Chapter 5: Open Space

5.1 Introduction

This chapter assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Actions on open space resources. Open space is defined in the 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review* (CEQR) *Technical Manual* as publicly accessible, publicly or privately owned land that is available for leisure, play, or sport or serves to protect or enhance the natural environment. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines indicate that an open space analysis should be conducted if an action would result in a direct effect, such as the physical loss or alteration of public open space, or an indirect effect, such as when a substantial new population could place added demand on an area's open spaces.

As described in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Jerome Avenue Rezoning consists of a series of land use actions (collectively, the "Proposed Actions") intended to facilitate the implementation of the objectives of the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan (the "Plan"). The affected area comprises an approximately 92-block area primarily along Jerome Avenue and its east west commercial corridors in Bronx Community Districts (CDs) 4, 5, and 7 (the "rezoning area"). The rezoning area is generally bounded by 184th Street to the north and East 165th Street to the south, and also includes portions of 183rd Street, Burnside Avenue, Tremont Avenue, Mount Eden Avenue, 170th Street, Edward L. Grant Highway, and East 167th Street.

5.2 Principal Conclusions

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. As described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space can be indirectly affected by a proposed action if the project would add enough population, either residential or non-residential, to noticeably diminish the capacity of open space in the area to serve the future population. A detailed analysis was provided that considered the indirect effects of the population generated by the Proposed Actions on open space resources. The analysis finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space due to reduced total, active, and passive open space ratios.

An analysis on potential direct effects on open space was also prepared. While the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces, these direct effects would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. No other direct open space effects would result from the Proposed Actions.

DIRECT EFFECTS

The detailed open space analysis presented in this chapter indicates that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse direct impact on open space resources, and would not result in any adverse air, noise, or other environmental impacts that would affect the usefulness of any study area open space. Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed action may result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources if (a) there would be direct displacement/alteration of existing open space within the study area that would have a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in overburdening of existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space. No open space resources would be physically displaced or their uses be changed as a result of the Proposed Actions, so this chapter relies on information provided in Chapter 6, "Shadows," Chapter 14, "Air Quality," and Chapter 16, "Noise," to determine whether the Proposed Actions would directly affect any open spaces within, or in close proximity to, the rezoning area.

The Proposed Actions would result in incremental shadow coverage on 41 open space resources. The shadows analysis identified significant adverse impacts at eight of these resources. The analysis determined that six resources (Bronx School of Young Leaders, PS 306 Schoolyard, Mount Hope Playground, Goble Playground, Inwood Park, Keltch Park) would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that could have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. Two resources (Edward L Grant Greenstreet, Jerome Avenue/Grant Avenue Greenstreet) would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the four to six hour minimum specified in the CEQR Technical Manual) as a result of incremental shadow coverage and vegetation at these resources could be significantly impacted. The analysis found that although the significant adverse shadow impacts would reduce the utility of these open spaces and public's enjoyment, the open spaces would continue to be available and provide other passive or active open space uses and therefore would not be a direct significant open space impact.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

The detailed analysis determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact to passive open space or to active open space in the residential study area. As the Proposed Actions are expected to introduce increments of 9,459 residents and 974 workers with the RWCDS, compared to the No-Action condition, a detailed open space analysis for both a worker (¼-mile) study area and residential (½-mile) study area was conducted, per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a portion of the rezoning area is located in an area that is considered underserved by open space, which includes portions of approximately 14 blocks at the northern end of the rezoning area. In addition, both the worker and residential study areas do not currently meet the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines for open space. The *CEQR Technical Manual*

indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio of five percent or more is generally considered significant. For areas that are considered extremely lacking in open space, a decrease of as little as one percent may be considered significant. An open space impact assessment also considers qualitative factors.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the worker study area's passive open space ratio would decrease 2.29 percent from the No-Action conditions, and it would remain well above the City's guideline ratio of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers, at 0.554 acres per 1,000 workers. Therefore, workers in the ¼-mile study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse impact in the worker study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Within the residential study area, the total active and passive open space ratios would remain below the City's guideline ratios of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents for all open space, which includes 2.0 acres of active and 0.5 acres of passive space per 1,000 residents. The total residential study area open space ratio would decline by 2.59 percent from 0.540 acres with No-Action conditions to 0.526 acres per 1,000 residents; the active open space ratio would decline by 2.47 percent from 0.364 to 0.355 acres per 1,000 residents; and the passive open space ratio would decline by 2.84 percent from 0.176 to 0.171 acres per 1,000 residents. These decreases would not exceed the five percent threshold and, therefore, not constitute a significant adverse indirect impact, however, the residential study area would continue to be underserved by open space.

5.3 Methodology

DIRECT EFFECTS

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed project would directly affect open space conditions if it: causes the loss of public open space; changes the use of an open space so that it no longer serves the same user population; limits public access to an open space; or results in an increased noise or air pollutant emissions, odor, or shadows that would temporarily or permanently affect the usefulness of a public open space. No open space resources would be physically displaced, nor would uses of open spaces be changed or public access be limited, as a result of the Proposed Actions, so this chapter relies on information provided in Chapter 6, "Shadows," Chapter 14, "Air Quality," and Chapter 16, "Noise," to determine whether the Proposed Actions would directly affect any open spaces within, or in close proximity to, the rezoning area. (It is noted that new open space would be made available, however, with the City Mapping actions in the vicinity of Corporal Fischer Place, which is included in the quantitative assessment of potential indirect effects in the With-Action conditions)

INDIRECT EFFECTS

As described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space can be indirectly affected by the Proposed Actions if they would add enough population, either residential or worker, to noticeably diminish the capacity of open space in the area to serve the future population. Typically, an assessment of indirect effects is conducted when a project would introduce more than 200 residents or 500 workers to an area; however, the thresholds for assessment are slightly different for areas of the City that have been identified as either underserved or well-served by open space. For areas underserved by open space, the threshold for assessment is more than 50 residents or 125 workers, and for areas well-served by open space, the threshold for assessment is more than 350 residents or 750 workers. As indicated on Figure 5-2, "Underserved Open Space Areas," the majority of the rezoning area is not located within an area that has been identified as either underserved or well-served; however, a small portion of the rezoning area is within an area defined as underserved.[1]

Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the open space analysis and impact assessment is based on the anticipated development from the projected development sites. As discussed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions would introduce up to 3,228 incremental residential units, which would introduce an estimated increment of 9,459 residents to the rezoning area, compared to the No-Action condition.[2] In addition as described in Chapter 1, the Proposed Actions would introduce approximately 2,128 new workers, a 974 increment compared to the No-Action condition. As such, an open space assessment for both the residential and worker populations generated by the Proposed Actions is warranted.

[1] The *CEQR Technical Manual* defines underserved areas as areas of high population density in the City that are generally the greatest distance from parkland, where the amount of open space per 1,000 residents is currently less than 2.5 acres. Well-served areas area defined as having an open space ratio above 2.5, accounting for existing parks that contain developed recreational resources; or are located within 0.25 miles (approximately a ten-minute walk) from developed and publicly accessible portions of regional parks.

[2] Assumes 2.92 persons per DU for residential units in Bronx Community District 4, 3.06 persons per DU for residential units in Bronx Community District 5, and 2.87 persons per DU for residential units in Bronx Community District 7.



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

N

0 0.25 0.5 Mile

Figure 5-1

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA

Open Space Study Area

The first step in assessing potential open space impacts is to establish the appropriate study areas for the new population(s) to be added as a result of the Proposed Actions. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* methodologies, the open space study areas are based on the distance a person is assumed to walk to reach a neighborhood open space, which differs by user. Workers typically use passive open spaces within a short walking distance of their workplaces. Residents are more likely to travel farther to reach parks and recreational facilities, and they use both passive and active open spaces. While they may also visit certain regional parks (like Central Park), such open spaces were not included in the study area's quantitative analysis but are described qualitatively. Workers are assumed to walk up to about ¼-mile distance to reach neighborhood open spaces, and residents are assumed to walk up to about ½-mile distance.

Two study areas were evaluated: a worker study area based on a ¼-mile distance from the rezoning area, and a residential study area based on a ½-mile distance. These two study areas were generally adjusted to include all census tracts with at least 50 percent of their area within the ¼-mile or ½-mile boundary, per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. In this way, the study areas allow analysis of both the open spaces in the area, as well as the population data.

In addition, these study areas are also considered in terms of a northern portion and a southern portion in order to provide a generalized understanding of differences that may exist.

As shown on Figure 5-1, "Open Space Study Areas," the ¼-mile worker study area is generally bounded by West 190th Street to the north, Webster Avenue to the east, East 162nd Street to the south, and the Major Deegan Expressway to the west. The residential study area is generally bounded by West Kingsbridge Road to the north, Bathgate Avenue to the east, East 157th Street to the south, and the Harlem River to the west.

Special consideration was given to Census Tract 63, which has less than 50 percent of its total land area within a ½-mile radius of the rezoning area, but which contains several large open spaces and is immediately adjacent to the rezoning area at its northern border. In order to account for Census Tract 63's unique position in this study only open spaces north of 161st Street were included in the analysis, while the entire population of the census tract was included in the analysis, providing for a more conservative analysis. Further, due to the large area covered by the worker and residential study areas, two subareas were defined to provide a more refined analysis of the northern (north of the Cross-Bronx Expressway) and southern (south of the Cross-Bronx Expressway) portions of the study areas.

Analysis Framework

The *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology suggests conducting an initial quantitative assessment to determine whether more detailed analyses are appropriate, but also recognizes that for projects that

introduce a large population in an area that is underserved by open space, it may be clear that a full, detailed analysis should be conducted.

With an inventory of available open space resources and potential users, the adequacy of open space in the study area can be assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative approach computes the ratio of open space acreage to the population in the study area and compares this ratio with certain guidelines. The qualitative assessment examines other factors that may affect conclusions about adequacy, including proximity to additional resources beyond the study area, the availability of private recreational facilities, and the demographic characteristics of the area's population. Specifically, the analysis in this chapter includes:

- Characteristics of the two open space user groups (residents and workers/daytime users) are determined. To determine the number of residents in the study areas, 2010 Census data is compiled for census tracts comprising the worker and residential open space study areas. As the study areas may include a workforce and daytime population that may also use open spaces, the number of employees and daytime workers in the study areas is also calculated, based on reverse journey-to-work census data (ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates).

- Existing active and passive open spaces within the ¼-mile and ½-mile open space study areas are inventoried and mapped. The condition and usage of existing facilities are described based on the inventory and field visits. In accordance with guidelines, field surveys of the ¼-mile and ½-mile study area open space resources were conducted during peak hours of use and in good weather Passively programmed open spaces were visited during peak weekday midday hours and actively programmed open spaces (or actively programmed portions of open spaces that have both active and passive open space resources) were visited during both weekday midday and peak weekend hours. Acreages of these facilities are determined and the total study area acreages are calculated. The percentage of active and passive open space are also calculated.

- Based on the inventory of facilities and study area populations, total, active, and passive open space ratios are calculated for the residential and worker populations and compared to City guidelines to assess adequacy. Open space ratios are expressed as the amount of open space acreage (total, passive, and active) per 1,000 user population.

- Expected changes in future levels of open space supply and demand in the 2026 analysis year are assessed, based on other planned development projects within the open space study areas. Any new open space or recreational facilities that are anticipated to be operational by the analysis year are also be accounted for. Open space ratios are calculated for future No- Action conditions and compared with existing ratios to determine changes in future levels of adequacy.

- Effects on open space supply and demand resulting from increased residential and worker populations added with the RWCDS associated with the Proposed Actions are assessed. The assessment of the Proposed Action's impacts are based on a comparison of open space ratios for the future No-Action compared to the future With-Action conditions. In addition to the quantitative analysis, a qualitative analysis is performed to determine if the changes resulting from the Proposed Actions constitute a substantial change (positive or negative) or an adverse effect to open space conditions. The qualitative analysis assesses whether or not the study areas are sufficiently served by open space, given the type (active vs. passive), capacity, condition, and distribution of open space, and the profile of the study area populations.



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

N

0 0.3 0.6 Mile

Figure 5-2

UNDERSERVED OPEN SPACE AREAS

Impact Assessment

Determination of impacts is based, in part, on how a project would change the open space ratios in the study areas. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an open space ratio decrease, resulting from the Proposed Actions, generally, may be considered to constitute a significant adverse impact, warranting a detailed analysis, if it would approach or exceed five percent. If a study area exhibits a low open space ratio (e.g., below 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents or 0.15 acres of passive space per 1,000 worker users), indicating a shortfall of open space, smaller decreases in that ratio as a result of the action may constitute significant adverse impacts. In addition to the quantitative factors cited above, the *CEQR Technical Manual* also recommends consideration of qualitative factors in assessing the potential for open space impacts. These include the availability of nearby destination resources, the beneficial effects of new open space resources provided by a project, and the comparison of projected open space ratios with established City guidelines. It is recognized that open space ratios of the City guidelines described above area not feasible for many areas of the City, and they are not considered impact thresholds alone. Rather, these are benchmarks that indicate how well an area is served by open space.

5.4 Existing Conditions

STUDY AREA POPULATION

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

Worker Population

As shown in Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations," based on ACS 2006-2010 Five-year Estimates reverse journey-to-work census data compiled by Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP), the existing worker population for the worker open space study area is estimated at approximately 39,905 workers. Of this number, approximately 23,450 workers are in the North Subarea and 16,455 workers are in the South Subarea.

Residential Population

As also shown in Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations," 2010 Census data indicate the worker study area has a residential population of approximately 205,514 persons. Of this number, approximately 114,804 residents are in the North Subarea and 90,710 residents are in the South Subarea.

Total User Population

Within the worker study area, the total population (residents plus workers) is estimated at 245,419 (refer to Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations"). Of this number, approximately

138,254 workers and residents are in the North Subarea and 107,165 workers and residents are in the South Subarea. Although this analysis conservatively assumes that the residents and employees are separate populations, it is possible that some of the residents live near their workplace or work from home. As a result, there is likely to be some double-counting of the daily user population in which residential and worker populations overlap, resulting in a more conservative analysis.

Table 5-1: Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

Total (North and South Subareas) *1/4-Mile Worker Study Area*			
Census Tract[1]	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
179.01	4,661	450	5,111
179.02	3,600	505	4,105
181.01	2,921	320	3,241
181.02	5,626	1,320	6,946
183.01	4,202	995	5,197
195	7,622	1,940	9,562
197	7,104	1,515	8,619
199	8,015	825	8,840
201	4,340	780	5,120
205.01	7,030	365	7,395
209	4,351	435	4,786
211	5,506	735	6,241
213.01	1,194	135	1,329
213.02	6,061	1,010	7,071
215.02	6,013	1,630	7,643
217	5,000	895	5,895
219	1,277	940	2,217
221.01	3,884	765	4,649
221.02	5,010	450	5,460
223	5,108	1,100	6,208
225	8,066	975	9,041
227.01	5,917	655	6,572
227.02	1,485	330	1,815
227.03	1,871	1,065	2,936
229.01	5,568	2,850	8,418
233.01	4,356	1,020	5,376
233.02	3,614	630	4,244
235.01	3,044	1,000	4,044
235.02	4,706	880	5,586
237.02	1,216	1,730	2,946
237.03	5,014	880	5,894
237.04	3,717	675	4,392
239	8,282	1,360	9,642
241	6,324	955	7,279
243	5,748	815	6,563
245.01	5,162	365	5,527
245.02	3,619	490	4,109
249	0	1,305	1,305
251	6,564	890	7,454
253	5,952	975	6,927
255	5,874	1,090	6,964
381	6,534	695	7,229
383.01	4,356	1,165	5,521
1/4-Mile Study Area Totals	***205,514***	***39,905***	***245,419***

Table 5-1 (continued): Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

Total (North and South Subareas) *1/2-Mile Residential Study Area*			
Census Tract	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
53	3,727	210	3,937
63	4,431	7,390	11,821
171	0	25	25
175	7,004	600	7,604
177.01	4,946	685	5,631
177.02	5,388	310	5,698
183.02	4,078	2,480	6,558
189	8,304	1,305	9,609
193	5,737	745	6,482
205.02	2,123	25	2,148
215.01	4,726	530	5,256
229.02	3,386	430	3,816
231	1,594	860	2,454
247	1,964	255	2,219
257	1,728	220	1,948
261	1,958	2,095	4,053
263	6,456	1,360	7,816
265	7,009	1,795	8,804
379	5,287	800	6,087
383.02	5,941	1,390	7,331
385	5,025	975	6,000
395	3,980	1,205	5,185
399.01	5,168	1,750	6,918
399.02	5,156	805	5,961
401	5,088	1,590	6,678
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals	**315,718**	**69,740**	**385,458**

Table 5-1 (continued): Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

North Subarea *1/4-Mile Worker Study Area*			
Census Tract	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
205.01	7,030	365	7,395
213.01	1,194	135	1,329
215.02	6,013	1,630	7,643
217	5,000	895	5,895
227.01	5,917	655	6,572
229.01	5,568	2,850	8,418
233.01	4,356	1,020	5,376
233.02	3,614	630	4,244
235.01	3,044	1,000	4,044
235.02	4,706	880	5,586
237.02	1,216	1,730	2,946
237.03	5,014	880	5,894
237.04	3,717	675	4,392
239	8,282	1,360	9,642
241	6,324	955	7,279
243	5,748	815	6,563
245.01	5,162	365	5,527
245.02	3,619	490	4,109
249	0	1,305	1,305
251	6,564	890	7,454
253	5,952	975	6,927
255	5,874	1,090	6,964
381	6,534	695	7,229
383.01	4,356	1,165	5,521
1/4-Mile Study Area Totals	***114,804***	***23,450***	***138,254***

Table 5-1 (continued): Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

North Subarea *1/2-Mile Residential Study Area*			
Census Tract	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
53	3,727	210	3,937
205.02	2,123	25	2,148
215.01	4,726	530	5,256
231	1,594	860	2,454
247	1,964	255	2,219
257	1,728	220	1,948
261	1,958	2,095	4,053
263	6,456	1,360	7,816
265	7,009	1,795	8,804
379	5,287	800	6,087
383.02	5,941	1,390	7,331
385	5,025	975	6,000
395	3,980	1,205	5,185
399.01	5,168	1,750	6,918
399.02	5,156	805	5,961
401	5,088	1,590	6,678
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals	***181,734***	***39,315***	***221,049***

Table 5-1 (continued): Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

South Subarea *1/4-Mile Worker Study Area*			
Census Tract	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
179.01	4,661	450	5,111
179.02	3,600	505	4,105
181.01	2,921	320	3,241
181.02	5,626	1,320	6,946
183.01	4,202	995	5,197
195	7,622	1,940	9,562
197	7,104	1,515	8,619
199	8,015	825	8,840
201	4,340	780	5,120
209	4,351	435	4,786
211	5,506	735	6,241
213.02	6,061	1,010	7,071
219	1,277	940	2,217
221.01	3,884	765	4,649
221.02	5,010	450	5,460
223	5,108	1,100	6,208
225	8,066	975	9,041
227.02	1,485	330	1,815
227.03	1,871	1,065	2,936
1/4-Mile Study Area Totals	***90,710***	***16,455***	***107,165***

Table 5-1 (continued): Study Area Residential and Worker Populations

South Subarea *1/2-Mile Residential Study Area*			
Census Tract	**Residential Population**	**Worker Population**	**Total Population**
63	4,431	7,390	11,821
171	0	25	25
175	7,004	600	7,604
177.01	4,946	685	5,631
177.02	5,388	310	5,698
183.02	4,078	2,480	6,558
189	8,304	1,305	9,609
193	5,737	745	6,482
229.02	3,386	430	3,816
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals	***133,984***	***30,425***	***164,409***
Notes: [1] All census tracts within the Bronx			

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

Worker Population

As shown in Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations," based on ACS reverse journey-to-work data compiled by CTPP, the existing worker population for the larger residential open space study area is estimated at approximately 69,740 workers. Of this number, approximately 39,315 workers are in the North Subarea and 30,425 workers are in the South Subarea.

Residential Population

As also shown in Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations," 2015 ACS Five-Year Estimates data indicate that the residential study area has a residential population of approximately 315,718 persons. Of this number, approximately 181,734 residents are in the North Subarea and 133,984 residents are in the South Subarea. As shown in Table 5-2, "½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown," people between the ages of 20 and 64 make up the majority (approximately 60.6 percent) of the residential population in the ½-mile study area. Children and teenagers (0 to 19 years old) account for approximately 31.6 percent of the residential study area population, and persons 65 years and over account for approximately 7.8 percent of the residential study area population. As also presented in Table 5-2, "½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown," the age breakdown of the residential study area includes a higher percentage of children and teenagers, as compared to the Bronx and New York City as a whole, and a lower percentage of adults aged 20 to 64 and persons 65 years and over.

The higher percentage of children and teenagers in the study area is also evident when comparing the median age of the residential study area population to that of the Bronx and New York City as a whole.

As shown in Table 5-2, the residential study area's average median age of 31.6, compared to 33.4 in the Bronx and 36.2 in New York City as a whole. The residential study area median ages by census tract range from a high of 47.4 years (Bronx Census Tract 261) to a low of 26.8 years (Bronx Census Tract 211).

Within a given area, the age distribution of a population affects the way open spaces are used and the need for various types of recreational facilities. Typically, children four years old or younger use traditional playgrounds that have play equipment for toddlers and preschool children. Children ages five through nine typically use traditional playgrounds, as well as grassy and hard-surfaced open spaces, which are important for activities such as ball playing, running, and skipping rope. Children ages ten through 14 use playground equipment, court spaces, Little League fields, and ball fields. Teenagers' and young adults' needs tend toward court game facilities and fields for sports, as well as more individualized recreation such as rollerblading, biking, and jogging, requiring bike paths, promenades, and roadways. Adults also gather with families for picnicking, ad hoc active sports, and recreational activities in which all ages can participate. Senior citizens engage in active recreation such as tennis, gardening, and swimming, as well as recreational activities that require passive facilities. As noted above, the demographic data for the residential open space study area suggest a need for facilities geared towards the recreational needs of children and teenagers, as the study area exhibits a high percentage of residents in the 0 to 19 age bracket.

Total User Population

As shown in Table 5-1, "Study Area Residential and Worker Populations," above, within the residential study area, the total population (residents plus workers) is estimated to be 385,458. Of this number, approximately 221,049 workers and residents are in the North Subarea and 164,409 workers and residents are in the South Subarea. Although this analysis conservatively assumes that residents and daytime users are separate populations, as noted earlier, it is possible that some of the residents live near their workplace or work from home. As a result, there is likely to be some double-counting of the daily user population in the study area, resulting in a more conservative analysis.

INVENTORY OF PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, open space may be public or private and may be used for active or passive recreational purposes. Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, publicly accessible open space is defined as facilities open to the public at designated hours on a regular basis and is assessed for impacts using both a quantitative and qualitative analysis, whereas private open space is not accessible to the general public on a regular basis and is considered qualitatively. Field surveys and secondary sources were used to determine the number, availability, and condition of publicly accessible open space resources in the worker and residential study areas.

An open space is determined to be active or passive by the uses that the design of the space allows. Active open space is the part of a facility used for active play such as sports or exercise and may include playground equipment, playing fields and courts, swimming pools, skating rinks, golf courses, lawns and paved areas for active recreation. Passive open space is used for sitting, strolling, and relaxation, and typically contains benches, walkways and picnicking areas. However, some passive spaces can be used for both passive and active recreation; such as green lawn or riverfront walkway, which can also be used for ball playing, jogging or rollerblading.

All of the publicly accessible open space and recreational resources within the two defined study areas are shown on Figure 5-3, "Open Space Study Area Resources," and listed in Table 5-3, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)," and Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)."

Table 5-2: ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

Total (North and South Subareas)														
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution												Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
179.01	4,661	353	7.6	276	5.9	314	6.7	316	6.8	3,085	66.2	317	6.8	35.1
179.02	3,600	247	6.9	334	9.3	228	6.3	329	9.1	2,260	62.8	202	5.6	29.0
181.01	2,921	100	3.4	271	9.3	147	5.0	196	6.7	1,887	64.6	320	11.0	33.2
181.02	5,626	482	8.6	288	5.1	467	8.3	345	6.1	3,524	62.6	520	9.2	32.8
183.01	4,202	190	4.5	238	5.7	183	4.4	257	6.1	2,648	63.0	686	16.3	42.6
195	7,622	627	8.2	452	5.9	668	8.8	625	8.2	4,622	60.6	628	8.2	32.4
197	7,104	672	9.5	775	10.9	433	6.1	685	9.6	4,137	58.2	402	5.7	29.0
199	8,015	576	7.2	699	8.7	683	8.5	688	8.6	4,853	60.5	516	6.4	33.0
201	4,340	432	10.0	438	10.1	351	8.1	228	5.3	2,476	57.1	415	9.6	30.4
205.01	7,030	566	8.1	544	7.7	453	6.4	710	10.1	4,109	58.4	648	9.2	30.8
209	4,351	278	6.4	352	8.1	304	7.0	270	6.2	2,911	66.9	236	5.4	30.9
211	5,506	560	10.2	590	10.7	428	7.8	502	9.1	3,136	57.0	290	5.3	26.8
213.01	1,194	95	8.0	63	5.3	81	6.8	142	11.9	716	60.0	97	8.1	34.6
213.02	6,061	673	11.1	468	7.7	563	9.3	450	7.4	3,517	58.0	390	6.4	28.9
215.02	6,013	437	7.3	628	10.4	452	7.5	434	7.2	3,652	60.7	410	6.8	31.3
217	5,000	294	5.9	270	5.4	295	5.9	419	8.4	3,357	67.1	365	7.3	34.3
219	1,277	86	6.7	59	4.6	92	7.2	62	4.9	841	65.9	137	10.7	32.1
221.01	3,884	478	12.3	351	9.0	283	7.3	232	6.0	2,339	60.2	201	5.2	27.7
221.02	5,010	411	8.2	548	10.9	345	6.9	372	7.4	3,013	60.1	321	6.4	30.8
223	5,108	285	5.6	510	10.0	394	7.7	315	6.2	3,103	60.7	501	9.8	30.7
225	8,066	766	9.5	541	6.7	787	9.8	996	12.3	4,474	55.5	502	6.2	26.9
227.01	5,917	515	8.7	284	4.8	282	4.8	404	6.8	3,992	67.5	440	7.4	31.2
227.02	1,485	90	6.1	72	4.8	105	7.1	131	8.8	966	65.1	121	8.1	36.6
227.03	1,871	137	7.3	194	10.4	99	5.3	208	11.1	1,110	59.3	123	6.6	29.6
229.01	5,568	507	9.1	381	6.8	495	8.9	453	8.1	3,444	61.9	288	5.2	28.6
233.01	4,356	220	5.1	477	11.0	259	5.9	346	7.9	2,753	63.2	301	6.9	34.0
233.02	3,614	284	7.9	401	11.1	232	6.4	264	7.3	2,132	59.0	301	8.3	29.4
235.01	3,044	249	8.2	227	7.5	176	5.8	240	7.9	1,914	62.9	238	7.8	33.1
235.02	4,706	322	6.8	209	4.4	345	7.3	406	8.6	2,801	59.5	623	13.2	38.0
237.02	1,216	86	7.1	30	2.5	80	6.6	103	8.5	841	69.2	76	6.3	32.6
237.03	5,014	565	11.3	407	8.1	390	7.8	456	9.1	2,904	57.9	292	5.8	26.9
237.04	3,717	405	10.9	424	11.4	294	7.9	196	5.3	2,018	54.3	380	10.2	28.2
239	8,282	813	9.8	552	6.7	801	9.7	628	7.6	4,855	58.6	633	7.6	29.2
241	6,324	538	8.5	706	11.2	497	7.9	480	7.6	3,747	59.3	356	5.6	28.0
243	5,748	467	8.1	429	7.5	506	8.8	515	9.0	3,356	58.4	475	8.3	32.5
245.01	5,162	381	7.4	339	6.6	411	8.0	432	8.4	3,218	62.3	381	7.4	29.5
245.02	3,619	201	5.6	198	5.5	223	6.2	302	8.3	2,457	67.9	238	6.6	34.2
249	-	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-
251	6,564	642	9.8	478	7.3	424	6.5	323	4.9	4,352	66.3	345	5.3	33.3
253	5,952	415	7.0	538	9.0	409	6.9	417	7.0	3,731	62.7	442	7.4	32.7
255	5,874	508	8.6	412	7.0	327	5.6	346	5.9	3,749	63.8	532	9.1	31.3
381	6,534	528	8.1	357	5.5	323	4.9	717	11.0	4,086	62.5	523	8.0	33.2
383.01	4,356	323	7.4	456	10.5	327	7.5	392	9.0	2,664	61.2	194	4.5	31.3

Table 5-2 (continued): ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

Total (North and South Subareas) (continued)														
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution												Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
53	3,727	280	7.5	384	10.3	348	9.3	345	9.3	2,183	58.6	187	5.0	29.2
63	4,431	167	3.8	244	5.5	269	6.1	312	7.0	2,976	67.2	463	10.4	36.1
171	-	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-
175	7,004	467	6.7	898	12.8	595	8.5	460	6.6	3,803	54.3	781	11.2	30.2
177.01	4,946	543	11.0	306	6.2	641	13.0	365	7.4	2,608	52.7	483	9.8	30.0
177.02	5,388	328	6.1	397	7.4	476	8.8	556	10.3	3,148	58.4	483	9.0	30.1
183.02	4,078	318	7.8	227	5.6	381	9.3	382	9.4	2,599	63.7	171	4.2	30.0
189	8,304	678	8.2	813	9.8	791	9.5	758	9.1	4,720	56.8	544	6.6	31.5
193	5,737	551	9.6	431	7.5	486	8.5	523	9.1	3,400	59.3	346	6.0	27.6
205.02	2,123	153	7.2	154	7.3	131	6.2	250	11.8	1,046	49.3	389	18.3	35.1
215.01	4,726	453	9.6	403	8.5	577	12.2	380	8.0	2,612	55.3	301	6.4	27.3
229.02	3,386	280	8.3	262	7.7	269	7.9	334	9.9	2,111	62.3	130	3.8	28.3
231	1,594	109	6.8	82	5.1	70	4.4	191	12.0	1,021	64.1	121	7.6	37.8
247	1,964	94	4.8	151	7.7	151	7.7	164	8.4	1,278	65.1	126	6.4	33.0
257	1,728	89	5.2	62	3.6	34	2.0	47	2.7	1,300	75.2	196	11.3	34.6
261	1,958	95	4.9	80	4.1	62	3.2	86	4.4	1,210	61.8	425	21.7	47.4
263	6,456	376	5.8	554	8.6	274	4.2	315	4.9	4,022	62.3	915	14.2	33.4
265	7,009	690	9.8	457	6.5	439	6.3	512	7.3	4,412	62.9	499	7.1	30.8
379	5,287	678	12.8	344	6.5	423	8.0	401	7.6	3,143	59.4	298	5.6	27.5
383.02	5,941	631	10.6	367	6.2	653	11.0	514	8.7	3,310	55.7	466	7.8	27.2
385	5,025	443	8.8	396	7.9	402	8.0	454	9.0	2,937	58.4	393	7.8	28.2
395	3,980	480	12.1	345	8.7	290	7.3	321	8.1	2,234	56.1	310	7.8	29.6
399.01	5,168	333	6.4	207	4.0	454	8.8	488	9.4	3,207	62.1	479	9.3	32.8
399.02	5,156	452	8.8	379	7.4	495	9.6	388	7.5	3,016	58.5	426	8.3	30.5
401	5,088	391	7.7	443	8.7	386	7.6	439	8.6	3,127	61.5	302	5.9	31.8
1/2-Mile Study Area Total	***315,718***	***25,883***	***8.2***	**24,652**	***7.8***	**24,053**	***7.6***	**25,317**	***8.0***	**191,173**	***60.6***	**24,640**	***7.8***	***31.6***
Total for Bronx	**1,428,357**	**107,959**	***7.6***	**99,658**	***7.0***	**98,842**	***6.9***	**104,581**	***7.3***	**859,322**	***60.2***	**157,995**	***11.1***	***33.4***
Total for NYC	**8,426,743**	***555,811***	***6.6***	**482,767**	***5.7***	**465,647**	***5.5***	**487,092**	***5.8***	**5,363,721**	***63.7***	**1,071,705**	***12.7***	***36.2***

Table 5-2 (continued): ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

North Subarea													
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution											Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
205.01	7,030	566	8.1	544	7.7	453	6.4	710	10.1	4,109	58.4	648	9.2	30.8
213.02	6,061	673	11.1	468	7.7	563	9.3	450	7.4	3,517	58.0	390	6.4	28.9
215.02	6,013	437	7.3	628	10.4	452	7.5	434	7.2	3,652	60.7	410	6.8	31.3
217	5,000	294	5.9	270	5.4	295	5.9	419	8.4	3,357	67.1	365	7.3	34.3
227.01	5,917	515	8.7	284	4.8	282	4.8	404	6.8	3,992	67.5	440	7.4	31.2
229.01	5,568	507	9.1	381	6.8	495	8.9	453	8.1	3,444	61.9	288	5.2	28.6
233.01	4,356	220	5.1	477	11.0	259	5.9	346	7.9	2,753	63.2	301	6.9	34.0
233.02	3,614	284	7.9	401	11.1	232	6.4	264	7.3	2,132	59.0	301	8.3	29.4
235.01	3,044	249	8.2	227	7.5	176	5.8	240	7.9	1,914	62.9	238	7.8	33.1
235.02	4,706	322	6.8	209	4.4	345	7.3	406	8.6	2,801	59.5	623	13.2	38.0
237.02	1,216	86	7.1	30	2.5	80	6.6	103	8.5	841	69.2	76	6.3	32.6
237.03	5,014	565	11.3	407	8.1	390	7.8	456	9.1	2,904	57.9	292	5.8	26.9
237.04	3,717	405	10.9	424	11.4	294	7.9	196	5.3	2,018	54.3	380	10.2	28.2
239	8,282	813	9.8	552	6.7	801	9.7	628	7.6	4,855	58.6	633	7.6	29.2
241	6,324	538	8.5	706	11.2	497	7.9	480	7.6	3,747	59.3	356	5.6	28.0
243	5,748	467	8.1	429	7.5	506	8.8	515	9.0	3,356	58.4	475	8.3	32.5
245.01	5,162	381	7.4	339	6.6	411	8.0	432	8.4	3,218	62.3	381	7.4	29.5
245.02	3,619	201	5.6	198	5.5	223	6.2	302	8.3	2,457	67.9	238	6.6	34.2
249	-	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-
251	6,564	642	9.8	478	7.3	424	6.5	323	4.9	4,352	66.3	345	5.3	33.3
253	5,952	415	7.0	538	9.0	409	6.9	417	7.0	3,731	62.7	442	7.4	32.7
255	5,874	508	8.6	412	7.0	327	5.6	346	5.9	3,749	63.8	532	9.1	31.3
381	6,534	528	8.1	357	5.5	323	4.9	717	11.0	4,086	62.5	523	8.0	33.2
383.01	4,356	323	7.4	456	10.5	327	7.5	392	9.0	2,664	61.2	194	4.5	31.3

Table 5-2 (continued): ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

North Subarea (continued)													
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution											Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
53	3,727	280	7.5	384	10.3	348	9.3	345	9.3	2,183	58.6	187	5.0	29.2
205.02	2,123	153	7.2	154	7.3	131	6.2	250	11.8	1,046	49.3	389	18.3	35.1
215.01	4,726	453	9.6	403	8.5	577	12.2	380	8.0	2,612	55.3	301	6.4	27.3
231	1,594	109	6.8	82	5.1	70	4.4	191	12.0	1,021	64.1	121	7.6	37.8
247	1,964	94	4.8	151	7.7	151	7.7	164	8.4	1,278	65.1	126	6.4	33.0
257	1,728	89	5.2	62	3.6	34	2.0	47	2.7	1,300	75.2	196	11.3	34.6
261	1,958	95	4.9	80	4.1	62	3.2	86	4.4	1,210	61.8	425	21.7	47.4
263	6,456	376	5.8	554	8.6	274	4.2	315	4.9	4,022	62.3	915	14.2	33.4
265	7,009	690	9.8	457	6.5	439	6.3	512	7.3	4,412	62.9	499	7.1	30.8
379	5,287	678	12.8	344	6.5	423	8.0	401	7.6	3,143	59.4	298	5.6	27.5
383.02	5,941	631	10.6	367	6.2	653	11.0	514	8.7	3,310	55.7	466	7.8	27.2
385	5,025	443	8.8	396	7.9	402	8.0	454	9.0	2,937	58.4	393	7.8	28.2
395	3,980	480	12.1	345	8.7	290	7.3	321	8.1	2,234	56.1	310	7.8	29.6
399.01	5,168	333	6.4	207	4.0	454	8.8	488	9.4	3,207	62.1	479	9.3	32.8
399.02	5,156	452	8.8	379	7.4	495	9.6	388	7.5	3,016	58.5	426	8.3	30.5
401	5,088	391	7.7	443	8.7	386	7.6	439	8.6	3,127	61.5	302	5.9	31.8
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals	***186,601***	***15,686***	***8.3***	***14,023***	***7.8***	***13,753***	***7.7***	***14,728***	***8.1***	***113,707***	***60.4***	***14,704***	***7.7***	***32***
Total for Bronx	**1,428,357**	**107,959**	***7.6***	**99,658**	***7.0***	**98,842**	***6.9***	**104,581**	***7.3***	**859,322**	***60.2***	**157,995**	***11.1***	***33.4***
Total for NYC	**8,426,743**	***555,811***	***6.6***	**482,767**	***5.7***	**465,647**	***5.5***	**487,092**	***5.8***	**5,363,721**	***63.7***	**1,071,705**	***12.7***	***36.2***

Table 5-2 (continued): ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

South Subarea													
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution											Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
179.01	4,661	353	7.6	276	5.9	314	6.7	316	6.8	3,085	66.2	317	6.8	35.1
179.02	3,600	247	6.9	334	9.3	228	6.3	329	9.1	2,260	62.8	202	5.6	29.0
181.01	2,921	100	3.4	271	9.3	147	5.0	196	6.7	1,887	64.6	320	11.0	33.2
181.02	5,626	482	8.6	288	5.1	467	8.3	345	6.1	3,524	62.6	520	9.2	32.8
183.01	4,202	190	4.5	238	5.7	183	4.4	257	6.1	2,648	63.0	686	16.3	42.6
195	7,622	627	8.2	452	5.9	668	8.8	625	8.2	4,622	60.6	628	8.2	32.4
197	7,104	672	9.5	775	10.9	433	6.1	685	9.6	4,137	58.2	402	5.7	29.0
199	8,015	576	7.2	699	8.7	683	8.5	688	8.6	4,853	60.5	516	6.4	33.0
201	4,340	432	10.0	438	10.1	351	8.1	228	5.3	2,476	57.1	415	9.6	30.4
209	4,351	278	6.4	352	8.1	304	7.0	270	6.2	2,911	66.9	236	5.4	30.9
211	5,506	560	10.2	590	10.7	428	7.8	502	9.1	3,136	57.0	290	5.3	26.8
213.01	1,194	95	8.0	63	5.3	81	6.8	142	11.9	716	60.0	97	8.1	34.6
219	1,277	86	6.7	59	4.6	92	7.2	62	4.9	841	65.9	137	10.7	32.1
221.01	3,884	478	12.3	351	9.0	283	7.3	232	6.0	2,339	60.2	201	5.2	27.7
221.02	5,010	411	8.2	548	10.9	345	6.9	372	7.4	3,013	60.1	321	6.4	30.8
223	5,108	285	5.6	510	10.0	394	7.7	315	6.2	3,103	60.7	501	9.8	30.7
225	8,066	766	9.5	541	6.7	787	9.8	996	12.3	4,474	55.5	502	6.2	26.9
227.02	1,485	90	6.1	72	4.8	105	7.1	131	8.8	966	65.1	121	8.1	36.6
227.03	1,871	137	7.3	194	10.4	99	5.3	208	11.1	1,110	59.3	123	6.6	29.6

Table 5-2 (continued): ½-Mile Study Area Residential Population Age Breakdown

South Subarea (continued)														
Census Tract	Total Residential Population	Age Distribution												Median Age
		Under 5		5-9		10-14		15-19		20-64		65+		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
63	4,431	167	3.8	244	5.5	269	6.1	312	7.0	2,976	67.2	463	10.4	36.1
171	-	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-	n/a	-
175	7,004	467	6.7	898	12.8	595	8.5	460	6.6	3,803	54.3	781	11.2	30.2
177.01	4,946	543	11.0	306	6.2	641	13.0	365	7.4	2,608	52.7	483	9.8	30.0
177.02	5,388	328	6.1	397	7.4	476	8.8	556	10.3	3,148	58.4	483	9.0	30.1
183.02	4,078	318	7.8	227	5.6	381	9.3	382	9.4	2,599	63.7	171	4.2	30.0
189	8,304	678	8.2	813	9.8	791	9.5	758	9.1	4,720	56.8	544	6.6	31.5
193	5,737	551	9.6	431	7.5	486	8.5	523	9.1	3,400	59.3	346	6.0	27.6
229.02	3,386	280	8.3	262	7.7	269	7.9	334	9.9	2,111	62.3	130	3.8	28.3
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals	***129,117***	***10,197***	***8.2***	***10,629***	***7.8***	***10,300***	***7.6***	***10,589***	***8.0***	***77,466***	***60.6***	***9,936***	***7.8***	***31***
Total for Bronx	**1,428,357**	**107,959**	***7.6***	**99,658**	***7.0***	**98,842**	***6.9***	**104,581**	***7.3***	**859,322**	***60.2***	**157,995**	***11.1***	***33.4***
Total for NYC	**8,426,743**	***555,811***	***6.6***	**482,767**	***5.7***	**465,647**	***5.5***	**487,092**	***5.8***	**5,363,721**	***63.7***	**1,071,705**	***12.7***	***36.2***

Notes:
[1] All census tracts within the Bronx
[2] Weighted average for study area census tracts

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates, and ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

- Rezoning Area
- Commercial Study Area
- Residential Study Area
- Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3a

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
1 Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
(1) Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3b

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

- Rezoning Area
- Commercial Study Area
- Residential Study Area
- Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3c

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

- Rezoning Area
- Commercial Study Area
- Residential Study Area
- Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3d

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
1 Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
(1) Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3e

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3f

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N
0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3g

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3h

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
1 Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
(1) Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3i

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
1 Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
(1) Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3j

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

- Rezoning Area
- Commercial Study Area
- Residential Study Area
- Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
- Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3k

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES



Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2016; STV Incorporated, 2016.

Rezoning Area
Commercial Study Area
Residential Study Area
Open Space Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Quantitative Analysis
Open Space Not Included in Analysis or Located Outside of the Study Area

N

0 500 1,000 Feet

Figure 5-3l

OPEN SPACE STUDY AREA RESOURCES

Table 5-3: Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)

Map No.	Name	Location	Owner/ Agency	Amenities	Subarea	Acreage	Passive		Active		Condition	Utilization	
							Acres	%	Acres	%		Weekday	Weekend
1/4-Mile Worker Study Area													
2	Bergen Park/Triangle	East 181st Street, Anthony Avenue, Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Benches, trees	North	0.21	0.21	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	4 – High	4 – High
3	Featherbed Triangle	Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard and Featherbed Lane	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, lawns	North	0.17	0.17	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
4	Martin Luther King Triangle	Woodycrest Avenue, Shakespeare Avenue, West 168th Street	DPR[1]	Benches, trees	South	0.11	0.11	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
5	P.S. 15	Hall of Fame Terrace between Andrews Avenue and Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard	DOE/DPR[2]	Benches, trees, lawns, plantings	North	0.28	0.28	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low
6	Slattery Playground	East 183rd Street between Valentine and Ryer avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, bathrooms, eateries, fitness equipment, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.91	0.09	10	0.82	90	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
7	P.S. 209	East 183rd Street between Valentine and Tiebout avenues	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.11	0.01	10	0.10	90	Acceptable	No Use	0 – Inaccessible

8	Grand Playground	West 181st Street between Grand and Davidson avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, playgrounds	North	0.38	0.04	10	0.34	90	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
9	Davidson Playground	West 180th Street between Davidson Avenue and Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.21	0.02	10	0.19	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
10	Walton Park	East 181st Street between Walton and Jerome avenues	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.34	0.03	10	0.31	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
11	P.S. 279	Morris Avenue between East Burnside Avenue and East 181st Street	DOE	Playgrounds, basketball courts, track	North	0.61	0.06	10	0.55	90	Acceptable	4 – High	1 – No Use
12	P.S. 306	West 177th Street, Jerome Avenue, Davidson Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playgrounds, basketball courts, track	North	0.05	0.01	10	0.05	90	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
13	Beanstalk Playground	Billingsley Terrace between Phelan Place and Sedgwick Avenue	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.27	0.03	10	0.24	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
14	Aqueduct Walk (includes Greenstreet)	Aqueduct Avenue between West 181st Street and Tremont Avenue	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, fitness equipment, handball courts, playgrounds	North	4.98	2.99	60	1.99	40	Unacceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate

15	University Malls	University Avenue between West 174th Street and West Tremont Avenue	DPR[1]	Trees, lawn	North	0.74	0.74	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
16	Devanney Triangle	East Burnside Avenue between Creston Avenue and Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, lawns	North	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	4 – High	4 – High
17	Echo Triangle	Echo Place, East Tremont Avenue, Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, plantings	North	0.16	0.16	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
18	Richman (Echo) Park	Valentine Avenue between East Tremont and East Burnside avenues	DPR[1]	Bathrooms, dog-friendly areas	North	4.59	2.30	50	2.30	50	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
19	Mount Hope Playground	East 177th Street at Walton Avenue	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.70	0.07	10	0.63	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	4 – High
20	Peace Park	Cross Bronx Expressway Service Road between Topping and Clay avenues	DPR[1]	Eateries, playgrounds	North	0.14	0.01	10	0.13	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
21	Park	Ittner Place between Monroe and Topping avenues	DPR[2]	Trees along sidewalk between Monroe and Topping avenues	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	Unacceptable	0 - Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

22	Taft Educational Campus	East 170th between Morris and Sheridan avenues	DOE	Baseball field	South	2.35	0.24	10	2.12	90	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
23	Jerome Playground South	Cross Bronx Expressway between Townsend and Jerome avenues	DPR[1]	Handball courts, playground	South	0.34	0.03	10	0.31	90	Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
24	Jennie Jerome Playground	Jerome Avenue between East 174th Street and Cross Bronx Expressway	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.29	0.03	10	0.26	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	4 – High
25	Featherbenches	Cross Bronx Expressway, Featherbed Lane, Jerome Avenue	DPR[1]	Benches, trees	North	0.14	0.14	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
26	Inwood Park	West Mount Eden Avenue between Inwood and Jerome avenues	DPR[1]	Benches, trees	South	0.36	0.36	100	0.00	0	Unacceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
27	Galileo Playground	Macombs Road between West 176th and 175th streets	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.71	0.07	10	0.64	90	Acceptable	4 – High	4 – High
28	Half-Nelson Playground	Nelson Avenue between Featherbed Lane and West 174th Street	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.61	0.06	10	0.55	90	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
29	Grant Park	East 170th Street between Sheridan and Morris avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, playgrounds, bird sanctuary	South	3.85	3.08	80	0.77	20	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
30	Park	East 170th Street and Sheridan Avenue		Paved, parking spaces	South	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

31	P.S. 64	East 170th and 171st streets, between Townsend and Walton avenues	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball courts, track	South	0.68	0.07	10	0.61	90	Acceptable	2 – Low	3 – Moderate
32	Keltch Park	Jerome Avenue between Macombs Road and Elliot Place	DPR[1]	Eateries	South	0.29	0.29	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	4 – High
34	Goble Playground	Goble Place between Inwood Avenue and Macombs Road	DPR[1]	Basketball Courts, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	South	0.38	0.04	10	0.34	90	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
35	West Bronx Recreation Center	Jesup Avenue between West 172nd Street and Cross Bronx Expressway	DPR[1]	Baseball fields, basketball courts, recreation centers, soccer fields, volleyball courts	South	1.88	0.19	10	1.69	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
36	Sedgwick Playground	Cross Bronx Expressway Sr. ramp between Undercliff Avenue and Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, fitness equipment, handball courts, playgrounds	North	1.05	0.21	20	0.84	80	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
37	Plimpton Playground	Plimpton Avenue between West 172nd Street and Edward L Grant Highway	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	South	1.00	0.10	10	0.90	90	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

38	Roberto Clemente State Park	301 West Tremont Avenue	NYSOPRHP	multi-purpose recreation building, an Olympic-size pool complex, ball fields, basketball courts, picnic areas, playgrounds and a waterfront promenade	North	25	2.50	10	22.50	90	Acceptable	4 – High	4 – High
39	Bridge Playground	Boscobel Place between Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard and Undercliff Avenue	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, playground	South	0.61	0.06	10	0.55	90	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
40	Bridge Park	Harlem River between West 175th Street and Alexander Hamilton Bridge	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawn, benches, pathways	North	3.58	3.58	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
41	Highbridge Park	Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard at West 170th Street	DPR[1]	Spray showers	South	0.82	0.82	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
42	Merriam Playground	West 168th Street between MLK Jr. Boulevard and Merriam Avenue	DPR[1]	Basketball Courts, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	South	2.94	0.88	30	2.06	70	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
43	Ogden Plimpton Playground	Ogden Avenue, Plimpton Avenue, West 170th Street	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	South	0.23	0.02	10	0.21	90	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
44	Park	East 167th Street and Sheridan Avenue		Paved, for pedestrians	South	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

46	Joyce Kilmer Park	Grand Concourse to Walton Avenue between East 161st and 164th streets	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, Wi-Fi hot spots, pathways, trees, plantings, lawns	South	6.33	4.43	70	1.90	30	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
47	Macombs Dam Park	River Avenue to the Harlem River between East 157th, West 161st and East 164th streets	DPR[1]	Baseball fields, basketball courts, bathrooms, fitness equipment, football fields, handball courts, playgrounds, running tracks, soccer fields, Wi-Fi hot spots	South	1.93	0.19	10	1.74	90	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
1/4-Mile Study Area Totals						***70.54***	***24.93***	***35.34***	***45.61***	***64.66***			

Map No.	Name	Location	Owner/ Agency	Amenities		Acreage	Passive		Active		Condition	Utilization	
							Acres	%	Acres	%		Weekday	Weekend
1/2-Mile Residential Study Area													
1	Devoe Park	West Fordham Road between Sedgwick and University avenues	DPR[1]	Bathrooms, dog-friendly areas, eateries, playgrounds, Wi-Fi hot spots	North	5.85	2.93	50	2.93	50	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
33	Claremont Park	Clay Avenue, Anthony Avenue between Mount Eden Parkway and East 170th Street	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, spray showers	South	38.00	3.80	10	34.20	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
45	Mullaly Park (includes Greenstreet)	Jerome Avenue to River Avenue between East 164th and McClellan Street at Cromwell Avenue	DPR[1]	Baseball fields, basketball courts, bathrooms, dog-friendly areas, handball courts, outdoor pools, playgrounds, recreation centers, skate parks, soccer fields	South	15.08	3.02	20	12.06	80	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	4 – High
54	Aqueduct Walk	Aqueduct Avenue between West Kingsbridge Road and West 181st Street	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, fitness equipment, handball courts, playgrounds	North	5.43	3.26	60	2.17	40	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low

55	St. James Park	Jerome Avenue, East 193rd Street, Creston Avenue, East 191st Street	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, dog-friendly areas, eateries, handball courts, playgrounds, recreation centers, soccer fields, spray showers, tennis courts, Wi-Fi hot spots	North	11.39	4.56	40	6.83	60	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
56	P.S. 246 (Poe Center)	East 193rd Street between Creston Avenue and Grand Concourse	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, track, tennis court	North	0.11	0.01	10	0.10	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	0 – Inaccessible
57	Poe Park	Grand Concourse between East 192nd Street and East Kingsbridge Road	DPR[1]	Historic houses, playgrounds, spray showers, Wi-Fi hot spots	North	2.33	1.40	60	0.93	40	Acceptable	2 – Low	3 – Moderate
58	Bryan Park	East Kingsbridge Road at East Fordham Road	DPR[1]	Trees, lawns, plantings, benches	North	0.15	0.15	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
59	Webster Playground	East 188th Street between Webster and Park avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, bathrooms, eateries, fitness equipment, handball courts, playgrounds	North	0.74	0.07	10	0.67	90	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	2 – Low
60	Thorpe Family Playground	East 183rd Street between Webster and Park avenues	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.20	0.02	10	0.18	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate

61	Washington Park	East 183rd Street between Washington and Park avenues	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.52	0.05	10	0.47	90	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
62	I.S. 391	Folin Street, East 182nd Street, Webster Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Basketball courts, benches	North	0.46	0.05	10	0.41	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
63	Bathgate Playground	Washington to Bathgate Avenue between West 181st and East 183rd streets	DPR[1]	Playground, lawns, trees, plantings, community garden	North	2.50	1.75	70	0.75	30	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
64	O'Brien Oval	East Tremont Avenue at Valentine Avenue between Carter Avenue and East 176th Street	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, lawns, plantings	North	0.23	0.23	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
65	Tremont Park	East 175th Street to East Tremont Avenue between 3rd and Arthur avenues	DPR[1]	Baseball fields, bathrooms, dog-friendly areas, fitness paths, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	North	15.00	7.50	50	7.50	50	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
66	Stop and Go Playground	West 175th Street between Washington and Bathgate avenues	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.32	0.03	10	0.29	90	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
67	Cleopatra Playground	Anthony Avenue between Prospect and Ittner Places	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, spray showers	North	0.62	0.06	10	0.56	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low

68	Mott Playground	Morris Avenue between McClellan and East 166th streets	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, bathrooms, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	South	0.98	0.10	10	0.88	90	Acceptable	4 – High	2 – Low
69	Jerome Slope	Jerome Avenue at East 165th Street	DPR[1]	Trees, lawns, plantings, overgrown	South	0.76	0.76	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
70	Nelson Playground	West 166th Street between Woodycrest and Nelson avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, bathrooms, handball courts, playgrounds, spray showers	South	1.22	0.12	10	1.10	90	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
71	Cedar Playground	West 179th Street between Cedar and Sedgwick avenues	DPR[1]	Basketball courts, bathrooms, fitness equipment, playgrounds, spray showers	North	1.80	0.18	10	1.62	90	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
72	University Woods	Cedar Avenue, Sedgwick Avenue between Hall of Fame Terrace and West 180th Street	DPR[1]	Dog-friendly areas, trees, lawns, plantings, overgrown	North	3.31	3.31	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
74	Muller Triangle	East Fordham Road, Creston Avenue, East 190th Street	DPR[1]	Benches, paved, trees, potted plants	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
1/2-Mile Study Area Totals						***177.58***	***58.32***	***32.84***	***119.26***	***67.16***			

Source: New York City Open Accessible Space Information System (OASIS), DPR, 2014 Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data

Table 5-4: Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)

No.	Name	Location	Owner/ Agency	Amenities	Subarea	Acres	Passive		Active		"Other Space" Notes	Condition	Utilization	
							Acres	%	Acres	%			Weekday	Weekend
Resources Not Included in Quantitative Assessment - 1/4-Mile Radius														
1	P.S. 33	2418 Jerome Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.02	0.00	10	0.02	90	1a	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	0 – Inaccessible
	P.S. 33	2418 Jerome Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.03	0.00	10	0.03	90	1a	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	0 – Inaccessible
2	P.S. 33	2424 Jerome Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Basketball court, handball court	North	0.23	0.02	10	0.21	90	1a	Acceptable	4 – High	3 – Moderate
3	Middle School 399 Playground	East 184th Street, Walton And Morris avenues	DOE	Basketball court, parking lot w/ courts	North	0.54	0.17	59	0.37	41	1d	Unacceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low
4		East 184th Street, Walton and Morris avenues		Basketball courts, parking lot	North	0.41	0.16	40	0.25	60	1d	Unacceptable	0 - Inaccessible	2 – Low
5	I.S. 206	2280 Aqueduct Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.13	0.01	10	0.12	90	1a	Acceptable	4 – High	0 – Inaccessible
6	Jardin De Las Rosas	Buchanan Place Between Jerome and Davidson avenues	DPR[1]	Community garden	North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
7	Junior High School 115	E 183rd Street, Ryer Avenue, Valentine Avenue	DOE	Paved area in between buildings w/ Playground	North	0.20	0.20	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 - Inaccessible	1 – No Use
8	Twin Parks West	2244 Tiebout Avenue	NYCHA	Trees, landscaped	North	0.14	0.14	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
9	Twin Parks West	2244 Tiebout Avenue	NYCHA	Trees, landscaped	North	0.10	0.10	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
10	Bronx Community College*	1930 Sedgwick Avenue		Trees, lawns, landscaped, sitting area	North	2.07	0.69	33	1.38	67	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
11	Bronx Community College	2155 University Avenue		Baseball field, soccer field, track	North	3.93	0.39	10	3.54	90	1a	Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use

12	Bronx Community College	2155 University Avenue		Tennis courts	North	0.25	0.02	10	0.23	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
	Bronx Community College	2155 University Avenue		Tennis courts	North	0.13	0.01	10	0.12	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
13	Bronx Community College	2155 University Avenue		Landscaped, lawns	North	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0	2a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
14	P.S. 91	2200 Aqueduct Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.04	0.00	10	0.04	90	1a	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	0 – Inaccessible
15	Morris Garden	East 181st Street Between Morris and Creston avenues	DPR[1]	Playgrounds, picnic tables, benches, trees, plantings	North	0.44	0.13	30	0.31	70		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
16	MARC Academy and Family Center	2105 Jerome Avenue		Playground	North	0.07	0.01	10	0.06	90	1a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
17	P.S. 279	2091 Walton Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.07	0.01	10	0.06	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
18	"No Name"	2066 Morris Avenue	2066 Morris Avenue Housing	Playground	North	0.02	0.00	10	0.02	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
19	P.S.396	1930 Andrews Avenue South	DOE/DPR[2]	Trees, landscaped	North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
	P.S.396	1930 Andrews Avenue South	DOE/DPR[2]	Trees, landscaped	North	0.08	0.08	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
20	Greenstreet	Intersection Of West Tremont and Sedgwick avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawns, paved	North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
21	"No Name"	1420 Grand Concourse	Grand Concourse Estate	Green space in between buildings	South	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
22	"No Name"	89 West Tremont Avenue		Open space behind building, trees, landscaped	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

23	"No Name"	Dr. MLK Blvd, West Tremont Avenue		Playground, open space in between buildings	North	0.31	0.03	10	0.28	90	1d	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
24	Greenstreet	Grand Concourse (South Of East Burnside Avenue)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved	North	0.09	0.09	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
25					North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
26	Mount Hope Garden	Creston Avenue Between East Burnside Avenue and East 179th Street	DPR[1]	Playgrounds	North	0.28	0.08	30	0.20	70		Under Construction	2 – Low	2 – Low
27	Leave it Better Kids' Garden	West Tremont Avenue between Grand and Davidson avenues	Green Thumb	Trees, raised beds, sitting area	North	0.23	0.23	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	2 – Low
28	P.S. 396	1930 Andrews Avenue South	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.09	0.01	10	0.08	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
29	Bronx School of Young Leaders	40 West Tremont Avenue		Playground, baseball, basketball, track	North	1.02	0.10	10	0.92	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low
30	"No Name"	1789 Davidson Avenue		Playground next to apt. building	North	0.22	0.02	10	0.20	90	1d	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
31	Graham Windham Early Learning	1818 Davidson Avenue		Playground, open space	North	0.10	0.01	10	0.09	90	1c	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
32	Macombs Jr High School 82	1700 Macombs Road		Playground, basketball courts	North	0.44	0.04	10	0.40	90	1a	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
33	Greenstreet	Intersection of Andrew and West Tremont avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawns	North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
34	Greenstreet	Intersection of Sedgwick and West Tremont avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
35	Greenstreet	Intersection of Morton Place and Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard	DPR[1]	Trees, lawns	North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

36	Greenstreet	Along Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard (Intersection of West Tremont Avenue)	DPR[1]	Trees, paved, raised plant beds	North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
37	Townsend Walk	Cross Bronx Expressway, between Townsend and Jerome avenues	DPR[1]	Extensions of sidewalk connecting Jerome and Townsend avenues, running along elevated Cross Bronx Expressway	North	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
38	Walton Walk	Cross Bronx Expressway, between Walton and Townsend avenues		Extension of sidewalk connecting Walton and Townsend avenues, running along elevated Cross Bronx Expressway	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
39	Walton Slope	Walton Avenue, East 174th Street below Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Trees, grass area next to Cross Bronx Expressway	North	0.55	0.55	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
40	Morris Mesa	N/S Cross Bronx Expressway between Morris Avenue and Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Playground	North	0.15	0.15	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
41	"No Name"	Adjacent to Cross Bronx Expressway		Trees, overgrown	North	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
42	P.S. 236 Langston Hughes	1871 Walton Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.27	0.03	10	0.24	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
43	I.S. 117	1865 Morris Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball courts, tennis courts	North	0.48	0.05	10	0.43	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

44	Townsend Garden	East 175th Street between Walton and Townsend avenues	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, raised beds, shed, pathways	North	0.15	0.15	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
45	176th Street Community Garden	Walton Avenue and East 176th Street	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, sitting area, shed, raised beds	North	0.23	0.23	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
46	Greenstreet (Mount Eden Malls)	East 170th Street between Grand Concourse and Wythe Place	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, plantings, lawn (fenced off)	South	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
47	Greenstreet (Mount Eden Malls)	Mount Eden Parkway between Grand Concourse and Morris Avenue	DPR1	Benches, trees, plantings, lawn	South	0.37	0.37	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
48					South	0.24	0.24	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
49					South	0.42	0.42	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
50	P.S. 170	Townsend and East Mount Eden avenues	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, green space	South	0.08	0.01	10	0.07	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
51	"No Name"	Selwyn Avenue between East 173rd and East 174th streets		Paved parking lot	South	0.08	0.08	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
52	P.S. 70	1701 Weeks Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Paved area in between buildings	South	0.10	0.10	100	0.00	0	2a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
	P.S. 70	1701 Weeks Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.20	0.02	10	0.18	90	1a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
53	Greenstreet	Intersection Of Featherbed Lane And Nelson Avenue	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, plantings	North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
54	Greenstreet	Intersection Of Grand Avenue And Macombs Road	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawn	North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
55	Park	Cross Bronx Expressway, Dr. MLK Jr. Boulevard, Plimpton Avenue		Grassy area next to Cross Bronx Expressway	North	0.22	0.22	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

56	"No Name"	Rockwood and Walton avenues		Playground	South	0.18	0.02	10	0.16	90	1d	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
57	"No Name"	East 170th between Grand Concourse and Wythe Place		Green space in between buildings	South	0.14	0.14	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
58	"No Name"	East 172nd between Morris and College avenues		Playground, basketball court, between buildings	South	0.57	0.06	10	0.51	90	1d	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	3 – Moderate
59	Greenstreet	Intersection of East 170th Street and Grand Concourse	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawn	South	0.16	0.16	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	4 – High
60	P.S. 28 Mount Hope*	1855 Anthony Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball court	North	0.19	0.02	10	0.17	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
61	"No Name"	West 175th between Macombs Road and Gerard Avenue		Open space between apt. buildings	North	0.27	0.27	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
62	Park	West Mount Eden Avenue between Macombs Road and Inwood Avenue		Trees, plantings, lawn, overgrown	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
63	Strip (Greenstreet)	Cross Bronx Expressway, Featherbed Lane, Inwood Avenue and Macombs Road	DPR[1]	benches and fenced in trees, plantings, overgrown (adjacent to Cross Bronx Expressway)	North	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
64	Palladia Inc. - Hill House	Grand Avenue and Macombs Road		Basketball court	North	0.04	0.00	10	0.04	90	1d	Acceptable	0 - Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
65	"No Name"	Featherbed Lane, Macombs Road, Jessup Avenue		Trees, lawns, benches next to apt. building	North	0.31	0.31	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
66	"No Name"	Cross Bronx Expressway, Featherbed Lane, Jerome Avenue		Trees, overgrown	North	0.21	0.21	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

67	Sedgwick Houses	1531 University Avenue	NYCHA	Playgrounds, landscaped, trees, lawns, sitting area, pathways	North	0.03	0.01	30	0.02	70	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
	Sedgwick Houses	1531 University Avenue	NYCHA	Playgrounds, landscaped, trees, lawns, sitting area, pathways	North	0.05	0.01	30	0.04	70	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
	Sedgwick Houses	1531 University Avenue	NYCHA	Playgrounds, landscaped, trees, lawns, sitting area, pathways	North	0.02	0.01	30	0.01	70	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
	Sedgwick Houses	1531 University Avenue	NYCHA	Playgrounds, landscaped, trees, lawns, sitting area, pathways	North	0.02	0.01	30	0.01	70	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
68	Greenstreet	Plimpton and Nelson avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	North	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
69	Greenstreet	Intersection of Popham Avenue and West 174th Street	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawn	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
70	Greenstreet	Edward L Grant Highway (south of Cross Bronx Expressway)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved		0.07	0.07	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
71	P.S. 199	West 172nd, Nelson and Shakespeare avenues	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball, baseball, track	South	0.85	0.08	10	0.77	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
72	Highbridge Voices	1380 Merriam Avenue		Playground	South	0.08	0.01	10	0.07	90	1a	Acceptable	4 – High	1 – No Use

73	Mosaic Success Garden	Ogden Avenue, West 169th Street, Merriam Avenue	Green Thumb	Trees, lawns, walking paths	South	0.34	0.34	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
74	Greenstreet	Intersection of Undercliff and Sedgwick avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, lawn	South	0.09	0.09	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
75	Target Bronx Community Garden	Anderson Avenue and West 165th Street		Trees, lawns, landscaped, raised beds	South	0.35	0.35	100	0.00	0	2e	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
76	Noonan Plaza	105 West 168 Street	Noonan Plaza LLC	Trees, lawns, landscaped, walkway	South	0.20	0.20	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
77	"No Name"	1200 University Avenue		Green space in between buildings	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
78	Greenstreet	Edward L Grant Highway (between Shakespeare and Nelson avenues)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved	South	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
					North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
79	W 170th Street and Edward L Grant Highway	W 170 St and Edward L Grant Hwy	DPR[1]	Greenstreet	South	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
80	Cpl Fischer Park	Nelson Avenue between West 169th and 170th streets	DPR[1]	Trees, lawns, overgrown	South	0.89	0.89	100	0.00	0		Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
81	Greenstreet	Along Edward L Grant Highway (up to West 169th Street)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved	South	0.18	0.18	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
82					South	0.15	0.15	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
83	Greenstreet	Intersection of Jerome Avenue and Edward L Grant Highway	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Paved space	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
84	Greenstreet	Intersection of Jerome and Shakespeare avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, bushes, flowers	South	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
85	Las Casitas Community Garden	Woodycrest Avenue between West 166th and 167th streets	Green Thumb	Seating area, trees, planting, raised beds, shed	South	0.19	0.19	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	3 – Moderate

86	"No Name"	West 166th, Nelson and Woodycrest avenues	NYCHA	Basketball court, lawn area, paved area	South	0.40	0.12	30	0.28	70	1d	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
87	Sheridan Academy for Young Leaders	1098 Sheridan Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, benches	South	0.35	0.03	10	0.32	90	1a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
88	Greenstreet	Intersection of Gerard and Jerome avenues	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved	South	0.10	0.10	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
89	Greenstreet	Grand Concourse (between East 168th and East 170th streets)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved, potted plants	South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
90					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
91					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
92					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
93					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
94					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
95					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
96					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
97					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
98					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
99					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
100	Greenstreet	Grand Concourse (above East 167th Street)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved, potted plants	South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
101					South	0.01	0.01	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
102	Greenstreet	Grand Concourse (between McClellan and East 167th streets)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved, potted plants	South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
103					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
104					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
105					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
106					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
107					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
108	Greenstreet	Grand Concourse (East 168th Street)	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, paved	South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
109					South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use

110	P.S./I.S. 218	50 East 168 Street	DOE/DPR[2]	Paved parking lot	South	0.01	0.01	100	0.00	0	2a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
111	P.S./I.S. 218	50 East 168 Street	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	South	0.01	0.00	10	0.01	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
112	P.S./I.S. 218	50 East 168 Street	DOE/DPR[2]	Landscaped	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	2a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
113	P.S./I.S. 218	1220 Gerard Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Basketball court, tennis court, track	South	0.39	0.04	10	0.35	90	1a	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	1 – No Use
114	"No Name"	1116 Woodycrest Avenue		Green space in between buildings	South	0.01	0.01	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
115	"No Name"	1325 Walton Avenue		Playground next to apt. building	South	0.02	0.00	10	0.02	90	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
116	Siena House Shelter	75 West 168 Street		Playground, green space	South	0.02	0.00	10	0.02	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 - Inaccessible
117	Sacred Heart School and Head Start	1248 Nelson Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Paved area	South	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0	2c	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
118	P.S. 073	1020 Anderson Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, tennis court	South	0.39	0.04	10	0.35	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	3 – Moderate
119	Greenstreet *	Intersection of Jerome Avenue and Macombs Dam Bridge		Trees, plantings	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
						0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
120	Yankee Stadium Baseball Field (part of Macombs Dam Park)*	East 161st and 164th streets, between River and Jerome avenues	DPR[1]	Baseball stadium, private	North	8.03	0.80	10	7.23	90		Acceptable	TBD	
Total Additional 1/4-Mile Study Area Open Space Not Included						***32.25***	***12.02***	***37.27***	***20.23***	***62.73***				

No.	Name	Location	Owner/ Agency	Amenities	Subarea	Acres	Passive		Active		"Other Space" Notes	Condition	Utilization	
							Acres	%	Acres	%			Weekday	Weekend
Resources Not Included in Quantitative Assessment - 1/2-Mile Radius														
125	Bronx Veterans Medical Center	110 West Kingsbridge Rd		Basketball court	North	0.08	0.01	10	0.07	90	1b	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
126	"No Name"	2620 Briggs Avenue		Playground	North	0.04	0.00	10	0.04	90	1d	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
127	Fordham Hill Owners Corp.	4 Fordham Hill Oval		Trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
128	Fordham Hill Owners Corp.	4 Fordham Hill Oval		Trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
129	Fordham Bedford Lot Busters Community Garden	Bainbridge Avenue and East 193rd Street	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawns, raised beds	North	0.19	0.19	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
130	Davidson Ave. Community Gardeners Group	West 190th Street between Davidson and Jerome avenues		Picnic tables, trees, lawns, plantings, pathways	North	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	1 – No Use
132	Fordham Hill Owners Corp.	4 Fordham Hill Oval		Playground	North	0.01	0.00	10	0.01	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	3 – Moderate
	Fordham Hill Owners Corp.	4 Fordham Hill Oval		Playground	North	0.03	0.00	10	0.03	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	3 – Moderate
133	Round the Clock Nursery	2380 Marion Avenue		Trees, landscaped	North	0.17	0.17	100	0.00	0	2c	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
134	"No Name"	Park Avenue between East 184th and East 187th streets		fenced in storage lot	North	0.13	0.13	100	0.00	0	3	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
135	Bronx Community College	1930 Sedgwick Avenue		Landscaped, lawns	North	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

136	P.S. 226	1900 Sedgwick Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.08	0.01	10	0.07	90	1a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
137	P.S. 226	1900 Sedgwick Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.11	0.01	10	0.10	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
138	"No Name"	2300 Washington Avenue		Open space between apt. buildings	North	0.01	0.01	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
139	The Angelo Patri School	2225 Webster Avenue		Trees, potted plants, paved	North	0.17	0.17	100	0.00	0	2a	Unacceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
140	"No Name"	333 East 181 Street		Trees, paved	North	0.14	0.14	100	0.00	0	2d	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
141	P.S. 23	2147 Washington Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball court	North	0.07	0.01	10	0.06	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
142	"No Name"	2147 Washington Avenue		Open space in between buildings	North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
143	Salvation Army Daycare Center	2121 Washington Avenue		Playground	North	0.06	0.01	10	0.05	90	1c	Acceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
144	Sovereign Realty Associates	2100 Tiebout Avenue		Playground	North	0.02	0.00	10	0.02	90	1d	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
145	P.S. 163	2075 Webster Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground	North	0.10	0.01	10	0.09	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
146	Twin Parks Southwest	2010 Valentine Avenue		Playground	North	0.18	0.02	10	0.16	90	1d	Acceptable	2 – Low	0 – Inaccessible
147	Twin Parks Southwest	2010 Valentine Avenue		Trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.13	0.13	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	4 – High	1 – No Use
	Twin Parks Southwest	2010 Valentine Avenue		Trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	4 – High	1 – No Use
148	Bathgate Daycare Center	1997 Bathgate Avenue		Playground	North	0.06	0.01	10	0.05	90	1c	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
149	Tremont United Methodist Church	1951 Washington Avenue		Playground	North	0.07	0.01	10	0.06	90	1f	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
150	St. Joseph's School	1946 Bathgate Avenue		Playground, open space	North	0.01	0.00	10	0.01	90	1a	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
	St. Joseph's School	1946 Bathgate Avenue		Playground, open space	North	0.00	0.00	10	0.00	90	1a	Unacceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible

151	P.S. 58	1873 Washington Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground, basketball court	North	0.23	0.02	10	0.21	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
152	El Batey de Dona Provi Garden	East 178th Street and Bathgate Avenue	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, raised beds, shed, pathways	North	0.13	0.13	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
153	Greenstreet	Intersection of Webster and Valentine avenues	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, sitting area, plantings, lawns	North	0.09	0.09	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	1 – No Use
154					North	0.09	0.09	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
155	Greenstreet	Intersection of East Tremont Avenue and East 176th Street	NYCDOT/ NYCDPR[3]	Trees, plantings	North	0.11	0.11	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
156	Park	Cross Bronx Expressway between Washington and Bathgate avenues		NYPD parking lot, paved	North	2.87	2.87	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
157	Garden of Eden	East 173rd between Weeks and Monroe avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, raised beds, shed, pathways	South	0.20	0.20	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low
158	Garden of Life	East 173rd between Weeks and Eastburn avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, lawns, raised beds, shed, pathways	South	0.19	0.19	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
159	Mount Eden Malls	Mount Eden Parkway between Weeks and Walton avenues	DPR[1]	Benches, trees, plantings, lawn	South	2.01	2.01	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low
160	Michel Square (Greenstreet)	Clay Avenue between East 171st Street and Claremont Parkway	DPR[1]	Trees, lawns	South	0.28	0.28	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	0 – Inaccessible

161	Greenstreet	Intersection of Clay Avenue and East 170th Street	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	South	0.00	0.00	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	1 – No Use
162	Greenstreet	Intersection of Teller Avenue and East 170th Street	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	South	0.08	0.08	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
163	Greenstreet	Intersection of Teller and Findlay avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
164	"No Name"	1517 Clay Avenue		Playground next to apt. building	South	0.08	0.01	10	0.07	90	1d	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	0 – Inaccessible
165	Claremont Neighborhood Garden	East 169th Street between Teller and Clay avenues	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings, raised beds, shed, pathways	South	0.19	0.19	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low
166	P.S. 053 Basheer Quisim	1250 Findlay Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Playground next to school trailers	South	0.07	0.01	10	0.06	90	1a	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
167	Jordan L Mott - Middle School 22	1150 Morris Avenue		Paved area between buildings	South	0.11	0.11	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
168	Greenstreet	Intersection of Jerome Avenue and East 161st Street	DPR[1]	Trees, plantings	South	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
169	Woodycrest Community Garden	Woodycrest Avenue and West 162nd Street	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, lawns, raised beds, shed, pathways	South	0.13	0.13	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
170	La Isla Garden	West 163rd Street between Woodycrest and Ogden avenues	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, lawns, raised beds, shed	South	0.11	0.11	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	1 – No Use	2 – Low

171	Taqwa Community Farm	West 164th Street between Woodycrest and Ogden avenues	Green Thumb	Trees, plantings, lawns, raised beds, shed, playground, tables	South	0.52	0.52	100	0.00	0		Acceptable	2 – Low	3 – Moderate
172	Park	Summit Avenue and West 164th Street		Fenced, overgrown lot	South	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0		Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
173	"No Name"	1100 Teller Avenue		Green space in between buildings	South	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0	2d	Unacceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
174	Paradise Learning Center	254 East 165 Street		Trees, lawns, fenced	South	0.03	0.03	100	0.00	0	2a	Unacceptable	1 – No Use	0 – Inaccessible
175	P.S. 35	East 163rd Street between Grant and Morris	DOE/DPR[2]	playground	South	0.31	0.03	10	0.28	90	1a	Acceptable	2 – Low	0 – Inaccessible
176	Highbridge Gardens	1065 University Avenue		trees, lawns, landscaped	South	0.12	0.12	100	0.00	0	2e	Acceptable	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
177	The Highbridge Green School	West 167th Street and University Avenue		basketball court	South	0.20	0.02	10	0.18	90	1a	Acceptable	1 – No Use	3 – Moderate
178	Highbridge Gardens	1065 University Avenue		trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.06	0.06	100	0.00	0	2e	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
	Highbridge Gardens	1065 University Avenue		Playground	North	0.10	0.01	10	0.09	90	1e	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
179	Highbridge Gardens	1065 University Avenue		trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.07	0.07	100	0.00	0	2e	Unacceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
	Highbridge Gardens	1065 University Avenue		trees, lawns, landscaped	North	0.02	0.02	100	0.00	0	2e	Unacceptable	2 – Low	2 – Low
180	P.S. 126	1110 University Avenue	DOE/DPR[2]	Paved area between buildings	South	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
181	"No Name"	Dr. MLK Blvd, West 168th and 167th Street		Forested area	South	0.04	0.04	100	0.00	0	3	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
182	"No Name"	1600 Sedgwick Avenue		Basketball court next to apt. building	North	0.15	0.01	10	0.14	90	1d	Acceptable	3 – Moderate	2 – Low

183	"No Name"	1661 Andrews Avenue South		Area in between buildings	North	0.17	0.17	100	0.00	0	2d	Acceptable	1 – No Use	1 – No Use
184	South Bronx Job Corporation Center	1741 Andrews Avenue South		Trees, lawns, landscaped, fenced	North	0.01	0.01	100	0.00	0	2d	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
185	Ezekiel P Rivers Jr. Learning Center	200 West Tremont Avenue		Open space behind building, trees, paved	North	0.05	0.05	100	0.00	0	2a	Unknown[1]	0 - Inaccessible[2]	0 – Inaccessible
186	River Park Towers	16 Richman Plaza		Playground, sitting area, landscaped	North	0.74	0.07	10	0.67	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 - Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
	River Park Towers	16 Richman Plaza		Playground, sitting area, landscaped	North	0.28	0.03	10	0.25	90	1d	Unknown[1]	0 - Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
187	P.S. 274	275 Harlem River Park Bridge	DOE/DPR[2]	Outdoor pools, sitting area	North	2.53	0.25	10	2.28	90	1a	Unknown[1]	0 – Inaccessible	0 – Inaccessible
Total Additional 1/2-Mile Study Area Open Space Not Included						***47.07***	***21.78***	***46.27***	***23.90***	***50.78***				

Notes:
[1] Designates open spaces between or behind buildings, or otherwise not visible from street level
[2] Indicates open space was fenced off and/or locked
Source: New York City Open Accessible Space Information System (OASIS), DPR, 2014 Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data

Source: New York City Open Accessible Space Information System (OASIS), DPR, 2014 Primary Land Use Tax Lot Output (PLUTO) data

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

As shown in Table 5-3, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)," the worker study area contains a total of 70.54 acres of open space, of which 24.93 acres (35.54 percent) are used for passive recreation and approximately 45.61 acres (64.66 percent) are used for active recreation. As shown on Figure 5-3, "Open Space Study Area Resources," and Table 5-3, 44 publicly accessible open space and recreational resources are located within the worker study area. The largest of these resources is Roberto Clemente State Park.

Other significant open space resources within the ¼-mile radius (e.g., open spaces greater than three acres in area) include Joyce Kilmer Park, Mullaly Park, Bridge Park, Grant Park, Richman (Echo) Park, Aqueduct Walk, and Claremont Park. Mill Pond Park is located along Exterior Street, north of East 150th Street, and contains barbequing areas, tennis courts, and landscaping. Franz Sigel Park is bounded by the Grand Concourse, East 151st Street, Walton Avenue, and East 158th Street, and contains baseball fields, basketball courts, bathrooms, dog-friendly areas, playgrounds, sitting areas, trees, and landscaping. Joyce Kilmer Park is bounded by the Grand Concourse, East 161st Street, Walton Avenue, and East 164th Street, and contains playgrounds, Wi-Fi hot spots, pathways, sitting areas, trees, and landscaping. Mullaly Park is bounded by River Avenue, East 164th Street, Jerome Avenue, and McClellan Street, and contains baseball fields, basketball courts, handball courts, outdoor pools, playgrounds, skate parks, soccer fields, recreation centers, bathrooms, dog-friendly areas, sitting areas, and landscaping. Bridge Park is located adjacent to the Major Deegan Expressway north of the Washington Bridge, and contains pathways, benches, trees, and landscaping. Grant Park is bounded by Morris Avenue, East 169th Street, Sheridan Avenue, and East 170th Street, and contains basketball courts, playgrounds, a bird sanctuary, trees, and landscaping. Richman (Echo) Park is located along Valentine Avenue bounded by East Tremont Avenue East Burnside avenues and contains basketball courts, handball courts, playgrounds, dog-friendly areas, sitting areas, and landscaping. Aqueduct Walk is located along Aqueduct Avenue and extends from West Fordham Road to West Kingsbridge Road, and contains playgrounds, pedestrian walkways, benches, and landscaping. Claremont Park is bounded by Clay Avenue, East 170th Street, Teller Avenue, and Mount Eden Parkway, and contains playgrounds, spray showers, baseball fields, basketball courts, dog-friendly areas, eateries, handball courts, outdoor pools, sitting areas, and landscaping.

The remainder of the open space resources within the worker (¼-mile) study area are less than three acres in size and primarily programmed with active open space uses, with numerous playgrounds, basketball courts, baseball fields, handball courts, spray showers, running tracks, and skate parks. Several of the ¼-mile study area open spaces (Bridge Park, Keltch Park, Inwood Park, Featherbenches, P.S. 15, Martin Luther King Triangle, Featherbed Triangle, Devanney Triangle, University Malls, Bergen Triangle, and Echo Triangle) included in the quantitative assessment are composed of entirely passively programmed uses. These open spaces are programmed with a mixture of benches/seating areas, paths, trees, and landscaping.

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

The residential study area includes all open spaces in the worker study area as well as 23 additional resources, six of which are partially located within the ¼-mile study area (refer to Table 5-3, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)," and Figure 5-3, "Open Space Study Area Resources"). As shown in Table 5-3, the residential study area contains a total of approximately 177.58 acres of publicly accessible open space (including all open spaces listed in the worker study area). Of this total, approximately 58.32 acres (32.84 percent) are passive space and 119.26 acres (67.16 percent) are active space (see Table 5-3).

The largest open space resource in the ½-mile study area is the 38.00 acre Claremont Park. Claremont Park include passive features, including lawns, wooded areas, landscaping, and eateries. It also includes active open space features, such as baseball fields, basketball courts, handball courts, and outdoor pools.

In addition to Macombs Dam Park, Aqueduct Walk, Richman (Echo) Park, Joyce Kilmer Park, and Bridge Park, there are four open space resources within the ½-mile study area that are greater than three acres in size: Fordham Landing Playground, St. James Park, Tremont Park, and University Woods. Fordham Landing Playground is located along the Major Deegan Expressway, bounded by Landing Road and Sedgwick Avenue, and contains baseball fields, basketball courts, handball courts, and playground equipment. St. James Park is bounded by Creston Avenue, East 190th Street, Jerome Avenue and East 193rd Street, and contains basketball courts, dog-friendly areas, eateries, handball courts, playgrounds, recreation centers, soccer fields, tennis courts, and spray showers. Tremont Park is bounded by Arthur Avenue, East 175th Street, Firefighters Boulevard, and East Tremont Avenue, and contains baseball fields, dog-friendly areas, fitness paths, handball courts, playgrounds, and spray showers. University Woods runs along Sedgwick Avenue from West 179th Street to West 183rd Street, and is a forested area containing trees, lawns, and plantings.

In addition to the passively programmed open spaces in the ¼-mile study area, noted above, there are five passively programmed open space resources within the ½-mile study area: Bryan Park, O'Brien Oval, Jerome Slope, John R Brown Triangle, and Muller Triangle. Active recreation features found in the ½-mile study area include numerous basketball courts, baseball fields, playgrounds, spray showers, and handball courts (refer to Table 5-3, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)").

ASSESSMENT OF OPEN SPACE ADEQUACY

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

As described above, the analysis of the worker study area focuses on passive open spaces that may be used by workers in the area. To assess the adequacy of open spaces in the area, the ratio of workers to acres of passive open space is compared to the City's planning guideline of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers. In addition, the combined passive open space ratio for both workers and residents in the ¼-mile study area is compared with the recommended weighted average ratio of 0.443 acres per 1,000 combined users.

Quantitative Assessment

The worker study area includes a total of 70.54 acres of open space, of which approximately 24.93 acres are passive space. A total of 205,514 residents live within this study area, and 39,905 people work within the worker study boundary; the combined residential and worker population is 245,419.

Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, the ¼-mile study area has a passive open space ratio of 0.625 acres per 1,000 workers, which substantially exceeds the City's guideline of 0.15 acres (see Table 5-5, "Adequacy of Open Space Resources – Existing Conditions," below). As such, the workers in the worker study area are well-served by open space in existing conditions. The combined workers and residents passive open space ratio is 0.102 acres per 1,000 residents and workers, which is lower than the recommended weighted average of ratio of 0.443 acres per 1,000 combined users (refer to Table 5-5 below). However, as noted in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, residents are more likely to travel farther to reach parks and recreational facilities, and they use both passive and active open spaces.

Considered as north and South Subareas, the North Subarea's ¼-mile study area has a passive open space ratio of 0.596 acres per 1,000 workers, and the North Subarea's ½-mile study combined workers and residents passive open space ratio is 0.179 acres per 1,000 combined users. The South Subarea's ¼-mile study area has a passive open space ratio of 0.666 acres per 1,000 workers, and the South Subarea's ½-mile study combined workers and residents passive open space ratio is 0.114 acres per 1,000 combined users.

Table 5-5: Adequacy of Open Space Resources – Existing Conditions

Total Study Area	Population	Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 Persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	39,905	70.54	24.93	45.61	1.768	0.625	1.143	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	245,419				0.287	0.102	0.186	N/A	0.443	N/A
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area										
Residents	315,718	177.58	58.32	119.26	0.562	0.185	0.378	2.5	0.5	2.0
Combined Workers and Residents	385,458				0.461	0.151	0.309	N/A	0.437	N/A

North Subarea	Population	Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 Persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	23,450	46.39	13.97	32.42	1.978	0.596	1.383	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	138,254				0.336	0.101	0.235	N/A	0.441	N/A
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area										
Residents	181,734	97.39	39.56	57.83	0.536	0.218	0.318	2.5	0.5	2.0
Combined Workers and Residents	221,049				0.441	0.179	0.262	N/A	0.438	N/A

South Subarea	Population	Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 Persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	16,455	24.15	10.96	13.19	1.468	0.666	0.801	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	107,165				0.225	0.102	0.123	N/A	0.446	N/A
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area										
Residents	133,984	80.19	18.76	61.43	0.599	0.140	0.458	2.5	0.5	2.0
Combined Workers and Residents	164,409				0.488	0.114	0.374	N/A	0.435	N/A

Notes:
[1]Based on target open space ratios established by creating a weighted average of the amount of open space necessary to meet the City guideline of 0.50 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents and 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates and ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Qualitative Assessment

As shown in Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)," most of the worker study area open spaces are in acceptable condition, and use levels are low to moderate at all of these facilities on the weekdays. The worker study area includes numerous passive open space features, such as benches, lawns, and pathways, which are suitable for use by the worker population in the area.

As shown on Figure 5-2, "Underserved Open Space Areas," there is a portion of the worker study area, at the northern end, that is within the Fordham Underserved Open Space Neighborhood. However, it should also be noted that 59 additional open space resources, which are not included in the quantitative assessment due to their limited hours or limited access, are located within the ¼-mile study area. As indicated in Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)," these 59 open space resources total 15.06 acres, approximately half of which (48.81 percent, or 7.35 acres) are composed of passively programmed open space, with the other half (51.19 percent, or 7.71 acres) composed of actively programmed open space. These additional open spaces include 8 community gardens, two pedestrian walkways, and several Greenstreets. While these facilities are conservatively excluded from the quantitative analysis, it is likely that they are used by a portion of the population who live and work in the ¼-mile study area.

The ¼-mile study area also contains other open space resources, which are not included in the previously discussed 59 resources. These resources consist of open space associated with schools, child care facilities, housing complexes, and medical facilities. These 61 additional open space resources total 17.19 acres, the majority of which (70.82 percent, 12.17 acres) are composed of actively programmed open space. While these facilities are conservatively excluded from the quantitative analysis, it is likely that they are used by a portion of the population who live and work in the ¼-mile study area.

In total 91 percent of the quantitative open spaces in ¼-mile study area are in acceptable condition. This number is 88 percent for the North Subarea and 94 percent for the South Subarea. Further, utilization for these quantitative spaces is 75 percent moderate to no use during the weekday and 77 percent moderate to no use on the weekend. For the North Subarea, moderate to no use on both the weekday and weekend is 65 percent. For the South Subarea, moderate to no use on the weekday is 89 percent and on the weekend is 94 percent.

Moreover, as noted above, the quantitative analysis is conservative as it assumes that residents and daytime users are separate populations, whereas it is possible, especially considering the size of the study area, that some of the residents live near their workplace, resulting in some double-counting of the daily user population in the worker study area.

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

The following analysis of the adequacy of open space resources within the residential study area takes into consideration the ratios of active, passive, and total open space resources per 1,000 residents, as well as the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 combined residents and workers.

Quantitative Assessment

With a total of 177.58 acres of open space, of which approximately 58.32 acres are for passive use and approximately 119.26 acres are for active use, and a total residential population of 315,718, the residential study area has an overall open space ratio of 0.562 acres per 1,000 residents (see Table 5-5,

"Adequacy of Open Space Resources – Existing Conditions"). This is substantially less than the City's planning guideline of 2.5 acres of combined active and passive open space per 1,000 residents. The study area's residential passive open space ratio (0.185) and active open space ratio (0.378) are below the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines of 0.5 acres of passive open space and 2.0 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents. As such, there is an existing shortfall of both passive and active open space in the residential study area.

When the employees who work within the residential study area are added to the population, the passive open space ratio is lower. As described earlier, workers typically use passive open space during the workday, so the passive open space ratio is the relevant ratio for consideration. With a combined worker and residential population of 385,458, the combined passive open space ratio in the residential study area is 0.151 acres per 1,000 users, which is below the *CEQR Technical Manual* guideline of 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

Qualitative Assessment

Although the residential study area contains a good mix of recreational facilities, with approximately one-third dedicated to passive uses and two-thirds dedicated to active uses, the open space ratios per 1,000 residents still are well below the guideline goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents and the citywide median of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

The deficiency of open space resources within the residential study area is partially ameliorated by several factors. As shown in Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)," the residential study area open spaces include a wide variety of actively programmed open spaces appropriate for the residential user groups. As noted above, the study area includes a high percentage of children and teenagers, as compared to the borough of the Bronx and New York City as a whole (refer to Table 5-2). Notably, 15 to 19 year olds comprise over eight percent of the study area population. As indicated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, teenagers and young adults tend to use court facilities, such as basketball courts, and sports facilities, such as football or soccer fields. 28 of the residential study area's 67 open spaces include such facilities (refer to Table 5-3, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Quantitative Analysis)"). In addition, and as noted in Table 5-3, most are in acceptable condition and typically moderately utilized (i.e. typically appearing to have capacity to accommodate more users).

In total 94 percent of the quantitative open spaces in ½-mile study area are in acceptable condition. This number is 93 percent in the North Subarea and 96 percent in the South Subarea. Further, utilization for these quantitative spaces is 79 percent moderate to no use during the weekday and 81 percent moderate to no use on the weekend. For the North Subarea, moderate to use on the weekday is 77 percent and on the weekend is 75 percent. For the South Subarea, moderate to no use on the weekday is 60 percent and on the weekend is 80 percent.

It should also be noted that a significant number of additional open space resources, which are not included in the quantitative assessment due to their limited hours or limited access, are located within

the ½-mile study area. As presented in Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)," these 25 open space resources total approximately 15.78 acres, including approximately 8.55 acres (54.18 percent) of passively programmed open space. Passive open space amenities include nine community gardens and several Greenstreets. While these facilities are conservatively excluded from the quantitative analysis, it is likely that they are used by people that live and work in the ½-mile study area.

As shown on Figure 5-2, "Underserved Open Space Areas," there is a portion of the worker study area, at the northern end, that is within the Fordham Underserved Open Space Neighborhood. However, the ½-mile study area also contains other open space resources, which are not included in the previously discussed 25 resources. These resources consist of open space associated with schools, child care facilities, housing complexes, medical facilities, and gardens. These 46 additional open space resources total 9.19 acres, the majority of which (59.42 percent, 5.46 acres) are also composed of actively programmed open space. While these facilities are conservatively excluded from the quantitative analysis, it is likely that they are used by a portion of the population who live and work in the ½-mile study area.

Moreover, as noted above, the quantitative analysis is conservative as it assumes that residents and daytime users are separate populations, whereas it is possible, especially considering the size of the study area, that some of the residents live near their workplace, resulting in some double-counting of the daily user population in the worker study area.

5.5 The Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

STUDY AREA POPULATION

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," in the 2026 future without the Proposed Actions, development is anticipated on 9 of the 45 projected development sites. In addition, 25 known and anticipated developments within a ½-mile of the rezoning area were identified. In total, these combined No-Action developments are expected to introduce approximately 4,744 residents and 2,011 employees to the ¼-mile study area, and approximately 6,258 residents and 2,205 employees to the ½-mile study area. In addition, residential and worker growth rates were developed, based on growth that occurred in the area between 2000 and 2010. These growth rates were applied to the existing residential and worker populations to account for general background growth anticipated in the area. As indicated in Table 5-6 (No-Action Open Space Study Area Population), the anticipated No-Action development, combined with the residential and worker growth rates, are expected to increase

to the ¼-mile study area population to 44,001 workers and 252,817 combined workers and residents. The ½-mile study area population is expected to increase to 329,000 residents and 404,916 combined workers and residents.

Table 5-6: No-Action Open Space Study Area Population[1]

Total Study Area	Existing Population	Incremental Background Population Growth	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	Additional Population in Study Areas	2026 No-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Workers	39,905	2,085	1,154	857	44,001
Combined Workers and Residents	245,419	1,339	3,422	3,333	253,513
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Residents	315,718	9,005	2,268	3,990	330,981
Combined Workers and Residents	385,458	11,892	3,422	5,040	405,812

North Subarea	Existing Population	Incremental Background Population Growth	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	Additional Population in Study Areas	2026 No-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Workers	23,450	1,013	497	134	25,094
Combined Workers and Residents	138,254	(3,717)	986	1,095	136,618
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Residents	181,734	(1,534)	489	1,920	182,609
Combined Workers and Residents	221,049	114	986	2,239	224,388

South Subarea	Existing Population	Incremental Background Population Growth	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	Additional Population in Study Areas	2026 No-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Workers	16,455	1,072	657	723	18,907
Combined Workers and Residents	107,165	5,055	2,436	2,239	116,895
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Residents	133,984	10,539	1,779	2,070	148,372
Combined Workers and Residents	164,409	11,778	2,436	2,801	181,424

Notes:
[1] Based on ten-year residential growth rate (2000 and 2010 Census) for Census Tracts in CD 4, 5, and 7, whose total area is located at least 50 percent within the study area. The worker growth rate is based on the *CEQR Technical Manual's* Annual Background Growth Rate (Table 16-4).
[2]Refer to Table 2-4 in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy."

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates, and ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

One change to the study area's open spaces is anticipated by the 2026 analysis year, which is demapping portion of adjacent Exterior Street and adding to Bridge Park (approximately 1.1 acres). As such, the quarter mile study area will be served by 71.64 acres of open space (including 24.93 acres of passive open space and 46.71 acres of active open space), and the ½-mile study area will be served by 178.68 acres of open space (including 58.32 acres of passive open space and 120.36 acres of active open space).

The North Subarea's quarter mile study area will be served by 46.39 acres of open space (including 13.97 acres of passive open space and 32.42 acres of active open space), and the North Subarea's ½-mile study area will be served by 97.39 acres of open space (including 39.56 acres of passive open space and 57.83 acres of active open space). The South Subarea's quarter mile study area, which will include the aforementioned increase of 1.1 acres to Bridge Park, will be served by 25.25 acres of open space (including 10.96 acres of passive open space and 14.29 acres of active open space), and the South Subarea's ½-mile study area will be served by 81.29 acres of open space (including 18.76 acres of passive open space and 62.53 acres of active open space).

ASSESSMENT OF OPEN SPACE ADEQUACY

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

As noted above, it is anticipated that new development in the ¼-mile study area will result in an increase in the population in the future without the Proposed Actions; no changes to the ¼-mile study area open space acreage are anticipated. As a result of the anticipated No-Action development, while the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 workers will decrease to 0.567 (from 0.625 in existing conditions), it will continue to exceed the City's guideline ratio of 0.15 acres (see Table 5-7). The ratio for the combined population of residents and workers will decrease to 0.098 (from 0.102 in existing conditions), however, it will be less than the calculated No-Action recommended weighted ratio of 0.439.

TABLE 5-7: Adequacy of Open Space Resources: No-Action Condition

Total Study Area		Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
	Population	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	44,001	71.64	24.93	46.71	1.628	0.567	1.062	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	253,513				0.283	0.098	0.184	N/A	0.439	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	330,981	178.68	58.32	120.36	0.540	0.176	0.364	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	405,812				0.440	0.144	0.297	N/A	0.435	N/A

North Study Area		Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
	Population	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	25,094	46.39	13.97	32.42	1.849	0.557	1.292	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	136,618				0.340	0.102	0.237	N/A	0.436	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	182,609	97.39	39.56	57.83	0.533	0.217	0.317	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	224,388				0.434	0.176	0.258	N/A	0.435	N/A

South Study Area		Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
	Population	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	18,907	25.25	10.96	14.29	1.335	0.580	0.756	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	116,894				0.216	0..094	0.122	N/A	0.443	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	148,372	81.29	18.76	62.53	0.548	0.126	0.421	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	181,424				0.448	0.103	0.345	N/A	0.436	N/A

Notes:

[1]Based on target open space ratios established by creating a weighted average of the amount of open space necessary to meet the City guideline of 0.50 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents and 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates and ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

In the 2026 No-Action condition, the additional population introduced to the ½-mile study area will increase the demand on the area's open spaces. With the anticipated No-Action development, the residential study area will continue to be underserved by open spaces in comparison to the City's guidelines. As indicated in Table 5-7 (Adequacy of Open Space Resources: No-Action condition), the No-Action total, passive, and active open space ratios per 1,000 residents are expected to decrease with No-Action conditions from Existing Conditions; total open space from 0.562 to 0.540, passive open space from 0.185 to 0.176, and active open space from 0.378 to 0.364. These No-Action residential open spaces ratios will continue to be less in the future without the Proposed Actions than the City's guideline ratio of 2.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents (as these open space ratios are already below city guidelines in existing conditions), including 0.5 acres of passive open space and 2.0 acres of active open space.

The combined passive open space ratio in the ½-mile study area is also expected to decrease in 2026 No-Action condition, to 0.144 acres per 1,000 combined workers and residents, and therefore, will continue to be less than the calculated recommended weighted ratio 0.437.

The total, passive, and active open space ratios within the residential study area will remain substantially below the City's guidelines in the future without the Proposed Actions. As with existing conditions, there is a substantial number of additional open space resources within the study area that are not included in the quantitative analysis, including multiple community gardens, schoolyards, and open spaces on NYCHA housing developments. These additional open spaces represent a considerable amount of accessible active and passive open space for the residential population.

5.6 The Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

In the 2026 future with the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that incremental development on the 45 projected development sites. In total, the RWCDS With-Action development would introduce an estimated 11,727 new residents and 2,128 new workers, compared to the No-Action conditions, which will introduce 2,268 new residents and 1,154 new workers.

DIRECT EFFECTS

No publicly-accessible open space is currently located on any of the projected development sites. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not cause the physical loss of publicly-accessible open space. In addition, as discussed in other chapters of this EIS, the Proposed Actions would not cause any increased shadows, noise, or air pollutant emissions that would affect the usefulness of any study area space,

whether on a permanent or temporary basis. Further, the Proposed Actions would not change the use of a publicly-accessible open space that that it no longer serves the user population, nor would it limit public access to any open spaces. Therefore, no significant adverse direct effects on open space would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

The Proposed Actions would result in incremental shadow coverage on 41 open space resources. The shadows analysis identified significant adverse impacts at eight of these resources. The analysis determined that six resources (Bronx School of Young Leaders, PS 306 Schoolyard, Mount Hope Playground, Goble Playground, Inwood Park, Keltch Park) would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that could have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. Two resources (Edward L Grant Greenstreet, Jerome Avenue/Grant Avenue Greenstreet) would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the four to six hour minimum specified in the CEQR Technical Manual) as a result of incremental shadow coverage and vegetation at these resources could be significantly impacted. The analysis found that although the significant adverse shadow impacts would reduce the utility of these open spaces and public's enjoyment, the open spaces would continue to be available and provide other passive or active open space uses and therefore would not be a direct significant open space impact.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

Study Area Population

In total, the RWCDS With-Action development would introduces an estimated 9,459 new residents over the No-Action condition and 974 more workers. As indicated in Table 5-8 (With-Action Open Space Study Area Population), this additional population increases the ¼-mile worker study area's worker population to 44,975, bringing the combined worker and residential population to 263,946. The ½-mile study area's residential population is expected to increase to 340,440, and the ½-mile study area's combined worker and residential population is expected to increase to 416,245.

Table 5-8: With-Action Open Space Study Area Population

Total Study Area	No-Action Population	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	2026 With-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area			
Workers	44,001	974	44,975
Combined Workers and Residents	253,513	10,433	263,946
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area			
Residents	330,981	9,459	340,440
Combined Workers and Residents	405,812	10,433	416,245

North Subarea	No-Action Population	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	2026 With-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area			
Workers	25,094	518	25,612
Combined Workers and Residents	136,618	3,783	140,401
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area			
Residents	182,609	3,265	185,874
Combined Workers and Residents	224,388	3,783	228,171

South Subarea	No-Action Population	Additional Population on Projected Development Sites	2026 With-Action Population
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area			
Workers	18,907	456	19,363
Combined Workers and Residents	116,894	6,650	123,544
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area			
Residents	148,372	6,194	154,566
Combined Workers and Residents	181,424	6,650	188,074

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Open Space Resources

As detailed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," the Proposed Actions are intended to facilitate implementation of recommendations of the Jerome Avenue Community Plan. As part of that plan, DPR is proposing to convert what is Corporal Fischer Way and a portion of city right-of-way into a 0.89 acre Corporal Fischer Public Park. Aside from this project, no changes to the study area's open spaces are anticipated by the 2026 analysis year. As such, the quarter mile study area would be served by 72.14 acres of open space (including 24.93 acres of passive open space and 47.21 acres of active open space),

and the ½-mile study area would be served by 179.18 of open space (including 58.32 of passive open space and 120.86 of active open space) in 2026 With-Action condition.

The North Subarea's quarter mile study area would be served by 46.39 acres of open space (including 13.97 acres of passive open space and 32.42 acres of active open space), and the North Subarea's ½-mile study area would be served by 97.39 acres of open space (including 39.56 acres of passive open space and 57.83 acres of active open space) in 2026 With-Action condition. The South Subarea's quarter mile study area would be served by 25.75 acres of open space (including 10.96 acres of passive open space and 14.79 acres of active open space), and the South Subarea's ½-mile study area would be served by 81.79 acres of open space (including 18.76 acres of passive open space and 63.03 acres of active open space) in 2026 With-Action condition.

Assessment of Open Space Adequacy

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

Quantitative Assessment

As presented in Table 5-9, "Adequacy of Open Space Resources: With-Action Condition," in the future with the Proposed Action, while the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 workers would decrease to 0.554 (from 0.625 in existing conditions), it would continue to exceed the City's guideline ratio of 0.15 acres (see Table-5-9). This also represents a decrease from the No-Action condition ratio of 0.567. North and South Subareas would similarly exceed the City's guideline ratio (0.15 acres per 1,000 residents) with ratios of passive open space per 1,000 workers of 0.545 in the North Subarea and 0.566 in the South Subarea. The passive open space ratio for the combined population of residents and workers would be 0.094, less than the calculated No-Action recommended weighted ratio of 0.440. Considered separately, these ratios are 0.099 in the North Subarea (including a portion of the Fordham Underserved Open Space Neighborhood) and 0.089 in the South Subarea. However, as noted in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* residents are more likely to travel farther to reach parks and recreational facilities, and they use both passive and active open spaces.

Table 5-9: Adequacy of Open Space Resources: With-Action Condition

Total Study Area	Population	Open Space Acreage			Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons			*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines		
		Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active	Total	Passive	Active
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	44,975	72.14	24.93	47.21	1.604	0.554	1.050	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	263,946				0.273	0.094	0.179	N/A	0.440[1]	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	340,440	179.18	58.32	120.86	0.526	0.171	0.355	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	416,245				0.430	0.140	0.290	N/A	0.436[1]	N/A
North Subarea	**Population**	**Open Space Acreage**			**Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons**			***CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines**		
		Total	**Passive**	**Active**	**Total**	**Passive**	**Active**	**Total**	**Passive**	**Active**
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	25,612	46.39	13.97	32.42	1.811	0.545	1.266	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	140,401				0.330	0.099	0.231	N/A	0.436[1]	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	185,874	97.39	39.56	57.83	0.524	0.213	0.311	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	228,171				0.427	0.173	0.253	N/A	0.435[1]	N/A
South Subarea	**Population**	**Open Space Acreage**			**Open Space Ratios per 1,000 persons**			***CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guidelines**		
		Total	**Passive**	**Active**	**Total**	**Passive**	**Active**	**Total**	**Passive**	**Active**
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area										
Workers	19,363	25.75	10.96	14.79	1.330	0.566	0.764	N/A	0.15	N/A
Combined Workers and Residents	123,544				0.208	0.089	0.120	N/A	0.445[1]	N/A
Residential 1/2-Mile Study Area										
Residents	154,566	81.79	18.76	63.03	0.529	0.121	0.408	2.5	0.5	2
Combined Workers and Residents	188,074				0.435	0.100	0.335	N/A	0.438[1]	N/A

Notes:
[1]Based on target open space ratios established by creating a weighted average of the amount of open space necessary to meet the City guideline of 0.50 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents and 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates, and ACS 2015 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning

Qualitative Assessment

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the worker passive open space ratio would remain above the City's guideline ratio. While the passive open space for combined residents and workers within the ¼-

mile radius would be less than the recommended weighted ratio, the worker study area residents would likely make use of additional open space resources outside of the ¼-mile study area. In addition, most of the worker study area open spaces are in good or excellent condition, and use levels are low to moderate during the weekday peak utilization periods for worker users (refer to Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)"). In total 91 percent of the quantitative open spaces in ¼-mile study area are in acceptable condition. This number is 88 percent in the North Subarea and 94 percent in the South Subarea. Further, utilization for these quantitative spaces is 75 percent moderate to no use during the weekday and 77 percent moderate to no use on the weekend. For the North Subarea, moderate to no use on both the weekday and weekend is 65 percent. For the South Subarea, moderate to no use on the weekday is 89 percent and on the weekend is 94 percent.

Moreover, the quantitative analysis is conservative as it assumes that residents and daytime users are separate populations, whereas it is possible, especially considering the size of the study area, that some of the residents live near their workplace, resulting in some double-counting of the daily user population in the worker study area.

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

Quantitative Assessment

In the future with the Proposed Actions, total open space ratios in the residential (1/2-mile) study area would decrease, from 0.540 in the No-Action condition to 0.526 per 1,000 residents in the With-Action (see Table 5-9, "Adequacy of Open Spaces: With-Action Condition"), and from 0.533 to 0.524 in the North Subarea and from 0.548 to 0.529 in the South Subarea.

The active open space ratio would decrease (compared to No-Action conditions), from 0.364 to 0.355 per 1,000 residents in total, and decrease from 0.317 to 0.311 in the North Subarea, and decrease from 0.421 to 0.408 in the South Subarea.

The total study area's passive open space ratio per 1,000 residents also would decrease compared to the No-Action conditions, from 0.176 to 0.171 acres per 1,000 residents, and would remain below the City's guideline ratio of 0.50. This number would also decrease from 0.217 to 0.213 in the North Subarea and from 0.126 to 0.121 in the South Subarea.

The passive open space ratio for combined residential and worker populations would decrease from 0.144 with No-Action conditions to 0.140 acres per 1,000 users, and would be less than the calculated guidance ratio of 0.436. This number would also decrease from 0.176 to 0.173 in the North Subarea and from 0.103 to 0.100 in the South Subarea.

Qualitative Assessment

In the future with the Proposed Actions, ratios of open space would continue to be lower than the measure of open space adequacy and the guideline planning goals. The population to be generated by the Proposed Actions with the RWCDS is not expected to have any special characteristics, such as a disproportionately younger or older population, that would place heavy demand on facilities that cater to specific groups.

It should also be noted that, while the amount of total and active open space resources in the residential study area currently is and would continue be in the future without and with the Proposed Actions, deficient in comparison to the City guidelines, the majority of the residential study area open spaces have low to moderate utilization levels, and most are in good or excellent condition (refer to Table 5-4, "Open Space Resources within the ¼-Mile and ½-Mile Open Space Study Areas (Qualitative Analysis)"). As discussed previously in Existing Conditions, approximately 94 percent of the quantitative open spaces in the ½-mile study area are in acceptable condition. This number is 93 percent in the North Subarea and 96 percent in the South Subarea. In total 94 percent of the quantitative open spaces in ½-mile study area are in acceptable condition. Further, utilization for these quantitative spaces is 79 percent moderate to no use during the weekday and 81 percent moderate to no use on the weekend. For the North Subarea, moderate to use on the weekday is 77 percent and on the weekend is 75 percent. For the South Subarea, moderate to no use on the weekday is 60 percent and on the weekend is 80 percent.

Further, as described above, an additional 182 open space resources totaling approximately 47.07 acres (including approximately 21.78 acres of passively programmed open space and 23.90 acres of actively programed open space) would be located within the ½-mile study area. While these facilities are conservatively excluded from quantitative analysis, it is likely that they are used by people that live and work within the ½-mile study area.

Determining Impact Significance

A significant adverse open space impact may occur if the Proposed Actions would reduce the open space ratio by more than five percent in the areas that are currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. In areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a reduction as little as one percent may be considered significant, depending on the area of the City. These reductions may result in overburdening existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space. Table 5-10 "Open Space Ratios Summary" expresses the percentage change from No-Action to With-Action conditions for both the worker and residential study areas. Please note that open space ratios are provided for the North Subarea and the South Subarea only as points of general reference; the determination of impact and impact significance is considered for the project, as a whole.

Table 5-10: Open Space Ratios Summary

Total Study Area	*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guideline	Open Space Ratios per 1,000			Percent Change (Future No-Action to Future With-Action)
		Existing	No-Action	With-Action	
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Passive-Workers	0.15	0.625	0.567	0.554	-2.29%
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Total - Residents	2.5	0.562	0.540	0.526	-2.59%
Passive - Residents	0.5	0.185	0.176	0.171	-2.84%
Active - Residents	2	0.378	0.364	0.355	-2.47%

North Subarea	*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guideline	Open Space Ratios per 1,000			Percent Change (Future No-Action to Future With-Action)
		Existing	No-Action	With-Action	
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Passive-Workers	0.15	0.596	0.557	0.545	-2.15%
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Total - Residents	2.5	0.536	0.533	0.524	-1.69%
Passive - Residents	0.5	0.218	0.217	0.213	-1.84%
Active - Residents	2	0.318	0.317	0.311	-1.89%

South Subarea	*CEQR Technical Manual* Open Space Guideline	Open Space Ratios per 1,000			Percent Change (Future No-Action to Future With-Action)
		Existing	No-Action	With-Action	
Worker (1/4-Mile) Study Area					
Passive-Workers	0.15	0.666	0.580	0.566	-2.41%
Residential (1/2-Mile) Study Area					
Total - Residents	2.5	0.599	0.548	0.529	-3.47%
Passive - Residents	0.5	0.140	0.126	0.121	-3.97%
Active - Residents	2	0.458	0.421	0.408	-3.09%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census; U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2006-2010 Five-Year Estimates. Special Tabulation: Census Transportation Planning.

Worker (¼-Mile) Study Area

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the worker study area's passive open space ratio would decrease by 2.29 percent from No-Action conditions (0.567), and would remain well above the City's guideline ratio of 0.15 per 1,000 workers, at 0.554 acres per 1,000 workers (refer to Table 5-10 "Open Space Ratios Summary"). Therefore, workers in the ¼-mile study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse impact in the worker study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Residential (½-Mile) Study Area

With respect to the reductions in open space within the residential study area, the total, active, and passive open space's ratio would remain below the City's guideline ratios for total (2.5), passive (0.5), and active (2.0) open spaces in the future with the Proposed Actions. The total residential study area open space ratio would decline by 2.59 percent to 0.526 acres per 1,000 residents, and by 1.69 percent to 0.524 acres per 1,000 residents in the North Subarea and by 3.47 percent to 0.529 acres per 1,000 residents in the South Subarea. The passive residential study area would decline by 2.84 percent to 0.171 acres per 1,000 residents, and by 1.84 percent to 0.213 acres per 1,000 residents in the North Subarea and by 3.97 percent to 0.121 acres per 1,000 residents in the South Subarea.

Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a project may result in a significant adverse impact if it would reduce the open space by more than 5 percent in areas that are currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. Further, in areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a reduction as small as 1 percent may be considered significant, depending on the area of the City. These reductions may result in overburdening existing facilities, or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space. As noted previously, the open space ratio would not decrease by more than 5 percent as a result of the Proposed Actions, although the area is currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents; moreover, the area is not extremely lacking in open space, although it includes at its northern end a portion of the Fordham Underserved Open Space Neighborhood. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts to residential study area open space resources. Further, per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual* the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact on open space resources in the residential study area.