

Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning EIS

CHAPTER 24: UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

A. INTRODUCTION

Unavoidable adverse impacts occur when a proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts for which there are no reasonably practicable mitigation measures, and for which there are no reasonable alternatives.

As described in previous chapters of this EIS, most of the potential significant adverse impacts of the proposed action could be avoided or mitigated by implementing a broad range of measures. However, there are a number of significant adverse impacts for which there are no reasonably practical mitigation measures or reasonable alternatives that would eliminate the impacts and meet the purpose and need of the proposed action. These include unavoidable adverse effects on archaeological resources, historic resources, and traffic.

B. HISTORIC RESOURCES

Archaeological Resources

Because development could potentially occur on any of the identified 76 projected and 264 potential development sites subsequent to the proposed action, there is a potential for disturbance of archaeological resources on any of the projected or potential development sites where such resources exist. As discussed in Chapter 7, “Historic Resources,” 14 of the projected development sites and 50 of the potential development sites include lots which have been determined to be sensitive for nineteenth century archaeological resources. Resources within portions of the development sites where new construction could occur, absent prior disturbance, would likely be destroyed by action-induced development. This would constitute a significant adverse impact.

The proposed action was assessed for possible mitigation measures in accordance with CEQR guidelines. The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies several ways in which impacts on potential archaeological resources can be mitigated, including:

- Redesigning the action so that it does not disturb the resource;
- Fieldwork/field testing - mitigation for potential prehistoric or historic archaeological resources often calls for excavation in the form archaeological testing to determine whether archaeological resources are, in fact, present. If any such resources are found, archaeological testing can also be used to determine their extent and their significance;
- Excavation - when avoidance of significant archaeological resources is not an option, then a data recovery program becomes the mitigation. As the value or significance of an archaeological resource relates to its potential to provide important information, the adverse effects of the action on the resource are considered mitigated when the information has been

recovered through systematic archaeological investigation. Mitigation is not considered to be complete until a final report has been reviewed and approved and the artifacts are curated in an appropriate repository (see below);

- Repositories - artifacts recovered from significant archaeological sites should be curated in an appropriate repository which would keep them to professional standards and make them available to researchers.

The proposed project is an areawide rezoning action that is likely to lead to potential development in the future. Based on the above mitigation options, no mitigation measures are feasible and practicable for the proposed action, because the area to be rezoned is privately-owned. In the future, if the sites are developed as-of-right in accordance with the new zoning, private ownership of the land prevents the City from requiring an archaeological testing program to test for potential archaeological remains, or from mandating the preservation or documentation of such remains, should they exist. As such, the archaeological impact identified in Chapter 7 is considered to be an unmitigated impact of the proposed action.

Architectural Resources

As discussed in Chapter 7, “Historic Resources,” the buildings comprising the Greenpoint Terminal Market site, which may be eligible for S/NR listing, would likely be demolished in part or entirely to facilitate residential and local commercial development on projected development Sites 56 and 60 and potential development Site 61. This would constitute a significant adverse impact. The proposed action would also facilitate new construction on Sites 222 and 291, which are adjacent to two eligible resources. If the eligible structures are not designated, they would not be subject to the City’s construction protection procedures, and may therefore be adversely impacted by adjacent development resulting from the proposed action. This would constitute a significant adverse impact.

The proposed action was assessed for possible mitigation measures in accordance with CEQR guidelines. The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies several ways in which impacts on potential architectural resources can be mitigated, including:

- Redesigning the action so that it does not disturb the resource;
- Relocating the action to avoid the resource altogether;
- Contextual redesign of a project that does not actually physically affect an architectural resource but would alter its setting;
- Adaptive reuse to incorporate the resource into the project rather than demolishing it;
- A construction protection plan to protect historic resources that may be affected by construction activities related to a proposed action;
- Data recovery or recordation of historic structures that would be significantly altered or demolished; and
- Relocating architectural resources.

Based on the above mitigation options, no mitigation measures are feasible and practicable for the proposed action, because the area to be rezoned and the sites identified for projected and potential development are privately-owned. In the future, if the sites are developed as-of-right in accordance with the new zoning, private ownership of the land prevents the City from requiring any of the above mitigation measures. As such, the architectural impacts identified in Chapter 7 are considered to be unmitigated impacts of the proposed action.

C. TRAFFIC

As discussed in Chapter 16, “Traffic and Parking,” the mitigation measures proposed for the intersection of McGuinness Boulevard and Greenpoint Avenue would mitigate the identified impacts in the PM peak hour. In the AM peak hour however, the eastbound approach would remain unmitigated. Additional measures were evaluated to address the impact to the eastbound approach in the AM. However, further signal timing adjustments to return this approach to its No-Action condition would be impractical as they would result in new or worsened impacts on other approaches and a reduction in pedestrian crossing time on McGuinness Boulevard. Increasing capacity through changes to curbside regulations or modifications to lane striping was also found to be ineffective, as was widening the approach to achieve an additional lane. Therefore, the proposed action’s impact to eastbound Greenpoint Avenue at McGuinness Boulevard in the AM peak hour would remain unmitigated.