

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY
NEW RIVER BUILDING AND FITNESS CENTER PROJECT

CEQR No. 14DCP019M
ULURP Nos. C140157ZSM, C140068MMM, C140068(A)MMM, M821257(D)ZAM,
N140158CMM, N140159CMM

April 2, 2014

A. INTRODUCTION

The Rockefeller University New River Building and Fitness Center project (the proposed project) is the subject of Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) applications currently under consideration by the New York City Planning Commission (CPC) and analyzed in a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) completed on March 21, 2014. Just prior to the issuance of the FEIS and Notice of Completion, the Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination (MOEC) released the 2014 edition of the *CEQR Technical Manual* to be used as guidance for any environmental review commenced on or after March 14, 2014. The analyses presented in the Rockefeller University New River Building and Fitness Center FEIS, which was substantially completed prior to the release of the 2014 manual, undertaken pursuant to the Final Scope of Work which was issued on November 1, 2013, reflect the guidance of the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

This Technical Memorandum has been prepared to consider whether the 2014 updates to the *CEQR Technical Manual* would result in any significant adverse environmental impacts not previously identified and addressed in the FEIS. This memorandum concludes that the updates included in the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* would not result in any new or different significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS.

**B. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF UPDATES TO THE
*CEQR TECHNICAL MANUAL***

As described in the Final Scope of Work, the FEIS did not analyze the technical areas identified below because the proposed project would not meet or exceed the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds requiring analysis. These technical areas are: socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, natural resources, water and sewer infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, energy, transportation, and greenhouse gas emissions. The 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds for analysis for these technical areas are consistent with those in the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*. Therefore, no further analysis of these technical areas was warranted.

The technical analyses prepared for the FEIS did include: project description; land use, zoning, and public policy; open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; hazardous materials; air quality; noise; public health; neighborhood character; mitigation; alternatives; unavoidable significant adverse impacts; growth-inducing aspects of the proposed project; and irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources. An evaluation of these technical areas in accordance with the 2014 updates to the *CEQR Technical Manual* has determined that the conclusions of the analyses would remain consistent with the findings of the FEIS and that there would be no new or different significant adverse impacts not already disclosed in the FEIS.

The discussion below considers whether the changes in air quality methodologies would result in any changes to the conclusions of the air quality analysis presented in the FEIS. In addition, updates to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* related to construction were also considered to conservatively assess whether any of the technical areas analyzed in the construction chapter would affect the conclusions of the construction analysis as presented in the FEIS. While the conclusions of the analyses for air quality and construction would not change with the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* updates, a discussion of these two technical areas is presented below.

AIR QUALITY

The air quality analyses presented in the FEIS included a laboratory spill analysis and an analysis of the effect of constructing a deck structure over the FDR Drive in the area of the proposed project. With regard to the laboratory spill analysis, there are no updates to methodology in the March 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*. With regard to the analysis of the effects of constructing a deck structure over the FDR Drive, the March 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual*, like the 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual*, advises using the MOVES emission model rather than the MOBILE model for vehicle emission. Since the March 21, 2014 publication of the FEIS, AKRF has evaluated the implications of using the MOVES emissions model rather than the MOBILE model that was used in the FEIS for the FDR Drive analysis and found that had the MOVES emission model been used in the FEIS analysis, carbon monoxide emissions would have been somewhat lower than the carbon monoxide emissions described in the FEIS. Because carbon monoxide concentration changes are proportional to emissions, the carbon monoxide concentration would decrease with a decrease in emissions. Particulate matter emissions would have been somewhat higher but concentration increases would remain below the thresholds established in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. These small changes in vehicle emissions would not have resulted in different conclusions than those presented in the FEIS—namely that the effect of constructing a deck structure over the FDR Drive would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to air quality.

CONSTRUCTION

The March 2014 updates to the *CEQR Technical Manual* do not include any changes to the methodologies that were used in the FEIS for evaluating the potential for construction impacts. Further, the March 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* updates to Open Space, Historic and Cultural Resources, Natural Resources, Hazardous Materials, Transportation, Air Quality, and Noise would not affect the analyses presented in the construction analysis of these technical areas, and no updates to the construction analysis is warranted. More importantly, the March 2014 updates to the *CEQR Technical Manual* would not change any of the conclusions of the construction analysis presented in the FEIS.

Unrelated to the 2014 *CEQR Technical Manual* updates, in Chapter 12, “Construction,” of the FEIS, the Construction—Air Quality analysis inadvertently included a text edit regarding the Restrictive Declaration. A Construction—Air Quality E Designation would not be assigned to the project site, however, the emissions controls that would be implemented during construction would be included in the Restrictive Declaration.

*