Appendix 5

Response to Comments on the Draft Scope of Work

Herkimer-Williams
CEQR No. 24DCP055K

Response to Comments on the Draft Scope of Work for a Draft Environmental Impact Statement

A. INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes and responds to public comments regarding the issues to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as described in the Draft Scope of Work (DSOW), issued on November 17, 2023 for the Herkimer-Williams project (the "Proposed Actions"). Oral and written comments were received during the public scoping meeting held by the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) on behalf of the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) on December 19, 2023. Written comments were accepted through the close of the public comment period, through December 29, 2023. **Appendix 6** contains the written comments received with respect to the DSOW. The Final Scope of Work (FSOW) issued on May 30, 2025 has been modified to incorporate and address substantive public comments on the DSOW where relevant and appropriate.

Section B below lists the elected officials, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the DSOW. Section C contains a summary of the relevant and substantive comments received by the lead agency and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Comments are organized by subject matter and generally parallel the chapter structure of the DSOW. Comments unrelated to the effects of the Proposed Actions on the quality of the environment are included under Section D, "Miscellaneous." The organization and/or individual that commented is identified after each comment. Where more than one commenter expressed a similar view, the comments have been grouped and addressed together.

B. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Elected Officials

1. Councilmember Sandy Nurse; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023, and written submission dated December 29, 2023.

Organizations and Interested Public

2. Michelle Neugebauer, Cypress Hills Local Development Corporation; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023 and written submission dated December 28, 2023.
3. Bill Wilkins, resident and Local Development Corporation of East New York; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
4. Colvin Grannum, formerly Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
5. Darryl Hollon, Business Outreach Center Network; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.

6. Christine Valentine, East New York Coalition for Community Advancement; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
7. Vicki Bergquist, resident; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
8. Peter Tulloch, resident; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
9. Lettice Layne, East New York Coalition for Community Advancement; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
10. Paul Harrison, East New York Coalition for Community Advancement; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023, and written submission dated December 29, 2023.
11. Shabazz Stuart, resident; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
12. Jack Knight, resident; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
13. Paul Toomer Muhammad, East New York Coalition for Community Advancement; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023, and written submission dated December 29, 2023.
14. Vernon Jay, Equity Platforms; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
15. La'shawn Allen-Muhammad, resident and Central Brooklyn Economic Development Corporation; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
16. Rohan Defreitas, Crescent Consulting; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
17. Susan Timm-Sirignano, resident; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023, and written submission dated December 29, 2023.
18. Ro Johnson, Coalition for Community Advancement; oral statement at the public hearing on December 19, 2023.
19. Carlo Casa, New York Building Congress; written submission dated December 19, 2023.
20. Paul Tulloch, Builders Management Inc.; written submission dated December 19, 2023.
21. Camille Newman, Brooklyn Women's Business Center @ LDCENY; written submission dated December 19, 2023.
22. Miguel Jimenez, resident; written submission dated December 22, 2023.
23. Boris Santos, East New York Community Land Trust; written submission dated December 28, 2023.

C. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK

1. Project Description

Comment 1.1: *The profusion of development scenarios in the DSOW illustrates the flexibility of the proposed C6-4 and M1-6 zoning to allow many different mixtures of residential, commercial, light industrial, and community facility space within the proposed high-density 12 FAR zoning. As such, the EIS must carefully analyze the maximum build-out for each potential scenario, their potential implications on the surrounding community, as well as analyses on what could happen if the project were to become unviable part-way through construction. This additional scenario could involve the initial phases (Sites B and C) of residential development proceeding under the LSGD but the developer then being unable to proceed with a commercial tower on Site D and instead choosing a residential development for that site. It is not clear whether the Alternate Residential Scenario would fully analyze this scenario since the Alternate Residential Scenario assumes development of the full site without the LSGD. (Nurse)*

Response 1.1: **Comment Noted. After issuance of the DSOW and the public scoping meeting, the RWCDS analysis framework was updated and no longer contemplates the Alternate Residential Scenario. The Alternate Residential Scenario has been supplanted by the Alternate Community Facility Scenario. As described in the FSOW, the proposed**

LSGD Special Permit would be applicable to Block 1555, Lot 19 (Projected Development Site 1A), Block 1576, Lots 1 and 34 (Projected Development Site 1B), Block 1577, Lots 17 and 26 (Projected Development Site 1C), Block 1577, Lots 32, 35, 51, and 53 (Projected Development Site 1D), and Block 1577, Lots 1, 7, 56, and 58 (Projected Development Site 1E). Overall, as outlined in the FSOW, the RWCDS analysis framework is conservative in its consideration of the potential land uses that could be built pursuant to the proposed LSGD Special Permit. Pursuant to the proposed LSGD Special Permit (for Projected Development Sites 1A through 1E), floors one through four of the new building on Projected Development Site 1B could be developed with either residential, commercial office, or light industrial uses, the second floor of the new building on Projected Development Site 1C could be developed with either residential or retail uses, and floors one through eight of the new building on Projected Development Site 1D could be developed with either residential or community facility uses. Therefore, the second RWCDS – the Alternate Community Facility Scenario – will be assessed for conservative analysis purposes, where deemed appropriate for any technical area in the EIS where this RWCDS serves as the more conservative RWCDS compared to the Proposed Development. The Applicant intends to develop either the Proposed Development or the Alternate Community Facility Scenario pursuant to the proposed LSGD Special Permit.

Comment 1.2: *The scope of work mentions that the applicant intends on exploring financing opportunities with the Department of Housing Preservation and Development, which would presumably be required in order to secure 100% affordability. With more budget cuts potentially coming down the line, however, it is unclear whether HPD can or will subsidize a project of this size to ensure 100% affordability. But this level of affordability would be necessary in a district like mine. In 2022, 384 and 1,114 people from Brooklyn Community Boards 4 and 5 entered the shelter system, respectively, underscoring the need for deep and permanent affordability in any residential project. I welcome these conversations as this project progresses. (Nurse)*

Response 1.2: **Comment Noted. As described in the FSOW, the Applicant has stated their intention to work with HPD to allow all of the proposed units in either the Proposed Development or the Alternate Community Facility Scenario to be designated as 100 percent affordable units, pursuant to available subsidy.**

Comment 1.3: *The proposal calls for the demapping of Herkimer Street between Williams Place and East New York Avenue. Local residents have expressed strong concerns that this action may negatively affect local traffic patterns, congestion, and existing parking availability. It is my understanding that the project may not be viable without demapping Herkimer and that the Department of Transportation has not raised any issues with the proposed action, although their study is ongoing. However, considering a primary goal of the City's neighboring public realm improvements is to improve pedestrian safety and traffic calming, the EIS must thoroughly analyze this action's impacts on congestion, traffic patterns, and resident safety, particularly within the bounds of Fulton Street, Atlantic Avenue, Van Sinderen, and Eastern Parkway. I also urge the applicant and DCP to explore alternatives to this demapping under the With-Action scenarios. (Nurse)*

Response 1.3: **As indicated in the FSOW, the Applicant no longer proposes a City Map Amendment to eliminate Herkimer Street between Williams Place and Fulton Street.**

Comment 1.4: *As proposed, the project would create over one million gross square feet in commercial space, 750,000 of which would be for commercial offices. The project will attempt to induce demand for this commercial office space citing the development's proximity to mass transit, cheaper local housing stock, and upcoming public realm improvements as enticing amenities. More amenities and capital will likely spur further private investment, causing issues of their own. Underpinning this proposal is the applicant's gamble that the labor market – and the nature of work, generally – will regress in favor of full-time, in-person office work. But office vacancy still remains high following the height of the pandemic: as of August 2023 Manhattan's office vacancy rate was hovering just below 20% while annual Manhattan vacancy rates are higher at 22%. The Downtown Brooklyn Partnership's recent Q1 2023 analysis found that the overall office vacancy in Downtown Brooklyn is also 20 percent. Generally speaking, outer borough office vacancy rates are lower at around 13 percent, but these spaces are still affected by altered relations to in-person office work. City budget analysts offer a dim outlook for commercial office occupancy, with some projecting vacancy rates hovering at or above 20% in the years to come. The Comptroller's recent report forecasts only a slight decrease in commercial office vacancy rates through 2027. Of course, the labor market will undoubtedly change over the years, certainly by the projected completion date of 2036. Currently, we do not have the evidence to justify new high-rise commercial office buildings and, considering the changing relationship to in-person office work, I am skeptical that such a gamble would pay off and I question the rationale behind proposing such high commercial office density. I urge you all to thoroughly examine the proposal's commercial office density and its potential consequences. As noted above, the EIS must fully examine the potential alternative uses for this density if commercial office is not economically viable to develop. (Nurse)*

Response 1.4: **Comment noted. As described in the FSOW, the Applicant's Proposed Development contains approximately 549,526 gross square feet (gsf) of total commercial space, of which approximately 435,766 gsf would be commercial office space and approximately 113,760 gsf would be commercial retail space. The Alternate Community Facility Scenario would contain approximately 598,775 gsf of total commercial space, of which approximately 461,749 gsf would be commercial office space and approximately 137,026 gsf would be commercial retail space. As such, the Applicant's contemplated development proposal and the RWCDS for the EIS contain less commercial space than the densities outlined in the DSOW. Furthermore, given the proposed M1-6 zoning district that would be mapped on the portion of the Proposed Development anticipated for commercial retail and office space, residential use is not permitted, and only a very limited range of community facility use (e.g., hospitals and ambulatory care facilities) is permitted. Thus, residential or community facility space would not be a viable alternate use of the building planned within the proposed M1-6 zoning district and thus commercial retail and office use does represent a reasonable worst-case scenario for the development of this building. However, note that residential and community facility uses are anticipated for the building planned for Projected Development Site 1D within the proposed C6-4 zoning district.**

Comment 1.5: *The zoning changes requested by the outside developer cleverly include the possibility of some of tallest buildings in New York City - heights previously unseen in this part of ungentrified Brooklyn. The current zoning of the study area is appropriate for East New York. East New York is a low-rise community. The rezonings of the past few years have allowed some 10-14 story residential towers along Atlantic Avenue, which have added many affordable housing units to our community. Fortunately, these mid-sized towers have not had a sizable negative impact on the flavor and culture of our community. Indeed, providing affordable housing along the edges of established low-rise residential areas has enabled our community to grow in an appropriate, meaningful way. Broadway Junction is currently zoned for relatively low-rise (approximately six story or fewer) manufacturing and residential buildings. The developer should use their real estate holdings to build important and meaningful structures within current zoning. (Timm-Sirignano)*

Response 1.5: **Comment noted. As described in the FSOW, the Proposed Actions would assist Broadway Junction, one of the largest transit centers in New York City, in fulfilling its potential as "a more accessible and dynamic transit hub and economic center," as described in NYCEDC's and DCP's 2019 report, *Broadway Junction: A Vision for the Future*.[1] In addition to providing open space and affordable housing, the Proposed Actions would also provide economic opportunities benefitting the surrounding neighborhoods. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the new development of a mixed-use development in a transit-rich area that would accommodate a variety of tenants, including an institutional anchor like an academic university, retail designed to cater to the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods, as well as offices. The Proposed Actions would increase density in the Project Area to create employment opportunities and provide community resources in a way that is not currently feasible based on existing site constraints.**

Comment 1.6: *The community has grave concerns about displacement and has seen that the City, the Economic Development Corporation and Totem do not have any plans for preventing the displacement of small business, manufacturers, and low and moderate income renters and minority homeowners in and around the Junction. The proposed Totem Plan is not true community driven development - the community wants transit equity, infrastructure improvements, community-led economic development such as new small businesses and expanded manufacturing (not offices and not just an incubator) and educational uses and opportunities such as a CUNY campus or trade school and residents and small business owners want to remain in the neighborhood to benefit from massive public investments proposed for Broadway Junction. (Neugebauer, Santos)*

Response 1.6: **Chapter 3 of the EIS "Socioeconomic Conditions," will analyze the potential for direct or indirect displacement as a result of the Proposed Actions. Furthermore, as described in the FSOW, the Applicant's proposal includes up to approximately 101,660 gsf of community facility space that is intended to be occupied by educational and/or medical office uses.**

[1] "*Broadway Junction: A Vision for the Future*" (2019). NYCEDC and DCP; https://edc.nyc/sites/default/files/2019-09/broadwayjunction.pdf

Comment 1.7: *The proposed Herkimer-Williams development is the wrong project for East New York at the wrong time! We request that the Environmental Impact Statement closely study the timing of the other public projects/investments being undertaken in Broadway Junction and how the proposed Totem development will interfere with/delay other higher priority projects for the residents of East New York, Brownsville and Bushwick. The ADA compliance project is slated to begin in 2024 and wrap up in 2029. The first and second phases of the proposed Herkimer Williams will overlap with the ADA work and the EIS must address the disruption and the City needs to prioritize transit equity. Moreover, the City through the Economic Development Corporation is planning to construct two public plazas in the Broadway Junction area adjacent to the Herkimer Williams development. The impact of the Herkimer Williams project on constructing the plazas should be assessed. (Muhammad)*

Response 1.7: **As outlined in the FSOW, a detailed construction analysis will be prepared as part of Task 19, "Construction." The detailed analysis will consider the potential effects of construction on transportation, air quality, and noise conditions, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. Furthermore, it should be noted that the buildings that comprise the Proposed Development would be built by a private developer, while the projects cited by the commenter are all public initiatives of the City.**

Comment 1.8: *The need for office space should be substantiated and the impact of unused office space be studied in the Environmental Impact Study. The East New York community needs good, permanent living wage jobs. Indeed, no apartment is affordable without a job. Our community has taken on a tremendous amount of new height and density through the East New York rezoning and now is the time for the City to make good on its promises to create employment for our residents. The 3,900 jobs promised in the East New York Industrial Business Zone did not materialize. It is time to invest in manufacturing, small businesses and education at Broadway Junction – these investments in attracting green construction and food production uses, in growing small Black and Latino owned small businesses and in securing a college or trade school to the Junction will generate the good jobs we seek. The Herkimer Williams project promises to bring 739,386 gsf of office space to Broadway Junction. The EIS should assess whether this is possible/feasible given the high office vacancy rates throughout the City and at 23% in Brooklyn presently. Is there a market for office space in New York City and in East New York? Has the nature of office work fundamentally changed and will hybrid work arrangements be a permanent change in the nature of work. Numerous studies have demonstrated that new office space is not needed in the City and especially not in Brooklyn. The EIS needs to examine what the impacts of potentially vacant office space will be in our community. Even if the office market were strong, we fail to see the benefits to local residents of moving existing jobs with people in those jobs to our community. East New York has a low share of office workers. How will the project ensure new jobs will benefit the local community? DCP need only to look at its own 2023 Community Districts Economic Profiles to see office work is not a big occupation in our neighborhood. What are the real economic opportunities to be created by the Herkimer Williams project and how will residents benefit? The EIS needs to examine the types of jobs that will be created by the project: What are the wages and benefits that retail and office workers are paid? Are these living wages that would qualify workers to even rent an apartment in the proposed housing units?*

What are the qualifications for these jobs and do the current residents qualify for these positions? (Muhammad, Layne)

Response 1.8: **Comment Noted. As described in the FSOW, the Applicant's proposal includes spaces for commercial office and retail tenancy, as well as spaces for community facility and industrial tenancy. In particular, the community facility space is intended to be occupied by educational and/or medical office uses and the overall commercial footprint has decreased from the approximately 739,386 gsf originally proposed in the DSOW. The RWCDS is intended to identify the reasonably most-intensive use of the land comprising the Proposed Development, and uses that result in the development or occupation of less square footage would generally be considered less environmentally impactful. Assessment of office vacancies and unused office space is outside the scope of CEQR. Furthermore, assessing the types of jobs, including wage standards, facilitated by the Proposed Actions is beyond the scope of CEQR.**

2. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

Comment 2.1: *The northern edge of the ENY IBZ borders currently on much needed additional M1-1 properties in the proposed project area. This manufacturing zoning provides synergy with the designated IBZ expanding the available square footage for industrial use. The proposed action would result in further space pressure on the industrial zone. The scope of the Herkimer-William environmental impact study must include dislocation costs of existing Broadway Junction-based businesses and the impact of reducing the manufacturing footprint around the IBZ. The environmental impact study for the Herkimer-Williams project must include the impact of proposed housing uses on the availability of high quality manufacturing spaces in the IBZ. It is entirely inappropriate to place large health care and student facilities next to this vital industrial center. The environmental impact study scope should consider the bi-directional impacts of uses such as schools, hospitals and residences on the industrial zone and vice versa. (Harrison, Santos)*

Response 2.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the EIS will provide an analysis of the Proposed Actions' potential impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy. The analysis will evaluate the Proposed Actions' consistency with land use and zoning conditions in the surrounding study area. The analysis will be conducted in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. Furthermore, Chapter 3 of the EIS, "Socioeconomic Conditions," will analyze the potential for direct or indirect business displacement as a result of the Proposed Actions.**

Comment 2.2: *Given that the ENYIBZ is close to the proximity of the proposed rezoning, and that the project seeks to rezone existing manufacturing land for mixed-uses, we expect that the impact to the ENYIBZ be studied. Specifically, how will the rezoning affect the industrial rental market space? Will attempts to further rezone manufacturing land in the IBZ, given this proposal, ensue? To what degree? The late 90s and the early 21st Century, has defined NYC as a City with eroding manufacturing land. The public policy of this City has been to allow or be complicit in the conversion of manufacturing land for residential or commercial purposes. We must protect industrial zones that have*

been known to create true economic opportunities for Black and Brown communities, especially those without any college/university degrees. (Santos)

Response 2.2: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 2.1. As outlined in the FSOW, the proposed Zoning Map Amendment includes an M1-6 zoning district, permitting light industrial uses, which would be mapped over portions of Block 1577 Lots 1, 7, 56, and 58. Furthermore, Chapter 3 of the EIS, "Socioeconomic Conditions," will analyze the potential for direct or indirect business displacement as a result of the Proposed Actions; however, as outlined in the FSOW, Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the Proposed Actions would not result in adverse effects on specific industries, as the Proposed Actions do not include any Citywide regulatory changes that would adversely affect the economic and operational conditions of certain types of businesses or processes.**

3. Socioeconomic Conditions

Comment 3.1: *The applicant requests a fairly broad rezoning – M1-2 to C6-4 and M1-6 – that would permit the maximum allowable residential FAR under the zoning code, as well as the maximum allowable commercial FAR. It is important to note and plan around the fact that this project will introduce a large amount of private capital to a low-income, primarily Black and brown community that is currently facing insufficient code enforcement, tenant and homeowner harassment, and increasing housing costs. Over 1,700 people currently live in Census Tract 367, which encompasses the entire project area. According to the latest Census data, nearly 50% of these residents are Black and 36.5% are Hispanic. More than 28,000 residents live within half a mile of the project site, 84% of them renters and over 86% of whom are Black and Hispanic. According to the latest American Community Survey data, the median household income for these neighboring census tracts is just $40,375, which is considered very low- and extremely low-income for one and four-person households, respectively. This is also well below the City's median household income of $70,000. The racial and class demographics in the district, therefore, demand deep and permanent affordability of any housing development as well as creative anti-displacement strategies extending beyond the project area. The scope of work mentions that the applicant intends on exploring financing opportunities with the Department of Housing Preservation and Development, which would presumably be required in order to secure 100% affordability. With more budget cuts potentially coming down the line, however, it is unclear whether HPD can or will subsidize a project of this size to ensure 100% affordability. But this level of affordability would be necessary in a district like mine. In 2022, 384 and 1,114 people from Brooklyn Community Boards 4 and 5 entered the shelter system, respectively, underscoring the need for deep and permanent affordability in any residential project. I welcome these conversations as this project progresses. (Nurse)*

Response 3.1: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 1.2.**

Comment 3.2: *The Herkimer-Williams proposal would also create about 250,000 gross square feet of ground floor retail that, we have been told, is essential to cross-subsidize the commercial office portion of the project. The architectural renderings show retail bases that would in all likelihood be exclusive to big box stores and chains. Many*

community members have expressed concern over inviting bigger retail stores to the area, citing Downtown Brooklyn as a prime example where similar land use and economic initiatives have resulted in commercial displacement and homogenization. Their concern is not unwarranted, as retail jobs are traditionally lower-paying than other private sector work and will affect neighboring local retail. The EIS should carefully analyze the potential displacement risks this retail space would create for the local economy, particularly for the Fulton Street commercial corridor in Community Board 5. (Nurse)

Response 3.2: **Comment noted. As described in the FSOW, the Applicant's Proposed Development contains approximately 113,760 gsf of commercial retail space, while the Alternate Community Facility Scenario would contain approximately 137,026 gsf of commercial retail space. As such, the Applicant's contemplated development proposal and the RWCDS for the EIS contain less commercial retail space than the densities outlined in the DSOW. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not facilitate the development of 200,000 sf or more of retail on a single development site, nor 200,000 sf or more of region-serving retail across multiple sites under either RWCDS. Pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, projects that result in the development of less than 200,000 square feet of region-serving retail would not have the potential to result in significant adverse indirect business displacement impacts and an assessment of indirect business displacement due to retail market saturation is not warranted.**

Comment 3.3: *Residential displacement is a primary concern. The draft scope of work concludes that the project would not cause any direct residential displacement, but rather has the potential for indirect residential displacement. Considering the impact this project will have on the local real estate market, the City must have dual strategies to protect existing residents from displacement while ensuring permanent and local housing tenure. In the three years following the East New York rezoning's announcement in 2014 – to use as an example as the largest local land use change in recent memory – Tax Class 1 properties saw their property values increase approximately 15% within a one mile radius of Broadway Junction. According to Streeteasy's data portal, East New York's median asking rent jumped from $1,500 to $1,700 in just one month following former Mayor de Blasio's announcement of the East New York rezoning, contributing to the larger trend of increasing rental prices. Moreover, community Boards 5 and 16 rank relatively high on the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development's (ANHD) "Housing Risk Chart," indicating that homeowners and tenants are facing extreme housing pressure. Despite the local Cease and Desist zone, my office continues seeing deed theft cases and harassment in East New York, both of which are difficult to combat without substantial investment and proactive outreach by the City and State. These issues illustrate how recent local land use actions have and will continue to trigger real estate speculation and indirect residential displacement in the broader community. Considering the local context, I believe a detailed analysis of indirect residential displacement will certainly be warranted and look forward to reviewing. Without stronger housing code enforcement, proactive outreach to community members, or creative solutions to retain community wealth, there is undoubtedly a risk of this rezoning resulting in further displacement and instability. Although this is a private application, considering the scale and potential of this development to transform the Broadway Junction area, I hope DCP and HPD are open*

to hearing and implementing aggressive solutions that will retain Black and brown homeownership in the area, as well as protect tenants from harassment and displacement. (Nurse)

Response 3.3: **Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the EIS, "Socioeconomic Conditions," will provide an assessment of the Proposed Actions potential for indirect residential displacement. As described in the FSOW, Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the socioeconomic character of an area includes its population, housing, and economic activity. Socioeconomic changes may occur when a project or action directly or indirectly changes any of these elements. Potential changes in race and ethnicity are not an analytical area included in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and such potential changes will not be included in the EIS; however, as part of the Proposed Actions' application, a Racial Equity Report (RER) will be prepared. Per *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, an indirect residential displacement analysis focuses on the Proposed Actions' potential effects on housing costs and the ability of residents to maintain occupancy of existing housing. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the demographic analysis in the EIS will focus on income, including average and median household income, income distribution, and income trends over time. The socioeconomic conditions analysis will consider whether the Proposed Actions could substantially alter these demographic and market conditions in a way that could lead to increased rents and potential indirect residential displacement in the study area. If the Proposed Actions could potentially introduce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions that may potentially displace a vulnerable population, a detailed analysis would be warranted and would be provided in the EIS.**

Comment 3.4: *The eastern Brooklyn areas of Brownsville, Ocean Hill, East New York, Cypress Hills have a low AMI and the IBZ has the potential to provide living wage jobs to the area. The proposed actions would weaken, not strengthen the ENY IBZ. The environmental impact study for the Herkimer-Williams proposal should include the jobs impact on the community of weakening this industrial base. (Harrison, Santos)*

Response 3.4: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions," the EIS will provide an analysis of direct business displacement, as well as indirect residential displacement, to determine the Proposed Actions' potential effects on the socioeconomic characteristics of the surrounding study area, the boundaries of which will be defined based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.**

Comment 3.5: *The NYC Department of City Planning should require that the Environmental Impact Study seriously consider the impact that big box retail and likely unaffordable commercial rents will have on local small businesses. The EIS needs to address how the proposed big box retail will impact these small businesses and immigrant entrepreneurship on Fulton Street and those on neighboring commercial strips in Community Boards 5, 4 and 16. The EIS should study the project's impact on the commercial rents in the neighborhood and the siphoning off of retail shoppers from community commercial strips. Further, in all of CB 5 about 13% of storefronts are vacant. How will the proposed development impact these commercial vacancy rates? We have seen throughout East New York in new affordable housing developments that storefronts remain vacant. Private developers and the NYC Department of*

Housing Preservation and Development are not appropriately underwriting these rents - the rents are too high and hence, commercial space remains vacant. The EIS should account for local market commercial conditions and study what the commercial rents should be to prevent displacement and provide opportunities to neighborhood entrepreneurs. CD 5 is classified as having the highest risks of displacement on the City's own Equitable Development Reporting tool. How will the building of office space and thereby the introduction of many white-collar jobs and big box retail influence the rental market and accelerate displacement pressures in East New York. East New York has a low share of office workers. How will the project ensure new jobs will benefit the local community? How do the proposed economic opportunities match with the socio-economic profile and education of the neighborhood? Residential displacement will surely occur if the EIS does not look at true market conditions. East New York is a small homes community and renters living in un-protected, non-rent regulated small homes are incredibly vulnerable. The EIS should look at the race and income of Low-to-Moderate Income renters and minority homeowners, eviction trends, rates of doubling and tripling up in local small homes, and the number of families in CB 4, 5 and 16 already send to the homeless system. The EIS should look at whether the proposed affordable housing will be truly affordable for current residents and whether the units be permanently affordable? If not, how will the socioeconomic impacts be studied to reflect their eventual transition to market rates? The EIS should document and examine vacant land, housing, manufacturing, community facility and commercial sales and rental prices in and around Broadway Junction two years prior to the announcement of public investments and current rental and sales prices. We anticipate that prices have already increased significantly and will only continue to escalate if displacement prevention strategies are implemented. The number of families receiving rental subsidies and their inability to find apartments even with those subsidies should be included. How will the impacts on nearby Low-to-Moderate Income and minority homeowners be studied? The EIS needs to examine current foreclosure rates and the rates at which small Low-to-Moderate Income and minority homeowners are leaving the community because of an inability to maintain and to afford their homes due escalating property taxes, homeowners' harassment, house flipping and inability to afford to retrofit, stop flooding and repair their homes. (Neugebauer, Layne, Santos)

Response 3.5: **Comment noted. Refer to Responses 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.**

Comment 3.6: *The environmental review needs to highlight the impact the proposal will have on land values and property taxes. Likewise, it must determine how residential rents will be affected and any prospective displacement due to rental increases. Specifically, how many tenants will be affected (i.e., the study has to outline the trickling affects based on distance from the project location) and to what extent (i.e., average rent increase)? The same must be provided for small homeowners. How many homeowners will be affected and to what extent (i.e. property taxes/land value increased)? It is worth noting that rezonings such as this one make it more difficult for organizations like ours [East New York Community Land Trust] to produce or build more social housing in our community. The 2016 East New York rezoning (albeit a neighborhood rezoning unlike the current spot zoning) made it more difficult to acquire land for the purposes of residential community development. Increases of land value make affordable housing projects less financially feasible in those parcels. It is therefore necessary for the City*

to study the effects that this project will have on land values since a public service such as affordable housing construction can be made more difficult for the general non-profit affordable housing industry and therefore general public. To what degree exactly (in average US dollars) will the value of land increase in the surrounding area (for all types of properties, industrial, residential and commercial)? (Santos, Neugebauer, Layne)

Response 3.6: Comment noted. Refer to Response 3.3.

4. Community Facilities and Services

No comments.

5. Open Space

Comment 5.1: The applicant has expressed interest in applying for City subsidy to secure 100% residential affordability. The applicant will likely qualify for State and Federal subsidies due to the project's proximity to Broadway Junction and potentially seek tax exemptions and public capital dollars to lock in affordability. Considering this potential magnitude of public subsidy, it is worth examining what the public will get in return. In each scenario – the applicant's proposal, the RWCDS, and the Alternate Residential Scenario – the project would create 24,536 gross square feet of privately-owned, publicly available open space, or just above half an acre. The project would also create tens of thousands of square feet of open space accessible only to the project's residents and office workers. I welcome open space at and around Broadway Junction that can complement the newly-renovated Callahan-Kelly Playground and the forthcoming public plazas, but I question whether or not half an acre of privately-owned, publicly available open space is an equitable or reasonable exchange for the millions of public dollars this project may necessitate. I hope that DCP critically analyzes this exchange and that, at the very least, the City helps coordinate between this and the upcoming public realm projects to create safe, beautiful, complementary open spaces. (Nurse)

Response 5.1: Comment noted. As described in the FSOW, the Applicant's proposal includes 20,080 sf of publicly accessible area (PAA) space, of which the largest component would measure approximately 4,904 sf on Projected Development Site 1A (Block 1555, Lot 19). As described in the FSOW, pursuant to the proposed combination acquisition and site selection action, the Applicant would grant the City of New York (with DCAS anticipated to hold jurisdiction) an easement to access and construct the PAA space on Block 1555, Lot 19 using capital funds with the intent that the PAA space be designed such that it functions harmoniously with the adjacent future public plaza to the north, on a portion of Block 1555, Lot 1. Furthermore, as described in the FSOW, the Applicant has stated their intention to work with HPD to allow all of the proposed units in either the Proposed Development or the Alternate Community Facility Scenario to be designated as 100 percent affordable units, pursuant to available subsidy.

6. Shadows

Comment 6.1: *I am worried about the shadows that would be imposed on the renovation of the two new public plazas that we have, as well as the Callahan-Kelly Playground, and also, as well as you know, if the children in the yard play in that area sunlight is very important. (Valentine)*

Response 6.1: **Comment noted. The EIS will include a detailed analysis of the Proposed Actions' effects on shadows in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance, as detailed in the FSOW. Should significant adverse impacts be identified, mitigation measures will be evaluated in consultation by the lead agency in consultation with expert agencies.**

Comment 6.2: *East New York has the highest number of community gardens of any community in New York City, with 54. The EIS should consider the project's various building heights and how the tall buildings would result in shadows impacts on sunlight reaching community gardens. (Timm-Sirignano)*

Response 6.2: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 6.1.**

Comment 6.3: *I am concerned about the height of the project and the potential for the project to impact sunlight conditions around Broadway Junction, which the speaker already feels is an area of the neighborhood with poor sunlight conditions. (Johnson)*

Response 6.3: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 6.1.**

Comment 6.4: *Given the current height of the proposed structures (over 300 or 400 feet, consisting of more than 20 stories) how much sun will be deprived for those commuting or living eastward of the project? Specifically, for how much time through the morning given eastward sunrise? The environmental study must specify this in quantifiable time measurements, especially given the newly renovated Callahan-Kelly Playground, that the public has come to love and that lies just eastward of the proposed site. How much sunlight will the public be deprived of quantifiably if the structure were of different height (say 12 to 15 stories which is what the 2016 ENY rezoning approved of maximally on Atlantic Ave)? (Santos)*

Response 6.4: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 6.1.**

7. Historic and Cultural Resources

No comments.

8. Urban Design and Visual Resources

Comment 8.1: *The NYC Department of City Planning should require that the Environmental Impact Study seriously consider the impact of the height of the buildings that would be allowed if the real estate developer is granted their current zoning change request. The EIS should consider the overall visual impacts the project's tall buildings would have on the predominantly low- and mid-rise community of East New York. The streetscape of East New York consists of stoops, front gardens and busy sidewalks. Our uniqueness stems from the propinquity we all experience. We are friends,*

neighbors, acquaintances, and people we all know by sight. Tall towers eliminate and decimate community cohesiveness. Please include ample study of the ample negative effects of tall buildings on our vibrant, cohesive, stable community. (Timm-Sirignano)

Response 8.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 8, "Urban Design and Visual Resources" the EIS will assess whether the Proposed Actions would negatively affect a pedestrian's experience of the study area, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.**

9. Hazardous Materials

No comments.

10. Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Comment 10.1: *The East York IBZ is directly adjacent to the proposed project area, and it shares transportation, energy, sewer and water infrastructure. And the IBZ is a terribly important resource for the creation, maintenance and growth of living wage jobs for Eastern Brooklyn. The EIS should study the potential impacts to the IBZ, including energy use, as the IBZ contains the sole electrical substation in the area. Con Edison is already close to limitations. The EIS should also assess the effects of the project on businesses and jobs in the area. (Harrison)*

Response 10.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 10, "Water and Sewer Infrastructure," the EIS will provide an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential effects on wastewater and stormwater conveyance systems, including the 26th Ward Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF).**

11. Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

No comments.

12. Energy

Comment 12.1: *The East York IBZ is directly adjacent to the proposed project area, and it shares transportation, energy, sewer and water infrastructure. And the IBZ is a terribly important resource for the creation, maintenance and growth of living wage jobs for Eastern Brooklyn. The IBZ includes the sole electrical sub-station providing power to East New York including the proposed project zoning modification area. Businesses operating in the industrial zone include manufacturing facilities requiring significant power. The environmental impact study for the Herkimer-Williams proposal must include a detailed review of the local electrical network, growth projections for the East New York sub-station grid in specificity, as well as the demand from alternative resulting uses in the Herkimer-Williams development. The EIS should also assess the effects of the project on businesses and jobs in the area. (Harrison)*

Response 12.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 12, "Energy," the EIS will provide an assessment of the Proposed Actions' potential effects on energy, including projections of the RWCDS energy consumption.**

13. Transportation

Comment 13.1: *I believe the public needs more detail on the project's proposed subterranean accessory parking spaces. Upon completion, the Herkimer-Williams project would sit adjacent to a newly-renovated, ADA-accessible Broadway Junction station. The applicant has previously stated that some if not all of the 250 accessory parking units could be reserved for MTA vehicles which currently overrun local streets to the detriment of pedestrian and driver safety. It is also unclear how much, if any parking will be available for residents. However, considering the project's proximity to Broadway Junction, I do not believe that added residential parking is necessary for this project. If these accessory parking spaces are potentially to be reserved for MTA or other workers in order to alleviate some of the existing congestion and parking issues residents face, this is an issue I hope the EIS will spell out in more detail. (Nurse)*

Response 13.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, Task 13, "Transportation," the EIS will provide a detailed analysis of Transportation conditions, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria. Nonetheless, all proposed parking within the Proposed Development is intended to serve project tenants and visitors and the Proposed Development is not currently anticipated to provide parking for MTA vehicles.**

Comment 13.2: *The project will negatively impact traffic and parking conditions for the ENY IBZ, affecting the competitive advantage of industrial firms in the ENY IBZ. The existing traffic network is presently congested/constrained, and the project's generated traffic would worsen such conditions. The road infrastructure supporting the zone is already constrained with Atlantic Avenue providing principal access. The project's parking demand should be taken into account, due to the surrounding area's already constrained network of street parking. The environmental impact study for the Herkimer-Wiliams proposal must include the broader impacts on the industrial zone and major truck routes feeding it. (Harrison)*

Response 13.2: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 13.1.**

Comment 13.3: *The MTA has a Zero-Emission Bus Transition Plan which community advocates are excited about for its potential to reduce noxious bus emissions coming from our large East New York Bus Depot. The ENY Bus Depot is directly adjacent to the Herkimer Williams sites and will significantly interfere with the electrification project. The City will be deploying 530 additional battery-electric buses in 2024-2026 and the ENY Bus Depot is targeted to be 75% electric in the first 2 stages of transition and completed in stage 4 2039. The ENY Bus Depot is currently (2023-2024) undergoing a comprehensive renovation independent of the zero-emission bus transition. The MTA has testified that the renovation and power conversion of the ENY Bus depot will require the rerouting of bus traffic for years and that interim parking of out-of-service buses in the immediate neighborhood will be required. DCP needs to ensure that the EIS investigates the rerouting of buses, the conflicts between the electrification project and the proposed Herkimer Williams development. Policy makers, City and elected*

representatives must prioritize the health of all East New Yorkers over private development. Another major transit development impacting the Broadway Junction area is the Interborough Express (IBX). The MTA estimates weekday ridership of up to 115,000. It will connect 20 neighborhoods to 17 subway lines and the LIRR with the two-year environmental review expected to start early 2024, completing in 2026. The IBX project proposes a major express stop at East New York. This will have a major impact on traffic and usage patterns and pedestrian needs in the Herkimer-William project area. The EIS needs to address potential delays/impacts for the Herkimer Williams project with the IBX. (Muhammad)

Response 13.3: **Comment noted, refer to Responses 1.3 and 13.1. The New York City Department of Transportation does not currently have plans to alter street roadbeds nor street direction in the vicinity of the East New York Depot and the Herkimer-Williams proposal. Furthermore, as outlined in the FSOW, the Applicant no longer proposes a City Map Amendment to eliminate Herkimer Street between Williams Place and Fulton Street. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not directly affect the operation of MTA bus routes. As of 2025, planning efforts remain underway for the IBX. Although an EIS for the IBX has not been completed, the MTA has selected a build year of 2045 to project IBX ridership figures. As described in the FSOW, the Herkimer-Williams proposal's build year is 2036.**

14. Air Quality

No comments.

15. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

No comments.

16. Noise

Comment 16.1: *Will the EIS study the impact of noise, including 24/7 subway and train noise that future residents and workers of the project would experience? (Valentine)*

Response 16.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, a detailed noise analysis will be prepared as part of Task 16, "Noise." The analysis methodology, which is outlined in the FSOW, will be conducted in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. If the noise analysis discloses the potential for significant adverse noise impacts, a range of mitigation measures will be proposed and considered in the EIS. If a potential significant adverse noise impact is unmitigated, a detailed public health analysis may be warranted.**

17. Public Health

No comments.

18. Neighborhood Character

No comments.

19. Construction

Comment 19.2: *According to the DSOW, upon ULURP certification the Herkimer-Williams project would have four development stages beginning in 2026 and last about ten years. The MTA's adjacent ADA accessibility and streetscape work is expected to begin next year and take around five years to complete. Additionally, the City's public realm improvements at Broadway Junction, while admittedly in its nascent stage, will take many years to complete when in motion. All of these projects' construction timelines will overlap for years and occur within 1000 feet of each other. These overlapping construction timelines pose potentially major disruptions for local residents and commuters. As such, the EIS must incorporate these public works' timelines to the extent possible when analyzing the potential environmental effects of this application. (Nurse)*

Response 19.1: **Comment noted. As outlined in the FSOW, a detailed construction analysis will be prepared as part of Task 19, "Construction." The detailed analysis will consider the potential effects of construction on transportation, air quality, and noise conditions, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.**

Comment 19.2: *East New York and Brownsville have high levels of residents with asthma, as well as other respiratory diseases and diabetes. So I'd like to know if you did a study about the health consequences from the environment dealing with the massive construction going on that would affect the children as well as adults that have asthma. (Valentine)*

Response 19.2: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 19.1.**

20. Mitigation

No comments.

21. Alternatives

No comments.

D. Miscellaneous

Comment D.1: *A project of this magnitude will undoubtedly impact the surrounding community in many ways, and I look forward to seeing the full results of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Racial Equity Report. Broadway Junction has been a focus of study for potential economic and housing development by community groups, City agencies, public officials, and non-governmental organizations for many years. All of these studies start with the presupposition that Broadway Junction is currently not meeting the needs of local residents and that it has the potential to be something more. While this application will not and does not seek to solve the myriad issues identified by these studies, it has the potential to permanently alter the built environment and daily life*

of residents, local businesses, and commuters alike. I look forward to working with the applicant, community residents, DCP, HPD, and other City agencies to build a consensus that will best meet the needs of local residents and the City as a whole. (Nurse)

Response D.1: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.2: *The City and applicant must explore legally binding mechanisms beyond the LSGD's Restrictive Declaration (which will only cover bulk, open space, and certain aspects of layout) to guarantee community benefits, uses, and the project layout. The applicant is publicly proposing a development including 100% affordable housing, community facility space, and light industrial space, none of which are actually required by the proposed zoning districts or LSGD. (Nurse)*

Response D.2: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 1.2.**

Comment D.3: *While it is not directly included within the EIS, this project's Racial Equity Report will provide useful data on the socioeconomic impacts on this project. However, this Report will use data from the City's Equitable Development Data Explorer which incorrectly locates the project area in Community Board 16 as opposed to Community Board 5 due to the tool approximating data from Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs). Since the project area sits at the intersection of Community Boards 4, 5, and 16, it is important to not only correct this but to also utilize data from these Community Boards in order to fully grasp the project's potential impacts on the local community. Considering the project area's location, I urge the Department to consider these community districts' data as well when advising the applicant on appropriate methodology for the Racial Equity Report. The racial and class demographics in the district, therefore, demand deep and permanent affordability of any housing development as well as creative anti-displacement strategies extending beyond the project area. (Nurse)*

Response D.3: **Comment noted. The RER completed for the Proposed Actions will include key neighborhood and demographic conditions for both CDs 5 and 16.**

Comment D.4: *I believe Herkimer Williams is a field of dreams and a turning point fac[ing] New York. For the past 2 years I have seen Totem's intelligent bottom-up, approach and development that incorporates the ideas of many and brings into the envelope a keen understanding of the needs of the community. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.4: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.5: *Broadway Junction is an underperforming asset and has the potential to be transformed into a critical engine for creating thousands of jobs and hundreds of housing units, strengthening local infrastructure. Totem is advancing an inclusive planning process which has included extensive community outreach for the past two years, initiating conversations with local residents, businesses, and nonprofits to gather their input. Totem has also co-sponsored a Town Hall meeting in partnership*

with a council member nurse who was just here and has been in consistent dialogue with the Community Board. These efforts are intended to ensure community driven development at Broadway Junction, and thus far Totem has proven itself as a willing and capable partner to deliver on the community's vision. For this site the residents and businesses of the community surrounding Broadway Junction deserve the economic, social, and psychological benefits that will be generated by the comprehensive development of Broadway Junction as proposed by Totem based on the input of the community. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)

Response D.5: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.6: *East New York has a rich tradition of industrial and manufacturing businesses which have historically provided quality jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities for the local community, on average, industrial jobs pay almost twice as much as jobs in the service and retail sectors, and are available to people who lack access to higher education. The project is located directly adjacent to the East New York Industrial business Zone, which is why we welcome the opportunity to support the industrial incubator as part of this project. At this moment there is a lack of modern, flexible, and affordable space for small industrial businesses and industrial entrepreneurs in the East New York area by providing flexible space technical assistance and access to relevant programming and resources in one location we believe that this hub can be a conduit for growing new local businesses in the East New York area. We look forward to the continued engagement and opportunity to advocate for the advancement of local East New York industrial businesses, entrepreneurs, and the quality of jobs they create. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.6: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.7: *As a resident, I deeply understand, and I echo the need for new affordable housing and economic opportunities for the community. No development does not change the growing pressure on housing in the area. In fact, no development would only increase it because the upcoming infrastructure investment in Broadway Junction and the actual investments are happening in community. It is gonna be amenities that people will be looking for. So I've already personally seen renters being pushed into the area from Bed-Stuy and Bushwick because of the growth and increased rents over there. So I totally understand the worry of displacement, and I think that's a really important thing that we must consider. If we do nothing and we don't invest in housing, it is gonna happen because the fact that we have these broader economic situations happening that are forcing people to come into the community looking for cheaper rent. And it just pushes out people here. The report should be forward looking. (Bergquist, Peter Tulloch)*

Response D.7: **Comment noted. Refer to Response 3.3. Indirect displacement analysis for residents will be assessed in the EIS, as outlined in Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions."**

Comment D.8: *I strongly believe residents here deserve the opportunities for economic advancement that have passed us by for generations. This all starts with bringing more affordable*

housing to the area. Affordable housing is the foundation of a healthy community, specifically creating more housing at Broadway Junction is crucial to improve the quality of life and economic well-being for all East New Yorkers. The Herkimer Williams project responds directly to these concerns. I see the project as a long term investment in East New York's economic and housing landscape, and by laying the groundwork for sustainable growth, the project will leave a lasting positive impact on the community that truly cannot be understated. I urge all community members to support Totem's vision and be involved so that we can have a direct impact on the project's results. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)

Response D.8: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.9: *The project heralds a potential transformative shift that extends well beyond Broadway Junction. We are excited to know that the project will yield additional commercial spaces as we work diligently to find brick and mortar homes for our business incubator participants. This project stands as a linchpin for propelling equitable growth in Brooklyn, and ensures the community directly benefits from economic development on par with the prosperity enjoyed by wealthier neighborhoods in the borough. In essence the project marks a pivotal stride towards creating a community where wealth is shared equitably, laying the groundwork for a more inclusive and prosperous Brooklyn for all. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.9: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.10: *The project would promote a great economic opportunity for a community like East New York, one where minorities, women, and local residents, as well as the local businesses, can have an opportunity to benefit greatly from development. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.10: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.11: *The rezoning of an M zoning district to permit housing raises concerns about displacement, the lack of good jobs and investment in industrial businesses and jobs in the surrounding area, as well as the lack of investment in job training, workforce development, and economic development. Although the new housing would be affordable, if you look at AMI, and then you look at how AMI is skewed, it is not necessarily going to be affordable in the way that it needs to be to prevent displacement from the community. Also, the prospect of lower-paying retail jobs that could be introduced by the project's commercial space concerns me, as most retail jobs do not pay living wages and retail jobs do not produce high income wage earners, generally. (Johnson)*

Response D.11: **Comment noted. Refer to Responses 2.2, 3.3, and 3.4. Direct business displacement, as well as an indirect displacement analysis for residents will be assessed in the EIS, as outlined in Task 3, "Socioeconomic Conditions." Note also that the Proposed**

Actions are currently anticipated to facilitate up to approximately 111,933 gsf of light industrial uses as well as retail and residential uses.

Comment D.12: *I am writing to express support for Totem's Herkimer-Williams rezoning proposal, a project that will bring much-needed transit-oriented development and thousands of critical jobs to one of the most under-resourced neighborhoods in New York City. This proposal aligns perfectly with concepts and best practices highlighted in the report on Transit-Oriented Development that the [New York] Building Congress published in March [2023]. Herkimer-Williams reflects a community-driven vision to address the longstanding need for affordable housing and economic development in East New York. The first phase of the project will bring online nearly 600 units of affordable housing, creating new employment opportunities for New Yorkers and construction firms. The project will also set aside approximately 15,000 square feet to create community space currently envisioned as an industrial incubator to generate jobs and training opportunities for Brooklynites. In addition to a significant number of much-needed affordable housing for an increasingly rent burdened community, the project would also bring new commercial spaces that can deliver a dynamic and thriving built environment that East New York deserves. New commercial space will attract businesses, foster economic growth, and employment opportunities for local residents. Herkimer-Williams addresses crucial local infrastructure needs, and we believe the project will serve as a catalyst for a more prosperous, inclusive and sustainable future for East New Yorkers and New York City. We strongly endorse Totem's vision and encourage your support. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.12: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.13: *I am writing to offer my support for the Herkimer-Williams project. I welcome projects like this that provide jobs for construction workers and industry. It contributes to the development of the neighborhood by providing housing. It encourages other small businesses such as restaurants, supermarkets, shops and other service industry businesses to come to the neighborhood. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)*

Response D.13: **Comment noted.**

Comment D.14: *East New York in particular has been overlooked and underinvested in for decades. As we strive to support local entrepreneurs in the area, it is crucial to build the infrastructure and resources necessary to encourage economic activity. The Herkimer-Williams plan recognizes the potential of the Broadway Junction area to serve as a vibrant hub for local and small businesses. The project will deliver essential retail and commercial space where there currently is none. Aspiring entrepreneurs in East New York should not have to look elsewhere to open up shop – they should have the ability to do so in the community they call home. Small businesses are critical to the prosperity of our community. When we nurture and uplift local businesses, economic growth will follow across the board. In the name of strengthening East New York's economy and business leaders, I strongly encourage you to support the Herkimer-*

Williams plan. (Allen-Muhammad, Casa, Defreitas, Grannum, Hollon, Jay, Jimenez, Knight, Newman, Paul Tulloch, Peter Tulloch, Stuart, Wilkins)

Response D.14: Comment noted.

Comment D.15: I am a resident of East New York and, as the co-owner of my family's candle-making business Brooklyn Candle LLC, a small business owner. I appreciate the opportunity to express my support for the Herkimer-Williams proposal. As a resident, one of my primary concerns is the lack of community amenities in the neighborhood. Most residents I know need to leave the neighborhood to do their shopping as the options to choose from in the area are few and far between. My neighbors and I agree that we would love to see more restaurants, coffee shops, bars, gyms, and good balanced supermarkets like Trader Joe's or Whole Foods at Broadway Junction. The Herkimer-Williams proposal would bring in over 200,000 square feet of retail space and open up the possibility for the types of amenities that we as a community are so desperately looking for. Additionally, our neighborhood is in need of additional non-retail amenities that would make the quality of life of residents much better. One I would love to see is a college campus. The closest university, Medgar Evers, is nearly four miles away from Broadway Junction. I am very excited by the possibility of Herkimer-Williams potentially serving as a satellite campus for one of New York's higher education institutions. Other amenities like urgent care facilities are also sorely needed, while entertainment options (like an indoor pool, comedy club, or a movie theater) and would be incredibly valuable additions that Herkimer-Williams could bring to our community. On the subject of housing, I am very supportive of Herkimer Williams' proposal to construct approximately 600 permanent affordable housing units in the area. I do hope that the project can additionally bring a mixture of other types of housing in conjunction with the low income housing they are building, such as market rate housing, real middle income housing, or moderate income housing. Thank you for your consideration, and I urge you to support Herkimer-Williams' vision for Broadway Junction. (Jimenez)

Response D.15: Comment noted.

Comment D.16: The project, as it stands, has the potential to unleash a wave of gentrification and displacement the likes that my generation and many generations before mine have not seen in the East Brooklyn area. I write knowing that the opportunities for future generations, like that of my future children, to become socioeconomically mobile, can be boosted or outright eliminated depending on the eventual outcome of this project. (Santos)

Response D.16: Comment noted.

Comment D.17: Given that the current proposal is for mixed uses, the environmental study must specify how the population in the area will be affected. To what extent will ridership increase in the Broadway Junctions station? How many people will be working/living at the site following all its phase completions? And to what extent will new school seat enrollments and additional or sustained sanitation and park maintenance services be needed? (Santos)

Response D.17: **Comment noted. The incremental residential and worker populations generated by the Proposed Actions will be assessed in the EIS, where applicable pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. Subway ridership at the Broadway Junction Subway Station complex will be assessed in the EIS, as outlined in Task 13, "Transportation." The Proposed Actions potential effects on public schools will be assessed in the EIS, as outlined in Task 4, "Community Facilities and Services."**