A. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the 2025 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, where significant adverse environmental impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate the impacts to the fullest extent practicable are developed and evaluated.

The potential for the Proposed Actions and resultant reasonable ~~worst-~~worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) to result in significant adverse impacts is evaluated in **Chapters 2 through 15** of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to open space, transportation (traffic and pedestrian conditions), and construction (noise). Potential mitigation measures for these impacts were developed in consultation with the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) and other involved agencies and are discussed in this chapter. Additional measures to mitigate these adverse impacts ~~will be~~were evaluated between the Draft EIS (DEIS) and Final EIS (FEIS). Therefore, the FEIS ~~will~~ refined practicable mitigation commitments, as appropriate, based on ~~ongoing~~ coordination with DCP and other relevant agencies.

B. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

Open Space

As described in **Chapter 4, "Open Space,"** the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact on total, active, and passive open space in the residential study area. The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies a range of potential mitigation measures for open space impacts, which may include, but are not limited to, creating new open space within the study area; funding for improvements, renovation, or maintenance at existing local parks; or improving existing open spaces to increase their utility or capacity to meet identified open space needs in the area, such as through the provision of additional active open space facilities. DCP (the lead agency), in collaboration with New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) determined that the provision of ~~5,050 square feet (sf) of~~ publicly accessible open space by the Applicant~~, comprising of 3,790 sf for active use and 1,260 sf for passive use,~~ would address the open space ratio shortfall~~ and fully mitigate the open space impact~~. It was determined that approximately 6,098 square feet (sf) of additional publicly accessible open space (including a minimum of 1,568 sf of passive open space and a minimum of 4,530 sf of active open space) would fully mitigate the open space impact. NYC Parks also identified partial mitigation measures at Taaffe Playground, including a full park reconstruction, a partial renovation project, and reconstruction of the handball courts. These mitigation measures ~~will continue to be~~were explored by the Applicant in collaboration with DCP and NYC Parks between DEIS and FEIS. Reconstruction of the handball courts at Taaffe Playground has been identified as a practicable and feasible measure to partially mitigate the indirect impact on open space. The partial mitigation would be required through one or more Restrictive Declarations (RDs) between one or more fee owners of the Applicant-controlled Projected Development Sites and the City of New York. The mitigation measure would only partially mitigate the open space impact and therefore, indirect

impacts to open space would remain as an unavoidable adverse impact.~~If no mitigation measures are implemented, the open space impact would remain unmitigated and result in an unavoidable adverse impact.~~

Transportation

As described below, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to vehicular traffic at nine intersections and pedestrian elements at six sidewalks. Mitigation measures that could address the significant adverse impacts are discussed below.

Traffic

As described in greater detail in **Chapter 8, "Transportation,"** the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at nine study area intersections (all signalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically four lane groups at four intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, no lane groups at any intersections in the midday peak hour, 10 lane groups at nine intersections in the PM peak hour, and no lane groups at any intersections in the Saturday peak hour are expected to be impacted. Implementation of traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes, modifications to lane striping, curbside parking regulation changes, and new traffic signals are being proposed, and would provide mitigation for some of the anticipated traffic impacts. The proposed traffic engineering improvements will be implemented at the discretion of the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT). If DOT determines that implementation of the proposed traffic engineering improvement at one or more locations is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Assuming all the proposed mitigation measures are implemented, **Table 16-1** shows that significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at four lane groups in the weekday AM peak hour and nine lane groups in the weekday PM peak hour. Intersections where these impacts would be fully mitigated would total four and eight during these same periods, respectively. **Table 16-2** provides a more detailed summary of the intersections and lane groups that would have unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. In total, impacts would remain unmitigated for one lane group at one intersection during the PM peak hour. All impacted lane groups and intersections during the AM peak hour are expected to be fully mitigated.

TABLE 16-1
Summary of Lane Groups/Intersections with Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

Peak Hour	Lane Groups/ Intersections Analyzed	Lane Groups/ Intersections with No Significant Impacts	Lane Groups/ Intersections with Significant Impacts	Mitigated Lane Groups/ Intersections	Unmitigated Lane Groups/ Intersections
Weekday AM	63/21	59/17	4/4	4/4	0/0
Weekday Midday	3/1	3/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
Weekday PM	63/21	53/12	10/9	9/8	1/1
Saturday	12/4	12/4	0/0	0/0	0/0

TABLE 16-2
Lane Groups with Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	**Weekday Midday**	**Weekday PM**	**Saturday**
Signalized Intersections				
1. Franklin Avenue & Flushing Avenue			SB-LTR	

Notes: SB-southbound, L-left-turn, T-through, R-right-turn.

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact six sidewalks in one or more analyzed peak hours. Recommended mitigation measures include the relocation or removal of impediments to sidewalk flow and sidewalk widening, which would mitigate the impact to ~~one~~ five sidewalks during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. As shown in **Table 16-3,** with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse impacts to ~~one~~ five sidewalks would be mitigated during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. One sidewalk would remain unmitigated during the weekday AM peak hour. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as NYC Parks for the relocation or removal of any street trees and NYC Fire Department (FDNY) for the implementation of the proposed sidewalk widening. If DOT determines that implementation of any one recommended pedestrian mitigation measures is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then these impacts would remain unmitigated and would constitute unavoidable adverse impacts.

~~In addition, DOT has identified potential mitigation measures for the remaining five sidewalk impacts, which include widening the sidewalks by five feet and eliminating the parking lane for the entire block of these sidewalks. These mitigation measures will continue to be explored by the Applicant in collaboration with DCP and DOT between certification of the DEIS and publication of the FEIS. If no mitigation measures are implemented, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, these impacts would remain unmitigated and result in unavoidable adverse impacts.~~

TABLE 16-3
Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts

Peak Hour	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners Analyzed	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners with No Significant Impacts	Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners with Significant Impacts	Mitigated Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners	Unmitigated Sidewalks/ Crosswalks/ Corners
Weekday AM	22/15/36	17/15/36	5/0/0	~~0~~4/0/0	~~5~~1/0/0
Weekday Midday	0/0/6	0/0/6	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0
Weekday PM	29/22/48	26/22/48	3/0/0	~~1~~3/0/0	~~2~~0/0/0
Saturday	6/7/17	6/7/17	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0

Notes: Sidewalk, corner, and crosswalk elements are analyzed for periods that exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold.
This table has been revised for the FEIS.

Construction

Transportation

It is expected that the mitigation measures identified for transportation for 2031 operational traffic impacts would also be effective at mitigating potential impacts during the peak construction periods. The proposed mitigation measures will be implemented at the discretion of DOT. If DOT

determines that implementation of the proposed traffic engineering improvement at one or more locations is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Noise

As described in **Chapter 14, "Construction,"** the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Project Area. However, building construction would typically occur during weekday daytime hours and would therefore not produce noise during nighttime hours when residents would be most sensitive to noise. Further, construction would comply with *New York City Noise Control Code* regulations. Per *New York City Noise Control Code* regulations, construction under the Proposed Actions would be required to prepare a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan, which may identify more control measures that would further reduce construction noise levels. At building façades that are predicted to experience noise impacts, the Applicant would offer to provide and install storm windows for the impacted façades that do not already have insulated glass windows and/or one window air conditioner per living room, bedroom, or any other noise sensitive space that does not already have an alternative means of ventilation. However, even with these potential mitigation measures, the most noise-intensive construction activity nearest the receptors experiencing significant adverse impacts would result in interior noise greater than the level considered acceptable according to 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines. Consequently, the temporary construction noise impacts predicted to occur at these receptors would be only partially mitigated and thus unavoidable, as discussed in **Chapter 18, "Unavoidable Adverse Impacts."**

C. OPEN SPACE

Within the 0.5-mile residential study area, the total, active, and passive open space ratios in the future with the Proposed Actions would remain below the City's planning goal ratios of 2.5 acres, which includes 2.0 acres of active and 0.5 acres of passive space per 1,000 residents, respectively. The residential study area total open space ratio would decrease by 1.52 percent to 0.269 acres per 1,000 residents; the residential study area active open space ratio would decrease by 1.52 percent to 0.202 acres per 1,000 residents; and the residential study area passive open space ratio would decrease by 1.52 percent to 0.067 acres per 1,000 residents. As these decreases would exceed the 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds indicating the potential for an impact and the residential study area would continue to exhibit low open space ratios and heavy playground utilization rate, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect impact on total, active, and passive open space in the residential study area.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies a range of potential mitigation measures for open space impacts, which may include, but are not limited to, creating new open space within the study area; funding for improvements, renovation, or maintenance at existing local parks; or improving existing open spaces to increase their utility or capacity to meet identified open space needs in the area, such as through the provision of additional active open space facilities. DCP, in collaboration with NYC Parks, determined that the provision of 5,050 sf of publicly accessible open space by the Applicant, including 3,790 sf for active use and 1,260 sf for passive use, would address the open space ratio shortfall and fully mitigate the open space impact. It was determined that approximately 6,098 square feet (sf) of additional publicly accessible open space (including a minimum of 1,568 sf of passive open space and a minimum of 4,530 sf of active open space) would fully mitigate the open space impact. NYC Parks also identified potential mitigation measures at Taffee Playground, including a full park reconstruction, a partial renovation project,

and reconstruction of the handball courts. Mitigation measures ~~will continue to be~~were explored by the Applicant in collaboration with DCP and NYC Parks between DEIS and FEIS. Reconstruction of the handball courts at Taaffe Playground has been identified as a practicable and feasible measure to partially mitigate the indirect impact on open space. The partial mitigation would be required through one or more RDs between one or more fee owners of the Applicant-controlled Projected Development Sites and the City of New York. The mitigation measure would only partially mitigate the open space impact and therefore, indirect impacts to open space would remain as an unavoidable adverse impact.~~If no mitigation measures are implemented, and no other mitigation measures are identified, the open space impacts would remain unmitigated and result in an unavoidable adverse impact.~~

D. TRANSPORTATION

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts at nine intersections and six sidewalks. Mitigation measures that could address the significant adverse impacts are discussed below.

Traffic

As described in **Chapter 8**, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at nine study area intersections (all signalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, four lane groups at four intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, no lane groups at any intersections in the midday peak hour, 10 lane groups at nine intersections in the PM peak hour, and no lane groups at any intersections in the Saturday peak hour are expected to be impacted.

As demonstrated below, some of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including:

- Modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing,
- Installation of new traffic signals,
- Elimination of on-street parking to add a travel lane, and
- Modifications to lane striping.

The types of mitigation measures proposed herein are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. **Table 16-4** summarizes the recommended mitigation measures for each of the intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed traffic engineering improvements will be implemented at the discretion of DOT. If DOT determines that implementation of the proposed traffic engineering improvement at one or more locations is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact. **Tables 16-5** and **16-6** show the v/c ratios, delays, and levels of service (LOS) for impacted lane groups at each intersection with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and compares them to No-Action and With-Action conditions for the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. According to 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, an impact is considered fully mitigated when the resulting LOS degradation under the Action-with-Mitigation condition compared with the No-Action condition is no longer deemed significant following the impact criteria described in **Chapter 8**. **Tables 16-5** and **16-6** show that significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at four lane

groups in the weekday AM peak hour and nine lane groups in the PM peak hour. Intersections where these impacts would be fully mitigated would total four and eight during these same periods, respectively. Note that no traffic impacts were identified for the weekday midday or Saturday peak hour. In total, impacts would remain unmitigated for one lane group at one intersection during the PM peak hour. Consequently, this impact would constitute an unavoidable significant adverse traffic impact as a result of the Proposed Actions (see **Chapter 18~~, "Unavoidable Adverse Impacts"~~**).

TABLE 16-4
Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures

Intersection		Signal Phase	No-Action Signal Timing (seconds)[1]				Proposed Signal Timings (seconds)[1]				Recommended Mitigation Measures
			AM	MD	PM	SAT	AM	MD	PM	SAT	
4	Spencer Street & Flushing Avenue	E-W Ped	Unsignalized				71 49		68 52		- Install signal at this intersection with a 120-second cycle length.
6	Warsoff Place & Flushing Avenue	E-W Ped	66 54		58 62		66 54		58 62		- Implement no standing anytime along the north curb of the WB approach from Nostrand Avenue to Warsoff Place. - Implement no standing anytime for 115' along the north curb of the WB approach receiving side. - Restripe WB approach to one 10' left-turn (140' storage left-turn) and one 11' thru lane and 19' receiving for EB approach.
7	Nostrand Avenue & Flushing Avenue	E-W LPI SB LPI	54 7 52 7		54 7 52 7		54 7 52 7		54 7 52 7		- Implement no standing anytime for 250' along the north curb of the WB approach. - Restripe WB approach to one 10' left-turn (175' storage left-turn) and one 15' thru lane.
8	Bedford Avenue & Park Avenue	E-W LPI NB			46 10 64				50 10 60		- Transfer 4s of green time from NB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak hour.
12	Nostrand Avenue & Park Avenue	E-W LPI SB			55 7 58				58 7 55		- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in PM peak hour.
13	Bedford Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	E-W NB			65 55				68 52		- Transfer 3s of green time from NB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak hour.
17	Nostrand Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	E-W LPI SB LPI			53 7 53 7				56 7 50 7		- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak hour.
18	Marcy Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	E-W LPI NB LPI	48 7 28 7		48 7 28 7		49 7 27 7		51 7 25 7		- Implement no standing anytime for 150' along the west curb of the NB approach. - Restripe NB approach to one 11' left-turn (100' storage left-turn) and two 11' thru-right lane. - Transfer 1s and 3s of green time from NB phase to E-W phase in the AM and PM peak hour.
19	Macy Avenue/Union Avenue & Flushing Avenue	E-W LPI NB	75 7 38		75 7 38		74 7 39		74 7 39		- Transfer 1s of green time from E-W phase to NB phase in the AM and PM peak hour.

Note: (1) Signal timings shown indicate green plus yellow (including all red) for each phase

TABLE 16-5
Action-With-Mitigation Conditions at Impacted Lane Groups – AM

	Signalized Intersections	Approach	Lane Group	No-Action Weekday AM V/C Ratio	No-Action Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	No-Action Weekday AM LOS	With-Action Weekday AM V/C Ratio	With-Action Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	With-Action Weekday AM LOS	Mitigation Weekday AM V/C Ratio	Mitigation Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	Mitigation Weekday AM LOS
1	Franklin Avenue &	EB	TR	0.53	26.2	C	0.54	26.4	C	0.54	26.4	C
	Flushing Avenue	WB	LT	0.69	14.1	B	0.76	16.1	B	0.76	15.7	B
		SB	LTR	0.72	39.5	D	0.85	50.8	D	0.85	50.8	D
2	Skillman Street &	EB	T	0.51	10.0	A	0.54	10.9	B	0.54	10.9	B
	Flushing Avenue	WB	T	0.51	9.4	A	0.56	9.6	A	0.56	9.4	A
		NB	LR	0.27	35.0	C	0.27	35.0	C	0.27	35.0	C
3	Bedford Avenue &	EB	LT	0.80	19.7	B	0.90	28.6	C	0.90	28.6	C
	Flushing Avenue	WB	TR	0.64	17.2	B	0.74	23.1	C	0.74	7.4	A
		NB	LTR	0.90	32.5	C	0.96	41.0	D	0.96	41.0	D
4	Spencer Street &	EB	TR	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.72	10.0	A
	Flushing Avenue	WB	LT	0.13	3.7 (Unsignalized)	A	0.23	7.8 (Unsignalized)	A	0.97	51.2 (Signalized)	D
5	Walworth Street &	EB	T	0.57	22.4	C	0.59	21.6	C	0.59	16.0	B
	Flushing Avenue	WB	T	0.46	2.2	A	0.50	2.7	A	0.50	2.6	A
		NB	LR	0.53	40.3	D	0.69	49.1	D	0.69	49.1	D
6	Warsoff Place &	EB	TR	0.78	21.5	C	0.84	24.8	C	0.84	25.3	C
	Flushing Avenue	WB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.87	56.3	E
		WB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.47	10.8	B
		WB	LT	0.90	13.7	B	1.49	239.2	F *	-	22.1	C
7	Nostrand Avenue &	EB	TR	0.80	31.3	C	0.82	31.1	C	0.82	32.2	C
	Flushing Avenue	WB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.60	27.8	C
		WB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.64	21.9	C
		WB	LT	1.31	175.0	F	1.43	225.3	F *	-	23.1	C
		SB	LTR	0.46	28.7	C	0.54	30.6	C	0.54	30.6	C
8	Bedford Avenue &	EB	LT	0.49	34.9	C	0.52	35.6	D	0.52	35.6	D
	Park Avenue	WB	TR	0.65	32.8	C	0.79	37.4	D	0.79	37.7	D
		NB	LTR	0.76	9.6	A	0.78	10.3	B	0.78	10.3	B
9	Spencer Street &	EB	TR	0.46	12.9	B	0.50	13.9	B	0.50	13.9	B
	Park Avenue	WB	LT	0.63	11.0	B	0.84	23.0	C	0.84	23.0	C
		SB	LTR	0.25	22.2	C	0.35	23.4	C	0.35	33.3	C
10	Walworth Street &	EB	LT	0.43	9.5	A	0.49	10.8	B	0.49	11.4	B
	Park Avenue	WB	TR	0.60	7.6	A	0.67	9.2	A	0.67	9.2	A
		NB	LTR	0.47	32.2	C	0.75	41.3	D	0.75	41.3	D
11	Sandford Street/Warsoff Place &	EB	TR	0.39	9.8	A	0.44	9.0	A	0.44	9.0	A
	Park Avenue	WB	LT	0.64	5.5	A	0.70	6.3	A	0.70	6.1	A
		SB	LTR	0.23	45.4	D	0.44	47.8	D	0.44	51.0	D

Notes:
EB - eastbound, WB - westbound, NB - northbound, SB - southbound
L - left, T - through, R - right, DefL - Analysis considers a defacto left-turn lane on this approach
V/C ratio - volume-to-capacity ratio
Sec/veh - seconds per vehicle
LOS - level of service
* - Denotes an impacted movement (LOS E or F, or v/c ratio greater than or equal to 0.9)
Analysis is based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology (Synchro 12)

TABLE 16-5 (Cont.)
Action-With-Mitigation Conditions at Impacted Lane Groups – AM

	Signalized Intersections	Approach	Lane Group	No-Action Weekday AM V/C Ratio	No-Action Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	No-Action Weekday AM LOS	With-Action Weekday AM V/C Ratio	With-Action Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	With-Action Weekday AM LOS	Mitigation Weekday AM V/C Ratio	Mitigation Weekday AM Delay (sec/veh)	Mitigation Weekday AM LOS
12	Nostrand Avenue & Park Avenue	EB	TR	0.45	13.7	B	0.50	14.9	B	0.50	14.9	B
		WB	LT	0.80	40.5	D	0.86	46.3	D	0.86	46.3	D
		SB	LT	0.42	16.6	B	0.43	16.0	B	0.43	16.8	B
		SB	R	0.14	14.2	B	0.14	13.9	B	0.14	14.6	B
13	Bedford Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	0.37	20.0	B	0.40	20.6	C	0.40	20.6	C
		WB	TR	0.62	17.6	B	0.69	19.6	B	0.69	19.6	B
		NB	LTR	0.96	53.3	D	0.98	57.8	E	0.98	57.8	E
14	Spencer Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.35	10.5	B	0.38	10.6	B	0.38	10.6	B
		WB	LT	0.53	26.3	C	0.57	24.5	C	0.57	24.5	C
		SB	LTR	0.45	29.8	C	0.55	32.0	C	0.55	33.0	C
15	Walworth Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	0.35	12.4	B	0.39	13.5	B	0.39	13.5	B
		WB	TR	0.44	14.8	B	0.55	20.1	C	0.55	20.1	C
		NB	LTR	0.67	42.1	D	0.75	46.6	D	0.75	46.6	D
16	Sandford Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.37	35.4	D	0.38	33.9	C	0.38	34.0	C
		WB	LT	0.50	15.0	B	0.55	15.5	B	0.55	15.5	B
		SB	LTR	0.39	37.3	D	0.57	35.6	D	0.57	35.6	D
17	Nostrand Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.55	21.6	C	0.64	24.7	C	0.64	24.7	C
		WB	LT	0.65	35.3	D	0.75	40.9	D	0.75	40.9	D
		SB	LT	0.51	13.1	B	0.52	13.3	B	0.52	13.3	B
		SB	R	0.10	9.9	A	0.14	10.4	B	0.14	10.4	B
18	Marcy Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	0.75	32.7	C	0.94	60.2	E *	0.90	50.0	D
		WB	TR	0.75	27.0	C	0.80	30.5	C	0.78	28.3	C
		NB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.41	35.1	D
		NB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.86	46.1	D
		NB	LTR	0.94	55.0	D	0.96	57.8	E	-	44.8	D
19	Marcy Avenue/Union Avenue & Flushing Avenue	EB	LT	0.64	17.3	B	0.71	21.0	C	0.73	23.1	C
		WB	TR	0.69	22.4	C	0.75	24.9	C	0.76	26.1	C
		NB	LTR	1.22	155.0	F	1.26	174.3	F *	1.22	156.2	F
		SW	R	0.05	10.9	B	0.06	11.0	B	0.06	11.4	B
20	Marcy Avenue & Park Avenue	EB	LT	0.70	33.3	C	0.84	47.0	D	0.84	47.0	D
		WB	TR	0.78	33.6	C	0.81	36.0	D	0.81	36.0	D
		NB	LTR	0.79	22.8	C	0.82	23.7	C	0.82	24.4	C
21	Williamsburg St E & Wythe Avenue	EB	L	0.44	18.2	B	0.44	18.2	B	0.44	18.2	B
		EB	LT	0.61	22.0	C	0.67	23.8	C	0.67	23.8	C
		NB	TR	0.92	55.0	E	0.94	57.8	E	0.94	57.8	E

Notes:
EB - eastbound, WB - westbound, NB - northbound, SB - southbound
L - left, T - through, R - right, DefL - Analysis considers a defacto left-turn lane on this approach
V/C ratio - volume-to-capacity ratio
Sec/veh - seconds per vehicle
LOS - level of service
* - Denotes an impacted movement (LOS E or F, or v/c ratio greater than or equal to 0.9)
Analysis is based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology (Synchro 12)

TABLE 16-6
Action-With-Mitigation Conditions at Impacted Lane Groups – PM

	Signalized Intersections	Approach	Lane Group	No-Action Weekday PM V/C Ratio	No-Action Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	No-Action Weekday PM LOS	With-Action Weekday PM V/C Ratio	With-Action Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	With-Action Weekday PM LOS	Mitigation Weekday PM V/C Ratio	Mitigation Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	Mitigation Weekday PM LOS
1	Franklin Avenue & Flushing Avenue	EB	TR	0.60	32.6	C	0.62	33.4	C	0.62	33.4	C
		WB	LT	0.68	16.3	B	0.76	19.9	B	0.76	23.7	C
		SB	LTR	0.93	54.6	D	1.07	91.7	F *	1.07	91.7	F *
2	Skillman Street & Flushing Avenue	EB	T	0.58	14.8	B	0.64	17.2	B	0.64	17.2	B
		WB	T	0.49	14.3	B	0.52	15.0	B	0.52	16.6	B
		NB	LR	0.16	24.4	C	0.19	24.8	C	0.19	24.8	C
3	Bedford Avenue & Flushing Avenue	EB	LT	0.83	20.0	B	0.95	33.5	C	0.95	33.5	C
		WB	TR	0.68	34.2	C	0.73	35.5	D	0.73	29.4	C
		NB	LTR	0.84	20.8	C	0.91	25.2	C	0.91	25.0	C
4	Spencer Street & Flushing Avenue	EB	TR	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.78	18.4	B
		WB	LT	0.21	6.8 (Unsignalized)	A	0.43	22.2 (Unsignalized)	C	0.95	47.2 (Signalized)	D
5	Walworth Street & Flushing Avenue	EB	T	0.56	11.3	B	0.61	11.7	B	0.61	13.6	B
		WB	T	0.45	15.1	B	0.46	16.1	B	0.46	3.9	A
		NB	LR	0.50	37.5	D	0.65	44.0	D	0.65	44.0	D
6	Warsoff Place & Flushing Avenue	EB	TR	0.78	21.2	C	0.87	26.5	C	0.87	24.6	C
		WB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.12	136.9	F
		WB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.44	18.0	B
		WB	LT	1.24	131.5	F	2.09	512.9	F *	-	53.8	D
7	Nostrand Avenue & Flushing Avenue	EB	TR	0.78	12.0	B	0.84	13.9	B	0.84	15.1	B
		WB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.75	65.6	E
		WB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.48	41.5	D
		WB	LT	1.28	193.2	F	1.47	274.4	F *	-	47.8	D
		SB	LTR	0.57	30.8	C	0.63	32.4	C	0.63	32.4	C
8	Bedford Avenue & Park Avenue	EB	LT	1.14	132.4	F	1.39	238.0	F *	1.12	121.7	F
		WB	TR	0.77	49.2	D	0.90	64.6	E *	0.82	52.4	D
		NB	LTR	0.77	16.2	B	0.81	18.1	B	0.87	20.4	C
9	Spencer Street & Park Avenue	EB	TR	0.44	9.4	A	0.48	10.5	B	0.48	12.2	B
		WB	LT	0.46	7.3	A	0.58	11.0	B	0.58	10.7	B
		SB	LTR	0.48	43.0	D	0.60	45.0	D	0.60	54.4	D
10	Walworth Street & Park Avenue	EB	LT	0.44	8.1	A	0.50	8.9	A	0.50	9.1	A
		WB	TR	0.49	14.1	B	0.56	14.9	B	0.56	13.8	B
		NB	LTR	0.55	25.5	C	0.85	42.6	D	0.85	42.4	D
11	Sandford Street/Warsoff Place & Park Avenue	EB	TR	0.42	8.1	A	0.48	9.6	A	0.48	9.6	A
		WB	LT	0.50	10.7	B	0.57	10.8	B	0.57	11.2	B
		SB	LTR	0.47	45.3	D	0.70	48.2	D	0.70	54.3	D

Notes:
EB - eastbound, WB - westbound, NB - northbound, SB - southbound
L - left, T - through, R - right, DefL - Analysis considers a defacto left-turn lane on this approach
V/C ratio - volume-to-capacity ratio
Sec/veh - seconds per vehicle
LOS - level of service
* - Denotes an impacted movement (LOS E or F, or v/c ratio greater than or equal to 0.9)
Analysis is based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology (Synchro 12)

TABLE 16-6 (Cont.)
Action-With-Mitigation Conditions at Impacted Lane Groups – PM

	Signalized Intersections	Approach	Lane Group	No-Action Weekday PM V/C Ratio	No-Action Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	No-Action Weekday PM LOS	With-Action Weekday PM V/C Ratio	With-Action Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	With-Action Weekday PM LOS	Mitigation Weekday PM V/C Ratio	Mitigation Weekday PM Delay (sec/veh)	Mitigation Weekday PM LOS
12	Nostrand Avenue & Park Avenue	EB	TR	0.53	15.6	B	0.60	16.1	B	0.56	13.2	B
		WB	LT	0.91	57.6	E	1.02	84.1	F *	0.92	56.9	E
		SB	LT	0.48	14.2	B	0.49	13.9	B	0.52	16.2	B
		SB	R	0.20	12.5	B	0.23	12.6	B	0.25	14.5	B
13	Bedford Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	0.86	43.0	D	1.02	77.6	E *	0.92	51.5	D
		WB	TR	0.67	38.2	D	0.72	38.2	D	0.69	34.1	C
		NB	LTR	0.83	38.6	D	0.85	40.1	D	0.91	47.5	D
14	Spencer Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.54	14.9	B	0.55	13.7	B	0.55	15.8	B
		WB	LT	0.70	15.8	B	0.75	16.6	B	0.75	17.5	B
		SB	LTR	0.58	44.4	D	0.71	46.9	D	0.71	47.0	D
15	Walworth Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	0.56	20.2	C	0.69	25.9	C	0.69	26.1	C
		WB	TR	0.54	25.9	C	0.64	27.5	C	0.64	25.8	C
		NB	LTR	0.55	37.0	D	0.63	40.2	D	0.63	40.2	D
16	Sandford Street & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.42	12.0	B	0.44	9.1	A	0.44	9.2	A
		WB	LT	0.40	10.8	B	0.43	11.2	B	0.43	10.4	B
		SB	LTR	0.60	35.0	C	0.83	48.2	D	0.83	48.6	D
17	Nostrand Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	TR	0.81	37.6	D	0.92	49.8	D	0.86	40.2	D
		WB	LT	0.88	56.8	E	1.06	101.8	F *	0.91	59.1	E
		SB	LT	0.68	21.4	C	0.70	21.2	C	0.75	23.5	C
		SB	R	0.18	14.0	B	0.23	14.4	B	0.26	15.9	B
18	Marcy Avenue & Myrtle Avenue	EB	LT	1.03	71.2	E	1.18	124.0	F *	1.05	75.1	E
		WB	TR	0.55	19.8	B	0.58	20.7	C	0.55	17.9	B
		NB	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.49	39.6	D
		NB	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.96	62.0	E
		NB	LTR	0.95	56.9	E	0.97	61.4	E	-	59.1	E
19	Marcy Avenue/Union Avenue & Flushing Avenue	EB	LT	0.83	21.5	C	0.97	41.0	D	0.93	32.8	C
		WB	TR	0.49	16.6	B	0.53	17.3	B	0.54	18.0	B
		NB	LTR	1.13	119.7	F	1.18	137.2	F *	1.14	122.0	F
		SW	R	0.13	11.8	B	0.14	11.9	B	0.14	12.4	B
20	Marcy Avenue & Park Avenue	EB	LT	0.67	31.4	C	0.83	45.9	D	0.83	45.9	D
		WB	TR	0.76	31.8	C	0.79	34.0	C	0.79	34.0	C
		NB	LTR	0.59	16.1	B	0.62	16.9	B	0.62	15.8	B
21	Williamsburg St E & Wythe Avenue	EB	L	0.26	15.5	B	0.26	15.5	B	0.26	15.5	B
		EB	LT	0.41	17.5	B	0.45	18.2	B	0.45	18.2	B
		NB	TR	0.79	45.1	D	0.81	46.2	D	0.81	46.2	D

Notes:
EB - eastbound, WB - westbound, NB - northbound, SB - southbound
L - left, T - through, R - right, DefL - Analysis considers a defacto left-turn lane on this approach
V/C ratio - volume-to-capacity ratio
Sec/veh - seconds per vehicle
LOS - level of service
* - Denotes an impacted movement (LOS E or F, or v/c ratio greater than or equal to 0.9)
Analysis is based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology (Synchro 12)

Effects of Pedestrian Mitigation on Traffic Conditions

Proposed pedestrian mitigation measures would not affect traffic conditions at any analyzed intersection in any peak hour.

Proposed Schedule For Traffic Mitigation Measures

Subject to the final review and approval of DOT, the mitigation measures summarized in **Table 16-4** would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse traffic impacts resulting from full build-out of development facilitated by the Proposed Actions in 2031. As the development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be expected to occur over a nearly five-year period, it is possible that some of the significant adverse traffic impacts could occur prior to full build-out in 2031, notably following the construction completion of the first two Projected Development Sites during the fourth quarter of 2027. As such, the proposed mitigation measures should be implemented during the first quarter of 2028.

Effects Of Traffic Mitigation On Parking Conditions

As discussed in **Chapter 8**, the Proposed Actions would generate a weekday parking demand of approximately 172 spaces in the weekday morning (7:00 am – 8:00 am.) period and 143 spaces in the overnight period. The Proposed Actions would also generate a peak Saturday parking demand of approximately 161 spaces in the Saturday morning (5:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) period and 143 spaces in the overnight period. Due to parking displacement from the proposed traffic mitigations, parking demand would increase by approximately 27 spaces during each of these periods. The Projected Development Sites would provide a total of 151 on-site parking spaces, which would not accommodate the demand. The excess demand not accommodated by on-site parking would seek parking availability within a ~~quarter~~0.25-mile radius of the Project Area. Additionally, in conjunction to the project, the Applicant will coordinate with DOT ~~will~~ to implement a "No Standing 7am – 6pm" regulation along the designated bus loading zones and school frontages on Walworth Street and Sandford Street, as well as a "No Standing Anytime" regulation along the west curb of Walworth Street between Park Avenue and Myrtle Avenue and along the east curb of Sandford Street between Park Avenue and Myrtle Avenue. The implementation of these regulations would result in the loss of approximately 71 on-street parking spaces. However, the "No Standing 7am – 6pm" regulation along the bus loading zones and school frontages would not be in effect during the overnight peak period, when residential parking demand peaks. Any potential deficit in parking would not be considered a significant adverse impact based on 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation in the well-served -project area.

As discussed above, the proposed traffic mitigation plan would incorporate a number of modifications to curbside parking regulations. As shown in **Table 16-4**, along the north curb of Flushing Avenue between Warsoff Place and Nostrand Avenue / Lee Avenue, new "N~~n~~o S~~s~~tanding A~~a~~nytime" restrictions would be implemented for 115 feet, which would displace a total of approximately 10 on-street parking spaces. Along the north curb of Flushing Avenue between Nostrand Avenue / Lee Avenue and Marcy Avenue, new "N~~n~~o S~~s~~tanding A~~a~~nytime" restrictions would be implemented for 250 feet, which would displace a total of approximately 11 on-street parking spaces. Lastly, along the west curb of Marcy Avenue between Myrtle Avenue and Vernon Avenue, new "N~~n~~o S~~s~~tanding A~~a~~nytime" restrictions would be implemented for 150 feet, which would displace a total of approximately six on-street parking spaces. With the proposed traffic mitigation, a total of approximately 27 on-street parking spaces would be displaced. DOT implementation of these measures would be determined pending DOT review, study, and resources.

Pedestrians

As discussed in **Chapter 8**, the results of the analyses of pedestrian conditions show that demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact six sidewalks in one or more peak hours under the With-Action Condition (see **Table 16-~~8~~7**).

A significant adverse pedestrian impact is considered mitigated if measures implemented return the anticipated conditions to an acceptable level, following the same criteria used in determining impacts. Standard mitigation for projected significant adverse pedestrian impacts can include providing additional signal green time or new signal phases; widening crosswalks; relocating or removing street furniture or other impediments to pedestrian flow; providing curb extensions, neck-downs, or lane reductions to reduce pedestrian crossing distance; and sidewalk widening. Discussed below are recommended mitigation measures to address the Proposed Actions' significant adverse pedestrian impacts. The mitigation measures consist of the relocation and removal of impediments to sidewalk flow, as well as sidewalk widening. The recommended pedestrian mitigation measures will be implemented at the discretion of DOT. If DOT determines that implementation of the recommended pedestrian mitigation measures at any of the six sidewalks is infeasible, then those impacts would remain unmitigated and would constitute unavoidable adverse impacts.

TABLE 16-~~8~~7
Summary of Significant Pedestrian Impacts

Corridor	Impacted Elements	Peak Hour	
		AM	PM
Flushing Ave between Bedford Ave and Lee Ave	North Sidewalk		X
Flushing Ave between Bedford Ave and Spencer St	South Sidewalk	X	
Myrtle Ave between Bedford Ave and Spencer St	North Sidewalk	X	
Flushing Ave between Spencer St and Walworth St	South Sidewalk	X	
Walworth St between Park Ave and Myrtle Ave	East Sidewalk	X	X
Flushing Ave between Lee Ave and Marcy Ave	North Sidewalk	X	X

Sidewalks

Of the 29 sidewalks analyzed, six are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by incremental demand from the Proposed Actions in one or more peak hours. **Table 16-~~9~~ 8** shows the recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts and their effectiveness. As shown in **Table 16-~~9~~8**, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Proposed Actions' significant adverse impacts to ~~one~~ five sidewalks would be mitigated during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. One sidewalk would remain unmitigated during the weekday AM peak hour. The mitigation measures include the relocation or removal of impediments and widening of sidewalk segments. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as NYC Parks for the relocation or removal of any street trees and FDNY for the implementation of the proposed sidewalk widening. If DOT determines that implementation of any one recommended pedestrian mitigation measure is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then these impacts would remain unmitigated and would constitute unavoidable adverse impacts.

~~In addition, DOT has identified potential mitigation measures for these five sidewalk impacts, which include widening the sidewalks by five feet and eliminating the parking lane for the entire block of these sidewalks. These mitigation measures will continue to be explored by the Applicant in collaboration with DCP and DOT between certification of the DEIS and publication of the FEIS.~~

~~If no mitigation measures are implemented, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, these impacts would remain unmitigated and result in unavoidable adverse impacts.~~

TABLE 16-~~9~~8
Action-With-Mitigation Sidewalk Conditions

Sidewalk		No-Action			With-Action			Action-with-Mitigation			
		Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Effective Width (ft)	Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Weekday AM Peak Hour											
S2	South Sidewalk along Flushing Ave between Bedford Ave and Spencer St	4.5	47.5	C	4.5	35.4	D *	7.0	56.4	C	Relocation/removal of 2 trees to another less constraint point
S5	North Sidewalk along Myrtle Ave between Bedford Ave and Spencer St	3.0	61.2	C	3.0	39.5	D *	7.0	94.6	B	Relocation/removal of a tree to another less constraint point
S7	South Sidewalk along Flushing Ave between Spencer St and Walworth St	7.5	46.5	C	7.5	37.1	D *	7.5	37.1	D *	Unmitigatable
S16	East Sidewalk along Walworth St between Park Ave and Myrtle Ave	2.0	291.9	B	2.0	24.9	D *	6.0	80.0	C	Widen the sidewalk by 4 ft along an approximately 198-feet segment
S26	North Sidewalk along Flushing Ave between Lee Ave and Marcy Ave	1.5	9.8	F	1.5	5.5	F *	4.0	26.4	D	Widen the sidewalk by 5 ft along an approximately 550-ft segment
Weekday PM Peak Hour											
S1	North Sidewalk along Flushing Ave between Bedford Ave and Lee Ave	4.0	52.0	C	4.0	36.1	D *	6.0	55.3	C	Relocation/removal of 2 furnitures and the bus stop sign to a less constrained point
S16	East Sidewalk along Walworth St between Park Ave and Myrtle Ave	2.0	187.0	B	2.0	23.1	D *	6.0	75.1	C	Widen the sidewalk by 4 ft along an approximately 198-ft segment
S26	North Sidewalk along Flushing Ave between Lee Ave and Marcy Ave	1.5	22.4	E	1.5	14.6	E *	4.0	45.9	C	Widen the sidewalk by 5 ft along an approximately 550-ft segment

Notes:
Sidewalk elements are analyzed for periods that exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold.
* denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.
This table has been revised for the FEIS.

Effects of Traffic Mitigation on Pedestrian Conditions

Proposed traffic mitigation measures, subject to DOT approval (discussed previously), would potentially affect pedestrian conditions at a total of three analyzed crosswalks and 14 analyzed corner areas at five intersections in one or more peak hours. The recommended traffic mitigation measures at each of these locations would consist of signal timing adjustments of one to five seconds. As shown in **Tables 16-~~10~~ 9** and **16-~~11~~10**, with implementation of these proposed signal timing adjustments, all affected analyzed crosswalks and corner areas would continue to operate at a non-adverse impact LOS C or better in all analyzed peak hours, and there would be no new pedestrian impacts. Sufficient pedestrian crossing time would also continue to be provided at all crosswalks.

TABLE 16-~~10~~9
Action-With-Traffic Mitigation Crosswalk Conditions

Intersection	Crosswalk	With-Action Condition				Action-with-Mitigation				Proposed Traffic Mitigation
		Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)		Level of Service		Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)		Level of Service		
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
Nostrand Ave & Park Ave	North	61.6	44.3	A	B	66.1	47.2	A	B	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in PM peak hour.
Nostrand Ave & Myrtle Ave	North	56.3	56.2	B	B	56.3	59.8	B	B	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak hour.
Marcy Ave & Flushing Ave	North	24.8	24.6	C	C	24.3	24.1	C	C	- Transfer 1s of green time from E-W phase to NS phase in the AM and PM peak hour.

Notes:
Crosswalk elements are analyzed for periods that exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold.
Action-with-mitigation takes into account pedestrian mitigation measures in all peak hours.
* denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

TABLE 16-~~11~~10
Action-With-Traffic Mitigation Corner Conditions

Intersection	Corner		With-Action Condition				Action-with-Mitigation				Proposed Traffic Mitigation
			Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)		Level of Service		Average Pedestrian Space (ft^2/ped)		Level of Service		
			AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
Bedford Ave & Park Ave	C04	NE	56.6	68.3	B	A	56.6	68.4	B	A	- Transfer 4s of green time from NB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak
	C05	SE		71.7		A		71.7		A	
Bedford Ave & Myrtle Ave	C06	NE	83.6	81.5	A	A	84.7	81.3	A	A	- Transfer 3s of green time from NB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak
	C07	SE	37.6	36.7	C	C	38.6	36.8	C	C	
Nostrand Ave & Park Ave	C37	NE	177.3	132.2	A	A	182.0	132.2	A	A	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in PM peak hour.
	C38	SE	209.3	191.4	A	A	211.0	191.4	A	A	
	C39	SW		63.1		A	64.4	63.4	A	A	
	C40	NW	128.5	97.0	A	A	131.2	97.6	A	A	
Nostrand Ave & Myrtle Ave	C41	NE	107.3	98.3	A	A	107.3	98.3	A	A	- Transfer 3s of green time from SB phase to E-W phase in the PM peak hour.
	C42	SW	145.4	105.6	A	A	145.4	105.9	A	A	
	C43	NW	129.9	99.7	A	A	129.9	99.7	A	A	
Marcy Ave & Flushing Ave	C44	NE		34.9		C	47.0	34.9	B	C	- Transfer 1s of green time from E-W phase to NB phase in the AM and PM peak hour.
	C45	SW		137.2		A	163.9	137.1	A	A	
	C46	NW	51.0	48.6	B	B	50.8	48.4	B	B	

Notes:
Corner elements are analyzed for periods that exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold.
Action-with-mitigation takes into account pedestrian mitigation measures in all peak hours.
* denotes a significant adverse impact based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

Proposed Schedule for Pedestrian Mitigation Measures

Subject to DOT approval, the pedestrian mitigation measures described above would be implemented to mitigate the significant adverse sidewalk impacts resulting from full build-out of development facilitated by the Proposed Actions in 2031. As the development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be expected to occur over a nearly five-year period, it is possible that the sidewalk impacts could occur prior to full build-out in 2031, notably following the construction completion of the first two Projected Development Sites during the fourth quarter of 2027. As such, the proposed mitigation measures should be implemented during the first quarter of 2028.

Effects Of Pedestrian Mitigation On Parking Conditions

The proposed sidewalk widening measures along portions of two analyzed sidewalks would result in a total parking displacement of approximately 13 parking spaces. As shown in **Table 16-10**, a four-foot sidewalk extension would be implemented along the east sidewalk of Walworth Street

between Park Avenue and Myrtle Avenue over a 198-foot segment, resulting in the displacement of approximately nine parking spaces. In addition, a 40-foot "No Standing Anytime" restriction would be implemented on the westbound Myrtle Avenue approach to accommodate truck turning movements, resulting in the displacement of approximately two parking spaces. Along the north sidewalk of Flushing Avenue between Lee Avenue and Marcy Avenue, a five-foot sidewalk extension would be implemented over a 550-foot segment. A 40-foot "No Standing Anytime" restriction would be implemented along the sidewalk extension, extending from the edge of the crosswalk, to accommodate truck turning movements and resulting in a displacement of approximately two parking spaces. Parking would continue to be permitted along the remainder of the sidewalk extension. DOT implementation of these measures would be determined pending DOT review, study, and resources. As mentioned previously, any potential deficit in parking would not be considered a significant adverse impact based on 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation in the well-served Project Area.

E. CONSTRUCTION

Transportation

As outlined in **Chapter 14**, it is expected that potential significant adverse traffic impacts could occur during construction. However, the 2031 operational period is the most conservative analysis scenario, as it would generate the highest number of incremental vehicle trips during the operational AM and PM peak hours and construction PM peak hour. Although the 2028 construction and operational period would generate 47 more vehicle trips during the construction AM peak hour compared to the 2031 operational period, these trips are expected to be distributed across the numerous construction and operational Projected Development Sites. In addition, based on automatic traffic recorder (ATR) data, traffic conditions during the 6:00 to 7:00 a.m. construction peak hour in 2028 is expected to be generally better or comparable than during the analyzed operational AM peak hour in 2031 with full build-out of the Proposed Actions. Consequently, there would be less likelihood of significant adverse traffic impacts during the construction peak hour in the Proposed Actions' peak construction period than with the full build-out during operational peak hours analyzed in the EIS.

Therefore, it is expected that the mitigation measures identified above for transportation for 2031 operational traffic impacts would also be effective at mitigating potential impacts during the peak construction periods. The proposed mitigation measures will be implemented at the discretion of DOT. If DOT determines that implementation of the proposed traffic engineering improvement at one or more locations is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent measure is identified, then that impact would remain unmitigated and would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Noise

As described in **Chapter 14**, the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts throughout the Project Area. The construction noise analysis predicted that noise levels due to construction could exceed the construction noise impact criteria at 14 locations adjacent to the work areas. At these receptors, construction would produce noise level increases that would be noticeable and potentially intrusive during the most noise-intensive nearby construction activities; however, the predicted maximum levels would not persist throughout construction, and the noise levels would fluctuate over the course of the construction period. Even so, these locations would experience construction noise levels whose magnitude

and duration could constitute temporary significant adverse impacts, as shown in **Table 16-~~12~~ 11** and **Figure 14-3**.

TABLE 16-~~12~~11
Adverse Significant Construction Noise Impact Locations

Receptors	Address	Land Use	Façade(s)
19, 20	48 Spencer Street	Commercial Office	E
36	783 Beford Avenue	Residential	E
39	53 Spencer Street	Residential	E
49	523 Park Avenue	Residential	W
50	55 Spencer Street	Residential	W
76	74 and 76 Spencer Street	Residential	E
120	78 and 80 Spencer Street	Residential	E
99	85 Spencer Street	House of Worship	E
102, 196	79 Spencer Street	House of Worship	N, W
110 through 112	84 Sandford Street	School	N, S, W
118, 119	79 Walworth Street	House of Worship	All
173	Projected Development Site 2	School	S
181	Projected Development Site 6	School	W
193, 195	Projected Development Site 11	Residential	N, W

However, construction would typically occur during weekday daytime hours and would therefore not produce noise during nighttime hours when residents would be most sensitive to noise. Further, construction would comply with New York City (NYC) Noise Control Code regulations. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the NYC Noise Control Code. These measures would include a variety of source and path controls.

In terms of source controls (i.e., reducing noise levels at the source or during the most sensitive time periods), the following measures, included under New York City regulations, would be implemented:

- Equipment that meets the sound level standards specified in Subchapter 5 of the *New York City Noise Control Code* would be utilized from the start of construction. **Table 14-9** in **Chapter 14** shows the noise levels for typical construction equipment that would be used for construction ~~of the Proposed Project~~under the Proposed Actions.
- As early in the construction period as logistics would allow, diesel- or gas-powered equipment would be replaced with electrical-powered equipment such as welders, water pumps, bench saws, and table saws (i.e., early electrification) to the extent feasible and practicable. Where electrical equipment cannot be used, diesel or gas-powered generators and pumps would be located within buildings to the extent feasible and practicable.
- The construction site would be configured to minimize back-up alarm noise. In addition, all trucks would not be allowed to idle more than three minutes at the construction site based upon Title 24, Chapter 1, Subchapter 7, Section 24-163 of the New York City Administrative Code.
- Contractors and subcontractors would be required to properly maintain their equipment and mufflers.

In terms of path controls (e.g., placement of equipment, implementation of barriers or enclosures between equipment and sensitive receptors), the following measures, under New York regulations, would be implemented:

- Noisy equipment, such as cranes, concrete pumps, concrete trucks, and delivery trucks, would be located away from and shielded from sensitive receptor locations to the extent practicable given site limitations (i.e., receptors on multiple sides).
- Noise barriers construction from plywood or other materials would be utilized to provide shielding (e.g., the construction sites would have a minimum 8-foot-tall barrier around the perimeter).
- Path noise control measures (i.e., portable noise barriers, panels, enclosures, and acoustical tents) would be used for certain equipment as necessary to the extent feasible and practicable to remain consistent with **Table 14-9**. The details to construct portable noise barriers, enclosures, tents, etc. are shown in DEP's *Rules for Citywide Construction Noise Mitigation.*[1]

In addition, the path control listed below would be implemented as a Project Component Related to the Environment (PCRE) beyond NYC regulations for the construction of the ~~Proposed Project~~total RWCDS for the Proposed Actions:

- Concrete operations at Projected Development Site 6 would be located within the ~~Development~~ development ~~Site's~~ site's construction barrier until 86 and 88 Walworth Street are vacated.

Mitigation measures to control noise at the receptors predicted to experience impacts would be ~~considered~~ implemented prior to construction of the ~~Proposed Project~~total RWCDS for the Proposed Actions~~ and would be further explored between the DEIS and FEIS~~. Mitigation measures to control noise at the receptors predicted to experience impacts would also be offered during construction of the ~~Proposed Project~~total RWCDS for the Proposed Actions. While some of the impacted buildings feature modern façade construction, including insulated glass windows and an alternative means of ventilation that would allow for the maintenance of a closed-window condition, it is not possible to definitively determine the presence of these features at all receptors that would have the potential to experience temporary significant adverse construction noise impacts. At building façades that are predicted to experience noise impacts, as shown in **Table 16-11**, ~~potential mitigation measures may include~~ the Applicant would offer to provide and install storm windows for the above façades that do not already have insulated glass windows and/or one window air conditioner per living room, bedroom, or any other noise sensitive space that does not already have an alternative means of ventilation.~~ Further study to refine the specific construction noise mitigation measures will be undertaken between the DEIS and FEIS.~~

~~These mitigation measures would be implemented prior to the start of construction.~~ Building façades with insulated glass windows or storm windows and alternative ventilation would provide sound attenuation such that even during warm weather conditions, interior noise levels would be up to approximately 30 dBA less than exterior noise levels. However, even with these potential mitigation measures, the most noise-intensive construction activity nearest the receptors experiencing significant adverse impacts would result in interior noise levels up to 63 dBA L_{10}, which is 18 dBA greater than the level considered acceptable according to 2025 *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines. Consequently, the temporary construction noise impacts

[1] As found at http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/pdf/noise_constr_rule.pdf.

predicted to occur at the above-mentioned receptors would be only partially mitigated and thus unavoidable, as discussed in **Chapter 18**.