DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

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

ERRATA

To: Recipients of the Saint Vincents Campus Redevelopment Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

From: Robert Dobruskin, AICP RD

Date: August 31, 2011

Re: Errata – Replacement Pages for the Saint Vincents Campus Redevelopment Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
CEQR No. 10DCP003M
ULURP Nos. 120029ZSM, 120030ZSM, 120031ZSM, N120032ZRM, and 120033ZMM

Please find attached selected replacement pages for Chapter 4, "Community Facilities and Services" and "Executive Summary" of the Saint Vincents Campus Redevelopment Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The replacement pages correct a minor error in the public schools analysis concerning the assignment of school seats for the future Foundling Hospital School.

The public schools analysis incorrectly assigned the schools seats for the future Foundling Hospital School as 363 elementary seats and 155 intermediate seats. The correct seats assignment is 518 elementary seats and 0 intermediate seats. This error has been corrected in the attached replacement pages. Correction of this error does not alter any of the conclusions of the Saint Vincents Campus Redevelopment DEIS.

Please replace pages 4-2, 4-8, 4-9, and 4-10 of Chapter 4, "Community Facilities and Services" and page S-15 of the "Executive Summary" with the corrected pages attached. This error has also been corrected in the on-line version of the DEIS posted on the DCP website at http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/env_review/eis.shtml. We apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused.

Attachments

cc: 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

Robert Dobruskin, AICP. *Director*
Celeste Evans, *Deputy Director*
22 Reade Street, New York, N.Y. 10007-1216 Room 4E (212) 720-3420
FAX (212) 720-3495
rdobrus@planning.nyc.gov

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

Elementary schools within the ½-mile study area would operate with ~~a utilization rate of less than 105 percent~~ surplus capacity 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~~ 512 seats in the future with the proposed projects. However, the proposed projects would increase the elementary school utilization rate by only ~~1.5~~ 1.4 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.

B. PRELIMINARY SCREENING

This analysis of community facilities has been conducted in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines and the latest data and guidance from agencies such as the Department of Education (DOE) and the Department of City Planning (DCP).

The purpose of the preliminary screening is to determine whether a community facilities assessment is required. As recommended by the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a community facilities assessment is warranted if a project has the potential to result in either direct or indirect effects on community facilities. If a project would physically alter a community facility, whether by displacement of the facility or other physical change, this "direct" effect triggers the need to assess the service delivery of the facility and the potential effect that the physical change may have on that service delivery. New population added to an area as a result of a project would use existing services, which may result in potential "indirect" effects on service delivery. Depending on the size, income characteristics, and age distribution of the new population, there may be effects on public schools, libraries, or child care centers.

DIRECT EFFECTS

The Center for Comprehensive Care would provide health care facilities in the O'Toole Building instead of the doctors' offices that would exist in the future without the proposed projects.

The proposed projects would not physically alter or directly displace any other community facility, and therefore the assessment of direct effects in this chapter is limited to the health care uses in the O'Toole Building.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

The *CEQR Technical Manual* provides thresholds that provide guidance in making an initial determination of whether a detailed analysis is necessary to determine potential impacts. **Table 4-1** lists those *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds for each community facility analysis. If a proposal exceeds the threshold for a specific facility, a more detailed analysis is warranted. A preliminary screening analysis was conducted to determine if the proposed projects would exceed established *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds warranting further analysis. Based on that screening, a detailed analysis is provided for public elementary and intermediate schools.

Table 4-3
Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students Introduced in the Study Area: 2015 Future Without the Proposed Projects

Study Area	New Housing Units	Students	
		Elementary	Intermediate
½-Mile, 1-Mile, and Sub-District 2 Study Areas	124	15	5
Sub-District 2 Study Area	NA*	711	234

Notes: * SCA provided an estimate of students in the future without the proposed projects in CSD 2 Sub-District 2 based on the Five Year (2009-2013) Number of Housing Units in "Projected New Housing Starts as Used in 2009-2018 Enrollment Projection: 2010-2014 Capital Plan" in CSD 2.
Source: SCA; DCP; AKRF, Inc.

PROJECTED SCHOOL CAPACITY

According to the DOE *Proposed 2010-2014 Five-Year Capital Plan—Proposed April 2011 Amendment*, there is no new school capacity under construction within the study areas. However, the current SCA capital plan includes the Foundling Hospital School, a new public elementary school that will include approximately 518 seats for students in pre-kindergarten through the fifth grade. The school is planned for the lower six floors of an existing building at the southeast corner of Sixth Avenue and West 17th Street—the current site of the New York Foundling Hospital. The New York Foundling Hospital organization will continue to occupy the office space on the upper floors of the building. According to SCA, in the course of developing plans for the project area, the Rudin Family received extensive feedback from the Greenwich Village community concerning school overcrowding.[1] The Rudin family, with SCA, developed and proposed the concept of transforming the bottom six floors of the building into a new school while allowing New York Foundling to continue to headquarter its offices in the same building. Although this school is not currently under construction, it is included quantitatively in the analysis based on consultation with DCP and SCA. It is scheduled for completion in 2014.

In addition, other changes to capacity at elementary and intermediate schools will occur because of the relocation of school organizations and the opening of new school organizations in the 2010-2011 school year which are not reflected in the 2009-2010 data presented above.

Elementary school capacity in the ½-mile study area and Sub-District 2 will increase by 779 seats as a result of the creation of new seats at P.S. 3 (261 seats) and the opening of the Foundling School (P.S. 340, 518 seats) in 2014. The new seats at P.S. 3 would be created because I.S. 896, a school that was previously located in the same building as P.S. 3, recently relocated to the Broadway Educational Complex at 26 Broadway in Manhattan. Additional capacity for P.S. 3 will be created in the space previously occupied by I.S. 896.

Intermediate school capacity in the 1-mile study area will increase by a total of 34 seats as a result of the relocation of M.S. 260 to a new facility at Union Square (34 seats) ~~and the opening of the Foundling School (155 seats). The Foundling School will also increase the intermediate school capacity in Sub-District 2 by 155 seats.~~ M.S. 260 is not located within the sub-district and therefore the increase in capacity is not included in the sub-district analysis.

[1] SCA Press Release, "Mayor, Chancellor Announce New Elementary School to be Built in Greenwich Village," May 8, 2008.

ANALYSIS

Elementary Schools

As shown in **Table 4-4**, elementary schools will operate with surplus capacity within the ½-mile study area, with an enrollment of 2,314 students compared to a capacity of ~~2,348~~ 2,503 seats (~~99~~ 92 percent utilization). Within Sub-District 2, elementary schools will be over capacity, with an enrollment of 4,297 students and a capacity of ~~3,684~~ 3,839 seats, resulting in a deficit of ~~613~~ 458 seats (~~117~~ 112 percent utilization).

Table 4-4
Estimated Public Elementary and Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2015 Future Without the Proposed Projects

Study Area	Projected Enrollment in 2015	No Build Students	Total No Build Enrollment	Capacity[2]	Available Seats	Utilization (%)
Elementary Schools						
½-Mile Study Area	2,299[1]	15	2,314	2,503	189	92
Sub-District 2	3,586[3]	711	4,297	3,839	-458	112
Intermediate Schools						
1-Mile Study Area	2,823[1]	5	2,828	3,004	176	94
Sub-District 2	530[3]	234	764	957	193	80

Notes:
1. To estimate enrollment for the ½-mile and 1-mile study areas in 2015, the total number of students enrolled in those schools (DOE Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization Report) in 2009-2010 was divided by the total number of students enrolled in CSD 2 schools in 2009-2010. The resulting percentages were applied to the CSD 2 elementary and middle school projected enrollments in 2015.
2. The school capacity includes the changes described above under "Projected School Capacity."
3. Elementary and intermediate school enrollment in Sub-District 2 in 2015 is estimated at 18.7 percent and 7.5 percent of CSD 2 enrollment, respectively, based on SCA data. These percentages were applied to the CSD 2 elementary and intermediate school projected enrollments in 2018 and were held constant to estimate total enrollment for the Sub-District schools in 2015 per DCP guidance.

Sources: DOE *Enrollment Projections 2009-2018 by the Grier Partnership*; DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2009-2010*, DOE *2010-2014 Proposed Five-Year Capital Plan*, April 2011.

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

As shown in **Table 4-4**, total intermediate school enrollment is expected to be 2,828 students within the 1-mile study area and 764 students within Sub-District 2. The 1-mile study area will have a surplus of ~~331~~ 176 seats (~~90~~ 94 percent utilization), while Sub-District 2 will operate with ~~348~~ 193 available seats (~~69~~ 80 percent utilization).

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECTS

For analysis purposes, it is conservatively assumed that the proposed projects could introduce up to 450 residential units to the study areas. Based on the CEQR student generation rates, the proposed projects would generate approximately 54 elementary and 18 intermediate school students in the study areas by 2015 (see **Table 4-5**).

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

An additional 54 elementary students would increase total enrollment to 2,368 students (~~101~~ 95 percent utilization) and schools would ~~result in a deficit~~ operate with a surplus of ~~20~~ 135 seats in the ½-mile study area (see **Table 4-6**). Elementary schools within Sub-District 2 would operate over capacity, with

an enrollment of 4,351 students and a capacity of ~~3,684~~ 3,839 seats (~~118~~ 95 percent utilization), resulting in a deficit of ~~667~~ 512 seats.

Table 4-5
Estimated Number of Students Introduced in the Study Areas: 2015 Future With the Proposed Projects

Housing Units	Students Introduced by Proposed Projects	
	Elementary[1]	Intermediate[1]
Up to 450	54	18

Note: [1] Based on student generation rates in Table 6-1a in the *2010 CEQR Technical Manual.*

Table 4-6
Estimated Public Elementary and Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2015 Future With the Proposed Projects

Study Area	Projected No Build Enrollment	Students from Proposed Projects	Total Enrollment with the Proposed Projects	Capacity	Available Seats	Utilization (%)
Elementary Schools						
½-Mile Study Area	2,314	54	2,368	2,503	135	95
Sub-District 2	4,297	54	4,351	3,839	-512	113
Intermediate Schools						
1-Mile Study Area	2,828	18	2,846	3,004	158	95
Sub-District 2	764	18	782	957	175	82

Sources: DOE *Enrollment Projections 2009-2018 by the Grier Partnership*; DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2009-2010*, DOE *2010-2014 Proposed Five-Year Capital Plan*, April 2011.

Although elementary schools within Sub-District 2 would operate with a shortage of seats in 2015, the proposed projects would introduce a small number of students relative to the overall enrollment of the study area. As a result, it would not substantially increase the elementary school utilization rate. Within Sub-District 2, the proposed projects would increase the utilization rate by ~~1.5~~ 1.4 percent. Because the proposed projects would increase the elementary school utilization rate by less than five percent, the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in Sub-District 2. Because elementary schools in the ½-mile study area would operate with ~~a utilization rate of less than 101 percent, a one percent increase over~~ surplus capacity, the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in the ½-mile study area.

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

The 18 new intermediate students would increase enrollment in the 1-mile study area to 2,846 students, and intermediate schools would operate with a surplus of ~~313~~ 158 seats (~~90~~ 95 percent utilization) (see **Table 4-6**). For Sub-District 2, intermediate school enrollment would increase to 782 by 2015 and the schools would operate at ~~70~~ 82 percent of capacity, with a surplus of ~~330~~ 175 seats.

Because intermediate schools would operate with surplus capacity in both study areas, the proposed projects would not result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in the 1-mile study area or Sub-District 2. ✷

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~~ surplus capacity 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~~ 512 seats in the future with the proposed projects. However, the proposed projects would increase the elementary school utilization rate by only ~~1.5~~ 1.4 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