TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 003
550 WASHINGTON STREET
SPECIAL HUDSON RIVER PARK DISTRICT
CEQR No. 16DCP031M

ULURP Nos. N 160308 ZRM, C 160309 ZMM, C 160310 ZSM, C 160311 ZSM, C 160312 ZSM, C 160313 ZSM, N 160314 ZAM, N 160315 ZAM, N 160316 ZAM, N 160317 ZCM

April 26, 2024

The 550 Washington Street Project (550 Washington Street/Special Hudson River Park District—CEQR no. 16DCP031M) was the subject of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and subsequent technical memoranda that considered the potential environmental impacts of the project[1]. The north block of the development site (bounded by Washington Street, Clarkson Street, Houston Street and West Street/Route 9A) was and continues to be proposed for redevelopment with both a market-rate residential building (also known as 80 Clarkson Street) and a senior affordable housing building (also known as 570 Washington Street). Together, the two buildings are expected to include approximately 400 units.

A modification is proposed to the affordable housing provisions of the existing Restrictive Declaration, to modify the unit mix as requested by HPD.

The proposed plans for the senior affordable units include a mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. A total of 176 senior affordable units are planned, with 83 studios (47.2%) 56 one-bedroom units (31.8%) and 37 two-bedroom units (21.0%). Based on a total of approximately 400 units between the two buildings, this would represent approximately 44% of all units as affordable.

All other elements of the approved design and the design requirements for the project will remain unchanged.

Environmental impact analyses are based on the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, which does not specifically require consideration of a project's unit mix based on the number of bedrooms. As such, for those technical areas requiring an estimation of project population, the area's median household size is applied to the estimated number of units proposed. This approach is often used by DCP in its analysis of projects and was used for the FEIS and subsequent technical memoranda for this project in the determination of potential project impacts. Therefore, because there is no increase in the number of units planned, there would be no change to the previous impact conclusions, including those for transportation, community facilities/schools, or other technical areas (for the analysis of schools, consistent with the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, senior units are altogether excluded from consideration).

---

[1] The FEIS Notice of Completion was issued on October 6, 2016, and the CPC Statement of Findings was issued on October 17, 2016. Technical Memorandum 001 was completed on October 17, 2016, and Technical Memorandum 002 was completed on December 9, 2016. Technical Memorandum 003 was filed with DCP on March 14, 2024.

Overall, as discussed below, the proposed mix of affordable units in the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse environmental impacts not previously identified, and no further analysis is warranted.

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

The proposed modification of the restrictive declaration would not result in any changes to land use, zoning, or public policy. Therefore, there would be no potential for changes to the previous conclusions. The mix of land uses would be the same as previously contemplated, with a small change to the unit mix. There would be no change to density on the development site and the maximum zoning envelope would be the same. The North Site would continue to provide new housing, including senior affordable housing, which would be supportive of the City's goals to create new market rate and affordable housing. It would also be consistent with the city's sustainability goals and would be consistent with applicable Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) policies. Overall, there would not be any land use compatibility issues or zoning/public policy impacts.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic analyses that were previously prepared determined that there would be no adverse impact as a result of indirect residential displacement (based on 30% of units being affordable). With an even greater percentage of units being affordable (44%), the potential for introducing higher incomes to the study area would be lessened. The conclusion remains valid that the affordable housing added by the proposed project would maintain a more diverse demographic composition within the study area, the proposed project is not expected to introduce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions that would potentially lead to the displacement of vulnerable populations, and that the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

COMMUNITY FACILITES

The proposed change in unit mix is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on community facilities.

While the proposed inclusion of 2 BR units will allow some number of mixed-age households to occupy the building, it is uncertain how many units would actually be occupied by non-seniors, and with only 37 2-BR units, any incremental population difference would not result in exceedances of the thresholds set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Furthermore, as described above, CEQR methodologies generally do not account for specific unit mixes in determining project effects; there would be no change to the total number of affordable units.

Therefore, there would be no change from the previous conclusions that there would be no significant adverse impacts to schools, libraries, child care facilities, health care facilities, and fire/police protection services.

OPEN SPACE

While the FEIS found that the approved project would result in a decrease in total and active open space ratios and therefore result in a significant adverse open space impact, changes to the project examined in Technical Memorandum 002 (which included a significant reduction in the total number of residential units from 1,586 to 593 units) would avoid the significant adverse open space. Current plans include less than 400 units and would therefore also not result in a significant adverse open space impact.

SHADOWS

There are no changes to bulk that would affect shadows. Development would fit within the approved building envelopes considered in previous analyses, and therefore shadow effects would be the same or

less. It was concluded that the project would not result in significant adverse shadow impact on any sunlight-sensitive resource, and that conclusion remains valid.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

No changes are proposed that would affect archaeological resources. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) previously indicated that the development site has no archaeological significance.

The proposed change in the mix of units would have no effect on architectural resources. Development would not result in any significant adverse impacts to architectural resources, as no historic architectural resources are located on the development site and no architectural resources in the study area would be directly affected. As previously concluded there would be no significant adverse indirect impacts to historic architectural resources in the study area because of distance, intervening buildings, and the lack of meaningful contextual relationships between the development site and study area architectural resources.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

No changes are proposed that would affect urban design and visual resources. The proposed massing, siting and design would be the same as previously considered. Therefore, the previous conclusion that the project would not have significant impacts to urban design and visual resources remains valid.

NATURAL RESOURCES

There are no natural resources on the site that would be affected and no change to shadows on the Hudson River. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts to natural resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The proposed change to the unit mix would not affect hazardous materials conditions. As discussed in previous analyses, measures have been and will continue to be undertaken in coordination with the Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation to ensure that construction of the proposed project does not result in any hazardous materials impacts.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

There are no changes proposed that would affect previous conclusions regarding water and sewer infrastructure. Overall, there would be no significant adverse impacts to water supply, wastewater treatment or stormwater conveyance infrastructure.

ENERGY

The proposed change would not result in a significant adverse energy impact. It would not significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy or generate a substantial indirect consumption of energy. As disclosed in previous considerations of energy, the project's modest incremental demand would not create a significant impact on energy capacity and would be negligible when compared to overall demand.

TRANSPORTATION

There would be no change in the total number of units and no change to the previous conclusions related to transportation. The development would not result in the potential for any new significant adverse impacts that were not previously disclosed in the FEIS and/or subsequent Technical Memoranda. Potential impacts would be fully mitigated with the implementation of mitigation measures comparable to those disclosed in the FEIS or improvement measures identified in Tech Memo 001 and 002.

AIR QUALITY

The FEIS analyses concluded that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts and included placement of an (E) designation (E-384) on the project site to ensure implementation of required air quality measures. With adherence to the requirements of the (E) designation, development would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

NOISE

The FEIS analyses concluded that there would be no significant adverse noise impacts and included placement of an (E) designation (E-384) on the project site to ensure appropriate noise attenuation measures. With adherence to the requirements of the (E) designation, development would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

PUBLIC HEALTH

As concluded in previous analyses, the project would not result in significant adverse impacts to public health, as it would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in technical areas related to public health, including air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, and noise.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The FEIS and previous memoranda determined that there would not be a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. The proposed change to the unit mix would not affect this conclusion and would not result in any impacts to neighborhood character. As noted in this memo, there would be no new or different impacts to the technical areas that contribute to neighborhood character, including land use, socioeconomic conditions, open space, historic and cultural resources, urban design, visual resources, shadows, transportation, and noise.

CONSTRUCTION

Impacts associated with construction would be the same as those previously identified. As anticipated, the now-occupied (Google) building on the South/Center Sites has the potential to experience noise generated by construction on the North Site. Therefore, as disclosed in the FEIS and Tech Memo 002, there is the potential for a temporary significant adverse noise impact on the South/Center Sites building due to noise from construction on the North Site.

Similarly, as previously disclosed, development on the North Site has the potential to result in construction noise levels that exceed *CEQR Technical Manual* noise impact criteria at 354-361 West Street (aka 160 Leroy Street). While that site provides for between 26 and 39 dBA of window/wall attenuation, there are no other feasible and practicable mitigation measures that would be able to reduce or eliminate this potential significant adverse noise impact. Overall, with regard to construction noise, conditions would be the same as previously identified. ✷