A. INTRODUCTION

The Applicant, Astoria Owners, LLC, is seeking a zoning map amendment, a zoning text amendment, a City Map amendment, a waterfront special permit, waterfront authorizations, and a waterfront certification by the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) Chairperson (collectively, "the Proposed Actions") affecting an approximately 3.8-acre site in the Astoria neighborhood of Queens Community District 1 (see **Figure ES-1**).

The Proposed Actions would facilitate a proposal by the Applicant to develop a new approximately 1,154,987 gross square foot (gsf) mixed-use development ("Proposed Project") on approximately 164,392 sf of lot area ("Projected Development Site 1"). The Proposed Project would be comprised of approximately 1,400 dwelling units (DUs) (approximately 1,130,462 gsf of residential area), of which 350 DUs would be affordable; approximately 1,887 gsf of local retail space; approximately 22,638 gsf of community facility space; 525 accessory parking spaces; and 41,363 sf of publicly accessible open space. The anticipated Build Year is 2031.

The proposed zoning map amendment would rezone Projected Development Site 1 (Block 911, Lot 1) and one additional site not under the control of the Applicant (Block 911, Lot 49). Together, these lots comprise approximately 199,245 sf (the "Project Area"). As discussed in detail below, it assumed that Block 911, Lot 49 would be redeveloped as a separate development site as a result of the Proposed Actions.

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

- Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the Project Area from an M1-1 to an R7-3/C2-4 district (Zoning Map 9a);
- Zoning Text Amendment to modify Appendix F of the Zoning Resolution (ZR) to include the Rezoning Area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area (MIHA);
- A City Map amendment to eliminate 3rd Street between 26th Avenue and the waterfront;
- Waterfront Special Permit to waive height and setback regulations (ZR 62-837(a));
- Waterfront Authorization to modify requirements within the waterfront public access area (ZR 62-822(a));
- Waterfront Authorization for phased developments (ZR 62-822(c)).

Figure ES-1
Project Location



Development of the Proposed Project requires approvals from the CPC for the following ministerial action:

- A certification by the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission (CPC) pursuant to ZR 62-811 pertaining to the provision of waterfront public access areas and visual corridors (not subject to ULURP).

This Executive Summary provides a detailed description of the Proposed Actions, including project background, project purpose and need, site description, project description, the approvals required, and the public review process for the Proposed Actions. It also summarizes the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyses that examine the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse environmental impacts in any technical area of the *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The decline of the New York City industrial/manufacturing sector during the past three decades has left many properties in this part of Queens vacant or underutilized. While the industrial sector has declined, residential populations in adjacent communities have substantially increased, leading to greater housing demand.

Proposed Rezoning Area (Project Area)

The Applicant-owned Projected Development Site 1 at 3-15 26th Avenue (Queens Block 911, Lot 1) is an irregularly-shaped lot with approximately 128 feet of frontage along 26th Avenue, approximately 581 feet of frontage along 3rd Street, and approximately 306 feet of frontage along the waterfront. The approximately 164,392 sf Projected Development Site 1 is currently zoned M1-1 (see **Figure ES-2**, "Zoning Map"). Projected Development Site 1 contains a vacant former industrial site. Third Street, north of 26th Avenue, is a privately-owned mapped street but currently unbuilt and is considered part of Projected Development Site 1.

The site located at 3-17 26th Avenue (Queens Block 911, Lot 49) is not under the control of the Applicant. Block 911, Lot 49 is approximately 34,853 sf and has approximately 151 feet of frontage along 26th Avenue. The site is currently zoned M1-1. Block 911, Lot 49 currently contains a vacant two-story 28,750 gsf warehouse building.

C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Proposed Zoning Map Changes

The Proposed Actions include an amendment of the City's zoning map to rezone the Project Area from the existing M1-1 to R7-3 with a C2-4 commercial overlay. The proposed zoning district would allow residential uses on the entire Project Area, which is prohibited under the existing M1-1 zoning. It would also allow a wider range of commercial uses through the mapping of a commercial overlay.

Existing Zoning M1-1



Proposed Zoning R7-3/C2-4



Legend

- Zoning District Boundary
- **Commercial Overlay**
- C1-3
- C1-4
- C2-3
- C2-4

Halletts North

Figure ES-2

Exisiting and Proposed Zoning Map

From M1-1 to R7-3

The existing low-density M1-1 zoning designation would be replaced with a contextual medium-density R7-3 residential zoning district, which would allow residential development. The Project Area is located directly adjacent to an existing R7-3 zoning district and directly north of a R6 zoning district. Therefore, the proposed zoning map change would extend residential zoning with similar districts.

The existing M1-1 zoning is a light manufacturing district with high performance standards that permits Use Groups 5 through 14, 16, and 17 as-of-right and has a maximum FAR of 1.0 for commercial and industrial uses. Certain community facility uses (Use Group 4) such as houses of worship and schools are also allowed in M1-1 districts up to an FAR of 2.4; residential uses are not permitted. M1-1 zoning districts typically act as buffers between M2 and M3 heavy manufacturing zoning districts and adjacent residential or commercial zoning districts.

The proposed R7-3 zoning district would be mapped on Block 911, Lots 1 and 49. R7-3 is a medium-density residential district that permits Use Groups 1 through 4 as-of-right and permits a maximum FAR of 6.0 with the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Program for residential uses and permits a maximum FAR of 5.0 for community facility uses on waterfront blocks.

C2-4 Commercial Overlays

A C2-4 commercial overlay is proposed to be mapped on the entirety of the rezoning area. C2 commercial overlays are mapped along streets within residential districts that serve the local retail needs of the surrounding residential neighborhood. Typical retail uses include grocery stores, restaurants, and beauty parlors. C2 districts permit a slightly wider range of uses than C1 districts, such as funeral homes and repair services. In R7-3 districts, C2 commercial overlays permit ground floor retail uses up to 2.0 FAR in mixed residential/commercial buildings; buildings without residential uses would also be allowed 2.0 FAR of commercial uses. The proposed C2-4 commercial overlay would allow for local retail development in the area.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

The Applicant is proposing to map the proposed rezoning area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area (Options 1 or 2) by creating a new map for Queens Community District 1 in Appendix F of the ZR. An MIH Area requires permanently affordable housing to be provided equivalent to either 25 percent (at an average of 60% of Area Median Income, or AMI) or 30 percent (at an average of 80% AMI) of the residential floor area developed. The MIH Area sets a new maximum permitted residential FAR which supersedes the FAR permitted by the underlying zoning district. With both the designation of the proposed rezoning area as an MIH Area and its rezoning to R7-3/C2-4, the maximum permitted FAR within the proposed rezoning area would be 6.0. Mapping of the MIH Area would facilitate development of approximately 350 affordable housing units on Projected Development Site 1, as the Applicant would provide affordable housing equivalent to 25 percent of the residential floor area pursuant to MIH Option 1.

City Map Amendment

The Proposed Actions involves a change to the City Map, including the elimination of 3rd Street between 26th Avenue and the waterfront. Third Street, north of 26th Avenue, is a privately owned mapped street but currently unbuilt and is considered part of Projected Development Site 1. As a result of the proposed

mapping action, 3rd Street would be demapped but would be built to provide public access to the proposed development as well as the proposed waterfront esplanade. Third Street would function as a public right-of-way for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Third Street would have a width of 50 feet, including a 22-foot travel way and two 13'-6" sidewalks. New infrastructure to support the Proposed Project would be placed within 3rd Street. The proposed new sidewalks and street would connect the proposed new development with the surrounding neighborhood and allow for pedestrian and vehicle use.

Waterfront Special Permit

The Proposed Project would require a waterfront special permit to modify height and setback regulations. A special permit pursuant to ZR 62-837(a) would allow for the granting of waivers for height and setback regulations for a *development* on a *zoning lot* within a *waterfront block.* This is being requested in order to achieve, according to the Applicant, a better site plan and an enhanced relationship between Projected Development Site 1, streets, open space and the waterfront.

Waterfront Authorizations and Certifications

The Proposed Project would require an authorization pursuant to ZR 62-822(a), ZR 62-822 (b) and ZR 62-822 (c) to modify requirements within the waterfront public access area and for phased development of the waterfront public access area, as modified by the above-referenced authorizations. In addition, the Applicant would seek certification by the CPC Chairperson for compliance with waterfront public access and visual corridor requirements, as modified by the above-referenced authorizations, pursuant to ZR §62-811 (a ministerial action). The proposed authorizations and certification would allow, according to the Applicant, development of a waterfront public access area that is superior in access, layout and amenities that will substantially add to the public use and enjoyment of the waterfront.

Additional Actions - Not Subject to City Planning Commission Approval

As a portion of Projected Development Site 1 falls within a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)-regulated tidal wetland adjacent area, the Proposed Project will require approvals from NYSDEC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for the proposed shoreline hardening measures required to raise the site. In addition, a new stormwater outfall is proposed to be located at 3rd Street to enable direct discharge of stormwater flows into the East River. The outfall would be permitted by NYSDEC and USACE, and the stormwater generated on-site would be treated for water quality prior to discharge. Additionally, a State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit from the NYSDEC will be required for stormwater discharges during the construction period because construction on Projected Development Site 1 involves more than one acre.

D. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Actions are intended to provide opportunities for new residential, commercial, and community facility development, as well as enhance and upgrade accessibility to the area's waterfront. The Applicant intends for the Proposed Actions to create opportunities for new housing development, including affordable housing, on underutilized and vacant land formerly used for manufacturing purposes and where there is no longer a concentration of industrial activity and strong demand for housing exists.

The proposed zoning map change is needed to permit construction of the Proposed Project. This would allow the redevelopment of Projected Development Site 1, a former waterfront industrial site, into an

economically integrated mix of residential, local retail, and community facility uses consistent with the planned and anticipated redevelopment of nearby waterfront sites to the east and west and complementary to the existing neighborhood to the south and east. Thus, the Proposed Actions would allow the Applicant to maximize use of its property while producing new waterfront development.

In addition, it is the Applicant's position that the Proposed Actions significantly advances the City's Comprehensive Waterfront Plan by facilitating the redevelopment of the area's inaccessible waterfront and completing the street grid in this area of Astoria. As noted below, the Proposed Actions would allow the Applicant to demap and build out the segment of 3rd Street north of 26th Avenue for improved vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Thus, the Proposed Actions would allow for the creation of physical and visual access to the waterfront, including a publicly accessible waterfront esplanade.

The proposed waterfront special permit for modification of height and setback requirements are needed in order to redistribute floor area across Projected Development Site 1, thereby creating a site plan and building layout and design that, according to the Applicant, is superior to what would be allowed as-of-right under the proposed zoning district. The proposed modification of waterfront access requirements would serve to facilitate an improved open space plan compared to what could be developed as-of-right.

E. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Applicant is proposing several actions to facilitate a new mixed-use, predominantly residential, development on Projected Development Site 1. The Proposed Actions described above will facilitate a new approximately 1,154,987 gsf mixed-use development on approximately 164,392 sf of lot area. It is expected that this Proposed Project would include the following components:

- Up to approximately 1,130,462 gsf of residential uses, comprising a total of approximately 1,400 DUs, of which 350 DUs would be affordable pursuant to MIH;
- Approximately 1,887 gsf of local retail space;
- Approximately 22,638 gsf of community facility space;
- Approximately 525 accessory parking spaces;
- Approximately 41,363 sf (0.95 acres) of publicly accessible open space.

In conjunction with the Proposed Project, the mapped but unbuilt portion of 3rd Street between 26th Avenue and the waterfront, which is privately owned, would be demapped and built out to provide public vehicular and pedestrian access to the Proposed Project and the waterfront (see **Figure ES-3**).

Figure ES-3 provides a preliminary site plan for the Proposed Project. As shown in this preliminary plan, the Proposed Project would be accessible via entrances/exits on the north side of 26th Avenue and the east side of 3rd Street. As shown in **Figure ES-3**, the Proposed Project would be comprised of three towers located along the waterfront north of 26th Avenue.

The Proposed Project would include approximately 41,363 sf (0.95 acres) of publicly accessible open space, which would include a waterfront esplanade that would run along the entire length of Projected Development Site 1, providing multi-layered active and passive recreation space (see **Figure ES-4**).

Figure ES-5 provides preliminary massing diagrams. As illustrated in the figure, the buildings comprising the Proposed Project will range in height from 23-stories on the southern portion of Projected Development Site 1 to a maximum of 35-stories on the waterfront. The Proposed Project would have a



Source: Studio V Architecture, PLLC

*This figure has been updated for the FSOW



Halletts North

Figure ES-4
Proposed Waterfront Open Space
For Illustrative Purposes Only



Source: Studio V Architecture, PLLC

Figure ES-5
Projected Development Site 1 - Proposed Massing
For Illustrative Purposes Only

podium height of 110 feet that would be topped with three towers ranging in heights between 238 feet and 350 feet.[1]

F. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

In order to assess the potential effects of the Proposed Actions, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) for both "future No-Action" (No-Action) and "future with the Proposed Action" (With-Action) conditions will be analyzed for an analysis year, or Build Year, of 2031. The future With-Action scenario identifies the amount, type and location of development that is expected to occur by the end of 2031 as a result of the Proposed Actions. The No-Action scenario identifies development projections for 2031 absent the Proposed Actions. The effect of the Proposed Actions would be the incremental change in conditions between the No-Action and With-Action scenarios.

Identification of Development Sites / Affected Area

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the following factors, commonly referred to as "soft site criteria," are generally considered when evaluating whether some amount of development would likely be constructed by the Build Year as a result of Proposed Actions:

- The uses and bulk allowed: Lots located in areas where changes in use would be permitted and/or contain buildings built to substantially less than the maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR) under the existing zoning are considered "soft" enough such that there would likely be sufficient incentive to develop in the future, depending on other factors specific to the area (e.g., the amount and type of recent as-of-right development in the area, recent real estate trends, site specific conditions that make development difficult, and issues relating to site control or site assemblage that may affect redevelopment potential); and
- Size of the development site: Lots must be large enough to be considered "soft." Generally, lots with a small lot size are not considered likely to be redeveloped, even if they are currently built to substantially less than the maximum allowable FAR. A small lot is often defined for this purpose as 5,000 sf or less, but the lot size criteria is dependent on neighborhood-specific trends, and common development sizes in the study area should be examined prior to establishing this criteria.

However, the following uses and types of buildings that meet the soft site criteria are typically excluded from development scenarios because they are unlikely to be redeveloped as a result of Proposed Action:

- Full block and newly constructed buildings with utility uses, as these uses are often difficult to relocate;
- Lots where construction is actively occurring, or has recently been completed, as well as lots with recent alterations that would have required substantial capital investment, unless recently constructed or altered lots were built to less than or equal to half of the maximum allowable FAR under the proposed zoning;

[1] It should be noted that, while the illustrative building heights of the Proposed Project described in the ~~Draft~~Final Scope of Work range between 230 feet and 350 feet in height, the proposed height, setback, and tower size waivers established in the proposed waterfront special permit would permit maximum building height envelopes for the three towers that would range between 238 feet and 350 feet in height. As such, the maximum permitted building height envelopes will be used for CEQR analysis purposes throughout this document, unless otherwise noted.

- Lots whose location or irregular shape would preclude or greatly limit future as-of-right development. Generally, development on irregular lots does not produce marketable floor space;
- Long-standing institutional uses with no known development plans; or
- Multi-unit buildings (existing individual buildings with six or more residential units, and assemblages of buildings with a total of 10 or more residential units, are unlikely to be redeveloped because of the required relocation of tenants in rent-stabilized units).

Definition of Projected and Potential Development Sites

To produce a reasonable, conservative estimate of future growth, identified development sites are typically divided into two categories: projected development sites and potential development sites. Projected development sites are considered more likely to be developed within the analysis period for the Proposed Actions (i.e. by 2031), while potential sites are considered less likely to be developed over the same period.

As shown below in **Table ES-1**, the Applicant-owned Projected Development Site 1 is considered a Projected Development Site, as in the future with the Proposed Actions the Applicant intends to develop the site with a mixed-use building, as detailed above. As shown in **Table ES-1** and discussed below in the "Future with the Proposed Actions" section, one other Projected Development Site has been identified in the proposed rezoning area: Block 911, Lot 49 ("Projected Development Site 2"). This property is not owned or controlled by the Applicant.

Block 911, Lot 49 currently accommodates a vacant 28,750 gsf warehouse/industrial building. Because the Proposed Actions would permit residential and commercial uses within the proposed rezoning area, this lot would be able to redevelop. Therefore, this lot is considered a Projected Development Site in the RWCDS (see **Table ES-1** below).

Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

It is assumed that under the No-Action scenario, Projected Development Site 1 would be developed as a warehouse use. The existing M1-1 zoning permits a 1.0 FAR for manufacturing and commercial uses. It is assumed that Projected Development Site 1 would be developed with a 2-story 172,612 gsf warehouse and 82 accessory parking spaces.

Under the No-Action condition, it is assumed that the existing vacant warehouse building on Projected Development 2 would be re-occupied with 28,750 gsf of warehouse uses and 14 accessory parking spaces.

Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

In the future with the Proposed Actions (the With-Action condition), the proposed zoning map amendment and zoning text amendment would be implemented in the Project Area. As such, the Project Area would be remapped as a R7-3/C2-4 district, and would be designated as an MIH Area. Under With-Action conditions, the maximum allowable FAR in the Project Area would increase to 6.0 when fully utilizing the additional FAR under the MIH Program.

As detailed above in the "Description of the Proposed Development," the Applicant intends to redevelop Projected Development Site 1 with a mixed-use building with an overall FAR of 6.0. Because this would maximize the floor area allowable on the Development Site, the Proposed Project is the RWCDS With-Action condition for Projected Development Site 1.

As detailed in **Table ES-1**, under the With-Action RWCDS, Projected Development Site 1 would be developed with an approximately 1,154,987 gsf development containing 1,400 DUs (of which 350 would be affordable), 1,887 gsf of retail space, 22,638 gsf of community facility space, and 525 accessory parking spaces. It is assumed that the community facility space would be medical office for conservative analysis purposes. As a result of the Proposed Project, 3rd Street, which is a mapped but unbuilt street north of 26th Avenue, would be demapped and built to allow public vehicular and pedestrian access. Access to the 525-space accessory parking garage would be via 3rd Street and 26th Avenue. The Proposed Project would also contain 41,363 sf of publicly accessible open space along the waterfront that would run along the entire length of Projected Development Site 1, providing multi-layered active and passive recreation space.

It is also expected that Lot 49 in the proposed rezoning area would be redeveloped in the future with the Proposed Actions, in accordance with the proposed R7-3/C2-4 zoning district. This site is anticipated to be redeveloped with a 219,296 gsf building containing 265 DUs (of which 66 would be affordable), approximately 15,000 gsf of commercial retail uses, and 115 accessory parking spaces.

In accordance with the City's MIH policy, under the Proposed Actions, the Applicant will choose either MIH Option 1 or 2, which would require 25 or 30 percent of the residential floor area be designated as affordable housing units for residents with incomes averaging between 60 and 80 percent of AMI and none of the units exceeding 130 percent of AMI. As discussed above, the Applicant intends on designating 25 percent of the residential floor area of the Proposed Project as affordable housing units (350 DUs).

As shown in **Table ES-1**, the With-Action RWCDS development would result in approximately 1,334,758 gsf of residential space, 16,887 gsf of retail space, and 22,638 gsf of community facility space on Block 911. The Proposed Actions would result in 1,665 DUs on the Projected Development Sites, of which 416 would be affordable units. In addition, the Proposed Actions would result in a total of 640 accessory parking spaces.

TABLE ES-1:
With-Action Scenario – Projected Development Sites on Block 911

Lot	Lot Area (sf)	Max. FAR	Max. Residential		Max. Commercial SF	Max. Community Facility SF	Max. Total Building SF	Max. Parking Spaces	Max. Building Height
			SF	DUs					
Projected Sites									
1 (Projected Development Site 1)	164,392	6.0	963,742 zsf (1,130,462 gsf)	1,400 (350 affordable)	1,787 zsf (1,887 gsf)	21,508 zsf (22,638 gsf)	987,037 zsf (1,154,987 gsf)	525	349'
49 (Projected Development Site 2)	34,853	6.0	194,568 zsf (204,296 gsf)	265 (66 affordable)	14,550 zsf (15,000 gsf)	0	209,118 zsf (219,296 gsf)	115	150'
Total RWCDS With-Action Projected Development on Block 911:			**1,158,310 zsf (1,334,758 gsf)**	**1,665 (416 affordable)**	**16,337 zsf (16,887 gsf)**	**21,508 zsf (22,638 gsf)**	**1,196,155 zsf (1,374,283 gsf)**	**640**	-

Notes: The Applicant-owned Projected Development Site is highlighted.

Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario for Analysis Purposes

As summarized in **Table 1-2**, compared to future conditions without the Proposed Actions, the RWCDS anticipates that the Proposed Actions would result in a net increase of 1,665 dwelling units (approximately 1,334,758 gsf), 16,887 gsf of retail space, 22,638 gsf of community facility space, and 544 accessory

parking spaces, as well as a reduction of approximately 201,362 gsf of industrial/warehouse space. The Proposed Actions would result in an increase of 3,7133~~,880~~ residents and a net reduction of 90 employees. This net increment will represent the basis for environmental analyses in the EIS.

Table ES-2: Net Change in Land Uses as a Result of the Proposed Actions

Use	No-Action	With-Action	Net Increment
Residential	--	1,334,758 gsf 1,665 DU	+1,334,758 gsf +1,665 DU
Retail	--	16,887	+16,887 gsf
Industrial/Warehouse	201,362	--	-201,362 gsf
Community Facility	--	22,638 gsf	+22,638 gsf
Accessory Parking Spaces	96	640	+544
Public Open Space	--	41,363 sf	+41,363 sf
Employees	252	162	-90
Residents	--	3,7133~~,880~~	+3,7133~~,880~~
Number of residents estimated based on average household size of 2.23 for Queens Community District Tabulation Area (CDTA) 1 (Queens CD 1 equivalent), 2020 US Census.			

G. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated in the future with the Proposed Actions in the primary or secondary study areas in the 2031 analysis year. The Proposed Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policy in the secondary study area. The Proposed Actions would allow a new development containing a mix of residential, retail, community facility uses in an area where there is a strong demand for these particular uses.

The Proposed Actions would result in an overall increase in residential and commercial uses throughout the primary study area, when compared to conditions in the future without the Proposed Actions. The proposed zoning map amendments would allow new residential and commercial development at a scale and density that is compatible with the existing zoning designations in the surrounding areas. Also, while the affected area is currently zoned for manufacturing uses, it is located within an area that is largely characterized by residential uses. The affected area contains vacant uses where residential uses are not permitted per the existing zoning. The proposed rezoning would therefore provide opportunities for new affordable and market rate residential development on those underutilized lots. The proposed rezoning action would ensure that the zoning designation more accurately reflects the area's development trends. As such, the Proposed Actions are not anticipated to result in significant adverse land use or zoning impacts.

Finally, based on the Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) Consistency Assessment Form (CAF) completed for the Proposed Actions (WRP #19-227), seven policies require further assessment. The assessment found that the Proposed Actions would be consistent with all applicable policies. The Proposed Actions would also be consistent with the public policies outlined in the *Housing New York*, *OneNYC 2050*, and the *FRESH* program. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not conflict with any applicable public policies.

Socioeconomic Conditions

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the five socioeconomic areas studied under CEQR including direct residential, direct business/institutional displacement, indirect residential displacement, indirect business/institutional displacement, and adverse effects on specific industries, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. The Proposed Actions would not result in the direct displacement of any residents or businesses or adverse effects on specific industries, and the proposed commercial and community facility uses would not represent a substantial new use warranting assessment of potential indirect business/institutional displacement.

With respect to potential indirect residential displacement, a detailed analysis finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse indirect residential displacement impact. The Proposed Actions would introduce 416 affordable residential units and 1,249 market-rate units that would otherwise not exist absent the Proposed Actions. Given the income levels of the residents in the ½-mile socioeconomic conditions study area, it is possible that residents introduced by the Proposed Actions could have incomes higher than those of the surrounding study area. As a whole, the socioeconomic characteristics of the population living in the study area is already changing and is likely to continue to change over the next several years under the No-Action condition by 2031. At-risk households are already experiencing rent pressures and the current average asking rents are not affordable to many of existing residents in the primary and secondary study areas. Given current market trends, it is very likely that demand for housing in the study area would continue to escalate in the future without the Proposed Actions, and that rents within the study area would significantly increase in the future without the Proposed Actions. Irrespective of the Proposed Actions, unprotected low- and moderate-income rental households would likely continue to experience indirect residential displacement pressures and could potentially move out of the area and therefore decrease in proportion to other households. The Proposed Actions' increase in supply of affordable housing may lessen the effects by relieving demand pressures and slowing down the pace of rental increase.

The Proposed Actions' contributions to rent pressures in the study areas would be limited by the supply of market-rate and affordable housing resulting from the Proposed Actions, which could serve to offset existing housing demand and rent pressures. The Proposed Actions are, therefore, not expected to result in a significant adverse impact with respect to indirect residential displacement. Further, the Proposed Actions would advance the goals of Housing New York, the City's ten-year strategy to build or preserve 200,000 units of high quality affordable housing to meet the needs of more than 500,000 people. The affordable housing added by the Proposed Actions would help to maintain a diverse demographic composition within the study area.

Community Facilities

Pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, detailed analyses of potential indirect impacts on public elementary, intermediate, and high schools, public libraries, and early childhood programs were conducted for the Proposed Actions. Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, detailed analyses of outpatient health care facilities and police and fire protection services are not warranted, although they are discussed qualitatively. As described in the following analysis and summarized below, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to elementary schools and on early childhood programs. No significant adverse intermediate or high school impacts or library impacts would result.

Public Schools

The rezoning area falls within the boundaries of New York City Community School District (CSD) 30, Sub-District 3. The RWCDS associated with the Proposed Actions would introduce 414 total students, with approximately 181 elementary school students, 66 intermediate school students, and 167 high school students.

Elementary Schools

In the future with the Proposed Actions CSD 30, Sub-District 3 elementary schools would continue to operate over capacity in the future with the Proposed Actions (as in the future without the Proposed Actions). CSD 30, Sub-District 3 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 136.4 percent to 141.06 percent in the With-Action condition, with a deficit of 1,596 available elementary school seats. The Proposed Actions would somewhat exacerbate the projected 2031 overcrowded conditions in elementary schools in Sub-District 3 of CSD 30. According to the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) a utilization rate of the elementary schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future With-Action condition; and (2) 100 or more new students generated by the proposed development past the 100 percent utilization rate.[2] The Proposed Actions would generate 181 elementary school students. As such, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary schools, per the criteria of the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Potential mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation section below.

Intermediate Schools

In the future with the Proposed Actions, CSD 30, Sub-District 3 intermediate schools would continue to operate under capacity, as under No-Action conditions. CSD 30, Sub-District 3 intermediate schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 74.30 percent to 76.39 percent in the With-Action condition, with 746 available intermediate school seats. According to the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) a utilization rate of the intermediate schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than

[2] The New York City Office of Environmental Coordination (OEC) recently released the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* (January 31, 2021) which included revisions to the criteria for determining significant adverse impacts to public elementary and intermediate schools. While the lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), hads instructed that the DEIS be prepared in accordance with the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a sensitivity analysis for public schools was prepared to determine if revisions included in the updated 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual* would result in significant adverse impacts that would not have occurred under the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*. ~~According to the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact to public elementary or intermediate schools may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) A utilization rate of elementary or intermediate schools that is equal to or greater than 100% in the With-Action Condition; and (2) an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the No-Action and With-Action conditions. Based on the impact criteria included in the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Actions would not have resulted in significant adverse impacts to public elementary or intermediate schools. According to the recently released 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse elementary or intermediate school impact may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) A utilization rate of elementary or intermediate schools that is equal to or greater than 100% in the With-Action Condition; and (2) 100 or more new students generated by the proposed development past the 100% utilization rate. Based on the updated impact criteria for public elementary and intermediate schools, the sensitivity analysis indicated that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to public elementary schools. Therefore, a~~As a result of the sensitivity analysis and as instructed by DCP, the public schools analysis presented in the DEIS hads been prepared in accordance with the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*. The sensitivity analysis (Appendix A of the DEIS) is no longer applicable to the FEIS, as each technical area of the FEIS has been updated to be consistent with the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

100 percent in the future With-Action condition; and (2) 100 or more new students generated by the proposed development past the 100 percent utilization rate. As the Proposed Actions would generate 66 intermediate school students and would and intermediate schools would continue to operate with capacity, no significant adverse impacts on intermediate schools would result, per the criteria of the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

High Schools

According to the 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual,* a significant adverse impact to high schools may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) a utilization rate of the schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future With-Action condition; and (2) an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the No-Action and With-Action conditions. The additional high school students introduced as a result of the Proposed Actions would raise the utilization for high schools in Queens by 0.20 percent from approximately 90.99 percent to 91.2 percent. Accordingly, the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse impact on high schools.

Libraries

The Project Area is within the catchment area of the Astoria Library. Assuming 2.33 persons per household based on 2014-2018 ACS data, the Proposed Actions would result in an increase of 3,880 residents to the area. This would increase the study area population, and therefore the number of residents per branch, by 4.2 percent.

As the Astoria Library study area population would increase by approximately 4.2 percent, which is below the 5% threshold that would create a significant adverse impact as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* the increase would not be expected to impair the delivery of library services. Furthermore, existing and future residents of the Astoria Library study area would have access to the entire Queens Public Library system through the interlibrary loan system and could have volumes delivered directly to their nearest library branch. There are also three other Queens Library branches located approximately one mile from the Project Area. In addition, the recent renovations along with the trend toward increased electronic research and interlibrary loans are expected to free up stack space, providing for increased capacity and programs to serve the future population. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to public libraries.

Publicly Funded Early Childhood Programs

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs. Based on the most recent child care multipliers in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this development would generate approximately 46 children under the age of six who could be eligible for publicly funded child care programs. With the addition of these children, there would be a deficit of 93 slots in the study area by 2031 (193.9 percent utilization), and the Proposed Actions would result in an increase in the utilization rate of approximately 46.5 percentage points over the No-Action condition.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse early childhood program impact may result, warranting consideration of mitigation, if a proposed action would increase the study area's utilization rate by at least five percentage points and the resulting utilization rate would be 100 percent or more. As the Proposed Actions would result in a 46.5 percentage point increase in the study area child care facility utilization rate and early childcare programs would operate over capacity in the future With-Action

condition the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to publicly funded early childhood programs. Potential mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation section below.

Police, Fire, and Health Care Services

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends a detailed analysis of indirect impacts on police, fire, and health care services in cases where a proposed action would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before. The rezoning area is a developed area with an existing and well-established community that is served by existing police, fire, and health care services. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not create a neighborhood where none existed before, and a detailed analysis of indirect effects on these community facilities is not warranted.

Open Space

A detailed open space analysis was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse open space impacts. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual,* a proposed action may result in a significant impact on open space resources if (a) there would be direct displacement or alteration of existing open space within the study area that would have a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in the overburdening of existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space.

Direct Effects

The Proposed Actions would not result in the physical loss of existing publicly accessible open space resources. The Proposed Actions would also not result in any significant adverse operational air quality, construction, noise, or shadow impacts affecting open space resources.

Indirect Effects

The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio of five percent or more is generally considered significant for a project located in an area that is currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. For areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a decrease of as little as one percent may be considered significant depending on the area of the City. The guidance for percent change in open space ratio is determined based on the open space ratio as outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. ~~Conversely, in areas that are well-served by open space, a greater percentage of change (more than five percent) may be tolerated.~~ An open space impact assessment also considers qualitative factors.

Although the Proposed Actions would not have a direct impact on open space resources in the study area nor would they result in the physical loss of existing public open space resources or significant adverse shadow, air, noise, or other environmental impacts that would affect the usefulness of any study area open space, the detailed analysis determined that the additional residents generated by the Proposed Actions would ~~result in a decrease in the active open space ratio of over five percent~~exacerbate existing deficiencies in active open space in the study area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to active open space. Potential mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation section below.

Shadows

A detailed shadows analysis was conducted and found that the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse shadows impact. The Proposed Actions would result in incremental shadow coverage (i.e. additional, or new, shadow coverage) on one open space resource, Whitey Ford Field, and one natural resource, the East River. Project-generated shadows would not affect the utilization, enjoyment, or character of these sunlight-sensitive resources and all vegetation would continue to receive a minimum of four to six hours of direct sunlight throughout the growing season. Additionally, project-generated shadows would not have any adverse impacts on the aquatic biota in the East River.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

A detailed assessment found that the Proposed Actions and subsequent development, while resulting in a notable change in the urban design of the primary study area, would not result in a significant adverse impact on the area's urban design and visual resources, as defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual*. While the proposed structures would be a departure from the existing conditions, the design would be consistent with anticipated future development in the surrounding area. In addition, the proposed waterfront open space would facilitate connections to adjacent existing and proposed open space resources and improve the streetscape. The Proposed Actions would also provide public access to the Proposed Project and the waterfront by demapping and building out the segment of 3rd Street north of 26th Avenue for improved public vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to visual resources. Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would open up new view corridors to significant visual resources that are currently obstructed by fencing and inaccessible to the public. In addition, the Proposed Actions would result in the creation of new visual resources in the form of waterfront open space. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources.

Natural Resources

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to groundwater, surface water, water quality, floodplains, wetlands, coastal resources, aquatic biota, wildlife or threatened or endangered species within or near the Project Area.

The proposed construction activities would not result in a net increase of fill below Mean High Water (MHW) and Spring High Water (SHW). There would be no net loss to the adjacent New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) tidal wetlands or aquatic habitat. However, as a portion of the Project Area falls within a NYSDEC-regulated wetland adjacent area, approvals from NYSDEC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for the proposed shoreline hardening measures are required to raise the site. The proposed stormwater outfall proposed at 3rd Street, which would result in direct discharge of stormwater flows into the East River, would be permitted by NYSDEC and USACE, and the stormwater generated on-site would be treated for water quality prior to discharge. This activity would occur above the Spring High Water (SHW) line and would not result in the loss of tidal wetlands.

Additionally, a State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit from NYSDEC would be required for stormwater discharges during the construction period because construction of the Proposed Project involves more than one acre. The stormwater management measures would improve the quality

of the stormwater currently discharged into the East River. As current stormwater runoff is not treated, this is a potential benefit to the adjacent tidal wetlands and associated aquatic resources.

Coordination with NYSDEC and USACE will be conducted during the application process. If any mitigation measures for the impacts associated with the hardening activities or outfall are required, they will be determined during that time.

The buildings and associated amenities are being constructed within the 100-year floodplain. As a result, construction would comply with New York Building Code requirements. The proposed construction activities would not adversely impact the flood levels or flood risks within the Project Area or within the Halletts Point Peninsula. Street trees located within 50 feet of the Project Area are under the protection of the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR), and NYCT coordination with NYCDPR would be conducted. It is anticipated that there would be minimal impacts to street trees or adjacent wildlife habitat. In addition, no threatened or endangered species are known to occur, or have the potential to occur in the vicinity of the Project Area.

Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources. Without the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that the natural resources conditions within the study area would generally resemble existing conditions.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials. The vast majority of the hazardous materials on Projected Development Site 1 have already been addressed by the Applicant through remediation of the Project Development Site Phase I during participation in the New York State Brownfield Cleanup Program ("BCP") as the Astoria Steel Site BCP Site #C241155 ("BCP Site") under the oversight of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") and the New York State Department of Health ("NYSDOH"). There is some remaining contamination, defined in the Final Engineering Report ("FER"), which will be managed by the current owner and all future owners pursuant to a Site Management Plan ("SMP") and Environmental Easement ("EE"). However, a Certificate of Completion ("COC") has been earned by the Applicant from the NYSDEC and NYSDOH such that the property is ready for the safe development of the Proposed Project.

With the EE already recorded, which mandates all current and future owners and operators of Projected Development Site 1 to maintain the engineering and institutional controls in the SMP, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials.

In addition, an (E) Designation (E-671) would be mapped on Projected Development Site 2 (Block 911, Lot 49). With the requirements of the (E) Designation on Projected Development Site 2, it is expected that there would be no impact from the potential presence of contaminated materials. The implementation of these preventative and remedial measures would reduce or avoid the potential that significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result from potential construction in the Project Area resulting from the Proposed Actions. Following such construction, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

According on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the analysis finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on the City's water supply, wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Water Supply

The anticipated water usage as a result of the Proposed Actions is expected to total ~~401,036~~384,336 gallons per day (gpd) over water demand under existing conditions. This incremental demand would represent less than 0.1 percent of the City's overall water supply and would be distributed over the 4.57-acre Project Area. As changes of this magnitude would not be large enough to have a significant adverse impact on the City's water system, the incremental demand with the Proposed Actions would not adversely affect the City's water supply or system water pressure.

Sanitary (Dry Weather) Flows

The Bowery Bay water pollution control plant (WPCP), which is designed to treat a dry weather flow of 150 million gallons per day (mgd), handled an average of 105~~104~~ mgd of sewage flow between ~~December 2019~~October 2020 and ~~November 2020~~September 2021. Based on rates in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Actions has the potential to result in an increase of 0.33~~9~~ mgd of sanitary sewage flow. This incremental increase in sanitary flow would represent approximately 0.22~~6~~ percent of the Bowery Bay WPCP's designated State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) capacity. Pursuant to CEQR methodology, as the projected increase in sanitary sewage would not cause the Bowery Bay WPCP to exceed its operational capacity or its SPDES-permitted capacity, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to sanitary sewage conveyance and treatment.

Stormwater (Wet Weather) Flows

The Proposed Actions would include improvements to stormwater infrastructure to support the new development, including the construction of a new internal storm drain to enable direct discharge of Project Area stormwater flows into the East River and therefore would decrease the amount of stormwater flows generated on the Project Area that could contribute to combined sewer overflow (CSO) events. Based on the analysis conducted in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, with the infrastructure improvements and Best Management Practices (BMP) implemented on Projected Development Site 1 by the Applicant, it is concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Transportation

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse transportation impacts related to traffic, transit, and pedestrians as detailed below. Potential mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation section below.

Traffic

The Proposed Actions are expected to result in net incremental increases of approximately ~~361~~356, ~~259~~270, ~~375~~326, and ~~333~~364 vehicle trips in the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours, respectively. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the weekday 8 to 9 AM, 1 to 2 PM, and 4:45 to 5:45 PM and Saturday 2 to 3 PM peak hours at 26 intersections in the traffic study area where additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Actions would be most heavily concentrated with 50 or more trips. The traffic

impact analysis indicates that during the AM peak hour, a total of ~~32~~30 lane groups at 18 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted. A total of 14 lane groups at 10 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted in the weekday midday peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, a total of ~~30~~27 lane groups at 17 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted. A total of 20 lane groups at 12 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted in the Saturday midday peak hour. In all, a total of ~~41~~40 lane groups would be significantly adversely impacted at 20 intersections (13 signalized and seven unsignalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours. The "Mitigation" section below discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

Transit

Subway

The analysis of subway conditions focuses on the 30th Avenue (N/W) New York City Transit (NYCT) subway station in proximity to the Project Area and the N/W subway route, where incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 200-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in AM and PM commuter peak hours.

Subway Station

In the future with the Proposed Actions at the 30th Avenue station, the M3-S3 street stairs at the northwest corner of 31st Street and 30th Avenue is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) E with a v/c ratio of 1.35~~1.45~~ in the PM peak hour, and the threshold on this stairs would exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria and would be considered significantly adversely impacted. The P1-P2 platform stairs leading to the Manhattan-bound trains at the 30th Avenue station is projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 1.47~~1.48~~ in the AM peak hour, and these stairs would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the AM peak hour. The P3-P4 platform staircase from the Astoria-Ditmars-bound trains at the 30th Avenue station is projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 1.42~~1.46~~ in the PM peak hour, and would exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, and both would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the PM peak hour. All other analyzed stairs, and the analyzed fare arrays at the 30th Avenue station are projected to operate at acceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hour in the With-Action condition and would not be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. The "Mitigation" section below discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse subway station impacts.

Subway Line Haul

The Project Area is served N/W subway route on the BMT Astoria Culver Line. The peak direction of travel is typically Manhattan-bound (southbound) in the AM peak hour and Queens-bound (northbound) in the PM peak hour. In the With-Action condition, southbound N/W trains are expected to be operating over capacity in the AM peak hour, and would experience an average incremental increase of 3.35~~3.46~~ persons/car during this period, less than the five persons/car *CEQR Technical Manual* impact threshold, and would therefore not be considered significantly adversely impacted. The northbound N/W trains are expected to be operating below capacity with average incremental increase of ~~3.21~~2.62 persons/car during the PM peak hour and would therefore also not be significant adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions in the PM hour.

Bus

The Project Area is served by the Q18, Q19, Q102, and Q103 operated by the MTA Bus Company. The Proposed Actions would generate a net total of approximately 9092 AM bus trips and 99106 PM bus trips, and a portion of the 796 754 AM and 886 700 PM subway trips on these routes. A preliminary screening assessment concluded that new demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 50-trip per direction *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM peak hour along the Q18, Q19, and the Q103 routes.

Based on projected levels of bus service in the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in a passenger capacity shortfall of 1610 on the eastbound Q18, twelve six on the northbound Q103, and 4642 on the southbound Q103 buses in the AM peak hour. The Proposed Actions would also result in a passenger capacity shortfall of 6342 on the northbound Q103 and 4525 on the southbound Q103 buses in the PM peak hour. Therefore, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, the eastbound Q18, northbound Q103 and southbound Q103 buses would be significantly adversely impacted in the AM peak hour, as well as the northbound Q103 and southbound Q103 buses in the PM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to these buses could be fully mitigated by the addition of one or two buses in each direction during the AM and PM peak hours. As further discussed in the "Mitigation" section below, the general policy of the MTA is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

Citywide Ferry Service (CWFS)

According to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, detailed analyses of the citywide ferry service (CWFS) are not typically required if a proposed actions would result in 50 or fewer peak hour CWFS peak hour ferry riders. The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of 49 and 47 ferry trips during the weekday commuter AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Therefore, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to the CWFS, and a detailed analysis of ferry conditions is not warranted.

Pedestrians

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of 281 314 walk-only trips during the weekday AM peak hour, 588503 in the midday peak hour, 474594 in the PM peak hour, and 533781 during the Saturday peak hour. New pedestrian trips to sidewalks, corner, and crosswalks in the vicinity of the Project Area would total 751762, 1,1011,076, 1,0071,034, and 1,4681,734 (including persons to/from bus, subway, ferry and "walk only"; in and out combined) during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively. Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at a total of 19 representative pedestrian elements where new trips generated by the Projected Development are expected to be most concentrated. These elements—eleven sidewalks, five corner areas, and three crosswalks—are primarily located in the vicinity of the Project Area and along corridors connecting the site to area subway station entrances and bus stops. Two sidewalks, three crosswalks, and one corner would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions in one or more analysis peak hours. The impacted sidewalks are the west sidewalk of 4th Street between 26th Avenue and 27th Avenue, and the north sidewalk of 27th Avenue between 3rd Street and 4th Street, which would be impacted in the Saturday and weekday midday peak hours, respectively. The impacted corner is the northeast corner of 27th Avenue and 4th Street, which would be impacted in the weekday midday peak hour. The impacted crosswalks are the north, east, and west crosswalks at 27th Avenue and 4th Street, which would be impacted in the weekday midday and/or

Saturday peak hours. Potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts are discussed in the "Mitigation" section below.

Street User Safety

Under the Vision Zero Queens Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and the Boroughs Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Update released in 2019, much of the Project Area is located outside a designated Priority Area where safety issues were found to occur systematically at an area-wide level. 21st Street is currently identified as a Priority Corridor.

Crash data for intersections in the pedestrian study area were obtained from the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT) for the three-year period between January 1, 2017~~2016~~, and December 31, ~~2018~~ 2019 (the most recent three-year period for which data are available). During this period, a total of ~~182~~ 214 reportable and non-reportable crashes, ~~522~~ 35 pedestrian/bicyclist-related injury crashes and no fatalities occurred at intersections in the traffic and pedestrian study area.

Under *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, high crash locations are defined as locations identified along a Vision Zero Priority corridor/intersection ~~those with 48 or more total reportable and non-reportable crashes~~ or where five or more pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes occurring in any consecutive 12 months of the most recent three-year period for which data are available. No intersections located within the traffic and pedestrian study areas were identified as high accident locations by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT). However, it is likely that pedestrians en route to and from Proposed Development Site 1 would choose to cross 26th Avenue at this more proximate location where a crosswalk is not present (there are no existing crosswalks on 26th Avenue). This would result in a pedestrian safety concern. It should be noted that an intersection, like 26th Avenue and 3rd Street, where incremental pedestrian trips are expected to traverse uncontrolled intersections, that does not warrant new control as mitigation measure, are considered pedestrian safety concerns. Potential measures to address these safety concerns are discussed in the "Mitigation" section below. ~~A review of the crash data identified the intersection of 21st Avenue and Astoria Park South/Hoyt Avenue North as a high crash location, which experienced five pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes in 2016. Improvements to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety, including high visibility crosswalks, protected bike path, pedestrian refuge island, and installation of speed limit signage have been implemented at this intersection.~~

Parking

The parking analyses document changes in the parking supply and utilization in within a ¼-mile and ½-mile of the Project Area under both No-Action and With-Action conditions. Under the With-Action conditions, it is assumed that a total of ~~640~~708 parking spaces would be provided on the Project Area. The total anticipated project-generated overnight parking demand of approximately 699 vehicles would exceed on-site supply by 68~~59~~ vehicles and the surplus demand would have to be accommodated in the parking study area surrounding the Project Area. During the overnight period, this excess demand would further exacerbate the No-Action parking deficit from ~~280~~ 286 spaces under the No-Action conditions to ~~348~~ 363 spaces within the ¼-mile radius of the Project Area, and from ~~499~~ 507 spaces under the No-Action conditions to ~~567~~ 584 spaces within the ½-mile radius of the Project Area. This shortfall would not be considered significant given the availability of alternative modes of transportation (including local bus routes and a proposed shuttle bus to N/W trains and the nearby ferry landing) and the magnitude of the shortfall (approximately one percent of ½-mile study area's capacity). The Projected Development is expected to result in a parking shortfall per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

Air Quality

An analysis of air quality determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to mobile source or stationary source air quality.

The maximum pollutant concentrations and concentration increments from mobile sources with the Proposed Actions are projected to be lower than the corresponding CEQR *de minimis* criteria. The parking facilities assumed to be developed as a result of the Proposed Actions were analyzed for potential air quality effects, which found that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts.

In terms of industrial sources, no businesses were found to have a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) air permit. One facility was identified in New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) certificate of operation within the study area. Therefore, an Air Toxics analysis was required. The results of this analysis found that no significant adverse impacts related to air toxics are anticipated.

Based on a detailed dispersion modeling analysis, there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and particulate matter (PM), from the proposed heat and hot water systems for the Proposed Actions and the existing steam plants. An (E) Designation (E-671) would be mapped in connection with the Proposed Actions to ensure that future developments would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to greenhouse gases as it would be consistent with the City's GHG emissions reduction goals, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with policies regarding adaptation to climate change as identified in OneNYC.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

It is estimated that the development facilitated by the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 9,214 total metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) of annual emissions from building operations and approximately 4,28918 metric tons of CO_2e emissions from mobile sources annually, for an annual total of approximately 13,503432 metric tons of CO_2e emissions. This represents approximately 0.026 percent of the City's overall 2017 GHG emissions of approximately 50.7 million metric tons. The proposed development would comply with the 2020 New York City Energy Conservation Construction Code, which governs performance requirements of HVAC systems and require substantial energy efficiency of new buildings.

The Proposed Actions would also advance New York City's GHG reduction goals by virtue of its nature and location. The Proposed Actions would facilitate development of a medium-density mixed-use residential, commercial, and community facility development in an area with existing urban infrastructure, including roadways, transit, sewer infrastructure, and water mains, thereby minimizing the need for extensive infrastructure development. By redeveloping sites that are located in an area supported by many transit options, including bus and subway service, as well as NYC Ferry and bicycle infrastructure, the Proposed Actions would support transit-oriented development in New York City.

Therefore, based on the adherence to the City's energy efficiency requirements and by virtue of the Proposed Actions' location and nature, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the City's applicable emissions reduction goals of transit-oriented development and construction of new resource- and energy-efficient buildings.

Resilience to Climate Change

Portions of the Project Area are located within the currently applicable 100-year and 500-year floodplains. Although some critical and vulnerable components of the Proposed Project would be located below the elevation of these floodplains, no building features are expected to be below the elevation of the Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) at any point over the building's lifespan and it is unlikely the Project Area would be affected by tidal flooding. As noted above, the Proposed Project would be constructed to meet the codes and any related resiliency requirements in effect at the time of construction.

As such, there would be no significant adverse impacts associated with the Project Area's location in the 100-year floodplain. All new vulnerable, critical, or potentially hazardous features would be protected through flood damage reduction measures or future adaptive actions and, therefore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with New York City policies regarding adaptation to climate change.

Noise

An analysis was conducted to determine whether traffic generated by the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors, and to determine the level of building attenuation necessary to ensure that interior noise levels for the Projected Development satisfy applicable interior noise criteria. Analysis of mechanical equipment is not warranted because such mechanical equipment would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations and, therefore, would not result in adverse noise impacts.

Noise from the increased traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Actions would cause significant adverse noise impacts as the relative increases in noise levels would be above the applicable *CEQR Technical Manual* significant adverse impact threshold (3.0-5.0 dBA). Mitigation measures to address the noise impacts on these sensitive receptors are discussed in the "Mitigation" section below.

Additionally, as the maximum With-Action L_{10} noise levels at Projected Development Site 1 ~~and Projected Development Site 2~~ would be greater than 70 dBA, attenuation of 31~~3~~ dBA would be required along Projected Development Site 1's 26th Avenue frontage within ~~140~~ 50 feet of ~~3rd Street~~26th Avenue and the facades facing 2nd Street and 9th Street within 50 feet of 26th Avenue~~, and 31 dBA on the Projected Development Site 1's facades facing 9th Street within 50 feet of 26th Avenue; and attenuation of 31 dBA along Projected Development Site 2's 26th Avenue frontage and all other facades within 50 feet of 26th Avenue~~. The (E) Designation (E-671) will require alternate means of ventilation for facades with an exterior noise level of 70 dBA or higher. With implementation of the attenuation levels required pursuant to the (E) designation (E-671), the projected developments would provide sufficient attenuation to achieve the *CEQR Technical Manual* interior noise level guidelines of 45 dBA or lower for residential and community facility uses. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts related to building interior noise level requirements at Projected Development Sites 1 and 2.

Public Health

The Proposed Actions are not expected to result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the following technical areas that contribute to public health: operational air quality, water quality, or hazardous materials.

Noise from the increased traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Actions and resultant reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) would cause significant adverse noise impacts as the relative increase in noise levels would be above the applicable *CEQR Technical Manual* significant adverse impact threshold (3.0 dBA). However, none of the residential buildings in the vicinity of the Project Area would experience elevated L_{eq} noise levels that would exceed 85 dBA. Additionally, predicted noise levels are at their highest during peak traffic commuting hours (generally between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM), when most residents are at work or school and away from their places of residence. Noise levels outside of the peak commuting hours (generally between 6:00 PM and 8:00 AM), when residents are more likely to be at home, would likely be considerably lower. As noise levels in the vicinity of the Project Area are expected to be significantly lower outside of work and school hours, when residents are more likely to be at home, and as the residential buildings in the vicinity of the Project Area would not experience L_{eq} noise levels in exceedance of 85 dBA, the Proposed Actions are not anticipated to cause excessively high chronic noise exposure and, therefore, are not expected to result in a significant adverse public health impact related to noise.

Additionally, the Proposed Actions would result in temporary, partially mitigated significant adverse construction-related noise impacts. However, while during some periods of construction the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise, as defined by *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds, the predicted overall temporary change in noise levels would not be large enough to substantially affect public health. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse public health impacts during construction.

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. Of the relevant technical areas specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy, socioeconomic conditions, shadows, or urban design and visual resources. The scale of significant adverse impacts to open space, transportation, and noise would not affect any defining features of neighborhood character, nor would a combination of moderately adverse effects affect the neighborhood's defining features. The development resulting from the Proposed Actions would be consistent with existing trends and would facilitate new mixed-use development, waterfront open space, and improved neighborhood circulation. Thus, based on the results of the preliminary assessment, there is no potential for the Proposed Actions to result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character, and further analysis is not warranted.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts on traffic and noise during peak construction periods. Construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space, hazardous materials, neighborhood character, or air quality.

Transportation

Peak construction conditions during the third quarter (Q3) and fourth quarter (Q4) of 2027 were considered for the analysis of potential transportation (traffic, transit, pedestrian, and parking) impacts during construction. Based on the anticipated numbers of vehicle trips from construction trucks and construction workers and incremental operational trips from the Project Area, incremental vehicle trips during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period are expected to be less than the incremental peak hour trips that would be generated with full build-out of the proposed development. In addition, there is less overall traffic on the study area street network during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM construction peak hours than during the analyzed 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:45 PM to 5:45 PM operational peak hours.

Construction traffic conditions during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period were evaluated at 21 intersections (10 signalized and 11 unsignalized) in the traffic study area where combined construction and incremental operational vehicle trips would potentially exceed the 50-trips/hour *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours. The construction traffic impact analysis identified the potential for significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the weekday AM construction peak hour, and ten lane groups at five intersections in the weekday PM construction peak hour. The "Mitigation" section below discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

Overall, combined construction and operational subway demand at the analyzed 30th Avenue (N/W) station in the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period would total approximately 139~~8~~ trips in the 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM construction peak hour, and 223 subway trips in the 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM construction peak hour. This demand would be substantially less than the numbers of trips generated at this station by full build-out of the Proposed Actions in the operational AM and PM peak hours (~~796~~527 and ~~886~~490 trips, respectively). It would also occur outside of the analyzed peak commuter periods when overall demand on the subway system is typically greatest. Consequently, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to the analyzed 30th Avenue (N/W) subway station or to subway line haul conditions during the construction peak hours in the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period.

Combined operational and construction bus demand in the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period would total approximately 155 trips in the 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM construction peak hour, and 210~~08~~ trips in the 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM construction peak hour. As these trips would be distributed among the four MTA Bus routes serving the Project Area, and would occur outside of the analyzed peak commuter periods when overall transit bus demand is typically greatest, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to local bus service during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period.

Combined operational and construction pedestrian demand in the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period would total approximately 190 trips in the 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM construction peak hour, and 326~~3~~ trips in the 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM construction peak hour. As these trips would be distributed among multiple access points along both 3rd Street and 26th Avenue, pedestrian demand during each peak hour is not expected to reach the 200 trips/hour *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold for a detailed

pedestrian analysis on any one analyzed sidewalk, corner area or crosswalk, and significant adverse pedestrian impacts are not expected to occur during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period.

Site-generated parking demand during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period would total approximately 41406 spaces during the 76:00 AM – 87:00 AM period, including 11592 spaces from construction workers and 291322 spaces of operational demand from Towers 1 and 2. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project's 525-space on-site parking garage would be completed prior to the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period, and that this parking capacity would be available to accommodate both operational demand and construction workers during the peak construction period. Therefore, the 406 spaces of combined construction and operational parking demand during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 peak construction period would be fully accommodated on-site, and the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse construction parking impacts.

Air Quality

Measures would be taken to minimize pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. These measures would include dust suppression measures, idling restrictions, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel. In addition, to minimize air pollutant emissions during construction, the use of newer and cleaner equipment during construction would be implemented to the extent practicable. With these measures in place and based on the duration and intensity of construction activities, the location of nearby sensitive receptors, and an examination of construction on-road sources, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse construction air quality impacts.

Noise

Detailed quantitative construction noise modeling was completed for the Proposed Project to determine typical construction noise levels for the major construction elements. Potential noise levels at sensitive receptor locations, such as residential properties and parks, were assessed. Multiple receptors were created along the façade of buildings to capture the noise levels at different floors of the building. The noise impact criteria described in Chapter 19, Section 410 of the *CEQR Technical Manual* served as a screening-level threshold for potential construction noise impacts. If the construction noise of a proposed project would not exceed these criteria at a given receptor, then that receptor would not have the potential to experience a construction noise impact. However, if the construction noise projection exceeds the noise impact criteria, then further consideration of the intensity and duration of construction noise at that receptor is warranted. The analysis also compared interior L_{10} noise levels to the CEQR interior noise guideline of 45 dBA.

The construction noise impact analysis identified potentially significant temporary adverse impacts in the following locations, as described below. Mitigation measures considered for these impacts are further discussed in the "Mitigation" section.

- ~~**3 04 26 Avenue:** A total of 6 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 82.4 dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 19.5 dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, while noise increase would not reach 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months or more.~~
- ~~**3 06 26th Avenue:** A total of 6 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 82.8~~

~~dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 19 dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, while noise increase would not reach 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months or more.~~

- **3-08 26th Avenue**: A total of 6 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis at this location is expected to be 80.6~~81.5~~ dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 20.6~~22.9~~ dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would not experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months. However, the location would experience an ~~and~~ increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more and interior noise levels at residences of this building would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur.
- **3-10 26th Avenue**: A total of 6 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 80.4~~81.3~~ dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 20.2~~22.8~~ dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would not experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months. However, the location would experience an increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more and interior noise levels at residences of this building would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur. ~~Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more.~~
- **26-02 4th Street:** A total of 24 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) at this receptor location is expected to be in the low 80s dBA with the maximum noise increment of approximately 23 dBA above ambient noise levels. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 79.5~~80.7~~ dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 20.8~~19.6~~ dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more and interior noise levels at residences of this building would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur.
- ~~**Astoria Cove Projected Site #1 Podium:** A total of 76 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) at this receptor location is expected to be in the 80s dBA with the maximum noise increment of approximately 27.5 dBA above ambient noise levels. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 69.5 dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 19.814.2 dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, while noise increases would not reach 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more.~~
- **Astoria Cove Projected Site #1 North Tower**: A total of 72~~84~~ receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 78.4~~77~~ dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 23.9~~20.1~~ dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more and interior noise levels at residences of

this building would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur.

- **Astoria Cove Projected Site #1 South Tower**: A total of 4759 receptors were studied in the analysis for this site. The maximum construction noise (Leq) during the modeled analysis period at this location is expected to be 76.677 dBA, with the maximum noise increment of 21.37 dBA above ambient level. Based on the modeling analysis and extrapolation of analyzed results, this receptor building would experience noise increase of at least 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and increase of 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months or more and interior noise levels at residences of this building would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur.

The Proposed Project is expected to be completed in 2028 and Projected Development Site 2 is expected to be completed in 2031. Tower 1 of Projected Development Site 1 is assumed to be completed and occupied in 2024 as Tower 2 construction is underway. Tower 2 will be completed and occupied in 2026 as Tower 3 construction is underway. Towers 1, 2, and 3 will be completed and occupied in 2029 as Projected Development Site 2 construction is underway. The project-on-project analysis concluded that construction for the Proposed Project could increase noise level by 15 dBA for 12 consecutive months and 20 dBA for 3 consecutive months for completed and occupied Phase 1 development and Phase 2 development and interior noise levels at noise sensitive spaces of these buildings would be above the acceptable interior L_{10} of 45 dBA during periods when significant noise increases occur. Therefore, based on the predicted magnitude and duration of noise increases, construction noise associated with the Proposed Actions at completed and occupied Phase 1 and Phase 2 project buildings would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impact.

Mitigation measures considered for these impacts are further discussed below under "Mitigation."

Other Technical Areas

LAND USE AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Construction activities would affect land use within the Project 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. These disruptions would be temporary in nature and would have limited effects on land uses within the surrounding area, particularly as most construction activities would take place within the Project Area or within portions of sidewalks, curbs, and travel lanes of public streets immediately adjacent to the sites. Overall, while the construction at the Project Area would be evident to the local community, the temporary nature 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 could temporarily affect pedestrian and vehicular access. Although construction may at times result in temporary disruption of pedestrian or vehicular circulation adjacent to the Projected Development Sites, pedestrian and vehicular access to the Project Area would always remain. Moreover, lane and/or sidewalk closures would not obstruct entrances to any existing businesses, and businesses are not expected to be significantly affected by any temporary reductions in the amount of pedestrian foot traffic or vehicular delays that could occur as a result of construction activities. Overall, construction activities associated with the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on surrounding 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 direct activity. Construction also would contribute to increased tax revenues for the City and State, including those from personal income taxes.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

No community facilities would be directly affected by construction activities for an extended duration. The portions of the Project Area to be developed will 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. Construction of the Projected Development Sites would not block or restrict access to any facilities in the area, and would not materially affect emergency response times significantly. The NYPD and FDNY emergency services and response times would not be materially affected 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 Project Area and no public open space resources would be used for staging or other construction activities. As discussed above, there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts on open spaces in the surrounding area taking into account dust control measures and other emission reduction measures incorporated in the Proposed Project. The construction noise analysis (discussed above) showed that, while construction noise could be perceptible at some of the nearby open spaces, the predicted construction noise levels would not rise to the level of a significant impact, and would therefore not result in a major change in the usability of these facilities.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Project Area does not possess archaeological significance, and therefore, the Proposed Actions do not have the potential to result in construction period archaeological impacts. The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse direct impacts to architectural resources as no historic architectural resources are located within the Project Area. Moreover, no architectural resources are located within 90 feet of the Project Area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse construction-related impacts to historic architectural resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The vast majority of the hazardous materials on Projected Development Site 1 have already been addressed by the Applicant through remediation of the Project Development Site Phase I during participation in the New York State Brownfield Cleanup Program (“BCP”) as the Astoria Steel Site BCP Site #C241155 (“BCP Site”) under the oversight of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (“NYSDEC”) and the New York State Department of Health (“NYSDOH”). There is some remaining contamination, defined in the Final Engineering Report (“FER”), which will be managed by the current owner and all future owners pursuant to a Site Management Plan (“SMP”) and Environmental Easement (“EE”). However, a Certificate of Completion (“COC”) has been earned by the Applicant from the NYSDEC and NYSDOH such that the property is ready for the safe development of the Proposed Project.

With the EE already recorded, which mandates all current and future owners and operators of Projected Development Site 1 to maintain the engineering and institutional controls in the SMP, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials.

In addition, an (E) Designation (E-671) would be mapped on Projected Development Site 2 (Block 911, Lot 49). With the requirements of the (E) Designation on Projected Development Site 2, it is expected that there would be no impact from the potential presence of contaminated materials. The implementation of these preventative and remedial measures would reduce or avoid the potential that significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would result from potential construction in the Project Area resulting from the Proposed Actions. Following such construction, there would be no potential for significant adverse impacts.

H. MITIGATION

The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities (publicly funded early childhood programs), active open space, transportation (traffic, transit, pedestrians), and construction (traffic and noise). Potential mitigation measures for each of these technical areas are identified below.

Community Facilities

Elementary Schools

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on public elementary schools. According to the updated 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse elementary school impact may result if a proposed action would result in both of the following: (1) A utilization rate of elementary schools that is equal to or greater than 100% in the With-Action Condition; and (2) 100 or more new students generated by the proposed development past the 100% utilization rate. The demand for elementary school seats with Community School District 30, Sub-District 3 would increase to 141.06 percent compared to the No-Action condition of 136.4 percent. Under the RWCDS, the Proposed Actions would introduce approximately 181 elementary school students. As such, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary schools. The significant adverse elementary school impact would occur with completion of 909 residential units, and therefore would occur upon completion and occupancy of Tower 3 in the last phase of the Proposed Project's construction.

Potential mitigation measures ~~are currently being~~were explored by the Applicant in consultation with the lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA), and the New York City Department of Education (DOE) and will be refined between the DEIS and FEIS. ~~If feasible mitigation is found, the impacts upon elementary school seats in the study area will be considered mitigated.~~ In order to address the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impact on public elementary schools, the Applicant will coordinate with SCA to provide programmatic funding for existing elementary schools within Community School District 30, Sub-District 3. This fund will go to a to-be-determined program in the sub-district, and will be outlined more specifically in the Restrictive Declaration. In addition, other options to address school seat demand in the future could include standard measures utilized by DOE/SCA to address school capacity such as redistricting, the provision of off-site capacity, or other administrative measures. Such measures could wholly or partially mitigate the significant adverse impact on public elementary schools. Absent the implementation of such measures, the Proposed Actions could result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact to elementary schools.

Early Childhood Programs

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on publicly funded early childhood programs. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse child care center impact could result if an action results in: (1) a collective utilization rate greater than 100 percent in the With-Action condition; and (2) the demand constitutes an increase of five percent or more in the collective capacity of early childhood programs serving the study area over the No-Action condition. Under the RWCDS, the Proposed Actions would introduce approximately 46 children potentially eligible for subsidized child care to the study area. The analysis of publicly funded early childhood programs found that under the With-Action condition, the child care study area would experience a utilization rate of 193.9 percent, an increase of 46.5 percentage points over No-Action conditions. As such, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on publicly funded early childhood programs. The significant adverse early childhood program impact would occur with completion of 34 affordable residential units, and therefore would occur upon completion and occupancy of Tower 1 in the first phase of the Proposed Project's construction.

~~Mitigation measures will possibly include adding capacity to existing facilities if determined feasible through consultation with the New York City Department of Education (DOE) or providing a new child care facility within or near the Project Area.~~ Consideration of providing additional child care facility capacity and/or other measures ~~is being~~were explored in consultation with the lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), and the New York City Department of Education (DOE) and ~~will be~~were further explored between the DEIS and FEIS. In order to address the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs, the Applicant will coordinate with DOE to develop possible mitigation measures which may include provision of suitable space on-site for a publicly funded early childhood program facility, provision of a suitable location off-site and within a reasonable distance (at a rate affordable to DOE providers), or funding to support additional capacity. As a city agency, DOE does not directly provide new child care facilities, instead it contracts with providers in areas of need. DOE also works towards creating public/private partnerships to facilitate the development of new child care facilities where there is an area of need. As part of that initiative, DOE may be able to contribute capital funding, if it is available, towards such projects to facilitate the provision of new facilities.

The Restrictive Declaration for the Proposed Project will require the Applicant to work with DOE to consider the need for and the implementation of one or more measures as listed above to provide additional capacity, if required, to mitigate the significant adverse impact to publicly funded child care facilities within the 1.5-mile study area or within Queens Community District 1. Based on the results of the analysis presented in **Chapter 4, "Community Facilities and Services,"** which accounts for the current inventory of publicly funded child care facilities and conservative future background projections, providing capacity for 27 publicly-funded early childhood program slots would be needed to reduce the increase in the utilization rate to less than five percent. Absent the implementation of such needed mitigation measures, the Proposed Actions could have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs.

Open Space

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse active open space impact. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse open space impact may occur if a proposed action would reduce the open space ratio by more than five percent in areas that are currently below the ~~City's median community *district*~~*CEQR Technical Manual's* open space ratio of ~~1~~2.5 acres per 1,000 residents over the

No-Action conditions. In areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a reduction as little as one percent may be considered significant depending on the area of the City. The guidance for percent change in open space ratio is determined based on the open space ratio as outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The RWCDS for the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 1,665 residential units, which would place new demands on the area's open space resources. Given the anticipated decrease in the active open space ratio in the study area, which would exceed ~~five~~ three percent, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact to the active open space resources in the study area. The significant adverse active open space impact would occur with completion of ~~622~~ 388 residential units, and therefore would occur upon completion and occupancy of Tower 2 in the second phase of the Proposed Project's construction.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* lists potential mitigation measures for open space impacts. These measures 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. Potential partial mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact ~~are currently being~~were explored by the Applicant in consultation with the lead agency, DCP, and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). As a part of those discussions, DPR has expressed a community need to improve and renovate the existing Triborough Bridge Playground B, located approximately 0.5 miles east of the Project Area, which could increase utility and provide additional active open space facilities in the neighborhood. Improvements and~~/or~~ renovations at the Triborough Bridge Playground B as a potential mitigation measure ~~will be~~were further refined between the DEIS and FEIS.

In order to address the significant adverse impact on active open space, the Applicant would be required to upgrade or replace a playground and sitting area (approximately 35,000 sf area), reconfigure existing storm water management systems, restore existing pavement in the playground and sitting area, and install eight security lights at the Triborough Bridge Playground B. These improvements would increase the utility of Triborough Bridge Playground B and its capacity to meet the active open space needs of the study area, and therefore would constitute partial mitigation of the potential significant adverse impact on active open space. Improvements to Triborough Bridge Playground B would occur during Phase 2 of the proposed ULURP Phasing Plan (i.e., before a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy is granted for the 388th unit).

The implementation of the above-described measures would constitute partial mitigation of the potential significant adverse impact on open space. ~~Additional mitigation measures will be explored further by the Applicant in consultation with DCP and the DPR between the DEIS and FEIS. If no additional feasible mitigation measures are identified, the impacts would be considered partially mitigated.~~

Transportation

Traffic

As described in **Chapter 11, "Transportation,"** the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts at 21 study area intersection during one or more analyzed peak hour during the weekday AM, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. Implementation of traffic engineering improvements, such as signal timing changes would provide mitigation for most of the anticipated traffic impacts. ~~Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to review and approval by the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT) and will be further refined between the DEIS~~

~~and FEIS.~~ If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative mitigation measure will be identified, if possible. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Table ES-3 shows that all significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated during the weekday AM, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. Assuming all the proposed mitigation measures were implemented, **Table ES-3** shows that significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at 10~~11~~ lane groups in the weekday AM peak hour, 4~~3~~ lane groups in the midday peak hour, ~~7~~6 lane groups in the weekday PM peak hour, and ~~6~~5 lane groups in the Saturday peak hour. Intersections where all impacts would be fully mitigated would total 6, 4~~3~~, ~~5~~4, and 3 during these same periods, respectively. **Table ES-4** provides a more detailed summary of the intersections and lane groups that would have unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. In total, impacts to one or more lane groups would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 16 intersections. The Applicant will commit to conducting a transportation monitoring program (TMP) at Projected Development Site 1, after the completion of Phases 1 and 2 and before the final Phase, to better estimate the transportation planning factors, the full build traffic demand generated by the Proposed Actions, and any future demand from No-Action developments. The TMP will revise traffic analyses where necessary to determine the likelihood of potential traffic impacts.

TABLE ES-3
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	91/26	~~59~~61/8	~~32~~30/18	~~11~~10/~~6~~5	~~21~~20/~~12~~13
Weekday Midday	89/26	75/16	14/10	~~4~~3/~~4~~3	~~10~~11/~~6~~7
Weekday PM	89/26	~~59~~62/9	~~30~~27/17	~~7~~6/~~5~~4	~~23~~21/~~12~~13
Saturday Midday	91/26	71/14	20/12	~~6~~5/3	~~14~~15/9

TABLE ES-4
Lane Groups with Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	**Weekday Midday**	**Weekday PM**	**Saturday**
Signalized Intersections				
26th Avenue & 21st Street				
27th Avenue & 4th Street				
27th Avenue & 8th Street		EB-R	WB-T~~, NB-L~~	
27th Avenue & 9th Street	WB-T, SB-L		WB-T~~, SB-L~~	WB-T, SB-L
27th Avenue & 12th Street	EB-LT		EB-LT, WB-TR	EB-LT
27th Avenue & 14th Street			WB-LT	
Astoria Boulevard & 8th Street			NB-LT	
Astoria Boulevard & 18th Street	SB-LR			
Astoria Boulevard & 21st Street	EB-L,TR. WB-T. NB-LT.	EB-TR. WB-T. NB-LT. SB- R.	EB-L,TR. WB-T, R. NB-LT. SB-R.	EB-TR. WB-T. NB-LT, SB-R.
24th Avenue & 21st Street	NB-LTR. SB-LT	NB-LTR	NB-LTR	NB-LTR
Hoyt Avenue North & 21st Street	~~WB-L.~~ NB-T. SB-TR	NB-T	WB-LT, NB-T	NB-T
Astoria Park S/Hoyt Avenue S & 21st Street				
30th Avenue & 21st Street				
Unsignalized Intersections				
26th Avenue & 3rd Street				
27th Avenue & 3rd Street	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR
27th Avenue & 18th Street		EB-LTR	EB-LTR	EB-LTR, WB-LR

Astoria Boulevard & Newtown Avenue	NB-LR		NB-LR	NB-LR
30th Avenue & 8th Street	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR
30th Avenue & Main Street	EB-LT		EB-LT	
30th Avenue & 12th Street	EB-LTR			
30th Avenue & 14th Street	EB-LTR. SB-LTR			
Notes: NB—northbound, SB—southbound, EB—eastbound, WB—westbound L—left-turn, T—through, R—right-turn				

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse impacts to the two sidewalks, three crosswalks, and one corner in one or more peak hours. Recommended mitigation measures consisting of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk flow and the widening of crosswalks or corner areas would fully mitigate the impacts to one sidewalk (west sidewalk of 4th Street between 26th Avenue and 27th Avenue),one crosswalk and one corner (27th Avenue and 4th Street). One sidewalk (north sidewalk of 27th Avenue between 3rd Street and 4th Street) and two crosswalks (north and east crosswalks at 27th Avenue and 4th Street) would be remain unmitigated during the weekday midday and/or Saturday peak hours. In addition, the proposed traffic mitigation measures would result in a new impact on the northwest corner in the ~~midday and~~ Saturday peak hour~~s~~ that would remain unmitigated. The Applicant will commit to the proposed mitigation measures described in further detail in Section E of the Mitigation chapter, as deemed practicable by DOT, as needed; ~~I~~implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as NYC Parks if a street tree is to be removed. ~~DCP, as lead agency, will explore potential mitigation measures in coordination with DOT and NYC Parks between publication of the DEIS and FEIS.~~ Absent the identification and implementation of additional feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the pedestrian impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts. The Applicant will commit to conducting a TMP at Projected Development Site 1, after the completion of Phases 1 and 2 and before the final Phase, to better estimate the transportation planning factors, the full build traffic demand generated by the Proposed Actions, and any future demand from No-Action developments. The TMP will revise pedestrian analyses where necessary to determine the likelihood of potential pedestrian impacts.

Transit

Subway

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to one platform stairs in the AM peak hour and two stairs in the PM peak hour at the 30th Avenue (N/W) station on the BMT Astoria Line. The Applicant will commit to conducting a TMP at Projected Development Site 1, after the completion of Phases 1 and 2 and before the final Phase, to better estimate the transportation planning factors, modal splits, subway station/line usage, bus route usage, the full build demand generated by the Proposed Actions, and any future demand from No-Action developments. The TMP will revise transit analyses based on findings of surveys and new data at the 30th Avenue station, and will be reviewed by New York City Transit (NYCT). Mitigation measures could include adding vertical capacity to the 30th Avenue subway station. Additionally, a preliminary study showe~~d~~s that a new street stair and elevator could potentially be located at the southwest corner of Newtown Avenue and 31st Street, adjacent to the 30th Avenue subway station's southbound platform. This measure would mitigate the impact at the Manhattan-bound platform stairs (P1-P2) during the AM peak hour.

~~The Applicant will continue to coordinate with NYCT to further explore mitigation measures between the DEIS and FEIS.~~ While the provision of a new street stair and elevator at the 30th Avenue subway station's Manhattan-bound platform could remove the impact at the Manhattan-bound platform stairs (P1-P2)

during the AM peak hour, this mitigation measure would not remove the impacts at the Manhattan-bound street stairs (M3-S3) and Queens-bound platform stairs (P3-P4) at the 30th Avenue station, and therefore, would be considered as partial mitigation. While further mitigation measures were explored between the DEIS and FEIS, none were identified as feasible or practical that could remove the impacts at the Manhattan-bound street stairs (M3-S3) and Queens-bound platform stairs (P3-P4). The provision of a new street stair would need to be preceded by construction of ADA-compliant elevators. The new street stair along the southbound platform would need to be funded by the Applicant following completion of the ADA accessibility improvements. Implementing the potential street stair and ADA-compliant elevator at the 30th Avenue station's Manhattan-bound platform has been determined to be not practicable, and thus, the projected impacts at the platform stairs (P1-P2) would be unmitigated. Absent the implementation of practicable mitigation measures at the impacted stairways, the Proposed Actions would have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on subway stations. Nonetheless, in an effort to redistribute future project-generated ridership to other nearby stations and lessen the potential impact on the 30th Avenue station, the Applicant would commit to work with NYCT to explore an additional free subway shuttle bus service connecting the site to the adjacent subway stops at Astoria Boulevard and Broadway.

Additionally, the Applicant will commit to conducting a TMP at Projected Development Site 1 to better estimate the transportation planning factors, modal splits, subway station/line usage, bus route usage, the full build demand generated by the Proposed Actions, and any future demand from No-Action developments. The TMP will revise transit analyses based on findings of surveys and new data at the 30th Avenue station, and will be reviewed by NYCT.

Bus

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts adverse bus line haul impacts are on the eastbound Q18, northbound Q103, and southbound Q103 buses in the AM peak hour, as well as the northbound Q103 and southbound Q103 buses in the PM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to the Q18 could be fully mitigated by the addition of one additional bus in eastbound direction in the AM peak hour. The significant adverse impact to the Q103 could be fully mitigated by one additional bus in northbound and southbound directions in the AM peak hour. The significant adverse impacts to the Q103 could be fully mitigated by the addition of ~~two~~one bus~~es~~ in northbound direction in the PM peak hour and one additional bus in southbound direction in the PM peak hour. While NYCT and MTA Bus Company routinely monitor changes in bus ridership and would make the necessary service adjustments where warranted, these service adjustments are subject to the agencies' fiscal and operational constraints and, if implemented, are expected to take place over time.

Noise

Significant adverse impacts related to traffic-generated noise are predicted to occur on 10 residential and commercial office buildings along 26th Avenue between 3rd and 4th Street, and along 3rd Street between 26th and 27th Avenue during various peak hours. Specifically, traffic-generated noise impacts are expected to occur at 3-04 – 3-06 26th Avenue, 3-08 – 3-10 26th Avenue, 26-38 3rd Street, 26-31 3rd Street, 26-24 3rd Street, 26-18 3rd Street, 26-19 3rd Street, 26-15 3rd Street, 26-11 3rd Street, and 26-35 3rd Street. Practicable and feasible mitigations measures ~~will be~~were explored in consultation with DCP and additional work ~~will be~~ was conducted between the DEIS and FEIS to provide a sufficient reduction to the identified noise increments to remain below the CEQR threshold (i.e., 3 dBA) or to lower interior noise levels at the identified impacted noise receptors to an acceptable range. ~~If warranted, possible~~As such, for impacted receptors at 3-04-3-06 26th Avenue, 3-08-3-10 26th Avenue, 26-38 3rd Street, 26-24 3rd Street, 26-19 3rd Street, 26-15 3rd Street, and 26-11 3rd Street that do not have an alternate means of ventilation (i.e., air

condition), the Applicant ~~mitigation measures c~~would offer through-window air conditioning units as partial mitigation~~ include installing storm windows or providing an alternate means of ventilation (including, but not limited to, air conditioning) to impacted existing noise receptors where these measures are not already in use~~. However, if interior noise levels at the identified impacted noise receptors are still above the acceptable level (i.e., 45 dBA or lower for residential/community facility uses, and 50 dBA or lower for commercial office uses)~~ and there are no other feasible and practicable mitigation measures that are identified~~, the significant adverse mobile source noise impacts would be considered either partially mitigated or would remain unmitigated. With respect to impacted future receptors at 26-31 3rd Street, 26-18 3rd Street, and 26-35 3rd Street, these locations are planned to have an alternate means of ventilation allowing for the maintenance of a closed window condition (i.e., central air conditioning). With 30 dBA window/wall attenuation given to newly constructed luxury buildings, interior noise levels at these buildings would be within the acceptable interior noise levels; therefore, the significant adverse mobile source noise impacts would be considered fully mitigated.

Construction

Traffic

Construction traffic conditions during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 construction were evaluated at 21 intersections (10 signalized and 11 unsignalized) in the traffic study area where construction vehicle trips would exceed the 50-trips/hour *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours. As discussed in **Chapter 17, "Construction,"** the construction traffic impact analysis identified the potential for significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the weekday AM construction peak hour, and ten lane groups at five intersections in the weekday PM construction peak hour.

As shown in **Tables ES-5 and ES-6**, implementation of recommended traffic signal timing changes at an existing traffic signal would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the construction PM peak hour. However, significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the construction AM peak hour and eight lane groups at four intersections in the construction PM peak hour would remain unmitigated.

Implementation of the recommended traffic signal timing changes is subject to review and approval by DOT. If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that this mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure may be identified.

TABLE ES-5
Summary of Lane Groups/Intersections with Significant Adverse Construction 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
Construction AM	66/21	64/20	2/1	0/0	2/1
Construction PM	66/21	56/16	10/5	2/1	8/4

TABLE ES-6
Lane Groups With Unmitigated Significant Adverse Construction Traffic Impacts

Signalized Intersections	Construction AM Peak Hour	Construction PM Peak Hour
27th Avenue & 3rd Street	---	SB-LR
27th Avenue & 18th Street	---	EB-LTR
Astoria Blvd & 21st Street	EB-TR, WB-T	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-T, NB-T
30th Avenue & 8th Street	---	SB-LT, WB-LR

NB – Northbound, SB – Southbound, EB – Eastbound, WB – Westbound
L – Left-turn, T – Through, R – Right-turn

Noise

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at several receptor locations surrounding the Project Area. As such, the Applicant is committed to feasible and practical noise mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate the potential construction noise impact. For units at 3-08 26th Avenue and 3-10 26th Avenue that do not have alternate means of ventilation (i.e., air conditioning), the Applicant would offer to provide through-window air conditioning units, which would partially mitigate the significant adverse noise impacts predicted to occur at these locations during construction. Construction activities would follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code (also known as Chapter 24 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, or Local Law 113) for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the New York City Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. In addition to the requirements pursuant to the New York City Noise Control Code, the Applicant is also committing to provide noise monitoring to ensure that violations of the NYC Noise Control Code do not occur at adjacent receptors during construction. However, the implementation of these measures would not eliminate all of the identified significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur during hours when the loudest pieces of construction equipment are in use. Consequently, these construction (noise) impacts would not be fully mitigated and would therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse construction (noise) impact.

I. ALTERNATIVES

No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative examines future conditions in the Project Area, but assumes the absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). Under the No-Action Alternative in 2031, it is anticipated that an as-of-right warehouse would be constructed on both Projected Development Sites 1 and 2 would be constructed pursuant to the existing M1-1.

The M1-1 zoning district permits 1.0 FAR for manufacturing and commercial uses. Under the No-Action condition, Projected Development Site 1 would be developed with a 2-story 172,612 gsf warehouse and 82 accessory parking spaces. Under the No-Action condition, it is assumed that the existing vacant warehouse building on Projected Development 2 would be re-occupied with 28,750 gsf of warehouse uses and 14 accessory parking spaces. The technical chapters of the EIS have described the No-Action Alternative as "the Future without the Proposed Actions."

The significant adverse impacts related to community facilities, open space, ~~and~~ transportation, noise, and construction anticipated for the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. However, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals of the Proposed Project. The benefits expected to result from the Proposed Project as intended by the Applicant - including promoting affordable and market-rate housing development through the introduction of increased residential density on-site, introducing new publicly accessible waterfront open space - would not be realized under this alternative, and the No-Action Alternative would fall short of the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative examines a scenario in which the density and other components of the RWCDS are changed specifically to avoid the unmitigated significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Development. There is the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts related to community facilities (public elementary schools and publicly funded early childhood programs), open space, transportation, noise, and construction traffic and noise. Overall, in order to eliminate all unmitigated significant adverse impacts, the RWCDS would have to be modified to a point where the principal goals and objectives would not be realized.

Lower Density Alternative

A Lower Density Alternative to the Proposed Actions was developed to determine whether the impacts to community facilities, open space, transportation, and construction could be reduced or eliminated while accomplishing the purpose and need established for the Proposed Actions. The Lower Density Alternative would result in 213 fewer DUs compared to the Proposed Actions, including 53 fewer affordable DUs; the same amount of commercial and community facility square footage (1,887 gsf and 22,638 gsf, respectively) and open space (0.95 acres) would be developed under both scenarios.

As outlined below, the Lower Density Alternative would still result in significant adverse impacts on community facilities, active open space, transportation, noise and construction noise. The Lower Density Alternative is expected to result in the same or a slightly lower number of significant adverse traffic impacts than the Proposed Actions. In addition, both the Lower Density Alternative and the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse bus line haul and subway station element impacts. As the Lower Density Alternative would not substantially alter the anticipated construction schedule, similar or slightly lesser construction noise impacts are anticipated under this alternative. These impacts could be mitigated and/or partially ~~-~~mitigated using the same mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Actions, with slightly lesser mitigation needed to mitigate the child care impact.

Overall, although the Lower Density Alternative would meet a number of the goals and objective of the Proposed Actions, this Alternative would meet these goals to a lesser degree than the Proposed Actions. Specifically, as the Lower Density Alternative would result in fewer residential units, it would be less supportive of the objective of the Proposed Actions to create opportunities for new housing development,

including affordable housing, while continuing to result in significant adverse impacts on child care facilities, active open space, transportation, and construction noise.

Potential CPC Modification Alternative

Under the Potential CPC Modification Alternative, the Proposed Project would be modified to shift Tower 3 approximately 15 feet to the south and Tower 2 approximately 6 to 10 feet to the east, and shift the terminus of the turnaround drive extending beyond 3rd Street north of 26th Avenue approximately 35 feet closer to 26th Street, thus creating additional open space areas along the waterfront as compared to the Proposed Actions. The modification is being considered by the CPC in response to questions raised during the public review process. The development program and building bulk under this alternative is identical to the Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) prepared for the Proposed Actions, with exception to the massing configuration of Towers 2 and 3, which will be shifted approximately 6 to 10 feet to the east and 15 feet to the south, respectively. Accordingly, the Potential CPC Modification Alternative would result in the same or similar significant adverse impacts as the Proposed Actions, requiring the same or similar mitigation measures, while still meeting the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

J. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

As described in the "Mitigation" section, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities (public elementary schools and publicly funded early childhood programs), open space (active open space), transportation (traffic, bus, subway, and pedestrians), noise, and construction (traffic and noise). To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for these identified significant adverse impacts. However, in some instances (a) no practicable mitigation was identified to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, and (b) there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet their purpose and need, eliminate their impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

Community Facilities

Public Elementary Schools

According to the ~~updated~~ 2021 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse elementary school impact may result if a proposed action would result in both of the following: (1) A utilization rate of elementary schools that is equal to or greater than 100% in the With-Action Condition; and (2) 100 or more new students generated by the proposed development past the 100% utilization rate. As discussed in **Chapter 4, "Community Facilities and Services,"** the demand for elementary school seats with Community School District 30, Sub-District 3 would increase to 141.06 percent compared to the No-Action condition of 136.4 percent. Under the RWCDS, the Proposed Actions would introduce approximately 181 elementary school students. As such, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts on elementary schools. The significant adverse elementary school impact would occur with completion of 909 residential units, and therefore would occur upon completion and occupancy of Tower 3 in the last phase of the Proposed Project's construction.

As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** potential mitigation measures ~~are currently being~~were explored by the Applicant in consultation with the lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA), and the New York City Department of Education (DOE) and ~~will be~~ refined between the DEIS and FEIS. As described in **Chapter 18**, in order to

address the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impact on public elementary schools, the Applicant will coordinate with SCA to provide programmatic funding for existing elementary schools within Community School District 30, Sub-District 3. This fund will go to a to-be-determined program in the sub-district, and will be outlined more specifically in the Restrictive Declaration. In addition, other options to address school seat demand in the future could include standard measures utilized by DOE/SCA to address school capacity such as redistricting, the provision of off-site capacity, or other administrative measures. Such measures could wholly or partially mitigate the significant adverse impact on public elementary schools. ~~If feasible mitigation is found, the impacts upon elementary school seats in the study area will be considered mitigated.~~ Absent the implementation of such measures, the Proposed Actions could result in an unmitigated significant adverse impact to elementary schools. If measures to fully mitigate the anticipated impact are not identified and/or implemented, the significant adverse impact on public elementary schools would remain an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

Publicly Funded Early Childhood Programs

Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* early childhood program multipliers, the development would result in approximately 46 children under the age of six who would be eligible for publicly funded early childhood programs. With the addition of these children, early childhood programs in the study area would operate at 193.9 percent utilization with a deficit of 93 slots. Total enrollment in the study area would increase to 192 children, compared with a capacity of 99 slots, which represents an increase in the utilization rate of approximately 46.5 percentage points over the No-Action condition.

CEQR Technical Manual guidelines indicate that a demand for slots greater than the remaining capacity of early childhood programs and an increase in demand of five percentage points of the study area capacity could result in a significant adverse impact. In the With-Action condition, early childhood programs in the study area would operate over capacity by approximately 193 slots and exhibit an increase in the utilization rate of approximately 46.5 percentage points as compared with the No-Action condition. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on early childhood programs. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** in order to address the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impact on publicly funded early childhood programs, the Applicant will coordinate with DOE to develop possible mitigation measures which may include provision of suitable space on-site for a publicly funded early childhood program facility, provision of a suitable location off-site and within a reasonable distance (at a rate affordable to DOE providers), or funding to support additional capacity. ~~mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact will possibly include adding capacity to existing facilities if determined feasible through consultation with the New York City Department of Education (DOE) or providing a new child care facility within or near the Project Area. Mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact will continue to be explored by the Applicant in consultation with the lead agency, the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), and the DOE, and will be refined between the Draft and Final EIS.~~

In connection with the approval of the Proposed Actions, a Restrictive Declaration will be recorded on the Development Site subject to CPC approval. The Restrictive Declaration for the Proposed Project will require the Applicant to work with DOE to consider the need for and the implementation of one or more measures as listed above to provide additional capacity, if required, to mitigate the significant adverse impact to publicly funded child care facilities within the 1.5-mile study area or within Queens Community District 1. Based on the results of the analysis presented in **Chapter 4, "Community Facilities and Services,"** which accounts for the current inventory of publicly funded child care facilities and conservative future background projections, providing capacity for 27 publicly-funded early childhood program slots would be needed to reduce the increase in the utilization rate to less than five percent. The Applicant would also re-evaluate the need for additional publicly-funded early childhood program seats at the

triggering 89th affordable unit, in consultation with DOE and other City agencies, as appropriate. Absent the implementation of such needed mitigation measures~~If measures to fully mitigate the project's anticipated impact are not identified and implemented~~, this would remain an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

Open Space

As discussed in **Chapter 5, "Open Space,"** as the Proposed Actions would result in a substantial decrease in the active open space ratio in the residential study area, and the active open space ratio would be below ~~the City~~CEQR's guideline ratio in the future, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse active open space impact. Potential partial mitigation measures for this significant adverse impact ~~are currently being~~were explored by the Applicant in consultation with the lead agency, DCP, and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and ~~will be~~were refined between the Draft and Final EIS. The *CEQR Technical Manual* lists potential mitigation measures for open space impacts. These measures 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. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** as a part of ongoing discussions between the relevant agencies, ~~DPR has expressed a community need~~ in order to address the significant adverse impact on active open space, the Applicant would be required to improve and renovate the existing Triborough Bridge Playground B, located approximately 0.5 miles east of the Project Area, which ~~c~~would increase utility and provide additional active open space facilities within the neighborhood. Specifically, the ~~I~~improvements ~~and/or renovations~~ at the Triborough Bridge Playground B would include replacing a playground and sitting area (approximately 35,000 sf area), reconfiguring existing storm water management systems at the playground, restoring existing pavement in the playground and sitting area, and installing eight security lights at the playground. ~~as a potential mitigation measure will be further refined, and additional mitigation measures, if any, will be explored further by the Applicant in consultation with DCP and DPR between the DEIS and FEIS.~~ These improvements would increase the utility of Triborough Bridge Playground B and its capacity to meet the active open space needs of the study area, and therefore would constitute partial mitigation of the potential significant adverse impact on active open space.~~If no additional feasible mitigation is found, the impacts will be considered partially mitigated. If~~ Therefore, as the significant adverse impact on open space ~~is~~ will not be fully mitigated, the Proposed Actions would result in an unavoidable adverse impact on open space.

Transportation

Traffic

As discussed in **Chapter 11, "Transportation,"** the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at total of 40~~39~~ lane groups would be significantly adversely impacted at 20 intersections (13 signalized and seven unsignalized) during one or more analyzed peak hours. The traffic impact analysis indicates that during the AM peak hour, a total of ~~32~~ 30 lane groups at 18 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted. A total of 14 lane groups at 10 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted in the weekday midday peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, a total of ~~30~~27 lane groups at 17 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacted. A total of 20 lane groups at 12 intersections are expected to be significantly adversely impacts in the Saturday midday peak hour. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** implementation of traffic engineering

improvements such as signal timing changes and lane restriping would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to ~~14~~ 10 lane groups in the weekday AM peak hour, ~~7~~3 lane groups in the midday peak hour, ~~11~~ 6 lane groups in the weekday PM peak hour, and ~~10~~ 5 lane groups in the Saturday peak hour. Intersections where all impacts would be fully mitigated would total ~~18~~6, ~~7~~3, ~~19~~4, and ~~10~~3 during these same periods, respectively. As shown in **Table ES-7**, no practicable mitigation was identified for the impacts to one or more lane groups in one or more peak hours at ~~14~~16 intersections. Consequently, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to review and approval by DOT. If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure may be identified. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would also remain unmitigated and would also constitute unavoidable adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

TABLE ES-7
Lane Groups With Unmitigated Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts

	Peak Hour			
	Weekday AM	**Weekday Midday**	**Weekday PM**	**Saturday**
Signalized Intersections				
26th Avenue & 21st Street				
27th Avenue & 4th Street				
27th Avenue & 8th Street		EB-R	WB-T~~, NB-L~~	
27th Avenue & 9th Street	WB-T, SB-L		WB-T~~, SB-L~~	WB-T, SB-L
27th Avenue & 12th Street	EB-LT		EB-LT, WB-TR	EB-LT
27th Avenue & 14th Street			WB-LT	
Astoria Boulevard & 8th Street			NB-LT	
Astoria Boulevard & 18th Street	SB-LR			
Astoria Boulevard & 21st Street	EB-L,TR. WB-T. NB-LT.	EB-TR. WB-T. NB-LT, SB, R.	EB-L,TR. WB-T, R. NB-LT. SB-R.	EB-TR. WB-T. NB-LT, SB-R.
24th Avenue & 21st Street	NB-LTR. SB-LT	NB-LTR	NB-LTR	NB-LTR
Hoyt Avenue North & 21st Street	WB-L. NB-T. SB-TR	NB-T	WB-LT, NB-T	NB-T
Astoria Park S/Hoyt Avenue S & 21st Street				
30th Avenue & 21st Street				
Unsignalized Intersections				
26th Avenue & 3rd Street				
27th Avenue & 3rd Street	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR
27th Avenue & 18th Street		EB-LTR	EB-LTR	EB-LTR, WB-LR
Astoria Boulevard & Newtown Avenue	NB-LR		NB-LR	NB-LR
30th Avenue & 8th Street	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR	SB-LT, WB-LR
30th Avenue & Main Street	EB-LT		EB-LT	
30th Avenue & 12th Street	EB-LTR			
30th Avenue & 14th Street	EB-LTR. SB-LTR			
Notes: NB—northbound, SB—southbound, EB—eastbound, WB—westbound L—left-turn, T—through, R—right-turn				

Notes:
NB – Northbound, SB – Southbound, EB – Eastbound, WB – Westbound
L – Left-turn, T – Through, R – Right-turn, DefL – Defacto left-turn

Transit

Subway Station Operations

Significant adverse subway station impacts are anticipated at the 30th Avenue Station during the AM and

PM peak hours. Specifically, the M3-S3 street stairs at the northwest corner of 31st Street and 30th Avenue is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) E with a v/c ratio of 1.35~~1.45~~ in the PM peak hour. The WIT on this stairs would exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria and would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the PM peak hour. The P1-P2 platform stairs leading to the Manhattan-bound trains at the 30th Avenue station is projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 1.47~~1.48~~ in the AM peak hour. As the WIT for this stairs would exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, these stairs would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the AM peak hour. The P3-P4 platform staircase from the Astoria-Ditmars-bound trains at the 30th Avenue station is projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 1.42~~1.46~~ in the PM peak hour. As the WIT for these stairs would exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, both would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the PM peak hour.

As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** potential measures to mitigate these impacts ~~will be~~were explored in consultation with New York City Transit (NYCT) between the Draft and Final EIS~~, and could include adding vertical capacity to the 30th Avenue subway station~~. However, implementing a potential street stair and ADA-compliant elevator at the 30th Avenue station's Manhattan-bound platform as described in Chapter 18 has been determined to be not practicable, and thus, the projected impacts at the station's Manhattan-bound platform stairs (P1-P2) would be unmitigated. Absent the implementation of practicable mitigation measures at the impacted stairways, the Proposed Actions would have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on subway stations. Nonetheless, in an effort to redistribute future project-generated ridership to other nearby stations and lessen the potential impact on the 30th Avenue station, the Applicant would commit to work with NYCT to explore an additional free subway shuttle bus service connecting the site to the adjacent subway stops at Astoria Boulevard and Broadway. It should also be noted that as part of the plan for partially mitigating the subway station impacts, the Applicant will also commit to conducting a TMP at Projected Development Site 1 to better estimate the transportation planning factors, modal splits, subway station/line usage, bus route usage, the full build demand generated by the Proposed Actions, and any future demand from No-Action developments. The TMP will revise transit analyses based on findings of surveys and new data at the 30th Avenue station, and will be reviewed by NYCT. ~~Additionally, a preliminary study shows that a new street stair and elevator could potentially be located at the southwest corner of Newtown Avenue and 31st Street, adjacent to the 30th Avenue subway station's southbound platform. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** this measure would mitigate the impact the Manhattan-bound platform stairs (P1-P2) during the AM peak hour; however, while the new stair would relieve some pressure on other stairs including the M3-S3 street stairs (on the northwest corner of 30th Avenue and 31st Street) and P3-P4 platform stairs, in the PM peak hour, the M3-S3 street stairs and P3-P4 platform stairs would continue to exceed thresholds for impact. If feasible mitigation is not found~~However, as the significant adverse impacts on subway stations would remain unmitigated, these impacts would be considered unavoidable.

Bus Line Haul

As described in **Chapter 11, "Transportation,"** the Proposed Actions would result in potential significant adverse bus line haul impacts on the eastbound Q18, northbound Q103, and southbound Q103 services would be significantly adversely impacted in the AM peak hour along with the northbound Q103 and southbound Q103 services in the PM peak hour. NYCT and MTA Bus routinely monitor changes in bus ridership and, subject to the agencies' fiscal and operational constraints, make necessary service adjustments where warranted. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** the identified potential impacts could be mitigated if increased service adjustments are made. If adjustments are not made, these impacts would be considered unavoidable.

Pedestrians

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to the two sidewalks, three crosswalks, and one corner in one or more peak hours. Recommended mitigation measures consisting of the relocation/removal of impediments to sidewalk flow and the widening of crosswalk or corner areas would fully mitigate the impacts to one sidewalk (west sidewalk of 4th Street between 26th Avenue and 27th Avenue), one crosswalk and one corner (27th Avenue and 4th Street). One sidewalk (north sidewalk of 27th Avenue between 3rd Street and 4th Street) and two crosswalks (north and east crosswalks at 27th Avenue and 4th Street) would be remain unmitigated during the weekday midday and/or Saturday peak hours. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by DOT, as well as DPR if a street tree is to be removed. ~~DCP, as lead agency, will explore potential mitigation measures in coordination with DOT and DPR between the Draft and Final EIS.~~ Absent the identification and implementation of additional feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the pedestrian impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts and would be considered unavoidable.

Noise

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts at 10 residential and commercial office receptor locations along 26th Avenue between 3rd and 4th Street, and along 3rd Street between 26th and 27th Avenue during various peak hours. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** practicable and feasible mitigation measures ~~will be~~were explored in consultation with DCP and additional work ~~will be~~was conducted between the DEIS and FEIS to provide a sufficient reduction to the identified noise increments to remain below the CEQR threshold (i.e., 3 dBA) or to lower interior noise levels at the identified impacted noise receptors to an acceptable range. ~~If warranted, possible~~ As such, for impacted receptors at 3-04-3-06 26th Avenue, 3-08-3-10 26th Avenue, 26-38 3rd Street, 26-24 3rd Street, 26-19 3rd Street, 26-15 3rd Street, and 26-11 3rd Street that do not have an alternate means of ventilation (i.e., air conditioning), the Applicant ~~mitigation measures c~~would offer through-window air conditioning units as partial mitigation ~~include installing storm windows or providing an alternate means of ventilation (including, but not limited to, air conditioning) to impacted existing noise receptors where these measures are not already in use~~. However, ~~if identified mitigation measures are determined to be impracticable and infeasible or~~ if interior noise levels at the identified impacted noise receptors remain above the acceptable level (i.e., 45 dBA or lower for residential/community facility uses, and 50 dBA or lower for commercial office uses) ~~and there are no other feasible and practicable mitigation measures that could be implemented~~, the significant adverse mobile source noise impacts would be considered either partially mitigated or would remain unmitigated. Therefore, consequently, these impacts would constitute an unavoidable significant adverse mobile source noise impact as a result of the Proposed Actions.

With respect to impacted future receptors at 26-31 3rd Street, 26-18 3rd Street, and 26-35 3rd Street, these locations are planned to have an alternate means of ventilation allowing for the maintenance of a closed window condition (i.e., central air conditioning). With 30 dBA window/wall attenuation given to newly constructed luxury buildings, interior noise levels at these buildings would be within the acceptable interior noise levels; therefore, the significant adverse mobile source noise impacts would be considered fully mitigated.

Construction

Traffic

Construction traffic conditions during the 2027 Q3 and Q4 construction were evaluated at 21 intersections (10 signalized and 11 unsignalized) in the traffic study area where construction vehicle trips would exceed the 50-trips/hour *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours. The construction traffic impact analysis identified the potential for significant adverse impacts to three lane groups at two intersections in the weekday AM construction peak hour, and ten lane groups at five intersections in the weekday PM construction peak hour. As discussed in **Chapter 18, "Mitigation,"** implementation of recommended traffic signal timing changes at an existing traffic signal would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the construction AM and/or PM peak hour. As shown in **Table ES-8,** no practicable mitigation was identified for the impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the construction AM peak hour and eight lane groups at four intersections in the construction PM peak hour. Consequently, these impacts would constitute an unavoidable significant adverse construction traffic impact as a result of the Proposed Actions.

TABLE ES-8
Lane Groups With Unmitigated Significant Adverse Construction Traffic Impacts

	Construction Peak Hour	
	Weekday AM	**Weekday PM**
Signalized Intersections		
Astoria Boulevard & 21st Street	EB-TR, WB-T	EB-L, EB-TR, WB-T, NB-T
Unsignalized Intersections		
27th Avenue & 3rd Street	---	SB-LR
27th Avenue & 18th Street	---	EB-LTR
30th Avenue & 8th Street	---	SB-LT, WB-LR

Notes: NB—northbound, SB—southbound, EB—eastbound, WB—westbound L—left-turn, T—through, R—right-turn

Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to review and approval by DOT. If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that the identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure will be identified. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated.

Noise

Chapter 17, "Construction," concludes that the Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at several receptor locations surrounding the Project Area. Construction activities would follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code (also known as Chapter 24 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, or Local Law 113) for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the New York City Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. However, the implementation of these measures would not eliminate all of the identified significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur during hours when the loudest pieces of construction equipment are in use. Consequently, these construction (noise) impacts would not be fully mitigated and would therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse construction (noise) impact.

K. GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Actions would result in more intensive land uses within the Project Area, however, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas. While the Proposed Actions could add new population with a higher average household income as compared with the existing population in the study area, the Proposed Actions would not directly displace existing residential tenants, and the Proposed Actions would not result in socioeconomic changes that would alter the residential market in a manner that would lead to notable project-generated rent pressures. The affordable housing added by the Proposed Actions are expected to help maintain a more diverse demographic composition within the study area and would further expand housing opportunities in an area where a strong demand for affordable housing exists. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to induce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions.

The Proposed Actions would improve existing infrastructure in and around the Project Area, including constructing a new street, improving existing roadways and sidewalks, developing new open space, and building new internal storm drains, an internal sanitary site connection, and an internal water main along Third Street and an associated stormwater outfall at the northern termini of Third Street. However, the study area is sufficiently well-developed such that improvements associated with the Proposed Actions would not induce additional notable growth outside of the Project Area.

Overall, the Proposed Actions are not expected to induce any significant additional growth beyond that identified and analyzed in the EIS.

L. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Resources, both natural and man-made, would be expended in the construction and operation of the development projected to occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. These resources include the building materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the proposed development by various mechanical and processing systems; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the proposed development. These are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some other purpose would be highly unlikely.

The Project Area does not possess any natural resource values and is currently occupied by vacant land and a vacant warehouse building. Although the Proposed Actions would result in an increase in new residential, community facility, and retail land uses and publicly accessible open space, the Proposed Actions would constitute an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the Project Area as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term.

These commitments of resources and materials are weighed against the Proposed Actions' goals of transforming a largely underused waterfront area into a new enlivened mixed-use development, including much-needed affordable housing, while providing new publicly accessible waterfront open space and transportation and infrastructure improvements that would serve both the existing residential population and new residents from the Proposed Actions.