A. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

The applicant Durst Development L.L.C. proposes a rezoning of a portion of the block bounded by West 57th and West 58th Streets, between Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues (Block 1105, the project block) in Manhattan, along with special permits, modifications to existing special permits and a Restrictive Declaration and other related land use actions, to facilitate the development of approximately 965,000 zoning square feet (zsf) (approximately 1.1 million gross square feet [gsf]) of residential, commercial, community facility, and parking uses on the project block (Block 1105) (see **Figure S-1**). The eastern portion of the block is currently developed with a residential building with ground floor retail and parking uses (The Helena) and a building with mini-storage uses. The entire block was the subject of a previous Environmental Impact Statement and Land Use Approval in 2001 (*West 57th Street Rezoning Final Environmental Impact Statement* [2001 *FEIS*], City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) No. 00DCP041M and ULURP Nos. 000148ZMM, 010149ZSM, 010150ZSM, 010151ZSM, and 010152ZSM). The project block is located in Manhattan Community District 4.

The proposed actions are being requested to facilitate the applicant's proposed project, in which it intends to build approximately 1.1 million gsf on the project block, including residential, retail, community facility, office, and parking uses. The proposed actions would result in the construction of a new building on the western and midblock portions of the project block (Lots 1, 5, 14, 19, p/o 36, and 43, collectively, projected development site 1), a one to two story midblock community facility building (also located on projected development site 1, p/o lot 36), the renovation and conversion of the mini-storage facility to residential, retail, and community facility use (p/o Lot 36, projected development site 2), and the creation of new retail space in the existing Helena apartment building. For analysis purposes, it is anticipated that the proposed project, including both projected development site 1 and projected development site 2, would be complete by 2015.

Development of the proposed project requires approvals from the CPC for the following discretionary actions:

- Rezoning of a portion of the project block from M1-5 to C6-2. The C6-2 district has a floor-area ratio (FAR) of 6.0 for all uses except community facility uses, which is a 6.5 FAR. This change would provide an adjusted FAR across the entire zoning lot of 8.63 with the 6.0 FAR and a maximum 8.8 FAR with the additional community facility FAR (given the maximum 10.0 FAR within the existing C4-7 district) (see **Figure S-2**);
- Special permit pursuant to Section 74-743 of the New York City Zoning Resolution to allow, in a large-scale development, (1) floor area to be distributed across the entire zoning lot, (2) buildings to be located without regard for distance between building regulations, and (3) to permit the location of buildings without regard to height and setback regulations;
- Special permit pursuant to Section 13-561 of the New York City Zoning Resolution for a 285 space accessory parking garage;



625 WEST 57TH STREET

Project Location

Figure S-1

7.9.12



Projected Development Site 1
Projected Development Site 2
Project Block
400-Foot Perimeter
Zoning District Boundary
Clinton Special Purpose District

0 200 400 FEET
SCALE

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Proposed Zoning
Figure S-2

- Modification of the Large Scale General Development site plan associated with the existing special permits (Amendment to ULURP No. C010151 ZSM); and
- Modification of the existing Restrictive Declaration (~~Amendment to~~ Modification and termination of Restrictive Declaration No. D-145 associated with ULURP No. C010148 ZMM).

The applicant is applying to the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) for discretionary actions that would allow construction of the proposed development on the project block, which is different from what was analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*. Because the development resulting from the proposed modifications may result in significant adverse environmental impacts not identified in the 2001 *FEIS*, this ~~Draft~~ Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been prepared. The ~~Draft~~ Final SEIS ~~(DSEIS)~~ (FSEIS) assesses whether any changed background conditions and whether the differences in program elements between the proposed development program and those assessed in the 2001 *FEIS* for the project block would result in any significant adverse impacts that were not adequately addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

The proposed discretionary actions from the CPC are subject to environmental review. This ~~DSEIS~~ FSEIS has been prepared in accordance with Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and CEQR Rules and Procedures adopted in 1991 (62 Rules of the City of New York, Chapter 5). The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* will generally be used as a guide with respect to environmental analysis methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the proposed project, unless otherwise stated. In addition, since the DSEIS was certified, the applicant has proposed revisions to the proposed project to reflect changes to the project as the design was refined and to respond to community concerns, and has continued to work on refinements to the proposed project with Community Board 4 (CB4), the Manhattan Borough President, and the Department of City Planning to respond to comments voiced at the scoping hearing, various CB4 meetings, and the DSEIS public hearing. The proposed applicant revisions and proposed modifications (together, the "modified project") are described below in "Modifications to the Proposed Project."

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT BLOCK

2001 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVALS

In 2001, the project block was the subject of a rezoning from an M2-3 zoning district to a C4-7 district within 125 feet of the avenues and in the midblock along West 57th Street (to a depth of approximately 100 feet), and to an M1-5 zoning district in the midblock facing West 58th Street. The proposed actions analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS* also included a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-743(a)(3) for the modification of height and setback regulations, a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-744(b) to allow residential uses located on the same level or below commercial uses, and two special permits pursuant to ZR Sections 74-52 and 13-562 for one 239-space above grade public parking garage on the western portion of the block, and for one 399-space below grade public parking garage on the eastern and midblock portions of the block. **Figure S-3** shows the site plan of the previously approved project. A Restrictive Declaration placed on the site in connection with the prior approvals requires that if the project block is developed in whole or part in accordance with the 2001 large scale permits, the block must be developed substantially in accordance with the special permit approved plans. The Helena building was constructed utilizing the special permits, and accordingly the remainder of the



Site Plan / Roof Plan Scheme A (Office - Office)

1"=40'



Partial Site Plan / Roof Plan @ 11th Avenue - Scheme B (Commercial - Residential)

1"=40'

NOTE: This site plan has been constructed

Previously Approved Project-Site Plan
Figure S-3

block is required to comply with the approved plans. Those plans specifically limit residential development to up to 520,800 zsf on the Eleventh Avenue portion of the site, and assumed a maximum of 600 dwelling units (The Helena has 597 dwelling units and approximately 519,860 zsf). The approved plans further limit the remainder of the block to non-residential uses and specifically limit certain retail uses (Use Groups 6A, 6C, and 10A, except radio and television studios) an aggregate of no more than 125,000 zsf, including no more than 78,000 zsf of Use Group 10A retail uses. The plans also include, among other things, maximum envelopes for buildings on the site, setback requirements from each of the streets, and other bulk limitations. The actions were approved by the City Council in April 2001.

The previously approved office-residential scenario presented in the 2001 *FEIS* included up to 1,574,250 gsf of development, which comprised approximately 511,500 gross square feet of office use in a building on the western portion of the project block; 270,000 gross square feet of light manufacturing uses in the midblock; 536,450 gsf of residential use in a building on the eastern portion of the block (600 residential units); and the remainder in retail, storage, and other uses, as well as a total of 638 public parking spaces.

The 2001 *FEIS* identified potentially significant impacts on hazardous materials, traffic, and noise. Mitigation measures included:

- Hazardous Materials: In order to avoid any adverse effects on the project block, a Remedial Action Plan was to be submitted to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), groundwater monitoring under the project block would be conducted, a dewatering system would be implemented if necessary, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) would be abated before the start of demolition of any structure containing asbestos, and any ACMs, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and lead based paint encountered during demolition would be removed/disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations. (In addition, since the 2001 *FEIS*, all buildings on the western and midblock portions of the project block have been demolished, site investigation has been completed in coordination with DEC, and cleanup is underway in coordination with DEC. See Chapter 9, "Hazardous Materials," for additional information.)
- Traffic and Transportation: The 2001 *FEIS* analyzed the effects of the office-residential scenario on traffic and transportation, and identified measures designed to reduce potential impacts to traffic and transportation including (a) facilitating access/egress to the future expanded Route 9A; (b) creating a two-way service drive to reduce conflicts on West 57th Street and enhance circulation; (c) eliminating curb cuts from the key frontages of Eleventh Avenue, Twelfth Avenue, and West 57th Street; and (d) widening West 58th Street adjacent to the site to accommodate two-way traffic and all of the project's service needs. Mitigation measures consisted of parking regulation and lane configuration changes at two intersections, and signal timing changes at five intersections. All measures were subject to review and approval by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) prior to implementation.
- Noise: In order to preclude the potential for significant adverse noise impacts, the 2001 *FEIS* identified a closed window condition with a minimum of 35 dB(A) window/wall attenuation to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A) for residential uses. An (E) designation was placed on the site to reflect this requirement.

The project block is currently zoned C4-7 and M1-5, within the Special Clinton District (see **Figure S-4**).

7.9.12



0 200 400 FEET

SCALE

Project Block

Zoning District Boundary

Clinton Special Purpose District

Existing Zoning

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-4

DEVELOPMENT SINCE 2001

In 2004, the applicant requested a modification of the existing special permits to allow an additional curb cut on West 57th Street for access to the 100-space accessory parking garage in The Helena. The modification was approved and the Restrictive Declaration covering the site was modified to reflect the changes to the approved plans.

The Helena, a 38-story, 597-unit residential apartment building with approximately 12,000 square feet of ground floor retail and 100 accessory parking spaces was completed in 2004 pursuant to the 2001 approvals as modified in 2004, and fully occupies the southeastern corner of the block. The 2001 *FEIS* assumed that the new residential development along Eleventh Avenue would include Lot 36 on the northeastern corner of the project block. However, this lot was not included in the development of The Helena; instead, Manhattan Mini-Storage currently occupies a 98,500 square foot, 6-story building with an approximately 20 space accessory parking area on this lot. The buildings on the mid and western portions of the project block were demolished subsequent to the 2001 *FEIS* and the lots are now vacant.

In 2008, an application was submitted to the New York City Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) for a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 73-19 to permit the development of a 1,750 seat school (Use Group 3) for grades Pre-K through 12 on a site partially within an M1-5 zoning district. The special permit was approved, but the project is not being pursued.

In 2010, the applicant demolished the building on the western portion of the block and filed an application for a building permit with the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) for a new building on the mid- and western portions of the block pursuant to the existing zoning and approvals for the site. Under this application, the mid- and western portions of the block would be developed with approximately 331,300 gsf of office use; 67,500 gsf of retail uses; and 538 public parking spaces. Subsequent to that filing, the applicant determined it would not construct new below-grade parking at the site, and amended the application to include only the 239-car above grade public garage permitted under the existing special permits. As discussed below, absent the proposed project this new building would be completed in the future without the proposed project.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed actions are being requested to facilitate the applicant's proposed project, in which it intends to build approximately 1.1 million gsf on the project block consisting of approximately 850,000 gsf of residential space (up to 863 residential rental units, of which the applicant intends to provide ~~including~~ up to 151 affordable units, or 20 percent of the units on projected development site 1); approximately 80,000 gsf of commercial office; 62,000 gsf of retail; 28,000 gsf of community facility space; and 285 additional accessory parking spaces (see **Table S-1**). As discussed below, the proposed actions would result in the construction of a new building on the western and midblock portions of the project block (Lots 1, 5, 14, 19, p/o 36, and 43, collectively, projected development site 1), a one to two story midblock community facility building (also located on projected development site 1), the renovation and conversion of the mini-storage facility to residential, retail, and community facility use (p/o Lot 36, projected development site 2), and the creation of new retail space in the existing Helena apartment building (see **Figure S-5**). For analysis purposes, it is anticipated that the proposed project, including both projected development site 1 and projected development site 2, would be complete by 2015.



Projected Development Site 1 Boundary

Project Block Boundary

Projected Development Site 2 Boundary

0 100 200 FEET

SCALE

Project Block Aerial Photo

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-5

Table S-1
Proposed Project Development Program

Project Components	Projected Development Site 1 (GSF)	Projected Development Site 2 (GSF)	Total GSF	Proposed Zoning Floor Area	Approx. Proposed FAR
Residential[1]	760,000	90,000	**850,000**	810,000	**5.0**
Total Residential Units	*753*	*110*	***863***	*NA*	***NA***
Affordable Residential Units	*151*[2]	*0*	***151***	*NA*	***NA***
Commercial Office (Flexible Use Space)[3]	80,000	0	**80,000**	75,500	**0.5**
Retail	55,000	5,000	**62,000**[4]	52,000	**0.3**
Community Facility	13,000[5]	15,000	**28,000**	27,600	**0.2**
Above-Grade Parking	50,000	0	**50,000**	0	**0.0**
Accessory Parking Spaces[6]	*285*	*0*	***285***	*NA*	***NA***
Mechanical and Loading	50,000	0	**50,000**	0	**0.0**
Total GSF	**--**	**--**	**1,120,000**	**965,100**[7]	**6.0**[7]

Note: GSF = gross square feet
[1] The residential GSF includes residential amenity, lobby, and storage space.
[2] It is expected that 20 percent or up to 151 units on projected development site 1 would be affordable.
[3] The commercial office GSF may be allocated as commercial space, residential space, amenity space, or community facility space. To provide for a conservative analysis, it is analyzed as office space. If it were allocated to residential space it would not affect the overall number of units in the proposed project.
[4] The total retail GSF includes approximately 2,000 gsf of new retail that would be created by relocating and converting the existing Helena garage entrance on West 57th Street.
[5] The community facility use on projected development site 1 would be located in the midblock community facility building.
[6] The proposed project would include a new 285-space accessory parking garage. The existing 100-space accessory parking garage under The Helena would be retained.
[7] The total proposed zoning floor area and FAR presented in this table includes floor area that may be allocated as commercial space, residential space, amenity space, or community facility space as both residential floor area and office floor area.
Source: Durst Development L.L.C.; SLCE Architects, LLP

PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT SITE 1

Projected development site 1 would be developed with two buildings—a mixed-use building and a midblock community facility use building—containing residential, office, retail, community facility, and parking uses (see **Figures S-6a, S-6b, S-7a, S-7b, and S-8**). The mixed-use building would occupy the majority of projected development site 1 (Lots 1, 5, 14, 19, and 43) and would contain approximately 760,000 gsf of residential space; approximately 80,000 gsf of commercial office; and 55,000 gsf of retail. The midblock community facility use building would be located on a portion of Lot 36 adjacent to projected development site 2. It is currently expected that the community facility space would be occupied by medical office uses. Projected development site 1 would include up to 753 residential rental units. The ~~proposed development program~~ applicant intends to include~~s~~ a set-aside of 20 percent of the residential units on projected development site 1 (or up to 151 units) as affordable housing units for a period of 35 years following completion of construction, with affordable housing defined as dwelling units affordable to families or individuals whose incomes at the time of initial occupancy do not exceed the applicable percentage of median income and family size thresholds. The applicant will seek to participate in both the New York State Housing Finance Agency's (HFA) "80/20" Housing Program, in which the applicant would receive tax-exempt financing, as well as the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development's 421-a Affordable Housing Program, as applied to a rental building with affordable units in which the applicant would receive property tax exemptions, in exchange for the reservation of 20 percent of the rental units on projected development site 1 as affordable housing. Even without these programs, the overall number of units on projected development site 1 would not change. However, this SEIS analyzes the provision of affordable housing to provide for a conservative environmental analysis.

12.4.12



Projected Development Site 1 Boundary

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Projected Development Site 1-Illustrative Ground Floor Plan

Figure S-6a



Projected Development Site 1

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Projected Development Site 1-Mezzanine Plan

Figure S-6b



FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES

Projected Development Site 1
North Elevation

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-7a



FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES

Project Development Site 1
South Elevation

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-7b



3 NORTH / SOUTH SECTION
SCALE: 1"=25'



4 NORTH / SOUTH SECTION
SCALE: 1"=25'

TOWER ENCROACHMENT CALCULATIONS (PURSUANT TO 33-45)

FACADE	PERMITTED	EXISTING/ PROPOSED	EXCESS AREA BEYOND PERMITTED
12th Avenue (Wide)	1,600 sf within 40'	0 sf (existing (B) (C)) + 0 sf (prop. (A)) = 0 sf Total within 40'	0 sf
W 58th Street (Narrow)	1,875 sf within 50'	0 sf (existing (C)) + 26,022 sf (prop. (A) (B)) = 26,022 sf Total within 50'	24,147 sf
W 57th Street (Wide)	1,600 sf within 40'	3,527 sf (existing (C)) + 98 sf (prop. (A)) = 3,625 sf Total within 40'	2,025 sf
11th Avenue (Wide)	1,600 sf within 40'	3,995 sf (existing (C)) + 2,417 sf(prop. (B)) = 6,412 sf Total within 40'	4,812 sf

LEGEND

- TOWER REGULATION AGGREGATE SQ. FT. NON-COMPLIANCE WAIVER PURSUANT TO ZONING RESOLUTION 74-743 (a)(2)
- TOWER REGULATION INITIAL SETBACK ABOVE DATUM EL. +103.50' NON COMPLIANCE WAIVER PURSUANT TO ZONING RESOLUTION 74-743 (a)(2)
- HEIGHT & SETBACK REGULATION NON-COMPLIANCE WAIVER PURSUANT TO ZONING RESOLUTION 74-743 (a)(2)

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE ABOVE MANHATTAN DATUM ELEV. 0.0'
2. AREA OF ENCROACHMENT NUMBERS REFLECT MAXIMUM ENCROACHMENT WITHIN THE TOWER ENVELOPE.
3. BUILDINGS TO OCCUPY NO MORE THAN 40% OF ZONING LOT WITHIN TOWER ENVELOPES, ABOVE MANHATTAN DATUM ELEV. +103.50'. (SEE Z-007 FOR CALCULATIONS)
4. PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS MAY EXCEED THE BULK ENVELOPE.



Projected Development Site 1-Section
Figure S-8

The proposed project would also include 285 accessory parking spaces above grade on projected development site 1, in addition to the 100 accessory spaces currently in The Helena on the project block, resulting in a total of 385 accessory parking spaces on the project block. (As described above in "History of the Project Block," the 2001 approvals included special permits for a 239-space above grade public parking garage on the western portion of the block, and for a 399-space below grade public parking garage on the eastern and midblock portions of the block.) The Helena parking garage would be accessed from a midblock access drive that would extend between West 57th and West 58th Streets.

The proposed project on projected development site 1 would rise to an elevation of approximately 470 feet, or 35 stories. For the purposes of presenting a reasonable worst-case analysis, ~~this~~ the DSEIS ~~analyzes~~ analyzed a building design that included a closed condition on the top 77 feet of the building. However, between the DSEIS and the FSEIS, ~~the proposed design may be modified on the top 77 feet of the building to have an open design with structural elements on all sides~~ additional wind tunnel testing of three possible building configurations was conducted, including the design analyzed in the DSEIS. The three possible configurations varied only in the design of the top 77 feet portion of the building. Subsequently, the configuration which would have on the top 77 feet portion of the building an open design with structural elements on the south façade, and louvers on the north and east façades (referred to as "Option A" in Chapter 11, "Air Quality") was selected as the design for the proposed project. **Figure S-9** shows a detailed view of the top section of projected development site 1 with the Option A design. The building would approximate a hexahedron shape around an interior courtyard, with the lowest portions along Twelfth Avenue and West 57th Street. The building would slope up toward the northeast, with the tallest point at the northeast corner. The midblock community facility use building would be one to two stories.

PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT SITE 2

In order to present a conservative analysis, it is assumed that the proposed actions would also facilitate conversion of the mini-storage facility; specifically, this would include demolition of the existing core, addition of three floors at the top of the existing building, renovation of the interior, and conversion to a mixed use building with ground floor retail, community facility, and residential above. For analysis purposes it is assumed that the building on the mini-storage site (p/o Lot 36, projected development site 2) would be converted to up to 110 residential rental units (approximately 90,000 gsf residential), 15,000 gsf community facility use, and approximately 5,000 gsf of ground-floor retail. In the future with the proposed project, projected development site 2 would rise to an elevation of approximately 135 feet, or 9 stories. **Figures S-~~9~~10 and S-11~~10~~** show the illustrative ground-floor plan and building section for projected development site 2.

THE HELENA

As part of the proposed project, the existing entrance to The Helena garage on West 57th Street would be relocated to the midblock access drive that would extend between West 57th and West 58th Streets and converted to approximately 2,000 gsf of new retail space.

PROPOSED ACTIONS

Development of the proposed project requires approvals from the CPC for the following discretionary actions:



Projected Development Site 1 Building Top
Figure S-9

11.30.12



Projected Development Site 2
Building Section

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-10

11.30.12



Projected Development Site 2

Projected Development Site 2
Illustrative Ground-Floor Plan

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-11

- Rezoning of a portion of the project block from M1-5 to C6-2. The C6-2 district has a floor-area ratio (FAR) of 6.0 for all uses except community facility uses, which is a 6.5 FAR. This change would provide an adjusted FAR across the entire zoning lot of 8.63 with the 6.0 FAR and a maximum 8.8 FAR with the additional community facility FAR (given the maximum 10.0 FAR within the existing C4-7 district) (see **Figure S-2**);
- Special permit pursuant to Section 74-743 of the New York City Zoning Resolution to allow, in a large-scale development, (1) floor area to be distributed across the entire zoning lot, (2) buildings to be located without regard for distance between building regulations, and (3) to permit the location of buildings without regard to height and setback regulations;
- Special permit pursuant to Section 13-561 of the New York City Zoning Resolution for a 285 space accessory parking garage;
- Modification of the Large Scale General Development site plan associated with the existing special permits (Amendment to ULURP No. C010151 ZSM); and
- Modification of the existing Restrictive Declaration (~~Amendment to~~ Modification and termination of Restrictive Declaration No. D-145 associated with ULURP No. C010148 ZMM).

The Restrictive Declaration currently encumbering the project block provides that the project site shall be developed in substantial conformity with the plans approved in connection with the 2001 large-scale permits as modified in 2004. As mentioned above, those plans specifically limit residential uses on the block to 520,800 zsf and further limit certain retail uses (use groups 6A, 6C and 10A, except radio or television studios) an aggregate of no more than 125,000 zsf, including no more than 78,000 zsf of Use Group 10A retail uses. As noted above, the eastern portion of the project block currently contains The Helena (the Eleventh Avenue tower in the 2001 *FEIS*). The Helena contains approximately 519,860 zsf of floor area and 597 residential units, which nearly maximizes the allowable residential use under the existing special permit and Restrictive Declaration. Therefore, the Restrictive Declaration and special permit would need to be modified to permit any additional residential uses on the zoning lot. The plans approved in 2001, as modified, also include, among other things, maximum envelopes for buildings on the project site, setback requirements from each of the streets, a through-block driveway near the western portion of the block, and other bulk limitations. Thus, modification of the Restrictive Declaration and special permit is also necessary for the proposed massing of the new buildings on the project site.

In connection with the proposed project, a Restrictive Declaration will be recorded at the time all land use related actions described above are approved. The Restrictive Declaration would, among other things:

- Require development in substantial accordance with the approved plans.
- Restrict as-of-right development in the event the special permit is not utilized.
- Provide for the implementation of "Project Components Related to the Environment"(i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of environmental impacts in the EIS), substantially consistent with the EIS.

The proposed actions listed above would increase the total permitted residential floor area on the zoning lot to 1,386,554 zsf and the Restrictive Declaration, as amended, would limit the number of residential units on the project block to 1,460. The 1,460 units would include the existing Helena with its existing 597 units, and up to 863 new units on the project block. The height, setback, floor area, and overall site plan size of the proposed buildings on projected development

site 1 and projected development site 2 would be restricted by the special permit drawings (see **Figures S-~~11~~12** and S-~~12~~13).

For the affordable housing component, it is expected that the proposed project would seek financing through the New York State HFA "80/20" program. The applicant will also seek to participate in the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development's 421-a Affordable Housing Program, as applied to a rental building with affordable units in which the applicant would receive property tax exemptions, in exchange for the reservation of 20 percent of the rental units on projected development site 1 as affordable housing. However, the applicant has not made a formal application to HFA and accordingly, the proposed project will not undergo coordinated review with HFA.

C. PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The project development sites are currently underdeveloped, with a large portion zoned for manufacturing use reflecting the former nature of this part of Manhattan. The proposed rezoning, along with the new and modified special permits, would allow for a mixed-use building with residential, commercial office, retail, community facility, and parking uses. This development would provide new rental residential uses—including affordable housing units—in the neighborhood, complement the existing residential use on the eastern portion of the block and in the surrounding area, and revitalize the vacant portions of the project block. Furthermore, the applicant has been unsuccessful in attracting tenants for either commercial or light manufacturing development of the size permitted each under the previously approved project, and therefore the change in the development program from the previously approved project to the proposed project would allow the applicant to maximize the development potential of the project site.

The proposed rezoning from M1-5 to C6-2 would facilitate development of the new mixed-use building with predominantly residential uses, ground floor retail, and office space and community facility uses, to be located on the western and mid-block portion of the block.

The new and modified special permits would allow the new development to be designed to enhance the relationship between the proposed project, adjacent streets, and surrounding development and to enliven and enhance the West 57th Street corridor.

The proposed special permit pursuant to ZR § 74-743(a)(2), to permit the location of buildings without regard to height and setback regulations, is being sought because the proposed buildings do not comply with, among other things, the setback distance requirements along West 58th Street. The proposed special permit pursuant to ZR § 74-743(a)(1) is also being sought to permit distribution of the allowable floor area from the portion of the building in the C4-7 zoning district to the C6-2 zoning district within the zoning lot.

The project will require a special permit pursuant to ZR § 13-561 for a 285 space accessory garage.

Modification of the existing Restrictive Declaration and special permits are needed to permit the new bulk configuration on the lot, as well as to allow more residential and retail uses, and to allow construction in accordance with the revised plans. The Restrictive Declaration will also include provisions for the implementation of "Project Components Related to the Environment"

LEGEND			
Minimum distance between buildings non-compliance waiver pursuant to Zoning resolution (74-743(a)(2) Minimum distance between buildings required	(F)	Distance required: 50'-0" window to wall. Distance provided 45'-0" @ Section 1. Distance provided 35'-5" @ Section 2.	Minimum distance between buildings non-compliance waiver pursuant to Zoning resolution (74-743(a)(2)
	(G)	Distance required: 60'-0" window to window . Distance provided 40'-0" @ Section 4.	



Minimum Distance Between Buildings Diagram

625 WEST 57TH STREET

Figure S-12



10 ISOMETRIC LOOKING SOUTHWEST

Tower Regulations Isometric Diagram

Figure S-13

(i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of environmental impacts in this SEIS) and mitigation measures, substantially consistent with this SEIS.

D. FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* ~~will~~ serves as the general guide on the methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the proposed project's potential effects on the various environmental areas of analysis. In disclosing impacts, the SEIS considers the proposed project's potential adverse impacts on the environmental setting. Because the proposed project would be operational in 2015, its environmental setting is not the current environment, but the future environment. Therefore, the technical analyses and consideration of alternatives assess current conditions and forecast these conditions to 2015 for the purposes of determining potential impacts.

Each chapter of the SEIS ~~will~~ first summarizes the conclusions of the 2001 *FEIS* for that particular technical area. The SEIS ~~will~~ then provides a description of "Existing Conditions" for 2011 and assessments of future conditions in 2015 without the proposed project (Future Without the Proposed Project) and with the proposed project (Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project).

Based on the preliminary screening assessments outlined in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* and as detailed in the ~~Draft~~Final Scope of Work, the following environmental areas would not require detailed analysis for the proposed project in this SEIS: natural resources; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation; and energy.

THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The future without the proposed project in all technical areas assumes that none of the discretionary actions currently being sought are approved. In this case, absent those proposed actions, development will be constructed pursuant to the new building application that the applicant filed with the DOB for a development on the western and midblock portions of the project block. This development, which is described in more detail below, conforms to the existing zoning and approvals for the project block (the permitted building).

The permitted building ~~will~~ design consists of new construction of approximately 331,300 gsf of office use and 67,500 gsf of retail uses and 239 public parking spaces on projected development site 1 (see **Table S-2**). The permitted building ~~would be~~ design is five stories tall (95 feet) with office uses located on floors 3 through 5 and ground floor retail (see **Figures S-~~13~~14** and **S-~~14~~15**). Parking would be located on the second floor. Parking would be accessed from a midblock access drive that would extend between West 57th and West 58th Streets. It is assumed that the mini-storage facility would remain in its current use in the future without the proposed project.



Permitted Building Ground Floor Plan

Figure S-14



SOUTH ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION

Permitted Building Elevation
Figure S-15

Table S-2
No Build Scenario

Project Component	Projected Development Site 1 (gsf)
Commercial Office	331,275
Retail	67,505
Above-Grade Parking*	54,313
Lobbies, Storage, and Mechanical	58,961
Total*	**512,054**

Notes: * The permitted building would include a 239-space public parking garage.
Projected development site 2 would remain in its current use.
Source: Durst Development L.L.C.; SLCE Architects.

The permitted building would not maximize the allowable floor area, height, or bulk under the existing zoning and approvals because there has been no demonstrated market at this location for either commercial or light manufacturing development of the size permitted each under the previously approved project. Furthermore, as noted above the applicant has filed for a new building application with the DOB for the permitted building. Therefore, this analysis conservatively assumes a smaller office and retail building in the future without the proposed project than permitted under the previously approved project.

As discussed above, the previously approved office-residential scenario presented in the 2001 *FEIS* included approximately 511,500 gross square feet of office use in a building on the western portion of the project block; 270,000 gross square feet of light manufacturing uses in the midblock; 536,450 gsf of residential use in a building on the eastern portion of the block (600 residential units); and the remainder in retail, storage, and other uses, as well as a total of 638 public parking spaces. Compared with the previously approved office-residential scenario, the permitted building would introduce approximately 180,000 gross square feet less of commercial office, none of the previously approved light manufacturing uses, and fewer parking spaces. As noted above, the residential uses have been developed pursuant to the 2001 approvals.

For each of the technical areas identified in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, the proposed project will be compared to the future without the proposed project.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed actions are subject to the City's land use and environmental review processes, described below.

UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE

The City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), mandated by Sections 197-c and 197-d of the City Charter, is a process specifically designed to allow public review at four levels: Community Board, Borough President, CPC, and City Council. The procedure sets time limits at each review with a maximum period of approximately 7 months.

The process begins with certification by the Department of City Planning (DCP) that the ULURP application is complete. The application is then referred to the Community Board in which the project takes place (for the proposed project, Manhattan Community Board 4). The Community Board has up to 60 days to review the proposal, hold a public hearing, and adopt a resolution regarding the proposal. Next, the Borough President has up to 30 days to perform the same steps. CPC then has up to 60 days, and during that time, a ULURP public hearing is held.

When a DSEIS accompanies the ULURP application, as with this proposal, the CEQR public hearing is held jointly with the ULURP hearing. Comments made at the DSEIS public hearing are incorporated into a Final SEIS (FSEIS); the FSEIS must be completed at least 10 days before any action by the CPC on the ULURP application. CPC then forwards the application to the City Council. Following the Council's vote, the Mayor, at his discretion, may choose to veto the action. The City Council can override that veto.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The lead agency is required to take a "hard look" at the environmental effects of a proposed action and, to the maximum extent practicable, avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the environment, as consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations. The EIS (SEIS, in this case) identifies and analyzes the significant environmental effects of a proposed action and how those effects could be avoided or minimized, providing a means for agencies to consider environmental factors and choose among alternatives in their decision-making processes.

The CEQR process provides a mechanism for decision makers to understand the environmental consequences, the alternatives, and the need for mitigating significant impacts. CEQR rules guide environmental review through the following steps:

- Establish a Lead Agency. Under CEQR, the "lead agency" is the public entity responsible for conducting environmental review. The lead agency is typically the agency with primary responsibility for the proposed action. Because CPC is the agency primarily responsible for zoning actions and special permits, DCP, on behalf of CPC, is the lead agency for this proposal.
- Determine Significance. The lead agency's first decision is to determine whether the proposed action may have a significant impact on the environment. This is based on an Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS). After review of the EAS, DCP, on behalf of CPC, determined that this proposal could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, requiring an EIS (SEIS, in this case) be prepared. DCP issued a Positive Declaration on September 1, 2011.
- Scoping. Once the lead agency has issued a Positive Declaration, it then issues a Draft Scope of Work for the EIS (SEIS, in this case). "Scoping" is the process of establishing the type and extent of the environmental impact analyses to be studied in the SEIS. The lead agency issued a Draft Scope of Work on September 1, 2011. A public scoping meeting was held for the proposed actions on October 4, 2011 at the Department of City Planning, Spector Hall, located at 22 Reade Street in Manhattan. Written comments were accepted through October 17, 2011, and a final scope of work, reflecting comments made during scoping, was issued on July 11, 2012.
- DSEIS. In accordance with the final scope of work, a Draft EIS (or DSEIS in this case) is prepared. The lead agency reviews all aspects of the document, calling on other City agencies to participate as it deems appropriate. Once the lead agency is satisfied that the DSEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion and circulates the DSEIS for public review. When a DSEIS is required, it must be certified as complete before the ULURP application can proceed. The Notice of Completion for this project was published July 11, 2012.
- Public Review. Publication of the Notice of Completion of the DSEIS initiates a public review period. During this period, which must extend for a minimum of 30 days, the public

may review and comment on the DSEIS either in writing or at a public hearing. As noted above, when the CEQR process is coordinated with ULURP, the hearings are typically held jointly. The lead agency must publish a notice of the hearing at least 14 days before it takes place, and must accept written comments for at least 10 days following the close of the hearing. All substantive comments become part of the CEQR record and must be summarized and responded to in the Final EIS (or FSEIS in this case). A public hearing on the DSEIS was held by CPC at 22 Reade Street on November 14, 2012, and written comments were received during the public comment period, which closed on November 26, 2012. Chapter 22 of this FSEIS, "Response to Comments on the DSEIS and Draft Scope of Work" summarizes and responds to substantive comments on the DSEIS. Comments received on the DSEIS are included in Appendix C.

- FSEIS. After the close of the public comment period for the DSEIS, the lead agency prepares a FSEIS. This document must include a summary restatement of each substantive comment made about the DEIS with a response. Once the lead agency determines that the FSEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion and circulates the FSEIS.
- Findings. The lead agency adopts a formal set of written findings, reflecting its conclusions about the potential significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed actions, potential alternatives, and mitigation measures. The findings may not be adopted until 10 days after the Notice of Completion has been issued for the FSEIS. Once findings are adopted, the lead and involved agencies may take their actions. The Notice of Completion for this FSEIS was issued on December 7, 2012.

F. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

This analysis finds that the proposed project would be compatible with, and supportive of, land use, zoning, and public policy initiatives in the area. Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning, and public policy that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

LAND USE

The change to the 2001 *FEIS* program would not alter the 2001 *FEIS* findings that development of the project block would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use on the project site or in the study area. As with the commercial building that would be constructed in the future without the proposed project, the proposed project would result in a substantial increase in the development density on the block. The proposed project would enliven the block with additional residents and employees, and transforming the site from an underutilized site to a higher-density mixed-use development. Development of the proposed project would be consistent with the existing and anticipated land use patterns in the surrounding study area. The proposed project would also be consistent with the ongoing trend of new high-density residential development throughout the study area, particularly along West End Avenue/Eleventh Avenue.

ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

The proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to zoning or public policy. The proposed project would replace the existing M1-5 zoning district on the northern portion of the midblock with a C6-2 zoning district, which would be consistent with the C4-7 zoning

district on the remainder of the project block. Overall, the proposed actions would affect the site design, bulk, and allowable uses, but would not be incompatible with surrounding zoning. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with goals of other public policy initiatives governing land use in the study area, including the Clinton Urban Renewal Area.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

This analysis finds that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the five areas of socioeconomic concern prescribed in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*: (1) direct displacement of residential population on a project site; (2) direct displacement of existing businesses or institutions on a project site; (3) indirect displacement of residential population in a study area; (4) indirect displacement of businesses or institutions in a study area; and (5) adverse effects on specific industries. Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions. The following summarizes the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

DIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

The proposed project would not directly displace any residents from the project block, and therefore there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project due to direct residential displacement.

DIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT

The proposed project would displace the mini-storage business currently located on projected development site 2, which would displace approximately 7 employees. This number of employees would be less than the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold of more than 100 employees for a detailed analysis of direct business displacement. Because the proposed project would not displace more than 100 employees, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project due to direct business displacement.

INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, if a project would introduce a more costly type of housing compared to existing housing and the housing expected to be built in the future without the proposed project condition, then the new population may be expected to have higher incomes. In accordance with 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, this analysis compares the type of housing introduced by the proposed project to the type of housing that would exist in the future without the proposed project to provide an indicator for future income levels in the ¼-mile study area. Within the ¼-mile study area, there is already an existing trend toward more costly housing and a higher income population, as demonstrated by recently built high-end residential developments and a dramatic increase in median household income from 1999 to 2009. The proposed project would introduce housing comparable to existing residential developments and developments expected in the future without the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed project's affordable housing component would introduce a population with incomes that more closely reflect those of lower income households in the ¼-mile study area. Overall, the proposed project would not introduce a new population with higher average incomes compared to those of the existing population and any new population expected to reside in the ¼-mile study area without the project. In addition, the project-generated population would represent less than 5

percent of the ½-mile study area population, and therefore would not introduce a population that could substantially affect residential market conditions in the ½-mile study area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

INDIRECT BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT

According to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, an assessment of indirect business displacement is warranted when a proposed project would result in more than 200,000 square feet of commercial development or retail, or if a project may affect conditions in the real estate market not only on the project site, but also in a larger area. The proposed project would not introduce more than 200,000 square feet of commercial development or retail uses compared to the future without the proposed project, nor would it have the potential to affect conditions in the commercial real estate market as it would introduce commercial and retail uses that are not markedly different from uses in the surrounding area. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project due to indirect business displacement.

ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC INDUSTRIES

The proposed project would not significantly affect business conditions in any specific industry or any category of businesses, nor would it indirectly reduce employment or impair the economic viability of any specific industry or category of business. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project due to adverse effects on specific industries.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

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

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

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Elementary Schools

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

Intermediate Schools

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

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

OPEN SPACE

Based on the methodology of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a preliminary analysis of the proposed project's indirect effects on open space was conducted to determine the need for a detailed analysis. The preliminary analysis concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public open space that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS* and that a detailed analysis is not necessary. Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS,* the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public open space.

Under the existing and future conditions, the active open space ratios would be below DCP's planning goals for open space. There would continue to be a shortfall of active open space, and the proposed project would result in an approximately 2.3 percent decrease in the active and passive public open space ratios as compared to the future without the proposed project. However, these decreases would be approximately 0.03 and 0.01 acres per 1,000 residents and would not be considered a significant change. There are large open space resources outside the study area, such as Central Park and other portions of Hudson River Park, that would continue to serve the study area population and the proposed project would provide recreation facilities for residents, such as an outdoor courtyard and fitness center, to offset project-generated open space demand. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in any adverse direct effects to public open space related to shadows, air quality, noise, or odors. The proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public open space resources in the study area that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

SHADOWS

The analysis shows that project-generated incremental shadow would fall on portions of the Hudson River, Hudson River Park, and the Route 9A Walkway/Bikeway in the mornings of all

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

seasons. Three other resources would experience incremental shadow in one season only: The plaza at 555 West 57th would receive 20 minutes of new shadow at the end of the June 21 analysis day; areas of Riverside Park South would experience approximately an hour of project-generated shadow on the December 21 analysis day, in the late morning; and the Parcel "O" Plaza—a newly developed, publicly accessible plaza at Freedom Place South and West 62nd Street—would experience incremental shadow during the final 53 minutes of the December 21 analysis day.

In the future without the proposed project, the 95-foot high building that would be built on the project site would be bulkier in the second through fifth stories in comparison to the proposed mixed-use building. Consequently, the proposed actions would result in approximately 30 to 40 minutes of reduced shadows on some small areas of Hudson River Park, the Route 9A Bikeway, and the Hudson River in some seasons.

The analysis concludes that, as with the project analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*, the incremental shadow would be limited in extent and duration on nearby sun-sensitive resources and would therefore not result in significant adverse impacts. The proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to shadows that were not previously addressed in the 2001 *FEIS.*

HISTORIC RESOURCES

This analysis finds that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to historic and cultural resources that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*. Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS,* the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

This analysis finds that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to urban design and visual resources that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*. Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS,* the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to urban design and visual resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Although construction on projected development site 1 would entail extensive subsurface disturbance at a site known to have soil, groundwater and soil vapor contamination (primarily from prior petroleum uses), impacts would be avoided by performing the subsurface work in accordance with a DEC-approved Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) which sets out procedures during construction (e.g., for handling and disposing of any contaminated soil and any encountered petroleum tanks) and requirements for the new buildings (e.g., a vapor barrier). The RAWP for the eastern portion of projected development site 1 was approved in March 2010 and its implementation is being overseen by DEC as part of New York's Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) pursuant to a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) entered into by the applicant. The RAWP for the western portion of projected development site 1 (under its petroleum site program) was approved by the DEC on December 20, 2011.

Redevelopment of project development site 2 would require, prior to and during interior or other demolition, addressing asbestos containing materials, lead-based paint, etc. in conformance with established regulatory requirements. Any excavation required would be conducted in accordance with established regulatory requirements. An (E) designation would be placed on Lot 36 to

ensure that appropriate procedures for any necessary subsurface disturbance are followed prior to, during, and following construction.

Consistent with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS*, with the placement of the (E) designation, the proposed project would include measures to avoid the potential for any significant adverse impacts relating to hazardous materials.

TRANSPORTATION

The effects of the proposed project on area traffic and parking conditions were analyzed during the weekday AM, weekday midday, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak periods. When compared to the future without the proposed project, the traffic analysis found that the proposed project would generate 24, 21, and 73 vehicles per hour (vph), in the weekday AM, weekday midday, and Saturday midday peak hours respectively, and would ~~create a negative~~ generate -35 vehicles per hour in the weekday PM peak hour. Further, the differences between the traffic circulation plans of the future with/without the proposed project creates somewhat different travel patterns. However, the increased travel demand and rerouting of traffic would not result in any significant impacts at the analyzed intersections. By comparison, the 2001 *FEIS* determined that demand generated by the then-analyzed commercial scenario would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at a total of two intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, two in the weekday midday peak hour, and six in the weekday PM peak hour. A number of operational changes to the study area street system were proposed to mitigate these impacts in the 2001 *FEIS.*

The parking analysis found that the proposed project would generate a peak parking demand of 385 spaces during the weekday peak period, including the existing demand from The Helena building. That demand would be accommodated within the proposed project's 285-space accessory parking garage and the existing 100-space accessory parking garage in The Helena residential building. As with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse parking impacts.

The pedestrian analysis found that the proposed project would generate an incremental increase between the future with/without the proposed project of 247, -295, 225, and 394 pedestrian trips, which include pedestrians walking to and from the subway and bus, during the weekday AM, weekday midday, weekday PM, and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. As the number of pedestrians within the study area is relatively light during existing conditions, the incremental increase of pedestrians in the study area would not cause impacts on the adjacent sidewalks, crosswalks or corners. As with the findings in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

AIR QUALITY

~~The air quality stationary source analyses conclude that the proposed project would potentially result in significant adverse air quality impacts (affecting $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2 and NO_2 concentrations) on Riverside Center Building 5. This impact would be the result of the proposed project's mixed-use building (on projected development site 1) affecting the dispersion of the exhaust plume from the adjacent Consolidated Edison Powerhouse boiler stack. As a result, higher concentrations of pollutants may occur on the Riverside Center Building 5. As discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation Measures," a potential mitigation measure that has been identified is the reduction of the proposed project's building height by 77 feet; this mitigation measure would fully mitigate and avoid the significant adverse air quality impacts on Riverside Center Building 5. In addition, other alternative~~

~~building configurations would be considered for projected development site 1, as described in in Chapter 20, "Mitigation Measures." This mitigation measure would not be required if wind tunnel modeling, to be conducted between the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS, determines that the proposed project and/or any of the alternative building configurations would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.~~

A summary of the general findings of the air quality analyses is presented below. ~~By comparison, the 2001 *FEIS* did not identify any significant adverse air quality impacts; it should be noted that at the time of the 2001 *FEIS*, CEQR guidance for the analysis of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions had not been developed.~~

Concentrations of CO due to the proposed project's parking facilities would not result in any violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or the City's *de minimis* criteria for CO.

Analysis of the emissions and dispersion of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) from the proposed project's HVAC sources indicate that such emissions would not result in a violation of NAAQS. Emissions of particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) were analyzed in accordance with the City's current $PM_{2.5}$ interim guidance criteria, which determined that the maximum predicted $PM_{2.5}$ increments from the proposed project would be less than the applicable annual average interim guidance criterion of 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$ for local impacts and 0.1 for neighborhood scale impacts. The air quality modeling analysis determined the highest predicted increase in 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed the applicable interim guidance criterion of 5 $\mu g/m^3$, while at some sensitive receptor locations, the maximum incremental increases in 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from stationary sources was predicted to exceed the City's interim criterion of 2 $\mu g/m^3$. However, based on an examination of the magnitude, frequency and extent of these impacts, it was determined that these predicted exceedances would not result in a significant impact. To ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project's HVAC emissions, certain restrictions would be required regarding fuel type, emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and exhaust stack location or height. These restrictions would be mapped as (E) designations for the project property.

Nearby existing sources from manufacturing or processing facilities were analyzed for their potential impacts on the proposed project. The results of the analysis demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts on the proposed project from industrial sources of emissions.

The proposed project would result in the development of new residential and commercial uses in close proximity to the Consolidated Edison Power House (also known as the 59th Street Steam Station), a steam plant that operates pursuant to and in compliance with federal and state air permitting requirements. Concentrations of pollutants from the Consolidated Edison Power House were therefore estimated for their potential impacts on the proposed project. Concentrations of NO_2, sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and PM_{10} were estimated using computer based dispersion modeling; ~~however~~further, due to the proximity of the Consolidated Edison Power House to the project site, concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ were estimated using a wind tunnel test procedure, which allows for more accurate predictions of pollutant concentrations from stationary sources. The analyses demonstrated that concentrations of NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10} from the Consolidated Edison Power House's approximately 500 foot boiler stack on the proposed project would be negligible and would therefore not result in any violations of the NAAQS for these pollutants. It was likewise determined that incremental increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from the Con Edison boiler stack would not exceed the city's current interim guidance criteria that are applicable to the proposed

project. The air quality analyses determined that emissions from the combustion turbine at the Consolidated Edison Power House would not result in any violations of the NAAQS for NO_2, SO_2 and PM_{10}. 24-Hour average incremental concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ were found to exceed the City's current interim guidance criterion at elevated receptors along portions of the north façade of projected development site 1. However, the magnitude, extent and frequencies of these occurrences would not result in a significant impact based on the City's interim guidance criteria.

The analysis of the Con Edison combustion turbine was performed assuming a modification of the combustion turbine so that it would fire natural gas instead of kerosene for normal operation and testing. Under this option, natural gas would be delivered to the Consolidated Edison Power House via a dedicated pipeline that would be directly connected to a nearby gas transmission main. This modification was considered as part of the Riverside Center development, which was subject to the City's CEQR process and the subject of a final supplemental environmental impact statement completed in 2010. Con Edison has started construction of the gas pipeline to provide the necessary gas service to the Consolidated Edison Power House. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has issued a certificate to operate, and the Title V permit for the Con Edison facility has been modified by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), for the combustion turbine natural gas conversion and operation. Based on this information, it is anticipated that the conversion of the combustion turbine will be completed prior to the Build year for the proposed project. The proposed project's Restrictive Declaration will include provisions requiring completion of modifications related to the combustion turbine at the 59th Street Station to address elevated $PM_{2.5}$ levels at the proposed project.

The wind tunnel analysis of the proposed project that was performed for ~~this~~ the DSEIS included existing buildings within the study area and development expected to be completed by the proposed project's 2015 Build year. The Riverside Center development includes three additional approved buildings (identified as 1, 3 and 4) that would be completed after the proposed project's Build year. ~~To assess whether these additional buildings (1, 3 and 4) would affect the dispersion of emissions from the Con Edison Power House and the concentrations of pollutants on the proposed project, an analysis was conducted using the EPA AERMOD model, which determined that the additional Riverside Center buildings do not affect the levels of predicted pollutant concentrations on the proposed project.~~ An additional wind tunnel analysis of the proposed project ~~will be~~ has been performed ~~between the DSEIS and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS)~~ to account for the full development of the Riverside Center Site. The results of this analysis ~~will be presented in the FSEIS~~ determined that the Consolidated Edison Power House would not cause incremental increases in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at the proposed project that would exceed the city's current interim guidance criteria with the full development of the Riverside Center development.

Existing and proposed developments near the proposed project were evaluated to assess whether the effect on plume dispersion from the ~~Con Edison 59th Street Station~~ Consolidated Edison Power House combustion turbine and boiler emissions due to projected development site 1 would result in any significant adverse air quality impact. The initial AERMOD analysis performed for the DSEIS showed that concentrations of ~~1-hour NO_2,~~ 1-hour SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ ~~were predicted~~ had the potential to exceed the NAAQS and $PM_{2.5}$ interim guidance criteria, respectively, on a small portion of proposed Riverside Center Building 5, on the north and east façades. This would be considered a significant adverse air quality impact. Therefore, ~~mitigation measures, including reducing the maximum height of projected development site 1, and/or other changes in the~~

~~building proposed for projected development site 1, may need to be implemented to avoid potential significant impacts. An additional~~ as stated in the DSEIS, a wind tunnel analysis ~~will be~~ was performed ~~between~~ subsequent to the DSEIS ~~and FSEIS~~ to examine building configurations that would avoid significant adverse air quality impacts on Riverside Center Building 5. The analysis demonstrated that the effect on plume dispersion from the Consolidated Edison Power House due to projected development site 1 would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on Riverside Center Building 5. ~~Mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 20, "Mitigation Measures."~~

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS[1]

Overall, the proposed project would result in mixed use development, energy efficient buildings, utilize low-carbon power sources, and would support the use of transit and non-motorized commuting, and would, therefore, be consistent with the City's citywide greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goal.

The proposed project's design includes many features aimed at reducing energy consumption and GHG emissions: The applicant intends to implement energy efficiency measures in the mixed-use building (projected development site 1) so as to achieve, at a minimum, 7 percent less energy consumption as compared with baseline buildings designed to code (achieving at least 10 percent energy cost reduction as compared to baseline). The development of the mini-storage conversion (projected development site 2) and community facility building (part of projected development site 1) would incorporate measures which would decrease energy consumption and the ensuing GHG emissions, including high-efficiency heating, ventilation, and cooling systems, building energy commissioning, efficient lighting and occupancy sensors, and Energy Star certified appliances. The project block is also well served by many public transportation options. Overall, the building energy use and vehicle use associated with the proposed project would result in approximately 10,439 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year.

The proposed project's design would also accommodate likely future sea level rise of up to 2 feet, which is the level of increase projected for the end of the century by the New York City Panel on Climate Change. Residential areas and critical infrastructure would not be vulnerable to future 1-in-100 flood levels when accounting for this potential additional flood elevation.

NOISE

Based on the analysis presented in the 2001 *FEIS*, an (E) designation requiring 35 dBA of window/wall attenuation was placed on Block 1105, Lot 5. However, the noise measurements that established (E) designation E-103 are now 10 years old and there has been development in the area since that time. Consequently, an updated building attenuation analysis based on new site-specific measurements was performed. The proposed project would not generate sufficient traffic to have the potential to cause a significant noise impact (i.e., it would not result in a doubling of Noise passenger car equivalents [Noise PCEs] which would be necessary to cause a 3 dBA increase in noise levels) and will be designed to provide the window/wall attenuation levels shown in **Table S-3**, which will result in acceptable interior noise levels according to CEQR criteria. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

[1] This chapter was not in the 2001 *FEIS* since it was not required by the 2001 *CEQR Technical Manual.*

Table S-3
Building Attenuation Requirements

Location	Façade	Elevation	Governing Noise Measurement Location/Source	Maximum Measured $L_{10(1)}$ Value(s) (in dBA)	Attenuation Required (in OITC)[2]
Projected Development Site 1: Mixed Use Building	North	Up to 100 feet	1[1], 2	79.7[3], 75.3[3]	35 within 100 feet of West Side Highway, 31 elsewhere
		Greater than 100 feet			28
	East	Up to 100 feet	4, 5	75.4[3], 69.3~~68.6~~[3]	31 within 120 feet of West 57th Street, 30[4] elsewhere
		Greater than 100 feet			28 within 120 feet of West 57th Street, 30[4] elsewhere
	South	Up to 100 feet	1, 2, 3	79.7[3], 75.3[3], 74.6[3]	35 within 100 feet of West Side Highway, 31 elsewhere
		Greater than 100 feet			28
	West	Up to 100 feet	1, 2	79.7[3], 75.3[3]	35 within 100 feet of West Side Highway, 31 elsewhere
		Greater than 100 feet			28
Projected Development Site 1: Community Facility Building	North	All	2	75.3[3]	31
	East, South, West	All	5	68.6[3]	30[4]
Projected Development Site 2	North	All	2	75.3[3]	31
	East	All	Existing (E) Designation	n/a	35
	South, West	All	5	68.6[3]	30[4]

Notes: [1] Because no measurement was performed along the north façade of the project site within 100 feet of the West Side Highway, the measurement at site 1 along the south façade of the project site within 100 feet of the West Side Highway was used to represent the north façade as well.
[2] Required attenuation values shown are for residential uses. Attenuation for commercial or cultural uses would be 5 dBA less.
[3] Noise levels adjusted based on build traffic increments.
[4] The maximum measured L_{10} is below 70 dBA, and the *CEQR Technical Manual* does not specify minimum attenuation guidance for exterior L_{10} values below this level, however the applicant has committed to 30 dBA of attenuation for residential uses or 25 dBA of attenuation for commercial/non-residential uses along the mid-block drive greater than 120 feet from West 57th Street.
Source: 625 West 57th Street Acoustical Analysis for DCP memorandum from Cerami & Associates to AKRF, dated October 30, 2011, revised November 15, 2011.

PUBLIC HEALTH

As described in this SEIS, the proposed project would not result in significant unmitigated adverse impacts for any areas of technical analysis. Therefore, like the 2001 *FEIS*, a full assessment of potential impacts on public health is not necessary, and the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public health.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Based on the methodology of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a preliminary analysis of the proposed project's effects on neighborhood character was conducted to determine the need for a detailed analysis. The preliminary analysis concluded that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character and that a detailed analysis was not necessary.

As described throughout this SEIS, the change to the 2001 *FEIS* program would not alter the 2001 *FEIS* findings that development of the project block would not have significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas contributing to neighborhood character. Overall, through the creation of new buildings that are consistent with their surroundings, and the revitalization of the project block, the proposed project would be consistent with the key components of the area's character and would, in fact, result in beneficial effects on neighborhood character. The proposed project would not have the potential to affect the defining features of the neighborhood's character, either through a significant adverse impact in a specific technical area or through a combination of moderate effects, and a detailed assessment of neighborhood character is not warranted. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character that were not addressed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

CONSTRUCTION

The analysis concludes that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts that were not previously identified in the 2001 *FEIS*. Consistent with the 2001 FEIS, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to construction.

TRANSPORTATION

No significant adverse transportation impacts would be expected due to construction of the proposed project.

The proposed project would result in 67 more vehicle trips (passenger car equivalents [PCEs]) when compared to construction of the permitted building in the future without the proposed project. However, when assigned to the local network, the project construction trip increments would not result in 50 or more vehicle trips through any intersection.

The proposed project would result in 216 more transit and pedestrian trips when compared to the future without the proposed project. Since the project block is well served by mass transit including the A, B, C, D, and 1 subway lines and various bus routes along Eleventh Avenue and West 57th Street, only nominal increases in incremental transit demand would be experienced along each of those routes and at each of the transit access locations (fewer than the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold of 200 trips each). Therefore, there would not be a potential for any significant adverse transit impacts during construction. In addition, the 216 incremental peak hour pedestrian trips would be distributed among numerous sidewalks and crosswalks in the area, such that no pedestrian elements are expected to incur 200 or more incremental pedestrian trips (the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold) resulting from the construction of the proposed project. Hence, there would not be a potential for significant adverse pedestrian impacts during construction. Also, where temporary sidewalk closures are required, adequate protection or temporary sidewalks and appropriate signage would be provided in accordance with NYCDOT requirements.

AIR QUALITY

No significant adverse air quality impacts would be expected at any sensitive receptor locations due to construction of the proposed project.

To ensure that the construction of the proposed project would result in the lowest practicable diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions, the project would implement an emissions reduction

program for all construction activities, including: diesel equipment reduction; clean fuel; best available tailpipe reduction technologies; utilization of newer equipment; source location; dust control; and idle restriction.

In terms of air pollutant emissions, the most intense construction activities are excavation and foundations work and superstructure construction, expected to take 25 months. Although exterior façade work, interiors, finishing, and commissioning would continue after superstructure work is complete, those efforts would result in very little emissions since the heavy duty diesel equipment associated with excavation and concrete work would no longer be needed on-site. The equipment that would be operating in these later phases would be mostly small, and would be dispersed vertically throughout the building, resulting in very low concentration increments in adjacent areas. During the excavation, foundation, and superstructure work, a handful of large non-road diesel engines would operate throughout the site. The only engine expected to be located in a single location for a long period of time is the tower crane, located on West 58th Street, approximately 165 feet west of The Helena building's property line and approximately 190 feet from The Helena building (the nearest sensitive residential location would be further than 190 feet because of the difference in elevation). Given the elevation of the tower crane engine, its location relative to nearby sensitive locations, and the emissions controls the tower crane would not result in substantial concentration increments. The proposed project includes the construction of a single building, and renovations to an existing building, and is therefore not as intense as some large-scale multi-building construction projects.

The only residential building adjacent to the construction site is The Helena building located in the southeast corner of the project block. Given the size of the project site and the space available, most of the heavy deliveries and intense activities such as concrete pumping would take within the site (for foundations) or along West 58th Street (for superstructure) and away from the Helena building to the extent practicable. For superstructure work, a concrete pump would be located inside the building core (northeast corner of projected development site 1) and concrete trucks would operate next to the core on West 58th Street (at a distance of approximately 140 feet from the Helena, and behind the superstructure).

NOISE AND VIBRATION

No significant adverse noise or vibration impacts would be expected at any sensitive receptor locations due to construction of the proposed project.

The applicant has committed to taking a proactive approach during construction, which employs a wide variety of measures that exceed standard construction practices, but the implementation of which is deemed logistically feasible and practicable, to minimize construction noise and reduce potential noise impacts. These measures will be described in the noise mitigation plan required as part of the New York City Noise Control Code.

The only sensitive receptor adjacent to the project site is The Helena residential building on the project block. The Helena has been designed to provide at least 35 dBA of attenuation. With these measures interior noise levels would be expected to be below 45 dBA L_{10}, the interior level that is considered acceptable for residential use according to the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Consequently, no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected at this location.

At the residential uses along West 61st Street between West End Avenue and Route 9A, approximately 800 feet north of the project site, the noise attenuation due to distance as well as the shielding from intervening buildings would be expected to result in maximum $L_{eq(1)}$ noise

levels due to construction in the low- to mid- 60 dBA. This would not be expected to result in an exceedence of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria given the relatively high noise levels at this location in future conditions without the proposed project. In addition, the buildings at this receptor are new and have double glazed windows and central air conditioning that would be expected to provide at least 30 dBA of attenuation of exterior noise. Consequently, no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected at this location.

At the school at Eleventh Avenue and West 58th Street, approximately 100 feet east of projected development site 2 and approximately 250 feet east of projected development site 1, the noise attenuation due to distance as well as the shielding from intervening buildings would be expected to result in maximum $L_{eq(1)}$ noise levels due to construction in the high 60 to low 70 dBA. This would not be expected to result in an exceedence of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria given the relatively high baseline noise levels at this location in future conditions without the proposed project. In addition, the school building at this location is new and has double glazed windows and central air conditioning that would be expected to provide at least 30 dBA of attenuation of exterior noise. Consequently, no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected at this location.

At Hudson River Park, approximately 200 feet west of the project site, the noise attenuation due to distance as well as the shielding from the intervening elevated Route 9A highway structure would be expected to result in maximum $L_{eq(1)}$ noise levels due to construction in the high 60 to mid 70 dBA. This would not be expected result in an exceedence of CEQR impact criteria given the relatively high noise levels from Route 9A at this location in future conditions without the proposed project. Consequently, no significant adverse noise impacts would be expected at this location.

In terms of potential vibration levels that would be perceptible and annoying, the three pieces of equipment that would have the most potential for producing levels which exceed the 65 vibration decibels (VdB) limit are pile drivers, the clam shovel drop, and vibratory roller. They would produce perceptible vibration levels (i.e., vibration levels exceeding 65 VdB) at receptor locations within a distance of approximately 230 feet. However, the operation would only occur for limited periods of time at a particular location and therefore would not result in any significant adverse impacts. Any blasting that may occur would be expected to produce vibrations less perceptible than those from the operation of the three pieces of equipment cited above. In no case are significant adverse impacts from vibrations expected to occur.

OTHER TECHNICAL AREAS

Historic and Cultural Resources

Similar to the permitted building as well as the development anticipated in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would result in new construction within 90 feet of the Consolidated Edison Power House, a known architectural resource. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission's (LPC) *Guidelines for Construction Adjacent to a Historic Landmark* as well as the guidelines set forth in section 523 of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* and the procedures set forth in DOB's TPPN #10/88. This includes preparation of a Construction Protection Plan (CPP), to be prepared prior to demolition and construction activities and submitted to LPC for review and approval. The Hudson River bulkhead, which is State and National Register-eligible, is located more than 90 feet away from the project site and would not be expected to be adversely affected by the project's construction-related activities.

Hazardous Materials

Although construction on projected development site 1 would entail extensive subsurface disturbance at a site known to have soil, groundwater and soil vapor contamination (primarily from prior petroleum uses), impacts would be avoided by performing the subsurface work in accordance with DEC-approved RAWPs which sets out procedures during construction (e.g., for handling and disposing of any contaminated soil and any encountered petroleum tanks) and requirements for the new construction (e.g., a foundation vapor barrier). The RAWP for the eastern portion of projected development site 1 was approved in March 2010 and its implementation is being overseen by DEC as part of New York's Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) pursuant to a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) entered into by the applicant. The RAWP for the western portion of projected development site 1 (under its petroleum site program) was approved by the DEC on December 20, 2011.

Redevelopment of projected development site 2 would require, prior to and during interior or other demolition, addressing asbestos containing materials, lead-based paint, etc. in conformance with established regulatory requirements. Any excavation required would be conducted in accordance with established regulatory requirements, or, if required, pursuant to an (E) designation (see Chapter 9, "Hazardous Materials").

Socioeconomic Conditions

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions. Construction would, in some instances, temporarily affect pedestrian and vehicular access on street frontages immediately adjacent to the project site. However, lane and/or sidewalk closures are not expected to occur in front of entrances to any existing or planned retail businesses, and construction activities would not obstruct major thoroughfares used by customers or businesses. Utility service would be maintained to all businesses. Overall, construction of the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts on surrounding businesses.

Land Use and Neighborhood Character

Throughout construction, access to surrounding residences, businesses, and institutions in the area would be maintained. In addition, measures would be implemented to control noise, vibration, emissions, and dust on construction sites, including the erection of construction fencing incorporating sound-reducing measures. Because none of these impacts would be continuous or ultimately permanent, a preliminary analysis found that construction would not create significant adverse impacts on land use patterns or neighborhood character in the area.

Rodent Control

Construction contracts would include provisions for a rodent (mouse and rat) control program. Before the start of construction, the contractor would survey and bait the appropriate areas and provide for proper site sanitation. During the construction phase, as necessary, the contractor would carry out a maintenance program. Coordination would be maintained with appropriate public agencies. Only the EPA and DEC-registered rodenticides would be utilized, and the contractor would be required to perform rodent control programs in a manner that avoids hazards to persons, domestic animals, and non-target wildlife.

ALTERNATIVES

This SEIS considers a No Action Alternative and a No Impact Alternative. By comparison, the 2001 *FEIS* considered three alternatives: a No Action Alternative, in which the 2001 existing uses would have remained on the project block (and was the same as the "Future without the Proposed Project" in the 2001 *FEIS*); an As-of-Right Alternative, in which development conforming to the project block's then M2-3 zoning would have been constructed; and a Rezoning Only Alternative, in which development would have occurred under a proposed rezoning, without special permits for general large-scale bulk modifications and public parking garages. As with the alternatives analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*, the proposed project would result in impacts similar to or lesser than the proposed development presented in that document.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

For the currently proposed project, the No Action Alternative would mean that the proposed residential building with commercial, community facility, and parking uses would not be constructed. Instead, development on the projected development sites would be within the envelope of the development analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*, but with a smaller commercial building containing approximately 331,300 gsf of office use, 67,500 gsf of retail use and 239 public parking spaces on projected development site 1. In the No Action Alternative, there would be no change in the assumed development of projected development site 2; the existing mini-storage building would remain. As described Chapter 1, "Project Description," the assumption regarding projected development site 1 is based on the fact that the applicant has applied for a building permit for such a building (the permitted building). The permitted building can be constructed under the land use approvals granted in 2001 without further discretionary approvals or actions. It would be smaller than that which is permitted under current zoning, and, accordingly, assuming that development on projected development site 1 as a basis for comparing the impacts of the proposed project to the future without the proposed project is more conservative than using the more fully built out development scenario that was analyzed in the 2001 *FEIS*.

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, natural resources, hazardous materials, water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, energy, transportation, greenhouse gases, noise, public health, neighborhood character, and construction impacts. This alternative would not result in a significant air quality impact.

NO IMPACT ALTERNATIVE

As described in Chapter 11, "Air Quality," and Chapter 20, "Mitigation Measures," potential significant air quality impacts were identified in the DSEIS with the proposed project. Therefore, further wind tunnel analyses ~~will be~~ were performed between the DSEIS and the FSEIS to confirm whether the proposed project would result in a significant adverse air quality impact~~. In addition, building design options will be examined for air quality impacts between the DSEIS and the FSEIS. The building design options would include a design that would allow air to flow through the top of the building on projected development site 1. Option A would be a design which would have on the top 77 feet portion of the building an open design with structural elements on the south façade, and louvers on the north and east façades, and Option B would be similar to Option A except instead of louvers it would be open on all sides with structural elements. The Option A and Option B designs will be analyzed in the wind tunnel between the~~

~~DSEIS and the FSEIS. A reduced height building (a building with a maximum overall height of 394 feet, 77 feet lower than the height evaluated for the proposed project on projected development site 1), is another design option for which the potential for air quality impacts would be mitigated.~~ The wind tunnel modeling examined three building designs: 1) a building design with a closed condition on the top 77 feet of the building, which was initially analyzed in the DSEIS; 2) an open design with structural elements on the south façade, and louvers on the north and east façades (referred to as "Option A" in Chapter 11, "Air Quality"), which was selected as the design for the proposed project; and 3) a design which would have on the top 77 feet portion of the building a more open design with structural elements on the south, north and east façades (Option B). The proposed development program would not change with the alternative building design options, and as with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources, natural resources, hazardous materials, water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, energy, transportation, greenhouse gases, noise, public health, neighborhood character, and construction impacts. The results of the wind tunnel analysis demonstrate that the effect on plume dispersion from the Consolidated Edison Power House due to projected development site 1 would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts under any of the building configurations analyzed. Therefore, any of the building configurations for projected development site 1 analyzed are considerable feasible. Furthermore, because no significant adverse impacts were identified for any analysis area, a No Impact Alternative is no longer required as part of this FSEIS.

GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed actions would facilitate the development of approximately 1.1 million gsf on the project block, consisting of approximately 850,000 gsf of residential space (up to 863 residential units, including up to 151 affordable units, or 20 percent of the units on projected development site 1); approximately 80,000 gsf of commercial office; 62,000 gsf of retail; 28,000 gsf of community facility space; and 285 accessory parking spaces. As stated in Chapter 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the proposed project is not expected to introduce enough of a different economic activity to alter existing economic patterns in the study area. While the proposed uses would be substantial additions to the study area, they do not represent new types of land uses. West 57th Street is a busy thoroughfare which already contains commercial and retail, residential, parking, and light manufacturing uses. As described in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the proposed project would be compatible with and complementary to existing study area land uses. The area surrounding the project site is fully developed, and the level of development is controlled by zoning. As such, the proposed project would not "induce" new growth in the study area. The proposed project and related actions are specific to the project site only.

In addition, the proposed project would not meet the CEQR thresholds of 1 million gallons per day of water usage, and the project site is located in a combined sewer area but would not exceed 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet of commercial space above the future without the proposed project scenario, and therefore, no additional analyses of infrastructure are required. The proposed project would utilize existing infrastructure, and the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to water supply or wastewater and stormwater infrastructure.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

There are a number of resources, both natural and built, that would be expended in the construction and operation of the proposed project. These resources include the materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the proposed development; and the human effort (i.e., time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the proposed development.

The resources are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the proposed project would be highly unlikely. The land use changes associated with the development of the proposed project site may be considered a resource loss. The proposed project constitutes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the development site as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term.

These commitments of land resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the proposed development. The proposed development would bring new residential, commercial and retail, community facility, and parking uses to an underdeveloped site. This is expected to substantially improve the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES

~~Potential impacts were identified in the area of air quality.~~ The air quality stationary source analyses in the DSEIS concluded that the proposed project would potentially result in significant adverse air quality impacts (affecting $PM_{2.5}$~~,~~ and SO_2 ~~and NO_2~~ concentrations) on Riverside Center Building 5. ~~This impact,~~ These potential impacts would be the result of the proposed project's mixed use building (on projected development site 1) affecting the dispersion of the exhaust plume from the adjacent Consolidated Edison Powerhouse boiler stack. ~~As~~ The DSEIS concluded that as a result, higher concentrations of pollutants ~~may~~ could occur on the Riverside Center Building 5.

~~A potential mitigation measure that has been identified is the reduction of the proposed project's building height by 77 feet; this mitigation measure would fully mitigate and avoid the significant adverse air quality impacts on Riverside Center Building 5.~~ Based upon analyses conducted subsequent to the certification of the DSEIS, ~~T~~this mitigation ~~would not be~~ is not required ~~if~~. The wind tunnel modeling~~, to be~~ that was conducted between the DSEIS and FSEIS, ~~determines~~ determined that the proposed project and/or any of the alternative building configurations analyzed would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. Therefore, mitigation is not required.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The applicant has proposed revisions to the proposed project analyzed in this Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS), and the City Planning Commission (CPC) is contemplating certain modifications to the proposed project (the "proposed modifications"), including:

APPLICANT PROPOSED REVISIONS

- Limit the number of residential units on the project block to a total of 1,432 (comprised of 597 existing units in the Helena and 835 new units on projected development sites 1 and 2).
- In addition to the affordable units analyzed as part of the Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) on projected development site 1 (up to 145), the RWCDS has been updated to reflect the applicant's intention to include up to 20 percent of the units

on projected development site 2 as affordable units (up to 22 affordable units) as a response to community comments. In total, it is assumed that the proposed project would include up to 167 affordable units on projected development sites 1 and 2.

- Consider, in the RWCDS, the inclusion of an approximately 25,000 gross square foot neighborhood grocery use intended by the applicant to be located in the retail space on projected development site 1.

In addition, as noted in Chapter 1, "Project Description," in order to provide for a conservative analysis 80,000 gross square feet (gsf) was analyzed as office space, but that space could be allocated as commercial, residential, amenity, or community facility space. During the design process, after the DSEIS was certified, it was determined that approximately 50,000 gsf of this space would be allocated to residential space; because the number of units on the project block would be limited in accordance with the Restrictive Declaration, this reallocation of office space to residential space would not affect the overall number of units in the proposed project.

CPC PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

- Narrow the width of the midblock access drive from 25 feet to 22 feet, and widen the adjacent sidewalks accordingly, resulting in an approximately 18 foot wide pedestrian path on the western edge and an approximately 10 foot pedestrian path on the eastern edge, as shown in **Figure 21-2**. The widened sidewalk would include benches to provide seating, and trees and planters that would flank the edges of the pedestrian walkway next to the vehicle drive through. The accessway would have a uniform elevation throughout (i.e., no sidewalk curbs) and the paving treatment would be continued into the lobby of the building on projected development site 1.
- Include retail frontage at the northeast portion of projected development site 1 adjacent to the midblock access drive along West 58th Street.
- Require a minimum of three establishments in projected development site 1 along West 57th Street.
- Require street level façade transparency on West 57th Street.
- Commit to "wrap-around" the Twelfth Avenue establishment to approximately 80 feet east along the West 58th Street frontage.
- Where feasible, include lit, ground-floor display areas along West 58th Street where mechanical space is required for the proposed building, subject to review by DCP and the New York City Department of Buildings.

Together, the proposed applicant revisions, updates to the RWCDS, and proposed modifications (the "modified project") would result in a decrease in the total number of residential units and an increase in the number of affordable units on the project block, a possible neighborhood grocery use, a reduction in the proposed commercial office square footage on the project block, changes to the project's midblock access drive, and requirements as to the number of storefronts on West 57th Street, street level façade transparency along West 57th Street, and the placement of display areas where certain mechanical space is required along West 58th Street.

The potential environmental impacts of the modified project are examined in Chapter 21, "Modifications to the Proposed Project." The analysis concludes that the modified project would not result in any significant adverse impacts, including transportation impacts. The modified project would have the same impact conclusions as those disclosed in the other chapters of this FSEIS. ✷