A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes and responds to all substantive oral and written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Actions made during the public comment period. These consist of comments made at the public hearing held by the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) and written comments submitted to the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP). The Notice of Completion for the DEIS was issued on March 25, 2022, which marked the beginning of the public comment period for the DEIS. The public hearing on the DEIS was held concurrently with the hearing on the Proposed Actions' Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) application at 10:00 A.M. on June 8, 2022, which was held remotely through the NYC Engage portal in support of the City's efforts to contain the spread of COVID-19. The comment period for the DEIS remained open until 5:00 pm June 21, 2022.

Section B below lists the elected officials, community boards, organizations and individuals who commented on the DEIS, and Section C contains a summary of relevant comments on the DEIS and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Comments are organized by subject matter and generally parallel the chapter structure of the DEIS. Where more than one commenter expressed similar views, those comments have been grouped and addressed together.

Written comments received on the DEIS and a transcript of verbal testimony given at the DEIS Public Hearing are included in Appendix E to this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

B. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Elected Officials

(no comments from elected officials)

Interested Organizations and Individuals

1. Bishop Mitchel Taylor, Urban Upbound, CEO; oral testimony at the public hearing on June 8, 2022
2. Alex Malescio, Urban Upbound, Senior Director of Programs; oral testimony at the public hearing on June 8, 2022 and written testimony dated June 8, 2022
3. Anju Rupchandani, Zone 126, Executive Director; oral testimony read by Alex Malescio on behalf of Anju Rupchandani at the public hearing on June 8, 2022

[1] This chapter is new to the FEIS.

C. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT EIS

1. Project Description

Comment 1.1: *I have faith that the Proposed Project's community facility uses will help to aid in the creation of many more small businesses fueled by local aspiring entrepreneurs. (1).*

Response 1.1: **Comment noted.**

2. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

No comments.

3. Socioeconomic Conditions

No comments.

4. Community Facilities and Services

No comments.

5. Open Space

No comments.

6. Shadows

No comments.

7. Urban Design and Visual Resource

No comments.

8. Natural Resources

No comments.

9. Hazardous Materials

No comments.

10. Water and Sewer Infrastructure

No comments.

11. Transportation

No comments.

12. Air Quality

No comments.

13. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

No comments.

14. Noise

No comments.

15. Public Health

No comments.

16. Neighborhood Character

No comments.

17. Construction

No comments.

18. Mitigation

No comments.

19. Alternatives

No comments.

20. Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No comments.

21. Growth Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Project

No comments.

22. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

No comments.

D. General[2]

Comment G.1: *The Applicant has been in coordination with local clergy and community members for the past few years and made efforts to keep the community engaged and informed on the project. (1)*

Response G.1: **Comment noted.**

Comment G.2: *Beyond the new affordable housing units and job opportunities the Proposed Project would generate, this project will offer a new community facility space for Urban Upbound and Zone 126, two organizations who have done incredible work in our community over the past 15 years. This project will bring valuable resources to the residents of Astoria who need it most and will allow these organizations to continue supporting the community at large. (1,2,3)*

Response G.2: **Comment noted.**

Comment G.3: *Frequent flooding and aging infrastructure at Urban Upbound's current facility in Astoria forced us to wage an ongoing battle to keep the Astoria office operational. However, the Proposed Project would provide Urban Upbound a community space not only free from constant emergency maintenance, but will also allow them to serve the community in a new space that is welcoming and inspiring. (2)*

Response G.3: **Comment noted.**

[2] The comments in this section express general views concerning the project or are otherwise unrelated to specific impact analyses set forth in the EIS.

Comment G.4: *The community facility space that the Applicant has committed to providing Urban Upbound at no cost will allow the organization to expand its programming to meet the needs of even more community members. Additionally, it is through this space that Urban Upbound will work to ensure economic output generated by the Proposed Project benefits residents of NYCHA's Astoria Houses and the surrounding community (2).*

Response G.4: **Comment noted.**

Comment G.5: *When new developments enter the neighborhood, it is important that we ask what role they can play at addressing long-standing inequalities. Connecting young public housing residents to tutoring, mentoring, and after-school opportunities is a great way to address inequality and promote opportunity (3).*

Response G.5: **Comment noted.**