elementary Schools

Within Sub-District 3 of CSD 2, elementary schools would operate with a shortage of seats in 2017 in the future with the proposed actions, and the increase in the size of that shortage attributable to the proposed actions would be approximately 4.7 percent, which would not exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of 5 percent or more generally used to identify significant adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in Sub-District 3.

Intermediate Schools

By 2017, in the future with the proposed actions, intermediate schools within Sub-District 3 of CSD 2 would operate with a surplus of seats. Therefore, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public intermediate schools within Sub-District 3.

LIBRARIES

With the new residential population that would be generated by the proposed actions, the Columbus Library would serve approximately 1.97 percent more residents, and the Riverside Library would serve approximately 1.67 percent more residents. For both the Columbus Library and Riverside Library, the catchment area population increases attributable to the proposed actions are under the five percent impact threshold in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, the population introduced by the proposed actions would not impair the delivery of library services in the study area, and the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public libraries.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

The proposed actions would introduce up to 238 new low- to moderate-income units by 2017. Based on *CEQR Technical Manual* child care multipliers, this would generate approximately 27 children under the age of six who would be eligible for publicly funded child care programs.

With the addition of these children, child care facilities in the study area would operate at a 162 percent utilization rate, which represents an increase in the utilization rate of 7.9 percentage points over conditions in the future without the proposed actions. This increase exceeds the 5 percent threshold in the *CEQR Technical Manual* for a significant adverse impact. Therefore, the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on child care facilities.

Several factors may limit the number of children in need of publicly funded child care slots in New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS)-contracted day care facilities, including the potential for future residents to make use of family-based child care facilities and private child care facilities. Nevertheless, following *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact to publicly funded child care facilities. Potential measures to mitigate this impact are discussed in the EIS.

OPEN SPACE

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual,* the rezoning area is located in an area that is considered neither well-served nor underserved by open space. The proposed actions would not result in the physical loss of or alterations to existing public open space resources; therefore an assessment of the proposed actions' direct effects on open space in the area was not conducted. Similarly, under development identified for both RWCDS 1 and RWCDS 2, the increase in the non-residential (worker) population in the rezoning area would be below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for assessment, therefore a non-residential indirect effects assessment was not conducted.

The area around the rezoning area currently does not meet New York City's planning goals for open space. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual,* a ratio of 2.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, with 2 acres of active open space and 0.5 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents, are considered optimal benchmarks; however, it is acknowledged that this planning goal may not be attainable in a densely populated area, such as Midtown Manhattan. With the new residential population, the open space ratios in the area around the rezoning area would decrease compared to the future without the proposed actions. However, the decrease in the open space ratios would be below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact. Therefore, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on open space resources in the area.

SHADOWS

The shadows analysis shows that project-generated incremental shadow would fall on portions of the Hudson River and existing or future sections of Hudson River Park in the mornings of all seasons. Three other resources would experience incremental shadow: The plaza at 555 West 57th Street would receive approximately 1 to 3 hours of new shadow at the end of the March 21/September 21, May 6/August 6, and June 21 analysis days, the John Jay College Seating Area Plaza would experience incremental shadow during the final 28 minutes of the December 21 analysis day and the future Riverside Center Open Space would experience new shadow for an hour in the middle of the December 21 analysis day.

The analysis concludes that with the proposed actions the affected resources would still receive adequate direct sunlight, and that the incremental shadow would not adversely impact the usability of the publicly accessible open spaces or the vegetation that grows within them. Overall, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse shadow impacts.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

There are no known architectural resources within the rezoning area or on the project block. There is one State and National Registers of Historic Places -eligible (S/NR) resource in the study area: the Consolidated Edison Power House, which is also pending New York City Landmark (NYCL) designation. This resource is located over 90 feet from the proposed project site; therefore the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse physical impacts.

There would also be no indirect impacts on architectural resources. Views to the Consolidated Edison Power House would not be obstructed. In addition, this architectural resource exists in a mixed context of older structures and more recently constructed high rise buildings in the study area. Therefore, the proposed actions would not adversely alter the setting or historic context of this architectural resource or result in a significant adverse impact related to historic and cultural resources.

URBAN DESIGN

This analysis finds that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to urban design and visual resources.

New development that would result from the proposed actions would be of greater height and density than in conditions absent the proposed actions. However, the increase in size would be in keeping with the scale of other buildings in the study area and in keeping with the ongoing redevelopment of the neighborhood, which includes a number of existing modern high-rise buildings. New uses, including residential apartments and ground-floor retail, would activate the streetscape and enliven the pedestrian experience.

There are no visual resources on the project site, rezoning area, or the remainder of the project block. The proposed actions would not change urban design features so that the context of a natural or built feature is adversely altered, and would not partially or fully block any significant public views to a visual resource.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Previous studies identified known and potential sources of contamination within the affected area, including: an active-status petroleum spill (Spill No. 0708204), urban fill materials, historical manufacturing, past and present automobile repair, and known aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and suspected underground storage tanks (USTs) on development site 1; a suspected AST and a historical auto body shop on development site 2; and past and present commercial, industrial and manufacturing use, petroleum storage, and reported spills in the surrounding area.

Based on the above findings, to reduce the potential for human or environmental exposure to contamination during and following construction of the proposed project, remediation and monitoring of active-status Spill No. 0708204 on the proposed project site would continue in accordance with NYSDEC requirements, including implementation of a NYSDEC-approved RAWP dated February 2013. An (E) designation (E-324) would be assigned to the proposed project site to ensure that remedial activities would be undertaken prior to its redevelopment. A New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) approved Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and associated Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) would be prepared for implementation during subsurface disturbance associated with project construction. The RAP would address requirements for items such as soil stockpiling, soil disposal and

transportation; capping of soil disturbed by the project with impervious surfaces or clean soil; dust control; quality assurance; vapor control measures, such as the installation of a vapor barrier beneath new building foundations; and procedures for addressing known or unexpectedly encountered petroleum storage tanks, underground hydraulic lifts or contamination. The CHASP would identify potential hazards that may be encountered during construction and specify appropriate health and safety measures to be undertaken to ensure that subsurface disturbance is performed in a manner protective of workers, the community, and the environment (such as personal protective equipment, air monitoring, and emergency response procedures). Since the bottom of the foundation would extend below the water table, the use of a sub-slab ventilation system is not considered feasible, as it would be inundated with water. Below-grade garage levels would be equipped with a separate ventilation system. Following construction, proper implementation of the RAP/CHASP would be documented to the OER before occupancy permits could be obtained.

Similarly, an (E) designation would be assigned to development site 2, which is not under the applicant's control, to ensure that investigation and, if warranted, remedial activities would be undertaken prior to its redevelopment. The (E) designation would require that prior to beginning construction or renovation involving subsurface disturbance (excavation), a Phase I ESA be conducted followed by a subsurface investigation (e.g., soil, groundwater, and soil gas sampling) in accordance with a scope submitted to the OER for review and approval. Based on the results of these studies, a RAP and associated CHASP are required to be prepared, submitted to the OER for review and approval prior to construction, and implemented during construction. A RAP addresses requirements for items such as: soil stockpiling, soil disposal, and transportation; dust control; quality assurance; and contingency measures should petroleum storage tanks or soil or groundwater contamination is encountered. A CHASP typically includes measures for worker and community protection, including personal protective equipment, dust control and air monitoring. Following construction, proper implementation of the RAP/CHASP would be documented to the OER before occupancy permits can be obtained.

Suspect lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials (ACM), and suspect polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) containing electrical and hydraulic equipment and fluorescent lighting fixtures may be present at the proposed project site, and/or at development site 2. During and following demolition associated with the proposed action, regulatory requirements pertaining to ACM, lead-based paint, and PCBs would be followed.

With the above-described (E) designation in place, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

The water and sewer infrastructure analysis conservatively considered RWCDS 2 for analysis purposes. The uses permitted under RWCDS 2 would increase the project site's water consumption, sewage generation, and stormwater runoff as compared to conditions in the future without the proposed actions. However, the analysis finds that the proposal would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, wastewater or stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

SANITARY SEWAGE

By the 2017 analysis year, RWCDS 2 would generate an incremental 281,160 gpd of sanitary sewage over the future without the proposed actions. This incremental increase in the volume of

sanitary flow to the combined sewer system would represent approximately 0.23 percent of the average daily flow to the North River Wastewater Treatment Plant (North River WWTP). This volume would not result in an exceedance of the North River WWTP's capacity, as per the plant's State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit, and therefore would not create a significant adverse impact on the City's sewage conveyance or treatment systems.

STORMWATER

The overall volume of stormwater runoff and the peak stormwater runoff rate from the project site is anticipated to increase slightly, due to the replacement of a paved portion of Block 1104, Lot 31 (approximately 8,000 sf) with more impervious building rooftop.

With the incorporation of selected best management practices (BMPs), identified in a Restrictive Declaration to be recorded, the peak stormwater runoff rates would be reduced compared to the future without the proposed actions and would not have a significant impact on the City's sewage conveyance or treatment systems.

TRANSPORTATION

TRAFFIC

Traffic conditions were evaluated at 15 intersections for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and the Saturday peak hours. In the With Action condition, there would be the potential for significant adverse impacts at 7 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 10 intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, 13 intersections during the PM peak hour, and 8 intersections during the Saturday peak hour.

Table S-3 provides a summary of the impacted locations by analysis time period and lane-groups.

TRANSIT

The screening assessment concluded that a detailed examination of subway line-haul analysis was not warranted. However, bus line-haul analyses and a detailed analysis of station elements at the 59th Street/Columbus Circle subway station (A, B, C, D, and No.1 lines) and the 57th Street/7th Avenue station (N, Q, and R lines) were prepared. Based on the result of the transit analysis, the proposed actions would not result in potential significant adverse impacts at the two stations analyzed during any of the peak periods.

The proposed actions would result in potential significant adverse impacts on bus line-haul levels on the eastbound M57 during the weekday AM peak period and the westbound M31 and westbound M57 during the weekday PM peak period. Potential measures to mitigate the projected potential significant adverse bus line-haul impacts are described in the EIS, "Mitigation." As discussed in the EIS, these impacts could be mitigated by increasing bus service along affected routes.

Table S-3
Summary of Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

Intersection		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
EB/WB Street	NB/SB Street				
West 57th Street	12th Avenue			WB-R	
West 56th Street	12th Avenue			SB-L (Mainline)	SB-L (Mainline)
West 55th Street	12th Avenue	WB-L	WB-L	WB-L	
West 58th Street	11th Avenue			SB-L	
West 57th Street	11th Avenue	EB-L WB-L WB-TR	WB-L	WB-L WB-TR SB-L	WB-L WB-TR NB-L
West 55th Street	11th Avenue		WB-LTR	WB-LTR	
West 58th Street	10th Avenue		EB-LT	EB-LT	
West 57th Street	10th Avenue	EB-LT WB-TR	EB-LT WB-TR	EB-LT WB-TR	EB-DefL WB-TR
West 56th Street	10th Avenue	EB-LT	EB-LT	EB-LT	EB-LT
West 55th Street	10th Avenue		WB-TR	WB-T	WB-TR
West 57th Street	9th Avenue	EB-T EB-R WB-T	EB-T EB-R WB-T	EB-R WB-LT	EB-R WB-T
West 56th Street	9th Avenue	EB-TR	EB-TR	EB-TR	EB-TR
West 57th Street	8th Avenue	EB-LT WB-TR	WB-TR	WB-TR	WB-TR

Notes: EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound; NB = Northbound; SB = Southbound; L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = Defacto Left Turn

PEDESTRIANS

Weekday and Saturday peak period pedestrian conditions were evaluated at key sidewalk, corner reservoir, and crosswalk elements at 8 intersections. Significant adverse impacts were identified only for the south crosswalk of West 57th Street and Eleventh Avenue. These impacts would occur during all of the four analysis time periods. **Table S-4** provides a summary of the impacted location by analysis time periods. As detailed in the EIS, these significant adverse impacts could be mitigated by widening the crosswalk.

Table S-4
Summary of Significant Adverse Pedestrian Impacts

Intersection	Pedestrian Element	2017 With Action			
		AM Peak Hour	Midday Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
57th Street and 11th Avenue	South Crosswalk	X	X	X	X

Notes: X = Impacted

VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Crash data for the study area intersections were obtained from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for the time period between May 31, 2009 and May 31, 2012. During this time period, a total of 250 reportable and non-reportable accidents, 2 fatalities, 378

injuries, and 77 pedestrian/bicyclist-related accidents occurred at the study area intersections. A total of accident data identifies three study area intersections as high pedestrian accident locations in the 2009 to 2012 period. These intersections are Tenth Avenue at West 57th Street, Ninth Avenue at West 57th Street and Eighth Avenue at West 57th Street.

The three intersections identified above would experience significant adverse traffic impacts during all analysis peak hours. However, the predicted impacts at these intersections could be fully mitigated with standard traffic engineering measures. Nonetheless, additional safety measures, such as the restriping of faded crosswalks, installation of pedestrian warning signs and the installation of countdown timers can be implemented to improve pedestrian safety at these intersections.

PARKING

The proposed actions would include a below-grade public parking garage with up to 500 parking spaces. The proposal is expected to eliminate the 1,000-space public parking garage that currently exists on the development site 1. Accounting for the change in on-site parking spaces, and the parking demand generated from background growth, No Action projects and the proposed actions, the With Action public parking supply and utilization analysis shows that there could be a parking shortfall during the weekday midday period within the ¼-mile off-street parking study area. It is anticipated that the excess demand could be accommodated with a slightly longer walking distance beyond the ¼-mile radius. Furthermore, as stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a parking shortfall resulting from a project located in Manhattan does not constitute a significant adverse parking impact, due to the multitude of available modes of transportation.

AIR QUALITY

A summary of the general findings of the air quality analyses is presented below. With the assignment of (E) designations related to air quality, and with restrictions on building height and massing in place in the Restrictive Declaration to be recorded, no significant adverse impacts related to air quality would result from the proposed actions.

Concentrations of CO due to the proposed parking garage would not result in any violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or the City's *de minimis* criteria for CO.

Analysis of the emissions and dispersion of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) from HVAC sources with the proposed actions indicate that such emissions would not result in a violation of NAAQS. Emissions of particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) were analyzed in accordance with the City's current $PM_{2.5}$ *de minimis* criteria, which determined that the maximum predicted $PM_{2.5}$ increments from the proposed actions would be less than the applicable annual average criterion of 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$ for local impacts and 0.1 for neighborhood-scale impacts. The air quality modeling analysis also determined the highest predicted increase in 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed the applicable *de minimis* criterion. As noted above under "Proposed Actions—E Designations," to ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts resulting from the proposed actions due to HVAC emissions, certain restrictions would be included in (E) designations for both the proposed project site and development site 2.

Emissions from testing of vehicles in the potential automotive showroom service area were determined to not result in any violations of NAAQS.

Nearby existing sources from manufacturing or processing facilities were analyzed for their potential impacts on new development within the rezoning area. The results of the analysis demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial sources of emissions on either the proposed project site 1 or 2.

$PM_{2.5}$ concentrations related to the DSNY vehicles traveling to and from the garage were analyzed, and the results demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts on the proposed actions.

The proposed actions would result in the development of new residential and commercial uses in proximity to the Consolidated Edison Power House (also known as the 59th Street Steam Station), a steam plant that operates pursuant to and in compliance with federal and state air permitting requirements. Concentrations of pollutants from the Consolidated Edison Power House were therefore estimated for their potential impacts on the proposed project. Concentrations of NO_2, sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and PM_{10} were estimated using computer based dispersion modeling; however, due to the proximity of the Consolidated Edison Power House to the proposed project site, concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ were estimated using a wind tunnel test procedure, which allows for more accurate predictions of pollutant concentrations from stationary sources. The analyses demonstrated that concentrations of NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10} from the Consolidated Edison Power House's boiler and combustion turbine stacks on the building on the proposed project site would not result in any violations of the NAAQS for these pollutants. It was likewise determined that incremental increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from the Con Edison Power House boiler and combustion turbine stacks would not exceed the city's *de minimis* criteria.

The analysis of the Con Edison Power House boilers and combustion turbine was performed considering modifications Con Edison is making so that all equipment would fire natural gas instead of distillate fuel under normal operations. Under these modifications, natural gas would be delivered to the Consolidated Edison Power House via a dedicated pipeline that would be directly connected to a nearby gas transmission main. Con Edison has started construction of the gas pipeline to provide the necessary gas service to the Consolidated Edison Power House, and conversion of the boilers and combustion turbine is anticipated to be completed in 2014, well before the 2017 analysis year. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has issued a certificate to operate, and the existing Title V permit for the Con Edison Power House has been modified by NYSDEC, for the combustion turbine and boiler natural gas conversion and operation.

Concentrations of pollutants from commercial, institutional and residential developments within 400 feet of the proposed project site were estimated for their potential impacts on the proposed project. It was determined that concentrations of NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10} from these sources would not result in any violations of the NAAQS for these pollutants, and it was determined that incremental increases in $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the city's *de minimis* criteria.

In addition, potential cumulative impacts from the Con Edison Power House and commercial, institutional and residential developments within 400 feet of the proposed project site were estimated for their potential impacts on the proposed project. It was determined that maximum concentrations of NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10} would not result in any violations of the NAAQS for these pollutants, and it was determined that incremental increases in $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the city's *de minimis* criteria.

Existing and proposed developments near the proposed project site were evaluated to assess whether the effect on plume dispersion from the Consolidated Edison Power House combustion

turbine and boiler emissions due to the proposed actions would result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The analysis demonstrated that the effect on plume dispersion from the Consolidated Edison Power House due to the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on buildings in the area, including Riverside Center Building 5 and the Durst West 57th Street development.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Conservatively based on RWCDS 2, the building energy use and vehicle use associated with the proposed actions would result in up to approximately 24,400 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year (the estimated GHG emissions from RWCDS 1 would be lower than those for RWCDS 2). This result does not include the incorporation of additional building energy reduction measures, which would reduce GHG emissions as compared to buildings designed to meet the minimum building code energy requirements.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines five goals through which a projects consistency with City's emissions reduction goal is evaluated: (1) Efficient Buildings; (2) Clean Power; (3) Sustainable Transportation; (4) Construction Operation Emissions; and (5) Building Materials Carbon Intensity.

The applicant is currently evaluating the specific energy efficiency measures and design elements that may be implemented, and intends to either earn the Energy Star from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under EPA's *Energy Star Qualified Multifamily High Rise Buildings* program or achieve certification under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system. To qualify for the Energy Star or LEED, the building would be required to exceed the energy requirements of the building code and ASHRAE 90.1-2007, so as to reduce energy expenditure by at least 10 percent for LEED, or 15 percent for Energy Star, as compared to a baseline building designed to meet the minimum building code requirements. The project's commitment to building energy efficiency, exceeding the building code energy requirements, ensures consistency with the CEQR Efficient Buildings goal.

The project would support the other GHG goals by virtue of its nature and location: the project's proximity to public transportation, its reliance and natural gas, its commitment to construction air quality controls, and the fact that as a matter of course, construction in New York City uses recycled steel and includes cement replacements all demonstrate that the project supports the GHG reduction goal.

Therefore, based on the commitment to energy efficiency and by virtue of the project's location and nature, the proposed actions would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goal, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

NOISE

The mobile source noise screening analysis concludes that the proposed project would not generate sufficient vehicular traffic to have the potential to cause a significant noise impact (i.e., it would not result in a doubling of Noise passenger car equivalents [Noise PCEs] which would be necessary to cause a 3 dBA increase in noise levels).

The building attenuation analysis concludes that in order to meet *CEQR Technical Manual* interior noise level requirements, between 28 and 35 dBA of building attenuation would be required for buildings on projected development sites 1) and 2. With the specifications required by (E) designations, the proposed actions would not result significant adverse noise.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Public health is the effort of society to protect and improve the health and well-being of its population. The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines as its goal with respect to public health "to determine whether adverse impacts on public health may occur as a result of a proposed project, and if so, to identify measures to mitigate such effects."

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, for most proposed projects, a public health analysis is not necessary. Where no significant unmitigated adverse impact is found in other CEQR analysis areas, such as air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, or noise, no public health analysis is warranted. If an unmitigated significant adverse impact is identified in one of these analysis areas, the lead agency may determine that a public health assessment is warranted for that specific technical area.

As described in the relevant analyses of this EIS, the proposed actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas related to public health. Therefore, a public health analysis is not necessary, and the proposed actions would not result in a significant adverse public health impact.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Based on the methodology of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a preliminary assessment of the proposed actions' effects on neighborhood character was conducted to determine the need for a detailed analysis. The preliminary assessment concluded that the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character and that a detailed analysis was not necessary. While the proposed actions would result in moderate effects in certain technical areas related to neighborhood character, such as shadows and open space, even taken together these moderate effects would not result in a cumulative significant adverse impact to the area's neighborhood character. Overall, the new residential, retail, hotel and other uses that are expected to result from the proposed actions would revitalize the proposed rezoning area, which is underutilized and will continue to be underutilized in the future without the proposed actions.

The proposed actions would continue the citywide trend toward redevelopment of former manufacturing areas—particularly those located near the waterfront—into vibrant mixed-use communities. More specifically, it would contribute toward the ongoing trend of redevelopment of this part of Manhattan's West Side, which has seen several mixed-use and residential projects built in the recent past and is expected to see additional redevelopment of underutilized sites in the near future.

The new buildings introduced through the proposed actions would be built to a comparable scale to other buildings in the surrounding area, and would conform with the existing higher-density residential development. In addition, the retail uses introduced along Eleventh Avenue and West 57th Street would contribute to the vitality of the streetscape and retail environment, and reinforce the character of 57th Street as a major mixed-use corridor running through the heart of Manhattan.

CONSTRUCTION

This analysis concludes that the proposed actions would result in significant adverse construction impacts with respect to vehicular traffic, which can be mitigated by using the same operational-period mitigation measures, described the EIS. The results of the construction analyses for each technical area are discussed in more detail below.

TRANSPORTATION

Peak construction conditions in the sixth quarter of construction were considered for the analysis of potential transportation (traffic, parking, transit, and pedestrians) impacts during construction. Based on the construction trip projections and comparison with operational analysis results, construction under the proposed actions is expected to result in significant adverse traffic impacts. However, no significant adverse impacts to parking, transit, pedestrian conditions are anticipated due to construction.

Traffic

During peak construction in the sixth quarter of construction, the project-generated trips would be less than what would be realized upon the full build-out of the proposed actions in 2017. Therefore, the potential traffic impacts during peak construction would be within the envelope of significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the Build condition. As detailed in the EIS, measures to mitigate the operational traffic impacts were recommended for implementation at 13 different intersections during one or more analysis peak hours. These measures would entail primarily signal timing changes and approach daylighting, all of which could be implemented early at the discretion of the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) to address actual conditions experienced at that time.

Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) plans would be developed, reviewed, and approved by the NYCDOT Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination (OCMC) for curb-lane and sidewalk closures as well as equipment staging activities.

Parking

The anticipated construction activities are projected to generate a maximum parking demand of 178 spaces during the sixth quarter of construction. This parking demand could be fully accommodated by off-street spaces and parking facilities within a ¼-mile radius of the project site, where an estimated 1,621 and 1,647 public parking spaces are currently available during the overnight and morning parking utilization periods, respectively. Therefore, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse parking impacts during construction.

Transit

The estimated number of total peak hour transit trips would be 223 during peak construction condition in the sixth quarter of construction. These construction worker trips would occur outside of peak periods of transit ridership and would be distributed and dispersed to nearby transit facilities and would not result in any significant adverse transit impacts during construction.

Pedestrians

The estimated number of total peak hour pedestrian trips traversing the area's sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks would be up to 398 during peak construction condition in the sixth quarter of construction. These trips are expected to have minimal impacts on pedestrian

operations during the construction peak hours. In addition, the 398 incremental peak hour pedestrian trips would be distributed among numerous sidewalks and crosswalks in the area. Therefore, there would not be a potential for significant adverse pedestrian impacts during construction.

AIR QUALITY

No significant adverse air quality impacts would be expected at any sensitive receptor locations due to the on-site and off-site construction activities under the proposed actions. To ensure that construction under the proposed actions would result in the lowest practicable diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions, the applicant would implement through a Restrictive Declaration an emissions reduction program for all construction activities to the extent practicable during construction of the applicant's mixed-use development on the proposed project site, including: diesel equipment reduction; clean fuel; best available tailpipe reduction technologies; utilization of newer equipment; source location; dust control; and idle restriction. However, there would be no mechanism presently to provide for a commitment to implement any of the above emission reduction measures on sites not controlled by the applicant at this time.

The overall construction duration under the proposed actions is expected to be short-term (less than two years). In addition, the most intense construction activities (demolition, excavation, and foundation work where a number of large non-road diesel engines would be employed) in terms of air pollutant emissions would last for only a portion of this duration, taking approximately 11 months for the applicant's mixed-use development on the project site and approximately 7 months for the potential hotel development on the development site 2, which is not controlled by the applicant. Based on the nature of the construction work involved, construction activities under the proposed actions would not be considered out of the ordinary in terms of intensity, and, in fact, emissions would be lower due to the emission control measures that would be implemented through a Restrictive Declaration during construction under the proposed actions. The nearest residences are the Helena Building and 625 West 57th Street (a site that is currently under construction and expected to be complete by 2015), located 75 feet north of the rezoning area across West 57th Street. West 57th Street would serve as a buffer between the emissions sources and these sensitive locations and such distance would result in enhanced dispersion of pollutants and, therefore, potential concentration increments from on-site sources at such locations would be reduced. Furthermore, the construction would not result in increases in vehicle volumes higher than those identified in the operational condition and, therefore, an off-site construction mobile source analysis is not warranted.

Based on analysis of all of the factors affecting construction emissions, on-site and off-site construction activities due to construction under the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impact on air quality.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

Noise

Noise associated with the proposed actions' construction activities would not result in any significant adverse impacts. Construction on the project site would include noise control measures as required by the New York City Noise Control Code, including both path and source controls, as well as additional project-specific source and path control measures.

Immediately north of the construction site across West 57th Street are existing and approved residential buildings (the existing Helena Building and the approved 625 West 57th Street),

which represent the nearest noise sensitive receptor locations to the project site. These buildings are located approximately 75 feet from the site. Construction on the proposed project site and development site 2 would be expected to last a total of approximately 24 months, but the most noise-intensive construction activities (demolition/excavation/foundation work) would last for only a portion of this duration, taking approximately 11 months for the applicant's mixed-use development and approximately 7 months for the hotel on development site 2, which is not controlled by the Applicant. Construction would have the potential to result in exceedances of the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise impact criteria at the residential receptors north of the project site on West 57th Street continuously for up to 19 months, which, according to the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, would not be considered a significant impact since it would be less than 24 months. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that significant noise impacts due to construction would occur "only at sensitive receptors that would be subjected to high construction noise levels for an extensive period of time." This has been interpreted to mean that such impacts would occur only at sensitive receptors where the activity with the potential to create high noise levels would occur continuously for approximately two years or longer. In addition, according to the 625 West 57th Street FEIS (*CEQR* No. 12DCP020M), each of these two buildings were designed to provide 28-35 dBA of window/wall attenuation, and would be expected to experience interior $L_{10(1)}$ values less than 45 dBA during the construction period, which would be considered acceptable according to the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. Therefore, based on these factors, no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected at any sensitive receptor locations from the proposed construction activities.

Vibration

The proposed actions are not expected to result in significant adverse construction impacts with respect to vibration. The buildings and structures of most concern with regard to the potential for structural or architectural damage due to vibration are The Helena residential building and the future building at 625 West 57th Street both located immediately north of the project site. However, both buildings are located more than 55 feet away from any pile driving locations, which is sufficiently far from the construction site that vibration levels would be below the threshold for structural damage for non-fragile structures. However, some construction activities would have the potential for resulting in vibration levels that exceed 65 VdB and would be perceptible and annoying. The equipment that would have the most potential for producing these levels is the pile driver. It would produce perceptible vibration levels (i.e., vibration levels exceeding 65 VdB) at receptor locations within a distance of approximately 230 feet. However, operation of this equipment would only occur for limited periods of time at a particular location and therefore would not result in any significant adverse impacts. In no case are significant adverse impacts from vibrations expected to occur.

OTHER TECHNICAL AREAS

Land Use and Neighborhood Character

Construction activities would affect land use in the rezoning area but would not alter surrounding land uses. As is typical with construction projects, during periods of peak construction activity there would be some disruption, predominantly noise, to the nearby area. There would be construction trucks and construction workers coming to the construction sites. There would also be noise, sometimes intrusive, from demolition, excavation, and foundation activities as well as trucks and other vehicles backing up, loading, and unloading. These disruptions would be temporary in nature and would have limited effects on land uses within the

study area, particularly as most construction activities would take place within the construction sites or within portions of sidewalks, curbs, and travel lanes of public streets immediately adjacent to the construction sites. Overall, while the construction under the proposed actions would be evident to the local community, the limited duration of construction would not result in significant or long-term adverse impacts on local land use patterns or the character of the nearby area.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Construction activities associated with the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions. Construction under the proposed actions would not block or restrict access to any facilities in the area, affect the operations of any nearby businesses, or obstruct major thoroughfares used by customers or businesses. Construction would create direct benefits resulting from expenditures on labor, materials, and services, and indirect benefits created by expenditures by material suppliers, construction workers, and other employees involved in the construction activity. The presence of construction personnel would increase revenues for local businesses such as eating and drinking establishments. Construction also would contribute to increased tax revenues for the City and State, including those from personal income taxes.

Community Facilities

While construction under the proposed actions would result in temporary increases in traffic during the construction period, access to and from any facilities in the area would not be affected during the construction period. In addition, the construction sites would be surrounded by construction fencing and barriers that would limit the effects of construction on nearby facilities. Construction workers would not place any burden on public schools and would have minimal, if any, demands on libraries, child care facilities, and health care. The New York City Police Department (NYPD) and the New York City Fire Department (FDNY) emergency services and response times would not be materially affected by construction significantly due to the geographic distribution of the police and fire facilities and their respective coverage areas.

Open Space

There are no publicly accessible open spaces within the rezoning area, and no open space resources would be used for staging or other construction activities. The nearest resources are the open space area at the approved 625 West 57th Street (a site that is currently under construction and expected to be complete by 2015), which is located 75 feet north of the project site, and the 555 West 57th Street open space area, which is located across the Eleventh Avenue and West 57th Street, approximately 200 feet east of the construction sites. At limited times, activities such as demolition, excavation, and foundation construction may generate noise that could impair the enjoyment of nearby open space users, but such noise effects would be temporary. Construction under the proposed actions would not limit access to any open space resources in the vicinity of the rezoning area. Therefore, proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space during construction.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) determined that the rezoning area is not archaeologically sensitive. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources would occur during construction under the proposed actions.

One architectural resource was identified in the study area: the early 20th century Consolidated Edison Power House, is located more than 345 feet from the project site, far more than the 90 feet as defined by the New York City Department of Buildings (NYCDOB) at which a resource could be damaged from vibration and additional damage from adjacent construction that could occur from falling objects, subsidence, collapse, or damage from construction machinery. Therefore the proposed actions would not result in adverse physical impacts to any architectural resource in the study area during construction.

Hazardous Materials

To reduce the potential for human or environmental exposure to contamination during and construction under the proposed actions, remediation and monitoring of active-status Spill No. 0708204 on the proposed project site would continue in accordance with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) requirements, including implementation of a NYSDEC-approved Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) dated February 2013. An (E) designation would be assigned to the proposed project site to ensure that remedial activities would be undertaken prior to its redevelopment. A New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) approved Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and associated Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) would be prepared for implementation during subsurface disturbance associated with project construction. The RAP would address requirements for items such as soil stockpiling, soil disposal and transportation; capping of soil disturbed by the project with impervious surfaces or clean soil; dust control; quality assurance; vapor control measures, such as the installation of a vapor barrier beneath new building foundations; and procedures for addressing known or unexpectedly encountered petroleum storage tanks, underground hydraulic lifts, or contamination. The CHASP would identify potential hazards that may be encountered during construction and specify appropriate health and safety measures to be undertaken to ensure that subsurface disturbance is performed in a manner protective of workers, the community, and the environment (such as personal protective equipment, air monitoring, and emergency response procedures). Since the bottom of the foundation would extend below the water table, the use of a sub-slab ventilation system is not considered feasible, as it would be inundated with water. Below-grade garage levels would be equipped with a separate ventilation system

Suspect lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials (ACM), and suspect polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) containing electrical and hydraulic equipment and fluorescent lighting fixtures may be present at the proposed project site and/or at development site 2. During and following demolition associated with the proposed actions, regulatory requirements pertaining to ACM, lead-based paint, and PCBs would be followed.

With the above-described measures, the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during construction.

ALTERNATIVES

Three alternatives were considered for comparison to the proposed actions: a No-Action Alternative, which assumes none of the proposed actions would be adopted, and none of the new construction or redevelopment that is expected with the proposed actions would take place; a Lower Density Alternative that considers a C6-3X zoning designation and development with no affordable housing component; and a No Impact Alternative that would reduce the size of development on the project site such that there would be no potential for significant adverse

impacts. While these alternatives would eliminate or reduce the significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the EIS, they would not achieve some or all of the project goals of creating affordable housing, facilitating redevelopment of underutilized space in the rezoning area, continuing the ongoing transition of the Clinton neighborhood into a residential and commercial neighborhood, activating the streetscape and retail environment in the rezoning area, and contributing to the ongoing redevelopment of 57th Street into a major mixed-use corridor with a vibrant commercial environment running through the heart of Manhattan.

MITIGATION

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The proposed actions are expected to result in significant adverse impacts to child care centers.

The proposed actions would be expected to introduce 27 children under the age of six who would be eligible for publicly funded child care programs to the 1.5 mile study area. With the addition of these children, child care facilities in the study area would operate at a 162 percent utilization rate, which represents an increase in the utilization rate of 7.9 percentage points over conditions in the future without the proposed actions. This increase exceeds the 5 percent threshold in the *CEQR Technical Manual* for a significant adverse impact. In order to avoid a significant adverse impact, the number of affordable units introduced by the proposed actions would need to be reduced to 152, which would generate 17 eligible children. Thus, the difference between the proposed actions and the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for significance is a shortfall of 10 child care slots. Possible mitigation measures to avoid a significant adverse impact could include adding capacity to existing facilities if determined feasible through consultation with the Administration of Children's Services (ACS). Mitigation measures will be further explored in consultation with DCP and ACS between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed actions could have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on child care facilities.

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic conditions were evaluated at 15 intersections for the weekday AM, midday and PM peak hours, and the Saturday peak hour. The proposed actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 7 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 10 intersections during the weekday midday peak hour, 13 intersections during the weekday PM peak hour, and 8 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. All of the locations where significant adverse traffic impacts are predicted to occur could be fully mitigated with the implementation of standard mitigation measures (including signal timing changes, approach daylighting, changing parking regulations, channelizing, etc.).

The proposed actions would also result in potential significant adverse bus line haul impacts on the eastbound M57 during the AM peak period and the westbound M31 and westbound M57 during the PM peak hour. NYCT and MTA Bus routinely monitor changes in bus ridership and, subject to the agencies' fiscal and operational constraints, makes necessary service adjustments where warranted. These impacts would be mitigated if increased service adjustments are made.

In addition, the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse pedestrian impact at one crosswalk location: the south crosswalk of 57th Street and Eleventh Avenue during all analysis time periods. The impacts at this crosswalk could be fully mitigated with a crosswalk widening and a signal light timing change during the weekday PM peak hour.

Between the DEIS and FEIS, the transportation and transportation-related analyses may be updated to reflect background changes associated with other projects or other changes. These changes could result in new, different, or worsened significant adverse impacts, all of which will be further detailed in the FEIS. If the updated analyses identify new, different, or worsened impacts that cannot be fully mitigated, they will be identified as unmitigated in the FEIS.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are defined as those that meet the following two criteria: (1) there are no reasonably practicable mitigation measures to eliminate the proposed project's impacts; and (2) there are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would meet its purpose and need, eliminate its impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

The proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities (publicly funded child care centers) and transportation (traffic and pedestrians).

To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for these identified significant adverse impacts, but absent implement of the mitigation it is possible that the impacts would not be eliminated and would therefore be considered "Unavoidable Adverse Impacts."

It is possible that new impacts related to community facilities (day care) and transportation, new unmitigated impacts and new mitigation may be identified between Draft and Final EIS. If conditions change or it is determined that proposed mitigation measures are not feasible, additional mitigation measures may be explored. If it is determined that other measures are not available to mitigate identified significant adverse impacts, either in part or in whole, those impacts would be identified in the FEIS as unmitigated and a discussion will be included in the FEIS.

GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The proposed actions would work toward preserving and strengthening the residential character of the community through the construction of a new residential building, complementing the existing and ongoing revitalization of the area and contributing to a developing retail environment. The proposed actions would facilitate the development of new residential uses that work toward the goals of creating both affordable and market-rate housing in Manhattan and throughout the City—residential uses are not permitted in the current M2-3 and M1-5 manufacturing zones. The rezoning would also allow for uses consistent with the emerging residential character of the neighborhood, on a scale appropriate to the surrounding area, while creating active retail uses at the street level along West 57th Street and Eleventh Avenue while contributing to the area's commercial base and existing built character.

The rezoning area is currently underdeveloped, and its designation for manufacturing uses reflects the former character of this part of Manhattan. The proposed rezoning, along with the other proposed actions, would allow for a mixed-use building in a neighborhood that is already experiencing change that reflects the citywide trend towards redevelopment of former manufacturing areas into vibrant mixed-use communities.

The Clinton neighborhood is in the process of transitioning from a predominantly commercial and industrial area to a residential and commercial neighborhood. This redevelopment trend is

expected to continue with projects that are currently under development, such as Riverside Center and 625 West 57th Street north of the rezoning area, as well as projects facilitated by the recently adopted West Clinton Rezoning, which was in part intended to increase residential and local retail uses and create a 24-hour neighborhood south of the rezoning area. Redevelopment within the proposed rezoning area would complement the existing and ongoing revitalization of the area, contribute to the vitality of the streetscape and retail environment, and reinforce the character of 57th Street as a major mixed-use corridor running through the heart of Manhattan. The addition of ground floor retail would complement the planned retail across the street and contribute to the transformation of this portion of West 57th Street into a vibrant wide commercial street with retail uses on both sides.

While the proposed actions would facilitate the redevelopment of a site that is largely underutilized, the developments on the proposed project site and the projected development site do not represent new types of land uses in the study area. The area currently contains a wide variety of uses, and has experienced significant redevelopment in the last decade with higher-density residential uses, such as the Helena Condominium, Riverside South, and Mercedes House residential high-rise buildings. In addition, higher-density residential mixed use redevelopment in the area is expected to continue independent of the proposed actions by 2017, with projects such as Riverside Center and 625 West 57th Street introducing new residential and retail uses. The proposed actions would be limited to the rezoning area, and would not affect development on other sites.

It is anticipated that the consumer needs of the new residential and worker populations would largely be satisfied by a combination of the new retail uses that are expected to be developed as a result of the proposed actions and the existing retail stores in the surrounding area and Manhattan as a whole. In addition, while the residential and commercial uses facilitated by the proposed actions are expected to introduce new populations to the rezoning area, the proposed actions are not expected to significantly alter existing economic patterns in the study area.

As discussed above, the infrastructure (e.g., sewers or water supply) in the study area is sufficiently well-developed and the proposed actions would not result in an expansion of infrastructure capacity in the surrounding area.

Overall, the proposed actions are not expected to induce any significant additional growth beyond that identified and analyzed in this EIS within the area proposed for rezoning.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

With the proposed actions there are a number of resources, both natural and built, that would be expended in the construction and operation of the developments on the proposed project site and projected development site. These resources would include the materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the developments; and the human effort (i.e., time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the developments.

The resources are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the developments would be highly unlikely. Redevelopment within the rezoning area would constitute an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the proposed project site and the project development site as land resources, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term.

These commitments of materials and land resources are weighed against the benefits of the proposed actions, which would work toward preserving and strengthening the residential character of the community through the construction of a new residential building with affordable and market-rate housing, complementing the existing and ongoing revitalization of the area and contributing to a developing retail environment. *

Celeste Evans

Celeste Evans, Deputy Director
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

cc:
Amanda M. Burden, FAICP
City Planning Commissioners
The Hon. Scott M. Stringer
Chair, Community Board 4, Manhattan
District Manager, Community Board 4, Manhattan
Gail Benjamin, City Council
Robert Kulikowski, OEC
Patrick Blanchfield, HPD
Terrell Estesen, DEP
Chung Chan, DEP
Colleen Alderson, DPR
Henry Colon, DOT
Shakil Ahmed, DOT
Naim Rasheed, DOT
Gina Santucci, LPC
Richard Barth
Jacquelyn Harris
David Karnovsky
Olga Abinader
Shampa Chanda
James Miraglia
Adam Wolff
Pat Bussey
Robert Dobruskin
Mauricio Garcia
Mehdi Amjadi
Susan Wong
Karolina Grebowiec-Hall
Leonard Gruenfeld, HFA