



THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
NEW YORK, NY 10007

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

for the

INWOOD REZONING PROPOSAL

Project: Inwood Rezoning Proposal

Lead Agency: Office of the Deputy Mayor for Housing & Economic Development
253 Broadway, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10007

CEQR Number: 17DME007M

ULURP Numbers: 180073 MMM, 180204 [A] ZMM, N180205 [A] ZRM,
180206 PPM, 180207 PQM, 180208 HAM

SEQRA Classification: Type I

Date Issued: June 14, 2018

Location: 62-Block irregularly-shaped area generally bounded by the Harlem River to the east, Academy Street, the Sherman Creek Inlet, Riverside Drive, Thayer and Dyckman Streets to the south, Indian Road, Payson Avenue, Broadway and Staff Street to the west, and Broadway Bridge to the north. The proposed City Map changes are located within or directly south, adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

Community District 12
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 New York State Environmental Conservation Law and its implementing regulations found at Part 617 of 6NYCRR (SEQRA), a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the actions described below and is available for public inspection at the offices listed at the end of this notice.

A public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a Technical Memorandum was held on May 9, 2018 at 10:00 AM at the at the City Planning Commission (CPC) Hearing Room, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271, in conjunction with the CPC's citywide public hearing pursuant to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). Written comments on the DEIS and Technical Memorandum were requested, received and considered by the Lead Agency, the NYC Office of the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Economic Development (ODMHED) until May 21, 2018. The FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS and Technical Memorandum as well as additional analysis conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS.

1. INTRODUCTION

The New York City Economic Development Corporation (NYCEDC), in close coordination with community stakeholders and City agencies, conducted the *Inwood NYC Planning Initiative*, a comprehensive planning and community outreach effort to take a broad look at the needs of this northern Manhattan community, comprising approximately 560 acres of Manhattan Community District (CD) 12. As a result of the *Inwood Planning Initiative* NYCEDC and its community and agency partners developed the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*, a set of strategies for Inwood, focusing on key community priorities: preserving and creating new affordable housing, creating a comprehensive zoning framework, expanding economic opportunities, and improving neighborhood livability. Specifically, the intent of these strategies is to preserve the existing character of the residential areas west of Tenth Avenue; extend the well-established mixed-use Inwood neighborhood eastward of Tenth Avenue to the Harlem River; accommodate the need for new housing, including affordable housing through Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH), as well as new retail, office, and community facility uses; create and reinforce a pedestrian-friendly streetscape; and provide public access to the Harlem River through new waterfront open space. Components of this comprehensive planning effort are still under way.

To begin to advance the *Inwood NYC Action Plan* strategies, NYCEDC, together with the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (NYCHPD), the Department of Citywide Administrative Services (NYCDCAS), the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks), and the New York City Department of Small Business Services (NYCSBS), is proposing a series of land use actions to implement a comprehensive rezoning plan. The proposed land use actions include zoning map amendments, zoning text amendments, City Map changes, site acquisition and/or site disposition by the City, and an Urban Development Action Area (UDAA) designation and Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) approval (collectively, "Proposed Actions").

The overall project area comprises a proposed rezoning area, proposed MIH Areas, a proposed Special Inwood District (SID), a Waterfront Access Plan (WAP), areas affected by City Map changes, a proposed site disposition and site acquisition area, and a proposed UDAA and UDAAP. NYCHPD is the co-applicant only for the UDAA and UDAAP. DCAS is the co-applicant only for the disposition and acquisition actions that are unrelated to the NYCHPD actions. NYC Parks is the co-applicant only for the acquisition actions related to future public open space along portions of the waterfront (Blocks 2183 and 2184). NYCSBS is the co-applicant only for the disposition and acquisition actions related to the City-owned waterfront site located in the Tip of Manhattan (Block 2197). The proposed zoning map changes would affect 59 blocks (approximately 230 acres) of the Inwood neighborhood of Manhattan CD 12. The proposed rezoning area, while irregularly-shaped, is generally bounded by the Harlem River to the east, the Sherman Creek Inlet, Riverside Drive, Thayer and Dyckman streets to the south, Indian Road, Payson Avenue, Broadway and Staff Street to the west, and Broadway Bridge to the north. The proposed City Map changes (described further below) are located within or directly south, adjacent to the proposed rezoning.

2. BACKGROUND

Study Area History

Inwood is thought to have been the site of Peter Minuit's purchase of Manhattan from the Lenape Indians in 1626. The area is historically, architecturally, and environmentally unique—almost half of the land is public park space that preserves the natural terrain and geological features of the island. Today, the neighborhood represents a dense and stable residential community that developed during periods of growth in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In the earlier 19th century, estates were built in the hilly western section of Inwood. The Dyckman Farmhouse, the only remaining 18th century farmhouse in Manhattan, was once the center of a thriving farm, with fields and orchards of cherry, pear, and apple trees. In 1906, the neighborhood began to shift towards residential use. When the first mass-transit station in the area opened, with the extension of the Interborough Rapid Transit (IRT) lines to Dyckman Street, rapid development of six- and seven-story apartment houses began on land purchased from existing farms and private estates. Working-class immigrants of varied cultural origins, seeking better living conditions than those of cramped tenements downtown, moved to Inwood to reside in new, spacious and more affordable apartments in buildings designed in the Neo-Classical, Italianate, and Tudor Revival styles.

Today, Inwood has one of the highest concentrations of residents of Dominican descent in the City, and is recognized as a center for Dominican culture. Although resident populations have often changed in Inwood, from migrating Native Americans to the immigrant populations of the 20th and 21st centuries, much of the built environment has changed little since the period of rapid development after the turn of the 20th century; approximately 70 percent of the existing housing in Inwood dates to this early 20th century development period, with approximately 200 units of housing developed in the last two decades.

As the pace of development continued during the early 20th century, steps were taken to create City parkland that would preserve the natural beauty of the landscape and provide open space for new residents. In 1911, Julia Isham Taylor donated land from her family's estate to create Isham Park. Spurred by her gift in 1916, the City finalized the purchase of adjacent land to the west for Inwood Hill Park, which today covers approximately 196 acres and contains the last remnant of natural growth forest in Manhattan.

New apartment houses were designed, named, and advertised in reference to the new parks. Around the time of the construction of the Independent Subway System (IND) transit line along Broadway in Inwood during the 1920s, a group of distinctive Art Deco style apartments were built in the blocks around that historic transportation corridor. Dyckman Houses, a group of seven 14-story buildings, were completed by the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) in 1951. The area east of Dyckman Houses was largely occupied by auto repair and boating uses from the 1910s through the 1950s.

New York-Presbyterian's Allen Hospital (Allen Hospital), located on the west side of Broadway at 220th Street, opened in July 1988 and services the surrounding communities of northern Manhattan and the Bronx. It is a 911-designated receiving facility and is part of New York-Presbyterian Hospital. The area to the south and west of Allen Hospital is occupied by Columbia University's Baker Athletic Complex and sports fields. This 26-acre area was dedicated in 1922 and hosted spring football practice that same year. The first stadium at the site, then known as Baker Field, opened in the fall of 1923, with 15,000 seats in temporary stands. Five years later, the university built a 32,000 wooden-seat stadium that served Columbia fans for 55 years, until the spring of 1983. Lawrence A. Wien Stadium was opened in 1984 and features an outdoor, eight-lane running track.

Overall, the built character of Inwood remains largely in place from when it was first developed. West of Tenth Avenue there is a strong existing neighborhood character consisting primarily of residential and mixed-use development, as well as thriving commercial corridors. However, the existing zoning does not have height limits and streetwall requirements to ensure that the existing character of the neighborhood is

preserved. Further, there are also no affordability requirements for new residential development to ensure the neighborhood remains affordable to people with a wide range of incomes.

Along and east of Tenth Avenue, the character of the residential/mixed-use core of Inwood stops, and this area is characterized by low-scale commercial and auto-related uses, parking lots, and transportation, sanitation, and utility infrastructure. This area is separated from the core residential community by the elevated rail line for the No. 1 subway line. This strict separation of uses and stark contrast in character was codified in the 1961 Zoning Resolution, which remains in effect today. New uses in the areas east of and along Tenth Avenue have been primarily limited to schools, and low-scale commercial (auto-related sales and repair, restaurants, and night-clubs) due to the area's existing C8 and manufacturing zoning. Some of these uses, especially community facility uses, directly serve the residential community west of Tenth Avenue. However, the existing zoning limits commercial and community facility development and does not permit new residential, including affordable housing.

Project Area

The project area is slightly larger than the proposed rezoning area and includes the Consolidated Edison (Con Edison) substations and ancillary uses located to the south of West 203rd Street. In its entirety, the project area comprises an approximately 62-block area, encompassing approximately 240 acres, generally bounded by the Harlem River to the east, the Sherman Creek Inlet, Riverside Drive, Thayer and Dyckman streets to the south, Indian Road, Payson Avenue, Broadway and Staff Street to the west, and Broadway Bridge to the north. Ten blocks within the project area are waterfront blocks along the Harlem River and Spuyten Duyvil Creek. The project area is located within Manhattan CD 12 at the northern tip of Manhattan Island. It is largely surrounded by parkland and natural features: Inwood Hill Park, Isham Park, and Hudson River to the west, the Harlem River to the east, Spuyten Duyvil Creek to the north, and Fort Tryon Park and Sherman Creek to the south.

The project area has five distinct sub-districts:

- ***Tip of Manhattan***, which comprises the area north of West 218th Street and east of Broadway;
- ***Upland Wedge***, which comprises the blocks (or portions thereof) along Broadway north of West 215th Street and along the west side of Tenth Avenue between West 207th and West 218th streets;
- ***Sherman Creek***, located east of Tenth Avenue between Academy Street and West 208th streets;
- ***The Commercial "U"***, which comprises the blocks with frontages along Dyckman Street between approximately Nagle Avenue and Broadway, Broadway between Thayer and West 207th streets, and West 207th Street between Broadway and Tenth Avenue; and
- ***The Upland Core***, including all areas west of Tenth Avenue, excluding the Upland Wedge and Commercial "U" (generally bounded by Tenth Avenue to the west, Thayer Street and Riverside Drive to the south, Payson Avenue and Indian Road to the west, and West 218th Street to the north).

Rezoning Area

The proposed rezoning area is slightly smaller than the project area. The proposed zoning map changes would affect 59 blocks (approximately 230 acres) of the Inwood neighborhood of Manhattan. The proposed rezoning area, is irregularly-shaped, and is generally bounded by the Harlem River to the east, the Sherman Creek Inlet, Riverside Drive, Thayer and Dyckman streets to the south, Indian Road, Payson Avenue, Broadway and Staff Street to the west, and Broadway Bridge to the north. The rezoning area excludes the existing Con Edison substation operations located to the south of West 203rd Street along and near the Harlem River waterfront. The proposed City Map changes (described in Section 4, below) are located within or directly adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

3. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Proposed Actions are intended to facilitate development patterns that meet the long-term community vision for Inwood by preserving the strong existing fabric in areas west of Tenth Avenue, extending the mixed-use character of Inwood east to the Harlem River, and supporting the needs of the community. These actions are intended to work in unison with the comprehensive set of strategies put forth in the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*.

The current land use patterns in Inwood date back over a hundred years to when the area was first developed. The enactment of the 1961 Zoning Resolution helped freeze this land use patterns in place. Today, much of this zoning does not permit the full range of development potential needed to fulfill the vision of the *Inwood NYC Planning Initiative*, which aims to preserve and create new affordable housing, create a comprehensive zoning framework, expand economic opportunities, and improve neighborhood livability. Tenth Avenue is a strong dividing line in the neighborhood, with land use and zoning patterns shifting dramatically from east to west. East of Tenth Avenue along the Harlem River waterfront, residential development is currently not permitted across large areas. In addition, the streetscape in these areas is inconsistent, as it is interrupted by auto-related uses that illegally occupy the sidewalk and the street and do not promote pedestrian safety or walkability. If rezoned as proposed, the area east of Tenth Avenue could accommodate growth in a manner that responds to community priorities, including new public open space along the Harlem River waterfront, affordable housing, and new commercial and community facility uses.

The areas west of Tenth Avenue have a strong existing neighborhood character consisting primarily of residential and mixed-use development, as well as dense commercial corridors. While there is a strong existing residential context (particularly in the Upland Core sub-district), the existing R7-2 zoning does not have height limits or streetwall requirements to ensure that this existing character is preserved. In addition, within the Commercial “U”, as well as areas south of Inwood Hill Park, significant market-rate housing can be built today with no affordable housing requirements. There is an opportunity to increase the allowable density to mandate the construction of affordable housing on wide streets that are near transit, while also imposing new height limits and urban design requirements, which ensure that new developments fits into the existing neighborhood context. The area also contains many ground floor retail uses that are non-conforming, which would be brought into compliance under the proposed rezoning.

In addition to extending the mixed-use character of Inwood east, and to preserving the residential fabric found west of Tenth Avenue, the Proposed Actions also aim to require affordable housing, promote a public waterfront and active streetscape, and encourage new commercial and community facility uses across the neighborhood. Where there is critical infrastructure, including the MTA facilities and Con Edison sub-stations and other facilities, existing zoning would remain in place to allow these important services to continue, or would be replaced by manufacturing zones that would facilitate the consolidation of these activities on a smaller footprint. The Proposed Actions would work in unison with other components of the *Inwood NYC Action Plan* to preserve existing affordable housing and protect tenants, support small businesses and entrepreneurs, and provide targeted public realm investments and increased programming and services to enhance overall quality of life for residents.

Through the establishment of the SID, the Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of mixed-use buildings with active ground floors that promote retail continuity and a consistent streetscape, with a variety of local retail and services to support the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, the Proposed Actions would support commercial growth and jobs, with potential for institutional expansion by Allen Hospital or other institutions. The Proposed Actions would encourage the creation of new open space along the Harlem River by developing a WAP and introducing a zoning mechanism that would require private developments to build out public waterfront open space. The Proposed Actions would also map residential districts where no housing is currently permitted, providing new opportunities for permanently affordable housing options for current and future residents at a range of income levels.

West of Tenth Avenue, where there is a strong existing residential character, the Proposed Actions would impose height limits and require streetwalls to promote consistency with the existing built character of the neighborhood. The proposed C2-4 commercial overlays would also serve to make existing ground floor retail uses conforming and encourage ground floor commercial uses. The intent of the Proposed Actions west of Tenth Avenue is to ensure that the strong existing residential and mixed-use character of this area remains intact. Under the zoning regulations applicable to the commercial corridors today, market-rate housing may be built without any requirement for affordable units. The Proposed Actions would require that new housing include a percentage of permanently affordable units, while also establishing height limits and streetwall requirements for new buildings similar to the existing built character of the neighborhood.

The Proposed Actions seek to realize the goals of the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*, and are integral to its success. The Proposed Actions are the result of a comprehensive planning and community outreach effort, that reflects the City's ongoing commitment to the community engagement process and the important role local community boards, community residents, business owners, community-based-organizations, elected officials, and other stakeholders have in the planning process.

Specifically, the Proposed Actions are intended to achieve the following land use objectives:

- ***Preserve the neighborhood's existing built character and protect the rent stabilized housing stock.***

Land use in the neighborhood west of Tenth Avenue is characterized by a strong and consistent built character, with five- to eight-story apartment buildings. In CD 12, 80 percent of the existing housing was built prior to 1947 and 70 percent is government regulated. Less than 200 units of new housing have been built in Inwood in the last two decades and, outside of Tenth Avenue and the commercial corridors, there are limited opportunities for new development. Furthermore, if new development were to occur under existing zoning, there would be no height limits or urban design requirements to ensure consistent development.

The Proposed Actions seek to ensure that Inwood's strong existing built character west of Tenth Avenue is preserved through a contextual zoning district (R7A) that would ensure height limits and institute urban design requirements for new buildings that are consistent with the existing built character. Density would also be capped at 4.0 FAR (i.e., comparable to what is currently built) to ensure that there is no incentive to redevelop lots currently occupied by buildings with rent stabilized housing.

- ***Provide opportunities for high quality, permanent affordable housing with options for tenants at a wide range of income levels.***

Today, Manhattan CD 12 is characterized by stable housing, with over 80 percent of the housing built prior to 1947, and over 70 percent of the housing government regulated.

The Proposed Actions would support the development of new permanently affordable housing by mapping new zoning districts to permit residential development in areas where it is not permitted today, and to increase residential density in areas, outside of the Upland Core sub-district, where it is permitted today. The Inwood neighborhood along and east of Tenth Avenue is characterized by a substantial number of underdeveloped sites with capacity for significant growth. By allowing for new residential development, the zoning changes would facilitate the expansion of the neighborhood's supply of housing, including new permanently affordable housing through the application of MIH.

The proposed zoning changes have been crafted to promote new residential development in areas that currently contain limited residential buildings. In the Upland Core, where there is a strong and consistent residential character today, contextual districts would be mapped to ensure the preservation of the existing

built fabric. The new zoning districts would not increase the allowable density, and therefore, would not promote additional development in these areas.

Within the proposed rezoning area, it is expected that a variety of City and State financing programs for affordable housing would be utilized and result in the creation of a substantial amount of affordable housing under the Proposed Actions. In addition, as new housing is created to serve a range of incomes, the application of the MIH requirement would guarantee that a percentage of residential units developed would remain permanently affordable, and would provide assurance that new development would address the needs of residents at lower income levels, even if local housing market conditions change.

The Inwood Branch of the New York Public Library (NYPL) (Inwood Branch Library) site in the Commercial “U” sub-district also presents a unique opportunity to leverage a City-owned site for affordable housing development. The City intends to redevelop this site with a modern library, Universal Pre-K classrooms, and 100 percent affordable housing to advance affordable housing development in the near-term.

Further, the City will aim to proactively preserve the existing affordable housing stock in the neighborhood through aggressive outreach to building owners to promote preservation loan and financing opportunities, providing tenant resources, and taking action against landlords who harass tenants. To address community calls for improved legal services, a City-funded provider, Legal Services NYC, opened an Inwood office in November 2016 to provide free services, including defense in eviction proceedings; assistance suing landlords who are harassing tenants; administrative action to address illegal rent overcharges; and other critical housing issues. The City’s Tenant Support Unit (TSU) goes door-to-door in Inwood and Washington Heights, informing tenants of their rights, identifying housing-related issues, and connecting tenants with a range of resources. In addition, on November 30, 2017, the City Council passed Certification of No Harassment (CONH) legislation that aims to discourage tenant harassment by preventing landlords with a history of harassment from New York City Department of Buildings (NYCDOB) permits. Manhattan CD 12 has been included as part of the CONH pilot program, which will go into effect in approximately nine months from the passage of the legislation.

- ***Establish a Waterfront Access Plan (WAP) to create a framework for future public waterfront open space along the Harlem River waterfront.***

While the western side of the neighborhood is well served by Inwood Hill Park—as well as Fort Tryon, Isham, and Sherman Creek parks—the Harlem River waterfront remains largely inaccessible. To support the vision for this area, the Proposed Actions include the creation of a WAP aimed at establishing a set of rules and regulations to facilitate the creation of high quality public open space through future private development and public investment. Building on the *Sherman Creek Waterfront Esplanade Master Plan* from 2011 and community-identified priorities, the WAP framework is intended to lead to new high quality open spaces and community amenities.

There are two primary barriers to achieving the goals of the WAP that would be addressed by the Proposed Actions. The first barrier is the presence of that unbuilt Exterior Street that exists on the City Map along the edge of the Harlem River in the Sherman Creek sub-district. Exterior Street is mapped along the extent of the blocks between West 202nd and West 203rd streets, West 203rd and West 204th streets, West 204th and West 205th streets, and West 207th and West 208th streets. This unbuilt exterior street extends over only a small portion of land and currently serves no functional purpose. The second barrier is the presence of small slivers of City-owned land along the same shoreline. Due to these barriers between sites on waterfront blocks and the Harlem River shoreline, new development by private property owners would not be required to provide public open space since the requirement is triggered on sites with at least 100 feet of shoreline. The Proposed Actions aim to remove these impediments by de-mapping the Exterior Street mapped in the Sherman Creek sub-district and seeking disposition authority for a portion of City-owned Lot 36 on Block 2185. These actions would allow privately-owned sites on waterfront blocks to merge with the City-owned land and, thus, become waterfront lots with public access

requirements. The intent of these mapping actions is to facilitate the vision of the WAP, including the creation of a continuous shore public walkway along the Harlem River over time from Sherman Creek to 208th Street. The WAP would also aim to enhance east-west connections and create visual corridors down to the Harlem River waterfront, especially in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district. In addition, the Proposed Actions involve the acquisition of portions of Block 2183; part of Lot 1 and Block 2184; part of Lot 1 to facilitate the creation of future public open space.

Further, in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, waterfront lots north of Ninth Avenue are too narrow to allow a viable development, while meeting the shore public walkway requirement. To achieve the goals of both allowing new commercial and community facility development in this sub-district, as well as creating continuous public waterfront access throughout the proposed rezoning area, the SID would allow a transfer of development rights across Ninth Avenue to ensure that more efficient building shapes can be achieved, since several of the existing waterfront lots in this sub-district are irregular in shape and would not allow efficient development. By allowing private owners in this sub-district to transfer their development rights from the waterfront lots to the upland lots, developers would be required to create more public open space along the waterfront, while creating a viable development on the upland lots.

- ***Create special rules for mixed-use buildings along the waterfront to facilitate the development of predictable and efficient building forms and maximize light and air.***

Today, existing land uses along the Harlem River waterfront consist primarily of one-story buildings and surface parking lots. The proposed SID would guide the bulk of new mixed-use development along the waterfront to achieve a predictable and efficient building form and maximize light and air on constrained waterfront lots. The SID regulations would permit higher density at appropriate locations, while also aiming to respect and enhance the pedestrian environment and provide public waterfront access. For private development sites located along the waterfront, the SID would allow for two density and bulk options (described in detail below). These two options are intended to accommodate the merger of private development sites near the waterfront with City-owned sites along the waterfront. As a result, private development along the waterfront would be incentivized to create public waterfront open space in exchange for additional development capacity.

In addition, the SID would permit alternative building envelopes and larger tower footprints to increase building efficiency and allow for a lower-cost construction typology. Along Ninth Avenue, a consistent streetwall would be required to create a comfortable pedestrian corridor, and part of the building façade facing the new waterfront open space would be required to step down in height to maximize light and air along the waterfront public access areas (WPAAs).

- ***Ensure that any new construction fits visually and architecturally into its surrounding neighborhood context.***

The predominant residential built form in the western portion of the proposed rezoning area is five- to eight-story apartment buildings; ground floor commercial uses are also common. West of Tenth Avenue in the Upland Core, the proposed zoning changes would promote the preservation and extension of the strong existing residential built character. In the Commercial “U”, the Proposed Actions would require consistent and predictable streetwalls and fixed height limits, which do not exist under today’s zoning. East of Tenth Avenue, proposed zoning would allow more variation in height and density with higher density permitted at appropriate locations towards the waterfront, while also aiming to extend the neighborhood’s existing commercial corridors along and east of Tenth Avenue, and respecting and enhancing the pedestrian environment. Contextual zoning districts would also integrate Quality Housing standards, including incorporating recreation areas and landscaping around new buildings.

- ***Create special rules for new development along the elevated rail line to provide light and air along the corridor and ensure adequate distance between residential uses and the train.***

The No. 1 elevated subway runs primarily along Tenth Avenue, a critical corridor connecting the neighborhood. To facilitate development along and adjacent to the elevated rail, the Proposed Actions would include special zoning bulk provisions within the SID for setbacks along the elevated rail line.

- ***Create walkable inviting streets by requiring non-residential ground floor uses and promoting diverse retail and community facilities to support community needs.***

The Proposed Actions include commercial overlays that would facilitate local retail to serve the shopping and service needs of area residents and workers, allow for a greater range of commercial uses, and provide continuity in the pedestrian realm. Along key corridors, new developments would be required to provide non-residential uses (i.e. commercial and community facility uses) on the ground floor and meet lighting, glazing, and transparency requirements. These requirements would enhance the existing streetscape, match existing mixed-use buildings in the area, and provide an improved pedestrian experience.

- ***Facilitate future improvements to subway stations that would improve circulation and access for the disabled.***

The Proposed Actions would facilitate future improvements to subway stations in order to improve circulation and access for the disabled. For certain lots adjacent to the West 215th Street (1) station, the West 207th Street (1) station, and the Dyckman Street (A) station, property owners would be required to coordinate with MTA and the City Planning Commission (CPC) chairperson prior to development to determine if an easement or sidewalk widening within the lot would be needed for station improvements such as an elevator. Any floor area utilized by MTA for station circulation improvements would be exempted from FAR calculations, and any development required to provide an easement for an improvement would be allowed to rise an additional story (ten feet).

- ***Promote commercial and community facility uses to spur job growth and potential institutional expansion, by allowing higher density commercial and non-residential districts.***

Parts of the Tip of Manhattan, Upland Wedge, and Commercial “U” sub-districts (along Tenth Avenue, West 218th Street, Dyckman, Tenth Avenue, and a portion of Ninth Avenue) are proposed to be designated as full commercial districts, permitting higher-density residential, community facility, and commercial uses. These areas would be permitted more commercial FAR than other parts of the proposed rezoning area. Further, in the northern portion of the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, the proposed zoning would not allow residential uses, to further facilitate the development of new commercial and community facility uses. The SID would allow a number of community facility uses in the proposed M1-5 and M1-4 districts to promote mixed-uses in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district. The proposed zoning changes in the Tip of Manhattan would leverage transit access and surrounding institutions to support commercial and community facility uses and spur future job growth. Further, the use and bulk requirements would be modified under the proposed SID to allow larger floor plates that can support institutional and medical uses. The proposed C6-2 district mapped in the southern portion of the Tip of Manhattan sub-district would allow for commercial and residential development to provide a transition between institutional uses at the northern end of the sub-district and the rest of the neighborhood. In addition, the Proposed Actions would allow non-residential buildings in certain commercial districts within the SID additional height to accommodate the higher floor-to-floor heights associated with commercial buildings. These heights would be the same as those permitted for MIH buildings.

- ***Promote the consolidation of utility vehicle storage and infrastructure uses to free up land for new mixed-use development and waterfront public access areas (WPAAs).***

Two blocks in the southern portion of the Sherman Creek sub-district between West 202nd and West 204th streets would be rezoned to allow for multi-story, high-performance, light industrial uses. The proposed M2-4 zoning district is intended to consolidate Con Edison’s operations, which currently occupy four

separate sites in the sub-district, into two sites, allowing the remaining two sites to be freed up for new mixed-use development and public waterfront access. In the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, the Proposed Actions are intended to consolidate Spectrum Communications' (formerly Time Warner) vehicle storage operations, freeing up land for new mixed-use development and public waterfront access.

- ***Enable the relocation and consolidation of existing wholesale businesses.***

The Proposed Actions would rezone the eastern portions of two blocks in the Sherman Creek sub-district to M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A, which would allow as-of-right semi-industrial and light industrial uses, as well as commercial, community facility, and residential uses. This zoning change is expected to support and encourage both the retention and expansion of existing commercial, semi-industrial, and light manufacturing uses, including wholesale, warehousing, and distribution establishments, while also allowing street-enlivening retail uses and residential growth to occur. Within the proposed M1-4/R9A and M1-4/R7A districts, the proposed SID would apply special use regulations similar to that of the Special Mixed-Use District (ZR Article XII, Chapter 3).

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

The FEIS incorporates the amended Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) application (referred to hereafter as the "A-Application") that addresses issues raised just before or shortly after the January 12, 2018 issuance of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The A-Application consists of a series of modifications to the Proposed Actions, including zoning text amendments and zoning map amendments, that were crafted in response to feedback on the application, to allow for the development of projects that meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Actions. Potential environmental impacts of the A-Application were evaluated in Technical Memorandum 001, completed between the DEIS and FEIS and provided for public review. The evaluation of the Proposed Actions in this FEIS incorporates the modifications associated with the A-Application.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendments

In addition to a zoning text amendment to establish the SID, the Proposed Actions include amendments to the text of the Zoning Resolution to apply the MIH program (see below) to the portions of the proposed rezoning area where zoning changes are promoting new housing, and to establish the WAP, as described below.

Establish Special Inwood District (SID)

The proposed SID would be mapped in the Tip of Manhattan, Upland Wedge, Sherman Creek, and Commercial "U" sub-districts of the proposed rezoning area, in addition to a portion of the Upland Core sub-district. The SID would modify the underlying zoning districts to establish additional requirements and modify underlying requirements, including those related to use, bulk, ground floor design, parking, and enclosures. The proposed SID would also facilitate future improvements to subway stations that would improve circulation and access for the disabled and establish supplemental regulations for the proposed M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A districts. A general summary of the components of the proposed SID is provided below.

- ***Use Regulations:*** In zoning districts that permit hotels, the SID would require a special permit for any new hotel developments within the proposed rezoning area. Within the manufacturing districts proposed for the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, additional community facility and commercial uses would be permitted as-of-right, heavy manufacturing uses would be limited and other uses, such as retail, would be limited to the ground floor. Within the proposed C6-2 zone in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, commercial or utility parking would be permitted as-of-right. In R7 and R8 districts with a C2-4 commercial overlay, commercial uses would be allowed as-of-right on the second story.

- *Floor Area Regulations:* The SID would modify underlying FARs on the waterfront blocks of the Sherman Creek sub-district. In the Tip of Manhattan, the SID would limit the FAR on waterfront sites within the proposed M-zones to 2.0 FAR, while also allowing the transfer of development rights from waterfront blocks to upland blocks within the M-zones. Lastly, the SID would allow additional bulk flexibility in the Sherman Creek sub-district at the intersection of West 207th Street and Ninth Avenue, by allowing lots mapped within both R8A and R9A districts to transfer residential floor area from the R8A to the R9A district.
- *Streetwall Location and Maximum Building Height:* Under the proposed SID, a five-foot sidewalk setback from the lot line would be required for all new developments in the C6-2 district proposed along West 218th Street, as well as along Ninth Avenue in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district. The SID would also include supplemental height and setback regulations for lots adjacent to the shoreline, for lots within 100 feet of an elevated rail line, lots within the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, and for other select portions of the neighborhood with known constraints. Specifically, lots that share a side lot line with an adjacent zoning lot containing buildings constructed prior to the 1961 Zoning Resolution that includes residential units, with legally required windows that face and are within 15 feet of the shared lot line, would be subject to the following provision. New buildings would be allowed to break the streetwall requirement for a portion of the lot and rise an additional story (ten feet) with the provision of an open area measuring a minimum of 15 feet along the shared lot line. Lastly, the SID would allow non-residential buildings in certain commercial districts additional height to accommodate the higher floor-to-floor heights associated with commercial buildings; these heights would be the same as those permitted for MIH buildings.
- *Ground Floor Design Regulations:* The proposed SID would include supplemental ground floor regulations in certain districts to generally require the ground floors of residential buildings to provide commercial, community facility, or other non-residential uses along major thoroughfares and other important pedestrian connections throughout the proposed SID, in addition to providing transparency requirements. The SID would also mandate that individual local retail and local service establishments occupy at least 50 percent of a building's streetwall. Banks and loan offices would be limited to a maximum 25 feet of streetwall.
- *Rear Yards:* The proposed SID would modify rear yard and rear yard equivalent requirements on select sites, including the proposed M-zones in the Sherman Creek sub-district and the proposed M-zoned upland sites in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district.
- *Parking Regulations:* The SID would reduce the underlying off-street accessory parking requirements for residential uses. Throughout the proposed SID, off-street accessory parking would be required for 20 percent of market-rate DUs. Within C2-4 overlays within the proposed SID, commercial and community facility off-street accessory parking requirements would be waived in mixed-use buildings. The SID would also modify zoning requirements to allow all permitted accessory off-street parking to be made available for public use. Per underlying zoning regulations, no accessory off-street parking would be required for affordable housing units. The SID would also modify underlying curb cut regulations and would allow rooftop parking as-of-right within the Sherman Creek M-zones.
- *Enclosure Requirements:* The SID would allow for a modification to existing enclosure and screening requirements for commercial and manufacturing uses within the Sherman Creek sub-district, to ensure the continuity of critical Con Edison utilities and operations. Any new development or enlargement would still be subject to the strict performance standards for development next to a residential district; however, the uses would not be required to be enclosed.
- *Transit Improvements:* Under the proposed SID, lots adjacent to the West 207th Street (No. 1) Station, West 215th Street (No. 1) Station, and Dyckman Street (A) Station, property owners would be required to coordinate with the MTA and CPC for a Chairperson prior to development to determine if an easement or sidewalk widening within the lot would be needed for station improvements. Any floor area utilized by the MTA for station circulation improvements would be

exempted from FAR calculations and any development required to provide an easement for an improvement would be allowed to rise an additional story (ten feet).

- *M1-4/R9A and M1-4/R7A Districts:* Within the proposed M1-4/R9A and M1-4/R7A districts, the proposed SID would apply special use regulations similar to that of the Special Mixed-Use District (ZR Article XII, Chapter 3).

Establish a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area

In accordance with Mayor de Blasio’s *Housing New York* plan, an MIH district is proposed to cover portions of the proposed rezoning area that would be rezoned to C4-4A, C4-4D, C4-5D, C6-2, C6-2A, M1-4/R7A, M1-4/R9A, R7D, R8A, R8, and R9A, as well as some portions rezoned to R7A that would generate significant increases in residential capacity as a result of the proposed zoning changes (e.g., an M1-1 district in Sherman Creek sub-district) in order to require the development of permanently affordable housing. The MIH program includes two primary options for set-aside percentages with different affordability levels. Option 1 requires 25 percent of residential floor area be affordable for residents with incomes averaging 60 percent of the area AMI (with ten percent of the floor area affordable at 40 percent AMI), and Option 2 requires 30 percent of residential floor area be affordable for residents with incomes averaging 80 percent AMI. In combination with these options, two other options may be made available. A “Deep Affordability Option” may be utilized under which 20 percent of residential floor area must be affordable housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 40 percent of AMI. Also, a “Workforce Option” may be utilized provided that 30 percent of residential floor area contains housing units affordable to households with income at a weighted average of 115 percent, with five percent of residential floor area comprising units affordable to households at an income band of 70 percent of AMI and another five percent of residential floor area affordable to households at an income band of 90 percent of AMI. The MIH options that would be applicable within the proposed rezoning area would be chosen during ULURP.

Establish Inwood Waterfront Access Plan (WAP)

The goal of the WAP would be to create a framework for a continuous shore public walkway over time through a mix of public and private investment. The WAP would cover the entirety of the Tip of Manhattan sub-district waterfront, and the entirety of the waterfront proposed to be rezoned in the Sherman Creek sub-district. Following standard WPAA guidelines, redevelopment on waterfront lots would trigger requirements to build out the shore public walkway on private sites; underlying zoning regulations would require a minimum 40-foot shore public walkway, unless modified by the WAP, as well as require supplemental public access areas equal to a total amount of waterfront public access that is at least 20 percent of the total lot area.

In the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, the goal of the WAP is to ensure quality open space in an area with narrow irregularly-shaped lots and limited potential for connections to the north (due to the Broadway Bridge) and the south (due to infrastructure). On the narrow irregularly-shaped northernmost sites, the developer may elect to reduce or waive the shore public walkway in exchange for an equal amount of contiguous waterfront open space on the same lot. For the rest of the sites in this sub-district, the developer may reduce the shore public walkway requirement from 40 feet to 20 feet, in exchange for an equal amount of contiguous waterfront open space on the same lot. The intention of these proposed modifications is to produce higher quality concentrated public open space, with increased potential for programming and amenities. The WAP would designate visual corridors at West 218th and West 220th streets and at Ninth Avenue to ensure strong visual connections down to the Harlem River Waterfront. Three supplemental public access areas would also be designated in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district (located generally between West 220th and West 218th streets). In addition, the WAP would require upland connections along West 218th and West 220th streets.

In the Sherman Creek sub-district, the proposed WAP would ensure that all sites in the proposed rezoning area build out waterfront open space connections, even when underlying zoning requirements would not

typically require waterfront open space due to intervening lots. On sites that would not typically be required to build out WPAA, a minimum 14-foot-wide walkway with a ten-foot clear pathway would be required to be built out within 40 feet of the shoreline. The WAP would also require the waterfront lot located between West 207th and West 208th streets to provide an easement to enlarge adjoining mapped streets and would waive the SPAA requirements for this site.

Proposed Zoning Map Amendments

Proposed R7A outside of the SID (EXISTING R7-2 DISTRICTS)

The proposed R7A contextual zoning district would be mapped over much of the proposed rezoning area zoned R7-2 in the Upland Core. These areas would be located outside of the proposed SID. R7A zoning districts are proposed to be mapped on:

- The portion of the proposed rezoning area generally bounded by West 218th Street to the north, Broadway to the east, Isham Park to the south, and Inwood Hill Park to the west;
- The portion of the proposed rezoning area generally bounded by Nagle Avenue to the east and the midblocks adjacent to Broadway (to the west), Dyckman Street (to the south), and West 207th Street (to the north);
- The portion of the proposed rezoning area generally bounded by Isham Park to the north, Seaman Avenue to the east, Riverside Drive to the south, and Inwood Hill Park to the west;
- The southern portions of the blocks generally bounded by Dyckman Street to the north, Seaman Avenue to the east, Riverside Drive to the south, and Staff Street to the west;
- The southern portion of two blocks bounded by Dyckman and Thayer streets and, Nagle Avenue, and Broadway; and
- The portions of the blocks generally bounded by Tenth Avenue to the east, West 207th Street to the south, Broadway to the west and West 213th Street to the north.

MIH would not be required in proposed R7A zoning districts because changing the zoning from the existing R7-2 to R7A would not create a significant increase in residential development.

R7A is a contextual zoning district that allows for the development of medium-density housing and community facilities. R7A districts allow for residential and community facility development up to 4.0 FAR. Buildings with qualifying ground floors would be restricted to a maximum base height of 65 feet, requiring a setback above the maximum base height, and would be limited to a maximum building height of 85 feet.

Off-street accessory parking is required for 50 percent of the market-rate DUs in R7A districts. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf or where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements are waived.

Proposed R7A within the SID (EXISTING M1-1 AND R7-2 DISTRICTS)

R7A contextual zoning would be mapped within the SID on the midblock portions of three blocks bounded by West 203rd and West 206th streets and Ninth and Tenth avenues in the Sherman Creek sub-district, replacing the existing R7-2 and M1-1 zoning districts.

While MIH would not be required in all the proposed R7A zoning districts (because changing the zoning from the existing R7-2 to R7A does not create a significant increase in residential development), it would

be mapped on the portion of the proposed R7A districts on the northern side of West 203rd Street, where existing M1-1 zoning exists today.

R7A is a contextual zoning district that allows for the development of medium-density housing and community facilities. R7A districts allow for residential and community facility development up to 4.0 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 4.6 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in R7A districts are restricted to a maximum base height of 75 feet, require a setback above the maximum base height, and are limited to a maximum building height of 95 feet.

Off-street accessory parking is required for 50 percent of the market-rate DUs in R7A districts; however, as noted above, the parking requirement would be adjusted by the SID to require only 20 percent of market-rate DUs to provide parking. No parking is required for affordable housing units, as per the underlying zoning. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf or where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, parking requirements are waived.

Proposed R7D within the SID
(EXISTING R7-2 DISTRICT)

An R7D zoning districts is proposed for the western frontage of Broadway between West 214th Street and West 218th Street in the Upland Wedge sub-district.

R7D is a contextual zoning district that allows for the development of medium-density housing and community facilities. R7D districts allow for residential and community facility development up to 4.2 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 5.6 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the R7D districts proposed for rezoning area. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in R7D districts are restricted to a maximum base height of 95 feet, require a setback above the maximum base height, and are limited to a maximum building height of 110 feet.

Off-street accessory parking is required for 50 percent of the market-rate DUs in R7D districts; however, the parking requirement would be adjusted by the SID to require only 20 percent of market-rate DUs to provide parking. No accessory parking is required for affordable housing units, as per the underlying zoning. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of accessory parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed R8 within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 AND M3-1 DISTRICTS)

An R8 zoning district with MIH is proposed on all or portions of four blocks along the Harlem River waterfront between West 204th Street and the North Cove in the Sherman Creek sub-district.

R8 zoning districts typically allow for residential development up to 6.02 FAR and community facility development up to 6.5 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 7.2 FAR of residential floor area is typically permitted in R8 districts. However, as noted above, the proposed SID would modify the underlying R8 waterfront regulations in the Sherman Creek sub-district, establishing two different maximum allowable FARs and bulk regulations depending on whether a property has a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline. The proposed SID would incentivize privately-owned sites to merge with City-owned waterfront lots to facilitate the creation of improved public waterfront open space. For waterfront lots with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, higher FAR and more flexible bulk requirements would be permitted by the SID.

Specifically, for lots that are located within waterfront blocks, but do not have a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum residential FAR would be 4.6. Buildings on these lots

would be required to have a streetwall height of no less than 40 feet and no greater than 75 feet, and a maximum building height of 95 feet (with a qualifying ground floor). The density and bulk regulations for these lots would be equivalent to an R7A District mapped with MIH. For lots that have a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum FAR would be 7.2 (as per the underlying zoning), and the WAP would require the provision of public waterfront open space.

For waterfront lots located between West 204th and West 207th streets, with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the proposed SID would increase the maximum tower footprint size and more bulk flexibility would be allowed to reduce construction costs and promote good design on constrained sites. If the building does not exceed 155 feet in height, the proposed SID would require development to maintain a streetwall height of no less than 60 feet and no greater than 105 feet. If the building height exceeds 155 feet, tower rules would go into effect. When electing to build a tower, anything over 125 feet tall would be considered a tower. For lots less than 1.5 acres, only one tower would be allowed, and on lots larger than 1.5 acres, two towers would be allowed. The proposed SID would also include tower regulations that would dictate the size and orientation of each tower. The maximum height of a tower would be 245 feet, and the footprint of the tower would not be allowed to exceed 10,000 sf per floor, with a maximum total dimension of 100 feet running parallel to Ninth Avenue. For developments with a tower, streetwall heights would be required to fall on or within 60 and 85 feet. Within 30 feet of the shore public walkway, a maximum of 70 percent of frontage may rise to 85 feet, with the remaining 30 percent of frontage limited to 30 feet tall.

For lots located between West 207th and West 208th streets, with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum tower footprint size and overall height would be increased to allow for more bulk flexibility in this constrained area. Along West 207th Street and Ninth Avenue frontages, buildings would be required to maintain a streetwall of no less than 60 feet and no greater than 105 feet tall, with a minimum ten-foot setback from the streetwall. Above the required setback, the portion of the building beyond 100 feet of West 207th Street would be limited to 145 feet, while the portion of the building within 100 feet of West 207th Street would be able to rise to 295 feet tall, as long as any portion above 175 feet is limited to a maximum floorplate of 10,000 sf. Within 70 feet of the shoreline, the maximum building height would not be able to rise above 85 feet, and within 30 feet along the former West 208th Street, 70 percent of the frontage could rise to a maximum of 85 feet tall, with the remaining 30 percent of frontage limited to a maximum height of 30 feet tall.

For sites that would have a split zoning condition mapped within both R8 and R9A districts, the proposed SID would allow the distribution of the total allowable floor area without regard for zoning district boundaries to allow greater flexibility for better site planning and building design along the waterfront. Developments in these districts would have to comply with all zoning regulations for visual corridors and WPAAAs.

Additionally, under waterfront zoning, development rights are typically generated by portions of waterfront lots between the upland boundary of the lot and the mapped bulkhead line. The SID would adjust waterfront zoning to limit those development rights to portions of waterfront lots between the upland boundary of the lot and the shoreline.

Under the proposed SID, off-street accessory parking would only be required for 20 percent of market-rate DUs (compared to 40 percent under the underlying R8 zoning regulations). No accessory parking would be required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. Further, under the SID, accessory parking would be exempted from floor area below a height of 33 feet (modified from the underlying requirement of below a height of 23 feet).

On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of accessory parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed R8A within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 AND R7-2 DISTRICTS)

R8A zoning districts with MIH are proposed in two areas:

- Along the Ninth Avenue western frontage of the three blocks bounded by West 203rd and West 206th streets, as well as the northern portion of West 207th Street approximately between Ninth and Tenth avenues in the Sherman Creek sub-district; and
- On the eastern frontage of Tenth Avenue, generally between West 203rd and West 207th streets as well as the midblock portion of the block bounded by West 207th Street, Ninth Avenue, West 206th Street and Tenth Avenue in the Sherman Creek sub-district.

R8A zoning contextual districts permit residential and community facility uses at a maximum FAR of 6.02 and 6.5, respectively; under MIH, up to 7.2 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the R8A districts proposed for the proposed rezoning area. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in R8A districts have a maximum base height of 105 feet and a maximum building height of 145 feet.

The proposed SID would also adjust the building bulk and height regulations of the proposed R8A district in select areas. For R8A areas to be mapped along the eastern side of Tenth Avenue between West 205th and West 207th streets adjacent to the 207th Street No. 1 train elevated station, the proposed SID would allow for a lower base height and a taller building to respond to the presence of the elevated rail structure. Along the elevated rail, buildings would be required to have a streetwall of at or between 25 and 105 feet tall. Above the base height, a setback would be required. The maximum building height would be 165 feet tall. For the lot on the north side of West 207th Street between Ninth and Tenth avenues, which is bounded on the north and west by the MTA Rail Yard, the proposed SID would waive the rear yard requirement along the rail yard to accommodate this irregularly shaped site; all other provisions of the R8A district would apply.

Off-street accessory parking is required for 40 percent of market-rate residential units in R8A. Under the proposed SID, market-rate off-street accessory parking requirements would be reduced to 20 percent. No accessory parking is required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of accessory parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed R9A within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 AND M3-1 DISTRICTS)

An R9A district with MIH is proposed on the Ninth Avenue frontages of the four blocks between West 206th Street and southern boundary of the MTA Rail Yard and Tenth Avenue and the Harlem River in the Sherman Creek sub-district.

R9A is a contextual zoning district that permits residential and community facility uses up to maximum FARs of 7.52 and 7.5, respectively; under the MIH program, up to 8.5 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the R9A districts proposed for the proposed rezoning area. While buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in R9A districts typically have a maximum base height of 125 feet and a maximum building height of 175 feet on wide streets and 165 feet on narrow streets, as discussed above, the maximum base heights and building heights would be modified in the proposed R9A zoning district under the proposed SID. Specifically, along the eastern frontage of Ninth Avenue between West 206th and West 208th streets, buildings in R9A districts would be limited to a maximum base height of 105 and would allow for taller overall building heights, to match the R8 waterfront districts. Specifically, the R9A portion of the waterfront block between West 207th and West 208th streets would be allowed to reach a maximum height of 295 feet and the R9A portion of the waterfront block between West 206th and West 207th streets would be allowed to

reach a maximum height of 245 feet. Further, as noted above, for sites that would have a split zoning condition and would be mapped within both R8 and R9A districts, the proposed SID would allow the distribution of the total allowable floor area without regard for zoning district boundaries to allow greater flexibility for better site planning and building design along the waterfront.

Under the proposed SID, accessory off-street parking would be required for 20 percent of market-rate residential units in the proposed R9A districts (compared to a 40 percent requirement pursuant to the underlying R9A district). No accessory parking would be required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. Further, on all waterfront blocks, under the proposed SID, accessory parking would be exempted from floor area below a height of 33 feet (modified from the underlying requirement of 23 feet). On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed C4-4A within the SID
(EXISTING C8-3 DISTRICT)

A C4-4A zoning districts with MIH is proposed for portions of three blocks bounded by Dyckman Street to the north, Seaman Avenue to the east, Riverside Drive to the south, and Staff Street to the west in the Upland Core sub-district.

C4-4A is an R7A equivalent district that typically permits residential, commercial, and community facility development up to 4.0 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 4.6 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the C4-4A district proposed for the proposed rezoning area. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in C4-4A districts are restricted to a maximum base height of 75 feet, require a setback above the maximum base height, and are limited to a maximum building height of 95 feet.

No accessory parking is required for commercial or community facility uses. Off-street accessory parking is required for 50 percent of the market-rate DUs in C4-4A districts, and no accessory parking is required for affordable housing units. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf or where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, parking requirements are waived.

Proposed C4-4D within the SID
(EXISTING C4-4, R7-2, R7-2/C1-4, AND C8-3 DISTRICTS)

C4-4D zoning districts with MIH are proposed for three blocks bounded by the intersection of Broadway and Tenth Avenue to the north, Tenth Avenue to the east, West 214th Street to the south and Broadway to the west; portions of five blocks generally forming the western frontages of Tenth Avenue between West 213th Street and West 207th Street; the northern and southern frontages of West 207th Street between Post and Tenth avenues; the northern and southern frontages of two blocks along Dyckman Street, generally between Nagle Avenue and Post Avenue; the eastern and western frontages of portions of three blocks along Broadway, generally between Dyckman Street and Cumming Street; and at the intersection of Broadway and West 207th Street.

C4-4D is an R8A-equivalent district that typically permits residential development up to 6.02, commercial uses up to 3.4 FAR, and community facilities up to 6.5 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 7.2 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the proposed rezoning area's C4-4D district. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in C4-4D districts have a maximum base height of 105 feet and a maximum building height of 145 feet. While the proposed SID would not change the allowable FAR in this area, the proposed SID would modify the bulk requirements in specific areas. For the C4-4D district proposed in the Commercial "U" sub-district, the proposed SID would modify the underlying bulk requirements for lots that share a side lot line with an adjacent zoning lot containing a building(s) constructed prior to the 1961 Zoning Resolution, which contain residential units, with legally required windows that face and are within 15 feet of the shared lot

line. For lots meeting these criteria, new buildings would be allowed to break the streetwall requirement for a portion of the lot and rise an additional story (ten feet) with the provision of an open area measuring a minimum of 15 feet along the shared lot line.

The proposed SID would modify the bulk regulations of the C4-4D district proposed in the Upland Wedge sub-district and at the intersection of Nagle Avenue and Dyckman Street, due to the elevated rail condition along Nagle Avenue. Specifically, in these two areas, the minimum base height would be lowered from a minimum of 60 feet to a minimum of 25 feet; the maximum underlying base height (105 feet) would not change. Above the base height, a 10-foot setback would be required on wide streets and 15-foot setback would be required on narrow streets, and the maximum building height would be increased to 165 feet.

The off-street accessory parking requirement in C4-4D districts is typically one space per 1,000 sf of commercial and health care facility uses, and is waived if fewer than 40 accessory parking spaces are required. Off-street parking is required for 40 percent of the market-rate DUs in C4-4D districts. Under the SID, the underlying market-rate accessory parking requirement would be reduced to 20 percent. No accessory parking would be required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of accessory parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed C4-5D within the SID

(EXISTING C4-4, R7-2, R7-2/C1-4, AND R7-2/C2-4 DISTRICTS)

A C4-5D zoning district is proposed within the Commercial “U” sub-district along the frontages of Dyckman Street, approximately between Vermilyea Avenue and Post Avenue; Broadway approximately between Cumming and West 207th streets; and West 207th Street approximately between Post Avenue and Broadway.

C4-5D is an R7D-equivalent contextual zoning district that allows for the development of medium-density housing, commercial, and community facility uses. C4-5D districts allow for commercial development up to 3.4 FAR, and residential and community facility development up to 4.20 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 5.6 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the proposed C4-5D district. Buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in C4-5D districts have a maximum base height of 95 feet, require a 10-foot setback on wide streets and 15-foot setback on narrow streets above the maximum base height, and have a maximum building height of 115 feet.

The SID would modify the underlying bulk requirements for lots that share a side lot line with an adjacent zoning lot containing a building(s) constructed prior to the 1961 Zoning Resolution, which include residential units, with legally required windows that face and are within 15 feet of the shared lot line. For lots meeting these criteria, new buildings would be allowed to break the streetwall requirement for a portion of the lot and rise an additional story (ten feet) with the provision of an open area measuring a minimum of 15 feet along the shared lot line.

In the proposed C4-5 district, the underlying off-street accessory parking requirements would apply for commercial and community facility uses. For residential uses the accessory off-street parking requirements are typically 50 percent of the market-rate DUs. However, under the SID, the underlying market-rate accessory parking requirements would be reduced to 20 percent. No accessory parking would be required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf and on zoning lots where the total amount of accessory parking required is less than 15 spaces, accessory parking requirements would be waived.

Proposed C6-2 within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1, M2-1, AND M3-1 DISTRICTS)

A C6-2 zoning district with MIH is proposed on portions of two blocks in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district:

- Along the northern frontage of West 218th Street between Broadway and Ninth Avenue, as well as the eastern frontage of the block on Ninth Avenue between West 218th Street and West 219th Street; and
- The portion of the block east of Ninth Avenue between West 218th and West 220th streets.

C6-2 is an R8-equivalent zoning district that typically permits residential development up to 6.02 FAR, commercial uses up to 6.0 FAR, and community facility development up to 6.5 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 7.2 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the proposed C6-2 district. However, as noted below, the proposed SID would modify the underlying permitted bulk regulations of the proposed C6-2 districts.

Along the upland portion of the district between Ninth Avenue and Broadway, buildings with qualifying ground floors developed pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Program in C6-2 districts would be limited to a maximum base height of 105 feet and would be required to set back ten feet on wide streets and 15 feet on narrow streets above the maximum base height. Building height would be restricted to a maximum of 210 feet, pursuant to the proposed SID provisions (compared to a maximum building height of 145 feet or governed by a sky exposure plane, pursuant to the underlying C6-2 zoning regulations) and would be required to set back ten feet on wide streets and 15 feet on narrow streets above the maximum base height, with the goal of ensuring a consistent streetwall and predictable building heights.

For the portions of the district between Ninth Avenue and the Harlem River waterfront, the proposed SID would establish two different maximum allowable FARs and bulk regulations depending on whether a property had a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, similar to what is described above for the proposed R8 zoning district modifications. For waterfront lots with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, a higher FAR, and more flexible bulk requirements would be permitted.

Specifically, for lots that are located within waterfront blocks but do not have a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum FAR would be 4.6. Buildings on these lots would be required to have a streetwall height of no less than 40 feet and no greater than 65 feet and a maximum building height of 95 feet. The density and bulk regulations on these lots would be equivalent to an R7A district mapped with MIH. For lots that do have a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum FAR would remain at 7.2 and, per underlying zoning and the WAP, the provision of provide public waterfront open space would be required.

For lots with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline, the maximum tower footprint size would be increased and more bulk flexibility would be allowed to reduce construction costs and ensure good design on constrained sites. Buildings would be required to maintain a streetwall height at or between 60 and 105 feet. If the building height exceeds 155 feet, tower rules would go into effect. When electing to build a tower, anything over 125 feet is considered a tower. For lots less than 1.5 acres, only one tower would be allowed, and on lots larger than 1.5 acres, two towers would be allowed. The proposed SID would also include tower regulations that would dictate the size, location, and orientation of each tower. The maximum height of a tower height would be 265 feet, and the footprint of the tower would not be allowed to exceed 10,000 sf per floor, with a maximum total dimension of 100 feet running parallel to Ninth Avenue. Within 30 feet of the shore public walkway, a maximum of 70 percent of frontage may rise to 85 feet, with the remaining 30 percent of frontage limited to 30 feet.

The proposed SID would ensure that waterfront regulations pertaining to height, setback, and bulk would apply to the future private waterfront development sites even if the City were to retain ownership of a portion of its property in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district between the future development site and the shoreline.

For the portions of the district between Ninth Avenue and the Harlem River waterfront, uses would also be modified to allow use group 16C, to facilitate the consolidation of existing vehicle storage operations, freeing up land for new mixed-use development and WPAAAs.

Development in this district would have to comply with all zoning regulations for visual corridors and WPAAAs; the locations of visual corridors and supplemental public access areas would be defined in the SID, as described above under the Inwood WAP. While under waterfront zoning, development rights are typically generated by portions of waterfront lots between the upland boundary of the lot and the mapped bulkhead line. Similar to the R8 districts, the SID would adjust waterfront zoning to limit those development rights to portions of waterfront lots between the upland boundary of the lot and the shoreline.

No off-street parking is required for commercial uses in C6-2 districts. Pursuant to the proposed SID, accessory off-street parking would be required for 20 percent of the market-rate DUs (compared to 40 percent pursuant to the underlying C6-2 zoning). No parking is required for affordable housing units, as per underlying zoning. Further, on all waterfront blocks under the SID, accessory parking would be exempted from floor area below a height of 33 feet (modified from the underlying requirement of 23 feet).

Proposed C6-2A within the SID
(EXISTING C8-4 DISTRICT)

A C6-2A zoning district with MIH is proposed on the block bounded by Broadway to the west, West 214th Street to the north, Tenth Avenue to the east, and West 213th Street to the south.

C6-2A is an R8A-equivalent zoning district that typically permits residential development up to 6.02 FAR, commercial uses up to 6.0 FAR, and community facility development up to 6.5 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 7.2 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted in the proposed C6-2A district. However, as noted below, the proposed SID would modify the underlying permitted bulk regulations for the proposed C6-2A district. Specifically, the minimum base height would be lowered from a minimum of 60 feet to a minimum of 25 feet; the maximum underlying base height (105 feet) would not change. Above the base height, a ten-foot setback would be required on narrow streets and 15-foot setback would be required on wide streets, and the maximum building height would be increased to 165 feet.

No off-street parking is required for commercial uses in C6-2A districts. Pursuant to the proposed SID, accessory off-street parking would be required for 20 percent of the market-rate DUs (compared to 40 percent pursuant to the underlying C6-2A zoning).

Proposed M1-4/R7A within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 DISTRICT)

An M1-4/R7A mixed-use zoning district is proposed in the Sherman Creek sub-district on the mid-block portion of the block bounded by West 202nd and West 203rd streets and Ninth and Tenth avenues. In the proposed M1-4/R7A district, new residential and non-residential uses (commercial, community facility, and light industrial) can be developed as-of-right and be located side-by-side or within the same building. Residential uses would be subject to the bulk controls of the governing R7A district. Commercial, industrial and community facility uses would be subject to the M1-4 bulk controls, except that community facilities would be subject to residential FAR limits. Specifically, commercial and light industrial uses would be permitted up to 2.0 FAR, and residential and community facility uses would be permitted up to

4.0 FAR; under the MIH program, up to 4.6 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted. The proposed SID would modify the underlying M1-4 use regulations to allow additional community facility and commercial uses; specifically, all community facility uses in Use Groups 3 and 4 would be allowed as-of-right and Use Group 6A food stores would not be limited in size. The SID would also limit Use Groups 6A, 6C, and 10A to the ground floor. In addition, industrial uses would be subject to performance standards in M1 districts.

No off-street accessory parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses in M1-4/R7A districts. For residential uses, pursuant to the proposed SID, parking would be required for 20 percent of the market-rate DUs (compared to 50 percent pursuant to the underlying M1-4/R7A zoning). On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf or where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, parking requirements are waived

***Proposed M1-4/R9A within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 DISTRICT)***

An M1-4/R9A mixed-use zoning district is proposed in the Sherman Creek sub-district on the eastern frontages of Tenth Avenue between West 201st and West 203rd streets. In the proposed M1-4/R9A district, new residential and non-residential uses (commercial, community facility, and light industrial) can be developed as-of-right and be located side-by-side or within the same building. Residential uses would be subject to the bulk controls of the governing R9A district. Commercial, industrial and community facility uses would be subject to the M1-4 bulk controls, except that community facilities would be subject to residential FAR limits. Specifically, commercial and light industrial uses would be permitted up to 2.0 FAR, and residential and community facility uses would be permitted up to 7.52 and 7.5, respectively; under the MIH program, up to 8.5 FAR of residential floor area would be permitted. The proposed SID would modify the underlying M1-4 use regulations to allow additional community facility and commercial uses; specifically, all community facility uses in Use Groups 3 and 4 would be allowed as-of-right and Use Group 6A food stores would not be limited in size. The proposed SID would also limit Use Groups 6A, 6C, and 10A to the ground floor. In addition, industrial uses would be subject to performance standards in M1 districts.

Pursuant to the proposed SID, a setback (ten feet on wide streets and 15 feet on narrow streets) would be required to facilitate a better sense of openness fronting the former Academy Street. Along West 202nd Street and the former Academy Street, buildings would be required to have a streetwall between 60 and 125 feet and within 30 feet of West 201st Street and the former Academy Street, the maximum building height would not be permitted to exceed 85 feet.

No off-street accessory parking is required for manufacturing and commercial uses in M1-4/R9A districts. For residential use, per the SID, parking would be required for 20 percent of market-rate DUs (compared to 40 percent pursuant to underlying M1-4/R9A zoning). On zoning lots smaller than 10,000 sf or where the total amount of parking required is less than 15 spaces, parking requirements are waived.

***Proposed M1-4 within the SID
(EXISTING M2-1 AND M3-1 DISTRICTS)***

An M1-4 zoning district is proposed in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district in the area bounded by Broadway to the east and Ninth Avenue to the west, the Harlem River to the north and east, and the easterly extension of West 220th Street to the south. M1-4 districts permit commercial and light industrial uses up to 2.0 FAR; pursuant to the proposed SID, community facility uses would be permitted up to 2.0 FAR (compared to 6.5 FAR under the underlying M1-4 zoning regulations).

The proposed SID would modify the underlying M1-4 use regulations in the proposed rezoning area to allow additional community facility and commercial uses. All community facility uses in Use Groups 3 and 4 would be allowed as-of-right in the proposed M1-4 district, including schools, dormitories, hospital

staff housing, museums, non-commercial art galleries, performing arts centers, and libraries. Further, Use Group 6A food stores, including supermarkets, grocery stores, or delicatessen stores, would not be limited in size. The SID would also limit Use Groups 6A, 6C and 10A to the ground level.

Building height and setbacks in M1-4 districts are controlled by a sky exposure plane, and commercial and community facility buildings can be constructed as towers. Development in this district would also have to comply with all zoning regulations for visual corridors and WPAA's; the locations of visual corridors and supplemental public access areas would be required in the WAP.

The SID would also include an allowance for the transfer of development rights from the area covered by the proposed M1-4 district to any lot(s) within the proposed M1-5 district mapped on the adjacent upland portion (discussed below). If more than 20,000 sf of development rights are transferred, a waterfront certification would be triggered. In the absence of a transfer, standard WPAA requirements would apply for the shallow waterfront lot.

No off-street accessory parking would be required in the proposed M1-4 zoning districts, as per underlying zoning regulations.

Proposed M1-5 within the SID
(EXISTING M1-1 AND M3-1 DISTRICTS)

M1-5 districts are proposed on one partial block on the southern frontage of West 218th Street and two full blocks bounded by Ninth Avenue to the north and east, West 218th Street to the south and, Broadway to the west, in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district. M1-5 districts typically permit commercial and light industrial uses up to 5.0 FAR, and community facility uses are permitted up to 6.5 FAR. Use requirements, similar to those described for the M1-4 district above, would also be set by the SID in the proposed M1-5 districts.

The SID would modify the underlying M1-5 zoning's height, setback, and lot coverage requirements to allow buildings with large floor plates. Specifically, pursuant to the proposed SID, new developments in the M1-5 district proposed in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district would have a maximum base height of 125 feet, with no minimum base height or streetwall requirements. Building height would be limited to 265 feet.

No off-street accessory parking would be required in the proposed M1-5 zoning districts, as per underlying zoning regulations.

Proposed M2-4 within the SID
(EXISTING M3-1 DISTRICTS)

An M2-4 district would be mapped on two full blocks bounded by West 204th Street to the north, the Harlem River to the east, West 202nd Street to the south, and Ninth Avenue to the west in the Sherman Creek sub-district. M2-4 districts typically permit commercial and industrial uses up to 5.0 FAR. The SID would modify underlying M2-4 zoning to accommodate an operational facility for Con Edison that would accommodate parking, storage uses, office space, and other accessory uses, including storing company vehicles and providing a centralized location from which Con Edison employees would be dispatched to work around the City (the "Con Edison work-out center"). Specifically, due to the sites' adjacency to narrow waterfront lots with limited development potential, the SID would waive the rear yard equivalent requirement to allow for better design, while still maintaining adequate light and area. The SID would also allow for a bridge to be built over a street to connect buildings on adjoining zoning lots, and to facilitate the construction of a more efficient facility. Lastly, the proposed SID would allow for accessory parking to be located on the rooftop as-of-right, rather than requiring a special permit, as required under the underlying M2-4 zoning regulation. No off-street accessory parking would be required in M2-4 zoning districts, as per underlying zoning regulations.

Proposed Commercial Overlays

The proposed zoning changes would replace or eliminate portions of existing C1-3 and C1-4 commercial overlays with C2-4 commercial overlays and would establish new C2-4 commercial overlays in the proposed R7A, R7D, R8, R8A, and R9A districts, as detailed below. In these areas, the C2-4 commercial overlays would support the development of mixed residential and commercial uses and would bring into conformance many existing nonconforming local retail and other commercial uses. Specifically, C2-4 commercial overlays would be mapped in the following locations:

- To a depth of 100 feet along the West 204th Street and West 206th Street frontages of the proposed R7A district in Sherman Creek sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet along the northern side of Dyckman Street between Payson Avenue and just west of Broadway in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet along either side of Broadway between West 215th Street and just north of West 207th Street in the proposed R7A district in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet along portions of Sherman Avenue between Thayer and West 207th streets and to a depth of 100 to 150 feet along portions of Sherman Avenue between West 207th and West 211th streets in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet at the northwest, southeast, and northeast corners of Academy Street and Vermilyea Avenue in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet at the northwest corner of Post Avenue and West 204th Street in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To depth of 100 feet at the southwest corner of Nagle Avenue and Academy Street of the proposed R7A district in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet at the northwest corner of Nagle Avenue and Thayer Street of the proposed R7A district in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet along the south side of West 218th Street for a distance of 150 feet east of Indian Road in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet on the southeast corner and 150 feet on the northeast corner of West 207th Street and Cooper Street in the Upland Core sub-district;
- To a depth of 100 feet along the northwest side of Broadway in the proposed R7D zoning district in the Upland Wedge sub-district;
- The entirety of the proposed R8 district in the Sherman Creek sub-district;
- The entirety of the two proposed R8A districts in the Sherman Creek sub-district; and
- The entirety of the proposed R9A district between West 206th and West 208th streets in the Sherman Creek sub-district.

C2-4 commercial overlays allow for local retail uses and commercial development (Use Groups 5 through 9, and 14) up to 2.0 FAR. Off-street accessory parking requirements for community facility and commercial uses would be waived in mixed-use developments.

Proposed City Map Changes

The Proposed Actions include changes to the City Map to:

- Demap a portion of Academy Street east of Tenth Avenue to facilitate the creation of future public open space along the Harlem River waterfront;
- Demap West 208th Street at the North Cove in the Sherman Creek sub-district to facilitate the creation of future public open space along the Harlem River waterfront;

- Demap (and dispose of) un-built and non-essential marginal and exterior streets mapped along and in the Harlem River (“Exterior Street”) between West 202nd and West 205th streets and from West 206th and West 208th streets in the Sherman Creek sub-district, with the goal of facilitating the future development of new public open spaces;
- Demap (and provide an easement for) a volume of the street above West 203rd Street east of Ninth Avenue that would extend for a length of 48 feet and width of 60 feet approximately 18 feet above grade up to a height of 75 feet above the street to facilitate the consolidation of Con Edison operations; and
- Demap (and provide an easement for) a portion of West 201st Street east of Ninth Avenue to facilitate the consolidation of Con Edison utility operations and to maintain utility access.

The proposed changes to the City Map are intended to reconnect the community to the Harlem River waterfront, improving neighborhood livability by increasing access to publicly accessible open space and the waterfront. The proposed demapping of Academy Street east of Tenth Avenue would also establish a key upland connection to the waterfront from the dense residential area west of Tenth Avenue, and is expected to serve as a publicly accessible open space along the Sherman Creek Inlet. The proposed demapping of Exterior Street would allow for the disposition of these properties for redevelopment along the waterfront with new waterfront public open space. The proposed demapping of portions of West 201st and West 203rd streets, as described above, are intended to consolidate Con Edison’s facilities in this area of the Sherman Creek sub-district, and to separate these operations from the projected mixed-use development and planned waterfront open space, as well as to maintain utility access. On West 203rd Street, Con Edison plans to construct an operational facility to store company vehicles and provide a centralized location from which Con Edison employees would be dispatched to work around the City (the “Con Edison work-out center”). Lastly, the proposed demapping of a portion of West 201st Street east of Ninth Avenue would allow this dead-end, currently gated, portion of the street to be formally closed to unauthorized vehicles. At the time of disposition, the City would retain an easement would be established on this portion of West 201st Street, which will be recorded against the property in order to maintain utility access.

Proposed Property Disposition

The Proposed Actions would include the disposition of the following properties (see also UDAAP section below):

- Block 2185; portion of Lot 36 (comprising 10,184 sf), bounded by West 205th Street to the north, Harlem River to the east, West 204th Street to the south and Ninth Avenue to the west in the Sherman Creek sub-district to facilitate the creation of waterfront open space;
- Block 2197; Lot 75 (comprising 106,450 sf), in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district to facilitate the creation of property with both street and waterfront frontage to allow subsequent development; and
- Block 2197, Lot 47 (comprising 62,275 sf) along the Harlem River in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district to facilitate the creation of property with both street and waterfront frontage to allow subsequent development (following its acquisition by the City, described in the following section).

The disposition of the City-owned lots along the Harlem River waterfront is intended to facilitate the creation of future public open space. As noted above (under the description of the proposed R8 district), the SID would allow for two density and bulk options along the waterfront, to provide an incentive for building out new public waterfront open space.

The proposed disposition of Block 2197; Lots 75 and 47 is intended to facilitate the reconfiguration of two irregularly shaped lots, one with no street frontage (Lot 75, owned by the City) and one with no waterfront frontage (Lot 47, owned by Spectrum Communications). With the Proposed Actions, the City

intends to reconfigure both lots to generally establish an east-west lot boundary, which would provide both lots with street frontage and effective waterfront frontage, facilitating the opportunity for future development and public waterfront access.

Proposed Property Acquisition

The Proposed Actions would include the acquisition of the following properties:

- Block 2197; Lot 47 (comprising 62,276 sf) along the Harlem River in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district to facilitate the creation of property with both street and waterfront frontage to allow subsequent development;
- An approximately 20,000 sf condominium unit within a future development on Block 2233; Lot 13 (Inwood Branch Library at 4780 Broadway) and a portion of Lot 20 (a portion of the adjacent J.H.S. 52 parking lot), for use as a library; and
- Portions of Block 2183; part of Lot 1 (8,626 sf), and Block 2184; part of Lot 1 (13,628 sf), to facilitate the creation of future public open space and public waterfront access.

As noted above, the proposed acquisition and disposition actions for Block 2197; Lot 47 are intended to reconfigure two adjacent City-owned and Spectrum Communications-owned lots in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district to provide both owners with properties with street and effective waterfront frontages to allow subsequent development. In the Commercial “U” sub-district, the proposed acquisition and disposition of the condominium unit would allow the City to replace the Inwood Branch Library in a planned mixed-use development on the site, for which an RFP has been released. The proposed acquisition of portions of Block 2183; part of Lot 1 and Block 2184; part of Lot 1, is intended to establish public access easements to facilitate the creation of future public open space and public waterfront access between West 202nd and Academy streets.

Urban Development Action Area (UDAA) Designation, Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) Approval, Disposition of City-Owned Properties

The Proposed Actions would include:

- ***Designation as an UDAA and UDAAP Approval:*** The Development Site (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20) consists of an underutilized property that inhibits the sound development of the surrounding community. Incentives are needed to improve the site in an effort to enhance the surrounding conditions. The project activities would protect and promote health and safety, and encourage sound growth and development. The Development Site is therefore eligible to be an UDAA and the proposed project is therefore eligible to be an UDAAP pursuant to Article 16 of the General Municipal Law.
- ***Disposition of City-Owned Property:*** The Development Site (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20) would be conveyed to the selected developer for the development of affordable housing, a new library, and Universal Pre-K classrooms. Upon completion, it is anticipated that the developer would convey the library portion to the NYPL directly or the City would reacquire the library portion (to be owned and operated by the NYPL), and the developer would convey the Pre-K portion to the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA).

E-Designations

The Proposed Actions include the placement of an (E) designation (E-459) for hazardous materials on all projected and potential development sites except for projected development site 25. In addition, (E) designation E-459 would be placed on a total of 21 projected and potential development sites (including nine projected and 12 potential development sites) to ensure that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts. These designations would specify the various restrictions, such as type of fuel to be used,

the use of low NOx burners, the distance that the vent stack on the building roof must be from its lot line(s), restrictions on operable windows, and/or the increase of the exhaust stack height. Furthermore, (E) designation (E-459) would be placed on 30 of the projected development sites and 34 of the potential development sites to ensure that there would be no significant adverse noise impacts. The (E) designation (E-459) is a mechanism that ensures no significant adverse impacts would result from a proposed action because of steps that would be undertaken prior to the development of a rezoned site. In addition, for the City-owned projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lots 13 and 20), review of a Phase II testing protocol and development of any necessary remediation plan, as well as the requirement for façade attenuation and an alternate means of ventilation will be required through the Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) between NYCHPD and the selected developer with oversight provided by NYCHPD and New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). The (E) designation (E-459) (or other measures equivalent to such a designation) would ensure that these identified sites would not be developed unless necessary remedial measures are implemented.

Non-ULURP Approvals

The Proposed Actions would result in the subdivision of City-owned waterfront lots, where tidal wetlands regulated by NYSDEC are mapped. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would require a permit from NYSDEC under the Tidal Wetlands Act (Article 25 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law) to subdivide City-owned property.

Finally, in addition to financing by NYCHPD, the selected developer of the Inwood Branch Library site would obtain funding from the NYCHDC to facilitate the development.

5. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

Analysis Year

For area-wide rezonings not associated with a specific development, a ten-year period is typically the length of time over which developers would act on the area-wide zoning map changes such as those proposed. However, given the level of density anticipated in the RWCDS and market conditions, it may take longer for the full extent of development to occur under the Proposed Actions, and as such, a fifteen-year build year was selected for the time frame of the environmental analyses. Therefore, an analysis year of 2032 is assumed for environmental analysis purposes.

Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS)

To assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, a RWCDS was developed for both the current (Future No-Action) and proposed zoning (Future With-Action) conditions for a 15-year period (build year 2032). The incremental difference between the Future No-Action and Future With-Action conditions serves as the basis for the impact analyses of the EIS. To determine the With-Action and No-Action conditions, standard methodologies have been used following the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines employing reasonable assumptions. These methodologies have been used to identify the amount and location of future development, as discussed below.

Development Site Criteria

In projecting the amount and location of new development that would occur in the proposed rezoning area with implementation of the Proposed Actions, several factors have been considered in identifying likely development sites. These include known development proposals, past and current development trends, and the development site criteria described below.

Generally, for area-wide rezonings that create a broad range of development opportunities, new development can be expected to occur on selected, rather than all, sites within the proposed rezoning area.

The first step in establishing the development scenario was to identify those sites where new development could be reasonably expected to occur.

The selection of development sites began with the baseline criteria suggested in the *CEQR Technical Manual*:

- Lots located in areas where a substantial increase in permitted FAR is proposed;
- Lots with a total size of 5,000 sf or larger (may include potential assemblages totaling 5,000 sf if assemblage seems probable);
- Underutilized lots (defined as vacant or lots constructed to less than or equal to half of the proposed FAR under the proposed zoning); and
- Lots located in areas where changes in use would be permitted.

The resulting initial list of development sites was further refined to exclude sites that would be very unlikely to be redeveloped as a result of the proposed zoning changes, for the following reasons (unless otherwise indicated through conversations with existing tenants and property owners):

- Sites where construction and/or renovation activity is actively occurring or has recently been completed;
- Sites with institutional uses, active and continuing through the build year, e.g., schools (public and private) and houses of worship, unless there are known development plans. These facilities may meet the development site criteria, because they are built to less than half of the permitted floor area under current zoning and are on larger lots. However, these facilities have not been redeveloped or expanded despite the ability to do so, and it is extremely unlikely that the increment of additional FAR permitted under the proposed zoning would induce redevelopment or expansion of these structures;
- Except for the Inwood Branch Library, sites containing government-owned properties, since the development and/or sale of these lots may require additional discretionary actions (e.g., site disposition action) from the pertinent government agency or the elimination of essential uses that cannot be relocated effectively;
- Sites crucial to the daily operations of utility companies; and/or
- Multi-story, multi-unit residential buildings with existing rent-stabilized tenants (such buildings are unlikely to be redeveloped because of the required relocation of tenants in rent-stabilized units).

Further criteria were applied to reflect specific observed development patterns within the proposed rezoning area. In recent years, the Inwood neighborhood has seen few entirely new developments constructed, despite being well served by public transportation. Market trends have indicated the neighborhood's limited and inconsistent ability to absorb significant development, with differences in development trends between the west and east of Tenth avenue portions of the neighborhood. Accordingly, certain sites that might be typically considered development sites were excluded or determined to be less likely to be developed if they met one or more of the following criteria:

- Sites generally smaller than 7,500 sf occupied by existing residential development; and/or
- Sites with a significant number of commercial and residential tenants.

Definition of Projected and Potential Development Sites

To produce a reasonable, conservative estimate of future growth, the resulting list of development sites has been divided into two categories pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines: projected development sites and potential development sites. The projected development sites are considered more likely to be developed within the 15-year analysis period for the Proposed Actions (i.e., by the 2032 analysis year), while potential sites are considered less likely to be developed over the same period.

Projected development sites were identified based on the following criteria, specific to the Inwood neighborhood:

- Sites closer to transit.
- Sites along main streets.
- Sites closer to the waterfront.
- Sites with known developers and/or development plans.
- Larger sites, relative to the SID sub-district in which they are located and as compared to surrounding sites.
- Vacant sites, or sites with minimal structures.
- Sites that would experience a large increase in the permitted density in the future with the Proposed Actions, compared to existing zoning.

Potential development sites were identified based on the following criteria:

- Sites farther from transit.
- Sites farther from the waterfront, relative to surrounding sites.
- Sites that are near an elevated rail line and/or infrastructure facilities to remain in the future with the Proposed Actions.
- Sites with recent renovations.
- Sites with significant existing structures.
- Sites with existing community facility uses.
- Slightly irregularly-shaped lots or otherwise encumbered parcels that would make as-of-right development difficult.
- Lots with multiple commercial tenants, which may be difficult to dislodge due to long-term leases.
- Active and successful neighborhood businesses or organizations unlikely to move.
- Sites divided between disparate zoning districts.
- Sites with potential contamination due to existing uses.
- Sites that would experience lesser increases in the permitted density in the future with the Proposed Actions, compared to existing zoning.

It is important to note that these criteria for both projected and potential sites are not exclusive – the determination of whether each site was projected or potential balanced each site’s location within the proposed rezoning area (i.e., west or east of Tenth Avenue), proximity to other development sites, and the ability of the market to absorb new development within the 15-year analysis period. Based on the above criteria, a total of 72 development sites (33 projected and 39 potential) have been identified in the proposed rezoning area. Table 1, below, provides a summary of the RWCDs for each analysis scenario.

The EIS will assess both density-related and site-specific potential impacts from development on all projected development sites. Density-related impacts are dependent on the amount and type of development projected on a site and the resulting impacts on traffic, air quality, community facilities, and open space. Site-specific impacts relate to individual site conditions and are not dependent on the density of projected development. Site-specific impacts include potential noise impacts from development, the effects on historic resources, and the possible presence of hazardous materials. Development is not anticipated on the potential development sites in the foreseeable future. Therefore, these sites have not been included in the density-related impact assessments. However, review of site-specific impacts for these sites will be conducted to ensure a conservative analysis.

TABLE 1
2032 RWCDS No-Action and With-Action Land Uses

Land Use	No-Action Condition	With-Action Condition	No-Action to With-Action Increment
Residential			
<i>Total Residential Units</i>	<i>798 DU</i> <i>(698,640 sf)</i>	<i>5,195 DU</i> <i>(4,536,770 sf)</i>	<i>+ 4,397 DU</i> <i>(+3,838,130 sf)</i>
Commercial			
Local Retail	181,995 sf	411,153 sf	+ 229,158 sf
Destination Retail	0 sf	104,376 sf	+ 104,376 sf
Supermarket	40,823 sf	67,781 sf	+ 26,958 sf
Office (<i>includes 233,198 sf medical research facility on Site 2 in With-Action</i>)	8,300 sf	441,297 sf	+ 432,997 sf
Auto-Related/Garage	96,548 sf	410,900 sf	+ 314,352 sf
Storage/Wholesale/Warehousing	18,545 sf	127,349 sf	+ 108,804 sf
Total Commercial (SF)	346,211 sf	1,562,856 sf	+ 1,216,645 sf
Community Facility			
Community Center	0 sf	74,663 sf	+ 74,663 sf
School (private)	0 sf	29,975 sf	+ 29,975 sf
Universal Pre-K (public)	0 sf	7,000 sf	+ 7,000 sf
Library	17,334 sf	20,360 sf	+ 3,026 sf
House of Worship	19,983 sf	29,974 sf	+ 9,991 sf
Nonprofit Office	5,000 sf	68,191 sf	+ 63,191 sf
Medical Office	22,125 sf	296,561 sf	+ 274,436 sf
Total Community Facility (SF)	64,442 sf	526,724 sf	+ 462,282 sf
Industrial			
Industrial	50,614 sf	0 sf	- 50,614 sf
Total Floor Area	1,159,907 sf	6,626,350 sf	+ 5,466,442 sf
Population¹			
Residents	2,218	14,442	+ 12,224
Workers	1,093	5,786	+ 4,693

Notes:

¹ Assumes 2.78 persons per DU for residential units in Manhattan CD12, based on 2010-2014 ACS for Marble Hill-Inwood NTA. Estimate of workers based on standard rates used in prior EIS documents, including the *East Midtown Rezoning FEIS*, *East New York Rezoning FEIS*, *Atlantic Yards FEIS*, *Western Rail Yards FEIS*, *Brownsville Ascend Charter School EA*, *Coliseum Redevelopment FSEIS*, *125th Street Corridor Rezoning FEIS*, *West 57th Street Rezoning FEIS*, and others. Employee rates used are as follows: one employee per 250 sf of office, three employees per 1,000 sf of retail/supermarket, one employee per 25 DU, one employee per 1,000 sf of auto-related/garage/storage/warehousing/industrial uses, one employee per 11.4 students in school uses, three employees per 1,000 sf of all other community facility uses.

Development Scenario Parameters

DWELLING UNIT FACTOR

The number of projected dwelling units in apartment buildings is determined by dividing the total amount of residential floor area by the average dwelling unit size of 875 sf and rounding to the nearest whole number. Since the issuance of the DEIS, NYCHPD, NYCHDC, and NYPL have selected a development team for the Inwood Affordable Housing Library Development Project, as well as announced the anticipated mixed-use development plans. As such, the Future With-Action Condition RWCDS for projected development site 25 has been updated in the FEIS to reflect the anticipated development program for this project, which would include 175 affordable DUs, rather than basing it on the average unit size used for other projected development sites.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING ASSUMPTIONS

The MIH program would require permanently affordable housing to be included within new residential developments, enlargements, and conversions from non-residential to residential use within mapped “Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas” (MIHAs). As noted above, the Proposed Actions include a zoning text amendment to establish a MIHA that would cover portions of the proposed rezoning area that would be rezoned to C4-4D, C4-5D, C6-2, R7D, R8A, R8, R9A, and portions of R7A to require the development of permanently affordable housing. Within this MIHA, all housing developments, enlargements and conversions that meet the criteria set forth in the MIH program must comply with the requirements of two primary options that pair set aside percentages with different affordability levels to reach a range of low and moderate incomes while accounting for the financial feasibility tradeoff inherent between income levels and size of the affordable set aside.

The amount of affordable housing constructed in the future with the Proposed Actions, and income levels for this housing, would depend on several factors. On privately owned sites, as a result of the Proposed Actions, the MIH program would require 25 (MIH Option 1) or 30 percent (MIH Option 2) of new housing to be affordable at a range of low- and moderate-income levels. In addition, sites may utilize affordable housing subsidies to produce additional affordable housing at a range of income levels; the amount and levels of affordability would vary depending on the programs utilized. On publicly controlled sites, the affordable program would be determined based on an agreement reached in conjunction with disposition of these sites. At this time, it has not been determined which of the MIH options would be applicable within the proposed rezoning area. Both the child care and parking analyses will utilize MIH Option 2 to ensure a sufficiently conservative basis for its specific analysis.

The proposed development at the Inwood Library site (projected development site 25) is assumed to be 100 percent affordable (175 units).

PARKING

The RWCDS assumes that all residential developments would provide accessory parking for the units for which it is required, with accessory parking waived if the number of required spaces is less than 15. As described in greater detail in the preceding section, pursuant to the proposed SID, accessory parking would be required for market-rate housing units throughout the SID at a ratio of 20 percent (i.e., 0.2 spaces per market-rate unit). Pursuant to the proposed zoning, no parking would be required for affordable housing units provided pursuant to MIH or other affordable housing units. In addition, the RWCDS assumes that accessory parking for commercial or community facility uses in mixed-use developments would be waived in the C2-4 districts under the proposed SID. The proposed SID would also allow for all accessory parking to be made publicly available.

BULK ASSUMPTIONS

As discussed above, the SID would allow for two potential development scenarios for waterfront areas being rezoned to R8 – one scenario that does not unlock higher development potential, and a scenario that does allow for increased development potential. Specifically, the proposed SID would incentivize lots with a minimum of 100 feet of frontage adjacent to the shoreline to merge with City-owned waterfront lots, thereby allowing for development at a higher FAR and more flexible bulk requirements. To assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, the RWCDS for the With-Action condition uses the scenario with the increased development potential to determine the potential for and impact of environmental impacts from the proposed zoning changes, as it represents the worst case for density-related and height-related impact categories.

In addition, as the proposed SID would allow for developments on lots that share a side lot line with an adjacent zoning lot containing buildings constructed prior to the 1961 Zoning Resolution that includes residential units, with legally required windows that face and are within 15 feet of the shared lot line, to

be allowed to break the streetwall requirement for a portion of the lot and rise an additional story (ten feet) with the provision of an open area measuring a minimum of 15 feet along the shared lot line. To assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, the RWCDs for the With-Action condition uses the scenario with the increased building height potential to determine the potential for and impact of environmental impacts from the proposed zoning changes, as it represents the worst case for height-related impact categories.

The proposed SID would also modify the bulk regulations of certain districts due to the elevated rail condition along the (1) train. Specifically, the minimum base height would be lowered from a minimum of 60 feet to a minimum of 25 feet; the maximum underlying base height (105 feet) would not change. Above the base height, a 10-foot setback would be required on narrow streets and 15-foot setback would be required on wide streets, and the maximum building height would be increased to 165 feet. To assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, the RWCDs for the With-Action condition assumes the increased building height potential to determine the potential for and impact of environmental impacts from the proposed zoning changes, as it represents the worst case for height-related impact categories.

As discussed above, the proposed SID would also facilitate future improvements to subway stations that would improve circulation and access for the disabled. Any floor area utilized by MTA for station circulation improvements would be exempted from FAR calculations, and any development required to provide an easement for an improvement would be allowed to rise an additional story (ten feet). To assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions, the RWCDs for the With-Action condition assumes the increased building height potential for certain sites to determine the potential for and impact of environmental impacts from the proposed zoning changes, as it represents the worst case for height-related impact categories. This increased building height would only apply to the RWCDs assumptions for projected development site 24 and potential development site A, which are not adjacent to lot line windows nor subject to elevated rail conditions.

Finally, in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, the proposed SID would require a five-foot sidewalk widening on the western side of Ninth Avenue between West 218th and West 219th streets, to improve circulation and mitigate significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified in the DEIS. This sidewalk widening, combined with the previously proposed widening on West 218th Street between Ninth and Tenth avenues, would ensure better pedestrian circulation in this part of Inwood. This would only affect the RWCDs assumed for projected development site 1, as the development on this site would be required to setback an additional five feet from Ninth Avenue between West 218th and West 219th streets.

The Future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action Condition)

In the future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action), the 33 identified projected development sites are assumed to mostly remain unchanged from existing conditions, or become occupied by uses that are as-of-right under existing zoning and reflect current trends if they are vacant, occupied by vacant buildings, or occupied by low intensity uses that are deemed likely to support more active uses. Table 1 shows the No-Action conditions for the projected development sites.

As shown in Table 1, it is anticipated that, in the future without the Proposed Actions, there would be a total of approximately 1,159,907 sf of built floor area on the 33 projected development sites. Under the RWCDs, the total No-Action development would comprise 798 residential units, 346,211 sf of commercial uses, 64,442 sf of community facility uses, and 50,614 sf of industrial uses.

Based on 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS) data, the average household size for residential units in Inwood is 2.78. Based on this ratio and standard ratios for estimating employment for commercial and community facility uses, the No-Action estimated population would include approximately 2,218 residents and 1,093 workers on these projected development sites.

The Future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action Condition)

The Proposed Actions would allow for the development of new uses and higher densities at the projected and potential development sites. As shown in Table 1, under the RWCDs, the total development expected to occur on the 33 projected development sites under the With-Action condition would consist of approximately 6,626,350 sf of total floor area, including 4,536,770 sf of residential floor area (5,195 DUs), 1,562,856 sf of commercial uses, and 526,724 sf of community facility uses, as well as up to 1,802 parking spaces. The With-Action estimated population would include approximately 14,442 residents and 5,786 workers on the projected development sites.

The With-Action condition also includes the proposed WAP. The WAP aims to revitalize the derelict river's edge through the creation of a shore public walkway along the Harlem River on waterfront development sites. The shore public walkway would connect and integrate existing street-end parks in the Sherman Creek sub-area as well as potential future City investments. Under the proposed WAP, private developments on sites along the waterfront would generally be required to provide these shore public walkways in accordance with specific design requirements.

Based on the RWCDs for the No-Action Scenario and With-Action Scenario conditions identified above, the net incremental change in development that would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions in the proposed rezoning area is identified in Table 1. As shown in the table, the net increment to be analyzed in the EIS would include 3,838,130 sf of residential floor area (4,397 DUs, including either 1,376 or 1,618 affordable units, depending on which MIH option is selected), 1,216,645 sf of commercial space, and 462,282 sf of community facility space, as well as a net reduction of approximately 50,614 sf in industrial space and up to 197 parking spaces (including accessory and public, and vehicle storage for Con Edison and Spectrum Communications utility vehicles, combined) depending on which MIH option is selected. The total difference between the built square footage in the No-Action and With-Action conditions is approximately 5,466,442 sf on the 33 projected development sites.

Table 1 also provides an estimate of the number of residents and workers on the 33 projected development sites in the No-Action and With-Action conditions. As indicated in the table, under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions would result in a net increment of 12,224 residents and 4,693 workers.

6. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated in the future with the Proposed Actions in the primary (project area) or secondary (¼-mile radius) study areas in the 2032 analysis year. The Proposed Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policy in the secondary study area. Overall, the Proposed Actions would encourage land uses that support the revitalization of the waterfront of Inwood, a neighborhood with excellent public transit accessibility. The Proposed Actions would introduce opportunities for new housing, including affordable housing, thereby expanding housing supply and providing more housing choices for current and future residents. Increasing rents, an aging housing stock, and a limited supply of lower- and mid-income housing pose a risk to the existing working- and middle-class character of the established Inwood neighborhood. The new housing facilitated by the Proposed Actions would help relieve pressure on existing housing stock by spurring new private housing developments, which will be required to provide permanently affordable units under the MIH program.

The Proposed Actions would also create new areas of commercial activity in order to expand the variety and types of retail, other commercial uses, and community facilities found today, and to bring jobs and new neighborhood services to the area. Higher-density development and a greater variety of land uses would ensure that existing and new residents and workers support greater diversity of retail, services, and

other commercial uses, as well as activate streets and public spaces. The proposed zoning districts would direct higher densities to areas that can accommodate future growth, including locations close to public transit and underbuilt waterfront lots.

The proposed WAP and SID would ensure development that would promote the public policies applicable to the area. Notably, the Proposed Actions are a direct result of the goals and principles outlined in *Housing New York* and support this public policy. *Housing New York's* five guiding policies and principles are fostering diverse, livable neighborhoods; preserving the affordability and quality of the existing housing stock; building new affordable housing for all New Yorkers; promoting homeless, senior, supportive, and accessible housing; and refining City financing tools and expanding funding source for affordable housing. The Proposed Actions would also promote the policies outlined in the New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP), facilitating new residential, commercial, and community facility development in an appropriate waterfront location and substantially improving waterfront access. The Proposed Actions would also be consistent with the public policies outlined in OneNYC and PlaNYC, the New York City Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) Program, the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone, the Sherman Creek Waterfront and Northern Manhattan Parks 2030 Master Plans, the Landmarks Law, Targeted Employment Areas, and the Industrial Action Plan.

Socioeconomic Conditions

This analysis finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the five socioeconomic areas of concern, including direct residential displacement, direct business/institutional displacement, indirect residential displacement, indirect business/institutional displacement, and adverse effects on specific industries.

Direct Residential Displacement

The initial assessment indicated that no further analysis of direct residential displacement is warranted. None of the 33 projected development sites include any residential units. Therefore, no existing residential units would be directly displaced due to the Proposed Actions.

Direct Business Displacement

The preliminary assessment finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to direct business displacement. In accordance with 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, direct displacement of a business or group of businesses is not, in and of itself, considered a significant adverse environmental impact. While all businesses contribute to neighborhood character and provide value to the City's economy, the *CEQR Technical Manual* specifies considerations for the preliminary assessment of direct business displacement to include: (1) whether the businesses to be displaced provide products or services essential to the local economy that would no longer be available to local residents or businesses; and (2) whether adopted public plans call for the preservation of such businesses in the area in which they are located.

Under the RWCDS, potential direct business displacement due to the Proposed Actions is expected to be limited to 31 businesses located on 12 of the 33 identified projected development sites. Such potential direct displacement is expected to occur over an approximate 15-year period on a site-by-site basis by 2032, and would be subject to lease terms and agreements between private businesses and property owners existing at the time of site redevelopment in the With-Action condition.

The 31 potentially displaced businesses provide jobs for an estimated 319 workers in five economic sectors, including food service, health care, transportation and warehousing, and other services, and account for less than four percent of the total employment (8,691 workers) in the ½-mile secondary study area. The employment associated with the potentially directly displaced businesses does not constitute a substantial portion of the secondary study area's employment base. Two of the potentially-displaced

businesses—Super Associated Marketplace and Compare Foods located on projected development sites 7 and 10—are large-format neighborhood grocery stores occupying approximately 31,900 sf and 18,000 sf, respectively, which are located within the boundaries of the City’s FRESH Program. The FRESH Program provides zoning and/or financial incentives to help promote the establishment and retention of neighborhood grocery stores. As neighborhood grocery stores within the boundaries of the FRESH Program, Super Associated Marketplace and Compare Foods are the subject of plans or programs to preserve, enhance, or protect them, but have not benefitted from FRESH incentives. While the potential direct displacement of these two supermarkets would adversely affect the availability of large format grocery stores within the immediate primary study area, with the Proposed Actions new commercial space development is expected to include two FRESH supermarkets under the RWCDs that would be comparable or larger in size to the existing Super Associated Marketplace grocery store on projected development site 7. Furthermore, there would continue to be other grocery stores within a reasonable area from which residents could shop, including numerous small-scale grocers and markets within both the primary and the secondary study areas. Therefore, the potential direct displacement of Super Associated Marketplace and Compare Foods grocery stores is not expected to result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. None of the other 29 businesses are the subject of regulations or publicly adopted plans aimed at preserving, enhancing, or otherwise protecting them in their current location.

The assessment finds that while these 31 businesses are valuable individually and collectively to the City’s economy, per *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, the directly displaced businesses do not provide products or services essential to the local economy that would no longer be available in the trade area due to the difficulty of either relocating or establishing a new, comparable business. The potentially directly displaced businesses also do not contribute substantially to a defining element of neighborhood character in the primary or secondary study area, and alternative sources for goods and services provided by these businesses can be found elsewhere in the secondary study area, the larger borough, or within a product’s trade area. It is expected that the potentially directly displaced businesses would be able to find comparable space within the secondary study area or elsewhere in the borough or City. In addition, it is the intent of the Proposed Actions to promote economic activity and further growth and development in Inwood, encouraging a mix of residential, commercial, and community facility uses and higher density concentrated along key corridors and along the waterfront. Under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions would result in the incremental development of 333,534 sf of retail, 26,958 sf of FRESH supermarket space, 432,997 sf of office, 108,804 sf of storage/wholesale/warehouse space, 63,191 sf of non-profit office, and 274,436 sf of medical office by 2032. Comparable services and employment opportunities to those provided by some of the directly displaced commercial businesses could be provided as part of the Proposed Actions.

Indirect Residential Displacement

In accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, the preliminary assessment determined that the Proposed Actions have the potential to substantially change the demographic composition and/or alter the real estate market conditions in both the primary and ½-mile secondary study areas, as they would increase the secondary study area population by more than five percent as compared to the future without the Proposed Actions.

Under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions could result in the development of 5,195 DUs (a net increase of 4,397 DUs compared to No-Action conditions) in the secondary study area in the 2032 With-Action condition, of which at least 1,379 are expected to be permanently affordable housing units. Assuming that all new residential units would be occupied and have an average household size of 2.78 persons per DU, under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions could introduce a net increase of up to 12,224 residents. This amount of new residential development would represent an approximately 14 percent increase in the housing stock and nearly a 15 percent increase in the residential population within the secondary study area, as compared to the No-Action condition. This development would be gradual and has potential to

occur over a 15-year period by private developers on a site-by-site basis, rather than all at once, with the full effects potentially being reached in 2032.

As a whole, despite the large inventory of rent regulated housing, the socioeconomic characteristics of the population living in the study area are already changing and are likely to continue to change over the next several years under the No-Action condition by 2032. The detailed analysis of the potential for indirect residential displacement impacts in the secondary study area estimates that approximately 83 percent of the rental housing stock is rent regulated and/or subsidized. An estimated 4,500 housing units in the secondary study area are unprotected by rent regulation. However, the vast majority of these unprotected rental housing units are located within buildings built before 1974 with six or more units; therefore, these currently unregulated units were once likely stabilized, but have subsequently been deregulated. Rent stabilized apartments can only legally be deregulated based on the respective apartment's rent (a legal regulated rent of \$2,700 or more) and occupant's income reaching a certain level (i.e., tenant(s) whose total annual household income exceeded \$200,000 for each of the past two years), which are higher than the median rents and household incomes in Inwood. Therefore, these unprotected apartments are likely priced at the higher end of the market and are expected to be occupied by tenants that would not be considered a vulnerable population pursuant to CEQR.

Nonetheless, any at-risk households in the neighborhood may already be experiencing rent pressures and the current average asking rents are not affordable to many of the existing residents in the primary and secondary study areas. Given current market trends, it is very likely that demand for housing in the study area would continue to escalate in the future without the Proposed Actions, and that rents within the study area could significantly increase in the future without the Proposed Actions. Therefore, irrespective of the Proposed Actions, any unprotected low-income rental households would likely continue to experience indirect residential displacement pressures.

The proposed zoning changes and mapping of MIH Area are intended to help stabilize the rental housing market by increasing the supply of housing, including requiring new residential development to provide at a minimum 25 percent of the respective floor area as permanently affordable housing. It is anticipated that through a combination of private and public sites, the City's proposed MIH program, and the availability of financing by the NYCHPD, a considerable amount of new residential units that are expected to be developed within the primary study area in the future with the Proposed Actions over the next 15 years would be permanently affordable and under regulatory agreements. It is currently the City's policy to reserve half of the permanently affordable housing that would become available for local residents already living in the respective community district. This would ensure that a substantial amount of protected affordable units would be provided in the primary study area as a result of the Proposed Actions, which would provide additional housing options for the low- and moderate-income renters, and would help ensure that Inwood and the larger secondary study area would continue to serve diverse housing needs for a range of housing income levels. The increased supply of housing is expected to provide opportunities for low- to moderate-income households to remain in the study area, including permanently affordable housing. It is expected that the residential population moving into affordable housing units would generally have income characteristics comparable to the existing residents of the secondary study area. The projected increase in housing units overall is expected to help decrease rent pressures, and ensuring that a portion of the new housing would be permanently affordable would create additional housing for those in most need.

Overall, the Proposed Actions' contributions to rent pressures in the secondary study area would be eased by the increase in supply of housing resulting from the Proposed Actions, which could serve to offset existing housing demand and rent pressures in Inwood and the secondary study area. In addition, the Proposed Actions would require permanently affordable housing, providing additional opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to remain in the area. Further, the City would aim to proactively preserve the existing affordable housing stock in the neighborhood through aggressive outreach to building owners to promote preservation loan and financing opportunities, providing tenant resources, and taking action against landlords who harass tenants. The Proposed Actions are, therefore, not expected

to result in a significant adverse impact with respect to indirect residential displacement.

Indirect Business Displacement

A detailed assessment finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement. The concern under CEQR is whether the Proposed Actions could lead to changes in local market conditions that would lead to increases in commercial property values and rents within the study area, making it difficult for some categories of businesses to remain in the area. Another concern under CEQR is whether the Proposed Actions could lead to displacement of a use type that directly supports businesses in the study area, or brings people to the area that form a customer base for local businesses.

It is the intent of the Proposed Actions to balance preservation and growth in the 59-block primary study area. The proposed zoning map changes are intended to direct economic growth and development in a manner that takes fuller advantage of the transportation assets and infrastructure in the study area. The Proposed Actions are expected to facilitate development patterns that meet the long-term community vision for Inwood by extending the mixed-use character of Inwood east to the Harlem River and preserving the strong existing residential fabric found in portions of the neighborhood west of Tenth Avenue.

The primary study area and the secondary study area have well-established residential and commercial uses and markets. While the Proposed Actions would facilitate substantial redevelopment within the primary study area, they would not introduce new uses or a new type of economic activity to the study area. The Proposed Actions would modify the underlying zoning districts as well as create a special zoning district east of Tenth Avenue that would expand economic opportunities and development options, as well as allow existing businesses and institutions to grow, by increasing density and allowing a wider variety and types of uses for several blocks in the primary study area currently zoned primarily for manufacturing or heavy commercial/automotive-related uses in the Tip of Manhattan, Upland Wedge, and Sherman Creek sub-districts. The proposed M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A districts on portions of two blocks in the Sherman Creek sub-district are intended to allow for the relocation of several wholesale tenants and facilitate the consolidation of their operations under the Proposed Actions. This zoning change is expected to support and encourage both the retention and expansion of existing commercial, semi-industrial, and light manufacturing uses, including wholesale, warehousing, and distribution establishments, while also allowing street-enlivening retail uses and residential growth to occur. The Proposed Actions also include increases in permitted densities along selected corridors, including in the Commercial “U” sub-district, to expand opportunities for housing, including significant amounts of protected affordable housing, and mapping commercial overlays along streets where existing ground floor commercial uses exist, to provide support for existing retail uses and encourage the growth of local scale commercial activity to support anticipated residential development in the area. While these changes in economic conditions could result in some limited indirect business displacement, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse indirect business displacement impacts within the primary or secondary study areas pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance.

The Proposed Actions and associated RWCDs would add an increment of 4,397 DUs, including an increment of at least 1,379 permanently affordable units, which would help to ensure there is a range of household incomes maintained within the study area. Ensuring a range of household incomes would help to preserve the existing range of price points and variety in retail offerings because people of different income levels would create the varied demands for goods at different price points. The Proposed Actions and associated RWCDs would result in an increment of 333,534 sf of retail, and 26,958 sf of FRESH supermarket, which is expected to be introduced gradually over a 15-year period. Most retail space resulting from the Proposed Actions is expected to be local retail that would largely support the local resident and worker populations and strengthen existing commercial corridors of Dyckman Street, Broadway, West 207th Street, and Tenth Avenues, and create new opportunities to the east of Tenth

Avenue along the waterfront, Ninth Avenue, and on West 218th, West 207th, West 206th and West 204th streets.

Retail establishments that could be vulnerable to indirect displacement as a result of the Proposed Actions would not meet the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria for significant displacement impact—i.e., collectively, they are not of substantial economic value to the City, in terms of importance to the City’s overall economic activity; they can be relocated elsewhere in the City; they are not subject to regulations or publicly adopted plans to preserve, enhance, or protect them; and they are not a defining element of neighborhood character. Any displacement pressure on existing retail stores is expected to be limited, as many existing stores would be able to capture additional sales from the new population, workers, and visitors introduced as a result of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions are also expected to generate additional local demand for neighborhood retail and services necessary to maintain a strong retail presence along the major retail corridors in the primary and secondary study areas. Further, as retail rents have been increasing in the primary study area within the Commercial “U” sub-district, the net increase of approximately 333,534 sf of retail space resulting from the Proposed Actions is expected to help stabilize the retail market by increasing the supply of available retail space. Therefore, the potential for indirect retail displacement as a result of increased rents would be limited, and would therefore, not lead to major changes within nearby commercial strips, would not result in adverse changes to neighborhood character, and would not result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts.

Area businesses that were identified as the most vulnerable to indirect business displacement in the study areas due to increased rents included wholesale, warehousing, light industrial, and automotive businesses located primarily in the Sherman Creek, Upland Wedge, and Tip of Manhattan sub-districts. These establishments consist of firms that would not directly benefit from the increased spending potential created by the increased residential, community facilities, and commercial development or the new residents, workers, and visitors. Many of these existing businesses would become legally non-conforming uses under the proposed zoning changes, as they are only permitted as-of-right in C8 and M zoning districts. Property owners in formerly M and C8 districts could seek to vacate existing tenants to redevelop the property for commercial, residential, and or mixed-use buildings. However, the potentially vulnerable businesses in the manufacturing zoned area would not meet the *CEQR Technical Manual’s* criteria for significant displacement impact—i.e., collectively, they are not of substantial economic value to the City, in terms of importance to the City’s overall economic activity; they can be relocated elsewhere in the City; they are not subject to regulations or publicly adopted plans to preserve, enhance, or protect them; and they are not a defining element of neighborhood character. In addition, there is already a trend within the primary study areas’ C8 and manufacturing zones toward conversion of warehouse and automotive uses to other uses (with the creation of office space at Inwood Center and the influx of several eating and drinking establishments along West 202nd and West 203rd streets near Tenth Avenue). The eastern portions of two blocks in the Sherman Creek sub-district would be rezoned to M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A, which would allow as-of-right semi-industrial and light industrial uses, as well as commercial, community facility, and residential uses. Therefore, while the Proposed Actions could lead to indirect business displacement in the above-identified C8 and manufacturing-zoned area, this would not be considered a significant adverse impact.

Adverse Effects on Specific Industries

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on specific industries within the secondary study area, or in the City more broadly. An analysis is warranted if a substantial number of residents or workers depend on the goods or services provided by the affected businesses, or if it would result in the loss or substantial diminishment of a particularly important product or service within the industry. The 31 businesses that could be potentially directly displaced from projected development sites by 2032 conduct a variety of business activities, vary in size, and are not concentrated within a specific business sector. Nor are the businesses subject to direct displacement essential to the survival of other industries outside of the secondary study area, as they do not serve as the sole provider of goods and services to an entire industry or category of business in the City. Collectively, these 31 businesses account

for a fraction of the total employment and economic activities in the secondary study area, and their products and services would continue to be available in the trade area to local residents and businesses. Furthermore, while the Proposed Actions are not expected to cause significant indirect displacement due to increased rents, any indirect displacement that may occur would not be concentrated in a particular industry. The mapping of M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A districts on portions of two blocks in the Sherman Creek sub-district is expected to expand development opportunities by providing flexibility to allow a wider range of uses and activities, and increasing the allowable density. The proposed M1-4/R7A and M1-4/R9A districts are intended to support the relocation, consolidation, and growth of existing warehouse and wholesale establishments in the Sherman Creek sub-district. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in an adverse impact on a particular industry or category of businesses within or outside of the study area, and would not substantially reduce employment or impair economic viability in an industry or category of business.

Community Facilities

Direct Effects

The Proposed Actions would not displace or otherwise directly affect any public schools, child care centers, health care facilities, or police and fire protection services facilities.

Temporary Direct Effects

The Inwood Branch Library is located on Block 2233, Lot 13, a portion of projected development site 25 (which comprises Block 2233, Lot 13 and a portion of Lot 20). As part of the Proposed Actions, projected development site 25 would be designated as an Urban Development Action Area (UDAA) and approved as an Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) to facilitate the development of affordable housing, Universal Pre-K (UPK) classrooms, and a new public library. As the redevelopment of projected development site 25 would include a new space for the Inwood Branch Library, the Proposed Actions would result in temporary direct effects only and not in any permanent direct effects to public libraries. During the construction of the proposed development on projected development site 25, a temporary library facility would be provided, in a central and accessible location in the Inwood neighborhood. It is expected that the temporary library facility would continue to operate under existing hours and would offer all existing core services, including circulation of materials, computer appointments, readers' advisory, and reference. NYPL would continue with as much current programming as possible by partnering with local community-based organizations and schools. Once construction of the new building on projected development site 25 is complete, the Inwood Branch Library would move back to its original site on projected development site 25 from the temporary location. With the provision of a temporary library facility for the duration of construction and the construction of a new, improved facility on projected development site 25, no significant adverse impacts on library facilities would result from the Proposed Actions.

Indirect Effects

Pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, detailed analyses of potential indirect impacts on public elementary, intermediate, and high schools, public libraries, and publicly funded child care centers were conducted for the Proposed Actions. Based on the *CEQR Technical Manual* screening methodology, detailed analyses of outpatient health care facilities and police and fire protection services are not warranted, although they are discussed qualitatively. As described in the following analysis and summarized below, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on public schools, libraries, or child care facilities.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on public schools. As defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse school impact may occur if a proposed action would result in both of the following conditions: (1) a utilization rate of the elementary or intermediate schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future With-Action condition; and (2) an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the No-Action and With-Action conditions.

The proposed rezoning area falls within the boundaries of New York City Community School District (CSD) 6, Sub-district 1. The 4,397 additional DUs anticipated as a result of the Proposed Actions would generate up to 528 elementary school students, 176 intermediate school students, and 264 high school students. Based on a detailed analysis of public elementary schools, under the RWCDs, the elementary utilization rate of CSD 6 would increase by 7.0 percentage points as compared to the No-Action condition, increasing from 82.7 to 89.7 percent. The detailed analysis of public intermediate schools also showed that the intermediate utilization rate of CSD 6 would increase by 6.5 percentage points under the RWCDs as compared to the No-Action condition, increasing from 64.8 to 70.4 percent. As CSD 6, Sub-district 1 elementary and intermediate schools would continue to operate with available capacity in the 2032 With-Action condition (with utilization rates of 89.7 and 70.7 percent, respectively), no significant adverse impacts on public elementary or intermediate schools would result.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the determination of impact significance for high schools is conducted at the borough level. In the future With-Action condition, Manhattan high schools are expected to operate with available capacity (82.6 percent utilization), and, therefore, no significant adverse impacts on public high schools would result.

LIBRARIES

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts to libraries. One NYPL branch library within the borough of Manhattan is located within a $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile radius of the proposed rezoning area: the Inwood Branch Library. The Proposed Actions would introduce an estimated 12,224 additional residents to the library's catchment area (compared to No-Action conditions); all of the action-generated residents were conservatively assigned to the most proximate library (the Inwood Branch Library), regardless of whether a projected development site was located within a $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile radius of other NYPL branch libraries located in the Bronx. In addition, while, in the future with the Proposed Actions, the existing Inwood Branch Library site would be redeveloped with a new mixed-use building with an 20,360-square foot (-sf) improved library space, the indirect library impact analysis conservatively assumes that the branch holdings would not increase in the With-Action condition. Using this methodology, the Inwood Branch Library's catchment area population is expected to increase by more than five percent in the future with the Proposed Actions, which may represent a significant adverse impact on library services according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if this increase would impair the delivery of library services in the study area. The Inwood Branch's holdings-per-resident ratio would remain relatively high, at 0.82. Residents in the study area would have access to the entire NYPL system through the interlibrary loan system and could have volumes delivered directly to their nearest library branch. In addition, residents would also have access to libraries near their place of work. Therefore, the population introduced by the Proposed Actions is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact on public libraries.

CHILD CARE SERVICES

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on publicly funded child care facilities. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse child care center impact could result if a proposed action results in: (1) a collective utilization rate greater than 100 percent in the With-Action condition; and (2) the demand constitutes an increase of five percent or more in the collective

capacity of child care centers serving the study area over the No-Action condition. Under the RWCDs, the Proposed Actions would add up to approximately 186 children potentially eligible for subsidized child care to the study area. The analysis of publicly funded child care services found that under the With-Action condition the child care study area would experience a utilization rate of 92.8 percent, with the utilization rate increasing by 4.6 percentage points from the No-Action condition. In the 2032 With-Action condition, study area child care facilities would continue to operate below capacity and, therefore, no significant adverse impacts on publicly funded child care facilities would result.

POLICE, FIRE, AND HEALTH CARE SERVICES

The *CEQR Technical Manual* recommends a detailed analysis of indirect impacts on police, fire, and health care services in cases where a proposed action would create a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before. The Proposed Actions are intended to preserve the existing character of the residential areas of Inwood to the west of Tenth Avenue, and to extend the well-established mixed-use Inwood neighborhood eastward of Tenth Avenue to the Harlem River. The proposed zoning changes would facilitate the construction of new housing, including affordable housing through MIH, as well as new retail, office, and community facility uses, create and reinforce a pedestrian-friendly streetscape, and provide public access to the Harlem River through new waterfront open space. The proposed rezoning area is a developed area with an existing and well-established community that is served by existing police, fire, and health care services. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not create a neighborhood where none existed before, and a detailed analysis of indirect effects on these community facilities is not warranted.

Open Space

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a proposed action may result in a significant impact on open space resources if (a) there would be direct displacement or alteration of existing open space within the study area that would have a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in the overburdening of existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space. The Proposed Actions would not have a direct impact on open space resources in the study area.

Direct Effects

The Proposed Actions would not result in the physical loss of existing public open space resources. The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse operational air quality or noise impacts affecting open space resources. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on three open space resources: the P.S. 18 Schoolyard, the Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet, and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street. As discussed in the “Shadows,” section below, shadows on the P.S. 18 Schoolyard and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street would affect the utility of the open spaces, while the Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season, potentially resulting in a significant adverse impact on the Greenstreet’s vegetation. While these would represent significant adverse shadow impacts, these open spaces would continue to be available for passive and active open spaces uses and, therefore, would not be a direct significant adverse open space impact.

In addition, as discussed in the “Construction” section below, construction activities associated with the RWCDs for the Proposed Actions would result in temporary significant adverse noise impacts at the Sherman Creek Street-End Parks at West 202nd, West 203rd, West 204th, and West 205th streets. While this is not desirable, there is no effective practical mitigation that could be implemented to avoid these noise impacts during construction. Noise levels in many parks and open space areas throughout the City that are located near heavily trafficked roadways and/or near construction sites experience comparable or higher noise levels. It should also be noted that construction noise impacts at these locations would not be expected to occur during the afternoon/evening or the weekends (i.e., outside of the typical construction

period) and that the City will require a noise mitigation plan for new construction prior to the start of work that would outline the ways the contractor intends to lessen the noise from each type of construction equipment. Therefore, while the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse construction noise impacts on this open space resource, the environmental impacts would be temporary and would not represent a direct significant adverse open space impact.

Indirect Effects

As the Proposed Actions are expected to introduce 12,224 residents and 4,693 workers under the RWCDs, compared to the No-Action condition, a detailed open space analysis for both a non-residential (¼-mile) study area and a residential (½-mile) study area was conducted, pursuant to the *CEQR Technical Manual*. In addition, given (1) the location of the proposed rezoning area in relation to open space resources, with the majority of the open space located to the west; and (2) the density of development anticipated in the (eastern) waterfront sub-districts of the Tip of Manhattan and Sherman Creek, in consultation with the NYC Parks, a supplemental indirect impact assessment was conducted for these two waterfront sub-districts.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a majority of the proposed rezoning area (generally west of Tenth Avenue) is located in an area that is considered well-served by open space, with the remainder of the proposed rezoning area (generally east of Tenth Avenue) considered neither well-served nor underserved by open space. The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio of five percent or more is generally considered significant for a project located in an area that is currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. For areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a decrease of as little as one percent may be considered significant. An open space impact assessment also considers qualitative factors. As discussed below, while no significant adverse impacts were identified for the larger non-residential and residential study areas or the Tip of Manhattan sub-district study areas, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on total and active open space resources in the Sherman Creek sub-district residential study area, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

NON-RESIDENTIAL (1/4-MILE) STUDY AREA

In the future with the Proposed Actions, while the non-residential study area's passive open space ratio would decrease by more than five percent from the No-Action condition (22.04 percent reduction), it would remain well above the City's planning guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers, at 7.30 acres per 1,000 workers. Therefore, workers in the ¼-mile study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse open space impact in the non-residential study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

RESIDENTIAL (1/2-MILE) STUDY AREA

With respect to the reduction in open space ratios in the residential study area, the residential total, passive and active open space ratios would decrease by more than five percent from the No-Action condition. While the residential total and passive open space ratios would remain above the City's planning guidelines of 2.5 acres and 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents, respectively, the residential active open space ratio would be below the City's planning guideline of 2.0 acres of active open space per 1,000 residents, at 1.48 acres per 1,000 residents. However, as (1) the total open space ratio would remain above the City's planning guideline of 2.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, at 3.79 acres per 1,000 residents; (2) the residential passive open space ratio would remain above the City's planning guideline of 0.5 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents, at 2.31 acres per 1,000 residents; (3) the proposed rezoning area is located in close proximity to several significant open space resources, just beyond the study area boundary, that provide additional active open space recreational opportunities; and (4) the Proposed Actions would substantially improve overall open space connectivity within the study area, the

Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space in the residential study area, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Tip of Manhattan Sub-district

No significant adverse open space impacts are anticipated in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district. While the residential and non-residential open space ratios are expected to increase by more than five percent, the With-Action ratios are expected to be higher than the City's optimal planning goals of 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers and 2.5, 0.5, and 2.0 acres of total, passive, and active open space per 1,000 residents, respectively.

Sherman Creek Sub-district

In the future with the Proposed Actions, while the Sherman Creek sub-district's non-residential study area's passive open space ratio would decrease by more than five percent from the No-Action condition (15.35 percent reduction), it would remain well above the City's planning guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers, at 1.54 acres per 1,000 workers. Therefore, workers in the study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources, and there would be no significant adverse open space impact in the Sherman Creek sub-district non-residential study area as a result of the Proposed Actions.

With respect to the reduction in open space ratios in the Sherman Creek sub-district residential study area, the residential total, passive, and active open space ratios would decrease by 8.83, 8.87, and 8.80 percent, respectively, from the No-Action condition. As the passive open space ratio for the sub-district's residential study area would remain above the City's planning guidelines of 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents, residents in the study area would continue to be well-served by passive open space resources and no significant adverse impacts would result in the Sherman Creek sub-district, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology. However, given the anticipated reduction in the total and active open space ratios, the fact that the ratios would be less than the City's open space planning goals, the waterfront location of the Sherman Creek sub-district, the separation of Sherman Creek from the greater open space study area's largest open space resources to the west (e.g., Inwood Hill Park, Fort Tryon Park, Fort Washington Park, and Isham Park), and the limited access points to open space resources to the south (e.g., Highbridge Park, with only one access point), the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on total and active open space in the Sherman Creek sub-district residential study area, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

Shadows

A detailed shadows analysis concluded that development resulting from the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadow impacts on four sunlight-sensitive resources. The 33 projected and 39 potential development sites identified in the RWCDs would result in incremental shadow coverage on 17 open space resources, two historic resources, and one natural resource. The detailed shadows analysis identified significant adverse shadow impacts at three open space resources (P.S. 18 Schoolyard, Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet, and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street) and one historic resource (Good Shepherd RC Church). The analysis determined that the P.S. 18 Schoolyard and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that would have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. The Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the four- to six-hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage and vegetation at this resource would be significantly impacted.

As action-generated incremental shadows would reach a maximum of nine of the church's 28 stained glass windows at any one time, incremental shadows would not result in the complete elimination of direct sunlight on all sunlight-sensitive features of Good Shepherd RC Church. However, as these incremental shadows may have the potential to affect the public's enjoyment of this feature for a duration of approximately three hours on December 21, this is being considered a significant adverse shadow impact. Mitigation measures to address these significant adverse shadows impacts are discussed in the "Mitigation" section below.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Archaeological Resources

For the purposes of this analysis, the study area for archaeological resources is limited to projected and potential development sites that are identified in the RWCDs for the Proposed Actions. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (NYCLPC) conducted an initial review of the projected and potential development sites, and in a letter dated June 8, 2017 and subsequent review in a letter dated February 16, 2018, determined that 40 lots on 14 projected and nine potential development sites possess potential archaeological significance. NYCLPC requested that a Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study of these sites be prepared to further clarify their archaeological sensitivity. The remaining projected and potential development sites in the proposed rezoning area were determined by NYCLPC to have no potential archaeological significance, and as such, no additional archaeological analysis of those properties is warranted.

A Phase 1A study of the 39 lots identified by NYCLPC in June 2017 was completed in September 2017, and a subsequent technical addendum (Addendum A) to assess the potential archaeological sensitivity of Lot 20 on Block 2233 was completed in May 2018. The Phase 1A and Addendum A conclude that 13 projected and eight potential development sites are potentially sensitive for prehistoric and/or historic archaeological remains and recommends that, should the sites be developed, archaeological testing be conducted prior to construction.

As detailed below, under 2032 With-Action conditions, the 13 projected development sites identified as potentially archaeologically sensitive in the Phase 1A would be redeveloped. The eight potential development sites are considered less likely to be developed by 2032. Under the RWCDs, several of these development sites are expected to be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, could disturb potential archaeological resources both without and with the Proposed Actions. However, the remainder of identified development sites would not be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbance on projected development sites 1, 2, 4 (partial), 5, 6 (partial), 7 (partial), 8 (partial), 12, 13 (partial), 25 (partial), and 33 (partial) and potential development sites B (partial), E, G (partial), I (partial), J, and Q (partial). Except for projected development site 25, all of these sites are currently privately-owned, and therefore, there are no mechanisms in place to require developers to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist, in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20) is City-owned, and therefore, NYCHPD would ensure that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources on a portion of Lot 20 would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer. With these measures in place, the Proposed Actions would avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources during construction on projected development site 25 to the maximum extent practicable.

In addition, it is anticipated that future development on projected development site 4 (which would be City-owned following the reconfiguration of Block 2197, Lots 75 and 47) would include a mechanism for ensuring that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources. Plans for developing this future City-owned site are not known at this time. If

the site should be developed by a private applicant, the City or NYCEDC would ensure that Phase IB testing (and any required follow-up procedures as according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*) would be required through legally-binding documents between the site's future developer and the City or NYCEDC. With these measures in place, the Proposed Actions would avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources during construction on projected development site 4 to the maximum extent practicable.

For all other sites identified above, because there is no mechanism to avoid or mitigate potential impacts on these privately-owned sites, significant adverse archaeological impacts on the nine projected and six potential development sites listed above would be unavoidable in the future with the Proposed Actions. It should be noted, however, that if human remains are encountered during the construction of an as-of-right project, it is expected that the developer would contact the New York Police Department (NYPD) and the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.

Architectural Resources

DIRECT (PHYSICAL) IMPACTS

None of the projected or potential development sites identified in the reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) for the Proposed Actions contain historic resources identified by NYCLPC as S/NR-listed, S/NR-eligible, New York City Landmark (NYCL)-designated, or NYCL-eligible. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in direct impacts to any known or potential historic architectural resources.

INDIRECT (CONTEXTUAL) IMPACTS

Although the developments resulting from the Proposed Actions could alter the settings or visual context surrounding known and/or potential historic resources, none of these changes would be significant adverse impacts. The Proposed Actions would not alter the relationship of any identified historic architectural resources to the streetscape, as all streets in the study area would remain open and each resource's relationship with the street would remain unchanged in the future with the Proposed Actions. No projected or potential developments would eliminate or substantially obstruct significant public views of architectural resources, as all significant elements of these historic resources would remain visible in view corridors on public streets. Additionally, no incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements would be introduced by the Proposed Actions to any historic architectural resource's setting under RWCDS With-Action conditions. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse indirect or contextual impacts on historic architectural resources.

CONSTRUCTION-RELATED IMPACTS

Designated NYCL or S/NR-listed historic buildings located within 90 linear feet of a projected or potential development site are subject to the protections of the NYCDOB's Technical Policy and Procedure Notice (TPPN) #10/88. As such, development resulting from the Proposed Actions would not cause any significant adverse construction-related impacts to NYCLs and S/NR-Listed resources. NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88 would apply to construction activities on potential development site F, located within 90 feet of the NYCLPC-designated Historic Street Lamppost Nos. 86, 87, & 88; projected development sites 6 and 7 and potential development sites I and M, which are all located within 90 feet of the NYCLPC-designated (and S/NR-eligible) University Heights Bridge; and potential development sites AH and AI, located within 90 feet of the S/NR-listed and NYCLPC-designated Dyckman House. No significant adverse construction-related impacts would occur to these resources.

Two S/NR-eligible historic resources are located in close proximity (i.e., within 90 feet) of projected or potential development sites that would not be redeveloped under the No-Action condition: P.S. 52 and P.S. 98. As the potential historic resources are not S/NR-listed or NYCL-designated, they are not afforded

the added special protections under NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88 beyond standard protection under NYCDOB regulations applicable to all buildings located adjacent to construction sites. However, to avoid any construction-related impacts to the S/NR-eligible P.S. 52, it is anticipated that additional protection measures would be required by NYCHPD during the construction of adjacent projected development site 25. These additional protection measures would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer, and therefore construction-related impacts to P.S. 52 would be avoided.

For the other potential historic resource (P.S. 98), additional protective measures afforded under NYCDOB TPPN #10/88, which include a monitoring program to reduce the likelihood of construction damage to adjacent S/NR-listed or NYCL-designated resources, would only become applicable if the potential resource is designated or listed in the future prior to the initiation of construction. If the potential resource is not designated or listed, however, it would not be subject to NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88, and may therefore be adversely impacted by construction of developments within 90 feet (on projected development site 5 and potential development sites E and J), resulting from the Proposed Actions. As discussed in the "Mitigation" section below, possible mitigation may include measures comparable to TPPN #10/88 applicable to the potential architectural resource. In the absence of site-specific discretionary approval, there is no mechanism that would ensure implementation and compliance since it is not known and cannot be assumed that owners of these properties would voluntarily implement the mitigation. In the absence of site-specific discretionary approval, there is no mechanism that would ensure implementation and compliance, since it is not known and cannot be assumed that owners of these properties would voluntarily implement this mitigation. ODMHED explored potential mitigation measures in coordination with NYCEDC and the NYCLPC between the DEIS and FEIS and determined that there were no feasible and practical mitigation measures to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse construction-related impact. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the construction (historic and cultural resources) impact to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse construction (historic and cultural resources).

SHADOWS IMPACTS

As discussed in the "Shadows" section above, the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church would experience incremental shadows on sunlight-sensitive features on the December 21 analysis day, which would be limited to the church's southern façade along Broadway and western façade. On December 21, incremental shadows would cover parts of anywhere from one to nine stained glass windows. From 1:49 to 2:51 PM (one hour and two minutes) incremental shadows would result in a complete loss of sunlight on the southern façade along Broadway. As project-generated shadows would reach a maximum of nine of the church's 28 stained glass windows at any one time, incremental shadows would not result in the complete elimination of all sunlight-sensitive features of this historic resource. However, as these incremental shadows may have the potential to affect the public's enjoyment of this feature for a total of three hours on December 21, this is being considered a significant adverse shadow impact. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible and practical mitigation measures, which are discussed in the "Mitigation" section below, the Proposed Actions could have an unmitigated significant adverse shadows impact on Good Shepherd RC Church.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

The Proposed Actions would result in development at a greater density than currently permitted as-of-right in the proposed rezoning area and would represent a notable change in the design character of the primary study area. Compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, the visual appearance, and thus the pedestrian experience of the primary study area, would change considerably. However, this change would not constitute a significant adverse urban design impact in that it would not alter the arrangement, appearance, or functionality of the primary study area such that the alteration would negatively affect a pedestrian's experience of the area. Rather, development anticipated in the With-Action condition would improve the pedestrian experience by replacing underdeveloped and vacant lots

with new buildings that would have active ground floor uses and transparency requirements along designated commercial corridors that would promote a more vibrant and walkable neighborhood character. New upland connections would also be required in the With-Action condition, thereby improving the pedestrian experience and enhancing access to the Harlem River and existing Street End Parks. The proposed contextual zoning districts would require streetwalls consistent with surrounding context, contributing to an enhanced pedestrian environment that would include improved sidewalk conditions throughout the proposed rezoning area.

The Proposed Actions include zoning map amendments, the creation of the SID to guide the bulk of new mixed-use development along the Harlem River waterfront and the elevated subway tracks, and the establishment of a WAP, among other actions, in the proposed rezoning area. The Proposed Actions are intended to facilitate a development plan that meets the long-term community vision for Inwood by extending the mixed-use character of Inwood east, to the Harlem River, and preserving the strong existing residential fabric found in portions of the neighborhood west of Tenth Avenue. The Proposed Actions also aim to require affordable housing, promote a public waterfront and active streetscape, and encourage new commercial and community facility uses across large swaths of the neighborhood. Through the establishment of the SID, the Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of mixed-use buildings with active ground floors that promote retail continuity and a consistent streetscape, with a variety of local retail and services to support the surrounding neighborhood. The Proposed Actions would require the creation of new open space along the Harlem River by developing a WAP and introducing a zoning mechanism that would incentivize private developments to merge with City-owned lots and build out public waterfront open space.

Although the With-Action developments would modify existing views of some visual resources located within, or visible from, the primary study area, no primary views would be blocked, and the modification of the resources' visual context would not be considered a significant adverse impact.

Additionally, while the Proposed Actions would not result in any new development in the secondary study area, many of the primary study area projected and potential developments located at, or near, the edge of the proposed rezoning area would be visible from certain sections of the secondary study area. However, the With-Action developments in the primary study area would result in structures that would be compatible with the existing built environment in Inwood. The projected and potential developments would introduce residential and retail uses, drawing pedestrians to the area and enlivening the streetscapes in the proposed rezoning area and its immediate vicinity. While the With-Action developments would be taller than the existing buildings in the Tip of Manhattan and Sherman Creek sub-districts, which would be visible from multiple points in the Marble Hill portion of the secondary study area as well as areas of the Bronx outside of the secondary study area, these changes would not be significant or adverse as the Harlem River provides a clear separation between the areas and the anticipated waterfront esplanade along the Harlem River is expected to improve views of the primary study area. Additionally, the RWCDS projected and potential developments would not significantly obstruct or alter view corridors of significant visual resources from the Upland Inwood/Fort George, Inwood Waterfront, or Marble Hill portions of the secondary study area.

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse urban design or visual resource impacts in the primary or secondary study areas, but rather, are expected to improve the pedestrian experience and create and enhance visual corridors of significant visual resources in the proposed rezoning area.

Natural Resources

Wetlands and Open Water Areas

Under the Proposed Actions, seven waterfront sites (projected development sites 2B, 4, 6, 10, 12, and 33 and potential development site I) are expected to have waterfront improvements (e.g., improved bulkhead or shoreline protection) that would stabilize the shoreline and would provide waterfront access and a

walkway in accordance with the proposed WAP. Given that these waterfront development sites have substantial linear feet of shoreline along the Harlem River, there is the potential for significant adverse impacts on natural resources and water quality that must be examined. Therefore, an assessment of potential natural resource impacts under the Proposed Actions was prepared in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines. While development is anticipated to occur under the Proposed Actions on several inland sites; none of these upland development sites possess significant natural resources, as identified by regulatory agencies. While impacts to natural resources on upland sites were also evaluated, the focus of the natural resources analysis was on the waterfront projected and potential development sites.

The increased sanitary sewage generated by the Proposed Actions would not exceed the available dry-weather capacity of the North River WPCP. Future development in the proposed rezoning area would be subject to stormwater treatment Best Management Practice (BMP) requirements to meet the City's site connection requirements and comply with the proposed WAP requirements to increase open space/softscape areas. The stormwater BMPs and additional softscape areas would result in reduced stormwater runoff such that the Proposed Actions would not exacerbate existing combined sewage overflows during storm events. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not degrade water quality or have a significant adverse impact on the aquatic biota of the Harlem River.

Groundwater

As described in the "Hazardous Materials" section below, the Proposed Actions include (E) designation E-459 which will be placed on all projected and potential development sites except for projected development site 25. For the City-owned property at projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lots 13 and part of 20), review of a Phase II testing protocol and development of any necessary remediation plan would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected developer with oversight provided through NYCHPD and NYCDEP. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources are expected.

Floodplains

Portions of eight projected development sites 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 33 and one potential development, site I are located in the 100-year floodplain, and the design and construction of buildings on these sites would need to comply with the New York City Building Code requirements for construction within the 100-year floodplain for applicable building categories. With adherence to these requirements, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on floodplains.

Vegetation and Significant Natural Communities

The proposed rezoning area is an urban context generally lacking significant terrestrial resource communities (i.e., the upland sites are developed with a mix of commercial, community facility and/or light industrial uses, or are vacant lots that are sparsely vegetated and contain rubble or other debris) with low species diversity and vegetative cover. The Proposed Actions are expected to have beneficial effects on vegetation by increasing the presence of landscaped areas, including additional tree and shrub plantings, as well as creating public waterfront access areas and landscaping as part of the proposed Inwood WAP.

Wildlife and Fish

The projected and potential development site maximum height (295 feet) is well below the 500 feet level where there would be increased risk of bird strikes for migratory birds at night. Daytime collision risks could occur, particularly for buildings with extensive reflective glass facades. To minimize the potential for daytime collisions, private developers could consider the use of materials and landscape-building

configurations during the architectural design phase that reduce the potential for resident and migratory bird strikes, such as those outlined in NYC Audubon's "Bird-Safe Building Guidelines."

The Harlem River is a designated Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and three federally-listed endangered species (the shortnose sturgeon, Atlantic sturgeon, and peregrine falcon) potentially occur in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning area. The Proposed Actions are not expected to significantly impact any life stage of the two fish species identified. No major filling or dredging, and no structures out over the water are anticipated to result from the Proposed Actions. Temporary in-water work that may result from the Proposed Actions (bulkheads, docks, new stormwater outfalls) could potentially create an increase in suspended sediments in the river. Impacts to the river bottom habitat, benthic communities, and fish communities of the Harlem River from the Proposed Actions are expected to be minor and short-lived. As part of permitting processes for any proposed in-water work, future developers of the waterfront projected and potential development sites would need to coordinate with the NYSDEC, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to identify appropriate avoidance, minimization and mitigation for any temporary and/or permanent aquatic habitat impacts.

The peregrine falcon has been documented as nesting on the Broadway Bridge, which is located directly north of the proposed rezoning area. The Proposed Actions are not expected to significantly impact peregrine falcons, their habitat, or nesting areas, as they would not result in work on the Broadway Bridge. Although temporary construction noise may result from the Proposed Actions that could potentially create nearby disturbances to the falcons, the effect of construction noise generated by construction in the future with the Proposed Actions are expected to be minor and limited to projected development site 2, the upland portion of which is approximately 124 linear feet from the Broadway Bridge and the waterfront portion of which is approximately 16 linear feet from the Broadway Bridge. Permitting processes for any proposed work near peregrine falcon nesting areas would be coordinated with NYSDEC and USFWS to identify appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation for any temporary impacts. Specific mitigation measures would be implemented as identified during the permitting process by federal and state agencies (potentially including construction timing restrictions). Therefore, it is concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse direct or indirect impacts to aquatic habitat/species from construction activity in the Harlem River or to the peregrine falcon's use of the Broadway Bridge.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts for hazardous materials. An assessment of potential hazardous materials impacts was performed for all of the 33 projected and 39 potential development sites. The hazardous materials assessment identified that each of the projected and potential development sites has some associated concern regarding environmental conditions. As a result, the proposed zoning map actions include an (E) designation (E-459) for all projected and potential development sites except for projected development site 25. For sites where upland lots with an (E) designation would be merged with demapped exterior streets (e.g., waterfront development sites in the Sherman Creek sub-district), the (E) designation requirements would apply to the entirety of the merged zoning lot and, as such, reduce or avoid adverse impacts related to hazardous materials. For the City-owned property at projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lot 13 and Lot 20), review of a Phase II testing protocol and development of any necessary remediation plan would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected developer, with oversight provided through NYCHPD and NYCDEP.

With the implementation of the measures required by the (E) designation or an equivalent institutional control, such as an LDA, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Water Supply

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply system. The 33 projected development sites in the proposed rezoning area are expected to generate a water supply demand of approximately 2,050,964 gallons per day (gpd) in the 2032 With-Action condition, an increase of 1,687,004 gpd, or approximately 1.7 million gallons per day (mgd), compared to demand in the future without the Proposed Actions. Future incremental demand from the projected development sites in the With-Action condition would be dispersed throughout the 59-block proposed rezoning area and would represent approximately 0.17 percent of the City's average daily water supply of approximately one billion gpd.

Wastewater Treatment

In the future with the Proposed Actions, wastewater from the projected development sites would continue to be treated by the North River Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP), which has a design capacity of 170 mgd. Under the RWCDs, development on the 33 projected development sites are expected to generate a total of approximately 1,695,735 gpd of sanitary sewage, an increase of 1,410,191 gpd over No-Action conditions. With an existing average dry weather flow of 107 mgd to the North River WPCP, the demand associated with the Proposed Actions would be well within the capacity of the affected treatment plant, no significant adverse impacts to the City's wastewater treatment services would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

In conjunction with the Proposed Actions, the NYCEDC is currently working with other City agencies (including the NYCDEP) to investigate and confirm existing sewer capacity in the neighborhood and to develop a new drainage plan for the area that would respond to future capacity requirements.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to wastewater treatment would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Stormwater and Drainage Management

Depending on rainfall volume and duration, the total combined volumes (including stormwater and wastewater) to the combined sewer system from the 33 projected development sites would range from 0.27 to 2.89 million gallons. Compared to existing volumes to the combined sewer system from the 33 projected development sites, combined flows would increase by 0.26 to 1.42 million gallons, depending on the storm event. These increased flows to the City's combined sewer system may be discharged as combined sewer overflow (CSO) into the Harlem and/or Hudson Rivers during rain events.

Because of the available assimilative capacity of the North River WPCP, the projected increased flows to the combined sewer system would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality. In addition, as noted above, NYCEDC is currently working with other City agencies (including NYCDEP) to investigate and confirm existing sewer capacity in the neighborhood and to develop a new drainage plan for the area that would respond to future capacity requirements. As part of the drainage plan, future development within the proposed rezoning area may be required to provide new sewer infrastructure, potentially including new separate storm sewers, which would reduce stormwater flows to the combined sewer systems and thereby reduce the potential for CSO events. As such, and in consideration of the required best management practices (BMP) measures that would be implemented on each projected development site by their respective developer in accordance with the City's site connection requirements, it is concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to local water supply or wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services. The Proposed Actions would generate an increment above the No-Action condition of approximately 169.5 tons per week of solid waste, but would not directly affect a solid waste management facility. Approximately 57.2 percent of the additional solid waste generated by the Proposed Actions would be handled by the DSNY, and 42.8 percent would be handled by private carters. Overall, the uses facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be expected to generate solid waste equivalent to approximately eight DSNY truck loads per week and up to six commercial carter truck loads per week. Although this would be an increase compared with conditions in the future without the Proposed Actions, the additional solid waste resulting from the Proposed Actions would be a negligible increase relative to the approximately 9,000 tons of waste handled by commercial carters every day or the 12,260 tons per day handled by DSNY, and it would also represent approximately 0.11 percent of the City's anticipated future weekly commercial and DSNY-managed waste generation in 2025, as projected in the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP). As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity. The Proposed Actions would also not conflict with, or require any amendments to, the City's solid waste management objectives as stated in the SWMP. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services.

The Proposed Actions are also not expected to directly affect operations at the DSNY garage. Under the Proposed Actions, it is anticipated that there would be no geometric changes nor operational changes (e.g., roadway closures, reversals, etc.) to the street network used by sanitation trucks to access the garage. In addition, there would be no changes to curbside parking regulations on block fronts along Ninth Avenue and West 215th and West 216th streets currently used for garage operations. (Sidewalks and curbside space adjacent to the DSNY garage are routinely used for sanitation truck and employee auto parking as well as for the storage of snow plow blades and other equipment.) The potential effects to garage operations from traffic and pedestrian mitigation measures associated with the Proposed Actions are further discussed in the "Mitigation" section below.

Energy

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on energy systems. Development facilitated by the Proposed Actions is expected to create an increased demand on energy systems, including electricity and gas. It is estimated that With-Action development on the 33 projected development sites would result in an increase of approximately 837.3 billion British thermal units (BTUs) over No-Action conditions. This increase in annual demand would represent approximately 0.5 percent of the City's forecasted future annual energy requirement of 173 trillion BTU and, therefore, is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact on energy systems. Moreover, any new developments resulting from the proposed actions would be required to comply with the NYCECC, which governs performance requirements of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, as well as the exterior building envelope of new buildings. In compliance with this code, new developments must meet standards for energy conservation, which include requirements relating to energy efficiency and combined thermal transmittance.

Transportation

Traffic

Traffic conditions were evaluated for the weekday 7:30-8:30 AM, 1:30-2:30 PM, and 4:45-5:45 PM and Saturday 3:45-4:45 PM peak hours at 66 intersections in the traffic study area where additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Actions would be most heavily concentrated. The traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at 47 intersections (34 signalized and 13 stop-controlled) during one or more analyzed peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified to 73

lane groups at 41 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 50 lane groups at 31 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 68 lane groups at 39 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 53 lane groups at 32 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. The “Mitigation” section below discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

Transit

SUBWAY

Subway Stations

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 3,537 and 4,344 new subway trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours. The analysis of subway station conditions focuses on a total of six New York City Transit (NYCT) subway stations in proximity to the proposed rezoning area where incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 200-trip *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in one or both peak hours. These include the Dyckman Street, 207th Street, 215th Street, and Marble Hill-225th Street stations served by No. 1 trains operating on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line and the Dyckman Street and Inwood-207th Street stations served by A trains operating on the on the Eighth Avenue Line.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the south-facing stair to the northbound (uptown) platform at the 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) D with a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio of 1.22 in the PM peak hour. Based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, this stair (stair S2) would be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand in the PM. All other analyzed stairs, and all analyzed fare arrays at the six study area subway stations are projected to operate at an acceptable LOS C or better in both peak hours in the With-Action condition and would therefore not be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

Subway Line Haul

The proposed rezoning area is served by two NYCT subway routes—A express trains operating on the Eighth Avenue Line and No. 1 trains providing local service on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line. To the south of the proposed rezoning area, A trains connect with C local service at the 168th Street station, and No. 1 trains connect with No. 2 and No. 3 express trains at the 96th Street station. The peak direction of travel on these lines is typically southbound in the AM peak hour and northbound in the PM peak hour.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the greatest increases in incremental trips per subway car would occur on No. 1 trains with an average of 7.9 additional southbound trips in the AM peak hour and 9.1 additional northbound trips in the PM, and on A trains with an average of 5.3 additional southbound trips in the AM and 5.4 northbound trips in the PM. As all of these trains would be operating below guideline capacity at their maximum load points in each peak hour, they would not be considered significantly adversely impacted by action-generated demand based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria. All other analyzed subway routes (the C and Nos. 2 and 3 trains) are expected to experience an average of less than five incremental trips per car in the peak direction in each peak hour as a result of the Proposed Actions, and therefore would also not be considered significantly impacted based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

BUS

The proposed rezoning area is served by a total of four local bus routes and one Select Bus Service (SBS) route operated by NYCT (the Bx7, Bx12, Bx12 SBS, Bx20, and M100), and one express bus route operated by MTA Bus Company (the BxM1). The Proposed Actions would generate a total of approximately 709 and 923 incremental bus trips on these routes during the weekday AM and PM peak

hours, respectively. A preliminary screening assessment concluded that new demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 50-trip per direction *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM peak hour at the maximum load points along the NYCT Bx7, Bx12 SBS, and M100 routes.

Based on projected levels of bus service in the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in capacity shortfalls of 15 spaces and 51 spaces on the northbound and southbound Bx7 services, respectively, in the AM peak hour, and three spaces on the northbound Bx7 in the PM peak hour. Therefore, based on *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, northbound Bx7 service would be significantly adversely impacted in both peak hours while southbound Bx7 service would be significantly impacted in the AM peak hour. These significant impacts could be mitigated by adding one northbound and one southbound Bx7 bus in the AM peak hour, and one northbound Bx7 bus in the PM peak hour.

Pedestrians

The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 2,298 walk-only trips in the weekday AM peak hour, 8,093 in the weekday midday, and 4,469 in the weekday PM peak hour. Persons en route to and from subway station entrances and bus stops would add 4,246, 3,664, and 5,267 additional pedestrian trips to proposed rezoning area sidewalks and crosswalks during these same periods, respectively. Peak hour pedestrian conditions were evaluated at a total of 186 representative pedestrian elements where new trips generated by projected developments are expected to be most concentrated. These elements—73 sidewalks, 61 corner areas, and 52 crosswalks—are primarily located in the vicinity of major projected development sites and corridors connecting these sites to area subway station entrances and bus routes. Based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, a total of seven pedestrian elements would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions, including two sidewalks, four crosswalks, and one corner area. Potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse pedestrian impacts are discussed in the “Mitigation” section below.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety

The entire length of Broadway within the traffic study area was identified in the *Vision Zero Manhattan Pedestrian Safety Action Plan* as a Priority Corridor where safety issues were found to occur systematically at an area-wide level. No Priority Intersections or Priority Areas were identified within the traffic or pedestrian study areas.

Crash data for traffic and pedestrian study area intersections were obtained from NYCDOT for the three-year reporting period between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2014 (the most recent period for which data were available for all locations). During this period, a total of 580 reportable and non-reportable crashes, one fatality, and 159 pedestrian/bicyclist-related injury crashes occurred at study area intersections. A review of the crash data identified five intersections as high crash locations (defined as those with 48 or more total reportable and non-reportable crashes or five or more pedestrian/bicyclist injury crashes occurring in any consecutive 12 months of the most recent three-year period for which data are available). NYCDOT has proposed or recently implemented improvements at four of these five high crash locations. Additional measures that could be employed to increase pedestrian/bicyclist safety could include installation of additional high visibility crosswalks where not already present, and improved street lighting.

Parking

The parking analyses document changes in the parking supply and utilization in the proposed rezoning area and within ¼-mile of projected development sites under both No-Action and With-Action conditions.

There are a total of 22 off-street public parking lots and garages within the parking study area of which eight are located on projected development sites. Seven of these facilities would be displaced by new

development under the Proposed Actions while one would be displaced under both the No-Action and With-Action conditions.

Under the With-Action RWCDs, it is assumed that up to 1,197 accessory parking spaces would be provided on projected development sites compared to the estimated 882 accessory spaces (including 599 spaces from existing uses and 283 spaces from new development) that would be present on projected development sites under the No-Action RWCDs. This total number of accessory spaces in the With-Action condition conservatively assumes that up to 30 percent of new residential development would be designated as affordable and would therefore not require accessory parking under the proposed zoning. It is also conservatively assumed that accessory parking requirements would be waived for any site requiring fewer than 15 parking spaces.

After accounting for new parking demand and the number of required accessory spaces provided on a site-by-site basis under the RWCDs, it is estimated that compared to the No-Action condition, incremental parking demand from new development associated with the Proposed Actions would total approximately 1,081 spaces at off-street public parking facilities and on-street in the weekday midday period and 1,012 spaces during the overnight period. In addition, under the Proposed Actions, a total of 721 spaces in seven existing public parking facilities located on projected development sites would be displaced, and no new public parking capacity would be provided on any projected development site.

In the future with the Proposed Actions, there would be a deficit of approximately 1,049 spaces of on-street and off-street public parking capacity within ¼-mile of the proposed rezoning area in the weekday midday period, and approximately 291 spaces during the overnight period. These deficits would reflect action-generated demand not otherwise accommodated in accessory or off-street public parking facilities as well as demand displaced from existing parking facilities on projected development sites. While some drivers destined for the parking study area would potentially have to travel a greater distance (e.g., between a ¼- and ½-mile) to find available parking, these shortfalls would not be considered a significant adverse impact based on *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria due to the magnitude of available alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse parking impacts during the weekday midday peak period for commercial and retail parking demand, nor during the overnight peak period for residential demand.

Air Quality

The analyses conclude that the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts on sensitive uses in the surrounding community, and the Proposed Actions would not be adversely affected by existing sources of air emissions in/around the proposed rezoning area. A summary of the general findings is presented below.

The stationary source analyses determined that there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems at the projected and potential development sites. At certain sites, an (E) designation (E-459) specifying fuel, boiler and/or stack location restrictions would be placed as part of the zoning proposal to ensure the developments would not result in any significant air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions due to individual or groups of development sites.

An analysis of the cumulative impacts of industrial sources on projected and potential development sites was performed. Maximum concentration levels at projected and potential development sites were below the air toxic guideline levels and health risk criteria established by regulatory agencies, and below National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Large and major emissions sources within 1,000 feet of a projected or potential development site were also analyzed. One existing emission source, the MTA 207th Street Rail Yard (MTA Rail Yard) boilers, has the potential to result in an exceedance of the one-hour NO₂ NAAQS at projected development site 5. To address this impact, restrictions on air intake and

operable window locations at projected development site 5 are proposed through an (E) designation (E-459).

The mobile source analyses determined that concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) and fine particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}) due to action-generated traffic at intersections would not result in any violations of NAAQS or exceed City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) *de minimis* criteria. Mobile source emissions resulting from incremental vehicle volumes anticipated in the future with the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse air quality impact.

The parking facilities assumed to be developed as a result of the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

It is estimated that the RWCDS associated with the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 50,650 total metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) of annual emissions from building operations and approximately 31,131 metric tons of CO₂e emissions from mobile sources annually, for an annual total of approximately 81,781 metric tons of CO₂e emissions. This represents approximately 0.16 percent of the City's overall 2015 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of approximately 52.0 million metric tons. It should also be noted that the estimated GHG emissions for the Proposed Actions conservatively do not account for any energy efficiency measures that may be implemented by individual developments on projected development sites.

The Proposed Actions would advance New York City's GHG reduction goals by virtue of their nature and location. By revitalizing and reinforcing the proposed rezoning area, which is served by six NYCT subway stations, six bus routes, and two commuter rail stations, the Proposed Actions support transit-oriented development in New York City. Further, the new buildings facilitated by the Proposed Actions, which would replace existing structures or vacant lots, would be subject to the NYCECC, which governs performance requirements of HVAC systems, as well as the exterior building envelope of new buildings. In compliance with this code, new development resulting from the Proposed Actions must meet standards for energy efficiency. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the City's applicable emissions reduction goals of transit-oriented development and construction of new resource- and energy-efficient buildings.

Portions of the proposed rezoning area are located within the 100- and 500-year flood zones and, therefore, are susceptible to storm surge and coastal flooding. Portions of the proposed rezoning area are also located within the 100- and 500-year projections developed by the New York City Panel on Climate Change (NPCC) for the 2050s. No new vulnerable, critical, or potentially hazardous features would be facilitated in areas that would likely flood from future mean higher high water (MHHW). New vulnerable and critical features within the current one percent annual chance floodplain would be designed with flood-resistant construction standards, and the Proposed Actions would not inhibit the ability of vulnerable features located within the future one percent annual chance floodplain to be made resilient through future adaptive actions, like retrofits. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with New York City policies regarding adaptation to climate change.

Noise

In the future with the Proposed Actions, the predicted peak period L₁₀ values at the receptor locations would range from a minimum of 65.8 dBA to a maximum of 87.1 dBA. When compared to the future without the Proposed Actions, the relative increases in noise levels are expected to range between 0.0 and 2.1 dBA, all falling below the 3.0 dBA *CEQR Technical Manual* impact threshold. Therefore, no significant adverse mobile source noise impacts due to action-generated vehicular traffic would occur.

The building attenuation analysis concludes that in order to meet CEQR interior noise level requirements, up to 43 dBA of building attenuation would be required for buildings, and in order to meet U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) interior noise level guidelines, 30 dBA of building attenuation would be required for any new development at projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20), as this site may receive Federal funding. The requirement for these levels of façade attenuation as well as the requirement for an alternate means of ventilation will be included in an (E) designation (E-459) or comparable measure that would apply to 30 of the 33 projected development sites and 34 of the 39 potential development sites. For the City-owned property at projected development site 25, the requirement for façade attenuation as well as the requirement for an alternate means of ventilation will be required through the LDA between the NYCHPD and the selected developer, with oversight provided through NYCHPD and the NYCDEP. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts related to building attenuation requirements.

Public Health

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse public health impacts as they would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the following technical areas that contribute to public health: air quality, water quality, operational noise, or hazardous materials. However, as discussed in the, “Construction” section below, the Proposed Actions could result in unmitigated construction noise impacts, as defined by *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds. As such, it was determined that a public health assessment as to construction noise was appropriate. The analysis found that while during some periods of construction the Proposed Actions could potentially result in significant adverse impacts related to noise, as defined by *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds, the predicted overall changes in noise levels would not be large enough to significantly affect public health. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse public health impacts during construction.

Neighborhood Character

The preliminary assessment conducted shows that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. The proposed rezoning area and surrounding study area include parts of the following three neighborhoods of northern Manhattan: Inwood; Fort George; and Marble Hill.

Per the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the preliminary assessment evaluates the expected changes resulting from the Proposed Actions in the following technical areas: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; transportation; and noise. The assessment uses the findings from the respective chapters of this EIS to identify whether the Proposed Actions would result in any significant adverse impacts or moderate adverse effects in these technical areas, and whether any such changes would have the potential to affect the defining features of neighborhood character. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts evaluated for this analysis. Although significant adverse impacts would occur with respect to open space, shadows, historic resources, and transportation, these impacts would not result in a significant change to one of the determining elements of neighborhood character.

Construction

Construction of the 33 projected development sites would not result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use and neighborhood character, socioeconomic conditions, open space, hazardous materials, transportation, or air quality. Based on the RWCDs construction schedule, construction activities would be spread out over a period of approximately 15 years, throughout an approximately 59-block proposed rezoning area, and construction of two-thirds of the projected development sites would be short-term (i.e., lasting up to 24 months). While construction of the projected development sites would result in temporary increases in traffic during the construction period, access to residences, businesses,

and institutions in the area surrounding the development sites would be maintained throughout the construction period (as required by City regulations). While construction of the new buildings due to the Proposed Actions would cause temporary impacts, particularly related to noise, it is expected that such impacts in any given area would be relatively short term, even under the worst-case construction sequencing, and therefore would not create neighborhood character impact. Further discussions of the findings of the construction transportation, air quality, noise, community facilities, open space, historic resources, and hazardous materials analyses are provided below.

Transportation

Construction travel demand is expected to peak in the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2024 when operational traffic from nine completed projected development sites would also be present on the study area street network. This period was therefore analyzed for potential transportation impacts during construction.

TRAFFIC

During construction, traffic would be generated by construction workers commuting via autos and by trucks making deliveries to projected development sites. In 2024, traffic conditions during the 6:00-7:00 AM and 3:00-4:00 PM construction peak hours are expected to be generally better than during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2032. Consequently, there would be less likelihood of significant adverse traffic impacts during the 2024(Q4) peak construction period than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2032. Any significant adverse traffic impacts expected during peak construction activity in 2024 would be most likely to occur at intersections in the immediate proximity of projected development sites 4 and 33 along the northern segment of Ninth Avenue, and sites 7 and 10 along the southern segment of Ninth Avenue, all of which would be under construction at that time.

NYCEDC in conjunction with NYCDOT and ODMHED has developed a scope of work for a traffic monitoring program (TMP). The TMP would be implemented if the Proposed Actions are approved, in order to determine whether the future volume projections presented in the FEIS are occurring at the rate assumed and to verify the need and effectiveness of various measures proposed to mitigate construction and operational transportation impacts.

TRANSIT

The construction sites are located in an area that is well served by public transportation, with six subway stations, two commuter rail stations, four local bus routes, one Select Bus Service (SBS) bus route, and one express bus route located in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning area. In 2024, transit conditions during the 6:00-7:00 AM and 3:00-4:00 PM construction peak hours are expected to be generally better than transit conditions during the analyzed operational peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2032; incremental demand would be lower during construction, and most construction trips would not occur during the peak hours of commuter demand. Consequently, there would be less likelihood of significant adverse subway and bus transit impacts in 2024 than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2032. It is expected that mitigation measures identified for 2032 operational transit impacts would also be effective at mitigating any potential impacts from construction subway and bus trips in 2024 when construction activity is expected to peak.

PEDESTRIANS

In 2024(Q4), pedestrian trips by construction workers would be concentrated in proximity to the four projected development sites that would be under construction in this period (sites 4, 7, 10 and 33) and along corridors connecting these sites to area transit services. As these construction trips would primarily occur outside of the weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods and the weekday midday peak period—the times when area pedestrian facilities typically experience their greatest demand—the

Proposed Actions' significant adverse pedestrian impacts would be less likely to occur during this peak construction period than with full build-out of the Proposed Actions in 2032. It is expected that the proposed mitigation measures identified for the 2032 operational pedestrian impacts in proximity to sites 4, 7, 10 and 33 would also be effective at mitigating any potential impacts from construction pedestrian trips during the 2024 (Q4) peak construction period.

PARKING

Construction worker parking demand would be equivalent to approximately 190 spaces in the 2024(Q4) peak construction period. While this demand would potentially contribute to a parking shortfall in the weekday midday and overnight within ¼ mile of projected development sites, it would not be considered a significant adverse parking impact under *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria given the availability of alternative modes of transportation in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning area.

Air Quality

The potential air quality impacts of the Proposed Actions were examined through a detailed analysis of a worst-case cluster of overlapping construction in the Sherman Creek area (projected development sites 7, 8, 9, and 10). This cluster of sites has the highest potential for air quality impacts in the study area, and smaller individual sites would have substantially lower impacts. The short-term and annual time periods for analysis were selected through preparation of a monthly emissions profile based on the potential construction equipment requirements for each site. Off-road equipment, on-road haul truck, and fugitive dust emissions were quantified and impacts at receptors using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) models and methods consistent with the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The analysis accounts for the emission control measures mandated by existing laws and regulations applicable to private developers, including the use of ULSD, dust control measures and idling restrictions.

No exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or CEQR *de minimis* criteria are predicted for carbon monoxide (CO), 24-hour particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5}), or annual average nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). The construction air quality analysis results show an exceedance of the CEQR *de minimis* criteria for annual average PM_{2.5}, with a predicted concentration of up to 0.53 µg/m³. The highest annual PM_{2.5} concentration increment would be geographically limited to sidewalk receptors directly adjacent to projected development sites 7 and 10. Sidewalk receptors do not represent an area of long-term air quality exposure. Adjacent to projected development site 7, the 0.3 µg/m³ CEQR *de minimis* criteria would be exceeded along approximately 45 linear feet on north facade and 25 linear feet on the east façade of one residential building (420 West 206th Street [Block 2202, Lot 9]). The highest ground-level concentration at this building would be 0.33 µg/m³. Modeling of receptors at multiple elevations at this building demonstrates the exceedance of the *de minimis* criteria would be limited to the ground level (lower 12 feet) of this six-story building. There are four sets of windows on the north façade and one window on the east façade within the area of the CEQR *de minimis* criteria exceedance. The maximum duration of the impact would be eight months—in subsequent years of activity after the excavation phase, equipment requirements and dust generation would decrease and the *de minimis* criteria would not be exceeded. In addition, depending on the extent to which construction occurs during winter months when windows are likely to be closed, the level of exposure would be less.

The remainder of the area of exceedance of the *de minimis* criteria around projected development site 7 comprises surface parking and commercial/warehousing land uses, resulting in limited potential for prolonged exposure of sensitive populations.

Adjacent to projected development site 10, the area of exceedance of the 0.3 µg/m³ CEQR *de minimis* criteria would include surface parking and commercial/warehousing land uses, as well as the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 204th Street. Exposure at the park would be short-term (length of time per park visit) and sporadic (number of times an individual visits the park); therefore, this would not

constitute exposure of populations to PM_{2.5} concentrations exceeding the *de minimis* criterion for prolonged durations during the construction of projected development site 10. No existing residential or community facility buildings are expected to exceed the *de minimis* criteria over prolonged durations during construction of projected development site 10.

For both projected development sites 7 and 10, the background concentration for annual average PM_{2.5} is 9.0 µg/m³, which indicates there is no potential for the 12 µg/m³ NAAQS to be exceeded based on the modeled annual PM_{2.5} concentration increments.

The duration of exposure would be temporary, as projected development sites 7 and 10 are completed, and concentrations at these locations would decrease below the *de minimis* criteria in subsequent construction years. The highest emissions would occur during the first eight months of 2024 when demolition/excavation/foundation work is expected to be occurring (which was included in the modeled worst-case time period). Both sites would end excavation/foundation work in 2024(Q3), after which time superstructure work would commence and generation of fugitive dust would decrease. Both sites would complete superstructure work in 2025(Q4), after which time construction equipment activity would decrease even further during the remaining interior fit-out phase. Therefore, considering the impacts would result in the temporary exceedance of the CEQR impact threshold and would be below NAAQS, the exceedance is not considered a significant adverse impact. Since no significant adverse impact occurs from the worst-case site cluster, no significant adverse air quality impacts would occur from the construction related to the Proposed Actions.

Noise

Detailed quantitative construction noise modeling was completed for a cluster of projected development sites as well as an individual site to determine typical construction noise levels for excavation, superstructure, and interior fit-out construction phases. Significant adverse construction noise impacts at sensitive receptors were identified in consideration of the magnitude of the noise level increase (three dBA, a “noticeable” noise level increase per the *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology), the anticipated absolute noise level (45 dBA interior noise levels for residential, mixed-use, and public facilities/institutions and 80 dBA for open space), and the duration of the predicted elevated noise level.

Four street-end parks directly adjacent to projected development sites at West 202nd, 203rd, 204th, and 205th streets would experience increases in noise levels of greater than three dBA and absolute noise levels exceeding 80 dBA during the construction of projected development sites 12 (components on either side of West 203rd Street) and 10. Although there would be no impact to the street-end parks on weekends, the high magnitude and duration of construction noise impacts on weekdays is considered a significant adverse impact.

A total of four places of worship, four schools, and one geriatric center would experience interior noise levels substantially above the CEQR interior noise criterion and would experience significant adverse noise impacts. These institutions would experience construction noise level increments of more than three dBA intermittently for between 12 and 52 months. Weekend usage of religious facilities would not be affected as construction would occur during the daytime on weekdays.

A total of 41 existing residential and mixed-use buildings were considered to have potentially significant adverse construction noise impacts; these impacts could occur intermittently during ten to 49 months durations. Although construction noise impacts would not occur at night and on weekends, the construction during the day near these locations may result in annoyance to building occupants.

Finally, an assessment of impacts from construction occurring near projected development site buildings that have been completed and occupied was performed. Significant impacts were identified at two sites out of the 33 projected development sites, taking into account (E) designation (E-459) attenuation requirements identified as part of the analysis.

The analysis is based on a conceptual site plan and construction schedule; it is possible that the actual construction may be of less magnitude, or that construction on multiple projected development sites may not overlap, in which case construction noise would be less intense than the analysis predicts. It should also be noted that even the locations considered to be significantly impacted would not experience continuous noise—construction noise is by its nature is intermittent and even in the peak construction periods there would be times when noise levels would be below the conservative noise levels predicted for impact assessment purposes.

Community Facilities

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, construction impacts to community facilities are possible if a community facility would be directly affected by construction (e.g., if construction would disrupt services provided at the facility or close the facility temporarily, etc.). The Proposed Actions would result in physical change to the existing building in which the existing Inwood Branch Library is currently located and would therefore result in temporary displacement of the existing Inwood Branch Library on projected development site 25 and relocation to a temporary location during the site's construction. During the construction of the proposed development on projected development site 25, a temporary library facility would be provided, in a central and accessible location in the Inwood neighborhood. It is expected that the temporary library facility would continue to operate under existing hours and would offer all existing core services, including circulation of materials, computer appointments, readers' advisory, and reference. NYPL would continue with as much current programming as possible by partnering with local community-based organizations and schools. Once construction of the new building on projected development site 25 is complete, the Inwood Branch Library would move back to its original site on projected development site 25 from the temporary location. With the provision of a temporary library facility for the duration of construction, no significant adverse impacts on the Inwood Branch Library would occur during the RWCDS construction.

In addition, while construction of the projected development sites would result in temporary increases in traffic during the construction period, access to and from any other community facilities in the proposed rezoning area would not be affected during the construction period. Construction workers would not place any burden on public schools and would have minimal, if any, demands on libraries, child care facilities, and health care services. NYPD and New York City Fire Department (FDNY) emergency services and response times would not be materially affected by construction due to the geographic distribution of the police and fire facilities and their respective coverage areas.

Open Space

While no open space resources are located on any of the projected development construction sites, several of the projected development sites are located in close proximity to existing open space resources. As such, depending on the timing of the construction for the projected development sites, access to existing open space resources may be limited due to potential construction staging activities on adjacent street beds. If the construction staging of their project is adjacent to a NYC Parks resource, the site developer would be required to apply for a construction permit with NYC Parks, which would limit the length of time a construction project may block an open space resource and dictate how the area must be restored following construction. It is anticipated that only one of the street end parks between West 202nd and West 205th streets would be closed at a time, allowing public access to the parks on adjacent streets. No other publicly accessible open space would be impeded during construction within the proposed rezoning area. In addition, while construction of the new buildings due to the Proposed Actions would cause temporary impacts, particularly related to noise, it is expected that such impacts in any given area would be relatively short term, even under the worst-case construction sequencing, and therefore would not create an open space impact. Therefore, no significant construction impacts to open space are expected.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study prepared for the Proposed Actions and a subsequent technical addendum (Addendum A) for Lot 20 on Manhattan Block 2233 concluded that 13 projected and eight potential development sites are potentially sensitive for prehistoric and/or historic archaeological remains. Under the RWCDS, several of these development sites are expected to be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, could disturb potential archaeological resources both without and with the Proposed Actions. However, the remainder of identified development sites would not be redeveloped under No-Action conditions, and as such, the Proposed Actions would result in new in-ground disturbance on projected development sites 1, 2, 4 (partial), 5, 6 (partial), 7 (partial), 8 (partial), 12, 13 (partial), 25 (partial), and 33 (partial) and potential development sites B (partial), E, G (partial), I (partial), J, and Q (partial); as such, construction-related archaeological impacts could occur at the above-listed projected and potential development sites.

In addition, two S/NR-eligible historic resources are located in close proximity (i.e., within 90 feet) of projected or potential development sites that would not be redeveloped under the No-Action condition: P.S. 52 and P.S. 98. As the potential historic resources are not S/NR-listed or NYCL-designated, they are not afforded the added special protections under the NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88 beyond standard protection under NYCDOB regulations applicable to all buildings located adjacent to construction sites. To avoid any construction-related impacts to the S/NR-eligible P.S. 52, it is anticipated that additional protection measures would be required by NYCHPD during the construction of adjacent projected development site 25. These additional protection measures would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer, and therefore construction-related impacts to P.S. 52 would be avoided. For P.S. 98, additional protective measures afforded under NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88 would only become applicable if the potential resource is designated or listed in the future prior to the initiation of construction. If the potential resource is not designated or listed, however, it would not be subject to TPPN #10/88, and may therefore be adversely impacted by the adjacent and nearby developments resulting from the Proposed Actions.

Hazardous Materials

Any potential construction-related hazardous materials would be avoided through the placement of an (E) designation (E-459) for all RWCDS development sites except projected development site 25, where the review of a Phase II testing protocol and development of any necessary remediation plan would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected developer. In addition, demolition of interiors, portions of buildings, or entire buildings are regulated by the NYCDOB and require abatement of asbestos prior to any intrusive construction activities, including demolition. The U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulates construction activities to prevent excessive exposure of workers to contaminants in the building materials, including lead paint. New York State Solid Waste regulations control where demolition debris and contaminated materials associated with construction are handled and disposed of. Adherence to these existing regulations would prevent impacts from construction activities at any of the projected development sites in the proposed rezoning area.

7. MITIGATION

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation (traffic, pedestrians, and transit), and construction (historic and cultural resources, noise). Mitigation measures being proposed to address those impacts, where feasible and/or practical, are discussed below. If no possible mitigation can be identified, the Proposed Actions would result in an unmitigated impact that would therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

Open Space

While no significant adverse open space impacts were identified for the larger non-residential and residential study areas or the Tip of Manhattan sub-district study areas in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria, the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on total and active open space resources in the Sherman Creek sub-district residential study area. Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions' significant adverse open space impact in the Sherman Creek sub-district may include: expanding existing parks; creating new open space on publicly-owned sites; pursuing opportunities to encourage owners of large privately-owned sites to create new open space as part of their redevelopment; making playgrounds accessible to the community after school hours through the Schoolyards to Playgrounds program, establishing new pedestrian plazas in streets through the City's Plaza Program, and/or improving existing parks to allow for more diverse programming and enhanced usability. These potential mitigation measures were explored by ODMHED in coordination with NYCEDC and NYC Parks.

Although many of the mitigation measures considered could substantially increase the amount and usability of open space resources for the additional population introduced by the Proposed Actions, it is infeasible to create new publicly-accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts (i.e., approximately 5.43 acres) within the Sherman Creek sub-district to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impact. The creation of 1.31 acres of publicly accessible open space along the Harlem River waterfront, Academy Street, and West 208th Street (as a result of the proposed WAP) would provide partial mitigation of this identified impact. However, absent the identification and implementation of other feasible and practicable measures, the Proposed Actions would continue to result in a significant adverse open space impact within the Sherman Creek sub-district.

Shadows

As discussed in the "Shadows" section above, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts at three open space resources (P.S. 18 Schoolyard, Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet, and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street) and one potential historic architectural resource (Good Shepherd RC Church). The analysis determined that the P.S. 18 Schoolyard and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street would experience significant incremental shadow coverage, duration, and/or periods of complete sunlight loss that would have the potential to affect open space utilization or enjoyment. The Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet would not receive adequate sunlight during the growing season (at least the four- to six-hour minimum specified in the *CEQR Technical Manual*) as a result of incremental shadow coverage and vegetation at this resource would be significantly impacted. Therefore, significant adverse shadow impacts would occur on these open space resources. Possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces may include relocating sunlight-sensitive features within an open space to avoid sunlight loss; relocating or replacing vegetation; undertaking additional maintenance to reduce the likelihood of species loss; or providing replacement facilities on another nearby site. Other potential mitigation strategies include the redesign or reorientation of the open space site plan to provide for replacement facilities, vegetation, or other features. These measures were explored between the DEIS and FEIS by ODMHED, NYCEDC, and NYC Parks and were found to be impracticable for the resources affected by the Proposed Actions; therefore, the potential significant adverse shadow impacts to the aforementioned resources remain unmitigated.

As project-generated incremental shadows would reach a maximum of nine of Good Shepherd RC Church's 28 stained glass windows at any one time, incremental shadows would not result in the complete elimination of direct sunlight on all sunlight-sensitive features of the church. However, as these incremental shadows may have the potential to affect the public's enjoyment of this feature for a duration of approximately three hours on December 21, a significant adverse shadow impact would occur on this historic resource, as per *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria.

The CEQR Technical Manual guidance discusses strategies to reduce or eliminate shadow impacts, including modifications to the height, shape, size, or orientation of a proposed development that would create the significant adverse shadow impact. The anticipated future development on projected development site 30 would generate the incremental shadows on the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church. Projected development site 30 is a privately owned site that is expected to bring a significant amount of new housing, including affordable housing to the neighborhood. To minimize incremental shadow coverage on the Good Shepherd RC Church, the maximum building height of projected development site 30 would have to be reduced to approximately 95 feet (compared to a maximum height of 155 feet under the Proposed Actions). Such a reduction in height would substantially limit the development potential on this site. As the Proposed Actions were developed to meet the long-term needs of the community, including providing opportunities for high quality, permanent affordable housing, reducing the residential development capabilities of projected development site 30 would be inconsistent with the goals of the of the Proposed Actions and is, therefore, impracticable.

For shadow-related historic resource impacts, a potential mitigation measure may include the use of artificial lighting to simulate sunlight conditions, i.e., mounting floodlights on the historic resource or adjacent structures aimed at the stained glass window at a certain appropriate angle. Artificial lighting could be used to simulate lost sunlight conditions at the affected stained glass windows of Good Shepherd RC Church during certain parts of the year. However, as projected development site 30 is a privately owned site with no currently known development plans, the potential implementation of this mitigation measure cannot be properly confirmed at this time. Furthermore, there is no mechanism in place to require a developer to design and mount floodlights as a mitigation measure in the future, when development on this site proceeds. Therefore, because potential mitigation measures for shadow impacts on the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church have been determined impracticable at this time, and because there are no available enforcement mechanisms to guarantee the installation of mitigation measures by a future developer, the significant adverse shadows impacts identified for this resource would remain unmitigated.

Historic and Cultural Resources

As described in the “Historic and Cultural Resources” section above, the Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse archaeology impact associated with potential prehistoric and/or historic archaeological remains on projected development sites 1, 2, 4 (partial), 5, 6 (partial), 7 (partial), 8 (partial), 12, 13 (partial), 25 (partial), and 33 (partial) and potential development sites B (partial), E, G (partial), I (partial), J, and Q (partial), which are expected to experience new in-ground disturbance compared to No-Action conditions. Except for projected development site 25, all of these sites are currently privately-owned, and therefore, there are no mechanisms in place to require developers to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist, in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20) is City-owned, and therefore, NYCHPD would ensure that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources on a portion of Lot 20 would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer. The LDA would ensure that Phase IB testing (and any required follow-up procedures as warranted according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*) with review and oversight by the appropriate City agency(s) would be undertaken by the selected site developer. With these measures in place, the Proposed Actions would avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources on projected development site 25 to the maximum extent practicable.

In addition, it is anticipated that future development on projected development site 4 (which would be City-owned following the reconfiguration of Block 2197, Lots 75 and 47) would include a mechanism for ensuring that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources prior to site development. Plans for developing this future City-owned site are not known at this time. If the site should be developed by a private applicant, the City or NYCEDC would

ensure that Phase IB testing (and any required follow-up procedures as warranted according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*) would be required through legally-binding documents between the site's future developer and the City or NYCEDC. As such, development on projected development site 4 would incorporate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the greatest extent practicable.

For all other sites identified above, all of which are privately-owned, there is no mechanism in place to require a developer to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist. In the event that human remains are encountered during the construction of an as-of-right project, it is expected that the developer would contact the NYPD and the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner. However, because there is no mechanism to ensure that the potential impacts would be avoided or mitigated in full at the nine projected and six potential development sites listed above, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources and therefore be considered unavoidable.

Transportation

Traffic

As described in the "Transportation" section above, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 47 study area intersections (34 signalized and 13 stop-controlled) during one or more analyzed peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified to 73 lane groups at 41 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 50 lane groups at 31 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 68 lane groups at 39 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 53 lane groups at 32 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. Implementation of traffic engineering improvements such as the installation of new traffic signals, signal timing changes to existing traffic signals, changes to lane configurations and modifications to curbside parking regulations would provide mitigation for many of the anticipated traffic impacts. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the traffic impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts.

Implementation of traffic mitigation measures (recommended traffic engineering improvements) is subject to review and approval by NYCDOT and will be based on the findings of a TMP developed in collaboration with ODMHED and NYCEDC. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure will be identified.

Significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at 18 lane groups during each of the weekday AM and Saturday peak hours, 21 lane groups during the midday peak hour, and 17 lane groups during the PM peak hour. Intersections where all impacts would be fully mitigated would total 15 during the AM peak hour and 14 during each of the weekday midday, PM, and Saturday peak hours. In total, impacts to one or more approach movements would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 29 intersections.

Transit

SUBWAY STATIONS

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse PM peak hour impact to south-facing street stair S2 to the northbound platform at the 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line. Stairway widening is the most common form of mitigation for significant stairway impacts, provided that NYCT deems it practicable; i.e., that it is worthwhile to disrupt service on an existing stairway to widen it and that a given platform and sidewalk affected by such mitigation are wide enough to accommodate the stairway widening. Another common potential mitigation measure would be to add vertical capacity (i.e., adding an elevator, escalator or additional stairways) in the vicinity of the impacted stairway.

The Proposed Actions would include a zoning text amendment to facilitate improvements to subway stations in the study area, to increase access for the disabled and improve circulation for all users. Specifically, for lots adjacent to the West 215th Street (1) and West 207th Street (1) subway stations on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line, and the Dyckman Street (A) subway station on the Eighth Avenue Line, property owners would be required to coordinate with MTA and CPC Chairperson prior to development to determine if an easement or sidewalk widening within the lot would be needed for station improvements. Any floor area utilized by MTA for station circulation improvements would be exempted from FAR calculations, and any development required to provide an easement for an improvement would be allowed to rise an additional story (ten feet).

Rezoning that add a few units of housing or commercial space over many building lots are rarely able to mitigate transit impacts as there is not a single developer responsible for the impact. Any mitigation to the significant stair impact at the West 207th Street (1) station would require that the station is in compliance with the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) interpretation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The easement language in the text would facilitate the mitigation in the future by providing space to build elevators at the station. Thus, NYCT and ODMHED have determined that the implementation of this zoning framework to accommodate necessary improvements to train stations in the study area would constitute partial mitigation of the Proposed Actions' significant PM peak hour stair impact at the West 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line. However, since the impact cannot be fully mitigated, it remains an unmitigated significant adverse transit impact.

BUS

The Proposed Actions would result in capacity shortfalls of 15 spaces and 51 spaces on the northbound and southbound Bx7 services, respectively, in the AM peak hour, and three spaces on the northbound Bx7 in the PM peak hour. These significant adverse impacts to Bx7 local bus service could be fully mitigated by adding one northbound and one southbound Bx7 bus in the AM peak hour, and one northbound Bx7 bus in the PM peak hour. The general policy of NYCT is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints. Absent the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, which would mitigate the transit (bus) impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse transit (bus) impacts.

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact a total of seven pedestrian elements in one or more peak hours, including two sidewalks, four crosswalks, and one corner area. Recommended mitigation measures to address these impacts are discussed below. The findings of the TMP would be used by NYCDOT as the basis for determining whether the future volume projections presented in the EIS are occurring at the rate assumed in the FEIS, and whether the mitigation measures proposed are warranted and appropriate. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the pedestrian impacts to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse pedestrian impacts. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by NYCDOT, as well as NYC Parks if a street tree is to be removed. If, prior to implementation, NYCDOT or NYC Parks determine that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure will be identified.

SIDEWALKS

Two of the 73 analyzed sidewalks are expected to be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions including one in the AM peak hour and two in each of the midday and PM peak hours. Eliminating illegal vehicle parking on the north sidewalk on West 218th Street between Broadway and Ninth Avenue through increased enforcement, which is expected in the future as development occurs and the neighborhood becomes more residential, would fully mitigate the significant adverse impact to this

sidewalk in the midday and PM. Also, removing a tree pit at the most constrained point on the south sidewalk on West 218th Street between Broadway and Ninth Avenue would fully mitigate the significant adverse impact to this sidewalk in all three analyzed peak hours. No unmitigated significant adverse sidewalk impacts would remain upon incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures.

CROSSWALKS

Four of the 52 analyzed crosswalks would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions, including two in the AM peak hour, three in the midday, and one in the PM peak hour. Widening these crosswalks by from one to 4.5 feet in conjunction with signal timing changes for traffic mitigation purposes would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to three of the four impacted crosswalks. However, no practicable mitigation was identified for the Proposed Actions' significant impacts to the east crosswalk on West 207th Street at Tenth Avenue in the midday and PM peak hours, and these pedestrian (crosswalk) impacts would remain unmitigated.

CORNER AREAS

One of the 61 analyzed corner areas—the northeast corner at Tenth Avenue and West 206th Street—would be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions in the AM and PM peak hours. To address these impacts, it is proposed to install a six-foot-wide sidewalk extension (bulb out) along both Tenth Avenue and West 206th Street at the corner area. No unmitigated significant adverse corner impacts would remain with implementation of this recommended mitigation measure.

Construction

Historic and Cultural Resources

As described in the “Historic and Cultural Resources” section above, two S/NR-eligible historic resources are located in close proximity (i.e., within 90 feet) of projected or potential development sites that would not be redeveloped under the No-Action condition: P.S. 52 and P.S. 98. To avoid any construction-related impacts to the S/NR-eligible P.S. 52, it is anticipated that additional protection measures would be required by NYCHPD during the construction of adjacent projected development site 25. These additional protection measures would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer, and therefore construction-related impacts to P.S. 52 would be avoided. For the other potential historic resource (P.S. 98), if it is designated or listed in the future, prior to the initiation of construction, the protective measures of TPPN #10/88 would apply and indirect significant adverse impact from construction would be avoided. Should P.S. 98 remain undesignated/unlisted, however, the additional protective measures of TPPN #10/88 would not apply, and the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts from developments within 90 feet (on projected development site 5 and potential development sites E and J), would be likely and not be mitigated.

In the absence of site-specific discretionary approval, there is no mechanism that would ensure implementation and compliance, since it is not known and cannot be assumed that owners of these properties would voluntarily implement this mitigation. ODMHED explored potential mitigation measures in coordination with NYCEDC and the NYCLPC between the DEIS and FEIS and determined that there were no feasible and practical mitigation measures to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse construction-related impact. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate the construction (historic and cultural resources) impact to the greatest extent practicable, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse construction (historic and cultural resources).

Noise

As discussed in the “Construction” section above, construction activities associated with the Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts at residential, open space, and community facility sensitive receptors. Future construction by private entities in the proposed rezoning area would be required to follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the New York City Noise Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. Partial mitigation for construction noise impacts could include noise barriers, use of low noise emission equipment, locating stationary equipment as far as feasible away from receptors, enclosing areas, limiting the duration of activities, specifying quiet equipment, scheduling of activities to minimize impacts (either time of day or seasonal considerations), and locating noisy equipment near natural or existing barriers that would shield sensitive receptors. The specific measures that would be implemented at particular sites are not within the direct control of the lead agency because each developer has flexibility in developing noise mitigation measures that comply with the New York City Noise Code that are suitable to the specifics of their individual project. The proposed measures discussed above are considered partial mitigations only. Consequently, these construction (noise) impacts would not be fully mitigated and would therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse construction (noise) impact.

8. ALTERNATIVES

No Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative examines future conditions within the proposed rezoning area, but assumes the absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). Under the No-Action Alternative, existing zoning would remain in the area affected by the Proposed Actions. It is anticipated that this area would experience moderate growth under the No-Action Alternative by 2032. Sixteen of the 33 projected development sites are expected to be redeveloped, or re-occupied, in the No-Action Alternative, resulting in a total of 698,640 sf of market-rate residential floor area (798 DUs), 64,442 sf of community facility uses, 346,211 sf of commercial uses, 50,614 sf of industrial uses, and 882 accessory parking spaces on the projected development sites. The technical chapters of this EIS have described the No-Action Alternative as “the Future Without the Proposed Actions.”

The significant adverse impacts anticipated for the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. However, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals of the Proposed Actions. The benefits expected to result from the Proposed Actions—including promoting affordable housing development by increasing residential density and establishing MIH, encouraging economic development by mapping new commercial districts and increasing density in a highly transit accessible area of the City, creating pedestrian-friendly streets through active ground floor retail uses, introducing new community resources, and creating a framework for public waterfront open space along the Harlem River waterfront — would not be realized under this alternative, and the No-Action Alternative would fall short of the objectives of the Proposed Actions.

No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative examines a scenario in which the density and other components of the Proposed Actions are changed specifically to avoid the unmitigated significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Actions. There is the potential for the Proposed Actions to result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts related to open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation (traffic, transit, pedestrians), and construction; the same analysis categories are discussed for the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative below.

Given the location of the proposed rezoning area in relation to open space resources—i.e., the majority of the open space located to the west and the density of development anticipated in the (eastern) waterfront sub-districts of the Tip of Manhattan and Sherman Creek—a supplemental indirect impact assessment was conducted for these two waterfront sub-districts. The assessment found that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse indirect open space impact in the Sherman Creek sub-district of the greater proposed rezoning area. Potential mitigation measures were explored by ODMHED, NYCEDC, and the NYC Parks. Although many of the mitigation measures considered could substantially increase the amount and usability of open space resources for the additional population introduced by the Proposed Actions, it is infeasible to create new publicly-accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts (i.e., approximately 5.43 acres) within the Sherman Creek sub-district to fully mitigate the identified significant adverse open space impact. The creation of 1.31 acres of publicly accessible open space along the Harlem River waterfront, Academy Street, and West 208th Street (as a result of the proposed WAP) would provide partial mitigation of this identified impact.

In order to avoid the sub-district's identified significant adverse residential study area open space impact, the number of residents that could be introduced on the projected development sites in the Sherman Creek sub-district would have to be reduced from 7,164 to 4,035 (or less than approximately 1,452 residential units). This would represent an approximately 44 percent reduction in the number of residential units anticipated in the Sherman Creek sub-district under the RWCDs. Such a reduction would inhibit the goals of the Proposed Actions to maximize the development of affordable housing.

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse shadows impacts on three open space resources (P.S. 18 Schoolyard, Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet, and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at West 205th Street) and one potential historic architectural resource (Good Shepherd RC Church). ODMHED explored potential mitigation measures in coordination with NYCEDC, NYC Parks, and the NYCLPC between the DEIS and FEIS that were all found to be impracticable for the resources affected by the Proposed Actions. Possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces were found to be impracticable for the resources affected by the Proposed Actions. In addition, as projected development site 30 is a privately owned site with no currently known development plans, the potential implementation of a mitigation measure cannot be properly confirmed at this time. Furthermore, there is no mechanism in place to require a developer to implement a mitigation measure in the future, when development on this site proceeds. Therefore, because potential mitigation measures for shadow impacts on the State/National Register of Historic Places- (S/NR-) eligible Good Shepherd RC Church have been determined impracticable at this time, and because there are no available enforcement mechanisms to guarantee the implementation of mitigation measures by a future developer, the significant adverse shadows impacts identified for this historic resource remain unmitigated.

In order to avoid these impacts, portions of the proposed rezoning area would need to be eliminated or building heights reduced on eight of the RWCDs projected/potential development sites by up to 225 feet. However, such reductions in height would substantially limit the development potential on these projected/potential development sites, and would be inconsistent with the goals of the Proposed Actions of locating higher bulk along the proposed rezoning area's primary corridors and waterfront and maximizing the amount of affordable housing developed on City-owned land. In the absence of feasible mitigation, the significant adverse impacts to these three sunlight-sensitive open space resources and one sunlight-sensitive potential historic architectural resource would be unavoidable.

The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in an unmitigated significant adverse archaeology impact associated with potential prehistoric and/or historic archaeological remains on projected development sites 1, 2, 4 (partial), 5, 6 (partial), 7 (partial), 8 (partial), 12, 13 (partial), 25 (partial), and 33 (partial) and potential development sites B (partial), E, G (partial), I (partial), J, and Q (partial), which are expected to experience new in-ground disturbance compared to No-Action conditions. Except for projected development site 25, all of these sites are currently privately-owned, and therefore, there are no regulatory or enforcement mechanisms in place to require a developer to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist. While it is

anticipated that development on site 4 (which would be City-owned following the reconfiguration of Block 2197, Lots 75 and 47) and projected development site 25 (Block 233, Lot 13 and part of 20, which is City-owned) would incorporate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable, the potential for unmitigated significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources cannot be ruled out at this time. Similarly, for the remaining nine projected development sites and six potential development sites, because there is no mechanism to avoid or mitigate potential impacts, the significant adverse impact would be unmitigated.

In order to avoid these impacts, significant portions of the proposed rezoning area would need to be eliminated, which would be counter to key goals of the rezoning proposal.

In addition, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 47 study area intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours. Because of existing congestion at a number of these intersections, even small increases in incremental project-generated traffic volumes at some of the congested intersection approach movements would result in significant adverse impacts that would not be fully mitigated, and almost any new development in the proposed rezoning area beyond what is expected to occur in the No-Action condition would result in unmitigated traffic impacts. Therefore, no reasonable alternative could be developed to completely avoid transportation impacts without substantially compromising the Proposed Actions' stated goals.

In regards to construction impacts, development under the Proposed Actions—specifically, on projected development site 5 and potential development sites E and J—could result in inadvertent construction-related damage to one S/NR-eligible historic resource that is located within 90 feet of the aforementioned projected and potential development sites: P.S. 98. In order to entirely avoid potential unmitigated adverse construction-related impacts to historic resources, this alternative would require that projected development sites 5 and potential development sites E and J be eliminated from the rezoning proposal. In addition, significant adverse construction noise impacts would occur at sensitive receptors at several locations throughout the proposed rezoning area. Construction activity is expected to follow the requirements of the NYC Noise Control Code. In order to completely avoid significant adverse construction noise impacts, project-generated construction would have to be restricted in such a manner as to not occur on the same block as, or within one to two blocks from, existing sensitive receptors, which would require elimination of the proposed rezoning area in the vicinity of these sensitive receptors. This would severely limit the Proposed Actions' goals and objectives.

Overall, given the above-described limitations, in order to avoid the identified significant adverse impacts in their entirety, the Proposed Actions would have to be modified to a point where their principal goals and objectives would not be realized.

Lower Density Alternative

The Lower Density Alternative was developed, partly in response to public comments on the Draft Scope of Work for the EIS, for the purpose of assessing whether lower density residential development in the proposed rezoning area would eliminate or reduce the significant, adverse impacts of the Proposed Actions while also meeting the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions. The Lower Density Alternative combines several lower residential density suggestions into a targeted framework that mirrors the overall intent of the Inwood Rezoning Proposal for each sub-district while reducing residential density. For example, in the Tip of Manhattan sub-district, the Lower Density Alternative maintains the manufacturing zoning proposed under the Proposed Actions (M1-5 and M1-4) while reducing the FAR and building heights from the proposed C6-2 district to C4-5D.

Under the Lower Density Alternative, the proposal analyzed would maintain the same R7A districts mapped within much of the Upland Core sub-district as the Proposed Actions, while reducing densities in the four other sub-districts as described below:

- Tip of Manhattan Sub-district – the C6-2 district in the Proposed Actions would become C4-5D (R7D equivalent) under the Lower Density Alternative.
- Upland Wedge Sub-District – the C4-4D and C6-2A districts in the Proposed Actions would become C4-5D (R7D equivalent) under the Lower Density Alternative.
- Sherman Creek Sub-district – M1-4/R9A, R9A, R8A, and R8 districts in the Proposed Actions would become R7D, and the M1-4/R7A district in the Proposed Actions would become R7A under the Lower Density Alternative.
- Commercial “U” Sub-District – the C4-4D districts along West 207th Street and the C4-5D districts along Broadway and West 207th Street in the Proposed Actions would become R7D with C2-4 commercial overlays, and the C4-4D districts to the west of Nagle Avenue along Dyckman Street and at Dyckman Street and Broadway would become C4-5D (R7D equivalent) under the Lower Density Alternative.
- Upland Core Sub-District – the C4-4A district along the south side of Dyckman Street to the west of Seaman Avenue in the Proposed Actions would become R7A with a C2-4 commercial overlay under the Lower Density Alternative.

Under the Lower Density Alternative, development is assumed to occur on the same 33 projected and 39 potential development sites. However, as the Lower Density Alternative would reduce the maximum permitted residential density in most portions of the proposed rezoning area, as well as reduce the maximum permitted commercial density in portions of the Commercial “U” sub-district and along the south side of Dyckman Street to the west of Seaman Avenue, as compared to the Proposed Actions, the RWCDS assumptions for all of the development sites in those affected areas would change. Compared to the Proposed Actions, the Lower Density Alternative would result in 1,106 fewer residential units on the identified projected development sites, 296,932 sf less of commercial uses, and 515 sf less of community facility uses. As with the Proposed Actions, the Lower Density Alternative would result in a net decrease of 50,614 sf of industrial space compared to No-Action conditions.

As with the Proposed Actions, the Lower Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; urban design and visual resources; natural resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; air quality; greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change; public health; and neighborhood character. As with the Proposed Actions, the Lower Density Alternative would result in similar significant adverse shadows, historic resources, transit, and pedestrian impacts as under the Proposed Actions, with slightly reduced impacts related to open space, traffic, and construction, compared to the Proposed Actions.

As under the Proposed Actions, the identified significant adverse bus transit impacts would be fully mitigated under the Lower Density Alternative. The Proposed Actions’ single significant subway station impact to a stair at the 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line would not occur under the Lower Density Alternative.

Both the Lower Density Alternative and the Proposed Actions would result in potential unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of open space, shadows, historic resources, traffic, pedestrians, and construction. However, with respect to traffic, there would likely be fewer intersections with unmitigated impacts under the Lower Density Alternative than there would be under the Proposed Actions.

The Lower Density Alternative would support, to a lesser degree, the Proposed Actions’ goals of promoting affordable housing development by increasing residential density and establishing MIH, encouraging economic development by mapping new commercial districts and increasing density in a highly transit accessible area of the City, creating pedestrian-friendly streets through active ground floor retail uses, and introducing new community resources. The Lower Density Alternative would result in

fewer residential units overall, and fewer affordable units, as well as reducing the amount of additional commercial development permitted along the southern side of Dyckman Street between Seaman Avenue and Staff Street, and along Broadway and West 207th Street in the Commercial “U” sub-district, as compared to the Proposed Actions. Furthermore, unlike the Proposed Actions, the Lower Density Alternative would not map any mixed residential/manufacturing zoning districts that could support and encourage both the retention and expansion of existing commercial, semi-industrial, and light manufacturing uses, while also allowing street-enlivening retail uses and residential growth to occur in the southern portion of the Sherman Creek sub-district. Therefore, the Lower Density Alternative would be less supportive of the Proposed Actions’ objectives while continuing to result in significant adverse impacts related to open space, shadows, historic resources, transportation, and construction.

9. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those that would occur if a proposed project or action is implemented regardless of the mitigation employed, or if mitigation is infeasible. The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to open space, shadows, historic and cultural resources, transportation, and construction. To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for these identified significant adverse impacts. However, in some instances no practicable mitigation was identified to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, and there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet their purpose and need, eliminate their impacts, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts. In other cases, mitigation has been proposed, but absent a commitment to implement the mitigation, the impacts may not be eliminated.

Open Space

No significant adverse open space impacts were identified for the larger non-residential and residential study areas in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria. A supplemental indirect impact assessment conducted for the waterfront sub-districts of the Tip of Manhattan and Sherman Creek indicated that the Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse impact on total and active open space resources in the Sherman Creek sub-district residential study area. Possible measures that could mitigate the Proposed Actions’ significant adverse open space impact in the Sherman Creek sub-district may include: expanding existing parks; creating new open space on publicly-owned sites; pursuing opportunities to encourage owners of large privately-owned sites to create new open space as part of their redevelopment; making playgrounds accessible to the community after school hours through the Schoolyards to Playgrounds program, establishing new pedestrian plazas in streets through the City’s Plaza Program, and/or improving existing parks to allow for more diverse programming and enhanced usability. These potential mitigation measures were explored by ODMHED, in coordination with NYCEDC and NYC Parks.

Although many of the mitigation measures considered could substantially increase the amount and usability of open space resources for the additional population introduced by the Proposed Actions, it is infeasible to create new publicly-accessible open space resources in sufficient amounts (i.e., approximately 5.43 acres) within the Sherman Creek sub-district to fully mitigate the significant adverse open space impact. The creation of 1.31 acres of publicly accessible open space along the Harlem River waterfront, Academy Street, and West 208th Street (as a result of the proposed WAP) would provide partial mitigation of this identified impact. However, as this impact cannot be fully mitigated it would constitute an unavoidable significant adverse open space impact.

Shadows

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse shadow impact on three open space resources (P.S. 18 Schoolyard, Broadway/West 215th Street Greenstreet, and the Sherman Creek Street End Park at

West 205th Street), as well as a significant adverse shadow impact (and shadow-related historic resource impact) on the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church.

The *CEQR Technical Manual* identifies possible measures that could mitigate significant adverse shadow impacts on open spaces, which may include relocating sunlight-sensitive features within an open space to avoid sunlight loss; relocating or replacing vegetation; undertaking additional maintenance to reduce the likelihood of species loss; or providing replacement facilities on another nearby site. Other potential mitigation strategies include the redesign or reorientation of the open space site plan to provide for replacement facilities, vegetation, or other features. These measures were explored between the DEIS and FEIS by ODMHED, NYCEDC, and NYC Parks and were found to be impracticable for the resources affected by the Proposed Actions; therefore, the potential significant adverse shadow impacts to the aforementioned open space resources remain unmitigated, and would therefore result in an unavoidable significant adverse shadows impact.

With regards to the significant adverse shadow impacts on the Good Shepherd RC Church ODMHED (the lead agency), NYCEDC, and NYCLPC explored additional measures discussed in the *CEQR Technical Manual* guidance. These measures aim to reduce or eliminate shadow impacts and include modifications to the height, shape, size, or orientation of a proposed development that would create the significant adverse shadow impact. The anticipated future development on projected development site 30 would generate the incremental shadows on the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church. Projected development site 30 is a privately owned site that is expected to bring a significant amount of new housing, including affordable housing to the neighborhood. To minimize incremental shadow coverage on the Good Shepherd RC Church, the maximum building height of projected development site 30 would have to be reduced to approximately 95 feet (compared to a maximum height of 155 feet under the Proposed Actions). Such a reduction in height would substantially limit the development potential on this site. As the Proposed Actions were developed to meet the long-term needs of the community, including providing opportunities for high quality, permanent affordable housing, reducing the residential development potential capabilities of projected development site 30 would be inconsistent with the goals of the of the Proposed Actions and is, therefore, impracticable.

Another potential mitigation measure that ODMHED, NYCEDC, and NYCLPC explored for the shadow-related historic resources impact includes the use of artificial lighting to simulate sunlight conditions, i.e., mounting floodlights on the historic resource or adjacent structures aimed at the stained glass windows at a certain appropriate angle. Artificial lighting could be used to simulate lost sunlight conditions at the affected stained glass windows of Good Shepherd RC Church during certain parts of the year. However, as projected development site 30 is a privately owned site with no currently known development plans, the potential implementation of this mitigation measure cannot be properly confirmed at this time. Furthermore, there is no mechanism in place to require a developer to design and mount floodlights as a mitigation measure in the future, when development on this site proceeds. Therefore, because potential mitigation measures for shadow impacts on the S/NR-eligible Good Shepherd RC Church have been determined impracticable at this time, and because there are no available enforcement mechanisms to guarantee the installation of mitigation measures by a future developer, the significant adverse shadows impact identified for this resource remains unmitigated and would, therefore, result in an unavoidable significant adverse shadow impact.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in significant adverse archaeology impacts associated with potential prehistoric and/or historic archaeological remains on projected development sites 1, 2, 4 (partial), 5, 6 (partial), 7 (partial), 8 (partial), 12, 13 (partial), 25 (partial), and 33 (partial) and potential development sites B (partial), E, G (partial), I (partial), J, and Q (partial). These sites are expected to experience new in-ground disturbance compared to No-Action conditions. With the exception of projected development site 25, all of these sites are currently privately-owned, and therefore, there are no regulatory mechanisms available to require developers to conduct archaeological testing or require the

preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist, in the future with the Proposed Actions.

Projected development site 25 (Block 2233, Lot 13 and part of Lot 20) is City-owned, and therefore, NYCHPD would ensure that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources on a portion of Lot 20 would be required through the LDA between NYCHPD and the selected site developer. The LDA would ensure that Phase IB testing (and any required follow-up procedures as warranted according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*) with review and oversight by the appropriate City agency(s) would be undertaken by the selected site developer. With these measures in place, the Proposed Actions would avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources during construction on projected development site 25 to the maximum extent practicable.

In addition, it is anticipated that development on site 4 (which would be City-owned following the reconfiguration of Block 2197, Lots 75 and 47) would incorporate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. While plans for developing this future City-owned site are not known at this time, it is anticipated that future development on projected development site 4 would be subject to a mechanism for ensuring that further archaeological testing is conducted to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources prior to site development. Specifically, if the site should be developed by a private applicant, the City or NYCEDC would ensure that Phase IB Archaeological Investigation (and any required follow-up procedures as warranted according to the *CEQR Technical Manual*) would be required through legally-binding document between the site's future developer and the City or NYCEDC. With these measures in place, the Proposed Actions would avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources during construction on projected development site 4 to the maximum extent practicable.

For all other sites identified above, all of which are privately-owned, there is no mechanism available to require a developer to conduct archaeological testing or require the preservation or documentation of archaeological resources, should they exist. In the event that human remains are encountered during the construction of an as-of-right project, it is expected that the developer would contact the NYPD and the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner. However, because there is no mechanism to ensure that the potential impacts would be avoided or mitigated in full at the nine projected and six potential development sites listed above, the Proposed Actions would remain unmitigated and would therefore result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact to archaeological resources.

Transportation

Traffic

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 47 intersections (34 signalized and 13 stop-controlled) during one or more analyzed peak hours. Significant adverse impacts were identified to 73 lane groups at 41 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 50 lane groups at 31 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 68 lane groups at 39 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 53 lane groups at 32 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. Many of these impacts could be mitigated through the implementation of traffic engineering improvements, including: installation of new traffic signals at five intersections that are currently unsignalized (i.e., stop controlled); modification of traffic signal phasing and/or timing; elimination of on-street parking within 100 feet of intersections to add a new travel lane; and channelization and lane designation changes to make more efficient use of available street widths.

The types of traffic mitigation measures proposed are standard measures that are routinely identified by the City and considered feasible for implementation. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements outlined is subject to review and approval by NYCDOT and will be based on

the findings of a TMP developed by NYCEDC, in coordination with NYCDOT and ODMHED. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated and would constitute significant adverse unavoidable traffic impacts.

With implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements, significant adverse traffic impacts would remain unmitigated at 55 lane groups at 26 intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, 29 lane groups at 17 intersections in the weekday midday peak hour, 50 lane groups at 25 intersections in the weekday PM peak hour, and 35 lane groups at 18 intersections during the Saturday peak hour. In total, impacts to one or more lane groups would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 29 intersections. These unmitigated impacts would generally occur along Broadway, Dyckman Street, West 207th Street, and Ninth and Tenth avenues.

Transit

SUBWAY STATIONS

The Proposed Actions would result in a significant adverse PM peak hour impact to south-facing street stair S2 to the northbound platform at the 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line. Stairway widening is the most common form of mitigation for significant stairway impacts, provided that NYCT deems it practicable; i.e., that it is worthwhile to disrupt service on an existing stairway to widen it and that a given platform and sidewalk affected by such mitigation are wide enough to accommodate the stairway widening. Another common potential mitigation measure would be to add vertical capacity (i.e., adding an elevator, escalator, or additional stairways) in the vicinity of the impacted stairway. As noted above, the Proposed Actions would include a zoning text amendment to facilitate improvements to subway stations in the study area, to increase access for the disabled and improve circulation for all users. Specifically, for lots adjacent to the West 215th Street (1) and West 207th Street (1) subway stations on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line, and the Dyckman Street (A) subway station on the Eighth Avenue Line, property owners would be required to coordinate with MTA and the CPC Chairperson prior to development to determine if an easement or sidewalk widening within the lot would be needed for station improvements. Any floor area utilized by MTA for station circulation improvements would be exempted from FAR calculations, and any development required to provide an easement for an improvement would be allowed to rise an additional story (ten feet). NYCT and ODMHED have determined that the implementation of this zoning framework to accommodate necessary improvements to train stations in the study area would constitute partial mitigation of the Proposed Actions' significant PM peak hour stair impact at the 207th Street (1) station on the Broadway-Seventh Avenue Line. In the absence of the implementation of stairway widening or other measures to add vertical capacity, the subway stair impact at this station would remain unmitigated and constitute an unavoidable significant adverse transit (subway) impact.

BUS

The Proposed Actions would result in capacity shortfalls of 15 spaces and 51 spaces on the northbound and southbound Bx7 services, respectively, in the AM peak hour, and three spaces on the northbound Bx7 in the PM peak hour. These significant adverse impacts to Bx7 local bus service could be fully mitigated by adding one northbound and one southbound Bx7 bus in the AM peak hour, and one northbound Bx7 bus in the PM peak hour. If these changes are not made by NYCT, these impacts would remain unmitigated and therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse transit (bus) impact as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Pedestrians

Incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would significantly adversely impact two of the 73 analyzed sidewalks, four of the 52 analyzed crosswalks, and one of the 61 analyzed corner areas in one or more peak hour. No practicable mitigation was identified for one of the crosswalk impacts, and it would

therefore be considered an unavoidable significant adverse pedestrian impact as a result of the Proposed Actions. All of the remaining pedestrian impacts could be fully mitigated through sidewalk widenings, tree pit removal, crosswalk widenings or increased enforcement of parking regulations. The findings of the TMP would be used by NYCDOT as the basis for determining whether the future volume projections presented in the EIS are occurring at the rate assumed in the FEIS, and whether the mitigation measures proposed are warranted and appropriate. Implementation of these measures would be subject to review and approval by NYCDOT, NYC Parks (for tree pit removal), and NYPD (for increased enforcement of parking regulations). If NYCDOT, NYC Parks, and/or NYPD determine that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, and no alternative and equivalent mitigation measure is identified, then the projected impact would remain unmitigated and would therefore also constitute an unavoidable significant adverse pedestrian impact as a result of the Proposed Actions.

Construction

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Proposed Actions have the potential to result in construction-related impact on the S/NR-eligible P.S. 98. If P.S. 98 is designated or listed in the future, prior to the initiation of construction, the protective measures of NYCDOB's TPPN #10/88 would apply and indirect significant adverse impact from construction would be avoided. Should P.S. 98 remain undesignated/unlisted, however, the additional protective measures of TPPN #10/88 would not apply, and the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts from developments within 90 feet (on projected development site 5 and potential development sites E and J), would not be mitigated.

In order to make TPPN #10/88 or similar measures applicable to historic resources in the absence of site-specific approval, a mechanism would have to be developed to ensure implementation and compliance, since it is not known and cannot be assumed that owners of these properties would voluntarily implement this mitigation. ODMHED explored potential mitigation measures in coordination with NYCEDC and the NYCLPC between the DEIS and FEIS, and determined that no feasible mitigation measures to fully mitigate the impact were identified at this time. Should this potential resource remain undesignated, unlisted, the Proposed Actions would result in an unavoidable significant adverse construction impact on the S/NR-eligible P.S. 98.

Noise

The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at several locations throughout the proposed rezoning area. Construction activities would follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code (also known as Chapter 24 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, or Local Law 113) for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the New York City Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. However, the implementation of these measures would not eliminate the identified significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur during hours when the loudest pieces of construction equipment are in use. The viability of possible mitigation measures will be explored between the DEIS and FEIS. Absent the identification and implementation of feasible and practicable measures, the Proposed Actions would result in unmitigated significant adverse construction noise impacts.

10. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The term "growth-inducing aspects" generally refers to "secondary" impacts of a proposed action that trigger further development outside the directly affected area. The *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed action is appropriate when the project: (1) adds substantial new land use, residents, or new employment that could induce additional development of a

similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments to serve new residential uses; and/or (2) introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity (e.g., sewers, central water supply).

On June 29, 2017, the City released the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*, a comprehensive plan for investment in Inwood's future, and on January 7, 2018 released the Winter 2018 Update to the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*, which outlines the progress the City and its community partners have made. The *Inwood NYC Action Plan* consists of strategies and actions to ensure that Inwood remains an affordable, attractive neighborhood for working families. The plan has emerged out of an intensive community planning process that, to date, has engaged over 3,000 local residents, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and elected officials. The City is committed to a continuous dialogue about the future of Inwood as an affordable neighborhood of opportunity. The Proposed Actions are intended to achieve the following land use objectives of the *Inwood NYC Action Plan*:

- Preserve the neighborhood's existing built character and protect the rent stabilized housing stock.
- Provide opportunities for high quality, permanent affordable housing with options for tenants at a wide range of income levels.
- Ensure that any new construction fits visually and architecturally into its surrounding neighborhood context.
- Establish a WAP to create a framework for public waterfront open space along the Harlem River waterfront.
- Create special rules for mixed-use buildings along the waterfront to facilitate the development of predictable and efficient building forms and maximize light and air.
- Create special rules for new development along the elevated rail line to provide light and air along the corridor and ensure adequate distance between residential uses and the train.
- Create walkable inviting streets by requiring non-residential ground floor uses and promoting diverse retail and community facilities to support community needs.
- Promote commercial and community facility uses to spur job growth and potential institutional expansion, by mapping higher density commercial and non-residential zoning districts.
- Promote the consolidation of public utility and infrastructure uses to create opportunities for new mixed-use development and waterfront public access areas (WPAAAs) along the waterfront.
- Establish controls for transient hotels to ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the Proposed Actions.

A RWCDs was developed to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions. The total development expected to occur by the analysis year of 2032 on the 33 projected development sites identified in the RWCDs under the With-Action condition would consist of approximately 5,195 DUs, 1,562,856 sf of commercial uses, and 526,724 sf of community facility uses, as well as up to 1,802 parking spaces. The incremental change between the No-Action and With- Action conditions that would result from the Proposed Actions would be a net increase of 4,397 DUs (including either approximately 1,379 or 1,618 affordable units, depending on which MIH option is selected), 1,216,645 sf of commercial space, and 462,282 sf of community facility space, as well as a net reduction of approximately 50,614 sf in industrial space and up to 197 parking spaces (including accessory and public, and vehicle storage for Con Edison and Spectrum Communications utility vehicles, combined) depending on which MIH option is selected. The environmental consequences of this growth are the subject of Chapters 2 through 20 of this FEIS.

The projected increase in residential population is likely to increase the demand for neighborhood services in the 59-block proposed rezoning area, ranging from community facilities to local goods and services retail. This would enhance the growth of local commercial corridors in the proposed rezoning area. However, the Proposed Actions take this potential growth into account as part of the RWCDs under the assumed commercial, retail, and community facility components. The Proposed Actions could also lead to additional growth in the City and State economies, primarily due to employment and fiscal effects during construction on the projected and/or potential development sites and operation of these developments after their completion. However, this secondary growth would be expected to occur

incrementally throughout the region and is not expected to result in any significant impacts in any particular area or at any particular site.

The Proposed Actions would result in more intensive land uses within the proposed rezoning area (generating new residents, daily workers, and visitors). However, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas. The Proposed Actions would not introduce a new economic activity, but under the RWCDS, would introduce a new residential population and a substantial amount of commercial and community facility uses that could alter commercial market trends, leading to the potential indirect displacement of some existing businesses. However, storefronts that might be vacated due to indirect displacement would not be expected to remain vacant; they would turn over to retail or community facility uses that could better capitalize on the market. The Proposed Actions would generate additional local demand for neighborhood retail and services necessary to maintain a strong retail presence along the major retail corridors in the study area. Therefore, the limited indirect retail displacement that could result from potential rent increase would not lead to major changes, would not result in adverse changes to neighborhood character, and would not generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas.

It is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would have significant spillover or secondary effects resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas, as the proposed rezoning would result in sufficient available density to meet all projected demands for projected residential, commercial, and community facility development in Inwood. The projected residential development would accommodate a portion of the City's current and future housing needs, and the retail, community facility, and open space components of the RWCDS would provide community benefits to the proposed rezoning area's existing and future residents and workers. By providing a new supply of housing, commercial, and community facility development within this rezoning framework, the Proposed Actions are expected to help stabilize or reduce the pressure for new development and changes in land use in areas adjoining the proposed rezoning area. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not induce significant new growth in the surrounding area.

11. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Resources, both natural and man-made, would be expended in the construction and operation of developments projected to occur as a result of the Proposed Actions. These resources include the building materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation of project-generated development by various mechanical and processing systems; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of project-generated development. These are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some other purpose would be highly unlikely.

The projected and/or potential development under the Proposed Actions also constitutes a long-term commitment of land resources, thereby rendering land use for other purposes highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. Although the Proposed Actions would result in the establishment of visual connections to the Harlem River and facilitate a shoreline public walkway and publicly accessible open spaces, as well as greater density and a wider variety of land uses, the land use changes that would result from the Proposed Actions may also be considered a resource lost. However, the land use changes that would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions would be part of an overall City strategy to provide affordable housing in areas well-served by public transportation. None of the projected or potential development sites possess any natural resource of significant value, and the sites are in large part developed or have been previously developed. It is noted that funds committed to the design, construction/renovation, and operation of projected or potential developments under the Proposed Actions would not be available for other projects. However, this is not considered to be a significant adverse impact on City resources.

In addition, the public services provided in connection with the projected and/or potential developments under the Proposed Actions (e.g., police and fire protection, public education, open space, and other city resources) also constitute resource commitments that might otherwise be used for other programs or projects. However, the Proposed Actions would enliven the area and produce economic growth that would generate substantial tax revenues providing a new source of public funds that would offset these expenditures.

The commitments of resources and materials are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would promote new residential development with significant amounts of permanently affordable housing, preserve existing affordability, encourage mixed-use development on key corridors, enhance and revitalize major thoroughfares through new economic development, protect the neighborhood character of the residential core, and help ensure predictable future development. The new land uses would be compatible with the surrounding area, and would extend the mixed-use character of Inwood east to the Harlem River, thereby better supporting the needs of the community.

12. CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The Proposed Actions would create a new Special Permit related to the development, conversion, or enlargement of hotels within the SID. A conceptual analysis was conducted to generically assess potential environmental impacts that could result from hotel development pursuant to the proposed Special Permit. Based on the assessment, development per the proposed new Special Permit would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts, as compared to the With-Action condition analyzed for the Proposed Actions.

13. NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION LAW

This Notice of Completion for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Inwood Rezoning Proposal has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law.

14. CONTACT OFFICE

Requests for copies of the FEIS should be forwarded to the contact office, Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination, 253 Broadway, 14th Floor, New York, NY 10007, or by email to ebrunner@cityhall.nyc.gov or telephone at (212) 676-3290. The FEIS is also available on the New York City Office of Environmental Coordination website: <http://www.nyc.gov/oec>.



Hilary Semel
Assistant to the Mayor
On behalf of the Deputy Mayor for
Housing & Economic Development

June 14, 2018

Date