This document is the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Sugar Hill Rezoning project (the Proposed Action). Acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission (CPC), which is the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) determined the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed project to be complete and issued a Notice of Completion for the DEIS on June 4, 2010. CPC held a public hearing on the DEIS in Spector Hall at 22 Reade Street in Manhattan, on July 28, 2010. Comments were accepted at that hearing and throughout the public comment period, which remained open until August 9, 2010.

This FEIS also reflects all substantive changes to technical analyses resulting from DEIS comments, agency reviews, and material changes in conditions since issuance of the DEIS. As detailed in the EAS for the Proposed Action, dated April 2, 2010, pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, the Proposed Action did not trigger a detailed analysis of Socioeconomic Conditions, Community Facilities, Natural Resources, Waterfront Revitalization Program, Infrastructure, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services, Energy, Traffic and Parking, or Transit and Pedestrians. In addition, the EAS screening analysis concluded that the Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse impacts in the areas of Urban Design, or Public Health. As such, this EIS provides analyses only for those technical areas that were not screened out in the EAS, namely: Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy; Open Space; Historic (architectural) Resources; Shadows; Visual Resources; Neighborhood Character; Hazardous Materials; Air Quality; Noise; and Construction Impacts.

On May 17, 2010, the City released the 2010 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, which updates the methodologies presented in the 2001 *CEQR Technical Manual*. As of that date, a substantial portion of the Sugar Hill Rezoning DEIS had already been completed. While references to the 2001 Manual and its methodologies remain in some sections of the FEIS, all of the analyses have been reviewed to ensure consistency with the methodologies of the 2010 Technical Manual and some have been updated where substantial changes were merited, or where the 2010 CEQR methodologies could result in potentially different or greater project-related impacts. In particular, the noise analysis has been revised to utilize the new 2010 CEQR methodologies, whereas the shadows analysis in the published DEIS already incorporated the new 2010 CEQR methodologies.

The FEIS includes the following principal changes:

- Chapter 1, "Project Description," has been revised to include a discussion of the Proposed Development's design concepts and goals.
- Chapter 4, "Shadows," has been revised to indicate that subsequent to publication of the DEIS, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) further explored the potential shadows impact identified in the DEIS and confirmed that there would be no significant adverse impact on plant growth in Highbridge Park as a result of the Proposed

Action. Chapter 12, "Mitigation," and Chapter 13, "Alternatives" have been revised accordingly to eliminate references to any project-related shadows impact.

- Chapter 5, "Historic and Cultural Resources," has been revised to provide additional information, including more details on the State and National Register listed Sugar Hill Historic District, as well as additional figures and text relating to the Proposed Development's potential effects on this historic district. The chapter has also been revised to indicate that, in addition to the identified direct impact, the Proposed Development would also result in a significant adverse indirect contextual impact to historic resources.
- Chapter 10, "Noise" of the FEIS has been revised to reflect new required noise attenuation values, in accordance with the guidelines of the 2010 *CEQR Technical Manual*.
- Chapter 12, "Mitigation," of the FEIS has been revised to eliminate references to any potential shadows impacts (as noted above), and to provide greater detail on certain mitigation measures identified in the DEIS with respect to historic and cultural resources (for both direct and indirect impacts).
- The appendices have been updated and amended to reflect corresponding changes to the technical analyses in the FEIS where applicable, and to provide additional agency correspondence.
- Chapter 17, "Response to Comments on the DEIS" has been added, although no comments were received during the public comment period.

Except where indicated, all text changes since publication of the DEIS are marked by underlining in this FEIS. No underlining is used for the Foreword or Chapter 17, "Response to Comments on the DEIS," both of which are entirely new.