DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Amanda M. Burden, FAICP, *Director*
Department of City Planning

August 19, 2011

NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF
THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Saint Vincents Campus Redevelopment

Project Identification
CEQR No. 10DCP003M
ULURP Nos. 120029ZSM, 120030ZSM, 120031ZSM, N120032ZRM, and 120033ZMM
SEQRA Classification: Type I

Lead Agency
City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street, Room1W
New York, New York 10007

Contact Person
Robert Dobruskin, AICP, Director (212) 720-3423
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the DEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). A public hearing on the DEIS will be held at a later date to be announced, in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's citywide public hearing pursuant to ULURP. Advance notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. Written comments on the DEIS are requested and would be received and considered by the Lead Agency until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing.

A. INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) considers the proposed redevelopment of the former campus of Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan. The redevelopment would comprise the proposed East Site project on portions of two blocks of the former campus and the Center for Comprehensive Care on the remainder of the project area.

The East Site project is a primarily residential redevelopment located on the east side of Seventh Avenue between West 11th and 12th Streets (the East Site) and an expanded and improved open space that is publicly

accessible on the triangular area to the west of Seventh Avenue and south of West 12th Street (Triangle Site). The East Site would include new and renovated buildings for residential use, medical office and ground floor retail space along Seventh Avenue, and accessory parking, mechanical space, and below-grade residential amenity space. RSV, LLC, the developer of the proposed East Site project, has committed to a maximum of 450 residential units. On the Triangle Site most of the Materials Handling Facility would be demolished to allow for the creation of a new publicly accessible open space. It is anticipated that construction of the proposed East Site project would be complete by 2015.

Contemporaneously with the development of the proposed East Site project, a health care facility would be developed, owned, and operated by the North Shore-Long Island Jewish Health System (NSLIJ) in the O'Toole Building on the west side of Seventh Avenue between West 12th and 13th Streets. The O'Toole Building would be completely renovated to provide a Center for Comprehensive Care with an emergency department on the ground floor and ambulatory surgery or pain management, an imaging center and other health care services on the upper floors. The façade would be restored in a manner that is sensitive to the historic design, and the building would retain its unique architectural form. On the Triangle Site, the area for medical gas storage and the adjacent driveway would be reused by NSLIJ.

The proposed East Site project and the Center for Comprehensive Care would be developed independently of each other, the proposed East Site project by RSV, LLC and the Center for Comprehensive Care by NSLIJ. They would also be subject to different approval processes. To develop the East Site project, a number of land use approvals are needed from the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) pursuant to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). No City land use approvals subject to ULURP are needed for the Center for Comprehensive Care, but it is subject to New York State Department of Health (DOH) approval. CPC will be lead agency for this environmental review. Due to the project area's location in the New York City Greenwich Village Historic District, the proposed projects are also subject to review and approval by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). LPC adopted a resolution approving the issuance a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed buildings on the East Site on July 7, 2009 and for the Center for Comprehensive Care on August 2, 2011.

HISTORY AND SITE CONDITIONS

From 1849 to April 2010 when the Hospital closed, Saint Vincent's served the Greenwich Village community and the lower West Side of Manhattan. Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan, the facility which occupied the project area, served as the anchor of the SVCMC system and the New York City academic medical center for New York Medical College in New York City.

Saint Vincents Catholic Medical Centers of New York d/b/a Saint Vincent Catholic Medical Centers (SVCMC) owns all three parts of the project area (see **Table S-1**). The now-vacant former hospital buildings occupy the East Site between West 11th and 12th Streets. Across Seventh Avenue a block to the north between West 12th and 13th Streets is the O'Toole Building. This building now houses a limited number of physicians' offices and ambulatory care facilities that will leave the building by mid-September 2011; there is also a public garage that will be closed. On the Triangle Site, the Materials Handling Facility, including a walled-in area previously used by SVCMC for medical gas tanks, is unused. The remainder of the Triangle Site is a fenced landscaped area.

Table S-1
Former Saint Vincent's Hospital Buildings

Location/ Building Name	Address	Height in Feet (Stories)	Former* Use	Gross Floor Area in sf
East Site				
Coleman/Link Pavilions	1 Seventh Avenue	190 (17) / 59 (4)	Coleman: inpatient services, diagnostics, operating rooms and emergency department Link: diagnostic facilities, operating rooms, emergency department	356,013
Cronin Building	133 West 11th Street	151 (14)	diagnostic labs, outpatient facilities, offices and public functions	88,170
Spellman Pavilion	143 West 11th Street	135 (11)	outpatient services, post-procedure recovery and diagnostic facilities	63,582
Reiss Pavilion	148 West 12th Street	109 (9)	inpatient and out-patient behavioral health facilities	67,120
Nurses' Residence	158 West 12th Street	140 (14)	administrative offices	73,903
Smith/Raskob Buildings	170 West 12th Street	146 (13) / 168 (15)	inpatient services, diagnostic and treatment facilities, and fast track emergency department	114,326
Triangle Site				
Materials Handling Facility	76 Greenwich Avenue	66 (1)	warehouse	26,320
O'Toole Building				
O'Toole Building	20 Seventh Avenue	55 (6)	Current Use: ambulatory care/ physician offices	162,020

Note: ***** Current Use in the case of the O'Toole building.
Source: SVCMC, 2009.

The buildings on the East Site date from different periods, have different overall heights and different floor-to-floor heights reflecting the variety of both their ages and their original purposes, and vary greatly in footprint and floor area.

- Coleman Pavilion, completed in 1983, is the tallest building on the East Site. It stands in the middle of the Seventh Avenue frontage.
- Link Pavilion adjoins the Coleman Pavilion to the south and occupies the corner of Seventh Avenue and West 11th Street. Completed in 1987 as a hospital wing to the Coleman Pavilion, it is the newest building on the East Site.
- Cronin Building, located at the eastern end of the East Site on West 11th Street was built in 1961 for research and laboratory facilities.
- Spellman Pavilion, on West 11th Street between the Link Pavilion and the Cronin Building, was constructed in 1941 for administrative offices.
- Smith/Raskob Buildings, north of the Coleman Pavilion at the corner of Seventh Avenue and West 12th Street, were constructed in 1950 and 1953, respectively, as inpatient pavilions serving the buildings that preceded the Coleman/Link Pavilions.
- Reiss Pavilion, built in 1955 as a residential behavioral health facility, is located at the eastern end of the East Site on West 12th Street.
- The Nurses' Residence, completed in 1924 to serve as a dormitory for the since closed School of Nursing, is located on West 12th Street between the Smith/Raskob Buildings and Reiss Pavilion.

The main entrance to the hospital was in the Smith Building on West 12th Street just east of Seventh Avenue. Ambulances arrived and parked along Seventh Avenue near the emergency department doors in the Coleman and Link Pavilions. The Link Pavilion contains two back-in emergency bays near the corner of West 12th Street.

The East Site is zoned C2-6 along Seventh Avenue and R6 in the midblock with a very small portion (less than 400 square feet) located in a C1-6 district. The Triangle Site is zoned C2-7 and the O'Toole Building Site is zoned C2-6 along Seventh Avenue and C1-6 in the midblock. The project area is also presently part of a large-scale community facility development (LSCFD) designated in 1979 that provided for the transfer of zoning floor area from the O'Toole Building and the Triangle Site to the East Site and for authorizations to modify lot coverage, height, and setback for the construction of the Link and Coleman Pavilions. The LSCFD also provided for the construction of the Materials Handling Facility and creation of a landscaped space on the Triangle Site.

NORTH SHORE LONG ISLAND JEWISH HEALTH SYSTEM

NSLIJ would own the O'Toole Building and operate within it the proposed Center for Comprehensive Care. NSLIJ is an integrated health care delivery system comprising 14 hospitals, two long-term care facilities, the nation's newest medical school, and The Feinstein Institute, a major research center. NSLIJ has become the nation's second-largest nonprofit, secular healthcare system and one of the largest clinically integrated healthcare networks in the country. Lenox Hill Hospital in Manhattan is one of its four major teaching hospitals.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED EAST SITE PROJECT

EAST SITE

The transfer of the East Site to a private developer would allow the site to be used for residential purposes on the entirety of the East Site, along with community facility and retail uses along Seventh Avenue consistent with the surrounding context. The redevelopment of the East Site with residential and other uses is intended to allow for the productive reuse of four historically contributing buildings within the Greenwich Village Historic District, allow for the replacement of other buildings on the East Site with new structures in keeping with the form and context established by the surrounding neighborhood, and allow for active new uses compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

TRIANGLE SITE

The proposed East Site project is intended to revitalize and reactivate the Triangle Site by creating a 15,102-square-foot open space that would be accessible to the public, while preserving the needed support for the proposed Center for Comprehensive Care. The new open space would be an at-grade plaza with planting, seating, and lighting, with the goal of providing an attractive and secure area for the surrounding community. The open space on the Triangle Site would be part of the proposed large-scale general development (LSGD) and would contribute to the open space requirements for the primarily residential development proposed for the East Site.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE CENTER FOR COMPREHENSIVE CARE

The Center for Comprehensive Care is intended to provide essential community healthcare services for the local geographic area that had been served by Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan. NSLIJ's goal is to create a patient-centered environment dedicated to efficient care, optimized staff performance, and enhanced patient experience.

The Center will provide the following services:

- Emergency Services;
- Diagnostic and Treatment Services, including imaging, ambulatory procedures, and laboratory services; and
- Other medical or health-related services appropriate to be located at the Center based upon future community health needs.

PROPOSED PROJECT APPROVALS

The discretionary approvals being requested for the proposed projects are described below.

APPROVALS FOR THE PROPOSED EAST SITE PROJECT

For the East Site project, these discretionary approvals being requested include zoning map, zoning text amendments, and special permits for the East Site and the Triangle Site, all of which are subject to CPC and City Council approval. The ULURP application refers to the proposed East Site project as the "Rudin West Village Project." Any changes to the Materials Handling Facility and the proposed design of the publicly accessible open space on the Triangle Site will require approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) from LPC. LPC permits issued under the New York Landmarks Law are not subject to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR). The design of the East Site development has been reviewed by LPC, and LPC issued Status Update Letter 10-1426 documenting LPC's approval of the design of the residential/commercial development on the East Site on July 7, 2009. No further LPC reviews of the design of the East Site buildings will be required.

A more detailed description of the discretionary land use and other approvals for the East Site project follows:

Zoning Map Amendments

- Rezoning of the East Site within 100 feet of Seventh Avenue from C2-6 to C6-2. This map amendment would increase the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for residential use from up to 3.44 to up to 6.02 and would maintain the current FAR of 6.5 for community facility. It would also increase the allowable FAR for commercial use from 2.0 to 6.0. The rezoning would also allow the East Site and a portion of the Triangle Site to be treated as an LSGD and allow for the grant of the LSGD special permits described below (see "Large-Scale General Special Permits").
- Rezoning of the midblock portion of the East Site from R6 and C1-6 to R8. This rezoning would increase the allowable FAR for residential use from up to 2.43 to 6.02 (3.44 to 6.02 for the small C1-6 district) and the allowable FAR for community facility or mixed use residential/community facility from 4.8 to 6.5 (unchanged in the small C1-6 district).

The two zoning map amendments would allow for a combined maximum floor area of 604,013 zoning square feet (zsf), at least 73,400 zsf less than exists on the East Site today.

Zoning Resolution Text Amendments

A zoning text amendment pursuant to ZR 74-743(a)(4) is proposed to make a special permit currently available only for LSGDs in Manhattan Community District 7 also available for LSGDs in Manhattan Community District 2. The special permit allows the floor area ratio available for new development to be used without regard to height factor or open space ratio requirements and allows for a reduction in open space requirements for appropriate open space with superior landscaping. This would permit a reduction in the required open space obligation for the residential portion of the project by up to 50 percent for appropriate open space with superior landscaping.

The proposed amended text would read as follows (underlined text is new):

> the maximum #floor area ratio# permitted pursuant to Section 23-142 (In R6, R7, R8 or R9 Districts) for the applicable district without regard for #height factor# or #open space ratio# requirements, provided that the #large-scale general development# is located partially in a C6-1, C6-2 or C6-3 District within the boundaries of Community Districts 2 or 7 in Manhattan or located within a C4-4 District within the boundaries of Queens Community District 7 and that a minimum of 50 percent of the required #open space# is provided within the #large-scale general development#. Required #open space# for the purposes of this paragraph, (a)(4), shall be calculated by utilizing the smallest #open space ratio# at the maximum #floor area ratio# pursuant to Section 23-142 for the applicable district;

Large-Scale General Development Special Permits

The East Site and a 15,102-square-foot portion of the Triangle Site would be developed as a LSGD, and several special permits available to LSGDs would be requested, as follows:

- LSGD special permits pursuant to ZR 74-743 as follows:
  - ZR 74-743(a)(1) to allow for distribution of total open space required by ZR 35-33 and 23-142 without regard for zoning lot lines or district boundaries. This would allow for approximately 15,102 square feet of the open space required as part of the East Site development to be located on the Triangle Site rather than on the East Site. No floor area or lot coverage distribution is being requested as part of the proposed East Site project.
  - ZR 74-743(a)(2) to allow the location of buildings without regard for the applicable court and height and setback (including rear yard setback) regulations set forth in ZR 23-632, 23-663, 23-84, and 33-432. This special permit would allow for modification of height and setback regulations, including rear setback controls, and outer court recess regulations for additions to the existing buildings and for certain of the proposed buildings.
  - ZR 74-743(a)(4) (as amended) to modify the open space regulations by reducing the open space requirement to 50 percent and permit the maximum residential FAR to be applied to development. This special permit would allow for the maximum residential FAR of 6.02 to be applied to development on the East Site and reduce the amount of required open space from 59,857 square feet to 29,928 square feet for appropriate open space with superior landscaping.
- LSGD special permit pursuant ZR 74-744(b) to allow commercial uses on the third floor of a building in the C6-2 district portion of the LSGD without regard for the locational restrictions set forth in ZR 32-42. This would allow doctors' offices proposed for the East Site within the C6-2 district to occupy a portion of the third floor of the development, with residential uses located on the second story and the remainder of the third floor.

As part of the LSGD special permits, the maximum amount of zoning floor area that would be allowed on the East Site would be limited to 590,660 square feet. Of this amount, no more than 31,251 square feet of zoning floor area would be available for community facility and commercial development, limited to the first three floors of the Seventh Avenue buildings on the East Site. Of this amount, commercial use would be limited to no more than 20,390 square feet of zoning floor area. The LSGD special permit would also limit the number of dwelling units to a maximum of 450. In addition, the zoning floor area that would be allowed on the Triangle Site would be limited to the existing gas storage area.

On the East Site, the LSGD special permits would establish a development envelope for the existing buildings and new development, and would also introduce a central courtyard running the length of the East Site. Unlike the present condition, where buildings extend into the interior of the block, the proposed design would create a

uniform rear building wall condition so that the interior courtyard has a consistent depth throughout its length and can have a coherent design. A limited portion of the interior courtyard would be for private yards for the townhouses and certain of the side street buildings, but the majority of the space would be open space accessible to all of the residents of the proposed East Site project.

The LSGD special permits would provide that the 15,102 square foot open space on the Triangle Site be a publicly accessible amenity, and would mandate that the open space conform to a design approved as part of the special permit. The Triangle Site open space is expected to be a heavily landscaped area fronting Seventh Avenue incorporating fixed, curvilinear seating surrounding the planting beds, moveable seating, lighting, and elements serving as a remembrance to events in the history of Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan.

As part of the LSGD special permits, the developer will enter into a Restrictive Declaration governing the development of the East Site and the portion of the Triangle Site encompassed within the LSGD boundaries. The Restrictive Declaration will among other things: require that the LSGD property be developed in accordance with plans adopted as part of the LSGD special permits; restrict the number of residential units to no more than 450 and limit the overall amount of floor area and the amount of commercial and community facility floor area allowed in the LSGD; provide for the construction and maintenance of the publicly accessible open space on the Triangle Site; and require that the proposed East Site project incorporate measures identified in the environmental review process that would avoid or minimize certain environmental impacts of the proposed East Site project.

Accessory Parking Garage Special Permit

A special permit pursuant to ZR 13-561 would be requested to allow for an accessory parking garage with approximately 152 spaces. This would be an increase above the 98 parking spaces that would be permitted as-of-right pursuant to ZR 13-12 and ZR 13-133. This would allow on-site accessory parking spaces for residents and tenants for approximately 30 to 40 percent of the anticipated residential units.

Upon the approval of the actions set forth above and the demolition of a portion of the Link-Coleman buildings, the height and setback waivers and floor area transfer granted under the LSCFD would no longer be required and the LSCFD would cease to exist.

Other Agency Approvals

Landmarks Preservation Commission

Due to the project area's location in the New York City Greenwich Village Historic District, the proposed East Site project is subject to review and approval by LPC. As noted above, LPC issued a Status Update Letter 10-1426 documenting LPC's approval of the design of the residential/commercial development on the East Site on July 7, 2009, and no further LPC approvals will be required for the buildings in this portion of the project area. In addition, any changes to the Materials Handling Facility and the design of the public open space on the Triangle Site will be subject to LPC review and approval. These LPC approvals are not subject to CEQR.

MTA-New York City Transit

It is proposed that the bus stop currently located at the corner of Seventh Avenue and West 12th Street be relocated one block south on the Triangle Site. In a letter dated August 15, 2011 (see **Appendix B**), MTA-New York City Transit indicated that it found the proposed relocation feasible and indicated that further coordination will be required with the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), which has jurisdiction over sidewalks and roads.

NYCDOT

It is possible that RSV, LLC will seek an assignment of an existing revocable consent from NYCDOT, to allow for the use of an existing tunnel under Seventh Avenue connecting the East Site and Triangle Site and potential

reuse of an existing utility connection running under West 12th Street between the medical gas storage area and the O'Toole Building.

APPROVALS FOR THE CENTER FOR COMPREHENSIVE CARE

The proposed Center for Comprehensive Care is consistent with current zoning and will not require approvals from the CPC or City Council. A Certificate of Need (CON) approval is required from DOH for the Center for Comprehensive Care. A CON application has been filed by NSLIJ. There will be review of the Center for Comprehensive Care by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). Review and approval by the LPC is required for alterations to the O'Toole Building. LPC held a hearing on the Center for Comprehensive Care on July 26, 2011 and voted to approve the project on August 2, 2011.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED EAST SITE PROJECT

The two components of the East Site Project—the residential development on the East Site and the redesigned open space on the Triangle Site are described below.

East Site

The vacant former hospital and support buildings on the East Site would be developed for residential use with retail and medical office uses on the lower floors of the buildings along Seventh Avenue. The Raskob and Smith Buildings, Spellman Pavilion, and Nurses' Residence would be adapted for residential use. Existing extensions in the rear yards of the Nurses' Residence and Spellman Pavilion would be removed and an extension to the rear yard setback line would be added to the Spellman Pavilion. A 60-foot-wide courtyard would be created between these buildings.

The Coleman, Link, and Reiss Pavilions and Cronin Building would be demolished and new buildings would be constructed at these locations. A new 16-story (approximately 189-foot-tall) residential building would be constructed on the site of the Link and Coleman Pavilions, and a new 10-story (approximately 112-foot-tall) apartment building would replace the Reiss Pavilion. A row of five 4- and 5-story (approximately 54 and 63-foot-tall, respectively) townhouses would be constructed on the site of the Cronin Building. Along Seventh Avenue, the buildings would include ground floor retail space as well as medical offices on the second and third floors and at the cellar level. An accessory parking garage with 152 spaces would be constructed below grade with access and egress on West 12th Street.

This arrangement of the East Site buildings would follow the development pattern of the area with taller buildings on the avenue stepping down to rowhouses or mid-rise buildings along the side streets. Further, each structure (other than the townhouses) would rise with setbacks, again recalling the architectural forms of the neighborhood. There would be an individual pedestrian entry to each of the residential buildings.

Overall, the residential portion of the proposed East Site project would contain a total of 724,880 gsf (624,280 gsf above grade), including 676,786 gsf of residential floor area (including approximately 84,800 gsf of residential amenity and below-grade space), 11,200 gsf of retail space, and 25,094 gsf of medical office space. The residential space would include 559,409 zsf of floor area. The developer of the residential buildings has committed to building no more than 450 units.

Triangle Site

On the Triangle Site the former Materials Handling Facility would be demolished except for the medical gas storage area (approximately 1,100 gross square feet) and the adjacent drive, which would be reused by NSLIJ. The open space would be expanded to 15,102 square feet, redesigned and made publicly accessible. The

contemplated landscape design includes several stands of trees, surrounded by plantings, paved areas, and undulating benches, as well as memorials to events in the history of Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan.

CENTER FOR COMPREHENSIVE CARE

NSLIJ would completely renovate the O'Toole Building to create the new state-of-the-art Center for Comprehensive Care. This facility would contain a new free-standing emergency department, ambulatory surgery, and a new imaging center, along with laboratory services.

Located on the ground floor for immediate access, the emergency department would provide the same diagnostic capabilities and staffing as a hospital emergency department. It would be open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week (24/7)—treating conditions from minor abrasions to acute abdominal pain, chest pain, and upper respiratory distress—including advanced life support technology, and it would accept ambulance traffic.

The façade would be restored to its originally designed condition as a finished concrete surface painted white. At ground level the glass blocks would be replaced in kind. The ground floor would be reconfigured to accommodate the new uses. A new loading dock and an ambulance driveway into the site and under the overhang of the building would be located at the southwest corner of the building off West 12th Street. At the northwest corner of the building on West 13th Street a new entrance for outpatients would be created with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant ramps and a canopy. The Seventh Avenue entrance would serve for walk-in emergency department visits and would be improved with a new exterior vestibule and entrance with projecting canopy, and ADA-compliant ramps. New mechanical equipment would be placed on the roof, in the area currently occupied by the cooling tower.

The emergency department would incorporate diagnostic and treatment services of a hospital emergency department including X-ray, CT, laboratory, and minor procedures. The upper floors would include ambulatory surgery and a state-of-the-art diagnostic/imaging center. This center would be equipped with the newest imaging technologies available, and services offered would include digital X-ray, CT, MRI, Ultrasound, and Angiography. Additional space would be allocated to physicians' practices.

The Center for Comprehensive Care, according to NSLIJ, is expected to receive more than 144,000 patient visits per year, including approximately 30,000 emergency visits per year. It is estimated that 391 employees (268 at peak shift), 453 patients, and 358 visitors would come to the Center on a daily basis.

FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The EIS has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

NSLIJ's Center for Comprehensive Care and the East Site project will be developed independently and will be subject to different approval processes. Although NSLIJ's Center for Comprehensive Care is not a part of the proposed East Site project and does not require any land use approvals, it is analyzed along with the proposed East Site project because both projects are located on the former Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan campus and are being developed contemporaneously.

For each technical area of the EIS, the analysis includes a description of existing conditions, an assessment of conditions in the future without the proposed projects, and an assessment of future conditions with the proposed East Site project as well as the Center for Comprehensive Care. **Table S-2** includes a comparison of existing, No Build, and Build conditions in the project area.

Table S-2
Comparison of Existing, No Build and Build Conditions

	Existing	No Build	Build
East Site			
Residential	—	—	676,786 GSF 450 units*
Community Facility (Medical Office)	—	—	25,094 GSF
Retail	—	—	11,200 GSF
Accessory Parking	—	—	152 spaces (accessory)
Vacant (former hospital buildings)	878,372	878,372	—
Total East Site GSF	878,372	878,372	724,880
Triangle Site	Materials Handling Facility and Medical Gas Storage (Vacant)	Materials Handling Facility and Medical Gas Storage (Vacant)	approximately1,100 GSF Medical Gas Storage
	approximately 7,390 sf Open Space (not publicly accessible)	approximately 7,390 sf Open Space (not publicly accessible)	15,102 sf Open Space (publicly accessible)
Total Triangle Site GSF	26,320	26,320	approximately1,100
O'Toole Building Site	Ambulatory care clinics and doctors' offices	Ambulatory care clinics and doctors' offices	NSLIJ Center for Comprehensive Care
	48-space parking garage	48-space parking garage	No parking garage
Total O'Toole Building Site GSF	162,020	162,020	152,556
Note: * The number of dwelling units would be limited to 450 under the LSGD special permit			

The proposed East Site project is expected to be complete and occupied in 2015. The Center for Comprehensive Care will be complete and occupied by 2014. The analysis year for the proposed projects will be 2015.

BASELINE CONDITIONS

Existing Conditions

For each technical area to be assessed in the EIS, the existing conditions in the project area and in the relevant study area are described. The analysis framework begins with an assessment of existing conditions because these can be most directly measured and observed. The assessment of existing conditions does not represent the condition against which the proposed projects is measured, but serves as a starting point for the projection of future conditions with and without the proposed projects and the analysis of project impacts.

The Future Without the Proposed Projects

Under the terms of the contract approved by the Bankruptcy Court and executed by RSV, LLC and SVCMC it is expected that the O'Toole Building will be conveyed to NSLIJ, and the East Campus Site and the Triangle Site will be conveyed to RSV, LLC, an entity controlled by Rudin Management. The conveyance of the O'Toole Building Site will be for the purpose of allowing for the reuse of the O'Toole Building by NSLIJ for health-related purposes. The conveyance of the Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan campus will take place independent of the proposed projects and accordingly the site will no longer be owned by SVCMC in the

future, either with or without the projects. In the future without the proposed projects, it is expected that the existing LSCFD would remain in place.

In the event that the DOH approvals for the Center for Comprehensive Care are not obtained by NSLIJ, the contract requires NSLIJ to reconvey the O'Toole Building Site to RSV, LLC or to another health care provider at the direction of RSV, LLC. In the event of reconveyance to RSV, LLC, Rudin Management advises that the O'Toole Building will be leased by it for health-related functions not requiring a DOH Certificate of Need, such as doctor's offices and clinic space similar to the uses in the building prior to the closure of Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan. Such doctors' offices and clinics, whether conducted pursuant to conveyance to a health care provider other than NSLIJ as directed by RSV, LLC, or under leasehold arrangements between RSV, LLC and health care entities, would be consistent with the LSCFD; they would also be consistent with the underlying zoning that allows 6.5 FAR for community facility use.

In the event that the land use approvals for the East Site are not obtained, Rudin Management advises that absent the proposed East Site project it will seek to maximize the value of the East Site by looking for one or more institutional users for the property, and would seek to convert the smaller floor plate buildings on the site to dormitory space and for the educational institutions in the area, and the larger floor plate buildings for classroom or conference center space associated with a non-profit institution. While some reuse of portions of the East Site property is likely in the future without the proposed projects, the amount and make-up of such use is speculative. Accordingly, as a conservative measure, the EIS will assume no active use of the East Site in the future without the proposed projects.

The EIS will also assume that there are no active uses on the Triangle Site in the future without the proposed projects. The loading bays and other above- and below-grade spaces of the Materials Handling Facility will be vacant and unused, as will the area devoted to medical gases. As in the existing condition, the open space on the Triangle Site will be fenced and not accessible to the public.

For each technical analysis, the No Build condition will also incorporate approved or designated development projects within the appropriate study area that are likely to be completed by the respective analysis years.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECTS

The identification of potential environmental impacts is based upon the comparison of the No Build condition to the future with the proposed projects ("Build condition"), as described above. Possible mitigation measures for all significant adverse impacts identified in the EIS are described in "Mitigation Measures." Where no mitigation is practicable, the EIS discloses the potential for unmitigated significant adverse impacts.

B. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

The analysis concludes that the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to land use, zoning, or public policy.

LAND USE

The new residential uses that would be introduced to the East Site would be consistent with land uses in the surrounding study area. The proposed townhouses and mixed-use apartment buildings, ranging in height from 4 to 16 floors, would be consistent with the elevator apartment buildings located to the north and south of the project area along Seventh Avenue, and the retail and medical office uses along Seventh Avenue proposed on the lower floors of those buildings would be an extension of land uses in adjacent parts of the study area. The proposed townhouses along West 11th Street would complement townhouses that already exist on that block

and elsewhere in the study area and the new mid-rise buildings along West 11th and West 12th Streets will be consistent with other midblock buildings nearby, including the adjoining buildings. The redevelopment of the East Site with residential and other uses is intended to allow for the productive reuse of four historically contributing buildings within the Greenwich Village Historic District and allow for the replacement of other buildings on the East Site with new structures in keeping with the form and context established by the surrounding neighborhood. As part of the LSGD, the provision of publicly accessible private open space on the Triangle Site would provide passive open space to the neighborhood. The new open space would be consistent with the pattern of smaller open spaces in the area such as Abingdon Square and Jackson Square.

Finally, the new Center for Comprehensive Care would occupy the O'Toole Building, continuing the history of health care uses in the area. That use would be consistent with the mixed residential, commercial, and community facility character of Greenwich Village. The portion of the Triangle Site would be used for the storage of medical gases in support of health care uses in the Center for Comprehensive Care and would not be part of the LSGD that would cover the East Site and the remainder of the Triangle Site. Therefore, the proposed projects would be in keeping with land uses within the study area and would not have any significant adverse impacts on land use.

ZONING

As a consequence of the closing of Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan, all of the buildings on the East Site (including the four buildings that LPC determined must be retained) are now vacant and in danger of falling into disrepair. The present zoning combined with the current LSCFD designation limits the potential to reuse the buildings in an economically viable way. The proposed zoning map amendments, together with the zoning text amendment and LSGD special permits would allow for the existing LSCFD designation to be eliminated and the primarily residential conversion of the East Site to take place. Establishment of a LSGD for redevelopment of the East Site would provide the flexibility needed to integrate the buildings to be retained with the new buildings in a manner consistent with the context of the East Site.

The zoning districts proposed for the East Site would be consistent with those found on the adjacent blocks and in other nearby parts of the study area. C6-2 districts and other R8-equivalent districts are found in the vicinity of the project site to the north, east, and west of the East Site. In particular, a C6-2 district extends along the West 13th Street corridor to the east from west of Sixth Avenue as far as Fifth Avenue (where the permitted FAR increases to 10.0 FAR). R8-equivalent districts are also located to the east of the project site at West 12th Street and Sixth Avenue, and to the north, from the midblock of West 13th Street to the midblock between West 16th Street and West 17th Street. The uses permitted under the proposed zoning would also be consistent with uses found on neighboring blocks.

The proposed zoning text amendment would permit the maximum floor area ratio available for new development to be used without regard to height factor or open space ratio requirements and to make open space allowances currently applicable only in LSGDs located in Manhattan Community District 7 applicable to LSGDs in Manhattan Community District 2. This would permit a reduction in the required open space obligation for the residential portion of the project by up to 50 percent for appropriate open space with superior landscaping.

This text amendment would allow for the East Site to be developed in a more contextual manner than zoning would otherwise allow. Specifically, this proposed text amendment would allow for the creation of a central courtyard running the length of the East Site. The proposed courtyard design would create a uniform rear building wall so that the interior courtyard has a consistent depth throughout its length and can have a coherent, superior design. The common area would be a passive open space with significant landscaping, seating, and uniform lighting throughout, providing both a visual amenity as well as open space for the residents. In

addition, a portion of the East Site's open space would be located on the Triangle Site, and would be open to the public instead of a being a solely private amenity as would be allowed under zoning.

While the proposed zoning text amendment would theoretically be available to other sites in Community District 2, it is unlikely that another property within Community District 2 would take advantage of the proposed text amendment. The text amendment is only applicable to LSGDs that are partially located within C6-1, C6-2, or C6-3 districts, which are not widely mapped in Community District 2. In addition, in order to meet the criteria for LSGDs, properties generally must consist of at least 1.5 acres and be in common ownership on a single zoning lot. Even if all of these criteria are met, the amended text would only be available by special permit, a discretionary approval subject to ULURP and its own review. Within Community District 2, the Westbeth Artists' Housing property located at 55 Bethune Street is the only property that meets these criteria; however this property is already built out and would likely not take advantage of the text amendment in the future.

The proposed Center for Comprehensive Care is consistent with current zoning and will not require approvals from CPC or the City Council.

Overall, the proposed projects would not have any significant adverse impacts on zoning in the study area.

PUBLIC POLICY

Due to the project area's location in the New York City Greenwich Village Historic District, the proposed projects are also subject to review and approval by LPC. The proposed projects would be consistent with the Landmarks Law and the goals and policies of LPC, which has issued a series of approvals for the proposed projects, and whose approval is being sought for the redesign of the Triangle Site (including the proposed open space). LPC adopted a resolution approving the issuance a Certificate of Appropriateness for the residential/commercial development on the East Site on July 7, 2009 and for the renovation of the former O'Toole Building on August 2, 2011. Overall, the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to public policy.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

For all five areas of socioeconomic concern—direct residential displacement, direct business displacement, indirect residential displacement, indirect business and institutional displacement, and adverse effects on specific industries—a preliminary assessment was sufficient to conclude that the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse socioeconomic impacts. The following summarizes the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

DIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

The project area does not contain any dwelling units. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed projects due to direct residential displacement.

DIRECT BUSINESS AND INSTITUTIONAL DISPLACEMENT

The proposed projects would not directly displace any businesses or institutions. The former hospital buildings on the East Site between West 11th and West 12th Streets are now vacant. The Triangle Site, bounded by West 12th Street, Seventh Avenue, and Greenwich Avenue, hosts an unused (vacant) Materials Handling Facility. The O'Toole Building, on Seventh Avenue between West 12th and West 13th Streets, now houses a limited number of physicians' offices and ambulatory care facilities but these will be relocated with or without the proposed projects and the building will be vacant by mid-September 2011. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts resulting from direct displacement of any businesses or institutions.

INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT

The proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect (secondary) residential displacement. The housing units introduced by the proposed East Site project would be offered at rents or sales prices comparable to residential rents and sales prices for other modern, newly constructed market rate units in the surrounding area and, as a result, the East Site project would not add a substantial new population with different socioeconomic characteristics compared to the size and character of the existing population. In addition, since the proposed projects would increase the population of the study area by less than 5 percent, it would not be expected to change real estate market conditions, and would not substantially alter neighborhood character in the study area in a manner that would result in indirect residential displacement.

INDIRECT BUSINESS AND INSTITUTIONAL DISPLACEMENT

The proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business and institutional displacement. The proposed projects would not introduce a new economic activity that would alter existing economic patterns in the study area. The study area already has a well-established residential market and a critical mass of non-residential uses, including health care uses.

ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC INDUSTRIES

The proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts on specific industries within the study area or the city more broadly. The proposed projects would not result in direct or indirect displacement, would not significantly affect business conditions in any industry or any category of business within or outside the study area, and would not substantially reduce employment or impair the economic viability in an industry or category of business.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

A detailed analysis of potential impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools was conducted for the proposed projects. Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, detailed analyses of public high schools, libraries, outpatient health care facilities, child care facilities, and police and fire services are not warranted. The proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse impacts on these facilities.

As described in the analysis and summarized below, the proposed projects would not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities.

DIRECT EFFECTS ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES

There has been a reduction in the health care services available to community residents since Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan closed. Contemporaneously with the development of the proposed East Site project, a new Center for Comprehensive Care would be incorporated into the former O'Toole Building. That would constitute a major improvement to health care services by adding emergency services, diagnostic imaging, and general and specialty physician care to the O'Toole Building.

Health care services located in the O'Toole Building, as operated by SVCMC, are expected to relocate by mid-September with or without the proposed projects. In the future without the proposed projects (No Build), it is assumed that RSV, LLC would lease the building for health-related uses. However, since no such uses would exist if the Center for Comprehensive Care is approved, there would be no displacement of community facilities.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The proposed projects are located in Sub-District 2 of Community School District (CSD) 2, which includes most of Lower Manhattan west of Broadway and south of 14th Street. The residential portion of the proposed projects would introduce 54 elementary school students and 18 intermediate school students. The assessment of public schools assesses the potential effects of these additional students on elementary schools within a ½-mile study area and Sub-District 2 and on intermediate schools within a 1-mile study area and Sub-District 2.

Elementary schools within the ½-mile study area would operate with a utilization rate of less than 105 percent in the 2015 future with the proposed projects (Build), and therefore the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the ½-mile study area. Within Sub-District 2, elementary schools would operate with a shortfall of 667 seats in the future with the proposed projects. However, the proposed projects would increase the elementary school utilization rate by only 1.5 percent. Therefore, the analysis concludes that the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the ½-mile study area or Sub-District 2.

By 2015 in the future with the proposed projects, intermediate schools within the 1-mile study area and Sub-District 2 would operate with a surplus of seats. Therefore, the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public intermediate schools within the ½-mile study area or Sub-District 2.

OPEN SPACE

DIRECT EFFECTS

The proposed projects would not remove or alter any existing publicly accessible open spaces, nor would it result in any significant adverse shadow, noise, or air quality impacts on any open spaces.

The proposed East Site project would increase the supply of publicly accessible open space in the study area by expanding and redesigning the area on the Triangle Site facing West 12th Street, and Seventh and Greenwich Avenues and making this approximately 0.35 acre privately owned open space accessible to the public.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

Table S-3 provides a comparison of open space ratios in the future without and with the proposed projects (or "No Build and Build conditions"). For the residential population, the total open space ratio (including both active and passive open space) and the passive open space ratio would increase minimally—the new residential population from the proposed projects would be offset by the provision of the new publicly accessible open space in the project area.

Table S-3
2015 Future With the Proposed Projects: Open Space Ratios Summary

Ratio[1]	City Guideline	Open Space Ratios			Percent Change Future Without to Future With the Proposed Projects
		Existing Conditions	Future Without the Proposed Projects	Future With the Proposed Projects	
Total/Residents	2.5	0.334	0.331	0.333	0.41
Passive/Residents	0.5	0.203	0.201	0.204	1.20
Active/Residents	2.0	0.131	0.130	0.129	-0.81

Notes: [1] Ratios in acres per 1,000 residents.

Due to the residential population that would be introduced by the proposed projects, the active open space ratio for residents would decrease by approximately 0.81 percent. This ratio would continue to fall short of City open space planning guidelines. However, the decrease in the active open space ratio would be approximately 0.001 acres per 1,000 residents and would not be considered a substantial change. It is recognized that the City

guidelines are not feasible for many areas of the city, and they are not considered impact thresholds. In addition, some of the active open space needs of the study area population would be met by open spaces outside the study area, particularly Hudson River Park. Therefore, even though the active open space ratio would continue to fall below city guidelines and would decrease slightly with the proposed projects, the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse indirect impact on open spaces in the study area.

While private open space and recreational facilities are not considered in the quantitative analysis, the new residential development would provide open space for use by the residents. Although space programming is still in development, the East Site would include recreational amenity space for the residents and may include facilities such as a pool and exercise rooms. In addition, the East Site would also include landscaped courtyard space, yard areas for the townhouses, and terraces for some apartments. These amenities, while not accessible to the general public, would serve residents who might otherwise use open spaces outside the project area.

Overall, the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse impacts on open space.

SHADOWS

The analysis concludes that there would be no significant adverse shadow impacts on public open space, natural resources or architectural resources with sunlight-dependent features. While there would be minor incremental shadows, these new shadows would not be substantial enough in extent or duration to cause a significant adverse impact.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

PROJECT AREA

The proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources.

The proposed East Site project and Center for Comprehensive Care would have no adverse impacts on archaeological resources. LPC reviewed the sites of the East Site, Triangle Site, and the O'Toole Building and determined in comments dated August 25, 2008 that the project area has no archaeological significance. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) indicated in a letter dated March 21, 2011 that they have no archaeological concerns with respect to the O'Toole Building Site (see **Appendix B**). Therefore, the proposed projects would have no significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources.

Under New York City Landmarks Law, LPC has reviewed and determined appropriate the proposed changes to the existing hospital buildings on the East Site and the proposed designs of the new residential buildings on the East Site and changes to the O'Toole Building. The demolition of the Materials Handling Facility, design of the open space on the Triangle Site will be subject to review and approval by LPC. The Materials Handling Facility post-dates the designation of the original district by LPC (and nomination of the district on the National Register) and as such is not described in the designation report. LPC's review and approval of the proposed alterations ensures that the historic characteristics are preserved and the changes would not result in adverse impacts on the historic character of the Greenwich Village Historic District.

The Center for Comprehensive Care would retain and reuse the unique architectural form of the O'Toole Building. The façade would be restored to its originally designed condition as a finished concrete painted white. To allow for the renovation of this building to house the Center for Comprehensive Care, a number of alterations would be required. The form of the ground floor would be altered at its northwest and southwest corners. The Seventh Avenue entrance would be improved with a new exterior vestibule and entrance with projecting canopy, and ADA-compliant ramps. The need for sufficient mechanical equipment would require that new equipment be placed on the roof. The equipment would be enclosed by a screen. These alterations would allow reuse of this important historic structure. Considerable planning has been undertaken to fit the

proposed uses within the unusually shaped and configured building, with the alterations designed to retain the form and essential architectural character of the building.

Construction of the proposed projects has the potential to result in inadvertent physical impacts on architectural resources in the Greenwich Village Historic District on the East Site, if appropriate precautions are not taken. The buildings to be retained and renovated as part of the East Site project—the Smith and Raskob Buildings, the Nurses' Residence, and the Spellman Pavilion—would themselves undergo alterations and would be located immediately adjacent to proposed demolition and construction activities for the new buildings. To avoid any construction-related impacts, a Construction Protection Plan (CPP) would be developed in consultation with LPC for these architectural resources. The CPP would be implemented by a professional engineer before any demolition, excavation, and construction would occur.

STUDY AREA

Known Architectural Resources

Four architectural resources were identified in the study area, the Greenwich Village Historic District, the Pratt Institute Building, the 154 West 14th Street Building, and the Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe at 229 West 14th Street.

Construction of the proposed projects also has the potential to result in inadvertent physical impacts on architectural resources in the Greenwich Village Historic District located within 90 feet of the project area. To avoid any construction-related impacts, architectural resources located within 90 feet of the project area would be included in the CPP.

The proposed projects would have no significant adverse impact on the Pratt Institute Building located at 138-146 West 14th Street, as it is at too great a distance to be potentially affected by construction-related activities. Due to its distance from the project area, the proposed projects would also have no contextual impacts on this architectural resource. The proposed projects would also have no adverse impacts on the 154 West 14th Street Building and the Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe at 229 West 14th Street. They are also located over 90 feet from the project area, and as such, would not be adversely impacted through project construction. The proposed projects would not obstruct any views to these resources nor adversely affect their context.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The proposed East Site project and Center for Comprehensive Care would not be expected to result in any significant, adverse impacts to urban design or visual resources that would negatively affect the pedestrian experience in comparison to the No Build condition. The proposed projects would not alter the placement of streets or natural features of the study area, and would be in keeping with building uses, sizes, and shapes found in the study area. They would expand the open space on the Triangle Site and make it publicly accessible. The O'Toole Building, a visual resource in the study area, would be restored and rehabilitated. The proposed East Site project would retenant the East Site with residential uses in new and renovated buildings. The new building on Seventh Avenue would have a more pedestrian friendly scale. The large vehicular openings on Seventh Avenue and double height arcade with recessed unfenestrated ground floor on West 11th Street would be replaced with a new building containing more modest retail openings. The ground floor storefront openings would be of a size similar to other buildings on Seventh Avenue and more suitable to those of a residential neighborhood than the No Build condition, where the Cronin and Link Buildings have narrow strip windows set in large expanses of brick wall. The ground floor retail proposed on Seventh Avenue and wrapping onto West 12th and West 11th Streets would provide visual interest and engage the pedestrian. This would be in keeping with retail uses found across West 11th Street on the avenues, and at the intersections of the avenues and the sidestreets where the retail uses on the avenues wrap the corners and provide storefront display windows and additional retail spaces continue on the sidestreets. The new townhouses would better

relate to the existing West 11th Street streetscape than the existing Cronin Building. The new residential building, to be clad in red brick and of a similar height as the Reiss Pavilion it would replace, would not substantially alter the pedestrian experience on West 12th Street. Further, the setback of the townhouses and the majority of the new residential building on West 11th Street behind landscaped areas and addition of new trees on West 12th and 11th Streets would also be in keeping with the urban design character of the sidestreets and positively affect the pedestrian experience. In comparison, in the No Build condition the East Site buildings would remain vacant and in their current configuration, the landscaped area on the Triangle Site would remain inaccessible to the public, and the exterior of the O'Toole Building would not be repaired and restored.

URBAN DESIGN

East Site

In comparison to the No Build condition (in which the East Site buildings would remain vacant and in their current form), the proposed East Site project would renovate, redevelop, and retenant the East Site. These proposed changes would alter the urban design of this part of the project area with the demolition of the Coleman, Link, and Reiss Pavilions and the Cronin Building, and the renovations of the Smith/Raskob Buildings, Nurses' Residence, and Spellman Pavilion. The new residential infill would change the buildings types on the East Site from vacant institutional buildings to retenanted and new residential buildings. The proposed East Site project would reduce the overall amount of development on the East Site. The changes in bulk and massing would be most visible to the pedestrian where the proposed 4- and 5-story townhouses would replace the 14-story Cronin Building on West 11th Street, and where the new Seventh Avenue building would replace the east-west orientation of the Coleman Pavilion with the bulk distributed north-south along the Seventh Avenue frontage. The proposed East Side project would enhance the ground level pedestrian experience by introducing ground floor retail openings at street level along Seventh Avenue that would replace the curb cuts and vehicular entrances associated with the former emergency department, and introduce ground floor retail with similar retail openings wrapping onto the side streets for a short distance. New landscaped areas would be created fronting onto the sidewalk on West 11th Street and in front of the new residential building that would replace the Reiss Pavilion on West 12th Street. The new 16-story (approximately 189-foot-tall [203 feet to the top of the mechanical penthouse]) residential building would replace the 17-story (approximately 190-foot-tall) east-west oriented Coleman Pavilion and four-story Link Pavilion (approximately 59-foot-tall). The new building's tower portion would be set above a lower height base and would have multiple setbacks. The setbacks would help to reduce the visibility of the taller portions of the buildings from the street. Further, the East Site buildings would step down in height to the east to heights similar to the mix of taller and shorter buildings on study area side streets. The proposed retail would be visually similar to that found on the adjacent blocks and on Seventh Avenue. Retail entrances would be limited to Seventh Avenue and at the intersection of West 11th Street and Greenwich and Seventh Avenues.

The East Site is characterized by buildings of varied massing, bulk, and height and the proposed East Site project would continue this condition by providing a series of discrete buildings to be constructed among the existing buildings to be retained. The East Site would consist of buildings of varying height, and as tall as other existing residential buildings in the study area. As a result, the changes to the pedestrian experience would be somewhat, but not substantially, different from the No Build condition.

In addition to the new residential building along Seventh Avenue, other changes to the East Site include the replacement of the 14-story (approximately 151-foot-tall) Cronin Building with 4- and 5-story (approximately 54- and 63-foot-tall, respectively) rowhouses. These new buildings would alter the urban design of the East Site's West 11th Street frontage, however, these changes would be in keeping with the residential context of the nearby rowhouses already on this street. The replacement of the 9-story Reiss Pavilion (approximately 109

feet tall) with a new 10-story (approximately 112-foot-tall) residential building with multiple setbacks would not be a significant departure from the No Build condition. It would not materially change the height of the building at this location and would have a series of setbacks not unlike the Smith Building which also sets back at the sixth and eighth floors. It would also be located on a street that has a strong residential character. While the new buildings on the East Site would alter the East Site's urban design, these buildings would be contextual with East Site buildings and the surrounding residential area. Further, the retained East Site buildings would maintain the existing streetwall though the inclusion of new retail in the Raskob Building and residential uses throughout the East Site would increase pedestrian activity from the No Build condition. The new entrance to the parking garage on West 12th Street would not adversely impact the streetscape, as the street would retain its mostly residential character and curb cuts are found throughout urban areas including for garage entrances in residential buildings throughout the study area, including within 3 buildings on West 12th Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues. This would not adversely alter the pedestrian experience as the pedestrian is used to navigating these entrances and watching for vehicles. In comparison to the No Build condition, the proposed changes to the East Site buildings would add active uses, adding multiple entrances to the East Site buildings similar to those found on adjacent blocks. These changes would slightly modify the pedestrian experience and be consistent with the character of conditions found around the project area. Therefore, the East Site project would not result in any significant adverse urban design impacts that would negatively affect the pedestrian experience.

Triangle Site

The proposed East Site project would positively affect the pedestrian experience at the Triangle Site. In comparison to the No Build condition, the Materials Handling Facility, its loading docks, and curb cut on West 12th Street would be removed The medical gas storage area and the adjacent driveway would be retained. The open space on the Triangle Site would be expanded and opened to the public, enlivening the space and activating the adjacent sidewalks with increased pedestrian activity. This change would allow views to and through the open space from vantage points throughout the study area. Overall, from an urban design perspective the Triangle Site would be transformed from a site with a building of an industrial character and smaller landscaped area to a primarily publicly accessible open space.

O'Toole Building

The proposed projects would not result in changes to the height and placement of the O'Toole Building on the block. The overall form of the O'Toole Building would be retained. The removal of the tiles on the building facade, which are in a deteriorate condition, would improve the overall appearance of the building. The renovation of the O'Toole Building would result in the building having a smaller gross floor area (approximately 152,556 gross square feet [gsf]) as compared to the building's 162,020 gsf due to the elimination of floor plates in certain areas of the building. The minor reduction in size would not be apparent to the pedestrian. The Center for Comprehensive Care would retain and reuse the architectural form of the O'Toole Building and the façade of the O'Toole Building would be restored to its originally designed condition of finished concrete painted white. To allow for the renovation of this building to house the Center for Comprehensive Care, a number of alterations would occur at street level and would be visible to the pedestrian. The form of the ground floor would be altered at its northwest and southwest corners to accommodate an entrance to the upper floor medical offices and an ambulance entry, respectively. Additional fenestration would be located at the West 13th Street entrance. The Seventh Avenue entrance would be modified with a new vestibule and entrance with projecting canopy and ADA-compliant ramps. The need for sufficient mechanical equipment would require new rooftop mechanical equipment to be placed on the roof, in the area currently occupied by the cooling tower. The new rooftop equipment would be screened and would be of a lower height than the slab-like stair tower. The proposed alterations to the O'Toole Building site would also include one new curb cut for the ambulance exit with the former garage entry curb cut used for loading

purposes and a new ambulance entry in comparison to the No Build where the existing curb cut would remain. There would be new canopies at the entrances extending to the curb, similar to the No Build condition. The proposed removal of the metal fence around the building (and replacement with a lower railing) and the replacement in kind of the deteriorated glass block wall at ground level would allow for greater visibility and interest at street level. It would also improve this visual resource's appearance. Therefore, the proposed alterations are not expected to result in any significant adverse urban design impacts that would negatively affect the pedestrian's experience.

VISUAL RESOURCES AND VIEW CORRIDORS

No visual resources or view corridors would be adversely affected by the proposed East Site project and Center for Comprehensive Care. Visual resources consist of the streets and buildings that make up the Greenwich Village Historic District, as well as the O'Toole Building, a distinctive building within the Greenwich Village Historic District ,The O'Toole Building would remain a visual resource in the neighborhood and its value as a visual resource would be improved through the renovations that would be undertaken as part of the Center for Comprehensive Care. The expansion of the Triangle Site into a publicly accessible open space would not obstruct views to historic buildings and would allow for longer views across it with the demolition of the Materials Handling Facility. Views of Sixth, Seventh, and Greenwich Avenues in the primary and secondary study areas and views on Fifth and Eighth Avenues and Hudson Street in the secondary study area would remain unobstructed. While views iews of Seventh Avenue would be somewhat altered by new buildings on the East Site adjacent to this avenue and to a lesser degree, the renovation of the O'Toole Building, there would be no significant adverse impacts to the Seventh Avenue corridor.

Views north from the diagonal streets south of Greenwich Avenue would include the new landscaped open space and portions of the East Site residential buildings and the renovated O'Toole Building. The activation of the Seventh Avenue frontage on the East Site for retail, as well as restoration of the O'Toole Building's façade and redesign of the open space on the Triangle Site, would generate visual interest at street level. Views to the two other visual resources visible from the primary and secondary study areas—the Jefferson Market Library and the Empire State Building—would not be affected by the proposed projects due to their distance from the project area.

The proposed projects would not alter the street pattern or block shapes of the project area or study areas, nor would it introduce incompatible uses. The addition of new residential buildings and alterations to existing buildings on the East Site would enliven the streetscape of the project area and surrounding area. The proposed alterations to the Triangle Site would provide public access to open space in this part of the project area, improving the pedestrian experience. Further, although some views in the study areas would be slightly modified by the alterations to the O'Toole Building, these changes would not adversely affect the pedestrian experience. Although some views in the primary study area near the project area would be changed by the proposed alterations to the project area buildings and the Triangle Site's open space, as described below, no significant visual resources or view corridors in the primary or secondary study area would be obstructed. Therefore, in comparison to the No Build condition, the proposed projects are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts on urban design, view corridors, or visual resources and would not adversely affect the pedestrian experience of these urban design components.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan, which occupies the entire project site, is located in a fully developed area in Manhattan and has limited potential to provide unique habitat for noteworthy wildlife. No other natural resources are present on or near the project area. Therefore, a detailed assessment of the potential for impacts on natural resources is not necessary and no significant adverse impact would occur.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The September 2005 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and updates in July 2009 and February 2011 identified historical and present potential sources of contamination including potential historical petroleum storage tanks, potential historical disposal of laboratory chemicals into the sewer system, and surface staining noted: near the hydraulic elevators in the Materials Handling Facility on the Triangle Site; near the emergency generator fuel pump in Coleman Pavilion; and in the generator room adjacent to the Nurses' Residence. Potential off-site sources included two dry cleaners located on the East Site block, one approximately 190 feet north of the O'Toole Building and others on blocks to the north and east.

The August 2011 Phase II subsurface investigation included the advancement of ten borings with collection of 19 soil samples and 7 groundwater samples for laboratory analysis. Laboratory results were compared to New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Soil Cleanup Objectives (which assume long-term exposure to soils) and Class GA Water Quality Standards (which assume use for drinking water). Since neither of these assumptions occurs now or would be expected to occur in the future, comparisons to these criteria are highly conservative. In summary, the laboratory results identified generally low levels of analytes in the soil and groundwater, typical of those often found in developed areas.

To avoid adverse impacts, the following measures would be undertaken prior to and during the proposed projects:

- Although the Phase II detected soil and groundwater constituents at levels generally below the most stringent DEC guidelines, to minimize the potential for impacts to the community and construction workers, all soil disturbance would be performed in accordance with a New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)-approved Remedial Action Plan and environmental Construction Health and Safety Plan (RAP and CHASP), the scope of which would be based on the findings of the Phase II. At a minimum, the RAP would provide for the appropriate handling, stockpiling, testing, transportation, and disposal of excavated materials, as well as any unexpectedly encountered tanks, in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. The RAP would also provide for vapor control measures such as vapor barriers or placing residential uses above separately ventilated parking areas. The CHASP would ensure that all subsurface disturbance is done in a manner protective of both workers, the community, and the environment. The applicant will enter into a Restrictive Declaration with the City to ensure the RAP/CHASP are prepared, approved and implemented.
- All demolition and renovation would be conducted in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements including those relating to asbestos, lead-based paint and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). These requirements would also be applicable to any demolition/ renovation that could occur in the future without the proposed projects.

With these measures, significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be avoided during and following construction. These measures will be incorporated as part of the proposed projects through a Restrictive Declaration.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

The proposed projects would not have an exceptionally large incremental demand for water, would not involve construction of a new stormwater outfall, and would not increase the amount of impervious area in the project area. The proposed projects would not result in wastewater discharges requiring industrial pretreatment or participation in the City's Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP). According to the thresholds of the *CEQR Technical Manual,* no analysis of water supply or wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment is needed and the proposed projects would not have a significant adverse impact on infrastructure.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

The proposed projects would have no effect on the City's Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) or other solid waste policies. Since the proposed projects would not result in a substantial increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity and would not be inconsistent with the City's SWMP or other policies, the proposed projects would not have a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services.

ENERGY

The total energy demand for the East Site is projected at 65,010 million BTU per year. Since the East Site is assumed for the purposes of the EIS to remain vacant in the future without the proposed projects, all of this demand would be incremental. The total energy demand for the Center for Comprehensive Care would be 28,007 million BTU. Due to improved energy efficiency, the incremental change for the O'Toole Building Site would be a reduction of approximately 1,401 million BTU per year compared to conditions without the proposed projects. Energy consumed by the proposed open space on the Triangle Site would be insignificant. Overall, the total energy demand would be 93,017 million BTU per year, of which 63,610 million BTU per year would be the incremental increase compared to conditions in the future without the proposed projects.

As noted in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the incremental demand caused by most projects would not create a significant impact on energy supply. Consequently, a detailed assessment of energy impacts is limited to those projects that may significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy. The proposed projects' energy demand is expected to be modest compared to the overall demand within Con Edison's New York City and Westchester County service area, and would be considered a negligible increment. The proposed projects would not be energy intensive facilities that would significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy.

The proposed projects would comply with the New York City Energy Conservation Code (NYCECC) and Energy Conservation Construction Code of New York State (ECCCNYS), incorporating all measures relating to energy efficiency and combined thermal transmittance. As described in greater detail in "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," the proposed projects would also incorporate a number of additional measures intended to reduce energy consumption.

Overall, the proposed projects would not have a significant adverse impact on energy.

TRANSPORTATION

The proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts related to traffic, transit, pedestrians, and parking.

In accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, the projected vehicle trip increments would not be sufficiently large enough to warrant a detailed traffic analysis and the proposed projects would not result in significant adverse traffic impacts.

Regarding transit, compared to the No Build condition, the proposed East Site project and Center for Comprehensive Care would result in net increments of 149, 44, and 194 person trips by subway and 0, 0, and 9 person trips by bus during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, respectively. Since both the incremental subway and bus trips are below the CEQR threshold of 200 peak hour transit trips, quantitative subway and bus analyses are not warranted and the proposed projects would not result in significant adverse impacts on the area's transit services.

Incremental pedestrian trips are expected to exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold of 200 peak hour pedestrian trips during the three weekday analysis peak hours. Therefore, Level 2 screening assessment was conducted to determine the need for additional quantified pedestrian analyses. Based on the

Level 2 screening assessment, there would be three pedestrian locations exceeding 200 pedestrian trips during one or more analysis peak hours. Based on the results of the detailed pedestrian analysis, the above three pedestrian locations would continue to operate at acceptable levels in the future with the proposed projects (Build condition) and would not result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts.

Accident data for the intersections near the project area were obtained from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for the time period between December 31, 2007 and December 31, 2010. During this period, a total of 209 reportable and non-reportable accidents, 1 fatality, 188 injuries, and 83 pedestrian/bicyclist-related accidents occurred at these intersections. A rolling 12-month total summary of the accident data identified five of these intersections as high pedestrian accident locations in the 2007 to 2010 period—Eighth Avenue and West 14th Street, Seventh Avenue and West 14th Street, Greenwich Avenue/West 11th Street and Seventh Avenue, Sixth Avenue and West 12th Street, and Sixth Avenue and West 14th Street.

With the proposed projects, these five intersections would experience modest increases in incremental vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The net incremental vehicular and pedestrian levels at these five intersections would be below the CEQR analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicular trips and 200 peak hour pedestrian trips, and therefore would not result in any significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts. With these small increases in vehicular and pedestrian activities, the proposed projects are also not anticipated to exacerbate any of the current causes of pedestrian-related accidents and are not expected to result in any significant adverse pedestrian safety impacts.

Nevertheless, pedestrian safety at the intersection of Eighth Avenue and West 14th Street could be improved by restriping the north and south crosswalks as high visibility or school crosswalks, and installing countdown timers on all crosswalks. At the intersection of Seventh Avenue and West 14th Street, pedestrian safety could be improved by restriping all crosswalks as high visibility crosswalks and installing countdown timers on all crosswalks. At the intersection of Greenwich Avenue/West 11th Street and Seventh Avenue, pedestrian safety could be improved by the installation of countdown timers on all crosswalks. And at the intersections of Sixth Avenue and West 12th and West 14th Streets, pedestrian safety could be improved by installing countdown timers on all crosswalks and by restriping the south crosswalk at the West 12th Street intersection as a school crosswalk.

With the proposed projects, the existing public parking facility at the O'Toole Building would be eliminated and a new accessory parking facility would be provided on the East Site. Accounting for the changes in on-site parking facilities in the future with the proposed projects, the parking supply and utilization analysis shows that there would be adequate parking supply in and near the project area to accommodate the projected incremental parking demand, and no significant adverse parking impacts would occur.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed projects would not significantly alter traffic conditions; therefore, no analysis of on-street mobile source emissions is warranted. Based on the analysis of the proposed East Site project's accessory parking garage in the residential development, there would not be any significant adverse air quality impacts. Thus, the proposed projects would not have significant adverse impacts from mobile source emissions.

Based on the stationary source analyses, there would be no potential significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts from emissions of nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter from the proposed fossil fuel-fired HVAC systems of the residential development on the East Site. There would be no significant adverse impacts from the Center for Comprehensive Care since the heating and hot water needs for the building would be served by Con Edison steam.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The building energy use and vehicle use associated with the proposed East Site project and Center for Comprehensive Care would result in approximately 10,037 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year. Of that amount, 3,367 metric tons of CO_2e would be generated by the Center for Comprehensive Care, while 6,671 metric tons of CO_2e would be generated by the uses on the East Site.

The proximity of the proposed projects to public transportation and efficient design are all factors that contribute to energy efficiency. At this time, the proposed projects are intending to meet the requirements for the United States Green Building Council's (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver certification. As such, specific measures would need to be incorporated into the design of the proposed projects to qualify for the LEED rating, which would decrease the potential GHG emissions from the proposed projects. Based on these project components and efficiency measures, the proposed projects would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goal, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

NOISE

The analysis concludes that the traffic generated by the proposed projects would not have the potential to produce significant noise level increases at any sensitive receptors near the project area. With the incorporation of the attenuation levels specified below under "Attenuation Requirements," noise levels within the proposed buildings would comply with all applicable requirements. Although noise levels within the proposed open space on the Triangle Site would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* noise exposure guidelines for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet, they would be comparable to noise levels in a number of open space areas that are also located adjacent to heavily trafficked roadways, including Hudson River Park, Riverside Park, Bryant Park, Fort Greene Park, and other urban open space areas such as the numerous small parks and playgrounds on nearby blocks in the Chelsea and Greenwich Village neighborhoods. Overall, the proposed projects would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The proposed projects would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in technical areas such as air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, or operational noise.

While during some periods of construction the proposed projects would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise as defined by CEQR thresholds, the predicted overall changes in noise levels would not be large enough to significantly affect public health. Therefore, the proposed projects would not result in significant adverse public health impacts.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The proposed East Site project would not have significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas contributing to neighborhood character. While certain buildings on the East Site and Triangle Site would be demolished and replaced, the proposed projects would include a range of uses that are already common in the area, including residential apartments and townhouses, neighborhood-oriented retail shops, and publicly accessible open space. Although the new and renovated buildings would represent a significant change to the project area, the types of uses would not be new to the area and the proposed changes would result in buildings that would be consistent with the existing mix of bulk, uses, and types of buildings in the neighborhood. The proposed below-grade parking garage would be entered from the east end of the East Site along West 12th Street, and would be in keeping with other accessory parking garages that are found in the immediate area, such as the garages in the residential buildings at 175 and 101 West 12th Street. The Triangle Site would be improved with an expanded publicly accessible open space, providing a new amenity and positive change to the neighborhood. Changes to the Triangle Site would be beneficial, as they would revitalize and reactivate the

Triangle Site by expanding and improving the existing open space and opening it to the public. The new open space would be an at-grade plaza with planting, seating, and lighting, with the goal of providing an attractive and secure area for the surrounding community. Taken together, the changes proposed for the East Site and Triangle Site would revitalize the project area—replacing vacant buildings with active uses, creating new public open space, and enlivening the neighborhood with street-level activity.

The proposed Center for Comprehensive Care would also not have significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas contributing to neighborhood character. The former O'Toole Building would be renovated and restored to house active health care uses in keeping with the site's historic use. As described in "Project Description," the new Center for Comprehensive Care is intended to provide a variety of health care services—including an emergency department—for the local geographic area that had been served by Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan.

Overall, the proposed projects would not have a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

TRANSPORTATION

Traffic

Construction of the proposed projects is expected to generate the highest amount of construction traffic during the early morning peak period in the ninth quarter of construction (months 25-27). A detailed traffic analysis conducted for the area intersections most affected by construction-related traffic concluded that projected construction activities would not result in any significant adverse traffic impacts.

Delivery trips would be made along NYCDOT-designated truck routes. Flaggers would be present at construction site driveways to manage the access and movements of trucks. Temporary curbside lane or sidewalk closures would take place in accordance with the detailed NYCDOT Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination (OCMC)-approved Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) plans.

Parking

Based on a quantified analysis, parking demand generated by the construction activities, mostly from the construction workers who commute by private automobile, would be accommodated by available nearby off-street parking facilities. Hence, the construction of the proposed projects is not expected to result in any significant adverse parking impacts.

Transit

The study area is well served by public transit, including the A, C, E, and L subway lines at the Eighth Avenue-14th Street station; 1, 2, and 3 subway lines at the Seventh Avenue-14th Street station; and F, L, and M subway lines and PATH service at the Sixth Avenue-14th Street station. There are also several local bus routes, including the M5, M6, M7, M14, and M20. Based on the number of projected construction workers being distributed among the various subway and bus routes, station entrances, and bus stops near the project area, only nominal increases in transit demand would be experienced along each of these routes and at each of the transit access locations during hours outside of the typical commuter peak periods. Hence, there would not be a potential for significant adverse transit impacts attributable to the projected construction worker transit trips. Any temporary relocation of bus stops along bus routes that operate adjacent to the project area would be coordinated with and approved by NYCDOT and New York City Transit (NYCT) to ensure proper access is maintained.

Pedestrians

Considering that pedestrian trips generated by construction workers would occur during off-peak hours and would be distributed among numerous sidewalks and crosswalks in the area, the preliminary analysis found that there would not be a potential for significant adverse pedestrian impacts attributable to the projected construction worker pedestrian trips. For limited periods of time, some sidewalks may be closed during construction. However, pedestrian circulation and access would be maintained at all times through the use of temporary sidewalks or sidewalk bridges.

AIR QUALITY

In order to prevent significant adverse impacts from construction equipment air emissions, the following measures would be implemented. These measures would also be included in the Restrictive Declaration as part of the approval process for the proposed projects.

- *Diesel Equipment Reduction*. Construction of the Center for Comprehensive Care and the East Site would minimize the use of diesel engines and use electric engines, which may operate on grid power to the extent practicable. To that end, the construction manager would contact Con Edison to seek the early connection of grid power to the sites by the start of construction. In addition, the capacity of the existing electric systems serving the O'Toole Building and the East Site would be investigated to determine the feasibility of using those systems to power construction prior to any new Con Edison service. Construction contracts would specify the use of electric engines and ensure the distribution of power connections as needed and subject to availability. Equipment that would use electric power instead of diesel engines would include, but not be limited to, concrete vibrators, and material/personnel hoists.
- *Clean Fuel*. Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD) would be used exclusively for all diesel engines throughout the construction sites. This would enable the use of tailpipe reduction technologies (see below) and would directly reduce DPM and SO_x emissions.
- *Best Available Tailpipe Reduction Technologies.* Non-road diesel engines with a power rating of 50 horsepower (hp) or greater and controlled truck fleets (i.e., truck fleets under long-term contract, such as concrete mixing and pumping trucks) would utilize the best available tailpipe technology for reducing DPM emissions. Diesel particle filters (DPFs) have been identified as being the tailpipe technology currently proven to have the highest reduction capability. The construction contracts would specify that all diesel non-road engines rated at 50 hp or greater would utilize DPFs, either original equipment manufacturer (OEM) or retrofit technology that would result in emission reductions of DPM of at least 90 percent (when compared with normal private construction practices). Ninety percent reduction has been verified by a study of actual reductions of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from comparable engines used at a New York City construction site. Controls may include active DPFs, if necessary.
- *Utilization of Tier 2 or Newer Equipment.* In addition to the tailpipe controls commitments, the construction program would mandate the use of Tier 2 or later construction equipment for non-road diesel engines greater than 50 hp. The use of "newer" engines, especially Tier 2, is expected to reduce the likelihood of DPF plugging due to soot loading (i.e., clogging of DPF filters by accumulating particulate matter); the more recent the "Tier," the cleaner the engine for all criteria pollutants, including PM. In addition, while all engines undergo some deterioration over time, "newer" as well as better maintained engines will emit less PM than their older Tier or unregulated counterparts. Therefore, restricting site access to equipment with lower engine-out PM emission values would enhance this emissions reduction program and implementation of DPF systems as well as reduce maintenance frequency due to soot loading (i.e., less downtime for construction equipment to replace clogged DPF filters). In addition, to minimize hourly emissions of NO_2, non-road diesel-powered vehicles and construction equipment meeting or

achieving the equivalent of higher EPA non-road diesel emission standards would be used in construction, where practical and feasible.

Using a worst-case emissions scenario, the detailed analysis of both on-site and on-road emissions, combined, determined that the maximum predicted incremental concentrations of particulate matter finer than 2.5 micron ($PM_{2.5}$) would not exceed the applicable interim guidance criteria, and, therefore, no significant adverse impact from $PM_{2.5}$ would be expected to occur. Annual-average nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter finer than 10 microns (PM_{10}) would be below their corresponding National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Therefore, the proposed projects would not cause or contribute to any significant adverse air quality impacts with respect to these standards.

Given the uncertainties regarding background concentrations and analysis methodology for the new 1-hour NO_2 standard, exceedances of the 1-hour NO_2 standard resulting from construction activities cannot be ruled out. Therefore, measures would be implemented by the proposed projects to minimize NO_x emissions from construction activities.

NOISE

Based on a detailed analysis, construction activities would be expected to result in significant noise impacts during weekday construction hours at the locations along West 11th and West 12th Streets adjacent to the project area. Significant adverse impacts are predicted to occur at the following residential locations:

- On the north side of West 12th Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues, at various locations on the front façades of the residential buildings located at 127 West 12th Street through 179 West 12th Street (Receptors J, I1, I2, and I3), including terrace locations at 179 West 12th Street (Receptor J);
- At various locations on the rear façade of the residential building located at 130 West 12th Street (I9);
- On south side of West 11th Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues, at various locations on the front façades of the residential buildings located at 126 West 11th Street through 160 West 11th Street (Receptors X1, X2, and X3);
- On the north side of West 11th Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues, at various locations on the front façades of the residential buildings located at 121 West 11th Street through 131 West 12th Street (Receptors X7, X8, and X9), as well as various locations on the rear façade of the residential buildings at 117 West 11th Street through 131 West 11th Street (Receptors X11 and X12); and
- At various locations on the façade(s) facing the proposed projects of the residential buildings located at 219 West 12th Street through 229 West 12th Street (Receptors K).

The buildings at most sensitive receptor locations, where the significant adverse noise impacts are predicted to occur, have both double-glazed windows and some form of alternative ventilation (i.e., central air conditioning, packaged terminal air conditioner [PTAC] units, or window air conditioning units). Consequently, depending upon the window attenuation and the type of air conditioning, even during warm weather conditions, interior noise levels would be approximately 25-35 dBA less than exterior noise levels. To maintain an interior $L_{10(1)}$ noise level of 45 dBA (the City Environmental Quality Review [CEQR] acceptable interior noise level criteria), a minimum of 30 dBA window/wall attenuation would be required. At locations on these buildings where significant noise impacts are predicted to occur, absent the development of additional measures to reduce project-related construction noise, the project sponsors would offer to provide storm windows and/or window air conditioning units to mitigate project-related construction noise impacts to owners of buildings that do not have double-glazed windows and alternative ventilation (i.e., some form of air conditioning). With existing building attenuation measures (i.e., double-glazed windows and/or storm windows and alternative ventilation) and the mitigation measures offered by the project sponsors, interior noise levels during much, if

not all, of the time when project construction activities are taking place, would be expected to be below 45 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria).

With regard to the residential terrace locations at Receptor J, $L_{10(1)}$ levels for the No Build condition would be in the mid-60s dBA and the highest $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels would be in the mid 70s dBA during some peak periods of construction activity. While noise levels at these terraces already exceed the acceptable CEQR range (55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ or less) for an outdoor area requiring serenity and quiet, during the daytime analysis periods construction activities are predicted to significantly increase noise levels and would exacerbate these exceedances and result in significant adverse noise impacts. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that could be implemented to eliminate the significant noise impacts at these terraces.

Noise levels at the open space locations (i.e., receptors 3, Y, and Z) are currently above the 55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ *CEQR Technical Manual* noise level for outdoor areas. Proposed construction activities would slightly exacerbate these exceedances; average $L_{10(1)}$ noise levels would be in the high 60s dBA in these open space locations. These predicted noise levels would result principally from the noise generated by traffic on nearby roadways, and no practical and feasible mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce noise levels to below the 55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ guideline. However, the noise levels in these locations are already fairly high and are comparable to noise levels in portions of other public open spaces in this area that are also located adjacent to trafficked roadways, including Jackson Square, Corporal John A. Seravalli Playground, and McCarthy Square. Although the 55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ guideline is a worthwhile goal for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet, this relatively low noise level is typically not achieved in parks and open space areas in New York City. Consequently, noise levels in these open space locations, while exceeding the 55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ CEQR guideline value, would not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

Between the DEIS and FEIS, options will be explored to (1) determine the practicability and feasibility of implementing any additional construction equipment control measures (beyond those already included in this analysis) that could be implemented during construction to reduce the magnitude of or eliminate project impacts; and (2) perform additional window/wall survey work for any sensitive receptors where significant noise impacts are expected to occur due to construction, so that mitigation measures can be more accurately defined. Absent the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed projects would have significant noise impacts at the locations specified above. The mitigation measures mentioned above and any developed during the analysis between DEIS and FEIS would also be included in the Restrictive Declaration as part of the approval process for the proposed projects.

A traffic noise analysis examined impacts due to peak construction-related vehicular (autos and trucks) trips, which would occur between the hours of 6 AM and 7 AM, prior to the start of operational construction activities. Based on the proportional modeling analysis results, two locations were identified as having the potential for significant impacts. At these two sites a detailed analysis was performed using the Federal Highway Administration's (FWHA) *Traffic Noise Model* (TNM). The TNM results indicated that, at these two locations, construction-related traffic would increase future without the proposed projects (No Build) noise levels by more than the 3-5 dBA *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria. However, the exceedance of the CEQR impact criteria at these locations would occur for less than two years, the threshold set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual* for identifying likely significant adverse impacts. Therefore, while the predicted increases of 3-5 dBA at these receptor sites may be perceptible and the related activities noisy and intrusive, the increases would not result in significant adverse noise impacts because of their limited duration.

The buildings and structures of greatest concern with regard to the potential for structural or architectural damage due to vibration are the Smith/Raskob Buildings, Nurses' Residence, and Spellman Pavilion on the East Site, and 130 West 12th Street and 131 West 11th Street immediately adjacent to the East Site. Generally, the types of construction equipment involved in construction activities that have the highest potential for resulting in architectural damage due to vibration are pile driving, ram hoes, truck loading/unloading, and

jackhammers. To minimize the potential for high vibration levels, drilled caissons are expected to be installed for the tower building on Seventh Avenue in the East Site. In terms of potential vibration levels that could result in architectural damage, construction that would have the most potential for producing levels exceeding 0.5 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) are within approximately 13 feet of pile driving; approximately 8 feet from a hoe ram or truck loading/unloading; and approximately 5 feet from a jackhammer. To avoid any significant adverse impacts, a CPP would be developed to protect known architectural resources within a lateral distance of 90 feet from the proposed construction activities. The CPP would include a monitoring component to ensure that if the 0.5 inches per second PPV limit is exceeded during construction, corrective action would be taken.

In terms of potential vibration levels that would be perceptible and annoying, the dominant vibration equipment (i.e., pile driving rig) would have the most potential for producing levels which exceed the 65 vibration decibels (VdB) limit at receptor locations within a distance of approximately 215 feet. However, the operation would only occur for limited periods of time at a particular location and therefore would not result in any significant adverse impacts. Although blasting is not expected to be used, if it were to be used, it is expected to produce vibrations less perceptible than the operation of the pile driving rig. In no case are significant adverse impacts from vibrations expected to occur.

OTHER TECHNICAL AREAS

Land Use and Neighborhood Character

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

Socioeconomic Conditions

Construction activities associated with the proposed projects would, in some instances, temporarily affect pedestrian and vehicular access in the area. However, these sidewalk and/or lane closures are not expected to obstruct entrances to any existing businesses or obstruct major thoroughfares used by customers, and businesses are not expected to be significantly affected by any temporary reductions in the amount of pedestrian foot traffic or vehicular delays that could occur as a result of construction activities. Utility service would be maintained to all businesses, although very short term interruptions (duration in hours) may occur when new equipment (e.g., a transformer, or a sewer or water line) is put into operation. Overall, a preliminary analysis found that construction of the proposed projects is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts on surrounding businesses.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The proposed projects received detailed analyses for the potential of impacts on historic and cultural resources. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) indicated that the project area has no archaeological significance in a letter dated August 25, 2008. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) concurred in that opinion in their review of the O'Toole Building Site (letter dated March 21, 2011). Therefore, archaeological resources are not a consideration for construction of the proposed East Site project nor the renovation of the O'Toole Building.

Under New York City Landmarks Law, LPC reviewed and determined appropriate the proposed changes to the existing hospital buildings on the East Site and the proposed designs of the new residential buildings on the East Site. Alterations to the exterior of the O'Toole Building have been approved by LPC. Demolition of almost all of the Materials Handling Facility and design of the open space on the Triangle Site are subject to review and approval by LPC. Adverse impacts to the historic character of the Greenwich Village Historic District would thus be avoided.

NSLIJ would retain the unique architectural form of the O'Toole Building and would restore the building's façade. To allow for the renovation of this building to house the Center for Comprehensive Care, a number of alterations would be required including modification of the ground floor at its northwest and southwest corners and a new doorway, canopy, and ADA-compliant ramps at the West 13th Street and Seventh Avenue entrances. In addition, the need for sufficient mechanical equipment would require a vertical enlargement of the existing sixth floor while preserving the distinctive circular forms on the roof.

Construction of the proposed projects has the potential to result in inadvertent physical impacts to adjacent architectural resources in the Greenwich Village Historic District if appropriate precautions are not taken. The buildings to be retained as part of the proposed East Site project—the Smith and Raskob Buildings, the Nurses' Residence, and the Spellman Pavilion—would themselves undergo alterations and would be located immediately adjacent to proposed demolition and construction activities for the new buildings. To avoid any construction-related impacts to these and other buildings in the Greenwich Village Historic District, a Construction Protection Plan (CPP) would be developed in consultation with LPC. Implementation of the CPP would be initiated by a professional engineer before any demolition, excavation, and construction would occur.

Hazardous Materials

Detailed laboratory analysis of project area soil and groundwater samples identified generally low levels of analytes in the soil and groundwater, typical of those often found in developed areas. Potential contaminants identified at the time of construction would be remediated (cleaned up) as part of the development of this area. Contaminated soil, historic fill, and demolition debris would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations. Potential impacts during construction and development activities would be avoided by implementing a Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP). The CHASP would ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts on public health, workers' safety, or the environment as a result of potential hazardous materials exposed by or encountered during construction. Following construction, any remaining contamination would be isolated from the environment, and it is expected that there would be no further potential for exposure. A Remedial Action Plan (RAP) would be prepared and would be approved by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), if necessary, in response to a reported petroleum spill.

With these measures in place, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials are expected to occur as a result of the proposed projects.

Rodent Control

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

The only significant adverse impacts identified were noise impacts during construction. Construction activities would be expected to result in significant noise impacts during weekday construction hours at the locations along West 11th and West 12th Streets adjacent to the project area. Measures to further mitigate adverse impacts will be refined and evaluated between the DEIS and FEIS. Therefore, the FEIS may include more complete information and commitments on all practicable mitigation measures to be implemented with the proposed projects.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The only significant adverse impact from the proposed projects would be noise during construction. Construction activities would result in significant adverse noise impacts during weekday construction at locations along West 11th and West 12th Streets immediately adjacent to the project area. Measures to reduce or eliminate the proposed projects' construction noise impacts will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS. If it is determined that there are no practicable mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the impacts, they would be considered unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECTS

The proposed projects would not induce development and would not expand infrastructure capacity. As described in "Project Description," proposed development would be limited to new and renovated buildings and new publicly accessible open space, all within the project area. A zoning text amendment is proposed to make a special permit currently available only for LSGDs in Manhattan Community District 7 also available for LSGDs in Manhattan Community District 2. However, other than the East Site, it is unlikely that another property within Community District 2 would take advantage of the proposed text amendment.

As discussed in "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the proposed projects would be consistent with and complementary to existing land uses in the area. The zoning districts proposed for the East Site would be consistent with those found on the adjacent blocks and in other nearby parts of the study area. The special permits and rezoning would apply to the East Site only and would not be applicable to other sites.

As stated in "Socioeconomic Conditions," the proposed projects would not result in direct or indirect residential displacement, direct or indirect business and institutional displacement, and would not have any adverse effects on specific industries. The East Site project would not add a substantial new population with different socioeconomic characteristics compared to the size and character of the existing population.

The proposed projects would not include the introduction of new infrastructure or an expansion of infrastructure capacity that would result in indirect development.

Therefore, the proposed projects would not "induce" new growth in the surrounding area.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

The proposed projects constitute an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the project area as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term. These commitments of land resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the proposed projects. The proposed projects would bring new residential, health care, and retail uses to the project area, which would remain largely vacant and underdeveloped without the proposed projects. The proposed Center for Comprehensive Care is intended to provide essential community healthcare services for the local geographic area that had been served by Saint Vincent's Hospital Manhattan prior to its closure. Finally, the proposed East Site project would include a new publicly accessible open space that would be a notable asset to the community.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECTS

The No Action Alternative is the "Future with the Proposed Projects" described in each of the analysis sections of this document. In this case it assumes that the buildings on the East Site and the Triangle Site remain vacant and no demolition, renovation, or new construction occurs. The O'Toole Building would be renovated and reoccupied with doctors' offices.

The No Unmitigated Impact Alternative seeks to avoid the significant noise impacts during construction. Such measures could include stopping work for a quarter (i.e., for a period of three months) after the first seven quarters of work, completing construction in less than two years, or only doing minor renovation. The first two are not feasible or practicable. The third would not satisfy the goals of the proposed projects. Additional measures to reduce or eliminate the proposed projects' construction noise impacts will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS. If it is determined that there are no practicable mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the impacts, they would be no practicable or feasible No Unmitigated Impact Alternative.

Alternatives suggested in both the 2009 scoping process and the 2011 scoping process include an alternative reusing the Reiss Pavilion, an alternative with garage access on West 11th Street or Seventh Avenue, and an alternative with affordable housing or housing for low- and moderate-income families. Alternatives identified in the 2011 scoping included: No Action Alternative with East Site Reuse, Lower Density Zoning Alternative-R6 or R7, Contextual Zoning Alternative, Alternative with new residential development at current zoning and retaining the Reiss Pavilion (in addition to the other buildings retained by the proposed East Site project), Alternative without Retail Windows on Side Streets, Alternative providing an inpatient hospital, Alternative Locations of Medical Gas Storage and Alternative with Community Facility Uses in the Materials Handling Facility. Most of these alternatives were not studied in detail because they do not meet the goals of the proposed projects, do not have sponsors, or do not avoid or reduce the significant adverse impacts of the proposed projects. However, two are considered in detail as illustrative alternatives: the No Action with East Site Reuse and the Community Facility Use in the Materials Handling Facility Alternative. ✷

Robert Dobruskin

Robert Dobruskin, AICP, Director
Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

cc: Amanda M. Burden, FAICP
City Planning Commissioners
The Hon. Scott M. Stringer, Manhattan Borough President
Brad Hoylman, Chair, Community Board 2, Manhattan
Bob Gormley, District Manager, Community Board 2, Manhattan
Gail Benjamin, City Council
James Comegys, NYSDOH
Beth Cumming, OPRHP
Adrienne Taub-Kane, MTA-NYCT
Robert Kulikowski, OEC
Terrell Estesen, DEP
Joshua Laird, DPR
Naim Rasheed, DOT
Gina Santucci, LPC
Richard Barth
Hannah Fischer-Baum
Sarah Goldwyn
Jacquelyn Harris
Samuel Hornick
Edith Hsu-Chen
David Karnovsky
Eric Kober
Diane McCarthy
Sam Voyages
Thomas Wargo
Sarah Whitham
Adam Wolff
Mehdi Amjadi
Pat Bussey
Celeste Evans
Mauricio Garcia
Susan Wong