Chapter 4: Community Facilities and Services

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the potential effects of the proposed project on community facilities in and around the project block. The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* defines community facilities as public or publicly funded facilities, including schools, health care, day care, libraries, and fire and police protection services. CEQR methodology focuses on direct impacts on community facilities and services and on increased demand for community facilities and services generated by new users such as the population that would occupy the proposed residential development. Although the proposed project includes community facility space, it is currently expected that it would be occupied by medical office uses, and therefore would not affect publicly-funded community facility services.

The analysis updates changes in background conditions since the 2001 *FEIS* and assesses whether any changed background conditions and the differences in program elements between the proposed development program and those assessed in the 2001 *FEIS* for the project block would result in any significant adverse impacts on community facilities and services that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

A detailed analysis of potential impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools was conducted for the proposed project. Based on the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, detailed analyses of public high schools, libraries, outpatient health care facilities, child care facilities, and police and fire services are not warranted. Therefore, as with the previously approved project and as analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*, the modifications to the proposed project and the changes to background conditions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public high schools, libraries, outpatient health care facilities, child care facilities, and police and fire services.

As described in the analysis and summarized below, this SEIS accounts for the changes in site development to reflect a modified condition on the project block in the future without the proposed project, in combination with changes in background conditions. Taking these changes into account, this SEIS concludes that the modifications to the proposed project, as with the previously approved project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on community facilities that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The proposed project is located in Sub-District 3 of Community School District 2 (CSD 2), which includes all of Manhattan west of Broadway between West 14th Street and West 59th Street. Pursuant to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, the residential portion of the proposed project would be expected to introduce 104 elementary school students and 35 intermediate

school students. The assessment of public schools assesses the potential effects of these additional students on elementary and intermediate schools within Sub-District 3 of CSD 2.

Elementary Schools

Within Sub-District 3, elementary schools would operate with a shortage of seats in 2015, but the proposed project would not substantially increase the elementary school utilization rate compared to the future without the proposed project.[1] Within Sub-District 3, the proposed project would increase the utilization rate by approximately ~~3.9~~ 4.0 percent, which is less than the CEQR threshold of 5 percent or more for a significant adverse impact. Because the proposed project would increase the elementary school utilization rate by less than five percentage points, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in Sub-District 3.

Intermediate Schools

By 2015 in the future with the proposed project, intermediate schools within Sub-District 3 would operate with a surplus of seats. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public intermediate schools within Sub-District 3.

Overall, the modifications to the proposed project, along with the changes in background conditions, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public elementary or intermediate schools.

B. SUMMARY OF 2001 FEIS FINDINGS

The 2001 *FEIS* analyzed potential impacts on police services, fire services, and public elementary, intermediate, and high schools resulting from the development of the office-office and office-residential scenarios. The study areas for analysis included: for police services, the Midtown North Precinct; for fire services, engine companies 40 and 23 and ladder companies 35 and 4; for elementary and intermediate schools, P.S. 111, P.S. 190, P.S. 191, P.S. 199, I.S. 44, and I.S. 118, all schools in Region 3 of CSD 2 and Region 1 of CSD 3 (now called Sub-District 3 of CSD 2 and Sub-District 1 of CSD 3, respectively), and all schools in CSD 2 and CSD 3 overall; and the high schools nearest the project site.

The 2001 *FEIS* found that the then proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on police or fire services or public elementary, intermediate, or high schools.

C. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the analyses in this SEIS compare conditions in the future without the proposed project to conditions in the future with the proposed project. The future without the proposed project scenario in all technical areas assumes that none of the discretionary actions now being sought by the applicant are approved. Absent those approvals, it is assumed that development on the projected development sites would be within the envelope of the development analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*, but with a commercial building containing approximately 331,300 gsf of office use, 67,500 gsf of retail use and 239 public parking spaces

[1] The sub-district utilization rate is calculated by dividing the number of enrolled students by the number of seats in the sub-district.

on projected development site 1. (Absent the approvals, there would be no change in the assumed development of projected development site 2—the existing mini-storage building would remain). The assumption regarding projected development site 1 is based on the fact that the applicant has applied for a building permit for such a building (the permitted building). The permitted building can be constructed under the land use approvals granted in 2001 without further discretionary approvals or actions. It would be smaller than that which is permitted under current zoning, and, accordingly, assuming that development on projected development site 1 as a basis for comparing the impacts of the proposed project to the future without the proposed project is more conservative than using the more fully built out development scenario that was analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

D. PRELIMINARY SCREENING

This analysis of community facilities has been conducted in accordance with 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines and the latest data and guidance from agencies such as the Department of Education (DOE) and the Department of City Planning (DCP).

The purpose of the preliminary screening is to determine whether a community facilities assessment is required. As recommended by the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a community facilities assessment is warranted if a project has the potential to result in either direct or indirect effects on community facilities. If a project would physically alter a community facility, whether by displacement of the facility or other physical change, this "direct" effect triggers the need to assess the service delivery of the facility and the potential effect that the physical change may have on that service delivery. New population added to an area as a result of a project would use existing services, which may result in potential "indirect" effects on service delivery. Depending on the size of a new development, its income characteristics, and the age distribution of its new population, there may be effects on public schools, libraries, or child care centers.

DIRECT EFFECTS

The proposed project would not physically alter or directly displace any community facility, and therefore an assessment of direct effects is not warranted.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* provides thresholds that provide guidance in making an initial determination of whether a detailed analysis is necessary to determine potential impacts due to indirect effects. **Table 4-1** lists those 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds for each community facility analysis. If a proposal exceeds the threshold for a specific facility, a more detailed analysis is warranted. A preliminary screening analysis was conducted to determine if the proposed project would exceed established 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds warranting further analysis. Based on that screening, a detailed analysis is provided below for public elementary and intermediate schools.

Table 4-1
Indirect Effects Analysis - Preliminary Screening Analysis Criteria

Community Facility	Threshold For Detailed Analysis
Public schools	More than 50 elementary/middle school or 150 high school students
Libraries	Greater than 5 percent increase in ratio of residential units to libraries in borough
Health care facilities (outpatient)	Introduction of sizeable new neighborhood
Child care centers (publicly funded)	More than 20 eligible children based on number of low- to moderate-income units by borough
Fire protection	Introduction of sizeable new neighborhood
Police protection	Introduction of sizeable new neighborhood

Source: 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual.*

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends conducting a detailed analysis of public schools if a proposed project would generate more than 50 elementary/intermediate school students and/or more than 150 high school students. Based on the development of up to 863 residential units and the CEQR student generation rates (0.12 elementary, 0.04 middle, and 0.06 high school students/housing unit in Manhattan), the proposed project would generate approximately 191 total students—with approximately 104 elementary school students, 35 intermediate school students, and 52 high school students. This number of students warrants a detailed analysis of the proposed project's effects on elementary and intermediate schools. Because the proposed project would not introduce more than 150 high school students, a detailed analysis of public high schools is not warranted.

LIBRARIES

Potential impacts on libraries can result from an increased user population. According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed project in Manhattan that generates a 5 percent increase in the average number of residential units served per branch (901 residential units in Manhattan) may cause significant impacts on library services and require further analysis. With up to 863 units, the proposed project would not exceed this threshold, and a detailed analysis of libraries is not warranted.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a proposed project would add more than 20 children eligible for child care to the study area's child care facilities, a detailed analysis of its impact on publicly funded child care facilities is warranted. This threshold is based on the number of low-income and low- to moderate-income units within a proposed project. In Manhattan, projects that introduce 170 or more low-income and low- to moderate-income units would introduce more than 20 children eligible for publicly funded child care. Because the proposed project is expected to include up to 151 affordable rental units, it does not meet or exceed the CEQR threshold of 20 children, and a detailed child care analysis is not warranted.

HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

Health care facilities include public, proprietary, and nonprofit facilities that accept government funds (usually in the form of Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements) and that are available to

any member of the community. Examples of these types of facilities include hospitals, nursing homes, clinics, and other facilities providing outpatient health services.

According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual,* if a proposed project would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before, there may be increased demand on local public health care facilities, which may warrant further analysis of the potential for indirect impacts on outpatient health care facilities. The proposed project would not result in the creation of a sizeable new neighborhood, and therefore a detailed analysis of indirect effects on health care facilities is not warranted.

POLICE AND FIRE SERVICES

The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends detailed analyses of impacts on police and fire service in cases where a proposed project would affect the physical operations of, or direct access to and from, a precinct house or fire station, or where a proposed project would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before. The proposed project would not result in these direct effects on either police or fire services, nor would it create a sizeable new neighborhood; therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

E. PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

METHODOLOGY

This analysis assesses the potential effects of the proposed project (specifically its residential component which is assumed to include up to 863 residential rental units) on public elementary and intermediate schools serving the project block. The project block is located in New York City CSD 2, which covers a large portion of Manhattan including the neighborhoods of the Financial District, Soho, Greenwich Village, Tribeca, Midtown, and the Upper East Side. Following methodologies in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for the analysis of elementary and intermediate schools is the school districts' "sub-district" ("regions" or "school planning zones") in which the project is located (see **Figure 4-1**). The proposed project is located in Sub-District 3 of CSD 2, which includes all of Manhattan west of Broadway between West 14th Street and West 59th Street.

This schools analysis presents the most recent capacity, enrollment, and utilization rates for elementary and intermediate schools in the Sub-District 3 study area. Future conditions are then predicted based on enrollment projections and data obtained from SCA's Capital Planning Division on the number of new students expected at the sub-district levels. The future utilization rate for school facilities is calculated by adding the estimated enrollment from proposed residential developments in the schools study area to DOE's projected enrollment, and then comparing that number with projected school capacity. DOE does not include charter school enrollment in its enrollment projections. DOE's enrollment projections for years 2009 through 2018, the most recent data currently available, are posted on the SCA website.[1] These enrollment projections are based on broad demographic trends and do not explicitly account for discrete new residential developments planned for the study area. Therefore, the estimated student population from the other new development projects expected to be completed within the

[1] Schools.nyc.gov. Enrollment projections by the Grier Partnership were used.

4.12.12



Project Block

❶ Public Elementary School

⑧ Public Intermediate School

Community School District (CSD) Boundary

CSD Subdistrict Boundary

0 1000 2000 FEET

SCALE

NOTE: See Table 4-2 for corresponding school numbers

Elementary and Intermediate Public Schools

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure 4-1

study area have been obtained from SCA's Capital Planning Division and are added to the projected enrollment to ensure a more conservative prediction of future enrollment and utilization. In addition, any new school projects identified in the DOE Five-Year Capital Plan are included if construction has begun.

The effect of the new students introduced by the proposed project on the capacity of schools within the study areas is then evaluated. According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact may occur if the proposed project would result in both of the following conditions:

1. A utilization rate of the elementary and/or intermediate schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future with the proposed project condition; and
2. An increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the future without the proposed project and future with the proposed project conditions.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

As shown in **Figure 4-1**, six elementary schools (serving grades Pre-K through 5) are located in Sub-District 3. As shown in **Table 4-2**, DOE's 2010-2011 school year enrollment figures, which are the most recent data currently available, indicate that elementary schools in Sub-District 3 of CSD 2 are operating at ~~83~~88 percent of capacity, with an enrollment of 2, 243~~161~~ students and a capacity of 2, 558~~612~~ seats, with surplus capacity of ~~451~~ 315 seats.

Table 4-2
Public Schools Serving the Proposed Project,
Enrollment and Capacity Data, ~~2010-~~2011-2012 School Year

Map No.	Name	Address	Enrollment	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (%)
Elementary Schools						
Sub-District 3 of CSD 2						
1	PS 111 Adolph S Ochs School (PS Organization)	440 West 53 St	~~383~~375	~~473~~505	~~90~~130	~~81~~74%
2	PS 11 William T Harris School	320 West 21 St	~~633~~700	~~833~~842	~~200~~142	~~76~~83%
3	PS 33 Chelsea School	281 Ninth Ave	~~381~~458	~~540~~532	~~159~~74	~~71~~86%
4	PS 51 Elias Howe School	520 West 45 St	~~339~~288	~~287~~225	~~-52~~63	~~11~~28%
5	PS 212 Midtown West School	328 West 48 St	343	342	-1	100%
6	Ballet Tech (PS Organization)	890 Broadway	~~82~~79	~~137~~112	~~55~~33	~~60~~71%
Sub-District 3 Total			**2,243~~161~~**	**2,558~~612~~**	**~~451~~315**	**~~83~~88%**
Intermediate Schools						
Sub-District 3 of CSD 2						
7	PS 111 Adolph S Ochs School (IS Organization)	440 West 53 St	~~229~~211	2843	~~54~~73	~~81~~74%
8	MS 260 Clinton School Writers	425 West 33 St	~~273~~256	484	~~211~~228	~~56~~53%
9	NYC Lab MS For Collaborative Studies	333 West 17 St	~~562~~575	~~643~~660	~~81~~85	87%
10	Ballet Tech (IS Organization)	890 Broadway	~~66~~75	~~111~~108	~~45~~33	~~59~~69%
11	Professional Performing Arts School (IS Organization)	328 W 48 St	~~85~~86	90	~~54~~	~~94~~96%
Sub-District 3 Total			**1,203~~215~~**	**1,626~~611~~**	**~~396~~423**	**~~75~~74%**

Notes: See Figure 4-1.
Sources: SCA *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, ~~2010-~~2011-2012*.

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

Sub-District 3 contains five schools with intermediate programs (serving grades 6 through 8). The most recent DOE enrollment data indicate that total enrollment at the intermediate schools in Sub-District 3 is 1,203~~215~~ students, or ~~75~~74 percent of capacity, with a surplus of ~~396~~ 423 seats (see **Table 4-2**).

THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

As noted above, SCA provides future enrollment projections by district for up to 10 years. The latest available enrollment projections have been used in this analysis to project student enrollment to 2015.

Per 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, an estimated 2,447 elementary school students and 1,231 intermediate students are projected for Sub-District 3 in 2015.

These enrollment projections focus on the natural growth of the City's student population and other population increases that do not account for new residential developments planned for the area. Therefore, the future utilization rate for school facilities is calculated by adding the estimated enrollment from proposed residential developments in the school study areas (as provided by SCA's Capital Planning Division) to SCA's projected enrollment, and then comparing that number with projected school capacity.

Table 4-3 outlines the estimated number of new public school students generated as a result of development in the future without the proposed project, which has been provided by SCA.

Table 4-3
Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students Introduced by Development in the Future Without the Proposed Project

Study Area	Students	
	Elementary	Intermediate
Sub-District 3 Study Area	964	296

Sources: SCA Capital Planning Division

PROJECTED SCHOOL CAPACITY

According to the DOE *Proposed 2010-2014 Five-Year Capital Plan—Proposed February 2012 Amendment*, the expansion of P.S. 51 would increase school capacity within the sub-district. Elementary school capacity in Sub-District 3 will increase by 77 seats as a result of the expansion of P.S. 51. Intermediate school capacity in Sub-District 3 will increase by a total of 311 seats. This increase would consist of 277 seats as a result of the expansion of P.S. 51 and 34 seats as a result of the relocation of M.S. 260 to its new M.S. 868 building in 2014.

In addition to these school projects, the SCA capital plan outlines a number of other school capacity projects for CSD 2, which would add approximately 3,900 school seats to the district, some of which would serve the study areas in the future without the proposed project. Although these projects are expected to increase school capacity, they are not included in the quantitative analysis because they are not yet under construction.

ANALYSIS

Elementary Schools

As shown in **Table 4-4**, elementary schools within Sub-District 3 will be over capacity in the future without the proposed project, with an enrollment of 3,411 students and a capacity of 2,~~689~~635 seats, resulting in a deficit of ~~722~~776 seats (~~126.9~~129.4 percent utilization).

Table 4-4
Estimated Public Elementary and Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2015 Future Without the Proposed Project

Study Area	Projected Enrollment in 2015	Students Introduced by Residential Development in the Future Without the Proposed Project	Total Enrollment – Future Without the Proposed Project	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (%)
Elementary Schools						
Sub-District 3	2,447[1]	964	3,411	2,635~~89~~[2]	~~722~~ -776	~~126.9~~129.4%
Intermediate Schools						
Sub-District 3	1,231[1]	296	1,527	1,937~~22~~[3]	~~395~~410	~~79.4~~78.8%

Notes:
[1] Elementary and intermediate enrollment projections for the sub-district were calculated per 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology.
[2] The expansion of the elementary school program at PS 51 would introduce 77 additional elementary school seats to the sub-district.
[3] The introduction of a new intermediate school program at PS 51 would introduce 277 additional intermediate school seats to Sub-district 3. The relocation of M.S. 260 to its new M.S. 868 building in 2014 would introduce 34 additional intermediate school seats to Sub-district 3.
Sources:
DOE *Enrollment Projections 2009-2018 by the Grier Partnership*; DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, ~~2010-~~2011-2012*, DOE 2010-2014 *Five-Year Capital Plan, Proposed Amendment*, February 2012; School Construction Authority.

Intermediate Schools

As shown in **Table 4-4**, total intermediate school enrollment is expected to be 1,527 students within Sub-District 3, which will operate with ~~395~~410 available seats (~~79.4~~ 78.8 percent utilization).

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

For analysis purposes, it is conservatively assumed that the proposed project would introduce up to 863 residential rental units to the study areas. Based on the CEQR student generation rates, the proposed project would generate approximately 104 elementary and 35 intermediate school students in the study area by 2015 (see **Table 4-5**).

Table 4-5
Estimated Number of Students Introduced in the Study Areas: 2015 Future With the Proposed Project

Housing Units	Students Introduced by Proposed Projects	
	Elementary[1]	Intermediate[1]
Up to 863	104	35

Note: [1] Based on student generation rates in Table 6-1a in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

In the future with the proposed project, elementary schools within Sub-District 3 would operate over capacity, with an enrollment of 3,515 students and a capacity of 2,635~~689~~ seats (~~130.7~~133.4 percent utilization), resulting in a deficit of ~~826~~ 880 seats (see **Table 4-6**).

Table 4-6
Estimated Public Elementary and Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2015 Future With the Proposed Project

Study Area	Future Without the Proposed Project Enrollment	Students Introduced by Proposed Project	Total Enrollment - Future With the Proposed Project	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (%)
Elementary Schools						
Sub-District 3	3,411	104	3,515	2,635~~689~~	-~~826~~880	~~130.7~~133.4%
Intermediate Schools						
Sub-District 3	1,527	35	1,562	1,937~~922~~	~~360~~375	~~81.3~~80.6%

Sources: DOE *Enrollment Projections 2009-2018 by the Grier Partnership*; DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, ~~2010-~~2011-2012*, DOE 2010-2014 *Five-Year Capital Plan, Proposed Amendment*, February 2012; School Construction Authority.

As noted above, a significant adverse impact may occur if the proposed project would result in (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 the proposed project; and (2) an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the future without the proposed project and future with the proposed project conditions.

In Sub-District 3, elementary schools would operate with a utilization rate of ~~130.7~~133.4 percent, which would exceed the 100 percent threshold cited in the first criteria above. However, as discussed below, the proposed project would not increase the utilization rate by 5 percentage points or more compared to the future without the proposed project.

Although elementary schools within Sub-District 3 would operate with a shortage of seats in 2015, the proposed project would not substantially increase the elementary school utilization rate. Within Sub-District 3, the proposed project would increase the utilization rate by approximately ~~3.9~~ 4.0 percent, which is less than the CEQR threshold of 5 percent or more for a significant adverse impact. Because the proposed project would increase the elementary school utilization rate by less than five percentage points, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in Sub-District 3. Therefore, like the previously approved project, the modifications to the proposed project, along with the changes to background conditions, would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

In the future with the proposed project in Sub-District 3, intermediate school enrollment would increase to 1,562 by 2015 and the schools would operate at ~~81.3~~80.6 percent of capacity, with a surplus of ~~360~~375 seats.

Because intermediate schools would operate with surplus capacity in ~~bo~~ the study area~~s~~, the modifications to the proposed project, like the previously approved project, would not result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in Sub-District 3. ✶