Chapter 25: Response to Comments on the DEIS[1]

This chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) summarizes and responds to substantive comments received during the public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), issued on April 22, 2022, for the Proposed Actions.

City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) requires a public hearing on the DEIS as part of the environmental review process. A public hearing was held on the DEIS in conjunction with the CPC hearing on the land use applications on August 10, 2022, to afford all interested parties the opportunity to submit oral and written comments. In support of the City's efforts to contain the spread of COVID-19, the public hearing was held remotely. The comment period remained open through 5:00 pm on August 22, 2022.

Section A provides a list of the organizations and individuals who commented on the DEIS. Section B 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 EIS. Where more than one commenter expressed similar views, those comments have been grouped and addressed together. Commenters who expressed general support or general opposition but did not provide substantive comments on the DEIS are listed at the end of Section B. All written comments and a transcript of the public hearing are included in Appendix H, "Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement."

A. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK[2]

COMMUNITY BOARDS

1. Doreen Mohammed, Member, Community Board 1, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Mohammed_CB1_218)

ORGANIZATIONS AND BUSINESSES

2. Edwin DeJesus, Green Party of New York, email letter delivered on August 8, 2022 (DeJesus_GPNY_078)
3. Mevla Miller, Chief Executive Officer, Association for a Better New York, email letter delivered on August 9, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Miller_ABNY_102, Miller_ABNY_235)
4. Julie Schwietert, Executive Director, Immigrant Families Together, email letter delivered on August 10, 2022 (Schwietert_IFT_110)

[1] This chapter is new to the FEIS.

[2] Citations in parentheses refer to internal comment tracking annotations.

5. Eric Benaim, President and Chief Executive Officer, Modern Spaces, email letter delivered on August 8, 2022 (Benaim_MS_114)
6. Rebecca Bratspies, Professor, CUNY Center for Urban Environmental Reform, email letter delivered on August 10, 2022 (Bratspies_CUER_116)
7. Carlos Cano, Chief Operating Officer, Urban Upbound, email letter delivered on August 10, 2022 (Cano_UU_117)
8. Richard Khuzami, President, Old Astoria Neighborhood Association, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Khuzami_OANA_133, Khuzami_OANA_253)
9. Nancy Preston, Moving Forward Unidos, email letter delivered on August 22, 2022 (Preston_MFU_169)
10. Christina Chaise, Vice President of Ravenwood Resident Association; Member of Justice for All Coalition, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Chaise_RRA_220)
11. Onindita Sarker Onadi, Community Organizer, CAAAV, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Onadi_CAAAV_227)
12. Carl Goodman, Executive Director, Museum of the Moving Image, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Goodman_MotMI_233)
13. Charles Yu, testimony given by Osagie Afe, Senior Director of Business Assistance, Long Island City Partnership, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Yu_LICP_234)
14. Silas Leavitt, Housing Development Coordinator, HANAC, Inc., oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Leavitt_HANAC_242)
15. Cynthia Davis, Director of Community Outreach, The Floating Hospital, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Davis_TFH_245)
16. Chris Hanway, Executive Director, Jacob A. Riis Neighborhood Settlement, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Hanway_JARNS_254)
17. Carlos Cano, testimony given by Alex Malescio, Chief Operating Officer, Urban Upbound, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Cano_UU_263)
18. Corwin Mason, Senior Pastor, Community Church of Astoria, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Mason_CCA_272)
19. Hassan Clark, Senior Associate Pastor, Center of Hope International, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Clark_CoHI_273)
20. Carlo A. Scissura, testimony given by Carlo Casa, President and CEO, New York Building Congress, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Scissura_NYBC_278)
21. Corinne Haynes, testimony given by Victoria Krammer, Resident Association President, Queensbridge Houses, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Haynes_QH_279)
22. Eddie Jorge, testimony given by Matt Shartran, Local 361 Iron Workers in New York City, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Jorge__IW_280)
23. Davon Lomax, Political Director, District Council 9, painting and building trades, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Lomax_DC9_282)
24. Kevin Foley, testimony given by Rena Aldrich, Owner, Goldstein and Foley, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Foley_GaF_283)
25. Elizabeta Salinovic, speaking on behalf of 32BJ Union, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Salinovic_32BJ_284)
26. Priya Akhtar, Organizer, CAAAV, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Akhtar_CAAAV_285)

GENERAL PUBLIC

27. Maria Fattore, email letters delivered May 25, 2022, July 21, 2022, and August 8, 2022 (Fattore_001, Fattore_005, Fattore_082)
28. Ruth Phelps, email letter delivered May 26, 2022 (Phelps_002)
29. James Bassi, email letters delivered July 20, 2022 and August 8, 2022 (Bassi_003, Bassi_041)
30. Jerry Est, email letter delivered July 20, 2022 (Est_004)
31. Colista Turner, email letter delivered July 21, 2022 (Turner_006)
32. Stephanie Beck, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Beck_007)
33. Elisabeth Mendez, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Mendez_008)
34. Christian Jimenez, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Jimenez_009)
35. John Restrepo, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Restrepo_010)
36. Ronan Fitzgerald, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Fitzgerald_011)
37. Hannah Berson, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Berson_012)
38. Aki Benjamin, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Benjamin_013)
39. Alexander Schafer, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Schafer_014)
40. Kerri Kearse, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Kearse_015)
41. Ali Bader, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Bader_016)
42. Julia Irish, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Irish_017)
43. Arlie Johansen, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Johansen_018)
44. Lino Millevoi, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Millevoi_019)
45. Kevin Kudic, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Kudic_020)
46. Emily Smith, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Smith_021)
47. Rebecca Satterlee, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Satterlee_022)
48. Michele Murtha, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Murtha_023)
49. Brendan Flavin, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Flavin_024)
50. S. Levcovici, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Levcovici_025)
51. Connor Laudani, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Laudani_026)
52. Lucy Marsanico, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Marsanico_027)
53. Blenda Millevoi, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Millevoi_028)
54. Aidan Donaghy, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Donaghy_029)
55. Kathleen Mulligan, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Mulligan_030)
56. Lauren Fisher, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Fisher_031)
57. Francis Vazquez, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Vazquez_032)
58. Benjamin Lehmann, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Lehmann_033)
59. Yvonne Golby, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Golby_034)
60. Elizabeth Ersekal, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Ersekal_035)
61. Connie Murray, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Murray_036)
62. Rebecca Walsh, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Walsh_037)
63. Maria Fernandez, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Fernandez_038)
64. Michelle Karell, email letters delivered August 8, 2022 and August 22, 2022 (Karell_039, Karell_162)
65. Anne Clark, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Clark_040)
66. Helena Farhi, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Farhi_042)
67. Angela Tiseo, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Tiseo_043)
68. Kelly McNamara, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (McNamara_044)
69. Simone Bonneville, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Bonneville_045)
70. Deb Amodeo, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Amodeo_046)

71. Wendy Werner, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 and August 22, 2022 (Werner_047, Werner_208)
72. Katherine Nellis, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Nellis_048)
73. Tylar Watson, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Watson_049)
74. Jessica Sorensen-Blaney, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Sorensen-Blaney_050)
75. Nicole Greenhouse, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Greenhouse_051)
76. Samuel Flibbert, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Flibbert_052)
77. Lindsay Denninger, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Denninger_053)
78. Gillian Antopol, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Antopol_054)
79. Courtney Bitting, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Bitting_055)
80. Jordan Whalen, email letters delivered August 8, 2022 and August 22, 2022 (Whalen_056, Whalen_197)
81. Jaya Saxena, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Saxena_057)
82. Hannah Weilbacher, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Weilbacher_058)
83. Adam Treitler, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Treitler_059)
84. Frank Vasquez, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Vasquez_060)
85. Eric Black, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Black_061)
86. Bea Angelini, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Angelini_062)
87. Jannatul Ahmed, email letters delivered August 8, 2022 and August 17, 2022 (Ahmed_063, Ahmed_159)
88. MJ Schneider, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Schneider_064)
89. Cynthia Mercado, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Mercado_065)
90. Amanda Vazquez, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Vazquez_066)
91. Amos Satterlee, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Satterlee_067)
92. John Benicewicz, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Benicewicz_068)
93. Lauren Reinhalter, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Reinhalter_069)
94. Jessica Figueroa, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Figueroa_070)
95. Michelle Scarr, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Scarr_071)
96. Finlay Scanlon, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Scanlon_072)
97. Neil Hanlon, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Hanlon_073)
98. Lee Moudj, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Moudj_074)
99. Melissa Trott, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Trott_075)
100. Veronica Smith, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Smith_076)
101. Edward Parra, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Parra_077)
102. Alex Lengle, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Lengle_079)
103. Rosie Kolbo, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Kolbo_080)
104. Candice Padro, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Padro_081)
105. Andrew Davenport, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Davenport_083)
106. Samantha Gutierrez, email letter delivered August 8, 2022 (Gutierrez_084)
107. John Buarotti, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Buarotti_085)
108. Sara Asseman, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Asseman_086)
109. Glorimar Marquez, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Marquez_087)
110. Lisa Karakaya, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Karakaya_088)
111. Kathryn Leonard, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Leonard_089)
112. Lipi Ari Begum, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Begum_090)
113. Anamul Hoque, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Hoque_091)
114. Putul Begum, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Begum_092)
115. Sabrina Ramirez, email letters delivered August 10, 2022 and August 22, 2022 (Ramirez_093, Ramirez_182)

116. Angela Di Manno, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (DiManno_094)
117. Buddy Kenney, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Kenney_095)
118. Laura Picallo, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Picallo_096, Picallo_226)
119. Joaquim Rabinovitch, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Rabinovitch_097)
120. Margarita Soto, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Soto_098)
121. Hawladar Abdus, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Abdus_099)
122. Johnny Farraj, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Farraj_100)
123. Maria Hantzopoulos, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (Hantzopoulos_101)
124. Ryan MacDonald, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (MacDonald_103)
125. Sara DiBona, email letter delivered August 9, 2022 (DiBona_104)
126. Danielle Matta, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Matta_105)
127. Ariadne Colon, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Colon_106)
128. Stephanie Tsopanidis, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Tsopanidis_107)
129. Rena Grossman, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Grossman_108)
130. Jack Wooldridge, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Wooldridge_109)
131. Anne Gregorio, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Gregorio_111)
132. Tracey DeBenedictis, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (DeBenedictis_112)
133. Anike Tella-Martins, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Tella-Martins_113)
134. Danielle Osorio, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Osorio_115)
135. Jenny Dubnau, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Dubnau_118, Dubnau_246)
136. Rishma Lucknauth, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Lucknauth_119)
137. Maya Baker, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Baker_120)
138. Demi Amindeneau, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Amindeneau_121)
139. Tyler Herald, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Herald_122)
140. Laurel Haines, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Haines_123)
141. Marien Alejandro, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Alejandro_124)
142. Tyler Winthrop, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Winthrop_125)
143. Olivia Zoda, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Zoda_126)
144. Gen Valentine, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Valentine_127)
145. Zachary Owen, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Owen_128)
146. Alex Brandes, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Brandes_129)
147. Catherine Theodorou, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Theodorou_130)
148. Fabian Fernandez, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Fernandez_131)
149. Eleanor Hartley, email letter delivered August 10, 2022 (Hartley_132)
150. Amy Hau, email letter delivered August 19, 2022 (Hau_134)
151. Nargis Khan, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Khan_135)
152. Abed Khan, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Khan_136)
153. Nasrin Sultana, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Sultana_137)
154. Mohammad Islam, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Islam_138)
155. Khaleda Akter, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Akter_139)
156. Din Mohammad, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Mohammad_140)
157. Rahima Khatun, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Khatun_141)
158. MD Zuhauzzaman, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Zuhauzzaman_142)
159. Afsana Mahin, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Mahin_143)
160. Sitara Begum, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Begum_144)
161. Marie Torniali, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Torniali_145)

162. MD Ahad, email letter delivered August 19, 2022 (Ahad_146)
163. Bilkis Begum, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Begum_147, Begum_236)
164. Mahfuza Mira, email letter delivered August 15, 2022 (Mira_148)
165. Jewel Ahmed, email letter delivered August 13, 2022 (Ahmed_149)
166. Joe Zamarelli, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Zamarelli_150)
167. Gulshan Aachol, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Aachol_151)
168. Mary Catherine Ford, email letter delivered August 11, 2022 (Ford_152)
169. Ulfatun Ridika, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Ridika_153, Ridika_288)
170. Ainan Ribin, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Ribin_154)
171. Shima Akter, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Akter_155)
172. Tauheda Amin, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Amin_156)
173. Hossain Delwar, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 and oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Delwar_157, Delwar_238)
174. Humayun Yasmin, email letter delivered August 17, 2022 (Yasmin_158)
175. Robert Young, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Young_160)
176. Allyssa Yost, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Yost_161)
177. Sarah Frazier, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Frazier_163)
178. Nassima Kebir, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Kebir_164)
179. Frank Siringo, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Siringo_165)
180. Michael Adams, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Adams_166)
181. Irina Leonardi, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Leonardi_167)
182. Debora Van Cura, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (VanCura_168)
183. Brent Wakelin, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Wakelin_170)
184. Maureen Donohue, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Donohue_171)
185. Michael Alilionis, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Alilionis_172)
186. Dominic Quintana, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Quintana_173)
187. Erinn Kehoe, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Kehoe_174)
188. Ruth Hennessy, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Hennessy_175)
189. Francis Kenney, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Kenney_176)
190. Zuleica Valencia, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Valencia_177)
191. Jessica Imbro, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Imbro_178)
192. Andrew Wood, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Wood_179)
193. Sam Camp, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Camp_180)
194. Devora Fein, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Fein_181)
195. Chris Levy, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Levy_183)
196. Pareena Lim, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Lim_184)
197. Chris Mejia, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Mejia_185)
198. Sarah Elghazoly, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Elghazoly_186)
199. Julia Borowski, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Borowski_187)
200. Melissa Bieri, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Bieri_188)
201. Jen Runne, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Runne_189)
202. Christopher Lehman, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Lehman_190)
203. Francis X. McHugh, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (McHugh_191)
204. Maryann Cummings, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Cummings_192)
205. Robin O'Hanlon, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (O'Hanlon_193)
206. Erica Baum, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Baum_194)

207. Robert Casimiro, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Casimiro_195)
208. Maria Lyrist, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Lyrist_196)
209. Kathleen Gallagher, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Gallagher_198)
210. Joss Grossberg, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Grossberg_199)
211. William Bregoli, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Bregoli_200)
212. Devon Bowser, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Bowser_201)
213. Eric Straker, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Straker_202)
214. Bright Limm, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Limm_203)
215. Jennifer Jung, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Jung_204)[3]
216. Aris Stathis, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Stathis_205)
217. Erica Heisler, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Heisler_206)
218. Scott Levine, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Levine_207)
219. Nancy Monahan, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Monahan_209)
220. Becca Jones, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Jones_210)
221. Henry Wong, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Wong_211)
222. Stephanie Jones, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Jones_212)
223. Molly Sailors, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Sailors_213)
224. Tal Rastopchin, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Rastopchin_214)
225. Kaitlyn Fox, email letter delivered August 22, 2022 (Fox_215)
226. Nancy Silverman, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Silverman_216)
227. Isadora Zanon, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Zanon_217)
228. Nakeah George, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (George_221)
229. John Miller, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Miller_222)
230. David Soukup, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Soukup_223)
231. Adis Kolenovic, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Kolenovic_224)
232. Joaquim Rabinovitch, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Rabinovitch_228)
233. George Stamatiadis, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Stamatiadis_232)
234. Mosammat Yasmin, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Yasmin_237)
235. Kazi Maryam, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Maryam_240)
236. Ali Seyedahmadian, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Seyedahmadian_241)
237. Mason Van Gieson, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (VanGieson_250)
238. Christian Diaz, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Diaz_256)
239. Colin White, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (White_257)
240. Carolina Korth, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Korth_259)
241. Joe Distefano, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Distefano_262)
242. Julia Forman, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Forman_268)
243. Gilbert Pickett, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Pickett_269)
244. Ana Contreras, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Contreras_271)
245. Steve Moskovic, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Moskovic_276)
246. Shawnta Alston, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Alston_281)
247. Tauhida Amin, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Amin_286)
248. Shima Akter, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Akter_287)
249. Hope Justice, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Justice_289)
250. John Maletiadis, oral comments delivered on August 10, 2022 (Maletiadis_290)

[3] The email submission from this commenter including an attached document that was corrupted and therefore not readable.

B. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment 1: What is the mechanism to require the affordable units, including schedule for delivery, unit sizes, rent, and income requirements? (Fattore_001)

The applicant has been vague about how much more (than 25 percent) affordable housing will be provided. It is appalling that they would only commit to more with help from the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD). (Silverman_216, Zanon_217)

The Community Board has requested 50 percent of the proposed residential units be affordable tied to actual AMI represented by income data for the area. The developers have not been responsive to this request. The developers have refused to lower the AMI requirement to include the "deeply affordable" option. (Fattore_005_Fattore_082)

Response: As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions include an amendment to Appendix F of the Zoning Resolution (ZR) to establish a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area over the Project Area, which would require a share of new housing to be permanently affordable. The number of affordable units would be determined by a number of factors, including the MIH option ultimately selected for the Proposed Actions. The number of affordable units presented in the DEIS is based on a percentage of floor area that would be affordable housing under the Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS), which is assumed to be MIH Option 1 (25 percent of residential floor area). Under the RWCDS, the Proposed Development would include 711 affordable units pursuant to MIH, and an additional 203 affordable units would be developed in the Additional Affected Area. Based on current projections, the Proposed Development's affordable units would include approximately 142 studio units (20 percent), approximately 285 1-bedoom units (40 percent) approximately 213 2-bedroom units (30 percent) and approximately 71 3-bedroom units (10 percent). Under MIH Option 1, 25 percent of the affordable units would be set aside for households making up to 60 percent Area Median Income (AMI) on average, with 10 percent of that number set aside for households making up to 40 percent AMI. Beyond providing the required MIH units the Applicant intends to actively work with various stakeholders to increase the number of affordable units, including deeply affordable units. These conversations are ongoing. The affordable units in the Additional Affected Area are on sites that are not under the Applicant's control and would be developed with others, therefore projections of the additional units' makeup are not known at this time.

Comment 2: Where are the population estimates for the proposed project provided? (Fattore_001)

Response: Accounting for all of the uses expected to be developed in the Project Area (including residential, commercial and community facility space) in both the Proposed Development and additional projected development in the Additional Affected Area, under the RWCDS, the Proposed Actions are expected to add approximately 8,124 new residents and approximately 1,133 new workers to the study area (see the population projections presented in Chapter 5 of the DEIS, "Open Space").

Comment 3: What is planned to provide services (including shopping, etc.) to the neighborhood, with the increase in population? What is the phasing? (Fattore_001)

The project would add to overcrowding in Astoria. (Murtha_023, Gregorio_111)

Response: See the response to Comment 2, above. The DEIS analyses use these population estimates to determine the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impacts, e.g., open space. Where significant adverse impacts have been identified, the DEIS identifies mitigation measures that eliminate or reduce the impacts to the fullest extent practicable, which includes additional services to support the projected new residential population. As discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation," as mitigation for identified significant adverse impacts, these services may include suitable space within the Proposed Development for early childhood programs, space for the Queens Public Library within the Proposed Development, and publicly accessible open space with active uses to provide an additional resource for active recreation for residents of the study area.

Chapter 19 of the DEIS, "Construction," addresses the anticipated construction schedule for the Proposed Actions. As noted in that chapter, the Proposed Actions would include 12 buildings on the Development Site (Projected Development Sites A, B, C, D, and E) that would be developed by the Applicant as well as new developments that would be facilitated on the Projected Development Sites not controlled by the Applicant (Projected Development Sites F, G, H, I, J, and K). At this time, there are no finalized construction programs or designs for the Proposed Development and the projected developments sites in the Additional Affected Area. Therefore, for analysis purposes, a reasonable worst-case conceptual construction phasing and schedule for the development anticipated to occur under the Proposed Actions was established to illustrate how construction could occur over approximately the next 10 years, through 2032 (see the conceptual construction schedule presented in Table 19-4 and Figure 19-1).

Comment 4: The project is out of scale/out of character for the neighborhood. (Fattore_005, Beck_007, Fitzgerald_011, Berson_012, Millevoi_019, Smith_021,

Donaghy_029, Fernandez_038, Bassi_041, Tiseo_043, Greenhouse_051, Benicewicz_068, Scarr_071, Trott_75, Fattore_082, Davenport_083, Leonard_089, Farraj_100, Hantzopolous_101, DiBona_104, Colon_106, DeBenedictis_111, Herald_122, Owen_128, Ford_152, VanCura_168, Mejia_185, Lyrist_196, Whalen_197, Levin_207, Zanon_217, Justice_289)

The project is too tall for the neighborhood. (Vazquez_032)

The proposed buildings should look more like Astoria. (Marquez_087)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, "Project Description," the Project Area is a transition point between a low- to mid-density residential neighborhood, a commercial and arts district centered around Kaufman Astoria Studios, a primarily low-scale, light manufacturing area, and the Long Island City (LIC) high-density mixed-use neighborhood. The Project Area is also bounded by a wide arterial roadway, Northern Boulevard. The Applicant believes that the Proposed Development has been designed around a series of guiding principles intended to reflect this context: the guiding principles include varied height profiles for the buildings from east to west, with the largest towers on Steinway Street and 35th Avenue to anchor the Steinway commercial corridor and on Northern Boulevard, and lower-scale buildings along 35th Avenue opposite the low-density residential buildings. The potential significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Actions on urban design of the area are assessed in Chapter 8 of the DEIS, "Urban Design and Visual Resources." The assessment concludes that, while the new development would include buildings that would be substantially taller than the surrounding built context, the mix of proposed land uses would be compatible with one another and with the surrounding area, and the development would provide a more active and pedestrian-friendly environment with new ground-floor uses and publicly accessible open space, therefore, the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse effect on urban design in the Project Area or the study area.

Comment 5: The neighborhood does not need more luxury housing that people in the neighborhood cannot afford. (Irish_017, Weilbacher_058, Mercado_065, Karakaya_088, Matta_105, Wooldridge_109, Imbro_178, Runne_189, Whalen_197, Grossberg_199, Mohammed_218, Begum_236, VanGieson_250, Akhtar_CAAAV_285, Ridika_288)

The project does not address the housing crisis in Astoria. (Kudic_020)

The project contributes to the housing crisis, and does not meet the needs of the community. (Picallo_226)

Astoria is already a thriving cultural district; more support for local artists and cultural workers is needed, not high-end development. (Dubnau_118)

The neighborhood needs public and active/green spaces, more public transit, and more affordable housing, not luxury residential buildings. (Lehmann_033, Clark_040, Tiseo_043, Greenhouse_051, Scarr_071, Trott_075, Farraj_100, Hantzopolous_101, DeBenedictis_112, Amindeneau_121, Runne_189)

There are no community spaces for the Bangali community. The developers are trying to build a high rise building and further push us out with the mask of community benefits. (Zuhauzzaman_142)

The neighborhood needs more affordable housing and real investment in schools and infrastructure. (Karakaya_088)

The project was not designed with any consideration for the actual needs and limitations of this neighborhood. (Hennessy_175)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions are intended to transform the Project Area into a vibrant, mixed-use community offering a wide variety of housing options, office space for the creative industries, neighborhood-serving healthcare facilities (e.g., local medical offices), retail, a state-of-the-art multiplex cinema, a full-service grocery store, and thoughtfully programmed publicly accessible open spaces throughout. The Applicant has undertaken extensive engagement with the community and has designed the Proposed Development to provide for a mix of uses that serve the needs of neighborhood residents. In particular, the Proposed Development will provide over 700 units of permanently affordable housing pursuant to the City's MIH Program where few currently exist. The Proposed Development would also include over 2 acres of publicly accessible open space that will offer amenities to a wide variety of users; these spaces would be fully publicly accessible and would support the open space needs of both the existing community and the new residential and worker populations introduced by the Proposed Actions.

In accordance with CEQR, a comprehensive evaluation of the Proposed Actions' potential impacts has been performed and is presented in the DEIS. Where significant adverse impacts are identified, the DEIS includes potential measures to mitigate or reduce those impacts, as discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation."

Comment 6: The only binding measures for the proposed project will be defined by zoning and legally required Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) compliance. If the proposed actions are approved, anything can be developed as long as it complies with zoning. (Fattore_005)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions include a Special Permit under ZR Section 74-743 which would control development on the Applicant-controlled lots as a Large-Scale General Development (LSGD). The Proposed Development would be subject to an approved site plan pursuant to the proposed Special Permit: the site plan would control development in the LSGD, including establishing building massings and

open spaces. Pursuant to the approved special permit, the Proposed Development would be required to include the publicly accessible open space and mix of uses assessed in the DEIS, containing office space, retail, a community center, and an arts and cultural center.

Comment 7: The parking requirements should be waived; the project doesn't need parking because it is near the subway. (Schafer_014)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in the DEIS, the Proposed Actions do not include approvals to waive the parking requirement of the proposed new zoning in the Project Area, and the Proposed Development would include five accessory group parking facilities providing the parking required by zoning. In order to address the comments received during the public review process related to parking, the Applicant is considering modifications to its application to reduce the parking provided with the Proposed Development so that it includes only the number of spaces required by zoning, and not including the additional spaces beyond the zoning requirement assessed in the DEIS. The potential modifications to the Proposed Development, including the reduction in parking, is assessed in the FEIS as the Proposed Modified Application Alternative, in Chapter 21, "Alternatives."

Comment 8: The project's dog park would not be accessible to the entire community and is not large enough to serve the area. The project cannot deliver the lifestyle benefits it promises. (Lucknauth_119)

While the area is in need of more green spaces and a dog run, the City should figure out a way to provide those things, not a developer. (Frazier_163)

The neighborhood doesn't need more privatized park-like spaces. The community amenities will be privately controlled an operated, serving only high-income residents. The green spaces are not for the community, but for the luxury unit residents. (Schneider_064, Trott_075, Brandes_129, Hartley_132, Runne_189, Bregoli_200, Zanon_217)

The project's "free and open spaces" are only pathways to get from one shopping or living section to the next, not actual designated park spaces or playgrounds. (Winthrop_125)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Development would include over two acres of publicly accessible open space, which would be provided as Public Access Areas (PAAs) on the Proposed Development's site plan. The PAAs have been designed and programmed as publicly accessible open space, pursuant to community input. Public amenities to be provided in the PAAs would include various forms of public seating; multipurpose lawns; water features; landscaped areas, large planters, and shade trees; a dog park; promenades and pavilions; interactive public art; and temporary recreational

features (e.g., cornhole, seesaws, adult swings). Other amenities could include an immersive playscape for children, open markets, kiosks, public art installations, sculptures, and enhanced streetscapes. Programming in the open spaces may include art exhibits, holiday markets, performances, farmer's markets, and events. All PAA spaces would be publicly accessible, and the Applicant would be responsible for the development and maintenance of the PAAs.

Comment 9: There are no plans for replacement of sewer lines or expanded train and bus service. (Amodeo_046)

The project will strain resources and infrastructure, including sanitation, parks, schools, and transportation. (Trott_075, Ahmed_159, Yost_161, Leonardi_167, Quintana_173, Mohammed_218, Dubnau_246, White_257)

The project does not address the lack of appropriate infrastructure in the neighborhood. There needs to be a plan to improve infrastructure. (Marquez_087, Siringo_165, Leonardi_167, Runne_189)

Response: In accordance with CEQR, a comprehensive evaluation of the Proposed Actions' potential impacts has been performed and is presented in the DEIS. This includes evaluations of the Proposed Actions' potential impacts on infrastructure, including transit infrastructure (see Chapter 13, "Transportation") and sewer infrastructure (see Chapter 10, "Water and Sewer Infrastructure"). Where significant adverse impacts are identified, the DEIS includes potential measures to mitigate or reduce those impacts, as discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation."

Comment 10: The public parking would not be available to use in the community. (Hartley_132)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," in conformance with zoning, parking would be provided in below-grade parking facilities on each of the Proposed Development's blocks, which would be accessory to the Proposed Development's residential, commercial, and community facility spaces; some of these spaces would be available to visitors to the area, such as patrons of the proposed relocated cinema.

Comment 11: Supermarkets are already few and far between; we do not need a new strain on our limited resources. (Theodorou_130)

Response: See the response to Comment 5, above. The Applicant has undertaken extensive engagement with the community and has designed the Proposed Development to provide for a revitalizing mix of uses that serve the needs of neighborhood residents. The Proposed Development would include a grocery store or supermarket as part of its proposed commercial space, and a supermarket is included in the Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) analyzed in the EIS.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Comment 12: The proposed project would result in gentrification. (Phelps_002, Est_004, Kearse_015, Johansen_018, Nellis_048, Ahmed_063, Scanlon_072, DeJesus_GPNY_078, Fattore_082, DiBona_104, Bratspies_CUER_116, Herald_122, Zoda_126, Valentine_127, Akter_139, Ridika_153, Ribin_154, Delwar_157, Preston_MFU_169, Fein_181, Levy_183, Lehman_190, Jones_212, Delwar_238)

The project will weed out those who cannot afford to pay higher rents In the area. (Phelps_002)

Luxury residential buildings displace longtime residents and small businesses. (Mendez_008)

The project would result in the displacement and pricing out of neighborhood residents and/or businesses. (Berson_012, Benjamin_013, Johansen_018, Millevoi_019, Millevoi_028, Mulligan_030, Fisher_031, Vazquez_032, Bonneville_045, Greenhouse_051, Antopol_054, Treilter_059, Black_061, Angelini_062, Vazquez_066, Hanlon_073, Davenport_083, Buarotti_085, Asseman_086, Hoque_091, Begum_092, DiManno_094, Abdus_099, Farraj_100, Hantzopolous_101, MacDonald_103, DiBona_104, Matta_105, Tella-Martins_113, Lucknauth_119, Baker_120, Haines_123, Winthrop_125, Fernandez_131, Khan_135, Khan_136, Islam_138, Akter_139, Mohammad_140, Khatun_141, Begum_144, Mira_148, Ahmed_149, Zamarelli_150, Yost_161, Kebir_164, Leonardi_167, Fein_181, McHugh_191, O'Hanlon_193, Baum_194, Limm_203, Levin_207, Werner_208, Jones_210, Rastopchin_214, Mohammed_218, Maryam_240, Forman_268, Amin_286, Justice_289)

The project would only benefit the developers while displacing existing residents and/or businesses. (Murray_036, Filbbert_052, Whalen_056, Ahmed_063, Mercado_065, Benicewicz_068, Scarr_071, Trott_75, Rabinovitch_097, Bratspies_CUER_116, Herald_122, Zoda_126, Aachol_151, Ribin_154, Dubnau_246, VanGieson_250)

The project would displace a large number of BIPOC, disabled, elderly, immigrant, and/or rent-burdened residents. (Kearse_015, Bassi_041, Weilbacher_058, Vasquez_060, Ahmed_063, Fattore_082, Picallo_096, Grossman_108, Dubnau_118, Herald_122, Khan_135, Khan_136, Sultana_137, Khatun_141, Mahin_143, Ahad_146, Begum_147, Zamarelli_150, Aachol_151, Ridika_153, Amin_156, Delwar_157, Yasmin_158, Ahmed_159, Valencia_177, Mejia_185, Cummings_192, Monhammed_218, Chasie_220, Onadi_227, Begum_236, Delwar_238, Maryam_240, White_257)

The project would harm lower-income, immigrant, and marginalized members of our community. It doesn't fit the true definition of affordable housing. (Schwiertert_IFT_110, Mohammed_218)

The project would drive up rents/cost of housing in the area. (Smith_021, Levcovici_025, Davenport_083, Soto_098, Owen_128, Akter_155, Delwar_157, Kebir_164, Quintana_173, O'Hanlon_193, Limm_203, Picallo_226, Onadi_227, Yasmin_237, Delwar_238, VanGieson_250, White_257, Akter_287)

The socioeconomic impacts of the project will be irreversible, impacting those least privileged in our community the most. (Tsopanidis_107)

Secondary displacement needs to be considered. (Dubnau_118)

The project would destroy the economic character of Astoria. (Ford_152)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement. Rents in Astoria are rising and are expected to continue to rise in the future without the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would introduce 3,643 incremental dUs, of which, 914 would be affordable under Mandatory Inclusionary Housing. The Proposed Actions would increase the supply of market rate housing, which the Applicant believes would be beneficial for affordability, and would also add affordable housing that would otherwise not exist absent the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would be the largest MIH project in Queens and would add affordable units in the community for those of moderate means. This housing is expected to serve to preserve a more diverse mix of incomes in the study area as compared with the No Action condition.

Comment 13: There are already vacant commercial office and retail spaces in the area; we don't need more. (Phelps_002, Clark_040)

The neighborhood does not need new shopping, grocery stores, or a new movie theater; it needs the rent to be affordable so businesses can use the existing buildings. (Winthrop_125)

This project would bulldoze the Astoria Regal movie theater that I cherish and leave it indefinitely closed. (Zamarelli_150)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the Proposed Actions would add an increment of 23,873 gross square feet (gsf) of retail space and an increment of 250,070 gsf of office space. As detailed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the retail added in the With Action condition would not be enough to alter or accelerate ongoing trends. In terms of office uses, the study area already has a strong commercial office market, particularly in the southwest portion of the study area in the Long Island City neighborhood. The office space in the With Action condition intends to connect the Project Area to Long Island City and would not alter or accelerate trends. The new residential and worker population that would be added to the area would increase demand for goods and services provided by existing businesses. The Regal United Artists Kaufman Astoria Cinema would be relocated in the Proposed Development.

Comment 14: The developers have said that people were not going to be displaced, but then admitted in the Community Board hearing that they would be displacing six apartments because people were struggling to pay their current rent. (Est_004)

Response: Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," of the DEIS discloses that nine residential dwelling units would be directly displaced by the Proposed Actions, including six dwelling units that are located on the Applicant-controlled Development Site, and three that are in the Additional Affected Area (the area not controlled by the Applicant that would be rezoned with approval of the Proposed Actions). According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, direct displacement of fewer than 500 residents would not typically be expected to substantially alter the socioeconomic character of a neighborhood. The potentially displaced residents represent less than one percent of the residents within the socioeconomic study area; therefore, this potential direct displacement would not substantially alter the socioeconomic character of the neighborhood. The Applicant is actively working with the residents of the six residential units that are located on Applicant-controlled sites to provide relocation assistance or support the 'residents' return to a unit in the Proposed Development.

Comment 15: The project will not provide enough truly affordable units. (Est_004, Smith_021, Laudani_026, Millevoi_028, Donaghy_029, Vazquez_032, Fernandez_038, Karell_039, Boneville_045, Greenhouse_051, Bitting_055, Davenport_083, Soto_098, Owen_128, Ahmed_149, Ribin_154, Alilionis_172, Valencia_177, Grossberg_199, Limm_203, Jones_212)

The 700 affordable units are not nearly enough to accommodate the residents that will be displaced. (Kearse_015)

The affordable housing being proposed does nothing to help those that would be displaced. (Kolbo_080)

The project does not do enough to address the lack of affordable housing in the area. I would be in favor if the developers provided a more reasonable allotment of affordable units. (Casimiro_195)

The area needs more permanently affordable apartments. (Lyrist_196)

The project doesn't address Astoria's lack of family housing or affordable units. (Heisler_206, Rastopchin_214)

The developers have refused to offer "deeply affordable Option 2" units, which would serve the Astoria community. (Fattore_005)

The community needs deeply affordable housing. The project does not provide deeply affordable housing. (Berson_012, Bassi_041, Tiseo_043, Greenhouse_051, Weilbacher_058, Scarr_071, Hanlon_073, DeBenedictis_112, Hartley_132, Fein_181, Baum_194, Levin_207, Mohammed_218, Akhtar_CAAAV_285)

Affordable housing for essential working and middle class citizens is needed. (Fattore_082)

The project should include at least 50 percent affordable units and include very low income eligibility. (Marquez_087)

The affordable housing created by the proposed project will still be unaffordable. (Benjamin_013, Donaghy_029, Mulligan_030, Saxena_057, Trott_075, DiBona_104, Dubnau_118, Imbro_178, Werner_208, Silverman_216, Picallo_226, Akhtar_CAAAV_285)

The market rate housing will be unaffordable to the average Astoria resident. (Millevoi_019, Fernandez_038, Tiseo_043, Scarr_071, Abdus_099, Farraj_100, Hantzopoulos_101, DeBenedictis_112, Winthrop_125, Brandes_129, Ahmed_159, Kebir_164, Leonardi_167, Wood_179, Ramirez_182, Whalen_197, Levin_207, Dubnau_246)

The affordable units are not affordable for neighborhood residents. (Ersekal_035, Werner_047, Smith_076, Picallo_096, Wooldridge_109, Lucknauth_119, Herald_122, Valentine_127, Brandes_129. Ford_152, Ahmed_159, Leonardi_167, Wood_179, Rastopchin_214, Mohammed_218, Onadi_227, Yasmin_237, Maryam_240, VanGieson_250, White_257)

The project would onlyIde 25 percent affordable units. (Mercado_065, Vazquez_066, Dubnau_118, Valentine_127, Brandes_129, Theodorou_130, Hartley_132, Leonardi_167, Rastopchin_214, Zanon_217, Picallo_226, Akhtar_CAAAV_285)

The neighborhood needs more affordable housing, including for seniors on fixed incomes, immigrants, low income residents, and for families. (Karakaya_088, Leonard_089, Matta_105, Bratspies_CUER_116, Imbro_178)

The developers' projected profit margins should be disclosed to help determine affordability levels. (Dubnau_118)

Response: See the response to Comment 1, above. The Proposed Actions would result in affordable housing in the Project Area under the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program, which would require a share of new housing to be permanently affordable. The number of affordable units presented in the DEIS is based on a percentage of floor area that would be affordable housing under the Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS), which is assumed to be MIH Option 1 (25 percent of residential floor area). Under the RWCDS, the Proposed Development would include 711 affordable units pursuant to MIH, and an additional 203 affordable units would be developed in the Additional Affected Area. Under MIH Option 1, 25 percent of the affordable units would be set aside for households making up to 60 percent Area Median Income (AMI) on average, with 10 percent of that number set aside for households making up to 40 percent AMI. Beyond providing the required MIH units, the Applicant intends to actively

work with various stakeholders to increase the number of affordable units, including deeply affordable units. These conversations are ongoing.

Comment 16: Rents have escalated in the last 10 to 15 years, and Astoria is no longer an affordable place to live. (Mendez_008)

The project would stress and increase prices on an already tight housing market. (Denninger_052)

The project's baseline rents will inflate rent in the area without providing anything meaningful in return. (Schneider_064)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," rents in the half-mile study area have increased since 2010 and are expected to continue to increase in the No Action Condition. The Proposed Actions would increase the supply of market rate housing, which the applicant believes would be beneficial for affordability, and would add 914 new affordable dwelling units that would not otherwise exist, absent the Proposed Actions.

Comment 17: No data has been provided to support the claim that the project would create 1,700 permanent jobs. (Bassi_041)

The promise of new jobs created would not make up for displacement cause by the project. (Nellis_048)

Whatever jobs the developers allude to will be unlikely to contribute to the prosperity of the community. (Trott_075)

Response: The estimate of jobs supported by the Proposed Development is based on standard industry ratios of jobs per square foot of development. Those ratios are as follows, Office: 250 sf per employee; Local Retail: 333 sf per employee; Community Facility: 1,000 sf per employee. The Proposed Actions would support a total of 1,863 jobs or an increment of 1,133 jobs as compared to the No Action Condition, see Chapter 5, "Open Space." The Proposed Actions would result in the direct displacement of 170 jobs, as discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions." The Proposed Actions would support over 10 times as many jobs as would be displaced. In addition, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement. The Project Area and broader half-mile study area have well-established residential, retail, and office markets such that the Proposed Actions would not introduce new economic activities to the projected development sites or to the study area and would not add to a concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to significantly alter or accelerate existing economic patterns.

Comment 18: The developers are buying buildings and not renewing the leases of the businesses operating there. (Fitzgerald_011, Fernandez_038, Greenhouse_051, Herald_122)

Response: Comment noted. The DEIS includes a preliminary assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Actions to direct business displacement, discussed in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions." The assessment determined that the potential displacement of 20 businesses on projected development sites and an estimated 170 jobs associated with those businesses does not constitute a significant adverse impact on the socioeconomic conditions of the area as defined by CEQR.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Comment 19: I am concerned about the project's impacts on schools. The schools are already overcrowded. (Fitzgerald_011, Berson_012, Benjamin_013, Levcovici_025, Millevoi_028, Ersekal_035, Soto_098, Khan_136, Chaise_220)

Response: The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to elementary, intermediate, or high schools as discussed in Chapter 4 of the DEIS, "Community Facilities." The analysis found that, including the new population introduced by the Proposed Actions, utilization for elementary and intermediate schools in the study area in the With Action condition would remain below 100 percent. Therefore, it is expected that school seats would be available for elementary and intermediate schools by the analysis year, based on the most recent projections.

Comment 20: The developers have removed a proposal and the proposed benefits of a new school. (White_257)

Response: Comment noted. Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," included an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential impact on community facilities including elementary, intermediate, or high schools, and concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to elementary, intermediate, or high schools.

Comment 21: The project will negatively impact my children's school which is adjacent to the project. (Golby_034)

Response: Comment noted. Chapter 4, "Community Facilities," included an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential impact on community facilities including elementary, intermediate, or high schools, and concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to elementary, intermediate, or high schools.

Comment 22: The project will not provide enough hospitals. (Levcovici_025)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 4 of the DEIS, "Community Facilities," the Proposed Actions would not create a sizeable new neighborhood; therefore, a detailed

analysis of hospitals was not warranted. The nearest hospital to the Project Area is Mount Sinai Queens; in addition to Mount Sinai Queens, there are approximately 25 health care facilities located within the 1-mile study area of the Project Area, as inventoried in DCP's Selected Facilities and Program Sites in New York City.

SHADOWS

Comment 23: The proposed project would result in high rise buildings that would create constant shadow throughout the area, including on a playground. The project will block out the sun. (Fattore_005, Millevoi_019, Laudani_026, Millevoi_028, Fernandez_038, Tiseo_043, Vazquez_066, Scarr_071, Farraj_100, Hantzopoulos_101, DeBenedictis_111, Herald_122, Valentine_127, Theodorou_130, Ford_152, Levin_207, Zanon_217, White_257, Forman_268)

Response: Shadows resulting from the Proposed Actions would, like all shadows, move clockwise and generally west to east over the course of each day, falling on different areas at different times and leaving other areas in sun as they move. In the spring and fall, and particularly the summer, shadows are short from mid-morning to mid-afternoon, and the shadows resulting from the Proposed Actions would be limited to the immediate vicinity west, north, or east of the Development Sites during these times, as shown in the figures associated with Chapter 6, "Shadows."

As discussed in Chapter 6 of the DEIS, "Shadows," the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in new shadows on sunlight sensitive resources, which include publicly accessible parks, was assessed in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The detailed shadows analysis that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact related to shadows on Playground Thirty Five XXXV, due to the potential shadows from proposed buildings covering large areas of the playground at times, eliminating much or all of the remaining sunlight in the park at times—particularly in the fall, winter, and early spring—and affecting the user experience in all seasons. Mitigation for the significant adverse impact is discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation." The Proposed Actions would not cause significant shadows on any other sunlight-sensitive resources.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Comment 24: The project will overwhelm existing infrastructure, including the sewer system. (Phelps_002, Berson_012, Johansen_018, Levcovici_025, Marsanico_026, Vazquez_032, Bassi_041, Antopol_054, Black_061, Rabinovitch_097, Ford_152)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 10 of the DEIS, "Water and Sewer Infrastructure," an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential impacts on the City's water supply,

wastewater treatment, and stormwater management and treatment infrastructure was undertaken in accordance with the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual.* The assessment concluded that, while the Proposed Actions would result in increased demand for water and treatment of sewage, the incremental increases would not constitute significant adverse impacts. In particular, concerning sanitary sewage, the incremental volume in sanitary flow to the combined sewer systems resulting from the new development is not anticipated to create a significant adverse impact on the City's sanitary sewage treatment system. All developments on the Projected Development Sites would be required to file a Site Connection Proposal Application (SCP) for approval from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to tie into the sewer system. In this process, before a building permit can be issued, site connection proposals must be certified for sewer availability by DEP. A site-specific hydraulic analysis of the existing sewer system will likely be required for the new development to determine whether the existing sewer system is capable of supporting higher density development and related increases in wastewater flows. Sewer upgrades may be required at the time of the SCP to accommodate the projected flows from the new development. This analysis and any improvements would be undertaken, as necessary, in coordination with DEP.

Comment 25: The developers have not been responsive to questions about water system delivery and sewer capacity, or about whether taxpayer funding would be needed to provide these services. The developers expect that the cost for water systems needed to service the project will be shouldered by the taxpayers. (Fattore_005, Fattore_082)

The project would not result In any infrastructure improvements. (Donaghy_029)

Response: See the response to Comment 24, above. As discussed in Chapter 10 of the DEIS, "Water and Sewer Infrastructure," the existing water mains in the Project Area are expected to be capable of handling the increase in water demand resulting from the Proposed Actions, and there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, therefore improvements to the water supply capacity are not warranted. Regarding sanitary sewer infrastructure, additional analysis will be conducted at the time of the site connection proposal for each new development in the Project Area to determine whether the existing sewer system is capable of supporting higher density development and related increases in wastewater flows. This additional analysis will determine if sewer upgrades are required to accommodate the projected flows from the new development. If improvements to the sewer infrastructure are determined to be necessary, they would be undertaken by the developer(s) in coordination with DEP.

Comment 26: During the May 13 Land Use meeting, the developers admitted that no study to determine sustainability of water and sewer infrastructure has been undertaken. (Fattore_005, Fattore_082)

Response: See the response to Comment 24 above; an analysis was undertaken based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which found that, while the Proposed Actions would result in increased demand for water and treatment of sewage, the incremental increases would not constitute a significant adverse impact on the City's water supply, wastewater treatment, or stormwater management and treatment infrastructure.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION

Comment 27: The developers have not been responsive to questions about sanitation, or about whether taxpayer funding would be needed to provide these services. (Fattore_005)

The project would result in more trash. (Amodeo_046)

The project would burden sanitation infrastructure. (Rabinovitch_097)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 11 of the DEIS, an analysis was conducted based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services. Specifically, the analysis found that incremental waste generated by new development would represent a negligible increase relative to the approximately 12,260 tons of solid waste handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) every day, or the 13,000 tons handled by private carters, therefore the Proposed Actions would not overburden available waste management capacity. The DSNY would collect solid waste generated by residential and community facility uses in the Project Area, which would be served by existing DSNY collection routes, and as a general practice, DSNY adjusts its operations to service the community. Commercial establishments in the Project Area would contract with private carters for collection; there are more than 2,000 private carting businesses authorized to serve New York City, and it is expected that their collection fleets would be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the increased demand for solid waste collection.

ENERGY

Comment 28: The project will overwhelm existing infrastructure including the electrical grid. (Phelps_002, Marsanico_026, Amodeo_046, Rabinovitch_097, Ford_152)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 12 of the DEIS, "Energy," an analysis was conducted based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse

impact related to energy systems. The Proposed Actions would generate an incremental increase in energy demand that would be considered negligible when compared with the overall demand within Consolidated Edison's (Con Edison's) New York City and Westchester County service area. Any new development resulting from the Proposed Actions would be required to comply with the New York City Energy Conservation Code (NYCECC), and would be required to meet standards for energy conservation. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 15, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change," for the Proposed Development, the Applicant intends to evaluate a number of certification programs and sustainable design features that may be incorporated into the design and construction of each new development on the Development Sites (Projected Development Sites A through E) in order to improve energy efficiency, such the use of local geothermal power production.

TRANSPORTATION

Comment 29: I am concerned about transportation impacts. (Fitzgerald_011, Johansen_018, Marsanico_027, Bassi_041)

Unavoidable adverse impacts have been identified in the EIS for transportation and traffic. (Fattore_082)

The project would burden transportation infrastructure. (Rabinovitch_097, DiBona_104)

The project doesn't address public transit and traffic and is destined to fail. (Tella-Martins_113)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in Chapter 13, "Transportation," a detailed transportation analysis was conducted for the DEIS and updated for the FEIS. The analysis concludes that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to: a) vehicular traffic at 23 intersections, b) subway line haul conditions on southbound N/W trains in the AM peak hour, and c) pedestrian conditions at three sidewalks and two crosswalks. Potential mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce these impacts to the fullest extent practicable are also discussed in the EIS, in Chapter 20, "Mitigation." Typical traffic mitigation measures include modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing; elimination of on-street parking to add a travel lane; and modifications to lane striping. The widening of some crosswalks is also recommended to improve pedestrian flow and mitigation crosswalk impacts.

Comment 30: The project would exacerbate already congested traffic in the neighborhood. (Beck_007, Berson_012, Donaghy_029, Lehmann_033, Amodeo_046, Ahmed_063, Lucknauth_119, Mejia_185, Bregoli_200)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 13, "Transportation," a detailed traffic analysis was conducted for the DEIS and updated for the FEIS. The analysis concludes that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts to vehicular traffic at 23 intersections. Potential mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce these impacts to the fullest extent practicable are examined in the EIS. As discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation," typical traffic mitigation measures include modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing; elimination of on-street parking to add a travel lane; and modifications to lane striping.

Comment 31: Where are the impacts of the proposed project's population on transit (including the R, M, and E trains) during peak hours? (Fattore_001)

The project would bring 8,000 residents to the study area, resulting in an "unavoidable adverse impact" on transit, as noted in the EIS. (Fattore_005)

The project will overwhelm transit, especially the R and M subway lines/the Steinway subway stop. (Phelps_002, Whalen_197)

The project would strain already unreliable subway lines. (Beck_007, Berson_012)

The project would strain the transit system. (Smith_021, Levcovici_025, Lehmann_033, Erskenkal_035, Vazquez_066, Davenport_083, Buarotti_085, Owen_128, Ford_152, Bregoli_200, Silverman_216, Korth_259)

The subways cannot handle the thousands of people the project will generate. (Winthrop_125)

Response: The DEIS includes a detailed analysis of the Proposed Actions' potential effects to three subway stations in proximity to the Project Area where incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 200-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM commuter peak hours—the 36th Street and Steinway Street stations on the Queens Boulevard Line and the 36th Avenue station on the Astoria Line. Based on the analysis, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts at any of these stations in either peak period. The DEIS also includes a detailed analysis of line haul conditions on the four subway routes serving the Project Area—the M, N, R and W. This analysis, updated for the FEIS, determined that the Proposed Actions would potentially result in a significant impact to southbound N/W trains in the AM peak hour, and that this impact could be fully mitigated by the addition of one southbound N/W train during this period, which NYCT has indicated would be feasible. Due to operating constraints where the N/W trains share tracks with the R train, adding one train to AM peak N/W southbound service would mean subtracting one train from AM peak R southbound service, which would result in longer wait times and higher average ridership loads on the remaining R trains. Based on the analysis of bus line haul conditions in the EIS, the Proposed Actions

are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to local bus service in either the AM or PM commuter periods.

Comment 32: In the event of a subway problem, the City buses would not be able to accommodate additional riders. In the event of a transit strike or emergency, riders would have to walk over the 59th Street Bridge or carpool into Manhattan. (Phelps_002)

Response: Comment noted. Analysis of transit conditions and potential changes in operations during a transit strike or other emergency situation is beyond the scope of a CEQR transit analysis.

Comment 33: There is no Express Bus service into Manhattan. (Phelps_002)

Response: Comment noted. Implementation of express bus service into Manhattan is under the purview of the MTA and beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comment 34: The project would not result in any improvements to subways, buses, and/or traffic. (Millevoi_028, Herald_122)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation," potential improvement/mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce the Proposed Actions' significant impacts to traffic and transit conditions are examined in the EIS.

Comment 35: There would be a lack of parking associated with the project. It is already difficult to find on-street parking. (Bonneville_045, Vazquez_066, Lucknauth_119)

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in the DEIS, the Proposed Development would include 1,390 parking spaces in five below-grade parking garages, and it is estimated that a further 243 parking spaces would be developed in the Additional Affected Area. While the Proposed Actions may potentially contribute to, or result in, off-street and on-street parking shortfalls, any projected shortfall in parking capacity would not be considered significant based on *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation.

Comment 36: I am concerned about the rising deaths for pedestrians and cyclists in the neighborhood. The project will add many more cars to the roads without any additional safety provisions. (Brandes_129)

Response: Chapter 13 of the FEIS includes a detailed assessment of street user safety, including pedestrians and cyclists. As discussed in the FEIS, three Priority Corridors were identified within the traffic and pedestrian study areas—Northern Boulevard, 34th Avenue and Broadway—and a review of crash data identified two intersections along Northern Boulevard as high crash locations—Northern

Boulevard at 43rd Street/42nd Place and Northern Boulevard at 39th Street/Steinway Street. In recent years, substantial safety improvements have been implemented by DOT along all three of these corridors as part of the City's Vision Zero initiative.

AIR QUALITY

Comment 37: The project will result in CO pollution from additional vehicles. (Phelps_002)

Response: As described in the DEIS, a quantified assessment of emissions from traffic generated by the Proposed Actions was performed for CO. The analysis determined that maximum concentrations due to project-generated traffic at intersections were below National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and furthermore, the increases in CO concentrations were predicted to be below CEQR de minimis criteria. Overall, no significant adverse impact on Air Quality is predicted due to CO emissions from additional vehicles.

Comment 38: The project will hurt the quality of life with poor air quality. (Vazquez_066)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 14, "Air Quality," the air quality determined that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts due to the Proposed Actions from stationary or mobile sources of emissions. The mobile source analyses in the DEIS determined that, at the two intersection sites analyzed for $PM_{2.5}$, the maximum annual incremental $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is predicted to exceed the de minimis criteria. This would be considered a significant adverse air quality impact in the absence of traffic mitigation measures. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation was performed using a more comprehensive analysis procedures which determined that the identified impacts related to mobile source Annual $PM_{2.5}$ increments were avoided, without the need for mitigation measures.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Comment 39: How the project will affect climate change in the neighborhood in the next 10 to 20 years has not been studied enough. (Bieri_188)

Response: In accordance with the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential impact on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the effects of climate change was prepared, discussed in Chapter 15 of the DEIS, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change." The assessments finds that the Proposed Actions are consistent with the applicable citywide GHG emissions reduction and climate change goals, and that there would be no significant adverse GHG emission or climate change impacts. In particular, the Proposed Actions would support GHG goals by virtue of its density and location in an area well-served by public transportation, and through requirements to

utilize natural gas in new developments. Furthermore, for the Proposed Development, the Applicant intends to evaluate a number of certification programs and sustainable design features to be incorporated into the design and construction of each new development on the Development Sites (Projected Development Sites A through E) in order to improve energy efficiency and reduce GHG emissions, consistent with the City's emission reduction goals. This may include additional local renewable power production, e.g., geothermal, to achieve the efficient building goals.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Comment 40: The neighborhood is in a high HVI zone and asthma alley; our community's health outcomes are overwhelmingly negative. The project's effects on traffic and air quality would directly affect health problems. (Amindeneau_121, Herald_122)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 17 of the DEIS, "Public Health," the DEIS analysis presented in Chapter 14, "Air Quality," determined that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact at two intersection locations related to particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), and at one of the intersections, the maximum annual incremental $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would remain in exceedance of the *de minimis* criterion with the implementation of traffic mitigation measures. Between the Draft and Final EIS, additional review and evaluation was performed using a more comprehensive analysis procedure to determine the magnitude and extent of annual neighborhood-scale $PM_{2.5}$ impacts from mobile sources. The additional analysis determined that the identified impacts related to mobile source Annual $PM_{2.5}$ increments were avoided, without the need for mitigation measures. The updated analysis results are provided in Chapter 14 of the FEIS, "Air Quality." Therefore, based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* because the Proposed Actions would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts, it would not result in an impact to public health related to air quality.

Comment 41: Rates of depression, anxiety, and mental health issues will be sky high with the project. (Ahmed_159)

Response: Comment noted.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Comment 42: The project would change the culture and character of the neighborhood. (Beck_007, Donaghy_029, Whalen_056, Black_061, Reinhalter_069, Scanlon_072, DiManno_094, DiBona_104, Colon_106, Haines_123, Owen_128, Grossberg_199, Chaise_220, Rabinovitch_228, Forman_268)

Luxury residential buildings destroy the community, displacing longtime residents and small business that make Astoria special. (Mendez_008)

The proposed project is aesthetically and economically out of character for the community. (Berson_012)

The area is already a vibrant neighborhood; the proposed project would destroy the neighborhood and the community. (Benjamin_013)

The project would be detrimental to the community. (Kudic_020, Smith_021, Camp_180)

The project is not in keeping with what makes Astoria a great place to live. (Bonneville_045, Weilbacher_058)

The project would destroy the quality of life in Astoria. (Fattore_082, Chaise_220)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 18 of the DEIS, "Neighborhood Character," a preliminary neighborhood character analysis was performed in conformance with the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. Specifically, while the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts in areas that contribute to neighborhood character (open space, shadows, and transportation), these effects would not be of such a degree that they would result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. In addition, the Applicant believes that the Proposed Actions would activate the Development Site and Additional Affected Area and would introduce open space in the Project Area that would complement the existing Playground Thirty-Five XXXV and would offer amenities to a wide variety of users in the neighborhood, which the Applicant believes would likely have beneficial effects on a number of the defining features of the neighborhood.

CONSTRUCTION

Comment 43: Construction of the proposed project will require active, local businesses to relocate or shut down. (Donaghy_029)

Response: As discussed in DEIS Chapter 19, "Construction," construction under the Proposed Actions would not block access to any facilities in the area, affect the operations of any nearby businesses, or obstruct major thoroughfares used by customers or businesses.

Comment 44: A 10-year construction project is wrong for Queens and inappropriate anywhere in New York City. (Murray_036)

Years' long construction will exacerbate already bad traffic. (Lucknauth_119)

Response: DEIS Chapter 19, "Construction," includes a detailed analysis of the potential for construction-period impacts from the Proposed Actions. As is typical with most large construction projects, construction under the Proposed Actions would result in temporary disruptions in the surrounding area. However, the Applicant has committed to implementing a variety of measures (e.g., environmental performance measures and community safety measures) during construction to minimize impacts to the nearby community. Chapter 19, "Construction," determined that the Proposed Actions' construction activities would result in significant adverse traffic impacts. As described in Chapter 20, "Mitigation," these construction-period traffic impacts could be mitigated through implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including: modification of existing traffic signal phasing and/or timing; elimination of on-street parking to add a travel lane; and modifications to lane striping. These measures are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to final review and approval by DOT. The Applicant will enter into a Restrictive Declaration to codify these requirements.

Comment 45: The project would result in many years of construction noise and pollution. (DeBenedictis_112)

Response: DEIS Chapter 19, "Construction," includes a detailed analysis of the potential for construction-period noise impacts from the Proposed Actions which concluded that construction activities associated with the Proposed Actions have the potential to result in construction noise levels that exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* construction noise screening thresholds. To minimize the noise effects during construction, the Applicant would follow the construction noise control requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code and would commit to measures to control construction noise that go beyond those required by Code. The Applicant will enter into a Restrictive Declaration to codify these requirements.

Measures would be taken to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. In addition, contractors would be required under contract specifications to implement an emissions reduction program to minimize the air quality effects from construction Measures would include, to the extent practicable, dust suppression measures, use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel, idling restrictions, diesel equipment reduction, the utilization of newer equipment (i.e., equipment meeting the EPA's Tier 3 emission standard), and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions presented in DEIS Chapter 19, "Construction," determined that construction under the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts due to construction sources.

Comment 46: The project's 10-year construction duration will deteriorate the already poor air quality even more. (Ahmed_063, Ahmed_159)

Response: Measures would be taken to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. In addition, contractors would be required under contract specifications to implement an emissions reduction program to minimize the air quality effects from construction Measures would include, to the extent practicable, dust suppression measures, use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel, idling restrictions, diesel equipment reduction, the utilization of newer equipment (i.e., equipment meeting the EPA's Tier 3 emission standard), and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions presented in DEIS Chapter 19, "Construction," determined that construction under the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts due to construction sources.

MITIGATION

Comment 47: The developers should be required to contribute to the additional cost of transportation demand. (Fattore_001)

Response: Comment noted. The applicant would be responsible for all costs associated with any proposed traffic and pedestrian improvement/mitigation measures identified in Chapter 20, "Mitigation," in the FEIS, and will enter into a Restrictive Declaration to codify these requirements.

ALTERNATIVES

Comment 48: The developers have consistently ignored repeated requests for alternatives to the proposed project. The modified project still ignores the request for only R6A, R7D, and R8X zoning. (Fattore_005)

Response: The modified zoning recommended by the commenter would result in a significant reduction in density that would not support the Proposed Actions' goals, therefore, it has not be considered as an alternative in the EIS. In particular, the reduced residential density would not support the Applicant's goals to provide housing, including a substantial amount of affordable housing. While the reduced density under this alternative zoning may result in reduced significant adverse impacts as compared to the Proposed Actions, it would not be expected to avoid all of the significant adverse impacts discussed in the EIS (see the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impact Alternative discussed in Chapter 21, "Alternatives").

Comment 49: Could the taller structures be lowered and moved closer to Northern Boulevard, to reduce the effect of shadows on the low rise residential buildings north of 35th

Avenue? If the buildings are lower, the footprint may result in the loss of open space, so this should be assessed. (Khuzami_OANA_253)

Response: Following the publication of the DEIS, in response to issues raised during the public review process by Community Board 1 (CB1), the Queens Borough President, and the CPC Commissioners concerning the Proposed Development's massing and scale along the northern side of the Development Site, an alternative to the Proposed Actions was developed which considers a modification to the Proposed Development's proposed building massing, which includes reductions of building heights along 35th Avenue and shifting of floor area to buildings on other portions of the Development Site. This alternative and its potential significant adverse impacts are assessed under the Proposed Modified Application Alternative in Chapter 21 of the FEIS, "Alternatives." The assessment determined that the Proposed Modified Application 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.

MISCELLANEOUS

Comment 50: I was unaware of the town hall meeting; there is lack of transparency in the process. Where is the report on the actual impact of the project? (Fattore_001, Fattore_005)

The Notice of Public Hearing is the first I have heard of the Innovation Queens project. (Phelps_002)

The developers have routinely failed to give adequate notice to Astorians about the Town Hall meetings. (Whalen_197)

The project did not include proper outreach to the community; the developers have not talked to residents or small business owners about the project or their impending displacement, or offered compensation to move. (Millevoi_019, Fernandez_038, Tiseo_043, Greenhouse_051, Scarr_071, Trott_075, Farraj_100, Hantzopoulos_101, Herald_122, Levin_207)

There has been a lack of engagement with the residents of this community. (Wooldridge_109, Mohammed_218)

The developers did not reach out to me/us about a luxury project. (Begum_090, Hoque_091, Begum_092, Islam_138, Akter_139, Mohammad_140, Khatun_141, Mahin_143, Ahad_146, Mira_148, Amin_156, Ahmed_159, Amin_286, Yasmin_237)

It enrages me that the developers have been spreading lies, claiming there is no community here. (Aachol_151)

People cannot attend public hearings at 10AM because most people are working then. (Onadi_227)

Response: The DEIS was prepared to evaluate the potential significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Actions in conformance with all applicable laws and regulations and following the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The DEIS was available for public review and comment. All public noticing for the public review of the Proposed Actions has been performed in accordance with the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) and CEQR. A public hearing was held on the DEIS in conjunction with the CPC hearing on the land use applications, on August 10, 2022, to afford all interested parties the opportunity to submit oral and written comments. For those who were unable to attend the public hearing, written comments on the DEIS were accepted, and the record remained open for 10 days after the public hearing to allow additional written comments on the DEIS. In addition, the Applicant has performed extensive outreach to the local community, beginning with the project planning stages and continuing through the ULURP and CEQR reviews.

Comment 51: The environmental effects of the project on the neighborhood in the next 10 to 20 years has not been studied enough. (Bieri_188)

Response: Comment noted. The DEIS presents a comprehensive analysis of the Proposed Actions' potential significant adverse impacts following the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual* and assumes that development within the Project Area, including new development in the Additional Affected Area, would occur over a 10-year period by 2032.

Comment 52: There is a lack of a plan to create well-paying, long-term union jobs. (Fattore_005)

The developers' commitment to hire union workers is dubious at best. (Bassi_041)

The developers have made no commitment to union labor or living wages. (Trott_075)

The agreement to hiring "local" workers fundamentally shifts who is considered "local." (Hartley_132)

The developers have been unresponsive to community concerns and have exploited union workers to come out and intimidate community members. It is clear the developers are concerned only with profits, and not the community. (Valentine_127)

The developers should make a commitment to using only union labor for development of the project. (Imbro_178)

Response: Comment noted. The use of union labor are not environmental considerations within the scope of CEQR.

Comment 53: Don't bring more new residents here when so many are already struggling. Use the money to hire social workers and advocates to lobby the City to streamline the housing voucher process. (Turner_006)

The project should not go forward, and the money should be invested into existing businesses and local endeavors. (Tella-Martins_113)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 54: The project would result in many positives that would benefit the neighborhood: thousands of jobs would be created during and after the construction phase; this area of Astoria is in desperate need of revitalization—the adjoining Steinway and 36th Avenue business districts would benefit from an influx of people shopping and dining in their small businesses; demand for housing is outpacing grown, and while we need deeply affordable housing, we also need low income, moderate, and middle income housing in order to create a diverse, mixed-income community; we need senior accessible housing; more than 700 permanently affordable housing units are better than none. However, the developers must do better by listening and adhering to requests from the community, especially reducing the height of the towers along 35th Avenue and Steinway Street; providing more units (30 percent) at deeper affordability, with an addition 5 percent permanently affordable senior units; and reduce the proposed parking to the bare minimum required and reallocate those savings to deeper affordability units. (Torniali_145)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 55: 25 percent affordable housing is fair. If the project is not approved, you won't get 700 affordable apartments. (Kolenovic_224)

Response: Comment noted.

RACIAL EQUITY REPORT

Comment 56: The racial impact report is disingenuous. (Hartley_132)

Racial and economic displacement resulting from the proposed project must be taken into account. (Dubnau_246)

Response: In accordance with the ULURP review of the Proposed Actions, a Racial Equity Report (RER) was prepared which includes all required information as required by Local Law 78 of 2021.

GENERAL OPPOSITION

Comment 57: I oppose this project. (Fattore_001, Phelps_002, Bassi_003, Est_004, Fattore_005, Beck _007, Mendez_008, Jimenez_009, Fitzgerald_011, Berson_012, Benjamin_013, Kearse_015, Irish_017, Johansen_018, Millevoi_019, Kudic_020, Smith_021, Satterlee_022, Murtha_023, Flavin_024, Levcovici_025, Millevoi_028, Donaghy_029, Mulligan_030, Fisher_031, Lehmann_033, Golby_034, Ersekal_035, Murray_036, Walsh_037, Fernandez_038, Karell_039, Clark_040, Bassi_041, Farhi_042, Tiseo_043, McNamara_044, Bonneville_045, Amodeo_046, Werner_047, Nellis_048, Watson_049, Sorensen-Blaney_050, Greenhouse_051, Flibbert_052, Denninger_053, Antopol_054, Whalen_056, Saxena_057, Weilbacher_058, Treitler_059, Vasquez_060, Black_061, Angelini_062, Ahmed_063, Schneider_064, Mercado_065, Vazquez_066, Benicewicz_068, Reinhalter_069, Figueroa_070, Scarr_071, Scanlon_072, Hanlon_073, Moudj_074, Trott_075, Smith_076, DeJesus_GPNY_078, Lengle_079, Kolbo_080, Padro_081, Fattore_082, Davenport_083, Guttierez_084, Buarotti_085, Asseman_086, Marquez_087, Karakaya_088, Leonard_089, Begum_090, Hoque_091, Begum_092, Ramirez_093, DiManno_094, Kenny_095, Soto_098, Abdus_099, Farraj_100, Hantzopoulos_101, MacDonald_103, DiBona_104, Matta_105, Colon_106, Tsopanidis_107, Grossman_108, Wooldridge_109, Schwietert_IFT_110, Gregorio_111, DeBenedictis_112, Tella-Martins_113, Osorio_115, Bratspies_CUER_116, Dubnau_118, Lucknauth_119, Baker_120, Amindeneau_121, Herald_122, Haines_123, Alejandro_124, Winthrop_125, Owen_128, Brandes_129, Theodorou_130, Fernandez_131, Hartley_132, Khan_135, Khan_136, Sultana_137, Islam_138, Akter_139, Mohammad_140, Khatum_141, Zuhauzzaman_142, Mahin_143, Begum_144, Ahad_146, Begum_147, Mira_148, Ahmed_149, Zamarelli_150, Aachol_151, Ford_152, Ridika_153, Ribin_154, Akter_155, Amin_156, Delwar_157, Yasmin_158, Ahmed_159, Young_160, Yost_161, Karrell_162 , Frazier_163, Kebir_164, Siringo_165, Adams_166, Leonardi_167, VanCura_168, Preston_MFU_169, Wakelin_170, Donohue_171, Alilionis_172, Quintana_173, Kehoe_174, Hennessy_175, Kenney_176, Valencia_177, Imbro_178, Wood_179, Camp_180, Fein_181, Ramirez_182, Levy_183, Lim_184, Mejia_185, Elghazoly_186, Borowski_187, Bieri_188, Runne_189, Lehman_190, McHugh_191, Cummings_192, O'Hanlon_193, Baum_194, Casimiro_195, Lyrist_196, Whalen_197, Gallagher_198, Grossberg_199, Bregoli_200, Bowser_201, Straker_202, Limm_203, Jung_204, Stathis_205, Heisler_206, Levin_207, Werner_208, Monahan_209, Jones_210, Wong_211, Jones_212, Sailors_213, Rastopchin_214, Fox_215, Silverman_216, Zanon_217, Mohammed_218, Chaise_220, Picallo_226, Onadi_227, Rabinovitch_228, Begum_236, Amin_286, Yasmin_237, Delwar_238, Maryam_240, Dubnau_246, Diaz_256, White_257, Korth_259, Alston_281, Akhtar_CAAAV_285, Akter_287, Ridika_288)

Response: Comment noted.

GENERAL SUPPORT

Comment 58: I support this project. (Restrepo_010, Schafer_014, Bader_016, Parra_077, Miller_ABNY_102, Benaim_MS_114, Cano_UU_117, Khuzami_OANA_133, Hau_134, George_221, Miller_222, Soukup_223, Stematiadis_232, Goodman_MotMI_233, Yu_LICPAfe_234, Miller_235, Seyedadhmadian_241, Leavitt_HANAC_242, Davis_TFH_245, Hanway_JARNS_254, Akhtar_255, DiStefano_262, Cano_UU_263, Meletiadis_265, Pickett_269, Contreras_271, Mason_CCA_272, Clark_CoHI_273, Moscovic_276, Scissura_NYBC_278, Haynes_QH_279, Jorge__IW_280, Lomax_282, Foley_GaF_283, Salinovic_32BJ_284)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 59: Local business owners need new people in the area. The project will create more jobs and public space, encouraging people to spend money locally, where they live and work. The project will boost the economy while making it an even more desirable neighborhood. (Restrepo_010, Bader_016)

The project will increase employment exponentially, creating well paying middle class union jobs with family sustaining wages. The project will support local businesses that are vitally important to the economic sustainability of the neighborhood. (Miller_ABNY_102, Lomax_282)

The project will benefit residents of the community by providing many needed amenities and services such as open space, access to the Floating Hospital, arts, and over 700 affordable units, and will benefit the surrounding businesses by generating annual spending for the local economy. (Benaim_MS_114, Davis_TFH_245)

The project presents an opportunity for affordable and senior housing, below market rate space for nonprofit organizations, and thousands of jobs, including a commitment to prioritize the contracting of minority, women, and locally owned business enterprises. (Cano_UU_117, Soukup_223, Cano_UU_263)

The project would: provide a significant number of affordable units for low and moderate income residents, including seniors; offer a significant amount of open green, recreation, and public space in an area where it is sorely needed; bring hundreds of living wage sustainable jobs, many of them union; and allows non-profit and community based organizations to expand operations and provide services to the community. (Hanway_JARNS_254)

The project would create much needed affordable housing, jobs, and/or support and opportunities for community facilities. (Yu_LICPAfe_234, Pickett_269, Mason_CCA_272, Clark_CoHI_273)

The project will bring new jobs and improved quality of life to the neighborhood. (Stematiadis_232)

The project will create over 3,700 construction jobs and 1,700 permanent jobs, including well-paying union jobs. It will also bring in a wide variety of community services and amenities and over 700 units of permanently affordable housing. (Scissura_NYBC_278)

The project will generate taxes that will support the City and bring about the vitality that will support area businesses as we recover from the pandemic. (Hau_134)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 60: This is a great location for a high-density project. New residential units will relieve pressure on existing housing stock and slow down the increase in housing costs. (Schafer_014)

More residential inventory is needed so that prices don't get artificially inflated. (Parra_077)

The project will produce much-needed affordable housing, including 700 permanently affordable units at a wide range of affordability levels, addressing housing instability concerns that have impacted New Yorkers and many area residents for decades. (Miller_ABNY_102, George_221)

We should welcome over 700 permanently affordable housing units. (Hau_134, Miller_222)

I support this project because adding 700 plus permanently affordable apartments will make a difference in the lives of 700 families who call Astoria home. (Haynes_QH_279)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 61: Kaufman Astoria Studios has had a long-standing relationship with neighbors and businesses. They are committed to the growth of this community. (Bader_016, Benaim_MS_114, Stematiadis_232)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 62: The project would enhance quality of life in the development area, with two acres of new, publicly accessible open space and areas for community services and amenities for neighborhood residents, including a Community Innovation Hub for nonprofits to expand services to Astoria. (Miller_ABNY_102, George_221)

Response: Comment noted.