THE CITY OF NEW YORK

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

NEW YORK, NY 10007

NOTICE OF COMPLETION
of the
FINAL SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
for the
PHASED REDEVELOPMENT OF GOVERNORS ISLAND
SOUTH ISLAND DEVELOPMENT ZONES

Lead Agency:	Office of the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Economic Development Hilary Semel, Assistant to the Mayor 100 Gold Street, 2nd Floor New York, NY 10038
CEQR Number:	11DME007M
SEQR Classification:	Type I
ULURP Numbers:	210127 ZMM, N210126 ZRM
Date Issued:	March 5, 2021
Location:	Block 1, Lot 10 Community District 1 Governors Island Borough of Manhattan

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review, Mayoral Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the City Environmental Quality Review Rules of Procedure found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York (CEQR), and the State Environmental Quality Review Act, Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law and its implementing regulations found in Part 617 of 6 NYCRR (SEQRA), a Final Second Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FSSGEIS) has been prepared for the actions described below and is available for public inspection from the office listed on the last page of this notice.

In accordance with SEQRA/CEQR, the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Economic Development (ODMHED) issued a Determination of Significance on August 23, 2018, requiring that a Second Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SSGEIS) be prepared for the Proposed Project. A Draft Scope of Work was made available to agencies and the public for review and comment. To provide a forum for public comments on the Draft Scope of Work, a public scoping meeting was held on September 26, 2018 at the Battery Maritime Building at 10 South Street, New York, New York, 10007. Written comments on the Draft Scope of Work were accepted until 5:00 PM on October 9, 2018. Based on comments received, a Final Scope of Work was prepared and issued on October 15, 2020 that describes the analyses determined to be appropriate for inclusion in the DSSGEIS.

A public hearing on the DSSGEIS was held remotely on February 3, 2021_by the City Planning Commission in conjunction with the Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP) Hearing. The comment period remained open through February 16, 2021.

A. INTRODUCTION

The Trust for Governor's Island is proposing to enable up to 4.5 million gross square feet of development on the South Island (the Proposed Project). The proposed density of development is intended to create a critical mass of active uses that would enliven the Island for 24/7 year-round usage and support the maintenance of the Island's open space and landscapes as well as the historic buildings on the North Island. This increase in density would also help finance improvements to infrastructure, including additional ferry service and expanded access.

The Proposed Actions include zoning text and map amendments and potential approval of capital funding. Specifically, the Special Governors Island District would be expanded to cover the entire Island and create new controls pertaining to the South Island. The underlying zoning for the South Island would be changed to a C4-1 mid-density commercial district, while the zoning for the North Island would remain R3-2. The Special Governors Island District controls applicable to the North Island would remain unchanged. The proposed zoning framework applicable to the South Island would provide controls for future development and facilitate the preservation and use of recreational open space on the South Island.

B. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND HISTORY

Governors Island Corporation, doing business as The Trust for Governors Island (the Trust), is a not-for-profit corporation and instrumentality of the City of New York. The Trust holds title to 150 acres of the 172-acre island located in Upper New York Bay, with the mission to transform Governors Island (the Island) into a vibrant resource for New York City, making the Island a destination with extraordinary public open space, as well as educational, not-for-profit, and commercial facilities. The remaining 22 acres of the Island are a National Monument owned by the National Park Service.

The Island is divided into two sections: (1) The "North Island" is the section of the Island north of Division Road and is approximately coterminous with the Governors Island Historic District (the Historic District), and (2) the "South Island" is the section of the Island south of Division Road, and is composed of nearly 80 acres. The South Island is home to vacant non-historic former Coast Guard buildings slated for demolition, 43 acres of new public open space completed in 2016 as part of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan for the Island, and approximately 33 acres designated in the same plan for future development consisting of East and West Development Zones (the Development Zones).

The Island is currently zoned as R3-2, and the Special Governors Island District is mapped on the North Island. Typically, R3-2 districts are general residence districts that allow a variety of low- to medium-density housing types. The Island is also subject to deed restrictions that both require and prohibit certain uses. The most significant restriction is the prohibition of permanent residential uses, except for specific non-permanent residential uses for short-term or extended stay accommodations. A rezoning of the North Island took place in 2013, establishing the Special Governors Island District and allowing a wide range of commercial,

recreational, cultural, and educational uses that are consistent with the character of the Historic District and provide flexibility in the adaptive reuse of the historic buildings.

The major access point for the Island is the Battery Maritime Building (BMB) in Lower Manhattan, where ferries owned by the Trust pick up and return visitors and freight. Additional weekend ferry service is provided from Pier 6 in Brooklyn to Yankee Pier on the Island, through service chartered by the Trust, and by an NYC Ferry shuttle from Pier 11 in Manhattan during the Island's public season. Since 2017, the Island has been open to the public every day of the week from May 1 to October 31 (the public access season).[1] The Island continues to host various arts, cultural, and recreational programs, including arts and educational festivals, concerts, and performances, and visitors to the Island can enjoy a variety of open spaces that allow for both passive and active recreation, including lawns, hills, ball fields, and play areas in a car-free environment.

A number of buildings on the Island are currently occupied by long-term active uses, including the Urban Assembly New York Harbor School (the Harbor School) in Buildings 134 and 550, a New York City public high school; Building 110, opened in Fall 2019 after a renovation by the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council (LMCC) to contain year-round artist workspaces, a gallery space, and a café. The QC Terme day spa has leased three historic buildings (Buildings 111, 112, and 114), which are currently under renovation for spa use with an expected opening date in 2021. The Trust, its contractors, and the Friends of Governors Island non-profit occupy year-round administrative offices in Building 108, as well as caretaker and ferry crew housing in Ft. Jay. The Trust issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) in March 2020 to find several multi-year, year-round arts and cultural tenants to lease space in Buildings 9 and 20 in Nolan Park.

Redevelopment of the Island was previously analyzed in two documents:

- *Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island,* issued by the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development (ODMED) in December 2011 (the 2011 Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement [FGEIS]). The 2011 FGEIS analyzed potential future development of the Island as follows: Phase 1 (2013), which comprised park and open space development now completed and the Later Phases (through 2030), which included subsequent phases of development. The Later Phases—Park and Public Space development consisted of proposed open space development established in a Park and Public Space Master Plan (the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan) developed by the Trust with significant public input. The Later Phases—Island Redevelopment included two components: redevelopment of the North Island Historic Structures and development within two designated South Island Development Zones.
- *Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island,* issued by the ODMED on May 23, 2013 (2013 FSGEIS). The 2013 FSGEIS analyzed the creation of the Special Governors Island District on the North Island; the reuse and reactivation of approximately 1.2 million square feet (sf) of space on the North Island, in addition to the 176,000 sf already in use in 2013; and the completion of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. In addition, a new structure was contemplated on the open area north of Building 110, immediately west of Soissons Landing (the Soissons Concession Site). Ferry service seven days per week to support the uses in the reactivated buildings and the expanded park and public spaces was also anticipated. The 2013 FSGEIS also considered the development of the two Development Zones by 2030 based on generic development programs (a university research option and a mixed use option including faculty and student housing and offices uses) since there were no specific development plans or proposals for those areas. The overall floor area was anticipated to be three million sf for the entire Island.

[1] Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 public access season did not begin until July 15th, and ferry service for the 2020 public access season was modified to allow for adequate social distancing space while both queuing and riding the ferries. As part of these modifications, the seasonal weekend ferry service to Brooklyn was relocated from Pier 6 in Brooklyn Bridge Park to Red Hook/Atlantic Basin.

As anticipated in both the 2011 FGEIS and the 2013 FSGEIS, the Second Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SSGEIS) considers the potential impacts of the proposed development of the Eastern and Western Development Zones and accessory actions in the context of the previously approved and developed park and public spaces as well as the previously approved renovation and reactivation of the North Island.

PROPOSED ACTIONS

In order to develop the South Island as anticipated, the following discretionary actions are contemplated:

- Zoning Map and Text Amendments to:
  - Expand the Special Governors Island District to the South Island and create new controls pertaining to the South Island; and
  - Change the underlying zoning on the South Island from R3-2 to a C4-1 mid-density commercial district.
- Approval of capital funding. The source has yet to be identified.

The expansion of the Special Governors Island District to the South Island would include the creation of new subdistricts, a Northern Subdistrict coterminous with the Historic District, and a Southern Subdistrict encompassing the remainder of the Island. Within the Southern Subdistrict, there would be three subareas: an Eastern Subarea coterminous with the Eastern Development Zone; a Western Subarea coterminous with Western Development Zone; and an Open Space Subarea containing the remaining area of the Southern Subdistrict, including the completed elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, as well as the unrealized elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan that will be completed as funding allows. The underlying R3-2 zoning and existing Special Governors Island District controls that are applicable to the Northern Subdistrict would remain unchanged. The maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) on the two Development Zones would go from 0.5 to 2.98; the special district text would create a maximum envelope of 4.275 million zoning square feet (zsf) of floor area within the two Development Zones, which can be transferred between them.

The C4-1 zoning district and the additional controls of the special district would enable approximately 4.5 million gross square feet (gsf) of development on the South Island Development Zones as well as more than six acres of new publicly accessible open spaces within or adjacent to the Development Zones. The proposed zoning framework applicable to the Southern Subdistrict would also define parcels for development within the newly created Eastern and Western Subareas, require primary and secondary connections within or adjacent to the development parcels, provide design controls for new and existing open spaces within and adjacent to the development parcels, specify permitted uses, restrict base height and overall building height and length, require setbacks, provide articulation requirements, restrict lot coverage, limit the maximum floor area, and provide design controls pertaining to upper portions of buildings. New zoning text applicable within the newly created Open Space Subarea would include use and bulk regulations that facilitate the preservation and use of recreational open space on the South Island, including the large central open space.

In addition to commitments made in the 2011 FGEIS and the 2013 FSGEIS to consider potential new impacts as development plans are advanced, the proposed rezoning of the South Island is subject to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) and the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Economic Development (ODMHED, formerly ODMED) is the lead agency for the preparation of the SSGEIS, with the Trust and the New York City Department of Small Business Services as co-applicants. The anticipated completion year remains 2030.

BACKGROUND AND PLANNING HISTORY

The Island's use as an American military and then U.S. Coast Guard base came to an end in 1996. Subsequently, a portion of the Island that includes two forts—Fort Jay and Castle Williams—was designated a National Monument in 2001; this National Monument and the remainder of the North Island were also designated as a National Historic Landmark District that is also a New York City Historic District and listed

on the State and National Registers of Historic Places, all with coterminous boundaries. In 2003, the Federal government deeded the 150-acre balance of the Island to the Governors Island Preservation and Education Corporation (GIPEC). GIPEC was established in 2002 as a subsidiary of the Empire State Development Corporation (ESDC) with responsibility for the Island. In July 2010, primary responsibility for the long-term ownership, development, funding, operation, and governance of the Island was transferred to New York City and is now under the direction of the Trust, the successor organization to GIPEC, and an instrumentality of the City of New York. The Island is subject to deed restrictions established by the Federal government as part of the transfer of the Island to GIPEC that both requires and prohibits certain uses and that stipulated development of public benefit uses on the Island.

The results of pre-planning efforts initiated after GIPEC took control of the Island were incorporated into the Governors Island Land Use Improvement and Civic Project General Project Plan (GPP), which both the GIPEC and ESDC boards adopted in January 2006.

When control of the Island was transferred from the State to the City in 2010, the City approved a zoning override to allow existing interim uses that support the public's use and enjoyment of the park to continue while the Trust initiated the process for the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. To further the Trust's goals, a Park and Public Space Master Plan was developed in 2010 that established the fundamental concepts for the design of the Island's parks and public spaces. The 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan also set aside the two Development Zones for future mixed-use development.

In 2005, a portion of the Historic District was opened to the public and since then, more of the Island has been opened to the public, a greater variety of programming has been added, more frequent ferry service has been provided, and the hours of operation for the public spaces have been increased. Extensive landscape construction in 2015 and early 2016 allowed the Trust to open the new South Island open spaces to the public in the summer of 2016, and the Island received 745,123 visitors in 2019.

PROJECTS PERMITTED BY PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS

Prior to the disposition of the Island from the Federal Government to New York State, a Final Environmental Impact Statement was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and completed in November of 1998. Additional environmental reviews were undertaken as planning for the Island has developed.

2008 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

In 2008, an Environmental Assessment Form was prepared and a Negative Declaration was issued for GIPEC's Enhanced Public Access program, which included the following: the relocation of the Harbor School to the Island, enhanced public access to portions of the South Island, a temporary food and entertainment facility, and conversion of Building 110 to artists' studios as well as demolition of the South Island buildings and some North Island buildings that did not contribute to the Historic District. The program has been implemented, except that demolition of several remaining South Island buildings is still to be completed.

2011 FGEIS

As discussed above, ODMED issued the FGEIS for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island in 2011. Because a number of aspects of the plan were yet to be determined at that time, their potential impacts were studied generically with the commitment to further analysis when more details were determined.

The 2011 FGEIS analyzed in detail an initial phase that consisted of park and public space development and infrastructure improvements, which were completed in 2013. The 2011 FGEIS also analyzed, generically, the "Later Phases," which included additional open space improvements identified in the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan but not funded at the time, as well as mixed-use development on the Island, specifically, the reactivation of the North Island buildings and development in the two Development Zones on the South Island.

The Later Phases were expected to comprise park and public spaces and Island redevelopment involving both reuse and reactivation of existing historic buildings on the North Island and new construction in the two Development Zones. Both were expected to occur over time and be complete by 2030.

The Later Phases-Park and Public Spaces were to provide 43 acres of newly designed open space through the center and perimeter of the South Island (9 acres of which would be newly opened to the public). The planned open spaces that have been completed include the Hills, Hammock Grove, Play Lawn, Oval, Liggett Terrace, and Parade Ground. Planned open spaces that would completed by 2030 as funding becomes available are Liberty Terrace, Yankee Landing, a widened Great Promenade at the perimeter of the Island, and the South Prow.

On the North Island, the Later Phases-Island Redevelopment examined the 2011 FGEIS assumed that the approximately 1.35 million sf of potential development space available in existing historic structures on the North Island would be reactivated. As part of the proposed reuse, it was assumed that the historic buildings would be restored. For the Development Zones, the 2011 FGEIS assumed that up to approximately 1.65 million sf would be built on these two areas. The 1.65 million sf reflected the built floor area that existed on the South Island when it was used as a Coast Guard base.

The 2011 FGEIS examined two development scenarios for the three million sf of space available between the North Island historic structures and the Development Zones. The first was a primarily University/Research Option and the second was a Mixed-Use Option. These options did not represent any existing plans or proposals for the Island; rather, they were generalized estimates based on the type and configurations of existing buildings, the underlying conditions of the Island itself, uses required and permitted under the deed, and the general level of inquiries received by the Trust for various uses on the Island. The initial phase of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan improvements were completed in 2013.

2013 FSGEIS

As noted above, the 2013 FSGEIS analyzed the creation of the Special Governors Island District on the North Island including: the reuse and reactivation of approximately 1.2 million sf of space on the North Island; and the completion of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. Ferry service seven days per week to support the uses in the reactivated buildings and the expanded park and public spaces was also anticipated. This additional development was assumed to be complete by 2022.

The 2013 FSGEIS also considered the development of the two Development Zones by 2030 based on generic development programs (a University/Research Option and a Mixed-Use Option including faculty and student housing and offices uses) since there were no specific development plans or proposals for those areas. The overall floor area for the entire Island was anticipated to be 3 million sf. It was assumed that the redevelopment of the Development Zones would require zoning and other land use actions that would be subject to future environmental review, at which time detailed analyses of the redevelopment of the Development Zones would be conducted.

Special Governors Island District

Creation of the Special Governors Island District through zoning map and text amendments on the North Island generally allowed commercial uses including, but not limited to hotels, offices, restaurants, retail, arts and crafts galleries, entertainment events and uses, and related uses compatible with the recreational, cultural, and educational resources, with certain new uses or establishments larger than 7,500 sf subject to review by Manhattan Community Board 1. The Special Governors Island District was mapped as an overlay on the existing R3-2 zoning district, which remained in place. The Special Governors Island District text and mapping were intended to serve as a catalyst for the reactivation and reuse of the North Island's historic structures. There were no changes to underlying R3-2 zoning designation, and the 2010 zoning override remains applicable.

Reactivation of Buildings on the North Island (2022)

The reuse and reactivation of the approximately 1.2 million sf of space on the North Island, in addition to the approximately 261,000 gsf currently activated, was an important goal of the Proposed Project as analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS. As part of the reactivation, the review of all proposed restorations of historic buildings will be informed by the *Governors Island Historic District Preservation and Design Manual* (*Preservation and Design Manual*) that was developed in connection with the disposition of the Island to GIPEC in 2003. The *Preservation and Design Manual* was created to help guide the adaptive reuse of the Historic District and ensure preservation of the historic and architectural resources that contribute to the Island's importance. Review of the project actions in the Governors Island Historic District by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) was conducted under the New York City Landmarks Law and/or Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) (as appropriate) pursuant to the *Preservation and Design Manual.*

Full Development of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan (2022)

Originally identified in the 2011 FGEIS as the "Later Phases – Park and Public Spaces," these open space improvements consist of 43 acres of newly designed open space through the center and perimeter of the South Island (nine acres of which was to be newly opened to the public).[2] The majority of these open space improvements have already been completed, and the remainder are expected to be completed by 2030 as funding allows.

Completed open space improvements include Liggett Terrace, Hammock Grove, the Oval, the Play Lawn, the Hills. Liggett Terrace includes, surrounding Liggett Hall, includes passive open space features and amenities. Hammock Grove, located to the south of Liggett Terrace includes rolling terrain planted with a dense grove of trees. The Oval, further to the south, and The Play Lawn, located to the east of The Oval and Hammock Grove, is composed of regulation-sized ball fields as well as smaller open areas with rolling topography. The Hills, located in the southernmost portion of the Island, rise up to 70 feet, include landscaped pathways, and provide extensive views of New York Bay.

The Great Promenade is a 2.2-mile path around the perimeter of the Island, currently open for walkers, bikers, runners, and limited vehicular traffic, but remains in an uncompleted condition.

The Great Promenade was originally planned in the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan to have two levels in certain areas if the upland grade is changed to elevate it out of the flood plain. A two-level Great Promenade remains a possibility, depending on the future grade of the Development Zones and available funding. The remaining open space elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan to be completed by 2030 as funding allows include Liberty Terrace, Yankee Landing, and the South Prow. Liberty Terrace was designed as a gathering area on the west side of the Island adjacent to the Great Promenade, and a new structure, The Shell, was designed to provide protected outdoor seating and space for a food concession. Improvements to Yankee Landing on the east side of the Island were designed to welcome future tenants and visitors using the ferry to Yankee Pier, and includes the construction of a new open canopy ferry shelter. At the southern end of the Island, a three-acre Wetland Garden will be excavated out of the existing Island where Picnic Point and an undeveloped portion of the Island outside of the Development Zones currently exist. This garden will be planted with a variety of salt-tolerant wetland plants, and the final design of it will depend on the future grade of the Development Zones.

Additional Ferry Service

To support the active new uses planned for the historic buildings on the North Island and an increase in visitors to the new park and public spaces, the 2013 FSGEIS anticipated that additional and expanded ferry service

[2] As discussed below, these park and public space improvements were analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and approved. The FGEIS assumed that these would be completed in 2030; however, the SGEIS anticipated their completion by 2022, and many of these open space improvements are complete as of 2020.

would occur by 2022. As reactivation has proceeded more gradually than contemplated in the 2013 FSGEIS, ferry service has also expanded more incrementally.

South Island Development Zones (2030)

Similar to the 2011 FGEIS, the 2013 FSGEIS considered two generic development programs for the Development Zones defined for the environmental analysis. The program assumed that new buildings on the South Island could be designed for academic, research, office, cultural, entertainment, and/or a conference center/hotel uses. Any remaining floor area in the Development Zones was expected to be used for some combination of not-for-profit offices, such as think-tanks or small organizations affiliated with academic and/or research institution uses; for-profit commercial office uses; offices for the Trust and Island contractors; maintenance and service space for Trust and Island operations; water transportation support uses; cultural uses including small galleries or museums; entertainment uses; other commercial uses; associated retail; and educational uses similar to the Harbor School located on the North Island.

As previously analyzed, the two Development Zones were anticipated in the 2013 FSGEIS to provide approximately 1.625 million sf of active uses to support and enliven the Island.

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

Changes to the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island as most recently analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS that now require analysis in a SSGEIS focus on the two Development Zones. The West Development Zone (approximately six acres), coterminous with the Western Subarea of the proposed Southern Subdistrict of the Special Governors Island District faces New York Bay. The East Development Zone (approximately 27 acres), coterminous with the Eastern Subarea of the proposed Southern Subdistrict of the Special Governors Island District faces Buttermilk Channel.

Although the two Development Zones have been anticipated development sites since 2010 and were considered in both the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS as such, the Trust is currently proposing to enable up to 4.5 million gsf of development on the South Island within the two Development Zones as part of the Proposed Project. The proposed development on the South Island would exceed the previously anticipated development, which totaled approximately three million sf, including approximately 1.375 million sf on the North Island and approximately 1.625 million sf on the South Island, and would require zoning changes as well as infrastructure and transportation improvements to support the occupants and uses.

The Proposed Project could continue to include university, dormitories, hotels, biotech/research laboratories, office space, cultural and accessory service retail, restaurant, and conference center uses as well as maintenance uses. Two scenarios for the land use programs have been identified for analysis purposes (see **Table 1**). One is a University/Research Option in which a majority of the development area would be dedicated to university and dormitory land uses. There would also be an approximately 410,000-gsf hotel (1,363 rooms), 1.5 million gsf of biotech/research space, approximately 459,000 gsf of cultural uses, service retail and a conference center, and maintenance and support facilities. The second is a Mixed-Use Option, which would dedicate approximately 1.705 million gsf to office use. This option would also have an approximately 410,000-gsf hotel (1,363 rooms), 1.5 million gsf of biotech/research space, service retail and a conference center, 140,000 gsf of maintenance and support facilities, while the cultural use area would be approximately 59,000 gsf.

Table 1
2020 SSGEIS South Island Development Options

Land Use	University/Research Option	Mixed-Use Option
University	1,170,000 gsf	360,000 gsf
Housing – Student Dorms	556,079 gsf (1,390 beds)	136,079 gsf (340 beds)
Hotel	408,832 gsf (1,363 rooms)	408,832 gsf (1,363 rooms)
BioTech/Research	1,500,000 gsf	1,500,000 gsf
Office	75,223 gsf	1,705,223 gsf

Cultural	459,101 gsf	59,101 gsf
Service Retail/Restaurant (Not destination, accessory to Island)	147,208 gsf	147,208 gsf
Conference Center (Not destination, accessory to Island)	43,582 gsf	43,582 gsf
Maintenance, Support, Other	140,000 gsf	140,000 gsf
Total South Island Development	**4,500,025 gsf**	**4,500,025 gsf**

The proposed density of development is needed to create a critical mass of active uses that would enliven the Island for 24/7 year-round usage and support the maintenance of the Island's open space and landscapes as well as the historic buildings on the North Island. This increase in density would also help finance improvements to infrastructure, including additional ferry service and expanded access.

The Proposed Actions include zoning text and map amendments. Specifically, the Special Governors Island District would be expanded to cover the entire Island, a Northern Subdistrict coterminous with the North Island and its Historic District, and a Southern Subdistrict encompassing the remainder of the Island. Within the Southern Subdistrict there would be three subareas: an Eastern Subarea coterminous with the Eastern Development Zone, a Western Subarea coterminous with Western Development Zone, and an Open Space Subarea containing the remaining area of the South Island. The underlying zoning for the South Island would be changed to a C4-1 mid-density commercial zoning district, while the zoning for the North Island would remain R3-2. No modifications of the deed restrictions are proposed and the Special Governors Island District controls applicable to the North Island would remain unchanged. The proposed zoning framework applicable to the South Island would provide controls for future development and facilitate the preservation and use of recreational open space on the South Island.

To accommodate the additional population on the South Island, is it anticipated that use of the BMB would be limited to passengers and additional passenger ferries would be required to expand capacity and increase headways, while vehicle and freight access to the Island would move to the Brooklyn waterfront and may depart from multiple potential locations. For analysis purposes, the freight departure locations considered are assumed to include the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Atlantic Basin, the South Brooklyn Marine Terminal (39th Street), and the 52nd Street Pier. While specific plans for freight deliveries would be developed in connection with the selection of future occupants of the South Island, the potential locations described above are studied in the SSGEIS to consider the potential environmental impacts of the freight transfer operations under a reasonable worst-case development scenario. Potential locations for freight handling were identified in coordination with the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC) and relevant agencies, and additional discretionary actions (e.g., land use actions and lease agreements) would likely be required.

In addition to the transportation infrastructure required to support development on the South Island, utility upgrades would also be required. These include, but are not limited to, a second water main service from Brooklyn to the Island required to provide additional water pressure to the system, as well as expanded on-Island power infrastructure and water/sewer distribution infrastructure. Some of these infrastructure projects would be subject to additional required review and approvals.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The purpose and need for the overall Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island is to activate the Island into a year-round resource for New Yorkers after centuries of use as a military base. The creation of new academic, research, cultural, and/or mixed-use facilities and additional public open space is not only an important public benefit, but it is also a catalyst for Island redevelopment.

Redevelopment of the two Development Zones would allow the Trust to increase its capacity to maintain and care for over 100 acres of public open space, increase transportation options, and would provide revenue to support year-round public access. Absent the Proposed Project, the Trust would likely be unable to facilitate the opening of the Island to the public year-round and public access would likely remain limited to the months of May through October. Rent revenues would help increase the financial resources and staff to support 24-

hour/7-day-a-week activity on the Island. The revenues generated from the Development Zones would also support the on-going effort to activate and invest in the historic buildings on the North Island and allow further investment in preservation and maintenance. Ultimately, the Proposed Project would fulfill the Trust's mission to transform the Island into a vibrant resource for New York City, making the Island a destination with extraordinary public open spaces, as well as educational, not-for-profit, and commercial facilities while helping to ensure the Island's financial self-sufficiency.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

ISLAND DEVELOPMENT SINCE THE 2013 FSGEIS

A number of developments on the Island have been completed since the 2013 FSGEIS. The first 30 acres of the new open spaces on the South Island opened to the public in 2014. When funding becomes available, the Trust will complete the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan with further improvements to the areas referred to as the Great Promenade, South Prow, Yankee Landing, and Liberty Terrace.

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Because the two Development Zones were not previously programmed or designed, studies were undertaken to establish design guidelines for zoning controls based on the following Guiding Principles:

1. Complement and enhance the park and public spaces and respond to environmental conditions.
2. Connect and establish a harmonious relationship with the park, esplanade, and Historic District.
3. Retain and frame views within the Island, and towards Upper New York Bay, Lower Manhattan, and the Brooklyn waterfront.
4. Activate building edges along public spaces.
5. Promote innovative design approaches to achieve a high level of resiliency and environmental sustainability.
6. Encourage flexibility to accommodate a wide range of building types and mix of uses.

The design guidelines are as follows:

Provide Access to the Island and Circulation on the Island

As noted above, the main access to the Island is provided from the BMB to Soissons Landing by ferries owned by the Trust. NYC Ferry operates seasonally from Pier 11 in Manhattan to Yankee Pier, and the Trust charters a private ferry on summer weekends from Brooklyn Pier 6 in Brooklyn Bridge Park bringing visitors to Yankee Pier. Freight deliveries and refuse/ recyclables collection currently operates from the BMB to Soissons Landing or to Lima Pier in the future, but the off-Island landing point is anticipated to move to the Brooklyn waterfront due to physical space constraints within the existing BMB terminal, extremely limited staging and queuing on South Street, and increased passenger traffic through the BMB. Freight may come from multiple locations on the Brooklyn waterfront and would unload at Lima Pier on the Island. The Proposed Project would increase the number and frequency of ferries for pedestrians and bring more ferries from the BMB to Yankee Pier for easier access to the two Development Zones. With the increased ferries to Yankee Pier, the direct connection from Yankee Pier to Division Road would be an important access corridor to both Development Zones, as well as the southern parts of the North Island. There would be access to the Western Development Zone from Soissons Landing or Yankee Pier along existing paths on the Island.

Respect Context

Respect for the context, including both the Historic District on the North Island, Island landscapes, and the existing park and open spaces in the middle of the South Island, is a key consideration for future development within the Development Zones. It is expected that current views on the South Island will change as the recently planted trees and other landscaping materials grow, mature and become taller. Views from the central open spaces on the South Island to the two Development Zones are important as are the views from Liggett Terrace and the Hills. The proposed buildings would be respectful of the existing Historic District and a transition

zone would be created in the zoning text such that buildings could not exceed 60 feet in height within 150 feet of the Historic District.

Establish Hierarchy of Paths and Nodes

The proposed zoning text creates a series of new pathways, a minimum number of which must be constructed in certain approved zones to connect the new development to the waterfront, the park, and the existing road network. Key paths would include the Great Promenade and Division Road. Another path would run roughly parallel to the Great Promenade from the east side of Liggett Hall south to the south end of the East Development Zone and two paths would run roughly perpendicular to the Great Promenade at the eastern edge of the Island to the open spaces in the center of the Island. Secondary connections would run through the Eastern and Western Development Zones to provide additional pedestrian connections between the central open spaces and the Great Promenade. Key nodes would include the junction of Yankee Pier and Division Road and the Oval Lawn adjacent to the East Development Zone.

Promote Density Adjacent to Transportation

Since the ferries to the Development Zones would operate from Yankee Pier, the greatest density of development would likely be located in the area near Yankee Pier.

Resilient Development

This principle responds to climate adaptation and resiliency concerns and is intended to protect future development from flooding caused by projected sea level rise and storm surges. Most of the waterfront areas of the South Island, as well as the waterfront areas of the North Island, are located within the 1 percent annual chance flood plain (100-year floodplain). Portions of the remaining Island, particularly around Liggett Hall, are located within the 0.2 percent annual chance annual flood plain (500-year floodplain). The central portion of the North Island is not located in a flood hazard area. Most of the new South Island's central open spaces were elevated above the 100-year floodplain, and in some cases, were elevated above the 500-year floodplain. With both Development Zones being located on the portion of the Island that was created with fill material, and being within the 100-year floodplain, resiliency is a key consideration and potentially involves elevating the grade of the sites or using new building typologies, including but not limited to, wet and/or dry flood-proofing measures and incorporating flood-damage-resistant materials. Any new construction in the Development Zones would comply with the requirements of Appendix G of the NYC Building Code.

Connect Park through Development Zones

The paths identified above as roughly perpendicular to the Great Promenade would create new pedestrian connections and view corridors from the central open spaces to the Great Promenade and from the Great Promenade to the open spaces in the center of the Island.

Transition from the North Island

An established transition zone that extends 150 feet to the south of the Historic District boundary would provide for a harmonious and respectful relationship between the historic buildings on the north side of Division Road and new construction south of Division Road. No portion of a building within the transition zone could exceed the maximum base height established.

As the densest development is intended to be close to the ferry landing at Yankee Pier, where most South Island tenants are expected to arrive, a new 25,000-sf public space, known as Yankee Pier Plaza, would be created at the northern end of the East Development Zone adjacent to the Historic District to accommodate the ferry passengers and the movement of pedestrians toward various sections of the Island.

Rationalize Development Zones through Parcelization

The paths through the East Development Zone would create regular and more feasible development parcels approximately the size of a standard city block, while allowing for a variety of potential building shapes and arrangements.

PROPOSED ACTIONS

Various discretionary approvals would be required for the Proposed Project, as follows:

- Zoning Map and Text Amendments to:
  - Expand the Special Governors Island District to the South Island and create new controls pertaining to the South Island, and
  - Change the underlying zoning on the South Island from R3-2 to a C4-1 mid-density commercial district.
- Approval of capital funding. The source has yet to be identified.

These actions are described in more detail below.

SPECIAL GOVERNORS ISLAND DISTRICT EXPANSION

The Special Governors Island District would be expanded to cover the entire Island as part of the proposed zoning map amendment. A new Northern Subdistrict would be established in approximately the location of the existing Special Governors Island District, and the existing Special Governors Island District controls applicable to the North Island would remain unchanged within this subdistrict. A new Southern Subdistrict would be established covering all portions of the South Island within the expanded Special Governors Island District. Within the Southern Subdistrict, three subareas would be established. A new Eastern Subarea, coterminous with the Eastern Development Zone, and a new Western Subarea, coterminous with the Western Development Zone, would provide zoning controls for each Development Zone, respectively. Specifically, new zoning text applicable within the South Island subareas would define parcels for development within the newly created Eastern and Western Subareas, provide design controls for open spaces with and adjacent to the development parcels, specify permitted uses, restrict base height and overall building height and length, require setbacks, provide articulation requirements, restrict lot coverage, limit the maximum floor area, and provide design controls pertaining to upper portions of buildings. Additionally, a new Open Space Subarea would be established within the Southern Subdistrict. New zoning text applicable within the Open Space Subarea would include use and bulk regulations that facilitate the preservation and use of recreational open space on the South Island. No modifications of the deed restrictions are proposed.

PROPOSED REZONING

The underlying zoning on the South Island would be changed from the existing R3-2 to a C4-1 mid-density commercial district, while the underlying zoning district on the North Island will remain R3-2. R3-2 districts are intended for low-density residential development from single-family houses to small apartment buildings and allow a FAR of 0.5, while C4-1 districts allow 1.0 FAR, but the text of the proposed zoning framework would allow up to 2.98 FAR with a maximum of 4.275 million zsf of floor area within the Development Zones. Typically, C4 districts are mapped in regional commercial centers and allow a variety of uses including dormitories, hotels, academic buildings, office buildings, and cultural institutions. The permitted uses and densities, however, would be specified by the Special Governors Island District text and limited by the Island's deed restrictions.

CAPITAL FUNDING

The Proposed Project would entail further improvements to the Island and the infrastructure serving it. Improvements that may be financed through capital funding could include expanded ferry service, completion of the remaining elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, and other required infrastructure upgrades to support new development and a larger population on the Island. Further improvements that may require capital funding could also be identified in the future.

OTHER APPROVALS

For the Development Zones, it is expected that New York City Department of Buildings (DOB) building permits would be required for any new structures. In addition, there would be New York City Fire Department approvals for emergency and fire access and fire hydrants.

Other approvals may include a Coastal Zone Consistency determination and State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) for stormwater discharge issues; DEC and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permits for in-water work, and DEC air permits or approvals related to potential future research/academic laboratory uses, if required. There may also be additional approvals required for the use of freight handling sites in Brooklyn.

Renovation of any historic structures on the North Island as part of the reactivation process analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS will be subject to review and approval by the LPC and OPRHP.

D. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK AND SCREENING ANALYSES

ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

SEQRA requires a lead agency to take a "hard look" at the potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and, to the maximum extent practicable, avoid or mitigate potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment, consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is a comprehensive document used to systematically consider environmental effects, evaluate reasonable alternatives, and identify and mitigate, to the maximum extent practicable, any potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. The EIS provides a means for the lead and involved agencies to consider environmental factors and choose among alternatives in their decision-making processes related to a proposed action.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL GENERIC ENVRIONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (SSGEIS)

A generic environmental impact statement (GEIS) is a broader, more general EIS that analyzes the impacts of a concept or overall plan rather than those of a specific project plan. A GEIS is useful when the details of a specific impact cannot be accurately identified, since no site-specific project has been proposed, but a broad set of further projects is likely to result from the agency's actions. A GEIS follows the same format as an EIS for a more specific project, but its content is necessarily broader.

Subsequent discretionary actions under the program studied in a GEIS may require further review under CEQR. According to 6 NYCRR Section 617.10, "GEISs and their findings should set forth specific conditions or criteria under which future actions will be undertaken or approved, including requirements for any subsequent SEQRA compliance." Therefore, as with the *Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island* (2011 FGEIS) and *Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island* (2013 FSGEIS), the SSGEIS, where appropriate, discusses possible conditions under which further environmental review would be required (e.g., increases in the size of the development program, identification of additional ancillary facilities in other locations). Often, a GEIS is used as the foundation for the subsequent environmental review for a site-specific project, since it would have established the analysis framework. Therefore, the subsequent supplemental environmental review need only target the specific narrow impacts associated with the subsequent action. In some technical areas, the changes examined in the SSGEIS for 2030 will make no significant difference to the conclusions that were presented in the previous FGEIS and FSGEIS for 2030. For these technical areas—socioeconomics and natural resources—detailed screening assessments are summarized at the end of this section.

In particular, the reasons for preparing the SSGEIS under the requirements of SEQRA and CEQR guidelines are that the anticipated uses of the Development Zones and the proposed zoning actions are now better known,

the scale of development is greater than previously studied, and the anticipated uses would require expanded ferry service including more vessels and more frequent trips. The document remains generic in that neither the program associated with the Development Zones nor the structures to house that development are specifically proposed. Therefore, the studies contained in the SSGEIS will necessarily be less detailed than if specific building uses and designs were available and will focus on identifying potential associated environmental concerns. To the extent required under CEQR/SEQRA in connection with future discretionary actions, it is possible that further environmental review may be necessary when certain, as yet undefined components of the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island are identified.

Methodology

The Proposed Actions would change the regulatory controls governing land use and development on the Island through the modification and expansion of the Special Governors Island District, facilitating the development of the Proposed Project. Accessory actions including the provision of capital funding (the source of which has not yet been identified) would also promote the proposed development on the South Island. The SSGEIS considers the potential impacts of the proposed development of the Development Zones and accessory actions in the context of the previously approved and developed park and public spaces (analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS) as well as the previously approved renovation and reactivation of the North Island (analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS). The SSGEIS considers alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the technical analyses, if any, and identifies mitigation for such impacts, to the extent practicable. The approach to the analysis framework is discussed further below.

Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario

Analysis Year

Similar to the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS, the SSGEIS considers the impacts of the Proposed Project based on two different generic development programs (described below) as no specific development program for these areas has been selected. Full build out of the Development Zones is expected to be completed in 2030, coinciding with the full reactivation of the North Island and the completion of later phases of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan as analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS. 2030 therefore serves as the analysis year for the SSGEIS. It is anticipated that in the future, the Trust will issue an RFP to enter into one or more long-term lease agreements with public and/or private entities to develop the Development Zones for uses permitted under the deed restrictions and proposed zoning. Potential impacts are considered cumulatively by assessing the full development of the Island, including those project components that would be completed before the 2030 analysis year.

Study Areas

In general, the study areas for the SSGEIS analyses include the Development Zones and the Island, including that portion of the Island owned by the National Park Service and not belonging to the Trust. Depending on the specific analysis, study areas may also include the area within 400 feet of the ferry landing at Pier 6 in Brooklyn Bridge Park and the area within 400 feet of the BMB in Lower Manhattan. Additional study areas in Brooklyn at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Atlantic Basin, the South Brooklyn Marine Terminal at 39th Street, and the 52nd Street Pier are examined for implications related to the transportation of freight to the Island.

Existing Conditions

For each technical area assessed in the SSGEIS, the existing conditions on the Island and in the relevant study areas is described.[3] The analysis framework begins with an assessment of existing conditions, because these

[3] The existing conditions cited in the SSGEIS are based on recent data collected prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has resulted in a number of temporary changes to conditions on the Island, including changes to short-term visitorship patterns. The length of the 2020 public access season was shortened (July 15th through October 31st), the National Monument remains temporarily closed, and the number of visitors who can access the Island via ferry is artificially constrained to maintain appropriate social distancing precautions on ferry routes. It is reasonable to expect that as the pandemic subsides and the region reopens, that such visitorship patterns will resume and the existing conditions described in this section will remain.

can be most directly measured and observed. The assessment of existing conditions serves as a starting point for the projection of conditions in the No Action Condition and the With Action Condition, and the analysis of potential impacts that could result from the Proposed Project.

Future without the Proposed Project

The SSGEIS assumes that in the No Action Condition, there would be no changes to the Island's zoning and consequently no new construction in the Development Zones or increased ferry service necessary to serve such development. The Island is assumed to continue to operate much the same as it does today. Visitation is dependent on certain factors that can be controlled, such as access the Island (number of operating days and hours, ferry capacity, and frequency). Public outreach and enhancements will continue to make the Island a highly visited summer weekend destination and, since 2017, one that has become a highly visited seven-days-a-week destination during the six-month-long public season as well. Absent the Proposed Project, it is anticipated that the Trust would likely be unable to extend this public season to year-round, and public access would likely remain limited to May through October. The open spaces on the Island would continue to be open to the public on a seasonal basis only, the buildings on the North Island will continue to be renovated and occupied by new uses as market demand allows, but the Development Zones would remain fenced-off and closed to the public.

As described above, approximately 1.1 million gsf of vacant space in the historic buildings on the North Island is currently available for renovation and reactivation, and the SSGEIS conservatively assumes that the entirety of this space will be reactivated in the No Action Condition pursuant to previous approvals. However, the reactivation and maintenance of these structures in the No Action Condition would lack the support provided by revenue generated through South Island development under the With Action Condition. Similar to the currently Proposed Project, the 2013 FSGEIS analyzing the reactivation of the North Island historic buildings considered two options for analysis, a University/Research Option and a Mixed-Use Option; this SSGEIS uses the With Action Condition analyzed and approved in the 2013 FSGEIS for the North Island as a baseline for technical areas such as the transportation section, in which a specific program option is assumed in the No Action Condition.

Only limited improvements are anticipated on the South Island under the No Action Condition. Existing landscaping materials and trees would mature and grow taller. It is assumed that the elements of the later phases of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan not yet built, including further improvements to Picnic Point and the completion of the 2.2-mile Great Promenade, will be built by 2030 as funding allows, completing the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. However, there would be no new construction in the Development Zones due to the constraints of the existing zoning. There would be no new buildings or accompanying academic and commercial users working or living in those buildings, enlivening the open spaces of the Island.

Future with the Proposed Project

In the With Action Condition, the proposed discretionary actions would be adopted facilitating the Proposed Project. The East and West Development Zones on the South Island, which were designated in the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan and previously evaluated for development in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS, would be redeveloped with new construction. Under the Proposed Project, the Development Zones could include up to a total of approximately 4,500,025 gsf of new development, limited by a maximum zoning floor area of 4,275,000 zsf on the South Island. The land uses identified for the Development Zones under the Proposed Project have different population characteristics. For example, university housing uses could generate on-site non-permanent residents whereas office or research uses would not. Other uses, including the hotel and cultural uses, would generate workers and visitors that would access the Island from the off-site ferry locations and would not reside on the Island full-time. Each analysis in the SSGEIS identified a "reasonable worst-case development scenario" that could result in the worst environmental effect for that technical area.

The two RWCDS scenarios, the University/Research Option and the Mixed-Use Option, are presented in **Table 2**. **Table 3** shows these two development options as compared to previously studied scenarios analyzed

in the 2013 FSGEIS. The analyses presented in the SSGEIS focuses on identifying potential environmental concerns associated with the potential uses identified in **Table 2** to the extent required under CEQR/SEQRA.

Table 2
2020 SSGEIS South Island Development Options

Land Use	University/Research Option	Mixed-use Option
University	1,170,000 gsf	360,000 gsf
Housing – Student Dorms	556,079 gsf (1,390 beds)	136,079 gsf (340 beds)
Hotel	408,832 gsf (1,363 rooms)	408,832 gsf (1,363 rooms)
BioTech/Research	1,500,000 gsf	1,500,000 gsf
Office	75,223 gsf	1,705,223 gsf
Cultural	459,101 gsf	59,101 gsf
Service Retail/Restaurant (Not destination, accessory to Island)	147,208 gsf	147,208 gsf
Conference Center (Not destination, accessory to Island)	43,582 gsf	43,582 gsf
Maintenance, Support, Other	140,000 gsf	140,000 gsf
Total South Island Development	**4,500,025 gsf**	**4,500,025 gsf**

Table 3
Comparison of South Island Development: 2013 FSGEIS vs. 2020 SSGEIS

Land Use	South Island Development – University/Research Option (gsf)		South Island Development – Mixed-Use Option (gsf)	
	2013 FSGEIS	2020 SSGEIS	2013 FSGEIS	2020 SSGEIS
University[1]	307,750	1,170,000	1,120,950	360,000
Housing – Student Dorms	588,000	556,079	188,000	136,079
Hotel[2]	121,875	408,832 (1,363 rooms)	46,875	408,832 (1,363 rooms)
BioTech/Research[3]	188,650	1,500,000	0	1,500,000
Office	119,550	75,223	0	1,705,223
Cultural[4]	0	459,101	0	59,101
Service Retail/Restaurant (Not destination, accessory to Island)	37,200	147,208	37,200	147,208
Conference Center (Not destination, accessory to Island)[2]	121,875	43,582	46,875	43,582
Public School[5]	0	0	45,000	0
Maintenance, Support, Other	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Total South Island Development	**1,624,900**	**4,500,025**	**1,624,900**	**4,500,025**

Notes:
[1] This category contains the categories of "Campus, Academic, and Housing-Faculty Housing" analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS.
[2] The 2013 FSGEIS did not differentiate between Hotel and Conference Center uses in its analysis program, therefore, these 2013 FSGEIS square footages have been allocated evenly between the two use categories in this table.
[3] This category contains the category of "Research" analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS.
[4] This category contains the categories of "General (Gallery, small museum, etc.), Artist Studio, and Movie Theater" analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS.
[5] This category analyzed in the 2013 FSGEIS has been eliminated from the 2020 SSGEIS program.
Sources: *Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island FGEIS (2011)*; *Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island FSGEIS (2013)*; The Trust for Governors Island

Two potential building bulk configuration options were created to illustrate the potential development: a configuration in which each parcel has several buildings and another configuration in which each parcel has one large building with a central courtyard. For analysis sections that rely on an illustrative massing of the proposed development, the configuration with multiple buildings per parcel was selected for analysis as it would constitute the reasonable worst case for these analyses because it would have the potential for building on building air quality effects within parcels, the taller buildings resulting from smaller footprints and floor plates would cast more shadow and result in a greater change in the urban environment, and would require more materials to construct. The configuration with multiple buildings per parcel would also be more reasonable for future development as each parcel could have more than one developer or institution and would not be limited to a single entity's proposal to develop an entire parcel.

Under the proposed zoning framework, Parcel W-1 of the Proposed Project would allow for a structure that rises a maximum height of 250 feet, or up to 290 feet with permitted obstructions. Parcel E-1 could be developed with buildings that rise to a maximum height of 230 feet, or up to 270 feet with permitted obstructions. Parcel E-2 could be developed with buildings that rise to a maximum height of 250 feet, or up to 290 feet with permitted obstructions. Parcel E-3 could be developed with buildings that rise to a maximum height of 200 feet, or up to 240 feet with permitted obstructions. Parcel E-4 could be developed with buildings that rise to a maximum height of 200 feet, or up to 240 feet with permitted obstructions. As stated above, a maximum of 4,275,000 zsf of floor area would be permitted in the South Island.

Currently, zoning would permit a maximum of 1,720,820 zsf of residential floor area on the South Island (i.e., 0.5 FAR would be generated by the entire South Island) or approximately 1,806,861 gsf. Consistent with the deed restrictions, such residential uses could only be occupied by non-permanent (i.e., extended stay) residential uses, such as faculty housing. Accordingly, the University uses assessed in the 2011 FGEIS included up to 1,650,000 gsf of faculty housing and in the 2013 FSGEIS included up to 1,120,950 gsf of

faculty housing. Based on the Proposed Actions, the maximum permitted residential floor area would decrease to approximately 718,465 zsf (i.e., 0.5 FAR generated only by the area of the Development Zones) or approximately 754,388 gsf. Given that under the Proposed Actions, the amount of permitted non-permanent residential use is decreasing from the levels previously analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS, for the purposes of the SSGEIS, it is conservatively assumed that the University program is entirely composed of campus and academic uses, except when otherwise indicated and as necessary to assess potential changes to the conclusions presented in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS.

In addition, the proposed zoning text amendments would make four zoning authorizations applicable to the South Island. First, by expanding the Special Governors Island District to the South Island, the proposed zoning would make the existing "Authorization for Certain Commercial Uses" (currently, Section 134-12 of the Zoning Resolution) available on the South Island, thereby providing a mechanism for the City Planning Commission (CPC) to authorize commercial uses in addition to those explicitly permitted under the proposed zoning. Second, the proposed zoning would create a new authorization to allow for modifications of certain bulk regulations applicable in the Southern Subdistrict as described above. Third, the proposed zoning would create new authorizations that would allow commercial uses to be located on a higher story than non-permanent residential uses. Finally, the proposed zoning would authorize modifications to the permitted locations of fences within required connections or open spaces. No authorization is necessary to develop the Proposed Project, and therefore, no authorization is included as a Proposed Action. If needed in connection with a future project proposal, any authorization would be a discretionary action subject to further environmental review. However, none of the authorizations would permit increases in the maximum permitted floor area or building heights, and the authorizations could only be granted if the CPC finds that (i) any additional commercial uses complement existing uses and are compatible with the nature, scale, and character of other uses within the South Island; (ii) any bulk modifications would result in a superior urban design or provide an equivalent or better distribution of bulk; (iii) any commercial uses located on a higher story than non-permanent residential uses would be sufficiently separated from the non-permanent residential uses within such a building; and (iv) any fences located within required connections or open spaces would not adversely affect access to the connection or open space during operable hours. Accordingly, it is anticipated that any additional commercial uses, bulk modifications, or changes in the permitted locations of commercial uses or fences that may be authorized would result in environmental impacts that are similar to the Proposed Project and would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts that are new or different than those disclosed in the SSGEIS.

The Proposed Project would also lead to increased ferry service, including more vessels and more frequent trips. This increased service could take the form of the Trust continuing to buy new vessels, the Trust contracting with a maritime provider (e.g., New York Waterways) to provide service to the Island, future tenants providing their own services to the Island, an expansion of NYC Ferry service to the Island, or a combination of all of these. For the purposes of environmental analysis, the Proposed Project is assumed to result in up to 15 trips per hour in the peak period in order to meet the potential maximum passenger capacity of approximately 9,000 passengers per hour in the worst case scenario. This is anticipated to require a fleet of up to 12 vessels using a combination of Tier 3 and Tier 4 Emissions Standards engines.

E. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

SCREENING ASSESSMENTS

As stated in the Determination of Significance issued by the Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination on August 23, 2018, certain technical areas do not require further evaluation of potential environmental impacts, including socioeconomic conditions and natural resources.

As described above, in addition to Phase 1 and the infrastructure improvements, the 2011 FGEIS analyzed, generically, the Later Phases, which included additional open space improvements, the re-tenanting of the North Island, and development in the South Island Development Zone. The 2013 FSGEIS reexamined the conclusions of the 2011 FGEIS in the context of the modified program for the North Island re-tenanting and the additional ferry service serving new tenants. In the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS, cumulative impacts

were fully studied for the North Island re-tenanting and related ferry service, the full Park Master Plan, and the South Island Development Zones. In some technical areas the changes to the development program for the currently Proposed Project will make no significant difference to the conclusions of the 2011 FGEIS or 2013 FSGEIS for 2030. Detailed screening assessments demonstrated that the current Proposed Project would have the same or less potential to have impacts than the Proposed Project analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS where no significant adverse impacts were identified in the areas of socioeconomic conditions and natural resources.

The Proposed Project would avoid natural resource impacts by considering the incorporation of building design features that reduce the likelihood of daytime bird collisions in the Development Zones, and through a combination of ongoing human activity and deterrent measures on Lima Pier. As common terns winter in South America from November through March each year, deterrents would be placed on Lima Pier during the winter period prior to the anticipated start of the re-use of Lima Pier, and would be maintained on the pier thereafter, to discourage birds from initiating any new nesting activity on the pier. If there were every anticipated to be prolonged lull in human activity on the pier during the period in which common terns establish nesting sites in New York City, additional deterrents would be placed on the pier. With the addition of these permanent passive deterrents on the pier, and with the increased human activity levels throughout construction and subsequent operations, the common terns would be deterred from attempting to nest on the pier in current and future seasons. Additional nesting space on the adjacent Tango pier is anticipated to continue to be available in the With Action condition. Local Law 15 of 2020 amended Section 28-101.4.3 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York to add a new exception that requires all new construction and renovation projects (where glazing is to be replaced) to use bird friendly materials. Local Law 15 also amends Sections 1402.1 and 1403.8 of the New York City building code by adding bird friendly building design and construction requirements up to 75 feet above grade. Buildings constructed in the Development Zone would be built in compliance with New York City Building Code requirements for the use of "bird-friendly glass," and as such, would not increase the potential for daytime bird collisions. Specifically, the exterior wall envelope, and any associated openings, will be constructed with bird friendly materials up to 75 feet above grade. Materials other than bird friendly materials will not exceed an aggregate of 10 square feet within any 10 feet by 10 feet square area of exterior wall below 75 feet above grade. While the Building Code only requires bird friendly building design for the first 75 feet above grade, the Trust will encourage respondents in future RFPs to incorporate bird friendly materials above 75 feet. With these measures, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to natural resources.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project's effects on the technical areas of air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, and noise are not anticipated to result in unmitigated adverse impacts, and therefore the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS findings of no significant adverse impacts with respect to public health remain unchanged.

LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to land use, zoning, and public policy, and therefore would not alter the conclusions of the 2013 FSGEIS.

With regard to land use, the proposed zoning map and text amendments to facilitate the activation of the Development Zones would result in a mix of uses that would be compatible with each other and with existing uses on the Island. The Proposed Project would provide a major benefit to the people of New York City and the surrounding region by adding active mixed uses including new institutional, commercial, and other development.

With regard to zoning, the proposed zoning map and text amendments would expand the Special Governors Island District to cover the entirety of the South Island, and the South Island would be re-zoned from R3-2 to a C4-1 mid-density commercial district. The increase in development would help establish the Island as an active resource for year-round usage and financially support critical maintenance of the Island's open spaces, renovation of the historic buildings on the North Island, and expanded public access and ferry service to the Island.

With regard to public policy, the full development of the Proposed Project would work towards fulfilling long-term public policies and master plans for the Island, including maintaining and expanding access to the Island, attracting and inspiring all New Yorkers through arts, culture, recreation, and learning, restoring historic resources, achieving financial self-sufficiency for the Island through responsible development partnerships, and promoting and supporting innovation in environmental stewardship and climate adaption. The proposed zoning map and text amendments would establish development at a greater density, which would ultimately support the Island as a year-round destination resource, a longtime goal of the Trust that would not be possible absent the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would be consistent with existing waterfront and other public policy plans such as OneNYC, the Comprehensive Waterfront Plan, the Waterfront Revitalization Program and the New York Works plan, ensuring that the Proposed Project would comply with waterfront regulations, while simultaneously promoting sustainability measures, creating new job opportunities, and meeting appropriate resiliency guidelines.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The new South Island development that would result from the Proposed Project would introduce many new workers and some non-permanent residents to the Island as well as new visitors. Analysis of police and fire protection services was undertaken and has concluded that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services.

POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

The Proposed Project would not directly affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, any existing police precinct house or fire station house located in Manhattan or Brooklyn, but would result in additional demand for police and fire protection services. The New York Police Department (NYPD) would continue to adjust its allocation of personnel and resources as the need arises. As the uses associated with the Proposed Project are specifically defined and scheduled, the Trust would undertake further review and coordination with the NYPD to ensure the adequate provision of police protection services. The Fire Department of New York (FDNY) does not allocate resources based on proposed or potential development, but continually evaluates the need for changes in personnel, equipment, or locations of fire stations and makes adjustments as necessary. The Trust would continue to coordinate with the FDNY to determine future needs and capacity as the Proposed Project is developed. A small structure used seasonally by the FDNY for operations located in one of the two Development Zones would be demolished in conjunction with the demolition of other remaining South Island buildings, and seasonal FDNY operations would be moved to either an existing building on the North Island or a new support structure on the South Island.

OPEN SPACE

The Proposed Project would not directly displace any existing open space resources, nor would the Proposed Project result in any significant adverse impacts to open space resources as a result of shadows, air quality, noise, or construction. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to Island open spaces with respect to direct effects. More importantly, the Proposed Project would create more than six acres of new public open spaces within and adjacent to the Development Zones.

The Proposed Project would increase the utilization of area open space resources due to the introduction of substantial new non-permanent residential and non-residential populations. In the With Action Condition, the total, active, and passive open space ratios would far exceed the City's planning goals for residential populations, and the non-residential passive open space ratio would also far exceed the City's planning goal for non-residential populations, and the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse open space impact as set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

The eventual development of the South Island with active mixed uses and an attendant user population was anticipated and planned for during the design of the open spaces that were created on the South Island as part of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. These open space areas have been designed to function in conjunction with development that would take place in the Development Zones with the Proposed Project. Future uses in the Development Zones may also provide on-site recreational amenities that would partially meet the

needs of new non-permanent residents and/or non-residents. The Proposed Project would also facilitate the creation of significant additional publicly accessible open space, more than six acres, within or adjacent to the Development Zones, ameliorating the impact of the new user populations introduced to the Island. Overall, consistent with the conclusions of the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to open space due to the introduction of new population to the Island.

SHADOWS

The potential buildings that would be built with the Proposed Project would cast incremental shadows on the adjacent and nearby open spaces of the Island. Some open space areas directly north, northeast, or northwest of the Development Zones—such as portions of the Hills, the Oval, Hammock Grove, Liggett Terrace, the South Battery, and the Great Promenade—would receive long durations and at times large extents of incremental shadow throughout the year. Though overall durations of incremental shadow coverage may be long, typically only a relatively small portion of a given open space area would be cast in incremental shadow with the majority of the open space area remaining sunlit. Despite the areas of incremental shadow, there would always be adjacent or nearby sunlit areas of open space with similar active or passive amenities for users to enjoy. The incremental shadow from the Proposed Project would not cause any significant adverse impacts to use or users of any open spaces, nor would it create any significant shading impacts to the health of the trees, plantings, and other vegetation in any resource. Incremental shadow would also fall on the surrounding waters of the Bay, but would not cause a significant adverse impact to aquatic resources.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

LPC and OPRHP have previously determined that the portion of the Island south of Division Road does not contain any architectural resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no direct or indirect impacts on such resources. To avoid inadvertent construction-related damage to historic resources on the North Island, any demolition or new construction for the Proposed Project that would occur within 90 feet of contributing elements of the Governors Island Historic District (the Historic District) would require the development of a Construction Protection Plan (CPP). The CPP will be reviewed and approved by LPC and/or OPRHP (as appropriate).

The majority of the North Island's historic resources are physically and visually separated from the Development Zones on the South Island by Division Road and the Historic District buildings along the north side of Division Road, primarily Liggett Hall. The Design Manual defines a "transition zone" that extends approximately 150 feet (the plan in the Design Manual is diagrammatic and not dimensioned) to the south of Division Road, with the goal of creating a harmonious relationship between the historic buildings on the north side of Division Road and the new construction south of Division Road. The proposed zoning rules would respect the goals of the transition zone by introducing specific restrictions, massing requirements, and pedestrian areas within the 150-foot area. The zoning text emphasizes the pedestrian character of Division Road with the creation of Yankee Pier Plaza and addition of frontage requirements along Yankee Pier Plaza; adds minimum and maximum base height requirements along Division Road; and prohibits portions of buildings over 60 feet in height within the transition zone boundaries. Specifically: 1) Yankee Pier Plaza, a new 25,000 sf open space, would be established at the northern boundary of the East Development Zone to provide a welcoming gateway and connection from the ferry terminal to the South Island's central open space, simultaneously providing a landscaped buffer between the Historic District and new construction in the East Development Zone; 2) the maximum base heights of new buildings along Yankee Pier Plaza would be a minimum of 30 feet and a maximum of 60 feet to align with the heights of Historic District buildings north of Division Road; 3) the zoning rules include frontage and transparency rules along Yankee Pier Plaza to ensure that there is an inviting pedestrian experience along Yankee Pier Plaza; and 4) within the 150-foot-wide transition zone, extending from the southern edge of the Historic District, no portion of any building within the Development Zones may exceed 60 feet.

While not yet designed, the proposed zoning would allow for new buildings within the South Island Development Zones that could be considerably taller than the small-scale low-rise Historic District buildings, changing their visual setting. Potential new buildings in the Development Zones could eliminate some current

views of Historic District buildings from elevated portions of the South Island, such as Outlook Hill, which were designed and developed through implementation of the 2010 Park Master Plan (which also created and set aside the Development Zones). The Proposed Project would not adversely alter the visual prominence of the Historic District, nor introduce visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that would be incompatible with the resource's setting. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would enhance the market demand to renovate and reactivate the Historic District buildings and expand ferry service and the public access season, thereby serving the preservation goals for the North Island and bringing more visitors to the Island, which is consistent with National Park Service (NPS) planning efforts to engage the public with the Governors Island National Monument (the Monument) and the wider Harbor through other new uses and programs of their own.

The changes in background conditions and the differences in program elements between the currently proposed development program and those assessed in the 2013 FSGEIS would not result in any significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources that were not addressed in the 2011 FGEIS and 2013 FSGEIS.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

URBAN DESIGN

Compared to the No Action Condition, the Proposed Project would introduce new development to the Development Zones on the South Island. The potential new buildings would replace vacant areas and temporary seasonal uses with active uses that are intended to enliven the South Island year-round and complement the surrounding open spaces. The new buildings could be taller and have different forms and massings than what could be created within the Development Zones in the No Action Condition; however, the proposed zoning controls would serve to connect and establish a harmonious relationship between the South Island's open spaces, the Historic District on the North Island, and the Development Zones. Furthermore, new development within defined areas of the South Island was always part of the long-term plan for the Island as envisioned in the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan. The proposed zoning controls would include a transition zone within 150 feet of the southern boundary of the Historic District, along Division Road, and within this area, no portion of any building could exceed 60 feet.. The new buildings on the south side of Division Road would have streetwall conditions and base heights that would complement the existing historic buildings on the north side of the road. The proposed zoning controls also would require new public open space within and adjacent to the Development Zones, including an expanded esplanade, new primary and secondary connections, and the creation of Yankee Pier Plaza, complementing the open space uses within the remainder of the South Island. The Proposed Project could also result in the elevation of the grade within the Development Zones to match that of the adjacent park consistent with the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, but other design options to improve resiliency would also be considered and a grade change may not ultimately be implemented.

The proposed uses within the Development Zones would activate the South Island year-round, by increasing pedestrian traffic and enlivening the pedestrian experience. The required primary and secondary connections through the East Development Zone would effectively create a new street pattern for this area where one does not currently exist.

Outside of the Development Zones, all buildings on the South Island will have been demolished in the No Action Condition, but like the rest of the Island, the area will remain closed to the public outside of the public access season. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be inconsistent with any building types, arrangements, or uses in the South Island study area. The Proposed Project would not result in any changes to buildings, natural features, open spaces, or existing streets in the remainder of the South Island and North Island study areas. In comparison with the No Action Condition, the Proposed Project would alter the visual character of the surrounding area; however, this would be an improvement over the vacant areas that would remain in the Development Zones in the No Action Condition. The new, active uses that would be created in the Development Zones as part of the Proposed Project are anticipated to complement the South Island's open spaces and the uses in the reactivated North Island historic buildings, thereby enhancing the pedestrian experience on the Island.

No development associated with the Proposed Project would occur within the off-Island study areas in the With Action Condition. It is anticipated that there would be an increase in pedestrian activity due to the increase in ferry riders and ferry service, but such increase would not be anticipated to affect the urban design of the off-Island study areas.

VIEW CORRIDORS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

In the With Action Condition, inland and cross-Island views from the Development Zones would change; however, these views would be partially obscured by the thick vegetation in the Hammock Grove as trees mature in the No Action Condition, and have already been altered by the previously completed changes in topography across the South Island. Views toward the waterfront and beyond from the Development Zones would remain; however, some views outward from the interior portions of the Development Zones would be more constrained or would continue to be obstructed by structures.

From the west side of the Island, views of the skylines of Lower Manhattan and Jersey City, Staten Island Ferries in the Harbor, the Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, and the Hudson River would remain. As Castle Williams juts out into the water, it would remain visible in views north along the Great Promenade from the west side of the South Island. From the southern tip of the Island, at Picnic Point and the Great Promenade, views to Staten Island, the Verrazzano Bridge, and the Statue of Liberty would remain. Views from Discovery Hill to these resources would now include the development on Parcel E-4; views from Outlook Hill to the north would now include the development on Parcel W-1. Views to the industrial waterfront of Brooklyn from the east side of the South Island along the Great Promenade would remain, and would now include the development on Parcels E-2, E-3, and E-4. East and west views along Division Road would not be obstructed, and would provide the best opportunity to view the relationship between the historic, low-rise North Island and the new buildings in the Development Zones. Given the narrow width of the road and its curving nature in the area around Hammock Grove and Liggett Terrace, however, as well as the requirement that portions of buildings within the transition zone south of Division Road be limited to a height of 60 feet, only a small portion of the new development would be visible in most views. It is also anticipated that as the new tree cover on the South Island continues to grow, particularly in the area closest to Division Road, this tree cover would screen some pedestrian-level views of the Development Zones and reinforce the spatial definition of Division Road.

The new construction in the Development Zones would partially eliminate some current views of the historic North Island buildings and Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn in the distance from elevated portions of the South Island, such as Outlook Hill; however, by limiting the building heights within the transition zone and requiring setbacks along the western edge of the West Development Zone (the Esplanade Area), the Proposed Project would maintain most northward views from the Hills toward the North Island and Manhattan. The creation of the Open Space Subarea as part of the Southern Subdistrict would further preserve a view corridor through the center of the South Island towards the North Island, particularly of Liggett Hall.

Views to the South Island from the North Island would include the upper portions of the proposed new buildings in the Development Zones. The historic buildings of the North Island would remain visible in the foreground, and views to these resources would not be obstructed; however, the context of these views would change. The context of the views from the North Island to the South Island would be more similar to that of other parts of the city where low-rise buildings exist in close proximity to taller, denser development, including the historic Brooklyn waterfront near Brooklyn Bridge Park.

In the With Action Condition, the new, taller buildings within the East Development Zone would be notable in views from Brooklyn Bridge Park. In particular, the tallest anticipated structure on Parcel E-2—at up to 290 feet in height—would be a new element in views from this location, (it should be noted that the top 40 feet of the maximum height would only be allowed as permitted rooftop obstruction(s). The context of these views will be changing in the No Action Condition through the development of the Great Promenade, potentially including two tiers, as well as the other currently uncompleted elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan that could be visible from Brooklyn. The new development on the South Island would not obstruct views to the North Island historic structures from Brooklyn Bridge Park or from Lower

Manhattan. While the context of these views to the North Island's historic structures would change, this change is not expected to be adverse. The new buildings on the South Island would partially obscure views to the North Island historic structures from Liberty Island, but not from Battery Park; however, in those distant views, it is difficult to distinguish the development on the Island against the backdrop of Manhattan and Brooklyn.

The open spaces on the South Island, created as part of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, are considered to be visual resources. Consistent with the vision of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, the Proposed Project would frame views of these open spaces and would bring more people to the South Island to enjoy these resources and views from the South Island.

Overall, the analysis concluded that the changes in background conditions and the differences in program elements between the current development program and those assessed in the 2013 FSGEIS would not result in any significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The 2011 FGEIS and prior environmental studies found that, although historical uses had resulted in releases of hazardous materials to the subsurface and the potential for hazardous materials in buildings—such as asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP)—the previously approved projects, which would require demolition and excavation, would avoid significant adverse hazardous materials impacts provided certain measures were undertaken prior to and during construction.

The required measures to avoid impacts, per the 2011 FGEIS (and which would also be applicable to the SSGEIS) were the following:

- Unless information exists to indicate that suspect ACM do not contain asbestos, prior to demolition, an asbestos survey would be completed and all ACM would be removed and disposed of prior to demolition in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.
- Any demolition activities with the potential to disturb lead-based paint would be performed in accordance with the applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulation (OSHA 29 CFR 1926.62—Lead Exposure in Construction).
- Unless labeling or laboratory testing data indicates that suspected PCB-containing fluorescent lighting fixtures, transformers, other electrical equipment, lifts, and elevators do not contain PCBs, and that fluorescent lights do not contain mercury, disposal would be performed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements.
- Disposal of any chemicals would be in accordance with applicable requirements.
- All subsurface soil disturbance would be performed in accordance with existing procedures relating to potential unexploded ordnance, including the use of ground-penetrating radar prior to conducting excavation.
- During all dewatering required during subsurface work, water would be discharged in accordance with DEC's SPDES permitting requirements. If necessary, the water would be pretreated prior to discharge.
- All excavated soil and fill requiring off-site disposal would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Should contaminated soil and/or petroleum tanks be encountered, applicable regulatory requirements (e.g., those relating to spill reporting and tank registration) would be followed to address removal of the tanks and any associated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Any petroleum storage tanks that would be disturbed by excavation activities would be closed and removed, along with any contaminated soil, in accordance with applicable requirements including DEC spill reporting requirements. If historical tanks are discovered, they would be properly registered, if required, with DEC and/or the New York City Fire Department. The DEC Petroleum

Bulk Storage record and Spill Prevention, Countermeasure and Control Plan (SPCC) would be kept updated with the status of the tanks.

- All subsurface disturbance would be performed in accordance with the April 2012 *Remedial Action Plan* (RAP) and *Health and Safety Plan* (HASP), prepared by AKRF, Inc., and approved by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in a letter dated May 8, 2012. The RAP provides the appropriate clean fill importation criteria and criteria for allowable reuse of excavated site soils (whether in the uppermost layer of landscaped areas or elsewhere), handling, stockpiling, testing, transportation, and disposal of excavated materials, including any unexpectedly encountered contaminated soil and petroleum storage tanks, in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. The RAP also provides procedures for dust control measures and situations where air monitoring would be required. The RAP includes specifications (Grace Preprufe 300R or equivalent) for a vapor barrier to be installed around the foundations of all newly constructed occupied buildings (which may be built in the Later Phases of the Proposed Project). The HASP would ensure that subsurface disturbance is performed in a manner protective of workers, visitors to the Island, and the environment.
    - For each phase, upon completion of all DEP-approved remedial requirements pertinent to that phase, as outlined in the RAP, a Remedial Closure Report (RCR), certified by a New York licensed Professional Engineer, will be submitted to DEP for approval. The RCR will document that the RAP and CHASP were properly implemented, including installation of the proper thicknesses and stipulations of soil caps, as well as any vapor barriers.

The SSGEIS addresses the proposed development of the Development Zones on the South Island in the context of the previously approved project. Although buildings remain in the Eastern Development Zone, there are no known petroleum storage tanks remaining. Following the demolition of these buildings, which is expected to occur with or without the Proposed Project, construction in the Development Zones, as was contemplated in the 2011 FGEIS, would require excavation, e.g., for new foundations, regrading and utility connections. Excavation could disturb any subsurface hazardous materials, but the potential for significant adverse hazardous materials impacts would be avoided by performing the demolition and excavation-related procedures in accordance with the measures outlined in the bullets above.

With implementation of the above measures, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

The analysis finds that the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts related to the City's water supply or to wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

By 2030 in the With Action Condition, the University/Research Option and Mixed-Use Option would generate an incremental water demand of 1,885,860 gallons per day (gpd) and 1,653,460 gpd respectively as compared to the No Action Condition. This represents a 0.17 percent and 0.15 percent increase in demand on the New York City water supply system. It is expected that with the proposed water supply improvements, there would be adequate water service to meet the incremental water demand with the two Proposed Project options, and it is anticipated there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply.

By 2030, the University/Research Option and Mixed-Use Option would generate an incremental 1,120,856 gpd and 888,456 gpd of sewage respectively over the No Action Condition. This incremental increase in sewage generation is approximately 4.15 percent and 3.29 percent of the average daily flow to the Red Hook Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). These incremental increases in sewage generation would not result in exceedance of the Red Hook WWTP's capacity, and are not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to the City's sanitary sewage conveyance and treatment system.

The overall volume of stormwater runoff and the peak stormwater runoff rate from the project area is anticipated to increase due to new roof surface area resulting from proposed buildings. The stormwater would continue to be conveyed to one of 27 stormwater outfalls on the Island directly to New York Harbor. In accordance with DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-

15-002), a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) consisting of both temporary erosion and sediment controls and post-construction stormwater management practices would be prepared prior to commencing any construction activities associated with the Proposed Project.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

The Proposed Project would not directly affect a solid waste management facility and would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity. The development resulting from the Proposed Project would generate an increment above the No Action Condition of approximately 178.01 tons per week of solid waste under the University/ Research Option and 202.64 tons per week of solid waste under the Mixed-Use Option. Under the University/Research Option, 65.06 tons would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY), and 112.95 tons would be handled by private carters. Under the Mixed-Use Option, 47.31 tons would be handled by the DSNY, and 155.33 tons would be handled by private carters. Although this would be an increase compared with the conditions in the No Action Condition, the additional solid waste resulting from the Proposed Project would be negligible compared to the approximately 12,260 tons of solid waste handled by the DSNY every day, or the approximately 9,000 tons handled daily by private carters. In addition, the Proposed Project would not conflict with, or require any amendment to, the City's solid waste management objectives as stated in the SWMP.

ENERGY

New development resulting from the Proposed Project on the Development Zones would not result in any significant adverse energy impacts. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate an incremental demand for approximately 1,035,987,804 million British thermal units (MBTUs) of energy per year under the University/Research Option and 1,031,995,804 MBTUs of energy per year under the Mixed-Use Option. This energy demand represents the total incremental increase in energy consumption between the No Action Condition and the With Action Condition under both Development Options. The Proposed Project would generate an incremental increase in energy demand that would be negligible when compared to the overall demand within Consolidated Edison's (Con Edison's) New York City and Westchester County service area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on energy systems.

TRANSPORTATION

TRAFFIC

Based on a detailed assignment of project-generated vehicle trips, 41 intersections (31 in Manhattan near the BMB ferry landing and 10 in Brooklyn near the Pier 6 ferry landing) were identified as warranting detailed analysis for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. The detailed analysis concludes that in the With Action Condition, there would be significant adverse impacts at 14 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour (10 in Manhattan and four in Brooklyn), 9 intersections during the midday peak hour (5 in Manhattan and four in Brooklyn), 12 intersections during the weekday PM peak hour (6 in Manhattan and 6 in Brooklyn), and 6 intersections during the Saturday peak hour (2 in Manhattan and 4 in Brooklyn).

As part of the Proposed Project, delivery trucks generated by both the North and South Island developments would be relocated from the BMB ferry terminal to the Brooklyn waterfront. For analysis purposes, four Brooklyn freight transfer locations (the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Atlantic Basin, South Brooklyn Marine Terminal (SBMT) at 39th Street, and the 52nd Street Pier) are considered. Based on a detailed assignment of project-generated delivery trips, an additional 11 intersections adjacent to Atlantic Basin, the SBMT, and 52nd Street Pier were analyzed for the weekday AM and midday peak hours (referred to as the "Brooklyn Freight" analysis). The detailed analysis concluded that in the With Action Condition, there would be significant adverse impacts at three intersections during the weekday AM peak hour and five intersections during the weekday midday peak hour.

Tables 4 through 6 provide a summary of the impacted locations by lane group and analysis time period for the Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Brooklyn Freight study areas, respectively. Potential measures to mitigate the projected traffic impacts have been identified and are described below under "Mitigation."

Table 4
Summary of Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts – Manhattan

Intersection		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
EB/WB Street	**NB/SB Street**				
Laight Street	Route 9A	WB-L	WB-L		
West Thames Street	Route 9A	SB-TR			
Hugh Carey Tunnel	Route 9A	NB-T			
Battery Place	Broadway/State Street			NB-L	
State Street/Water Street	Peter Minuit Plaza	EB-T			
Water Street	Whitehall Street	EB-LT NB-L NB-TR	NB-L NB-TR	NB-L NB-TR	
Water Street	Broad Street	WB-LTR NB-R SB-LTR	EB-LTR SB-LTR	EB-LTR NB-R SB-LTR	
Water Street	Hanover Square/Old Slip	NB-R			
South Street	Old Slip	WB-TR NB-L NB-TR		WB-TR	
South Street	Wall Street	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR	SB-LR
South Street	Broad Street	SB-R	SB-R	SB-R	SB-R
Total Impacted Intersections/Lane Groups		**10/16**	**5/7**	**6/9**	**2/2**

Notes: L = Left Turn, T = Through, R = Right Turn, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound, NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound

Table 5
Summary of Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts – Brooklyn

Intersection		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
EB/WB Street	NB/SB Street				
Joralemon Street	Furman Street	WB-LR		EB-L EB-R WB-LR	
Atlantic Avenue	Columbia Street			EB-R WB-L WB-LT	EB-R WB-L WB-LT
BQE Ramp	Columbia Street	NB-TR	SB-L	NB-TR SB-L	SB-L
Atlantic Avenue	Henry Street		WB-LT	WB-DefL	WB-DefL
Atlantic Avenue	Clinton Street	EB-LT	EB-LT	EB-DefL	
Atlantic Avenue	Court Street	WB-T	WB-T	WB-L WB-T	WB-T SB-LTR
Total Impacted Intersections/Lane Groups		**4/4**	**4/4**	**6/12**	**4/7**

Notes: L = Left Turn, T = Through, R = Right Turn, DefL = Defacto Left Turn, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound, NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound

Table 6
Summary of Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts – Brooklyn Freight

Intersection		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour
EB/WB Street	NB/SB Street		
Bowne Street	Van Brunt Street	EB-LTR	EB-LTR
39th Street	2nd Avenue	EB-LTR WB-LTR (39th Street) WB-LT (Off-Ramp)	EB-LTR WB-LTR (39th Street) WB-LT (Off-Ramp)
39th Street	3rd Avenue	EB-LTR	EB-LTR
42nd Street	1st Avenue		EB-LTR
43rd Street	1st Avenue		EB-LR
Total Impacted Intersections/Lane Groups		**3/5**	**5/7**

Notes: L = Left Turn, T = Through, R = Right Turn, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound, NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound

WEAVING ANALYSIS

The Proposed Project is expected to have traffic trip increments passing through two weaving areas in Manhattan during the peak hours analyzed. One weaving area connects southbound South Street to the southbound FDR Drive between Old Slip and Broad Street. The other connects the northbound FDR Drive service road to the northbound FDR Drive. According to the results of a weaving analysis, and per *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds, both weaving areas would have the potential for significant adverse traffic impacts during all peak hours.

TRANSIT

The preliminary transit screening assessment concluded that a detailed analysis of station circulation elements and control areas was warranted for the Bowling Green Station (No. 4 and 5 trains) and the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station (No. 1, R, and W trains) in Manhattan and the Court Street-Borough Hall Station (R and No. 2, 3, 4, and 5 trains) in Brooklyn for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. A subway line-haul analysis was also conducted for all subway lines serving the two Manhattan stations for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Bus line-haul analyses for the M15, M15 Select Bus Service, M20, and M55 routes in Manhattan were also conducted for the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

The subway station analyses identified significant adverse impacts at the following subway station elements:

- Bowling Green Station stairways[4] P1-S1 and P2-S2 during the weekday AM and PM peak hours;
- Bowling Green Station E345 escalator during the weekday AM peak hour;
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairways P3 (to the R, W train Manhattan-bound platform) and P4-P3-P2-P1 (to the No. 1 train platform) during the AM and PM peak hours;
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairways P8 (to the R, W train Manhattan-bound platform) and M1/S1 (to/from Whitehall Street) during the AM peak hour; and
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairway P2 (to the R, W train Brooklyn-bound platform) during the PM peak hour.

Discussions with NYCT have been undertaken to identify feasible mitigation measures for the above significant impacts and are discussed below under "Mitigation."

The subway and bus line-haul analyses conclude that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

PEDESTRIANS

Weekday and Saturday peak period pedestrian conditions were evaluated at key area sidewalk, corner reservoir, and crosswalk locations; 22 sidewalks, 19 corner reservoirs, and 12 crosswalks were selected for detailed analysis in Manhattan and eight sidewalks, eight corner reservoirs, and four crosswalks were selected for detailed analysis in Brooklyn for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. As summarized in **Table 7**, significant adverse impacts were identified for two sidewalks, three corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday AM peak hour; three sidewalks, five corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday midday peak hour; three sidewalks and 10 crosswalks during the weekday PM peak hour; and four crosswalks during the Saturday peak hour in Manhattan. No impacts were identified in Brooklyn. Potential measures (i.e., crosswalk widenings, signal timing adjustments, etc.) were identified to mitigate the projected pedestrian impacts and are discussed below under "Mitigation."

[4] At the Bowling Green Station, the P1-S1 stairway, serving the south end of the southbound No. 4, 5 train platform, is also known as the S1A/S1B stairway. The P2-S2 stairway, serving the R200A control area, denotes two flights of stairways (P2A/P2B and S2A/S2B) and, together with E345, provides access to the Whitehall Street side of the station.

Table 7
Summary of Significant Adverse Pedestrian Impacts – Manhattan

Intersection	Pedestrian Element	2030 With Action Condition			
		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
State Street and Bridge Street	West Sidewalk along State Street between Bridge Street and Bowling Green	X		X	
Broad Street and Beaver Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between Beaver Street and Exchange Place	X	X	X	
	Southwest Corner	X	X		
	Northwest Corner	X	X		
	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
Whitehall Street and Stone Street	Northeast Corner	X			
	North Crosswalk			X	
	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	
	South Crosswalk	X		X	
Broad Street and Bridge Street	Northwest Corner		X		
	West Crosswalk		X		
Broad Street and South William Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between South William Street and Marketfield Street		X		
Broad Street and Marketfield Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between Marketfield Street and Beaver Street		X		
Broad Street and Pearl Street	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
	Southwest Corner		X		
	Northwest Corner		X		
Whitehall Street and State Street / Water Street	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Broad Street and Water Street	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
Whitehall Street and South Street	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza	West Sidewalk along State Street between Peter Minuit Plaza and Pearl Street			X	
	South Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Total Impacted Pedestrian Elements		**14**	**17**	**13**	**4**

Note: X = Impacted

VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Crash data for the study area intersections were obtained from the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) for the time period between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2016. During this period, a total of 3 fatalities, 383 injuries, and 86 pedestrian/bicyclist-related crashes occurred at study area intersections. A rolling total of crash data identified two high crash locations in the 2014 to 2016 period: Route 9A and Albany Street and Atlantic Avenue and Henry Street. A summary of the identified high crash locations, prevailing trends, project-specific effects, and recommended safety measures is provided in **Table 8**.

Table 8
Summary of High Crash Locations

High Crash Intersections	Prevailing Trends	Peak Hour Project-Specific Effects	Recommended Safety Measures
Route 9A and Albany Street	None	Incremental trips: 132 vehicles	Install pedestrian countdown timers on the east and west crosswalks and restripe the east crosswalk
Atlantic Avenue and Henry Street	None	Incremental trips: 90 vehicles	Install pedestrian countdown timers on the north and south crosswalks

Source: NYCDOT crash data, January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2016

PARKING

The With Action Condition public parking utilization is expected to increase to 110, 135, 116, and 87 percent of the off-street parking capacity within ¼-mile of the BMB ferry landing and to 215, 248, 214, and 224 percent of the off-street parking capacity within ¼-mile of the Pier 6 ferry landing during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday time periods, respectively. These utilization levels represent parking shortfalls of 153 spaces in the AM peak period, 524 spaces in the midday peak period, and 229 spaces in the PM peak period in Manhattan and 464 spaces in the AM peak period, 596 spaces in the midday peak period, 460 spaces in the PM peak period, and 500 spaces in the Saturday peak period for Brooklyn. It is expected that excess parking demands resulting from the Proposed Project during the weekday peak periods would need to be accommodated by on-street parking or off-street parking beyond a ¼-mile walk from the ferry landings. Alternatively, motorists could choose alternate modes of transportation. As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and discussed in the parking analysis methodology section below, a parking shortfall resulting from a project located in Manhattan or portions of Brooklyn Heights (including the area surrounding the Pier 6 ferry landing) does not constitute a significant adverse parking impact, due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation.

AIR QUALITY

The mobile source analyses determined that concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) due to the Proposed Project would not result in any violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) at the intersections analyzed, and that incremental concentrations of particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) would not exceed the City's *de minimis* criteria for $PM_{2.5}$.

An analysis was performed of the emissions and dispersion of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and PM_{10} from potential fossil fuel-fired heating and hot water systems, which determined that such emissions would not result in a violation of the NAAQS. Emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ were analyzed in accordance with the City's current $PM_{2.5}$ *de minimis* criteria, which determined that the maximum predicted $PM_{2.5}$ increments from the Proposed Project would be less than the applicable annual average criterion of 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$ for local impacts and 0.1 $\mu g/m^3$ for neighborhood-scale impacts. The air quality modeling analysis also determined the highest predicted increase in 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed the applicable *de minimis* criterion. To ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts resulting from the Proposed Project due to heating and hot water emissions, additional air quality measures were identified with respect to fuel type, emission limits and stack height and setbacks.

An analysis of the expanded ferry service determined that emissions from the ferry vessels would not result in an exceedance of the NAAQS or the City's *de minimis* criteria. In order to minimize and avoid potential air quality impacts, the ferry engines would use meet the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Tier 3 engine emissions standards at a minimum, as well as Tier 4 engines where practicable.

The Proposed Actions would allow a range of commercial and institutional uses, including some that are generally limited to manufacturing districts (e.g., uses within Use Groups [UGs] 16, 17, and 18). Accordingly, the proposed zoning text would require that buildings containing these UGs conform with the New York City performance standards applicable to M1 areas with respect to smoke, particulate, odors and other matters, and would prohibit the locations of such uses in buildings that also contain non-permanent residential or similar use types. Furthermore, in order to avoid potential air quality impacts, the certain UGs would be prohibited from locating within 400 feet of any non-permanent residential or similar use types.

This prohibition will be incorporated into leases or other legally binding agreements between the Trust and designated developer(s) for the Proposed Project, pursuant to which the Trust and/or the City of New York, as appropriate, will have the right to exercise any remedy necessary to obtain or compel performance with this prohibition. With the foregoing zoning requirements and restrictions, no significant air quality impacts would occur on the Proposed Project from potential light industrial uses and therefore no analysis was required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The building energy use for the Proposed Project would result in up to approximately 45 to 46 thousand metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year for the University/Research Option and the Mixed-Use Option, respectively. The fuel use associated with on-road vehicle use and the ferry operations would result in up to approximately 17 to 24 thousand and 17 thousand metric tons of CO_2e emissions per year, respectively. The total transportation emissions are equivalent to 0.28 to 0.33 percent of the citywide emissions from passenger vehicles in 2017 (12,456,065 metric tons CO_2e). Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in up to approximately 80 to 85 thousand metric tons of CO_2e total emissions.

Since the Proposed Project would involve zoning changes that would predominantly affect properties that would be developed in the future by private parties subject to ground leases with the Trust, decisions regarding construction and building design for those sites, which would affect energy use and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, would be made by developers under the building code requirements in effect at the time and any additional requirements from the Trust included in the ground lease. The City is addressing citywide building energy efficiency and other GHG-related design questions through its ongoing long-term GHG policy development and implementation process and it is expected that NYC building and energy codes will continue to require increased GHG reductions in the future. Additionally, the Trust will select future development partners through competitive bidding/RFP processes and will explicitly favor building submissions that include energy conservation measures above and beyond the New York City Energy Conservation Code (NYCECC) and include additional points in the scoring process to select developments for specific and demonstrable commitments to sustainable designs (such as passive house designs, use of fully electric systems, or LEED certifications).

While the use of ferry transportation to and from the Island would result in increased GHG emissions, the dedicated ferry service represents the most efficient and practicable transit option for the Proposed Project. The Trust will utilize ferry vessels with engines that meet EPA's Tier 3 emissions standards, and will consider Tier 4 marine engines to power future ferry vessels to be purchased, if practicable. Furthermore, as part of the City's continued implementation of *OneNYC*, the City will seek further long-term GHG emission reductions from the transportation sector, including ferries.

The Proposed Project would support other GHG goals by virtue of the nature and location of the projected development, i.e., their reliance on public transportation to ferry landings; and their use of natural gas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goals, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

A portion of the Project Area is within the 1 percent annual chance floodplain (Zone AE) and a smaller portion of the Project Area is within a wave impact zone (Coastal A Zone) in the flood hazard area. Proposed new construction would be within the 1 percent annual chance floodplain sometime between the 2020s and 2050s. New construction would incorporate both wet and dry flood protection measures into their design wherever possible to protect against potential flood hazards in future projected conditions. Critical infrastructure (i.e., electrical, plumbing, mechanical equipment) for each building, where appropriate, would be elevated above the projected future flood levels, and, as necessary, ground floor uses could be limited to uses that can be relocated in the event of flooding. Elevators would also be flood-proofed.

The potential for climate change to affect the Proposed Project has been considered and measures and adaptive management strategies will be incorporated to increase climate resilience and to account for potential changes in environmental conditions resulting from climate change.

NOISE

The introduction of new land uses in the Development Zones would generate additional ferry traffic to accommodate an increase in people traveling to and from the Island with the Proposed Project. The analysis concludes that noise generated by ferries associated with the Proposed Project would be noticeable only at open spaces adjacent to Yankee Pier, but that the total noise level would be comparable to existing levels elsewhere on the Island, and consequently would not result in significant adverse impacts.

To meet CEQR interior noise level requirements, the analysis prescribes up to 31 dBA of building attenuation for the buildings associated with the Proposed Project. Noise levels in the newly created open spaces would be greater than the 55 dBA $L_{10(1)}$ prescribed by CEQR criteria, but would be comparable to other parks around New York City and would not constitute a significant adverse impact.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts associated with neighborhood character. As described in the relevant sections of the SSGEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; shadows; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; or noise. Although significant adverse transportation impacts could occur off-Island (in Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn) in the With Action Condition—including during the construction period, if construction occurred at the pace assumed in the analysis—most of these impacts would be at least partially mitigated, and would not result in a significant overall change to the defining elements of the study area's neighborhood character.

Overall, the full development of the Proposed Project would result in a noticeable change to the neighborhood character of the Island; however, it is expected that this change would be beneficial and not adverse. The character of the Island would continue to be defined by its unique setting in Upper New York Bay, its geographic isolation, its historic district and landscape, plentiful landscaped open spaces, and sweeping views of the harbor. The Proposed Project would improve neighborhood character by introducing appropriate mixed uses in place of underutilized land and vacant buildings and enliven the South Island with new 24/7 worker, student, and visitor populations. The development proposed for the South Island would not adversely affect existing uses or proposed open space uses. Furthermore, the Island's existing and approved open spaces would accommodate the new populations on the Island, the Island would continue to serve as a destination park and open space for the region, and the Proposed Project would further expand the amount of publicly accessible open space by more than six acres within and adjacent to the Development Zones.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the Proposed Project—as is the case with most construction projects—would result in temporary disruptions in the surrounding area. As described in detail below, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project may potentially result in temporary significant adverse transportation impacts during peak periods if construction occurred at the pace assumed in the analyses. Additional information for key technical areas is summarized below. Impacts would be reduced during other periods of construction or if construction occurred over a less compressed period without as much overlap between the development parcels.

TRANSPORTATION

Potential transportation impacts during peak construction conditions were assessed in the same manner as the operational impacts, as presented in "Transportation."

Traffic

For purposes of the construction traffic analysis, the combined daily workforce and truck trip projections in the peak quarter (third quarter of 2023) were used as the basis for estimating peak hour construction trips. Based on a detailed assignment of these project generated vehicle trips, two intersections in Manhattan were selected for detailed analysis during the weekday 6:00 to 7:00 AM peak hour and four intersections in Manhattan were selected for detailed analysis during the weekday 3:00 to 4:00 PM peak hour. The detailed analysis concludes that there would be significant adverse construction impacts at one intersection during the weekday 6:00 to 7:00 AM peak hour and two intersections during the weekday 3:00 to 4:00 PM peak hour. Similar to the operational impacts, these significant adverse impacts would remain unmitigated during construction.

Parking

The anticipated construction activities are projected to generate a maximum parking demand of 189 spaces in Manhattan and 37 spaces in Brooklyn during peak construction. Conservatively assuming the parking utilization under the No Action condition, there would be approximately 73 available spaces in Manhattan and a parking shortfall of 524 spaces in Brooklyn during the weekday midday period. Accounting for the construction worker parking demand highlighted above would result in a parking shortfall of 116 spaces in Manhattan and a parking shortfall of 561 spaces in Brooklyn during the peak construction period. It is expected that excess parking demand resulting from the Proposed Project would need to be accommodated by on-street parking or off-street parking beyond a ¼-mile walk from the BMB ferry landing in Manhattan and the Pier 6 ferry landing in Brooklyn. Alternatively, motorists could choose other modes of transportation. As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and discussed in the above parking analysis methodology, a parking shortfall resulting from a project located in Manhattan and portions of Brooklyn Heights (including Pier 6 and its surroundings) does not constitute a significant adverse parking impact, due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation.

Transit

During peak construction, project-generated transit trips would be less than those with the full build-out of the Proposed Project in 2030. In addition, construction worker trips would occur outside of typical commuter peak periods (when transit ridership is typically higher). Therefore, the potential transit impacts during peak construction are expected to be within the envelope of significant adverse transit impacts identified in "Transportation," for the full build-out of the Proposed Project. Some of these impacts, if materialized during the project's construction period, could be similarly mitigated by the recommended measures summarized in "Mitigation." However, since not all transit impacts associated with the full build-out of the Proposed Project could be fully mitigated, there is also the potential for unmitigated transit impacts while the project is under construction.

Pedestrians

During peak construction, the project-generated pedestrian trips would be less than those with the full build-out of the Proposed Project in 2030. Although significant adverse pedestrian impacts were identified for six sidewalks, three corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday AM peak hour; six sidewalks, five corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday midday peak hour; seven sidewalks and 10 crosswalks during the weekday PM peak hour; and four corners during the Saturday peak hour in Manhattan in "Transportation," for the full build-out of the Proposed Project, the construction worker trips would be made outside of these peak periods when background pedestrian levels would be lower. However, in compliance with NYCDOT instructions, detailed pedestrian analyses were additionally prepared for the east sidewalk along Whitehall Street between State Street/Water Street and South Street; the south sidewalk along South Street between Whitehall Street and Broad Street, the northeast corner of Whitehall Street and South Street, and the east crosswalk at Whitehall Street and South Street for the 6 AM to 7 AM and 3 PM to 4 PM construction peak hours.

Similar to the conclusions made for the operational pedestrian analyses in "Transportation," the east crosswalk at Whitehall Street and South Street would incur significant adverse pedestrian impacts, which cannot be mitigated, during the 6 AM to 7 AM and 3 PM to 4 PM construction peak hours.

AIR QUALITY

The air pollutant emission levels associated with construction of the Proposed Project would not be considered out of ordinary in terms of intensity and are typical of ground-up building construction in New York City. Measures would be taken to minimize pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. These measures would include dust suppression measures, idling restrictions, and the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel. In addition, to minimize air pollutant emissions during construction, emissions reduction measures such as the use of best available technologies and the use of newer and cleaner equipment during construction of the Proposed Project would be implemented to the

extent practicable. With these measures in place and based on the duration and intensity of construction activities, the location of nearby sensitive receptors, and an examination of construction on-road sources, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse construction air quality impacts.

NOISE

Construction of the Proposed Project would be expected to result in elevated noise levels at noise receptors on the Island that are proximate to proposed construction work areas. At some open space areas on the Island immediately adjacent to the construction work areas, noise would at times be noticeable and potentially intrusive. Furthermore, construction of the Proposed Project would result in elevated noise levels at the completed and occupied buildings within Parcels E-2 and E-3 at times during construction on immediately adjacent parcels. However, noise from construction would be intermittent and of limited duration at any individual receptor. Consequently, noise associated with the construction of the Proposed Project would not rise to the level of a significant adverse noise impact.

F. ALTERNATIVES

Three alternatives are considered in the Alternatives chapter, a No Action Alternative, a 2013 Alternative, and a No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative. None were determined to achieve the policy goals of the Proposed Project.

No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative assumes that there would be no changes to the Island's zoning and consequently no new construction in the Development Zones or increased ferry service necessary to serve such development. The Island is assumed to continue to operate much the same as it does today. The Trust would likely be unable to extend the public season to year-round. Buildings on the North Island would continue to be renovated and occupied by new uses as market demand allows. Only limited improvements are anticipated on the South Island under this alternative, including the completion of unbuilt elements of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan as funding allows, and the Development Zones would remain fenced-off and closed to the public. There would be no new buildings or accompanying academic and commercial users.

The significant adverse impacts related to transportation and construction-period transportation would not occur under the No Action Alternative; however, none of the important public benefits associated with the Proposed Project (major new economic development and job creation, completion of the 2010 Park and Public Space Master Plan, creation of a long-term rental income funding source for the revitalization and maintenance of the Island's open spaces and historic resources, creation of new publicly accessible open spaces, and expansion of public access to the Island year-round) would occur in the No Action Alternative. Furthermore, without the density of uses and population created by the Proposed Project and the substantially increased ferry service it would fund, attracting tenants to renovate and repurpose many vacant North Island historic buildings would continue to be challenging.

2013 Alternative: The 2013 Alternative assumes that the future uses of the Development Zones would be consistent with the scenarios previously studied in the 2013 FSGEIS, a total of 1.625 million gsf of development with limited or no cultural, amenity, and research and development uses. Like the Proposed Project, this alternative is considered under both a potential University/Research Option and a Mixed-Use Option, though the range of uses studied in 2013 under both options were more limited than in the currently Proposed Project. The 2013 Alternative would not allow for the same economic development benefits, would not have the same place-making potential, and would not generate sufficient rental income necessary to achieve the major goals of the Proposed Project.

Under the 2013 Alternative, there would be seven fewer intersections with significant adverse traffic impacts during the weekday AM peak hour (four in Manhattan and three in Brooklyn), five fewer intersections during the weekday midday peak hour (two in Manhattan and three in Brooklyn), four fewer intersections during the weekday PM peak hour (two in Manhattan and two in Brooklyn), and two fewer intersections during the Saturday peak hour (zero in Manhattan and two in Brooklyn), compared to the Proposed Project. Overall, with just over one-third of programmed square footage, and not achieving the important policy objectives of the

Proposed Project, the 2013 Alternative would still result in, depending on analysis peak hour, 44 to 67 percent of the significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the Proposed Project.

There would be three fewer subway station stairways with significant adverse transit impacts during the weekday AM peak hour (all in the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station), and five fewer stairways during the weekday PM peak hour (three in the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station and two in the Bowling Green Station), compared to the Proposed Project. Overall, the 2013 Alternative would still result in all of the weekday AM significant adverse subway station impacts identified for the Proposed Project at the Bowling Green Station (including one escalator impact); 25 percent of those identified during the weekday AM peak hour at the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station; and none of those identified during the weekday PM peak hour at either station.

Under the 2013 Alternative, there would also be fewer pedestrian elements with significant impacts in Manhattan, including three fewer sidewalks and nine fewer crosswalks during the weekday AM peak hour; five fewer sidewalks, five fewer corners, and six fewer crosswalks during the weekday midday peak hour; five fewer sidewalks and seven fewer crosswalks during the weekday PM peak hour; and one fewer crosswalk during the Saturday peak hour, compared to the Proposed Project. Overall, the 2013 Alternative would still result in, depending on analysis peak hour, 20 to 34 percent of the weekday and 75 percent of the Saturday significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified for the Proposed Project, without achieving the important policy objectives of the Proposed Project. Where significant adverse transportation-related impacts are anticipated under the 2013 Alternative, they could be mitigated with the same or lesser measures as those described in Chapter 20, "Mitigation." However, there could also be the potential for unmitigated significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts under the 2013 Alternative for the same locations identified for the Proposed Project.

Additionally, the important public benefits associated with the Proposed Project would be significantly less or unachievable. Under the 2013 Alternative, it is unlikely that the Island would develop into a 24/7 neighborhood given the lack of enlivening cultural spaces, more limited food concessions, and amenity retail uses that are anticipated in the Proposed Project. As a result, it would be difficult to attract an academic anchor tenant under the 2013 Alternative, as these prospective tenants see these amenity uses as requirements for their respective student, faculty and employee populations. As a result, both the University/Research Option and Mixed-Use Option in the 2013 FSGEIS would fail to meet the goals and objectives of the Proposed Project in that neither would (i) create the mix of uses that would be required to attract a major academic anchor tenant, (ii) allow for the development of significant office and research and development space associated with and resulting from a major academic anchor, nor (iii) provide the resulting economic development and job creation benefits to the City that would result from the Proposed Project. Furthermore, as rent-generating uses such as hotel, research and development, commercial office, food and beverage, and amenity retail uses, are limited under the 2013 Alternative compared to the Proposed Project, the Trust would not generate the financial resources from rental income to fund the adequate maintenance and care for the Island's more than 100 acres of public open space and its historic resources or to significantly increase the frequency of ferry service and public access to the Island. It is anticipated that the reduced density and opportunity for development under this alternative would leave the Trust unable to attract critical tenants to the South Island Development Zones and unable to create the critical mass of commercial demand to attract tenants to invest in vacant North Island historic buildings.

No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative: The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative assumes a level of development on the South Island that could be implemented such that there would be no unmitigated traffic, transit, or pedestrian impacts.

All of the Proposed Project's unmitigable significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts could be eliminated by constructing only 360,000 gsf (8 percent), 675,000 gsf (15 percent), and 360,000 gsf (8 percent) of the total development program of the Proposed Project, respectively. However, more similar to the No Action Alternative at this level of development at 675,000 gsf or less, the public benefits associated with the Proposed Project under the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative would not be achieved. The Trust would not generate the additional revenue necessary to independently maintain all the public open

spaces on the Island, would be unable to increase the number transportation options to the Island or to support year-round public access, would fail to activate the Island for 24/7 use or achieve the economic development goals of the Proposed Project, and would not generate the income and market demand needed to renovate and reactivate many of the North Island historic buildings.

G. MITIGATION

The Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to transportation in the areas of traffic, transit, and pedestrians. Potential mitigation measures for each of these technical areas are identified below.

TRANSPORTATION

The Proposed Project would result in potential significant adverse impacts to traffic, transit (subway), and pedestrians, as detailed below. No significant adverse impacts were identified for bus line-haul, parking, and vehicular and pedestrian safety.

As part of the transportation mitigation, a Transportation Monitoring Program (TMP) would be conducted and submitted to NYCDOT for review and approval. The details of the TMP, including the development thresholds for monitoring, have been finalized in conjunction with the Final SSGEIS. The TMP shall include, but would not be limited to, trip generation surveys, data collection, LOS analyses, etc. Prior to commencing any monitoring, the applicant will develop a monitoring scope of work in accordance with the TMP, and submit the scope of work to NYCDOT for review and approval. This would include collecting peak hour visitation counts and an in-person multi-modal travel survey to compare to projected trip generation estimates. If the vehicular, pedestrian, and/or transit trips exceed those projected in the SSGEIS and there were identified significant impacts associated with those travel modes, then the impacted locations would be assessed to determine if the approved mitigations should be implemented or modified. The assessment could include updated counts and analyses to verify the need for mitigation measures and any adjustment to those measures.

TRAFFIC

Traffic conditions were evaluated at 41 intersections. The analysis of the With Action Condition identified the potential for significant adverse traffic impacts at 14 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour (10 in Manhattan and four in Brooklyn), 9 intersections during the midday peak hour (5 in Manhattan and 4 in Brooklyn), 12 intersections during the weekday PM peak hour (6 in Manhattan and 6 in Brooklyn), and 6 intersections during the Saturday peak hour (2 in Manhattan and 4 in Brooklyn).

Based on a detailed assignment of project-generated delivery trips resulting from the relocation of delivery trips from the BMB to the Brooklyn waterfront, an additional 11 intersections adjacent to Atlantic Basin, the SBMT, and 52nd Street Pier were analyzed for the weekday AM and midday peak hours. The detailed analysis concluded that in the With Action Condition, there would be significant adverse impacts at three intersections during the weekday AM peak hour and five intersections during the weekday midday peak hour.

The majority of the locations where significant adverse traffic impacts are predicted to occur could be fully mitigated with the implementation of standard traffic mitigation measures (e.g., signal timing changes, lane restriping, and parking regulation changes). However, the following intersections could not be fully mitigated with standard traffic mitigation measures:

- Route 9A and West Thames Street for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Route 9A and Hugh Carey Tunnel for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Battery Place and Broadway/State Street for the weekday PM peak hour;
- State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Hanover Square/Old Slip and Water Street for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Broad Street and Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;

- Broad Street and South Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- South Street and Old Slip for the weekday AM and PM peak hours;
- Columbia Street and the Brooklyn Queens Expressway (BQE) Ramp for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- Atlantic Avenue and Clinton Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Atlantic Avenue and Court Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- 39th Street and 2nd Avenue for the weekday AM and midday peak hours;
- 42nd Street and 1st Avenue for the weekday midday peak hour; and
- 43rd Street and 1st Avenue for the weekday midday peak hour.

WEAVING ANALYSIS

The Proposed Project is expected to have traffic trip increments passing through two weaving areas in Manhattan during the peak hours analyzed. One weaving area connects southbound South Street to the southbound Franklin Delano Roosevelt East River Drive (FDR Drive) between Old Slip and Broad Street. The other connects the northbound FDR Drive service road to the northbound FDR Drive. According to the results of a weaving analysis, and per *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds, both weaving areas would have the potential for significant adverse traffic impacts during all peak hours. While the weave areas would operate at unacceptable conditions under the No Action Condition, the additional project-generated trips could exacerbate conditions. Given the limited space available in both weaving areas, increasing capacity by striping additional moving lanes is not feasible and it is expected that the significant adverse impacts would remain unmitigated, which could yield safety concerns at these locations. Therefore, these weave areas will be monitored in coordination with NYCDOT as part of the TMP.

TRANSIT

A detailed analysis of station circulation elements and control areas was prepared for the Bowling Green Station (No. 4 and 5 trains) and the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station (No. 1, R, and W trains) in Manhattan and the Court Street-Borough Hall Station (R and No. 2, 3, 4, and 5 trains) in Brooklyn for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. A subway line-haul analysis was also conducted for all subway lines serving the two Manhattan stations for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Bus line-haul analyses for the M15, M15 Select Bus Service, M20, and M55 routes in Manhattan were also conducted for the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Based on the subway station analysis results, potential significant adverse impacts were identified at the vertical circulation elements (i.e., stairways and escalators):

- Bowling Green Station stairways P1-S1 (serving the south end of the southbound No. 4, 5 train platform) and P2-S2 (from street level to the R200A fare control area) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours;
- Bowling Green Station E345 escalator (from street level to the R200A fare control area) during the weekday AM peak hour;
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairways P3 (to the R, W train Manhattan-bound platform) and P4-P3-P2-P1 (to the No. 1 train platform) during the AM and PM peak hours;
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairways P8 (to the R, W train Manhattan-bound platform) and M1/S1 (to/from Whitehall Street) during the AM peak hour; and
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station stairway P2 (to the R, W train Brooklyn-bound platform) during the PM peak hour.

Consultation with NYCT has been conducted to identify potential mitigation measures. Where measures are determined to be infeasible at the impacted locations, the identified significant adverse impacts would be unmitigated. While not fully mitigating the identified impacts, NYCT has accepted the following mitigation

measures: standardizing Bowling Green Station's P1-S1 stairway; increasing the existing speed of Bowling Green Station's E345 escalator; improving stairway operations of the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station's P2, P3, and P8 stairways; and implementing a wayfinding signage program (coupled with increasing the existing speed of the nearby ES371 and ES372 escalators) for the P4-P3-P2-P1 stairways. The identified impact at Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station's M1/S1 stair would remain unmitigated. The subway and bus line-haul analyses conclude that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

PEDESTRIANS

Pedestrian conditions were evaluated at 22 sidewalks, 19 corner reservoirs, and 12 crosswalks in Manhattan and eight sidewalks, eight corner reservoirs, and four crosswalks in Brooklyn for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. As summarized in **Table 9**, in the 2030 With Action Condition, potential significant adverse impacts were identified for two sidewalks, three corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday AM peak hour; three sidewalks, five corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday midday peak hour; three sidewalks and 10 crosswalks during the weekday PM peak hour; and four crosswalks during the Saturday peak hour in Manhattan. No impacts were identified in Brooklyn.

Table 9
Summary of Significant Adverse Pedestrian Impacts – Manhattan

Intersection	Pedestrian Element	2030 With Action Condition			
		Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
State Street and Bridge Street	West Sidewalk along State Street between Bridge Street and Bowling Green	X		X	
Broad Street and Beaver Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between Beaver Street and Exchange Place	X	X	X	
	Southwest Corner	X	X		
	Northwest Corner	X	X		
	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
Whitehall Street and Stone Street	Northeast Corner	X			
	North Crosswalk			X	
	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	
	South Crosswalk	X		X	
Broad Street and Bridge Street	Northwest Corner		X		
	West Crosswalk		X		
Broad Street and South William Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between South William Street and Marketfield Street		X		
Broad Street and Marketfield Street	West Sidewalk along Broad Street between Marketfield Street and Beaver Street		X		
Broad Street and Pearl Street	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
	Southwest Corner		X		
	Northwest Corner		X		
Whitehall Street and State Street/ Water Street	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Broad Street and Water Street	West Crosswalk	X	X	X	
Whitehall Street and South Street	East Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza	West Sidewalk along State Street between Peter Minuit Plaza and Pearl Street			X	
	South Crosswalk	X	X	X	X
Total Impacted Pedestrian Elements		**14**	**17**	**13**	**4**

Note: X = Impacted

The majority of significant adverse pedestrian impacts could be fully mitigated through standard mitigation measures. However, the following pedestrian elements could not be fully mitigated with standard mitigation measures:

- West sidewalk along Broad Street between South William Street and Marketfield Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- West sidewalk along Broad Street between Marketfield Street and Beaver Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- West sidewalk along Broad Street between Beaver Street and Exchange Place for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Northwest corner of Broad Street and Pearl Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Water Street for the AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and South Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- South crosswalk at State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- North crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the PM peak hour;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- South crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the AM and PM peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Bridge Street for the midday peak hour; and
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Beaver Street for the AM and PM peak hours.

The proposed pedestrian mitigation measures would be subject to approval prior to implementation by NYCDOT. Ifthe mitigation measures are not approved by NYCDOT prior to implementation, then the identified significant adverse pedestrian impacts would be unmitigated.

H. GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The term “growth-inducing aspects” generally refers to the potential for a proposed project to trigger additional development in areas outside the project site that would otherwise not have such development without the proposed project.

The full development of the Proposed Project—including up to 4.5 million gsf of new uses within the Development Zones on the South Island and expanded ferry service to the Island—would result in a substantial change to land use on the Island. It would introduce new workers, students, non-permanent residents, and visitors to the Island. However, because the Island is physically separated from other existing neighborhoods, the Proposed Project would have limited potential to induce additional development off of the Island.

The Proposed Project’s expanded ferry service from the BMB in Lower Manhattan and Pier 6 in Brooklyn to the Island would result in increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic near these off-Island locations, but the potential for induced growth is also limited in these areas. The BMB is located at the tip of Lower Manhattan, an already extensively developed area. The Pier 6 ferry landing is located in Brooklyn Bridge Park, which also occupies the waterfront area to the north. To the south of the ferry landing is a large maritime industrial facility not anticipated for redevelopment, and to the east are two recently completed residential buildings and the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, which acts as a barrier to neighborhoods further east. Thus, there is limited potential for new growth to be induced in the vicinity of the Pier 6 ferry landing.

I. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRREDEEMABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

There are a number of resources, both natural and built, which would be expended in the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. These resources include the material used in construction; energy in the

form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of the Proposed Project; and the human effort (i.e., time and labor required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the Proposed Project). The resources are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the Proposed Project would be highly unlikely. The Proposed Project constitutes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the Development Zones as land resources, thereby rendering their use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term.

These commitments of land resources and materials are weighed against the public purpose and benefits of the Proposed Project: to activate the Island into a year-round resource for New Yorkers after centuries of use as a military base and to ensure the Island's future financial self-sufficiency through the creation of new academic, research, cultural, and/or mixed-use facilities and additional public open space on the South Island, fulfilling long-term public policies for the Island and meeting requirements set forth in the deed from the federal government.

J. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Unavoidable significant adverse impacts are defined as those that meet the following two criteria:

- There are no reasonably practicable mitigation measures to eliminate the proposed action's impacts; and
- There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that would meet its purposes and need, eliminate its impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

The only unavoidable adverse impacts anticipated to result from the Proposed Project were identified in the technical area of transportation.

As discussed in "Transportation," the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 14 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour (10 in Manhattan and four in Brooklyn), 9 intersections during the midday peak hour (5 in Manhattan and 4 in Brooklyn), 12 intersections during the weekday PM peak hour (6 in Manhattan and 6 in Brooklyn), and 6 intersections during the Saturday peak hour (2 in Manhattan and 4 in Brooklyn). As described in "Mitigation," the majority of the locations where significant adverse traffic impacts are predicted to occur could be fully mitigated with the implementation of standard traffic mitigation measures (e.g., signal timing changes, lane restriping, and parking regulation changes). However, the following intersections could not be fully mitigated with standard traffic mitigation measures:

- Route 9A and West Thames Street for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Route 9A and Hugh Carey Tunnel for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Battery Place and Broadway/State Street for the weekday PM peak hour;
- State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Hanover Square/Old Slip and Water Street for the weekday AM peak hour;
- Broad Street and Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Broad Street and South Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- South Street and Old Slip for the weekday AM and PM peak hours;
- Columbia Street and the BQE Ramp for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- Atlantic Avenue and Clinton Street for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours; and
- Atlantic Avenue and Court Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours.

The relocation of delivery trips from the BMB to the Brooklyn waterfront would also result in significant adverse impacts to three intersections during the weekday AM peak hour and five intersections during the weekday midday peak hour. As described in "Mitigation," the following intersection could not be fully mitigated with standard traffic mitigation measures:

- 39th Street and 2nd Avenue for the weekday AM and midday peak hours;
- 42nd Street and 1st Avenue for the weekday midday peak hour; and
- 43rd Street and 1st Avenue for the weekday midday peak hour.

In addition, the Proposed Project is expected to have traffic trip increments passing through two weaving areas in Manhattan during the peak hours analyzed resulting in a significant adverse impact. Given the limited space available in both weaving areas, increasing capacity by striping additional moving lanes is not feasible and it is expected that the significant adverse impacts would remain unmitigated.

For transit, several subway station elements in the Bowling Green Station (Nos. 4 and 5 trains) and the Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station (No. 1, R, and W trains) in Manhattan would experience a significant adverse transit impacts. As described in "Mitigation," some of these impacts could be fully or partially mitigated, while others would remain unmitigated. Both partially mitigated and unmitigated impacts are considered unavoidable adverse impacts under CEQR. Accordingly, although partial mitigation measures and other flow-improvement measures are proposed and will be investigated, the following are the subway station elements that would be expected to incur unavoidable adverse impacts:

- Bowling Green Station – S1A/S1BP1-S1 stairways and E345 escalator; and
- Whitehall Street-South Ferry Station – M1/S1, P2, P3, P8, and P4-P3-P2-P1 stairways.

The Proposed Project would also result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts to two sidewalks, three corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday AM peak hour; three sidewalks, five corners, and nine crosswalks during the weekday midday peak hour; three sidewalks, one corner, and 10 crosswalks during the weekday PM peak hour; and four crosswalks during the Saturday peak hour in Manhattan. No impacts were identified in Brooklyn. As described in "Mitigation," the majority of significant adverse pedestrian impacts could be fully mitigated through standard mitigation measures. However, the following pedestrian elements could not be fully mitigated with standard mitigation measures:

- West sidewalk along Broad Street between South William Street and Marketfield Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- West sidewalk along Broad Street between Marketfield Street and Beaver Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- West sidewalk along Broad Street between Beaver Street and Exchange Place for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- Northwest corner of Broad Street and Pearl Street for the weekday midday peak hour;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Whitehall Street and State Street/Water Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Water Street for the AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and South Street for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- South crosswalk at State Street and Peter Minuit Plaza for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours;
- North crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the PM peak hour;
- East crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the AM, midday, and PM peak hours;
- South crosswalk at Whitehall Street and Stone Street for the AM and PM peak hours;
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Bridge Street for the midday peak hour; and
- West crosswalk at Broad Street and Beaver Street for the AM and PM peak hours.

K. NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION LAW

This Notice of Completion for the Final Second Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island—South Island Development Zones has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law.

L. CONTACT OFFICE

The FSSGEIS is available for review from the contact person listed below and on the website of the Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination CEQR Access portal and at http://www.nyc.gov/oec

Project Contact: Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination
Denise Pisani, Deputy Director
100 Gold Street, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10038
Phone: (212) 788-6835
Email: dpisani@cityhall.nyc.gov

_____ March 5, 2021

Hilary Semel
Assistant to the Mayor

Date