

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Proposed Modifications to the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning Project and Related Actions at New York City Council

May 11, 2005

I. INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning project was certified as complete by the lead agency on March 4, 2005. Subsequent to completion of the FEIS, a Technical Memorandum, dated March 11, 2005, was prepared to assess the potential effects of proposed modifications by the City Planning Commission (CPC) to the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Zoning Map and Text Amendment Applications (C050111(A) ZMK, N050110(A) ZRK). The modifications included the elimination of 13 blocks or portions of blocks from the proposed rezoning area, maintaining the existing M1-1 and M1-2 zoning in those areas, and some modifications to the zoning text amendment relating to waterfront public access area maintenance and limitations on tower dimensions of towers facing the waterfront. That memorandum concluded that the CPC modifications would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS.

On March 14, 2005, the City Planning Commission (CPC) voted to select the Revised Affordable Housing Bonus and Incentives (Revised AHBI) Alternative, which is analyzed in Chapter 23, "Alternatives," and Appendix J of the FEIS, with the proposed modifications assessed in the March 11 technical memorandum.

Pursuant to the City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure, the New York City Council (the "Council") has now proposed certain additional amendments to the CPC-approved Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning project and related actions. These are described below and their potential for creating significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS is assessed herein.

II. SUMMARY OF COUNCIL MODIFICATIONS

Zoning Map Changes

- Changes to the zoning map would rezone for mixed use portions of 13 blocks, where City Planning Commission modifications maintained manufacturing zoning, thereby restoring areas originally proposed for mixed use under the proposed action analyzed in the FEIS. Projected and Potential development sites under these modifications would be those analyzed under the Revised AHBI Alternative.

- Changes to the zoning map would remove a portion of a block bounded by Greenpoint Avenue, West Street, Kent Street, and a line 100 feet west of Franklin Street from the rezoning in order to maintain M1-1 zoning in this area. Potential Development Sites 53 and 54 and a portion of Projected Development Site 55 would be removed from the rezoning area as a result of this modification; however, the development projected to occur on Site 55 (conversion of 12,000 square feet from industrial to commercial use) would still be expected to occur under the action as modified by the Council.

Zoning Text Changes

- Changes to the zoning text would reduce the base FAR available to developments in R6A, R6 wide street, and R7A districts within the rezoning area without affordable housing under the Inclusionary Housing program,. Developments in R6A or R6 wide street districts would be permitted up to 2.7 FAR, with up to 3.6 FAR if providing affordable housing under the Inclusionary Housing bonus. Developments in R7A districts would be permitted up to 3.45 FAR, with a bonus up to 4.6 FAR for affordable housing. The total amount of development projected on sites within these districts would not change as a result of this modification.
- Changes to the zoning text would reduce the rate of floor area increase for sites utilizing the Inclusionary Housing bonus from 2:1 to 1.25:1. Combined with the change to permitted FARs in R6A, R6 wide street, and R7A districts described above, this modification would increase the number of affordable housing units generated by upland sites from 185 to 640.
- Modifications to the maximum permitted FARs for mixed community facility-residential buildings in the rezoning area would limit maximum FAR for such buildings to correspond with the maximum residential FAR. This modification would not affect any of the development projections.
- Modifications to the Inclusionary Housing program for the waterfront area would eliminate the option of providing middle-income housing in order to earn the floor area bonus. Developments utilizing the bonus would be required to provide low- or low- and moderate-income units. As a result of this modification, the waterfront Inclusionary Housing bonus would no longer produce the 303 middle-income units projected under the Revised AHBI Alternative.
- Changes to the waterfront Inclusionary Housing bonus would reduce the maximum FAR permitted for developments not providing affordable housing to 3.7, with a bonus up to 4.7. Modifications to the zoning text would also increase the percentage of affordable units required to earn the bonus to 20% if all low-income, or 10% low-income plus 15% moderate-income. As a result of this modification and the modification described immediately above, the number of low- and moderate-income units generated through the waterfront Inclusionary Housing bonus increases by 653.
- Modifications to the permitted tower heights would reduce permitted heights in R8 districts by 20 feet (to 230 feet and 330 feet) for developments not providing affordable housing. This would increase the incentive for developments to utilize the Inclusionary Housing bonus but would not alter any of the specific development projections.

- Modifications to the permitted base heights in R8 districts would increase the minimum height above which floorplate limitations apply for buildings providing affordable housing from 85 to 100 feet. This modification would not affect the amount of projected development, but could result in buildings on waterfront sites with slightly more floor area at a height of between 85 and 100 feet and as a result other portions of the buildings would be of a slightly lesser height.
- Text changes establishing a procedure for the transfer to the City of public access areas in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Waterfront Access Plan (WAP), would create an incentive for city takeover of responsibility for maintenance and operation of required public open space on the waterfront. These modifications would not affect the requirements of the WAP.
- The elimination of alternate public access and visual corridor requirements for Parcel 5 in the WAP would eliminate an option by which the provision of open space on the city-owned Parcel 5b could have altered the requirements on adjacent privately-owned sites in the event all three sites were developed together. This modification would not affect projected development.

Other Changes

- Based on the availability of more detailed information about the expected development of City-owned Parcel 5b, it is projected that 431 of 550 units generated by this site would be affordable to low- and moderate-income households. This would be a reduction of 119 affordable units from the estimate in Appendix J.
- Based on the availability of more detailed information about the expected development of city-owned Parcel 5b, it is projected that 2.0 acres of new open space would be provided on the waterfront. This would be an increase from the 1.5-acre estimate in Appendix J.

II. POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE GREENPOINT-WILLIAMSBURG REZONING PROJECT AND RELATED ACTIONS

The proposed Council modifications would have the following effects on development within the affected area. The proposed changes summarized above would not alter the total number of dwelling units projected as a result of Revised AHBI Alternative, as supplemented by Appendix J, adopted by the CPC.¹ However, the proposed changes would result in a greater number of affordable dwelling units, as shown in Table 1 below.

¹ For purposes of this Technical Memorandum, the term “Revised AHBI Alternative” refers to the Revised AHBI Alternative as analyzed in Chapter 23 (“Alternatives”), as supplemented and modified by the Technical Memorandum in Appendix J to the FEIS.

Table 1: Comparison of Number of Affordable Dwelling Units to be Provided

	FEIS: Appendix J	Proposed Council Modifications	Difference
Upland	Low-income units: 185	Low-income units: 640	455
Waterfront	Low- and moderate-income units: 910	Low- and moderate-income units: 1,563 Low-income: 1,042 Mod-income: 521	653
	Middle-income units: 303	Middle-income units: 0	(303)
Site 3.1	Low-income units: 550	Low-income units: 431	(119)
Site 222	Low-income units: 75	Low-income units: 100	25
Site 327	Low-income units: 37	Low-income units: 37	0
	Total: 2,060 affordable units (low, moderate, middle)	Total: 2,771 Low- and Moderate (2,250 Low-income and 521 moderate-income)	711

The removal of a portion of a one block area, as described above under Zoning Map Changes, would eliminate Potential Development Sites 53 and 54 from the proposed rezoning area. A portion of Projected Development Site 55 would also be eliminated from the rezoning area; however, this site would remain as a Projected Development Site as the change would not alter the development projected to occur on the site (conversion of 12,000 square feet from industrial to commercial use). Also, the restoration of mixed-use zoning on portions of 13 blocks, as described above under Zoning Map Changes, would restore the 4 Projected Development Sites (Sites 224, 277, 295 and 308) and the 37 Potential Development Sites (Sites 215, 246-258, 276, 278-290, 292-294, 299-302, 307, and 309) which had been removed from the proposed rezoning area under the CPC modifications. Also, as a result of the proposed Council modifications, the three potential sites which had been changed to projected sites (Sites 241, 242 and 244) under the CPC modifications would be considered as potential sites again.

Overall, the proposed amendments would increase the opportunity for affordable housing, and increase opportunities for open space, particularly in Greenpoint. As noted above, the proposed Council changes would be expected to result in approximately 2 acres of publicly accessible open space on Site 3.1, compared to an estimated 1.5 acres assumed in Appendix J of the FEIS.

As described above, modifications to the permitted base heights in R8 districts would not affect the amount of projected development, but could result in buildings on waterfront sites with slightly more floor area at a height of between 85 and 100 feet and as a result other portions of the buildings would be of a slightly lesser height.

These changes would not result, either cumulatively or individually, in any significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS. There would be no net change in the number of units projected in Appendix J; however, the proposed modifications to the Inclusionary Housing Program and other changes that would alter the estimate of affordable housing units warrant consideration of the potential for greater impacts on public schools and daycare, as discussed below, whereas the addition of open spaces would slightly improve the open space ratios in Greenpoint.

A. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

The proposed Council modifications would not change the development density projected under the Revised AHBI Alternative as supplemented in Appendix J. The proposed modifications would

maintain manufacturing zoning designations on a portion of one block, bounded by Greenpoint Avenue, Kent, West and Franklin streets, where there is existing industrial activity. The block that would retain its manufacturing zoning designation under the proposed modifications is adjacent to areas proposed for mixed use zoning districts, and would therefore not conflict with existing or projected uses.

With the proposed Council modifications, the proposed action would continue to support the goals of providing opportunities for new residential development in the area, including affordable housing, while allowing the continuation of industrial uses, together with the residential re-use of underutilized and vacant land. As with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy.

B. Socioeconomic Conditions

As shown in Table 1 above, the proposed changes would add 711 low- and moderate-income units, for a total of approximately 2,771 affordable units in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg rezoning area (compared to 2,060 affordable units analyzed in Appendix J, of which 1,757 were assumed to be low- and moderate-income units). These units would serve to reduce and further mitigate the significant indirect residential displacement impacts identified for the Revised AHBI Alternative analyzed in the FEIS, as supplemented in Appendix J. Although most of the displaced residents identified in the FEIS would likely qualify for these affordable units, the units would also be accessible to other qualifying New York City households. The additional 711 affordable units provided by the proposed changes, in addition to those provided by the Revised AHBI Alternative as supplemented in Appendix J, would further reduce the indirect residential displacement impact and expand the partial mitigation provided under the Revised AHBI Alternative.

For direct residential displacement and direct and indirect business displacement, the effect of the proposed changes would be the same as with the Revised AHBI Alternative analyzed in the FEIS, as supplemented in Appendix J, and would not result in any significant adverse impacts. The proposed Council modifications would therefore not result in significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions.

C. Community Facilities and Services

Schools

By 2013, the difference in the number of affordable units and market-rate units under the Council modifications would result in an increase in the number of public school students compared to the Revised AHBI Alternative analyzed in the FEIS, as supplemented in Appendix J. Compared to Appendix J, there would be an increase of 24 elementary school students in Greenpoint and an increase of 36 elementary school students in Williamsburg, for a total increase of 60 elementary school students in the study area.

As shown in Table 2, when the students generated with the Council modifications are added to future No-Action conditions, the utilization of elementary schools within the Greenpoint sub-area would increase from 78 percent in the No-Action to 153 percent, a shortfall of 1,176 elementary school seats within the Greenpoint sub-area (compared to an increase to 152% and a deficiency of 1,152 seats under the Revised AHBI Alternative analyzed in the FEIS, as supplemented in Appendix J). Given that there are not sufficient available seats for the additional elementary school students in the

Greenpoint sub-area, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC, there would be a significant adverse impact on elementary schools in this sub-area.

The utilization rate for elementary schools in the Williamsburg sub-area would increase from 83 percent under No-Action conditions to 98 percent, with 139 available seats (see Table 2). The utilization rate for elementary schools within the ½-mile study area, which encompasses the Greenpoint and Williamsburg sub-areas, would increase from 81 percent to 112 percent, a shortfall of 1,037 elementary school seats within the study area (compared to an increase to 111% and a shortfall of 977 seats in Appendix J). Although part of this shortfall could be accommodated in available intermediate school space, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC, this would constitute a significant adverse impact on elementary schools within the study area as a whole.

TABLE 2

Future with CPC-Approved Project Plus Council Modifications:

Estimated Public Elementary & Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization in 2013

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	No-Action Projected Enrollment in 2013	Students Generated by CPC-Approved Project with Council Mods.	Total Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Seats Available	Percent Utilization
Total for Greenpoint Sub-Area	1,730	1,678	3,408	2,232	-1,176	153%
Total for Williamsburg Sub-Area	5,229	946	6,175	6,314	139	98%
Total for Study Area	6,959	2,624	9,583	8,546	-1,037	112%
Total for Elementary Schools in CSD14	10,838	2,624	13,462	16,549	3,087	81%
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS	No-Action Projected Enrollment in 2013	Students Generated by CPC-Approved Project with Council Mods.	Total Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Seats Available	Percent Utilization
Total for Greenpoint Sub-Area	533	629	1,162	1,253	91	93%
Total for Williamsburg Sub-Area	2,112	355	2,467	3,706	1,239	67%
Total for Study Area	2,645	984	3,629	4,959	1,330	73%
Total for Intermediate Schools in CSD14	3,784	984	4,768	7,543	2,775	63%

DOE, *Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2002-2003* and DCP, *Enrollment Projections for 2003-2012*

No significant adverse impacts on public intermediate or high schools are anticipated. Although the Council modifications would increase the number of intermediate school students added to the study area by 21 students compared to Appendix J, intermediate schools within both the Greenpoint and Williamsburg sub-areas as well as the entire ½-mile study area and the CSD would continue to operate at well below capacity, as shown in Table 2. The Council modifications could also add 623 high school students to the study area by 2013 (compared to 598 students in Appendix J), however, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, no significant adverse impacts to high schools would be expected in Brooklyn.

The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact not already identified in the FEIS. However, as compared to the CPC-approved project, the proposed Council modifications could result in a somewhat greater impact on elementary schools in the Greenpoint sub-area and the ½-mile study area as a whole, and would require a slightly greater degree of

mitigation than the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC. Whereas the Revised AHBI Alternative as assessed in Appendix J would require mitigation for a shortfall of 1,152 elementary school seats within the Greenpoint sub-area and 977 elementary school seats within the ½-mile study area, the project with the Council modifications would require mitigation for an anticipated shortfall of 1,176 elementary school seats within the Greenpoint sub-area and 1,037 elementary school seats within the ½-mile study area.

The impacts resulting from the Council modifications would be mitigated by: creating additional capacity in Greenpoint by constructing a new elementary school or building additional capacity at existing schools; adjusting school catchment areas (attendance zones) within the school district to relieve overcrowding in the affected schools; and adjusting grade levels within schools to better utilize available space in elementary and intermediate schools. Funding for additional school capacity would be reflected in amendments to the Department of Education's Five-Year Educational Capital Facilities Plan, as discussed in the Mitigation chapter of the FEIS.

Libraries

The study area is currently served by three BPL branch facilities, including the Greenpoint Branch, Leonard Branch, and Williamsburgh Branch, with a total of approximately 275,214 library volumes. The 2013 study area population would increase by approximately 22,029 residents with the proposed Council modifications. This would increase the study area population in the future with the proposed action to a total of approximately 158,614 residents (compared to 158,115 residents in Appendix J). As a result, the volumes to resident ratio would decrease somewhat from the future No-Action ratio of 2.02 to a ratio of 1.74 per resident (same as in Appendix J).

Despite these moderate decreases in the volumes to resident ratios, it is anticipated that no significant adverse impacts on libraries within the study area would occur. As with the CPC-approved project, the BPL would continue to evaluate its library utilization rates within the study area based on various factors, including population, circulation, program attendance, and computer usage, to determine if and when additional library services would be needed. In addition, based on BPL's plans to expand and strengthen its branch collections, and to replace or expand the Greenpoint Branch, it is expected that the three library branches would adequately serve the expanded population in the study area resulting from the Council modifications. The proposed Council modifications would therefore not result in significant adverse impacts to library facilities.

Day Care

As the proposed Council modifications would increase the number of low and moderate income units by 711 compared to Appendix J, the additional demand for publicly assisted day care for low- to moderate-income households would be greater for the proposed modifications than under the Revised AHBI Alternative as assessed in Appendix J. The addition of 711 low and moderate income units would result in a total of 2,771 low- and moderate-income units in the study area, which would generate approximately 942 children under the age of 12 potentially eligible for publicly funded daycare, compared to 597 eligible children in Appendix J. This would increase demand by approximately 32.4 percent over the existing capacity of 2,911 slots. Because the Council modifications, like the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, would result in an increase of more than five percent in a deficiency of day care slots over the No-Action condition, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative, a significant adverse impact to publicly funded day care centers in the study area is expected.

The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact not already identified in the FEIS. As described in the FEIS, possible mitigation measures include adding capacity to existing facilities or providing a new daycare facility within or near the proposed action area. At this point however, it is not possible to know exactly which type of mitigation would be most appropriate and when, because the demand for publicly funded day care depends not only on the amount of residential development in the area, but the proportion of new residents who are children of low-income families. Therefore, as is standard practice, the Administration for Children's Services (ACS) would monitor development of the proposed action area and respond to provide the capacity when needed.

Health Care

The hospital facilities serving the study area had approximately 479,790 outpatient ambulatory visits and approximately 252,642 emergency room visits in 2000. With the Council modifications, up to 2,771 low- to moderate-income housing units (with an estimated residential population of 7,887) could be added to the study area. Based on the national average for emergency room visits for Medicaid patients of 65.4 annual emergency room visits per 100 persons insured by Medicaid (low-income population), the addition of 7,887 low-to moderate-income residents to the study area could add an estimated 5,158 annual visits to study area emergency rooms, compared to the No-Action.

Therefore, the low-to moderate-income population resulting from the Council modifications would generate an increase in demand over the No-Action condition of approximately 2.0 percent in study area hospital emergency room visits and an increase of 1.1 percent in outpatient ambulatory visits (compared to an increase of approximately 1.5 percent and of 0.8 percent, respectively, in Appendix J).

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, impacts are identified if the proposed action would result in an increase of 5 percent or more in the demand for emergency and outpatient ambulatory services over the No-Action conditions, or would result in a facility exceeding its capacity. As the increase with the Council modifications, like that under the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC, is well below the CEQR impact threshold, no significant adverse impacts on emergency and outpatient ambulatory services are expected as a result of the Council modifications. As such, the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse impacts to health care facilities.

Police and Fire Protection Services

The proposed Council modifications would add a total of approximately 22,029 residents to the study area (compared to an estimated 21,516 residents in Appendix J). This increase in population could further increase the demand for police and fire protection services. However, the NYPD would determine deployment of additional personnel after assessment of crime trends, population, and the amount of 911 calls that are received in an area. While the additional population would require additional resources in the area from the NYPD, the NYPD would be able to allocate resources as necessary along with the pace of development. Likewise, FDNY regularly conducts reviews of call volumes throughout the City, and the FDNY would continue to evaluate area operations over time, typically on a semi-annual or annual basis. As such, it is anticipated that additional fire and EMS units would be allocated as necessary to serve the additional population resulting from the Council modifications. The proposed modifications would therefore not result in significant adverse impacts to police or fire protection services.

D. Open Space

As noted above, in addition to the additional low- and moderate-income units expected to be developed as a result of the Council modifications, an estimated 2.0 acres of new open space are expected to be provided on Site 3.1, compared to an estimated 1.5 acres assumed in Appendix J. This would increase the total open space acreage within the Greenpoint sub-area accordingly. Because the exact nature of this open space is not known at this time, as in Appendix J, for analysis purposes, it is assumed to consist of 50% active open space and 50% passive open space.

As shown in Table 3, with the Council modifications, under Scenario A, all of the open space ratios would increase relative to No-Action conditions, except within the Greenpoint sub-area, where the total open space ratio would increase by 1.8%, the active open space ratio would decrease by 9.8%, and the passive open space ratio would increase by 15.3% (compared to an increase of 1.0% in the total ratio, a decrease of 10.5% in the active ratio, and an increase of 14.4% in the passive ratio in Appendix J). Given the small increase in the total open space ratio, and the availability of other qualitative factors (provision of waterfront access for example) which would offset the decrease in the active open space ratio, no significant adverse impact would be anticipated within Greenpoint under Scenario A with the Council modifications.

Under Scenario B, the Greenpoint sub-area would undergo a decrease in its total open space ratio by 11.1%, a decrease in the active open space ratio by 21.7%, while the passive open space ratio would increase by 1.4% (compared to a decrease of 12.1% in the total ratio, a decrease of 22.6% in the active ratio, and an increase of 0.3% in the passive ratio in Appendix J). Therefore, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC, the development resulting from the proposed Council modifications would result in a significant open space impact in the Greenpoint sub-area under Scenario B, but would require a slightly lesser degree of mitigation than the project assessed in Appendix J.

Whereas mitigating the impact under Scenario B would require a total of 5.25 acres of open space to be added to the Greenpoint sub-area in Appendix J, the necessary mitigation with the CPC modifications would be slightly reduced to approximately 4.9 acres. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact to open space resources not already identified in the FEIS for the Revised AHBI Alternative.

E. Shadows

The proposed Council modifications would eliminate two potential development sites (Sites 53 and 54) from the Greenpoint portion of the proposed action area, and would also reduce the permitted heights in R8 districts by 20 feet (to 230 feet and 330 feet) for developments not providing affordable housing. In addition, the modifications would increase the minimum height above which floorplate limitations apply for buildings providing affordable housing in R8 districts from 85 to 100 feet. Although this last modification could slightly alter the bulk of developments resulting from the proposed action, it would not increase the overall heights of developments, and would therefore have no effect on the shadow analysis for the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Public Open Space Resources for CPC-Approved Project With Council Modifications

		EXISTING	NO-ACTION	2013 WITH-ACTION IN APPENDIX J		2013 WITH COUNCIL MODIFICATIONS	
				Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario A	Scenario B
Greenpoint Sub-area	Population (persons)						
	Residential	39,481	39,817	53,684	53,684	53,877	53,877
	Open Space Acreage (acres)						
	Active	17.08	17.08	20.61	17.83	20.86	18.08
	Passive	12.83	14.63	22.56	19.78	22.81	20.03
	Total	29.91	31.71	43.17	37.61	43.67	38.11
	Open Space Ratio (acres/1,000 resident)						
	Active	0.433	0.429	0.384	0.332	0.387	0.336
	Passive	0.325	0.367	0.420	0.368	0.423	0.372
	Total	0.758	0.796	0.804	0.700	0.810	0.708
	% Change in Open Space Ratio						
			From Existing to No-Action	From No-Action to With- Action in Appendix J		From No-Action to With-Action with Council Modifications	
	Active	-	-0.9%	-10.5%	-22.6%	-9.8%	-21.7%
	Passive	-	12.9%	14.4%	0.3%	15.3%	1.4%
Total	-	5.0%	1.0%	-12.1%	1.8%	-11.1%	
Williamsburg Sub-area	Population (persons)						
	Residential	89,590	96,768	104,418	104,418	104,737	104,737
	Open Space Acreage (acres)						
	Active	31.11	35.11	46.23	43.06	46.23	43.06
	Passive	11.54	14.59	27.34	24.17	27.34	24.17
	Total	42.65	49.70	73.57	67.23	73.57	67.23
	Open Space Ratio (acres/1,000 resident)						
	Active	0.347	0.363	0.443	0.412	0.441	0.411
	Passive	0.129	0.151	0.262	0.231	0.261	0.231
	Total	0.476	0.514	0.705	0.643	0.702	0.642
	% Change in Open Space Ratio						
			From Existing to No-Action	From No-Action to With- Action in Appendix J		From No-Action to With-Action with Council Modifications	
	Active	-	4.6%	22.0%	13.5%	21.5%	13.2%
	Passive	-	17.1%	73.5%	53.0%	72.8%	53.0%
Total	-	8.0%	37.2%	25.1%	36.6%	24.9%	
1/2-Mile Study Area	Population (persons)						
	Residential	129,071	136,585	158,102	158,102	158,614	158,614
	Open Space Acreage (acres)						
	Active	48.19	52.19	66.84	60.89	67.09	61.14
	Passive	24.37	29.22	49.896	43.946	50.15	44.20
	Total	72.56	81.41	116.74	104.84	117.24	105.34
	Open Space Ratio (acres/1,000 resident)						
	Active	0.373	0.382	0.423	0.385	0.423	0.385
	Passive	0.189	0.214	0.316	0.278	0.316	0.279
	Total	0.562	0.596	0.738	0.663	0.739	0.664
	% Change in Open Space Ratio						
			From Existing to No-Action	From No-Action to With- Action in Appendix J		From No-Action to With-Action with Council Modifications	
	Active	-	2.4%	10.7%	0.8%	10.7%	0.8%
	Passive	-	13.2%	47.7%	29.9%	47.7%	30.4%
Total	-	6.0%	23.8%	11.2%	24.0%	11.4%	

One of the eliminated development sites is a conversion site, and the second, potential development Site 54, would not cast any incremental shadows on the open space resources analyzed in Chapter 6, "Shadows". Moreover, as the RWCDs analyzed in the FEIS assumes that all developments in R8 districts, which are mapped on the waterfront, would provide affordable housing, the maximum building heights with the Council modifications would be the same as those analyzed for the Revised AHBI Alternative in the FEIS. The proposed Council modifications would not alter any of the shadows cast by development resulting from the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, and the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact.

F. Historic Resources

Archaeological Resources

Neither of the two potential development sites removed as a result of the proposed Council modifications (Sites 53 and 54) include lots which have been determined to be sensitive for nineteenth century archaeological resources. There would be the same potential for disturbance of archaeological resources on the 14 projected and 50 potential development sites identified in the archaeological assessment for the Revised AHBI Alternative in the FEIS, and the same significant adverse impacts on those sites could occur. As with the Revised AHBI Alternative, these are considered to be unavoidable adverse impacts as no mitigation measures are feasible because the sites to be rezoned are privately owned. The proposed Council modifications would therefore not result in any significant adverse impact not already identified in the FEIS.

Architectural Resources

Of the two sites that would be eliminated as a result of the proposed Council modifications, potential Site 53 is identified as potentially eligible for LPC designation and State/National Register listing. However, as noted in the FEIS, this site is identified as a conversion site in the RWCDs, and no significant changes to this resource were anticipated. None of the sites eliminated as a result of the proposed modifications are located immediately adjacent to any designated or eligible resources. Therefore, the proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts not already identified in the FEIS.

G. Urban Design and Visual Resources

The proposed Council modifications would reduce the permitted heights in R8 districts by 20 feet (to 230 feet and 330 feet) for developments not providing affordable housing. This modification is intended to increase the incentive for developments to utilize the inclusionary Housing bonus, and it is expected that developments in R8 districts, which are mapped on the waterfront, would provide affordable housing. Therefore, the maximum building heights with the Council modifications would be the same as those analyzed for the Revised AHBI Alternative in the FEIS.

The proposed Council modifications would also increase the minimum height above which floorplate limitations apply for buildings providing affordable housing in R8 districts from 85 to 100 feet. This modification would result in negligible changes to the bulk of projected developments. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

H. Neighborhood Character

The proposed modifications would maintain manufacturing zoning designations on a portion of one block in the Greenpoint area, which is adjacent to areas proposed for mixed use zoning districts, and

would therefore not conflict with existing or projected uses. As such, the retention of manufacturing zoning on this block would not adversely affect neighborhood character. The proposed modifications would therefore not result in any significant adverse impact.

I. Natural Resources

As the two potential development sites that would be eliminated by the proposed modifications are located in the developed upland area, their elimination would not have any effect on natural resources. The effects of projected developments with the Council modifications would generally be the same as those with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC. The difference in the number of new affordable units would result in an additional 513 residents in the study area, compared to Appendix J. This is estimated to increase the sewage generation in the study area by approximately 57,456 gallons per day (0.06 mgd), which is a negligible increase. As discussed in Appendix K of the FEIS, an assessment of increased pollutant loadings from CSOs as a result of the Revised AHBI Alternative assumed a 2.42 MGD increase in dry weather flow, and demonstrated that the resulting pollutant loadings would be insignificant. Because the 2.42 MGD increase that formed the basis of this analysis is greater than the actual increase from the No-Action under any development scenario, the impacts from increased CSOs under any of the alternative development scenarios, including the action with the proposed Council modifications, would be even lower than the insignificant levels shown. As with the Revised AHBI Alternative, the proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

J. Hazardous Materials

The proposed modifications would maintain the existing manufacturing zoning designation on a portion of one block in the Greenpoint area. As the two potential development sites (Sites 53 and 54) identified on this block would be eliminated from the proposed action and would not be developed/converted as a consequence of the proposed rezoning, they would not be mapped with (E) designations for hazardous materials. Otherwise, the same projected and potential development sites would receive (E) designations under the proposed Council modifications as would for the Revised AHBI Alternative. See Table A attached at the end of this memorandum for a complete listing of (E) designations for hazardous materials. The proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

K. Waterfront Revitalization Program

The Revised AHBI Alternative has been determined to be compatible with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program. The proposed modifications would result in the same overall amount of projected development, with an additional amount of affordable units and open space. As with the Revised AHBI Alternative, the proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact.

L. Infrastructure

The proposed modifications would not affect the projected development density in terms of the number of projected units, although they would create more low- and moderate-income units compared to the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC. The difference in the number of new affordable units would result in an additional 513 residents in the study area, compared to Appendix J. This is estimated to increase the water consumption and sewage generation in the study area by approximately 57,456 gallons per day (0.06 mgd), which is a negligible increase. The proposed Council modifications would therefore not result in any significant adverse impact.

M. Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

The proposed changes would not affect the projected development density in terms of the number of projected units, although they would create more low- and moderate-income units compared to the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC. The difference in the number of new affordable units would result in an additional 513 residents in the study area, compared to Appendix J. This is estimated to increase the residential solid waste generated in the study area by approximately 9,027 pounds per week, which is a negligible increase equivalent to approximately 0.6 tons per day. As with the revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC, the proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse impact.

N. Energy

The proposed changes would not affect the projected development density in terms of the number of projected units, and therefore would not change the energy consumption associated with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by CPC. The proposed changes would therefore not result in any significant adverse impact.

O. Traffic and Parking

As the proposed changes would not change the total number of residential units projected in Appendix J, there would be no changes to the traffic patterns or traffic network established for the Greenpoint-Williamsburg study area. As such, the proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse impacts not already identified in the FEIS. The same mitigation measures required under the Revised AHBI Alternative as adopted by the CPC would be required under the proposed Council modifications.

P. Transit and Pedestrians

As the proposed changes would not change the number of residential units projected in Appendix J, there would be no changes to transit or pedestrian conditions. As such, there would be no additional or different transit or pedestrian impacts, and the proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse impact not already identified in the FEIS. The same mitigation measures required under the Revised AHBI Alternative as adopted by the CPC would be required under the proposed Council modifications.

Q. Air Quality

Mobile Sources

As the proposed changes would not change the number of residential units projected in Appendix J, there would be no changes to the traffic patterns or traffic network established for the Greenpoint-Williamsburg study area. As a result, there would be no incremental change or additional impacts concerning mobile source air quality and, as with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, the proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

Stationary Sources

The elimination of the two potential development sites would result in lower levels of project-generated emissions from HVAC sources; therefore, no additional HVAC screening analysis is necessary. As presented in the FEIS, industrial sources at projected development sites were not

included in the With-Action scenario and were not analyzed in the air quality impact analysis. Therefore, Projected Development Site 55, a portion of which would be removed from the proposed rezoning area, was reviewed to identify any industrial activities that currently exist at this site. Based on the review conducted, two new industrial sources were identified, each of which has a paint spray booth equipped with a fabric filter pollution control system. These sources were analyzed in order to determine if any additional significant impacts could potentially occur on nearby projected and potential development sites.

The industrial source analysis was conducted using the Industrial Source Complex Short Term (ISC3) dispersion model developed by EPA. Available permit information from NYCDEP was used in the analysis. The modeling was conducted using the same model options as presented in the FEIS for the Revised AHBI Alternative. The concentrations determined from the previous modeling were added to maximum impacts from the industrial facilities analyzed herein, to provide a conservative estimate of cumulative impacts at development sites in the vicinity of the industrial facilities.

Predicted worst-case impacts were compared with the short-term guideline concentrations (SGCs) and annual guideline concentrations (AGCs) recommended in the NYSDEC's DAR-1 AGC/SGC Tables. The results of the analysis demonstrated that the additional industrial pollutants emitted under the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts at the remaining projected and potential development sites.

As potential development Site 54, which received an (E) designation for industrial sources in the FEIS, would be eliminated from the proposed rezoning area and would not be developed/converted as a consequence of the proposed rezoning, it would not be mapped with an (E) designation with the proposed Council modifications. Otherwise, the same development sites would receive (E) designations for industrial source air quality under the proposed Council modifications as would for the Revised AHBI Alternative, as supplemented in Appendix J. As with the Revised AHBI Alternative adopted by the CPC, with the mapping of the industrial source air quality (E) designations, the proposed Council modifications would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

See Tables B and C attached at the end of this memorandum for a complete listing of development sites requiring (E) designations for air quality HVAC systems and industrial sources, respectively. It should be noted that the sites listed in Table B are identical to those identified in the FEIS.

R. Noise

As the proposed changes would not change the number of residential units projected in Appendix J, there would be no changes to the traffic patterns or traffic network established for the Greenpoint-Williamsburg study area. Neither of the potential development sites removed as a result of the proposed Council modifications (Sites 53 and 54) required (E) designations for noise under the CPC-approved project. As such, there would be no change in the sites requiring (E) designations for noise with the proposed Council modifications. See Table D attached at the end of this memorandum for the complete listing of development sites requiring (E) designations for noise (it should be noted that the sites listed in Table D are identical to those identified in the FEIS). The proposed Council modifications would therefore not result in any significant adverse impact.

S. Construction Impacts.

The proposed changes would not result in any significant adverse construction period impacts.

T. Public Health

The proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts.

TABLE A
Hazardous Materials (E) Designation Status of Projected and Potential Development Sites With Council Modifications

Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation
1	2472/410	yes	37	2531/12	yes	77	2698/11, 15	yes
2	2472/425	yes	38	2531/35, 36	yes	78	2698/25, 26	yes
3	2494/1; 2502/1; 2472/2; 2520/57; 2510/1	yes	39	2531/20	yes	79	2699/9	yes
3.1	2472/32, 2494/6	yes	40	2532/1	yes	80	2699/15, 17	yes
3.2	2472/100	yes	41	2538/1	yes	81	2701/1, 2, 50	yes
4	2482/1, 4, 6	yes	42	2539/1, 8	yes	82	2713/9, 13	yes
5	2482/7, 8	yes	43	2539/27, 29	yes	83	2713/1	yes
6	2482/53	yes	44	2543/1	yes	84	2714/33	yes
7	2482/21	yes	45	2549/1	yes	85	2714/13	yes
8	2482/26, 39	yes	46	2549/10	yes	86	2714/30, 32	yes
9	2483/61, 62	yes	47	2549/14	yes	87	2719/1, 4, 8, 11	yes
10	2483/11, 12	yes	48	2549/25	yes	88	2719/13, 14, 16	yes
11	2483/14, 15	yes	49	2549/28	yes	89	2719/31, 32	yes
12	2483/17, 19, 20	yes	50	2549/36	yes	90	2720/9, 10, 12	yes
13	2483/59, 60	yes	51	2556/45, 46	yes	91	2720/19, 41	yes
14	2483/48	yes	52	2556/55, 57, 58	yes	92	2720/43, 44, 45, 46	yes
15	2483/25	yes	55	2557/24	yes	93	2724/1, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37	yes
16	2483/45	yes	56	2567/1; 2570/36; 2556/1; 2564/1	yes	94	2724/7, 10, 12	yes
17	2487/10, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 72,	yes	57	2562/1, 10	yes	95	2724/18	yes
18	2503/1	yes	58	2562/37, 39	yes	96	2727/1, 47	yes
19	2511/1	yes	59	2562/29	yes	97	2289/14	yes
20	2511/11, 12, 14	yes	60	2565/1	yes	98	2290/5	yes
21	2511/31	yes	61	2568/1	yes	99	2290/10	yes
22	2512/60	yes	62	2570/1	yes	100	2291/1	yes
23	2512/52, 54	yes	63	2571/1, 9	yes	101	2291/17	yes
24	2520/1	yes	64	2571/18	yes	102	2292/29, 33	yes
25	2521/1	yes	65	2589/5	yes	103	2292/11, 12	yes
26	2521/5, 6, 7	yes	66	2589/13	yes	104	2721/8	yes
27	2521/11, 12, 13	yes	67	2590/1	yes	105	2721/11	yes
28	2521/32	yes	68	2590/210, 215, 222	yes	106	2722/34, 36	yes
29	2521/19	yes	69	2644/43	yes	107	2722/8	yes
30	2522/10	yes	70	2679/46	yes	108	2722/10	yes
31	2522/16, 18	yes	71	2697/16	yes	109	2722/13, 15, 16	yes
32	2522/24	yes	72	2697/7	yes	110	2722/19	yes
33	2522/31	yes	73	2697/1	yes	111	2722/21	yes
34	2530/1, 55, 56	yes	74	2698/1	yes	112	2722/25	yes
35	2531/1, 2, 3	yes	75	2698/5	yes	113	2723/1	yes
36	2531/9, 10, 110	yes	76	2698/7	yes	114	2723/5, 7	yes

TABLE A (continued)
Hazardous Materials (E) Designation Status of Projected and Potential Development Sites With Council Modifications

Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation
115	2723/29, 30	yes	153	2736/1, 9, 48	yes	190	2320/15	yes
116	2723/33, 36	yes	154	2736/20, 23	yes	191	2321/36, 37, 38	yes
117	2723/37, 38	yes	155	2737/10, 11	yes	192	2319/31; 2321/13, 14	yes
118	2296/14	yes	156	2738/3, 5	yes	193	2321/18	yes
119	2297/5	yes	157	2738/10	yes	194	2321/25	yes
120	2297/1	yes	158	2738/13, 15	yes	195	2322/1	yes
121	2298/31	yes	159	2738/21, 24	yes	196	2322/6	yes
122	2298/29	yes	160	2309/5, 13	yes	197	2322/10, 11, 28, 30	yes
123	2298/13	yes	160.1	2309/1	yes	198	2323/9, 10	yes
124	2298/21	yes	161	2309/17	yes	199	2324/1; 2332/1	yes
125	2299/1	yes	162	2310/9, 10, 11	yes	200	2325/4, 5, 103	yes
126	2299/9	yes	163	2312/22	yes	201	2325/11, 12	yes
127	2299/21	yes	164	2313/1	yes	202	2325/24, 25, 26	yes
128	2300/1, 5	yes	165	2313/5, 7	yes	203	2325/27, 28, 29	yes
129	2300/20, 26	yes	166	2313/11, 13, 22	yes	204	2325/31, 32	yes
130	2731/1	yes	167	2313/15	yes	205	2326/32, 33, 34, 35	yes
131	2731/44, 45, 47	yes	168	2313/23, 24, 26	yes	206	2326/17, 18, 19	yes
132	2731/38, 41	yes	169	2313/27, 28, 29	yes	207	2327/2	yes
133	2731/35, 36	yes	170	2314/1	yes	208	2327/4, 5	yes
134	2732/33	yes	171	2314/5	yes	209	2327/16, 17, 18	yes
135	2732/5	yes	172	2315/14	yes	210	2327/19, 31, 34	yes
136	2732/27, 30	yes	173	2315/21	yes	211	2277/1; 2287/1, 16, 30; 2294/1, 5; 2301/1, 50, 60, 70; 2590/25, 100	NO
137	2733/6, 7, 10	yes	174	2741/3, 7, 8	yes	212	2331/7, 8	yes
138	2734/3, 4, 5, 7, 11	yes	175	2741/47	yes	213	2331/42	yes
139	2734/13	yes	176	2741/13	yes	214	2333/1	yes
140	2734/35, 38	yes	177	2741/15	yes	215	2334/1, 3, 28, 30, 40, 45, 50	yes
141	2304/36, 37	yes	178	2741/19	yes	216	2334/22, 23	yes
142	2304/10, 12, 13, 14	yes	179	2742/2, 4, 5, 9	yes	217	2335/6, 10, 12	yes
143	2304/15	yes	180	2742/15	yes	218	2335/13, 14, 15	yes
144	2305/15, 16, 17	yes	181	2742/17, 20	yes	219	2337/20	yes
145	2305/18	yes	182	2742/35	yes	220	2338/1	yes
146	2306/1, 11, 15, 27, 28, 30	yes	183	2746/40, 41, 42	yes	221	2339/7	yes
147	2306/9	yes	184	2746/39	yes	222	2340/1	yes
148	2306/18	yes	185	2317/1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 36,	yes	223	2341/9	yes
149	2307/31, 33, 36, 38	yes	186	2317/12, 13	yes	224	2342/1	yes
150	2307/1	yes	187	2317/16, 17	yes	225	2342/16	yes
151	2307/14, 16, 19	yes	188	2317/18	yes	226	2342/23, 26	yes
152	2307/25, 27	yes	189	2319/31	yes	227	2343/5	yes

TABLE A (continued)
Hazardous Materials (E) Designation Status of Projected and Potential Development Sites With Council Modifications

Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation	Site #	Tax Blocks/Lots	(E) Designation
228	2343/18, 19	yes	269	2368/, 31, 32, 33, 34	yes	309	2387/6, 7, 12	yes
229	2344/5	yes	270	2369/4, 6, 7	yes	310	2399/1, 8	yes
230	2344/26	yes	271	2369/14	yes	311	2411/1, 12	yes
231	2344/25	yes	272	2369/19	yes	312	2390/15	yes
232	2344/16	yes	273	2369/27	yes	313	2390/16, 17	yes
233	2346/30	yes	274	2369/37, 38	yes	314	2393/14	yes
234	2346/26	yes	275	2369/40	yes	315	2393/23, 24	yes
235	2349/1, 15, 18, 21	yes	276	2371/1, 3, 5, 10	yes	316	2404/1, 5	yes
236	2350/1	yes	277	2371/33	yes	317	2416/7, 8	yes
237	2350/2	yes	278	2371/40, 42	yes	318	2416/27	yes
238	2350/4	yes	279	2371/48	yes	319	2428/28, 29, 30	yes
239	2350/24	yes	280	2372/1	yes	320	2441/4, 104, 107	yes
240	2350/26	yes	281	2372/5	yes	321	2441/41, 47	yes
241	2351/40, 2351/1	yes	282	2372/9	yes	321.1	2441/38	yes
242	2351/28	yes	283	2374/1	yes	322	2441/12	yes
243	2352/20	yes	284	2374/7	yes	323	2441/24	yes
244	2353/6, 8	yes	285	2374/27, 28, 31	yes	324	2442/11	yes
245	2353/13, 26, 28	yes	286	2375/1	yes	325	2442/21	yes
246	2357/1, 4	yes	287	2375/5	yes	326	2442/25	yes
247	2357/25	yes	288	2375/10	yes	327	2443/6, 37, 41	yes
248	2357/, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24	yes	289	2375/12	yes	328	2443/13	yes
249	2358/1, 38	yes	290	2375/16	yes	329	2443/23	yes
250	2358/4, 36	yes	291	2378/40	yes	330	2443/29, 30	yes
251	2358/6, 29, 31	yes	292	2378/1, 2, 3	yes	331	2444/2, 3, 4, 5	yes
252	2358/11, 14, 15	yes	293	2378/11	yes	332	2444/11	yes
253	2358/22	yes	294	2378/14	yes	333	2444/28	yes
254	2358/24, 25, 27, 28	yes	295	2378/21, 26	yes	334	2446/68	yes
255	2363/2, 3	yes	296	2378/29, 32	yes	335	2446/78	yes
256	2363/36, 38	yes	297	2378/35, 36	yes			
257	2363/9, 28	yes	298	2379/42, 43, 44	yes			
258	2363/20, 26	yes	299	2379/8, 9	yes			
259	2364/15, 16, 17	yes	300	2379/12, 13	yes			
260	2366/1	yes	301	2379/16, 19	yes			
261	2366/32	yes	302	2379/24, 27	yes			
262	2366/16, 21	yes	302.1	2381/1	yes			
263	2367/7	yes	303	2381/14, 15, 16	yes			
264	2367/15	yes	304	2382/28	yes			
265	2367/27, 28	yes	305	2384/8	yes			
266	2368/1	yes	306	2384/22, 23, 24, 25	yes			
267	2368/18, 19, 21, 22	yes	307	2386/7, 12, 14	yes			
268	2368/26, 27, 28	yes	308	2387/2	yes			

TABLE B
Projected Development Sites Receiving Air Quality (E)
Designation for HVAC Systems

Site	Block	Lot
60	2565	1
56c	2570	36
105	2721	11
199b	2332	1

TABLE C
Projected and Potential Development Sites Receiving Air
Quality (E) Designation for Industrial Sources

Site	Block	Lot
<i>Projected Development Sites</i>		
230	2344	26
<i>Potential Development Sites</i>		
52	2556	55, 57, 58
64	2571	18
69	2644	43
84	2714	33
85	2714	13
115	2723	29, 30
116	2723	33, 36
154	2736	20, 23

TABLE D
Development Sites Receiving (E) Designation for Noise

30 dBA Attenuation			
Site #	Block	Tax Lot	Minimum Required Building Attenuation (dBA)
<i>Projected Development Sites</i>			
3	2494	1	30
	2502	1	
	2472	2	
	2520	57	
	2510	1	
10	2483	11	30
	2483	12	
15	2483	25	30
19	2511	1	30
22	2512	60	30
26	2521	5	30
	2521	6	
	2521	7	
43	2539	29	30
	2539	27	
56	2567	1	30
	2570	36	
	2556	1	
	2564	1	
302.1	2381	1	30
314	2393	14	30
<i>Potential Development Sites</i>			
1	2472	410	30
2	2472	425	30
3.1	2472	32	30
	2494	6	
3.2	2472	100	30
20	2511	11	30
	2511	14	
21	2511	31	30
24	2520	1	30
27	2521	11	30
	2521	12	
	2521	13	
34	2530	1	30
	2530	55	
	2530	56	
36	2531	9	30
	2531	10	
	2531	110	
37	2531	12	30
38	2531	35	30
	2531	36	
40	2532	1	30

30 dBA Attenuation (continued)			
Site #	Block	Tax Lot	Minimum Required Building Attenuation (dBA)
41	2538	1	30
42	2539	1	30
	2539	8	
44	2543	1	30
51	2556	45	30
	2556	46	
52	2556	55	30
	2556	57	
	2556	58	
62	2570		30
67	2590	1	30
68	2590	210	30
	2590	215	
	2590	222	
142	2304	10	30
	2304	12	
	2304	13	
	2304	14	
298	2379	42	30
	2379	43	
	2379	44	
302	2379	24	30
	2379	27	
303	2381	14	30
	2381	15	
	2381	16	
306	2384	22	30
	2384	23	
	2384	24	
	2384	25	
315	2393	23	30
	2393	24	
316	2404	1	30
	2404	5	
35 dBA Attenuation			
<i>Projected Development Sites</i>			
199	2324	29	35
	2324	33	
<i>Potential Development Sites</i>			
222	2340	1	35
233	2346	30	35
234	2346	26	35
304	2382	28	35
317	2416	27	35
318	2416	27	35