



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

**POSITIVE DECLARATION**

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE A  
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

<b>PROJECT:</b> Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island— North Island Re-Tenancing and Park and Public Space Master Plan Governors Island, Manhattan Block 1, Lot 10 CEQR Number: 11DME007M	<b>LEAD AGENCY:</b> Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development 100 Gold Street New York, New York 10038
--	--

**DATE ISSUED:** December 5, 2012

**TYPE OF ACTION:** Type I

**NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island—North Island Re-Tenancing and Park and Public Space Master Plan.

Governors Island  
Borough of Manhattan, Community District 1

**PROPOSED PROJECT**

Governors Island Corporation, doing business as The Trust for Governors Island (The Trust), is seeking discretionary approvals (the “proposed actions”) that would support and allow for the re-tenancing of approximately 1.2 million square feet (sf) of the North Island’s existing historic structures with a mix of uses, some of which would not be permitted under the Island’s existing zoning.

Governors Island is located in New York Harbor, approximately 800 yards south of Manhattan and 400 yards west of Brooklyn. The northern part of the Island (North Island) consists of the approximately 92-acre area north of Division Road and is designated as both a National Historic Landmark District and a New York City Historic District. The portion of the Island south of Division Road (South Island) largely consists of 1960s and 1970s non-historic development on

land created from material from the excavation of the Lexington Avenue subway line. The entire island is zoned R3-2.

The Trust proposes to create a Special Governors Island District (Special District), a new zoning district on the North Island, which would generally allow commercial uses compatible with the use of the Island as a recreational, cultural, and educational resource, in the existing R3-2 district. The Special District would complement existing uses and allow new uses compatible with the nature, scale and character of other uses within the North Island. The Island is anticipated to be re-tenanted with a mix of uses to include university space, student dormitory space, hotel use, movie theater use, office space, accessory retail and restaurant uses, cultural uses, artist studios, and a public school. As part of the re-tenanting, it is expected that two non-historic building additions may be demolished and potentially replaced with new structures of the same floor area and similar bulk. In addition, a new structure would be constructed on the North Island (in an open area north of Building 110, immediately west of Soissons Landing [the Soissons Concession Site]).

In support of the re-tenanting, ferry service would be expanded to seven days per week. Open space improvements would also be made.

Redevelopment of the Island was previously analyzed in a Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Phased Redevelopment of Governors Island issued by The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development (ODMED) in December 2011 (the 2011 FGEIS). The 2011 FGEIS analyzed potential future development of the Island as follows: Phase 1 (2013), which consisted of park and open space development that was funded at that time. Construction of this park and open space development is underway. The 2011 FGEIS also analyzed Later Phases (through 2030), which consisted of Later Phases-Park and Public Space development and Later Phases-Island Redevelopment. The Later Phases-Park and Public Space development consisted of proposed open space development established in a Park and Public Space Master Plan (the Park Master Plan) developed by The Trust. The Later Phases-Island Redevelopment consisted of two components: redevelopment of the North Island Historic Structures and development within two areas called the South Island Future Development Zones.

Similar to the 2011 FGEIS, the project will consider the impacts of the South Island Development Zones based on a generic development program since there are no specific development plans or proposals for those areas. Together, the components in the Project Description and the South Island Development Zones are referred to as the “Proposed Project.” An Environmental Assessment Statement was not completed for the North Island Re-Tenanting based on the information in the 2011 FGEIS that the Proposed Project would require further environmental review as specific development plans are proposed.

#### **DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS SUBJECT TO CEQR AND SEQRA**

The Proposed Project would require multiple City approvals, of which the zoning map and text amendment and capital funding are the discretionary actions requiring review under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR). The ODMED will be the lead agency for CEQR. The actions that would be required for the proposed project include:

- 1) Zoning map and text amendments to create and map the Special Governors Island District over the North Island. (“rezoning area”).

- 2) Review of project actions within the Governors Island Historic District pursuant to the guidelines of the *Governors Island Historic District Preservation and Design Manual*.
- 3) Approval of capital funding.

Other approvals are expected to include a Coastal Zone Consistency determination and may include State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits from the New York State Department of Conservation for wastewater and/or stormwater discharge issues.

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**

In accordance with Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York (CEQR), the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, lead agency for the referenced project, has determined that the proposed project may have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, a Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SGEIS) is required to evaluate and disclose the extent to which impacts may occur.

Aspects that may require evaluation of potential environmental impacts include:

- 1) The potential for substantial impacts related to land use, zoning, and public policy;
- 2) The potential for substantial impacts as a result of shadows;
- 3) The potential for substantial impacts related to historic and cultural resources;
- 4) The potential for substantial urban design/visual resource impacts;
- 5) The potential for substantial impacts related to transportation;
- 6) The potential for substantial impacts related to air quality;
- 7) The potential for substantial greenhouse gas emissions;
- 8) The potential for substantial impacts related to noise;
- 9) The potential for substantial impacts related to public health;
- 10) The potential for substantial impacts related to neighborhood character; and
- 11) The potential for substantial construction impacts.

**Statement in Support of Determination:**

The above determination is based on the finding that:

- 1) The project would require zoning map and text amendments to create the Special Governors Island District. The proposed actions would directly affect the land use on the project site, which is located within the City's coastal zone. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to affect land use, zoning, and public policy will be examined.
- 2) The proposed project would result in a new structure in close proximity to open space uses as well as the replacement of two non-historic additions to historic buildings. Therefore, an analysis will be performed to identify the project's potential to result in shadow impacts on sunlight-sensitive resources.
- 3) The project would have the potential to result in direct physical impacts as well as visual and contextual changes to the Island's architectural resources. Therefore, an analysis of potential effects on architectural resources will be performed.

- 4) Development of the proposed project would result in the renovation of historic structures and some new construction on the North Island, which could result in changes to the Island's urban design and visual character. Therefore, an analysis of the proposed project's effects on urban design and visual resources will be undertaken.
- 5) The proposed project is expected to exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds for an analysis of transportation, and consequently could have significant traffic, parking, pedestrian, and transit impacts. Therefore, a detailed analysis of the potential transportation impacts of the proposed project is warranted and will be provided.
- 6) The proposed project would result in new stationary and mobile sources of pollutant emissions. The stationary source air quality impact analysis will address the effects of emissions from the re-tenanted buildings and the new building on pollutant levels. Mobile sources would include increased traffic. Therefore, an analysis of the potential air quality impacts of the proposed project is warranted and will be provided.
- 7) Because the FGEIS committed to future analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as project components are refined, and since the building program anticipated under the re-tenanting has been updated since the FGEIS, a GHG consistency assessment will be provided.
- 8) The noise analysis will examine the potential for vehicular and ferry traffic to result in noise impacts. In addition, the future building attenuation requirements will be assessed as will the potential for school playground noise levels to affect those requirements.
- 9) According to the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a public health assessment may be warranted if an unmitigated significant adverse impact is identified in other CEQR analysis areas, such as air quality or noise. If unmitigated significant adverse impacts are identified in any one of these technical areas and a public health assessment is warranted, an analysis will be provided for that specific technical area.
- 10) Neighborhood character is determined by a number of factors, including: land use, zoning, and public policy; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; transportation; and noise. A preliminary assessment will be undertaken to determine whether the proposed project would affect a contributing element of neighborhood character; if it would, a detailed assessment will be undertaken.
- 11) Construction of the project would occur over an extended period of time, and would consist of construction associated with the both re-tenanting and construction of new structures. To the extent that information is known or anticipated to be different than presented in the FGEIS, an assessment will be provided.

Aspects that will not require evaluation of potential environmental impacts include:

- 1) Socioeconomic conditions;
- 2) Community facilities and services;
- 3) Open space;
- 4) Natural resources;
- 5) Hazardous materials;
- 6) Water and sewer infrastructure;
- 7) Solid waste and sanitation services;
- 8) Energy

These environmental areas will not require evaluation based on the following:

As described above, in addition to the Phase 1 park and infrastructure improvements, the 2011 FGEIS analyzed, generically, the Later Phases, which included additional open space improvements, the re-tenanting of the North Island, and development in the South Island Development Zones. In total, the Island was projected to be redeveloped with 3 million sf of development. Compared to the program that was analyzed in the FGEIS, the currently Proposed Project would modify the mix of uses for the Later Phases, but the overall floor area of the proposed development would remain 3 million sf. Specifically, compared to the program presented in the FGEIS, the currently Proposed Project would have approximately 131,600 sf less of university/faculty housing, 54,000 sf more cultural space, and 77,700 sf more public school space in the University/Research Option. The Mixed-Use Option in the currently Proposed Project would have approximately 529,050 sf less of university/faculty housing, 288,700 sf more office, 117,600 sf more cultural space, and 122,700 sf more public school space compared to the FGEIS.

In the FGEIS, cumulative impacts were fully studied for the North Island re-tenanting, the full Park Master Plan, and the South Island Development Zones in the FGEIS. In some technical areas the changes to the development program for the currently Proposed Project will make no significant difference to the conclusions of the FGEIS for 2030. Detailed screening assessments are provided for these technical areas, below.

#### **SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to socioeconomic conditions, as detailed below for the five socioeconomic areas of concern prescribed in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

##### *DIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not directly displace any residential units. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the Proposed Project due to direct residential displacement.

##### *DIRECT BUSINESS AND INSTITUTIONAL DISPLACEMENT*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not directly displace any of the existing commercial and institutional uses on the Island. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the Proposed Project due to direct business and institutional displacement.

##### *INDIRECT RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT*

Because the Island is not currently developed with residential uses, development would not have the potential to cause indirect residential displacement on the Island, under both the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would introduce less academic housing to the Island than the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS. Thus, the Proposed Project would not alter the 2011 FGEIS conclusion that academic housing on the Island would not affect rents in existing off-Island residential areas since the Island is physically separated from other existing residential neighborhoods. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect residential displacement.

### *INDIRECT BUSINESS AND INSTITUTIONAL DISPLACEMENT*

The 2011 FGEIS analyzed potential impacts associated with the introduction of commercial development and the users associated with that development and concluded that it would not substantially alter the existing economic activities on the Island and would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to indirect business and institutional displacement.

The currently Proposed Project would result in a slightly different mix of new residents, employees, students, and visitors on the Island compared to the 2011 FGEIS. However, as in the FGEIS, this new population would likely result in higher demand for the types of seasonal concessions accessory to the park and public space currently offered, and any increases in rent would be offset by additional revenues generated by the new population's demand for these seasonal uses. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse indirect impacts to On-Island businesses as a result of the Proposed Project.

With respect to institutional uses, the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council does not currently pay rent for their space; and it is expected that this lease arrangement with The Trust will continue in the future. Also, the Harbor School would not experience indirect displacement pressure because the New York City Department of Education signed a 40 year lease for their current space in 2008. Therefore, as with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, there would be no significant adverse indirect impacts to On-Island institutions as a result of the Proposed Project.

Both the program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and the Proposed Project would result in an introduction of new residential and worker populations, resulting in increased foot traffic in the Off-Island Study Areas. Since there would be substantial foot traffic in these Off-Island Study Areas in the future without the Proposed Project, neither program would introduce a new economic activity to the Off-Island Study Areas, and nor would they result in indirect business and institutional displacement impacts. Moreover, the Proposed Project would not substantially increase the new residential and worker population as compared to the 2011 FGEIS development program. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to cause significant adverse impacts due to indirect business displacement.

### *ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC INDUSTRIES*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in direct displacement and is not expected to include any regulatory changes with the potential to adversely affect conditions within a specific industry.

### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to public schools, child care centers, libraries, outpatient health care facilities, or police and fire protection services, as detailed below.

#### *PUBLIC SCHOOLS*

The 2011 FGEIS development program included a 1,200 seat public school for grades K-12, which was expected to accommodate all of the students generated by the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS. Like the program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would include the development of sufficient school capacity to accommodate all of the public school students that could be introduced by faculty housing on the Island by 2030.

### *CHILD CARE CENTERS*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any low-income and/or low- to moderate-income housing. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be expected to introduce children eligible for publicly funded child care and the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to child care facilities.

### *LIBRARIES*

Both the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS and the Proposed Project would introduce a residential population to the Island and would, therefore, generate demand for public library facilities in Brooklyn and Manhattan. The space for dormitory uses and faculty housing uses under the currently Proposed Project would be less than that analyzed for the full development of the Island in the 2011 FGEIS, and therefore would not alter the FGEIS conclusions with respect to public libraries. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to public library services.

### *OUTPATIENT HEALTHCARE FACILITIES*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a hospital or public health clinic. The space for dormitory uses and faculty housing uses under the currently Proposed Project would be less than that analyzed for the full development of the Island in the 2011 FGEIS, and it is expected that the new residential, worker, and visitor population that would be introduced by the Proposed Project would continue to have access to the outpatient healthcare facilities in the study area. Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to publicly funded healthcare facilities.

### *POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES*

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not directly affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a precinct house. The residential, worker, and visitor population that would be introduced by the Proposed Project would result in additional demand for police protection services similar to the population that was analyzed for the full development of the Island in the 2011 FGEIS. The FGEIS concluded that because the full development of the Proposed Project may necessitate the commitment of NYPD personnel, resources, or equipment to the Island, there would be the potential for a significant adverse impact related to police protection services, which would be further evaluated in future environmental review of the Later Phases-Island Redevelopment. The Proposed Project would not alter this conclusion, and, because the program for the South Island Development Zones has not been specifically proposed, defined, or designed, the potential impacts to police protection services will be further evaluated in the future environmental review of the South Island Development Zones. In any case, based on New York City Police Department (NYPD) policy, NYPD would continue to adjust its allocation of personnel and resources as the need arises.

As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not affect the physical operations of, or access to and from, a fire station house. However, the residential, worker, and visitor population that would be introduced by the Proposed Project would result in additional demand for fire protection and emergency medical services similar to the population that was analyzed for the full development of the Island in the 2011 FGEIS. The FGEIS concluded that because the full development of the Proposed Project may necessitate the

commitment of FDNY personnel, resources, or equipment to the Island, there would be the potential for a significant adverse impact related to fire protection and EMS services, which would be further evaluated in the future environmental review of the Later Phases-Island Redevelopment. The Proposed Project would not alter this conclusion, and, because the program for the South Island Development Zones has not been specifically proposed, defined, or designed, the potential impacts to fire protection services will be further evaluated in the future environmental review of the South Island Development Zones. In any case, the Fire Department of the City of New York (FDNY) does not allocate resources based on proposed or potential development, but continually evaluates the need for changes in personnel, equipment, or locations of fire stations and makes adjustments as necessary.

## **OPEN SPACE**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to open space. Under the Proposed Project, the Park Master Plan for the Island would be the same as analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS.

### *DIRECT EFFECTS*

The 2011 FGEIS identified the potential for significant adverse impacts as a result of the Later Phases-Island Redevelopment component of the Proposed Project, which would result in development that could directly affect the future open space through increased shadows or other conditions. The re-tenanting of the North Island would not have significant adverse direct impacts on open space, as this component of the Proposed Project would primarily result in reuse of existing buildings. As part of the re-tenanting, it is expected that two non-historic building additions may be demolished and potentially replaced with new structures of the same floor area and similar bulk, and that a new structure would be constructed on the open area north of Building 110, immediately west of Soissons Landing. These minor changes would not have the potential to result in significant adverse direct open space impacts. The two potential replacements of non-historic structures are expected to be substantially similar in size and bulk to the existing structures, and thus would not result in any material change to shadows on the Island. With respect to the new structure north of Building 110, this new structure would be located away from most of the park and public spaces on the Island and any new shadows cast on nearby open space, such as the Great Promenade, would not affect the usefulness of that open space.

Consistent with the 2011 FGEIS, when the uses associated with the South Island Development Zones are specifically defined and designed, the potential for significant adverse impacts related to direct effects on open space would be further evaluated in future environmental reviews.

### *INDIRECT EFFECTS*

The space for dormitory uses and faculty housing under the currently Proposed Project would be less than that analyzed for the full development of the Island in the 2011 FGEIS and the number of visitors would be unchanged. Therefore, the changes to the development program would not alter the finding of the FGEIS that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse open space impacts due to indirect effects. In addition, the Proposed Project would also not be expected to create consistent open space demands on open spaces near the ferry landings, nor would it diminish the ability of these open spaces to serve their user populations.

Because the Proposed Project would not alter the Park Master Plan, it would provide the same wide range of active and passive facilities to serve the varying open space needs of the different user populations that would be introduced (residents, workers, commuter students, and visitors). Consistent with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, new play areas and sports fields would provide active recreation space for residents and visitors of all ages, and new and improved passive open space areas would be developed to serve the passive recreation needs of the residential, worker, commuter student, and visitor populations.

### **NATURAL RESOURCES**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to natural resources. As analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the South Island Development Zones largely overlap with currently developed areas, and the location of these development zones would not change under the Proposed Project. Therefore, little existing open space habitat would be modified or lost by future construction activities within these areas, as well the North Island re-tenanting. The Later Phases-Park and Public Spaces would result in beneficial effects on plants and wildlife on and around the Island, and these plans have not changed since the 2011 FGEIS.

As analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, portions of the park and open space elements to be developed in the South Island by 2030 would be located within the current 100-year floodplain. Fill material would be added to these areas to raise the elevation above the projected future 100-year flood elevation. The design of any new buildings within the South Island Development Zones would have to be consistent with the New York City Building Code requirements for construction within the 100-year floodplain.

With the reduction in impervious cover and implementation of erosion and sediment control measures and the stormwater management measures that would be specified in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP), stormwater discharged during construction the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to littoral zone tidal wetlands, or to water quality, or aquatic biota of the Upper Bay.

Thus, as with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts to existing terrestrial plant and wildlife communities, floodplains, wetlands, water quality, or aquatic biota in the Upper New York Bay.

### **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to hazardous materials. The 2011 FGEIS found that, with certain measures undertaken prior to and during construction, the Proposed Project would prevent hazardous materials impacts. No change to these measures is proposed as part of the Proposed Project, and therefore, as with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FEGIS, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

### **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to water and sewer infrastructure. As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would result in increased demand on the

City's water supply and wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure, but this incremental demand would not result in any significant adverse impacts.

The changes to the development program under the Proposed Project would not materially affect the water demand for the full development of the Proposed Project as analyzed in the FGEIS. The Proposed Project, like the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, would include two new 12-inch water mains, which would provide adequate water supply. Therefore, it is expected that there would be adequate water service for the Proposed Project and there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply.

The Proposed Project would likewise not materially affect the sewage generation for the full development of the Proposed Project as analyzed in the FGEIS. Therefore, as with the program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the incremental sanitary sewage generation associated with the Proposed Project would not be expected to create a significant adverse impact on the City's sanitary sewage treatment system.

The Proposed Project would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with regard to stormwater runoff. As noted in the 2011 FEGIS, when the specific uses for the South Island Development Zones are identified and designed, it is anticipated that additional environmental review will be required.

#### **SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to solid waste. The changes to the development program under the Proposed Project would not materially affect the solid waste generation for the full development of the Proposed Project as analyzed in the FGEIS. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to solid waste and sanitation services.

#### **ENERGY**

The modifications to the 2030 development program would not alter the findings of the 2011 FGEIS with respect to energy. As with the development program analyzed in the 2011 FGEIS, the Proposed Project would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on energy because the Proposed Project would not significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy.

Accordingly, ODMED directs that a Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement be prepared in accordance with 6 NYCRR 617.9 and Sections 6-08 and 6-09 of Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, as amended.

#### **Public Scoping:**

Public Scoping is the process whereby the public is invited to comment on the proposed scope of analysis planned for the Draft SGEIS. A Draft Scope of Work has been prepared outlining analysis methodologies proposed for use in the Draft SGEIS.

A public meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 8, 2013 to provide a forum for public comments on the Draft Scope of Work. The public meeting will be held at the New York City Department of City Planning's Spector Hall, 22 Reade Street, New York, New York, 10007. The

scoping meeting will commence at 6:00 P.M. Written comments on the Draft Scope of Work will be accepted until 5:00 P.M. on Friday, January 18, 2013.

Copies of the Positive Declaration and Draft Scope of Work for the project may be obtained by any member of the public from:

Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination  
100 Gold Street, 2nd Floor  
New York, New York 10038  
Telephone: (212) 788-9956

These documents are also available on the websites of the Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination and The Trust for Governors Island: [www.nyc.gov/oec](http://www.nyc.gov/oec) and [www.govisland.com](http://www.govisland.com), respectively.

Requests for additional information may be directed to:

The Trust for Governors Island  
Attn: Simon Bertrang, Vice President for Planning, Design and Preservation  
10 South Street – Slip 7, New York, New York 10004  
(212) 440-2233 – [sbertrang@govisland.nyc.gov](mailto:sbertrang@govisland.nyc.gov)

Written comments will be accepted until 5:00 P.M. on Friday, January 18, 2013 and may be submitted at the public scoping meeting or to Robert Kulikowski at the Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination at the above address.

The Positive Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law.



Robert R. Kulikowski, Ph.D.  
Assistant to the Mayor

December 5, 2012  
Date