# City Environmental Quality Review

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) SHORT FORM**

**FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS ONLY** • Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency (see instructions)

## Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. **Does the Action Exceed Any Type I Threshold in 6 NYCRR Part 617.4 or 43 RCNY §6-15(A) (Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended)?**
   - [ ] YES
   - [x] NO

   If “yes,” STOP and complete the FULL EAS FORM.

2. **Project Name** 59-02 Borden Avenue Self-Storage Special Permit

3. **Reference Numbers**
   - CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency) 19DCP219Q
   - BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)
   - ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable) 200031ZSQ
   - OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable) (e.g., legislative intro, CAPA)

4a. **Lead Agency Information**
   - NAME OF LEAD AGENCY NYC Department of City Planning
   - NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON Olga Abinader
   - NAME OF APPLICANT Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.
   - NAME OF APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON Bruce Talvy

5. **Project Description**
   The applicant requests the issuance of a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of a self-service storage facility in conjunction with the as-of-right development of a Home Depot store and two additional retail buildings on the development site. The self-service storage facility would consist of 136,853 sf in six stories rising to a height of approximately 86 feet above grade. The facility would be located on the Borden Avenue frontage of the development site.

6. **Project Location**
   - BOROUGH Queens
   - COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S) 2
   - STREET ADDRESS 59-02 Borden Avenue
   - TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S) Block 2657, Lot 40
   - ZIP CODE 11378

7. **Existing Zoning District, Including Special Zoning District Designation, If Any** M1-1, Subarea 2 of a Designated Area in an M District

8. **Zoning Sectional Map Number** 13c

9. **Required Actions or Approvals**
   - CITY MAP AMENDMENT [x] YES [ ] NO
   - ZONING MAP AMENDMENT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: modification; renewal; other); EXPIRATION DATE: SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION 74-932

   - CITY MAP AMENDMENT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - ZONING MAP AMENDMENT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: modification; renewal; other); EXPIRATION DATE: SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION 74-932

   - VARIANCE (use) [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - VARIANCE (bulk) [ ] YES [ ] NO
   - SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type: modification; renewal; other); EXPIRATION DATE: SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION 74-932
SPECIFY AFFECTED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

Department of Environmental Protection: □ YES ☒ NO If “yes,” specify:

Other City Approvals Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)
- □ LEGISLATION
- □ RULEMAKING
- □ CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES
- □ 384(b)(4) APPROVAL
- □ OTHER, explain:

Other City Approvals Not Subject to CEQR (check all that apply)
- □ PERMITS FROM DOT’S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION AND COORDINATION (OCMC)
- □ LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVAL
- □ OTHER, explain:

State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding: □ YES ☒ NO If “yes,” specify:

7. Site Description: The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory controls. Except where otherwise indicated, provide the following information with regard to the directly affected area.

Graphics: The following graphics must be attached and each box must be checked off before the EAS is complete. Each map must clearly depict the boundaries of the directly affected area or areas and indicate a 400-foot radius drawn from the outer boundaries of the project site. Maps may not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size and, for paper filings, must be folded to 8.5 x 11 inches.
- □ SITE LOCATION MAP
- □ ZONING MAP
- □ SANBORN OR OTHER LAND USE MAP
- □ TAX MAP
- □ FOR LARGE AREAS OR MULTIPLE SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THAT DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S)
- □ PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE TAKEN WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBMISSION AND KEYED TO THE SITE LOCATION MAP

Physical Setting (both developed and undeveloped areas)
- Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): 316,200 Waterbody area (sq. ft) and type: N/A
- Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): 316,200 Other, describe (sq. ft.):

8. Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project (if the project affects multiple sites, provide the total development facilitated by the action)

SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): 136,853
- (self-storage facility)
- NUMBER OF BUILDINGS: 4 (self-storage, as-of-right Home Depot and two retail buildings)
- GROSS FLOOR AREA OF EACH BUILDING (sq. ft.): 136,853 (self-service storage facility)
- HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.): 68' (self-storage)
- NUMBER OF STORIES OF EACH BUILDING: 6 (self-service storage facility)

Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? □ YES ☒ NO If “yes,” specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant:

The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant:

Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pileings, utility lines, or grading? ☒ YES □ NO If “yes,” indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface permanent and temporary disturbance (if known):

AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: 37,467 (self-storage) sq. ft.
- VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: 56,214 (self-storage) cubic ft. (width \( \times \) length \( \times \) depth)

AREA OF PERMANENT DISTURBANCE: 37,467 (self-storage) sq. ft.

Description of Proposed Uses (please complete the following information as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Community Facility</th>
<th>Industrial/Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (in gross sq. ft.)</td>
<td>154,854</td>
<td>136,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (e.g., retail, office, school)</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>self-service storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the proposed project increase the population of residents and/or on-site workers? □ YES ☒ NO If “yes,” please specify:
- NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL RESIDENTS:
- NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL WORKERS:

Provide a brief explanation of how these numbers were determined:

Does the proposed project create new open space? □ YES ☒ NO If “yes,” specify size of project-created open space: sq. ft.

Has a No-Action scenario been defined for this project that differs from the existing condition? ☒ YES □ NO If “yes,” see Chapter 2, “Establishing the Analysis Framework” and describe briefly: Under the No-Action condition, the development site would be developed with a one-story, 23-foot-tall, 134,230 gross square foot Home Depot store and two one-story,
18-foot-tall retail buildings totaling 20,624 gsf. However, an additional one-story, 23-foot-tall retail building of 24,000 gsf would be located along Borden Avenue in place of the self-storage facility. All buildings would be as-of-right. The retail building would require 80 parking spaces located on the rooftop. In the No-Action condition, there would be a total of 599 parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational):</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS:</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE?</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project</th>
<th>(check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>☒ MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>☐ PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ OTHER, specify: vacant land, open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project’s impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the “no” box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the “yes” box.
- For each “yes” response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a “yes” answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.
- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Short EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered “no,” an agency may request a short explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4

(a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses? ☒ 

(b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning? ☒

(c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?

(d) If “yes,” to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach. See Section 2.1.

(e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?

(f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City’s Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?

### 2. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5

(a) Would the proposed project:

- Generate a net increase of 200 or more residential units? ☒
- Generate a net increase of 200,000 or more square feet of commercial space? ☒
- Directly displace more than 500 residents? ☒
- Directly displace more than 100 employees? ☒
- Affect conditions in a specific industry?

### 3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 6

(a) Direct Effects

- Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations? ☒

(b) Indirect Effects

- Child Care Centers: Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)

- Libraries: Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)

- Public Schools: Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6)

- Health Care Facilities and Fire/Police Protection: Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood?

### 4. OPEN SPACE: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7

(a) Would the proposed project change or eliminate existing open space? ☒

(b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bron, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?

(c) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bron, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island?

(d) If the project is located in an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees? ☒
5. **SHADOWS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) If “yes” to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources. See attachment.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **NATURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) If “yes,” complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form, and submit according to its instructions.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in Appendix 1 (including nonconforming uses)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (e.g., gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than the amounts listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Would the proposed project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project’s projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week):</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. ENERGY:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project’s projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs):</td>
<td>89,469,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. TRANSPORTATION:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) If “yes,” conduct the screening analyses, attach appropriate back up data as needed for each stage and answer the following questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. AIR QUALITY:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mobile Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Stationary Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If “yes,” would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City’s solid waste management system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) If “yes” to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on the guidance in Chapter 18?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. NOISE:</strong> CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Would the proposed project generate a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. **PUBLIC HEALTH**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20

(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Quality; Hazardous Materials; Noise?  

(b) If “yes,” explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, “Public Health.” Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.

18. **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 21

(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows; Transportation; Noise?  

(b) If “yes,” explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, “Neighborhood Character.” Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.

19. **CONSTRUCTION**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22

(a) Would the project’s construction activities involve:

- Construction activities lasting longer than two years?  
- Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare?  
- Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, etc.)?  
- Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out?  
- The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction?  
- Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services?  
- Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource?  
- Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources?  
- Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall?  

(b) If any boxes are checked “yes,” explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, “Construction.” It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination.

20. **APPLICANT’S CERTIFICATION**

I swear or affirm under oath and subject to the penalties for perjury that the information provided in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief, based upon my personal knowledge and familiarity with the information described herein and after examination of the pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry of persons who have personal knowledge of such information or who have examined pertinent books and records.

Still under oath, I further swear or affirm that I make this statement in my capacity as the applicant or representative of the entity that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental action(s) described in this EAS.

**APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME**  
Bruce Talvy

**DATE**  
Feb. 13, 2019

**SIGNATURE**

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.
### Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT CATEGORY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Adverse Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design/Visual Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials?

If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

- [ ] Positive Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a Positive Declaration and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

- [ ] Conditional Negative Declaration: A Conditional Negative Declaration (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

- [x] Negative Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a Negative Declaration. The Negative Declaration may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

### LEAD AGENCY’S CERTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division</td>
<td>Stephanie Shellope, AICP</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEAD AGENCY**
Department of City Planning acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission

**DATE**
November 27, 2019
NEGATIVE DECLARATION  (Use of this form is optional)

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to 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 and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, the Department of City Planning, acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement (EAS) and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which finds the proposed actions sought before the City Planning Commission would have no significant effect on the quality of the environment. Reasons supporting this determination are noted below.

Hazardous Materials:

An (E) designation (E-553) for hazardous materials and noise has been incorporated into the proposed actions. Refer to Appendix 1: (E) Designation", attached to this Determination of Significance, for the site affected by the (E) designation and applicable (E) designation and applicable (E) designation requirements in place, the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy:

A detailed analysis related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy is included in the EAS. A significant adverse impact related to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy would result if the new land use interferes with the proper functioning of the land use patterns in the area or surrounding area. The Applicant's proposal would facilitate the development of a complex of retail spaces that would include a self-storage facility in the future with the proposed action. The analysis shows that while the action would allow a use that is otherwise not otherwise permitted at the site, the requested special permit is specific to that site and would not result in changes to the zoning or land use patterns in the surrounding area. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable public policy goals. The analysis concludes that the proposed action would not result in significant adverse impact to Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy.

Urban Design and Visual Resources:

An assessment related urban design and visual resources is included in the EAS. In the future with the proposed action, the visual appearance within the primary study area and development site would change as the action would facilitate a building with a height increment of 53 feet for the proposed self-storage facility; however this change would not meet the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual threshold for 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 experience of the area. The analysis concludes that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design or visual resources.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA). Should you have any questions pertaining to this Negative Declaration, you may contact Alexander McClean at (212) 720-3429.
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Determination of Significance Appendix: (E) Designation

To ensure that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse hazardous materials and noise, and (E) Designation (E-553) will be placed on the development sites as described below:

Hazardous Materials

The (E) Designation requirements for hazardous materials will be placed on Projected Development Site (Block 2657; Lot 40).

Task 1-Sampling Protocol

The applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase I of the site along with a soil, groundwater and soil vapor testing protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented. If site sampling is necessary, no sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of samples should be selected to adequately characterize the site, specific sources of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum based contamination and non-petroleum based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2-Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER. If remediation is indicated from test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

A construction-related health and safety plan should be submitted to OER and would be implemented during excavation and construction activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil, groundwater and/or soil vapor. This plan would be submitted to OER prior to implementation.
EAS Figures
Figure 1  Site Location Map
Figure 2  Tax Map
Figure 3  Zoning Map
Figure 4  Land Use Map
Figure 5  Photo Key Map
All photos taken December 2018.
1

Project Description

This section provides descriptive information about the requested discretionary land use action(s) and the development project that could be facilitated by the requested actions. The purpose of this chapter is to convey project information relevant to the environmental review.

1.1 Introduction

The applicant, Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., is requesting a special permit pursuant to Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of an approximately 136,853 sf, six-story self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development that will consist of a Home Depot store and two one-story retail buildings.

1.2 Development Site

The development site consists of Block 2657, Lot 401 (59-02 Borden Avenue in Maspeth, Queens) and is bounded by Borden Avenue to the north, Maurice Avenue to the east, 55th Drive to the south, and 58th Street to the west (see EAS Figure 1). The site has approximately

---

1 The applicant intends to pursue a tax lot subdivision for the portion of the lot that will be the site of the proposed self-storage facility.
400 feet of frontage on Borden Avenue, 299 feet of frontage on Maurice Avenue, and 398 feet of frontage on 55th Drive. The development site is located in an M1-1 zoning district, which permits community facility uses (UG-4), retail and commercial uses (UG5-14), general service uses (UG16), and manufacturing uses (UG17) as-of-right. At this location, a special permit is required for self-service storage facilities in UG16D.

The site is a 316,200-square foot lot that previously contained a one- and two-story manufacturing building that was leased by Coca-Cola and used as a warehouse and bottling facility. The building was built in or around 1955 and was approximately 203,213 gsf. Demolition of the existing building is complete.

1.3 Proposed Action

The applicant is seeking a special permit pursuant to Zoning Resolution (ZR) section 74-932 (Self-service storage facility in designated area within Manufacturing Districts) to facilitate the development of a self-service storage facility in conjunction with the as-of-right Home Depot and retail development.

1.4 Proposed Project

The applicant would develop a six-story, 68-foot-tall approximately 136,853 sf self-storage facility that would be located on the Borden Avenue frontage of the development site as part of a larger as-of-right development that would consist of a one story, 23-foot-tall Home Depot store of 134,230 gsf and two, one-story, 18-foot-tall retail buildings that would total 20,624 gsf.

The self-storage facility would be accessed from Borden Avenue and the interior of the project site. Four loading bays for the self-storage use would be provided as part of the development. The facility would rise four stories before being set back to comply with sky exposure plane requirements to a total height of approximately 68 feet above grade.

1.5 Project Purpose and Need

The special permit is necessary to develop the self-service storage facility proposed on the development site. Given Home Depot’s experience at other locations, the applicant anticipates that the proposed self-storage facility would be used not only by residents to store personal belongings but by local contractors and small businesses to store tools and construction supplies.

1.6 Analytical Framework and Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario

Future No-Action Condition

Under the No-Action condition, the development site will be developed with a one-story, 23-foot-tall, 134,230 gross square foot Home Depot store and two one-story, 18-foot-tall
retail buildings consisting of a total of 20,624 gsf. An additional one-story, 23-foot-tall retail building of 24,000 gsf would be located along Borden Avenue in place of the self-storage facility. All buildings would be as-of-right.

In the No-Action condition, there would be a total of 599 parking spaces, consisting of 519 spaces for the Home Depot and an additional 80 spaces for the third retail building.

**Future With-Action Condition**

In the With-Action condition, the development site would be developed with the proposed project described above in Section 1.4.

In the With-Action condition, there would be a total of 523 parking spaces at the site, consisting of 519 spaces for the Home Depot and 4 parking spaces for the self-storage facility. As noted above, four loading berths would also be provided at the self-storage facility (see Figures 1-1 and 1-2).

The total floor area on the zoning lot would be 291,707 gsf, or a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.93 overall.

**Increment for Analysis**

As shown in Table 1-1, the proposed project would result in a net increase of 158,246 sf of self-storage space at the development site over the No-Action condition.

**Table 1-1  Future No-Action and Future With-Action Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No-Action Condition</th>
<th>With-Action Condition</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Storage SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136,853</td>
<td>+136,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>178,854</td>
<td>154,854</td>
<td>-24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis (Build Year)**

Assuming approval of the proposed project in 2020, construction of the proposed project is expected to occur over a period of approximately 24 months. Therefore, the completion of the proposed project is expected in 2022.
Figure 1-1  Zoning Lot Site Plan
Figure 1-2  Self-Storage Facility Plan
2.1

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

This section considers the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy. Under the guidelines of the 2014 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, this analysis evaluates the uses in the area that may be affected by the proposed project and determines whether the proposed project is compatible with land use, zoning, and public policy conditions, or may otherwise affect them. The analysis also considers the proposed project’s compatibility with zoning regulations and other public policies applicable to the area.

2.1-1 Introduction

The applicant is seeking a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of a self-service storage facility in conjunction with an as-of-right Home Depot store and two one-story retail buildings.
2.1-2 Methodology

This analysis of land use, zoning, and public policy follows the guidelines set forth in the CEQR Technical Manual for a preliminary assessment (Section 320). According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary land use and zoning assessment:

› Describes existing and future land uses and zoning information, and describes any changes in zoning that could cause changes in land use;

› Characterizes the land use development trends in the area surrounding the development site that might be affected by the proposed project; and

› Determines whether the proposed project is compatible with those trends or may alter them.

The following assessment method was used to determine the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse impacts on Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy:

1. Establish a "study area", a geographic area surrounding the development site to determine how the proposed project may affect the immediate surrounding area. For this assessment, a study area of 400 feet surrounding the development site was used.

2. Identify data sources, including any public policies (formal plans, published reports) to be used to describe the existing and No-Action conditions related to Land Use, Zoning, and/or Public Policy.

3. Assess the proposed project’s potential effects on Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy to determine whether the proposed project is consistent with or conflicts with area land uses, zoning, or the identified policies.
   • If a proposed project could conflict with the identified policies, a detailed assessment would be conducted; or
   • If the proposed project is found to not conflict with the identified policies, no further assessment is needed.

2.1-3 Assessment

Existing Conditions

Land Use

Development Site

The development site consists of Block 2657, Lot 40 (known as 59-02 Borden Avenue in Maspeth, Queens) and is bounded by Borden Avenue to the north, Maurice Avenue to the east, 55th Drive to the south, and 58th Street to the west. The site is improved with a one-story and two-story manufacturing building that was leased by Coca-Cola and used as a warehouse and bottling facility until recently. The existing building is currently being demolished.
Study Area

As shown in Figure 2.1-1, the study area consists of predominantly light manufacturing uses, including primarily one- to two-story warehouses on large lots, some factory buildings such as a hardwood floor supplier located on Maurice Avenue and a window and door manufacturer located along 55th Drive across the street from the site, and parking. There are also a few commercial lots located east and southeast of the site, including restaurants and bars east and south of the development site and a six-story hotel in the eastern portion of the study area.

Outside the study area, there are residential uses to the southeast, a park (Frank Principle Park) approximately 430 feet east of the development site, and a cemetery (Mount Zion Cemetery) approximately 620 feet north of the site. The area is served by the Q39 and Q67 buses. The Long Island Expressway runs parallel to Borden Avenue across from the site.

Figure 2.1-1  Land Use Map
Zoning

The development site and study area are within an M1-1 district (see Figure 2.1-2). The maximum permitted FAR for commercial or manufacturing uses in an M1-1 zoning district is 1.0. M1 districts typically include light industrial uses, such as woodworking shops, repair shops, and wholesale service and storage facilities. M1-1 zoning districts permit community facility uses (UG-4), retail and commercial uses (UG5-14), general services uses (UG16), and manufacturing uses (UG17) as-of-right. At this location, a special permit is required for self-service storage facilities (UG16D) (see “Public Policy,” below).

Figure 2.1-2  Zoning Map
Public Policy

The City’s 10-Point Industrial Action plan (November 2015) sets forth the following goals: protect and strengthen core industrial areas, invest in industrial and manufacturing businesses, and advance industrial-sector training and workforce development opportunities for New Yorkers. The site is located within the Maspeth Industrial Business Zone (IBZ), and as such, policies related to the 10-point Industrial Action Plan apply to the development site.

One policy of the plan, which aims to limit mini-storage development in IBZs through land use controls, resulted in the establishment of the Self-Storage Text Amendment. The Self-Storage Text Amendment, which was approved on December 19, 2017, introduced a Special Permit under the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission to be required for all new self-storage development in Designated Areas in M districts. The site is located within Subarea 2 of a Designated Area in an M District, and therefore, the development site is subject to regulations related to the Self-Storage Text Amendment. According to the text amendment, a special permit is required pursuant to ZR Section 74-932 to develop new self-storage facilities in Subarea 2.

No-Action Condition

As described in Section 1.0, Project Description, the development site would be developed with a one-story, 24-foot-tall, 134,268 gross square foot Home Depot store and two one-story, 18-foot-tall retail buildings consisting of a total of 20,400 gsf. An additional one-story, 23-foot-tall retail building of 24,000 gsf would be located along Borden Avenue in place of the self-storage facility. All buildings would be as-of-right.

Land Use

In the No-Action condition, the former warehouse and bottling facility will be replaced by an as-of-right Home Depot and three retail buildings. This would be consistent with other existing retail buildings located in the area, as noted previously. There would be no other changes to land uses within the study area.

Zoning

Absent the approval of the proposed project, there would be no modifications to the existing zoning. In addition, the buildings would be built according to existing zoning regulations.

Public Policy

Under the No-Action condition, there are no known public policy changes anticipated to affect the development site or study area.
With-Action Condition

Land Use

The With-Action condition would result in a mix of retail and self-storage uses at the development site, which would be consistent with uses in the surrounding area. As discussed previously, the study area consists primarily of manufacturing uses, and the proposed self-storage use (which is considered as a manufacturing use) would be in keeping with that trend. The commercial component of the proposed development would be consistent with other existing retail buildings located in the area.

Zoning

As noted previously, the proposed project is a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of the self-service storage facility portion of the project. While the special permit would allow a use that is not otherwise permitted at the site by underlying zoning regulations, the requested action is specific to the proposed development site and would not result in zoning changes to the surrounding area. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant adverse zoning impact.

Public Policy

The 10-Point Industrial Plan aims to encourage the growth of industrial and manufacturing sectors in New York City and to protect core industrial areas from encroachment. The plan’s goal to limit non-industrial uses in the city’s core industrial areas includes implementing restrictions on personal mini-storage and household goods storage facilities in IBZs. As described in Section 1.0, Project Description, the applicant anticipates that the proposed self-storage facility would be used not only by residents to store personal belongings but by local contractors and small businesses to store tools and construction supplies. Therefore, although the proposed development would include self-storage use, the proposed Home Depot and self-storage facility would provide a service to local manufacturing businesses and contractors by offering these businesses a place to shop for and store their supplies.

As previously mentioned, the proposed project is located in Sub Area 2 of the designated areas within manufacturing districts for self-storage facilities under section 74-932 of the City’s Zoning Resolution.

Further, the request for the special permit would apply solely to development site. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with public policy.

2.1-4 Conclusion

The proposed project would result in the development of a self-storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development of a Home Depot store and two retail buildings. While the proposed project would allow the development of a self-storage facility where it would not otherwise be permitted by zoning regulations, the action would be limited to the development site. In addition, the proposed Home Depot and self-storage facility would
provide a service to local manufacturing businesses and contractors. As such, the analysis described above demonstrates the proposed development would not result in a significant adverse impact to land use, zoning, or public policy.
2.2

Shadows

A shadow is defined in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual as the condition that results when a building or other built structure blocks the sunlight that would otherwise directly reach a certain area, space, or feature. The purpose of this chapter is to assess whether new structures may cast shadows on sunlight sensitive publicly accessible resources or other resources of concern such as natural resources, and to assess the significance of their impact.

2.2-1 Introduction

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a shadows assessment is required for proposed actions that would result in new structures greater than 50 feet in height or located adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight-sensitive resource. Such resources include publicly-accessible open spaces, important sunlight-sensitive natural features, or historic resources with sun-sensitive features. A significant adverse shadow impact occurs when the incremental shadow added by a proposed project falls on a sunlight-sensitive resource and substantially reduces or completely eliminates direct sunlight exposure, thereby significantly altering the public’s use of the resource or threatening the viability of vegetation or other resources.
As described in Section 1.0, “Project Description,” the proposed action is expected to facilitate the construction of a 68-foot-tall self-service storage facility in conjunction with as-
of-right Home Depot and retail development. Therefore, a Tier 1 analysis was conducted.

2.2-2 Preliminary Assessment

In accordance with the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary screening assessment is conducted to ascertain whether shadows resulting from a project could reach any sunlight-sensitive resource at any time of year. This preliminary screening assessment consists of three tiers of analysis:

› **Tier 1 Screening:** The first tier determines a simple radius around the proposed building representing the longest shadow that could be cast. If there are sunlight-sensitive resources within the radius, the analysis proceeds to the second tier;

› **Tier 2 Screening:** The second-tier analysis reduces the area that could be affected by project-generated shadows by accounting for a specific range of angles that can never receive shade in New York City due to the path of the sun in the northern hemisphere. According to the CEQR Technical Manual, shadows cannot be cast within New York City within 108 degrees from True North;

› **Tier 3 Screening:** If the second tier of analysis does not eliminate the possibility of new shadows on sunlight-sensitive resources, a third tier of screening analysis further refines the area that could be reached by new shadows by looking at specific representative days of the year and determining the maximum extent of shadow over the course of each representative day. For the Tier 3 screening, three-dimensional modeling software with the capacity to model shadows is used, and the maximum building envelope that could be achieved as a result of the proposed project is modeled and geo-located within the program. Terrain provided by the modeling software is also incorporated into the model to account for how changes in elevation throughout the study area can influence shadows that could be cast by the proposed project. The representative days are December 21 (winter solstice), June 21 (summer solstice), March 21/September 21 (vernal/autumnal equinox), and May 6/August 6 (halfway between summer solstice and the equinoxes). The modeling software is also used to approximate times that shadows cast from the proposed project could enter and exit a resource.

If the Tier 3 screening indicates that, in the absence of intervening buildings, shadows from the proposed project would reach a sunlight sensitive resource on any of the representative analysis days, a detailed shadow analysis is typically undertaken. Because existing buildings (or No-Action buildings) may already cast shadows on a sun-sensitive resource, the proposed project may not result in additional (incremental) shadows upon that resource.

The proposed project would consist of a self-service storage facility approximately 68 feet in height and could cast a maximum shadow of approximately 292.4 feet around the self-storage portion of the development site. As such, a Tier 1 Screening Assessment was

---

1 Although the proposed project would be 68 feet tall, the analysis was conducted using a previously proposed height of 74 feet. Because the current proposed height is shorter, this section reflects the most conservative assessment.
conducted. **Figure 2.2-1** shows that there are no potential sunlight-sensitive resources identified within the shadow study area. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

**Figure 2.2-1 Tier 1 Screening Assessment**
2.2-3 Conclusion

The proposed action would result in a new building greater than 50 feet in height, and a preliminary shadows assessment (Tier 1 assessment) was undertaken. The Tier 1 analysis indicated that there are no open space resources or historic resources that could potentially receive shadows from the proposed project and no further analysis is warranted.
2.3 Historic and Cultural Resources

This section assesses the potential for a proposed action to result in significant adverse impacts on historic and cultural resources, including both archaeological and architectural resources.

2.3-1 Introduction

The applicant is requesting a special permit pursuant to Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of a self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development that will consist of a Home Depot store and two one-story retail buildings. The proposed project would require ground disturbance. Therefore, a preliminary assessment of the proposed project’s potential impacts on historic and cultural resources was conducted.

2.3-2 Preliminary Assessment

Construction of the self-service storage facility would require approximately 56,214 cubic feet of ground disturbance.

However, a letter from the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), dated December 17, 2018, determined that the site is not architecturally or archaeologically significant (see Attachment 1). As such, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant adverse architectural and archaeological impacts.
2.3-3 Conclusion

Although the proposed project would require in-ground disturbance, LPC determined that the site does not contain architecturally or archaeologically significant resources. Therefore, the proposed project is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources, and no further analysis is warranted.
2.4 Urban Design and Visual Resources

An urban design assessment considers whether and how a project may change the pedestrian’s experience of the built environment in a project area. The assessment focuses on the components of a proposed action that may have the potential to alter the arrangement, appearance, and functionality of the built environment. In addition, the assessment considers the potential for the proposed action to affect any view corridors associated with visual resources.

2.4-1 Introduction

This section considers the potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse urban design and visual resources impacts. As defined in the 2014 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, urban design is the totality of components that may affect a pedestrian’s experience of public space. A visual resource is the connection from the public realm to significant natural or built features, including views of the waterfront, public parks, landmark structures or districts, otherwise distinct buildings or groups of buildings, or natural resources.

Based on the CEQR Technical Manual, a preliminary assessment of urban design and visual resources is appropriate when there is the potential for a pedestrian to observe, from the street level, a physical alteration beyond that allowed by existing zoning. Examples include projects that permit the modification of yard, height, and setback requirements, and projects
that result in an increase in built floor area beyond what would be allowed “as-of-right,” or in the future No-Action condition.

As described in Section 1.0, Project Description, the applicant seeks a special permit to facilitate the construction of a service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development. Because the requested action would facilitate the introduction of a new building that is not currently allowed by existing zoning, a preliminary assessment of urban design and visual resources was conducted.

2.4-2 Preliminary Assessment

The proposed action would result in the construction of a 68-foot-tall self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development consisting of a Home Depot and two retail buildings. Similar to the Home Depot and two retail buildings, the self-service storage facility would conform to the height and setback requirements of the existing zoning district, and no relief to bulk regulations would be sought as part of the proposed project. The special permit is being requested to allow the self-service storage use on the development site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

2.4-3 Conclusion

Because the requested action would facilitate the introduction of a new building not currently allowed by zoning, a preliminary analysis of urban design and visual resources was conducted. However, the self-service storage facility would conform to bulk requirements and no relief to these requirements would be sought. The special permit is being requested only to allow the self-service storage use on the development site. Therefore, the proposed project is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources, and no further analysis is warranted.
Figure 2.4-1  No-Action and With-Action condition comparison with a southeast view of the site

No-Action

With-Action
2.5 Hazardous Materials

The goal of the hazardous materials assessment is to determine whether a proposed project would lead to a potential increase in exposure of hazardous materials to people or the environment or whether the increased exposure would lead to significant public health impacts or environmental damage.

2.5-1 Introduction

As described in the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, a hazardous material is any substance that poses a threat to human health or the environment. Substances that can be of concern include, but are not limited to, heavy metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, methane, polychlorinated biphenyls and hazardous wastes (defined as substances that are chemically reactive, ignitable, corrosive, or toxic).

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, the potential for significant impacts from hazardous materials can occur when:

› hazardous materials exist on a site;
› an action would increase pathways to their exposure; or
› an action would introduce new activities or processes using hazardous materials.
2.5-2 Methodology

The potential for hazardous materials was evaluated in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), dated August 21, 2017, prepared by Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. (GES). This Phase I ESA was prepared in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Practice E1527-13, inclusive of the “All Appropriate Inquiry” requirement amended in the Federal Register on December 30, 2013. The USEPA “All Appropriate Inquiry” requirement establishes specific regulatory requirements for conducting appropriate inquiries into the previous ownership, uses, and environmental conditions of a property for the purposes of qualifying for certain landowner liability protections under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Based on the results of the Phase I ESA, GES conducted a subsurface investigation at the development site. The results of the subsurface investigation were summarized in a Phase II ESA prepared by GES, dated July 10, 2018. In addition, a supplemental Phase II ESA was completed during the on-site geotechnical drilling activities in March and April of 2018.

2.5-3 Assessment

Existing Conditions

The development site is an irregularly shaped 316,200-square foot (sf) parcel located on the side of Borden Avenue (and the Long Island Expressway [LIE]), west of Maurice Avenue, east of 58th Street, and north of 55th Drive. The site was improved with a two-story warehouse facility previously utilized by Coca Cola as a bottling plant; that building was demolished.

As described in Section 1.0, “Project Description”, the applicant is requesting a special permit to facilitate the development of approximately 136,853 sf six-story self-service storage facility that would be developed as part of a larger as-of-right development that would consist of a Home Depot store and two one-story retail buildings.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

As described above, a Phase I ESA, dated August 21, 2017, was completed by GES for the development site and was prepared in accordance with ASTM Method E1527-13. The goal of the Phase I ESA process is to identify “Recognized Environmental Conditions” (RECs), which means the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property. The term “Historic Recognized Environmental Conditions” means a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or
meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls.

Per the ASTM Standard, the Phase I ESA reviewed a variety of information sources, including current and historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, topographic maps, historic City Directories and aerial photographs; state and federal environmental regulatory databases identifying listed sites; and local environmental records. The Phase I ESA also included reconnaissance of the site and surrounding neighborhood and interviews with the former Plant Manager.

As stated in Practice E1527-13, there may be environmental issues or conditions at the site, which may be requested by the user to be addressed as part of the Phase I ESA, which are not covered within the scope of ASTM Practice E1527-13. These issues are referred to as non-scope considerations. The following non-scope considerations were addressed in a limited capacity within the Phase I ESA: radon, lead-based paint (LBP), asbestos-containing materials (ACM), wetlands, and mold and water damage.

The following REC was identified in association with the development site:

- One (1) 20,000-gallon fuel oil UST identified as Tank #011 was documented to be closed in-place as of July 1, 1992. The abandoned-in-place UST represents a REC since the location of the tank is unknown and no details regarding the tank closure were available for review.

In addition to the REC, the following historic recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) were identified for the development site:

- Two (2) closed NYSDEC spills (Spill Nos. 13-04739 and 13-02133) are associated with a past hazardous materials release of ammonia hydroxide. This past release has been resolved to the satisfaction of the NYSDEC and both spill incidents have been closed. Therefore, the past release of ammonia hydroxide is unlikely to pose a significant environmental threat.

- Multiple closed NYSDEC spills were identified on adjoining property to the east. Since these spills are closed and resolved to the satisfaction of the NYSDEC, they are not likely to pose a significant environmental threat to the development site and are identified as HRECs.

The following business environmental risks (BERs) were identified for the development site:

- Based on age, there is a potential for asbestos-containing material (ACM) to be present.

- Historic automotive repair operations within a portion of the bottling plant may have resulted in impacted soil and groundwater media.

- Multiple bulk tank storage sites were identified on adjacent sites. There is a potential for residual petroleum impacts at the development site that may be encountered during redevelopment activities.
• Although NYSDEC records state that multiple former USTs were removed, no information regarding the removal activities or locations of the tanks were made available for review. There may be contaminated soils associated with former tanks.

• Multiple aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) may be present inside the facility, which was inaccessible during the Phase I ESA site reconnaissance. The status of the ASTs could not be confirmed.

• Stormwater catch basins at the development site could be a source of contamination because the structures tend to collect contaminants over time due to regular site operations and/or minor spills of contaminants at the development site.

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

GES conducted initial and supplemental subsurface investigations at the development site with the primary purpose of identifying and evaluating subsurface impacts related to recent and historical uses of the development site. The results of these investigations were summarized in a Phase II ESA dated July 10, 2018. The initial Phase II ESA involved the installation of five (5) soil borings installed to 20-feet below grade surface (bgs) and groundwater samples from five (5) temporary groundwater monitoring wells. A supplemental Phase II ESA was completed and involved a total of 59 soil borings installed to varying depths. Five temporary groundwater wells were also installed under the supplemental Phase II ESA to further evaluate groundwater conditions.

Soil Sample Results

Ninety-five (95) soil samples were collected by GES and submitted for laboratory analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) and metals. The results of the analysis indicate exceedances of VOCs in three soil boring locations. SVOC exceedances were identified in 20 soil boring locations. Furthermore, metal exceedances were identified in 74 out of the 94 samples analyzed. To further characterize soils, TCLP analyses were performed on 24 of the soil samples. The results of the TCLP analyses indicate that two soil boring locations contained the metal lead at concentrations that would characterize these soils as “hazardous waste.”

Groundwater Quality Results

A total of ten (10) groundwater samples were collected by GES and submitted for laboratory analysis for VOCs, SVOCs and total and dissolved-phase metals. The resultant laboratory data indicated VOCs at concentrations above applicable standards in one boring location. SVOCs were detected below applicable standards in all sample locations. Several metals (arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, selenium, silver and mercury) were detected in dissolved-phase concentrations that exceeded applicable regulatory standards.
Future No-Action Condition

Absent the proposed project (No-Action condition), the development site will be developed with an as-of-right project consisting of a Home Depot and three retail buildings. While under the No-Action condition, the lead and reviewing agency would not review the Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA and provide administration with respect to the hazardous materials analyses, development of the site will be undertaken in accordance with appropriate local, state and federal requirements, including New York State Department of Labor (NYSDOL) and/or New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) protocols.

Future With-Action Condition

As detailed in Section 1.0, “Project Description,” in the With-Action condition the development site would be developed with a six-story self-service storage facility (requiring a special permit) as part of a larger as-of-right project consisting of a Home Depot and two retail buildings. The self-storage facility would be located on the Borden Avenue frontage.

The Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA will be reviewed by the lead agency and associated reviewing agency (the New York City Department of Environmental Protection [NYCDEP]). Any additional investigations or requirements set forth by the lead or associated reviewing agency (NYCDEP) would be followed, which would result in no significant adverse impacts relating to hazardous materials. With the implementation of the above measures, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be expected during construction and operation of the proposed project.

2.5-4 Assessment

The potential for hazardous materials was evaluated in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), dated August 21, 2017, prepared by Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. (GES), a Phase II ESA prepared by GES, dated July 10, 2018, and a supplemental Phase II ESA in March and April of 2018. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) requested that in order to address on-site environmental conditions, the proposed actions include an (E) designation for hazardous materials (E-553).

The (E) designation for hazardous materials will apply to the entire lot, however the applicant intends to pursue a tax lot subdivision for the portion of the lot that will be the site of the proposed self-storage facility. Once the subdivision is complete, the (E) designation would apply to this future tax lot. In the event that the subdivision is complete before consideration by the City Planning Commission, the Negative Declaration may be revised to reflect the new tax lot upon which the (E) designation would apply.
Compliance in association with the hazardous materials (E) Designation on the would be conducted under the administration of the New York City’s OER. The (E) designation process generally begins with preparation of a Phase I ESA to determine potential recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and areas of concern (AOCs) that may require additional investigation. Any potential RECs or AOCs identified would follow the (E) designation protocol for additional investigation and potential remedial action. However, the (E) Designation process as it relates to the development site would utilize the existing reports described above to supplement any additional subsurface investigations that may be required by OER. The applicable text for the (E) designation to be applied to the development site (E-553) would be as follows:

Task 1: Sampling Protocol

Prior to construction, the applicant submits to OER, for review and approval, a Phase II Investigation protocol, including a description of methods and a site map with all sampling locations clearly and precisely represented.

No sampling should begin until written approval of a protocol is received from OER. The number and location of sample sites should be selected to adequately characterize the site, the specific source of suspected contamination (i.e., petroleum-based contamination and non-petroleum-based contamination), and the remainder of the site's condition. The characterization should be complete enough to determine what remediation strategy (if any) is necessary after review of the sampling data. Guidelines and criteria for selecting sampling locations and collecting samples are provided by OER upon request.

Task 2: Remediation Determination and Protocol

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be submitted to OER after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such results, a determination is made by OER if the results indicate that remediation is necessary. If OER determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by OER.

If remediation is indicated from the test results, a proposed Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) must be submitted to OER for review and approval. The applicant must complete such remediation as determined necessary by OER in accordance with the approved RAWP. The applicant should then provide proper documentation that remedial action has been satisfactorily completed.

An OER-approved construction-related Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) would be implemented during evacuation and construction and activities to protect workers and the community from potentially significant adverse impacts associated with contaminated soil and/or groundwater. This plan would be submitted to OER for review and approval prior to implementation.
2.5-5 Conclusion

To avoid the potential for significant adverse impacts relating to hazardous materials on the development site, under the proposed actions, an E-Designation would be applied (E-553); the E-Designation is under the regulatory oversight of the New York City Office of Environmental Remediation (OER). The (E) designation for hazardous materials would apply to the entire lot, however the applicant intends to pursue a tax lot subdivision for the portion of the lot that will be the site of the proposed self-storage facility. Once the subdivision is complete, the (E) designation would only apply to this future tax lot. In the event that the subdivision is complete before consideration by the City Planning Commission, the Negative Declaration may be revised to reflect the new tax lot upon which the (E) designation would apply.

With the implementation of the above measures, the proposed action would result in no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.
2.6

Air Quality

Ambient air quality, or the quality of the surrounding air, may be affected by air pollutants produced by motor vehicles, referred to as "mobile sources"; by fixed facilities, usually referenced as "stationary sources"; or by a combination of both. Under CEQR, an air quality assessment determines both a proposed project's effects on ambient air quality as well as the effects of ambient air quality on the project.

2.6-1 Introduction

According to the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, air quality impacts can be characterized as either direct or indirect impacts. Direct impacts result from emissions generated by stationary sources, such as stack emissions from on-site fuel burned for boilers and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. Indirect effects are caused by off-site emissions associated with a project, such as emissions from on-road motor vehicles ("mobile sources") traveling to and from a development site.

This section examines the potential for air quality impacts from the proposed project. As discussed in Section 1, Project Description, the applicant, Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., is requesting a special permit pursuant to Section 74-932 to facilitate the
development of an approximately 136,853 sf, six-story self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development that will consist of a Home Depot store and two one-story retail buildings.

A screening analysis of mobile source emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Particulate Matter (PM) on ambient pollutant levels in the study area was conducted per CEQR Technical Manual guidance. Absent approval of the proposed action, additional retail would be developed in the area where the self-service storage facility would be constructed; therefore, the With Action condition would result in a lower number of vehicle trips than in the No Action condition since self-storage use is a lower traffic generator than retail use. Additionally, the proposed project increment would be less than the minimum development densities that would require a transportation analysis for the EAS and would not exceed the CEQR Level 1 screening thresholds for vehicle trips. Thus, the number of incremental vehicular trips for the project site would be lower than the CEQR Technical Manual CO-based screening threshold of 170 vehicles per hour, and the PM$_{2.5}$-based screening threshold of 20 and 23 truck equivalents (for collector and arterial roads, respectively) per hour.

Because the proposed actions would not introduce a sensitive use (i.e. the proposed actions would allow a self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right Home Depot and retail development), an analysis of industrial and large/major sources is not warranted.

Therefore, this air quality assessment focuses on the potential for the proposed self-service storage facility’s heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems to result in significant adverse impacts on surrounding uses.

### 2.6-2 Pollutants of Concern

Air pollution is of concern because of its demonstrated effects on human health. Of special concern are the respiratory effects of the pollutants and their potential toxic effects, as described below.

**Carbon monoxide (CO)** is a colorless and odorless gas that is a product of incomplete combustion. Carbon monoxide is absorbed by the lungs and reacts with hemoglobin to reduce the oxygen carrying capacity of the blood. At low concentrations, CO has been shown to aggravate the symptoms of cardiovascular disease. It can cause headaches, nausea, and at sustained high concentration levels, can lead to coma and death.

**Particulate matter** is made up of small solid particles and liquid droplets. PM$_{10}$ refers to particulate matter with a nominal aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less, and PM$_{2.5}$ refers to particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less. Particulates can enter the body through the respiratory system. Particulates over 10 micrometers in size are generally captured in the nose and throat and are readily expelled from the body. Particulates smaller than 10 micrometers, and especially particles smaller than 2.5 micrometers, can reach the air...
ducts (bronchi) and the air sacs (alveoli) in the lungs. Particulates are associated with increased incidence of respiratory diseases, cardiopulmonary disease, and cancer.

**Nitrogen oxides (NOx),** the most significant of which are nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2), can occur when combustion temperatures are extremely high (such as in engines) and atmosphere nitrogen gas combines with oxygen gas. NO is relatively harmless to humans but quickly converts to NO2. Nitrogen dioxide has been found to be a lung irritant and can lead to respiratory illnesses. Nitrogen oxides, along with VOCs, are also precursors to ozone formation.

**Sulfur Dioxide (SO2)** emissions are the main components of the “oxides of sulfur,” a group of highly reactive gases from fossil fuel combustion at power plants, other industrial facilities, industrial processes, and burning of high sulfur containing fuels by locomotives, large ships, and non-road equipment. High concentrations of SO2 will lead to formation of other sulfur oxides. By reducing the SO2 emissions, other forms of sulfur oxides are also expected to decrease. When oxides of sulfur react with other compounds in the atmosphere, small particles that can affect the lungs can be formed. This can lead to respiratory disease and aggravate existing heart disease.

**Non-criteria pollutants** may be of concern in addition to the criteria pollutants discussed above. Non-criteria pollutants are emitted by a wide range of man-made and naturally occurring sources. These pollutants are sometimes referred to as hazardous air pollutants (HAP) and when emitted from mobile sources, as Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs). Emissions of non-criteria pollutants from industrial sources are regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Federal ambient air quality standards do not exist for non-criteria pollutants; however, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) has issued standards for certain non-criteria compounds, including beryllium, gaseous fluorides, and hydrogen sulfide. NYSDEC has also developed guidance document DAR-1 (August 2016), which contains a compilation of annual and short term (1-hour) guideline concentration thresholds for these compounds. The NYSDEC’s DAR-1 guidance thresholds represent ambient levels that are considered safe for public exposure. EPA has also developed guidelines for assessing exposure to non-criteria pollutants. These exposure guidelines are used in health risk assessments to determine the potential effects to the public.

### 2.6-3 Impact Criteria

The predicted concentrations of pollutants of concern associated with a proposed project are compared with either the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria air pollutants or ambient guideline concentrations for non-criteria pollutants. In general, if a project would cause the standards for any pollutant to be exceeded, it would likely result in a significant adverse air quality impact. In addition, the City’s *de minimis* criteria are also used to determine significance of impacts for CO and PM$_{2.5}$.
National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to set standards on the pollutants that are considered harmful to public health and the environment. The NAAQS were implemented as a result of the CAA, amended in 1990 (see Table 2.10-1)\(^1\). The NAAQS applies to six principal (“criteria”) pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), particulate matter 10 (PM\(_{10}\)), particulate matter 2.5 (PM\(_{2.5}\)), sulfur dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and ozone.

Table 2.6-1 National and New York State Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>35 ppm (40,000 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>9 ppm (10,000 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>53 ppb (100 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>100 ppb (188 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>0.075 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>150 µg/m(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>12.0 µg/m(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>35.0 µg/m(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (80 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>0.14 ppm (365 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Hour</td>
<td>0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>75 ppb (196 µg/m(^3))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Non-criteria Pollutant Thresholds

Non-criteria, or toxic, air pollutants include a multitude of pollutants of variable toxicity. No federal ambient air quality standards have been promulgated for toxic air pollutants. However, EPA and NYSDEC have issued guidelines that establish acceptable ambient levels for these pollutants based on human exposure.

The NYSDEC DAR-1 guidance document presents guideline concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m\(^3\)) for the one-hour and annual average time periods for various air toxic compounds\(^2\).

In order to evaluate impacts of non-carcinogenic toxic air emissions, EPA developed a methodology called the “Hazard Index Approach.” The acute hazard index is based on short-term exposure, while the chronic non-carcinogenic hazard index is based on annual exposure limits. If the combined ratio of pollutant concentration divided by its respective short-term or annual exposure threshold for each of the toxic

---


pollutants is found to be less than 1.0, no significant adverse air quality impacts are predicted to occur due to these pollutant releases.

In addition, EPA has developed unit risk factors for carcinogenic pollutants. EPA considers an overall incremental cancer risk from a proposed action of less than one-in-one million to be insignificant. Using these factors, the potential cancer risk associated with each carcinogenic pollutant, as well as the total cancer risk of the releases of all the carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined, can be estimated. If the total incremental cancer risk of all the carcinogenic toxic pollutants combined is less than one-in-one million, no significant adverse air quality impacts are predicted to occur due to these pollutant releases.

**CO De Minimis Criteria**

New York City has developed *de minimis* criteria to assess the significance of the increase in CO concentrations that would result from the impact of project-generated mobile sources, as set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. These criteria set the minimum change in CO concentration that defines a significant adverse environmental impact. Significant increases of CO concentrations in New York City are defined as:

- An increase of 0.5 ppm or more in the maximum eight-hour average CO concentration at a location where the predicted No-Action eight-hour concentration is equal to or between 8.0 and 9.0 ppm; or
- An increase of more than half the difference between baseline (i.e., No-Action) concentrations and the eight-hour standard, when No-Action concentrations are below 8.0 ppm.

**PM$_{2.5}$ De Minimis Criteria**

New York City uses de minimis criteria to determine a project’s potential to result in a significant adverse PM$_{2.5}$ impact under CEQR. The de minimis criteria are as follows:
› Predicted increase of more than half the difference between the background concentration and the 24-hour standard;

› Annual average PM$_{2.5}$ concentration increments which are predicted to be greater than 0.1 µg/m$^3$ at ground level on a neighborhood scale (i.e., the annual increase in concentration representing the average over an area of approximately 1 square kilometer, centered on the location where the maximum ground-level impact is predicted for stationary sources; or at a distance from a roadway corridor similar to the minimum distance defined for locating neighborhood scale monitoring stations; or

› Annual average PM$_{2.5}$ concentration increments which are predicted to be greater than 0.3 µg/m$^3$ at a discrete receptor location (elevated or ground level).

Background Concentrations

Background concentrations are ambient pollution levels associated with existing stationary, mobile, and other area emission sources. NYSDEC maintains an air quality monitoring network and produces annual air quality reports that include monitoring data for CO, NO$_x$, PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$, and SO$_2$. To develop background levels, the latest available pollutant concentrations from NYSDEC monitoring sites located closest to the development sites were used. If the pollutant concentration from the nearest monitoring station is not available, the next closest monitoring station is selected, and so forth. **Table 2.6-2** summarizes the background concentrations for each of the pollutants.
### Table 2.6-2 Background Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Monitoring Location</th>
<th>Background Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>Queens College 2</td>
<td>1.36 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>Queens College 2</td>
<td>0.90 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>Queens College 2</td>
<td>112.2 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Queens College 2</td>
<td>31 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>Division St</td>
<td>28 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>Division St</td>
<td>20.7 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>Queens College 2</td>
<td>18.2 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. 1-hour CO and 8-hour CO background concentrations are based on the highest second max value from the latest five years of available monitoring data from NYSDEC (2013-2017).
2. 1-hour NO₂ background concentration is based on three-year average (2015-2017) of the 98th percentile of daily maximum 1-hour concentrations from available monitoring data from NYSDEC.
3. Annual NO₂ background concentration is based on the maximum annual average from the latest five years of available monitoring data from NYSDEC (2013-2017).
4. 24-hour PM₁₀ is based on the highest second max value from the latest three years of available monitoring data from NYSDEC (2015-2017).
5. The 24-hour PM₂.₅ background concentration is based on maximum 98th percentile concentration averaged over three years of data from NYSDEC (2015-2017).
6. 1-hour SO₂ background concentration is based on maximum 99th percentile concentration averaged over the latest three years of available monitoring data from NYSDEC (2015-2017).


PM₂.₅ impacts are assessed on an incremental basis and compared with the PM₂.₅ de minimis criteria, without considering the annual background. Therefore, the annual PM₂.₅ background is not presented in the table.

### 2.6-4 HVAC Analysis Methodology

As discussed above, this air quality assessment focuses on the potential for the proposed self-service storage facility’s HVAC system to result in significant adverse impacts on surrounding uses.

As described in Section 220 and Section 321 in Chapter 17 of the CEQR Technical Manual, for single-building projects that would use fossil fuels (i.e., fuel oil or natural gas) for its HVAC system, a preliminary stationary source screening analysis is typically warranted to evaluate the potential for impacts on existing buildings from the project’s HVAC emissions. The CEQR Technical Manual provides screening nomographs based on fuel type, stack height, minimum distance from the source to the nearest receptor buildings with similar or greater heights, and floor area of development resulting from the proposed project. There are three different curves representing three different stack heights (30 feet, 100 feet, and 165 feet) on the figures, and the height closest to but not higher than the proposed stack height is selected. Based on the development size, if the distance from the development site to the nearest building of similar or greater height is less than the minimum...
required distance determined, there is the potential for a significant air quality impact from the project’s boilers, and further analysis needs to be conducted using the USEPA’s AERMOD model.

2.6-5 HVAC Assessment

In the With-Action scenario, the self-service storage facility would total 136,853 gsf and would rise six stories to a height of 68 feet above grade. Consistent with CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, it is assumed that the stack would rise three feet above the roof for a total height of 71 feet above grade. The self-storage facility would be a part of a larger as-of-right development which consists of the following: a 23-foot tall, 134,230 gsf Retail A (i.e. Home Depot) building, an 18-foot tall, 12,400 gsf retail building, Retail B, and an 18-foot tall, 8,224 gsf retail building, Retail C. Consistent with CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, it is assumed that the stacks would rise three feet above the roofs for total heights of 26 and 21 feet above grade.

A survey of existing residential land uses and other sensitive receptor sites within a 400-foot radius of the development site was conducted. The survey indicated that the tallest building within 400 feet of the development site is the With-Action self-storage facility. This building’s absolute roof elevation\(^3\) is approximately 91 feet.

A screening analysis was performed for the self-storage facility assuming a distance of 400 feet between the source to the receptor and a total development size of 136,853 sf square feet. Based upon the proposed height and square footage, the minimum screening distance necessary to avoid potential adverse air quality impacts to adjacent properties was determined to be approximately 81 feet assuming No. 2 fuel oil is used for the HVAC system (see Figure 2.6-1). As there are no buildings of equal or greater height within 400 feet of the development site, a screening distance of 400 feet is used per the CEQR Technical Manual. With the minimum source to receptor distance determined to be 400 feet, the screening distance requirement is met regardless of fuel type (natural gas or No.2 oil), and there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts related to the proposed building’s HVAC system.

---

\(^3\) Absolute roof elevation is a sum of the proposed building height above grade, the ground elevation, and 3 feet of stack height.
A screening analysis was also performed for the Retail A building assuming a distance of 400 feet between the source to the receptor and a total development size of 134,320 sf square feet. Based upon the proposed height and square footage, the minimum screening distance necessary to avoid potential adverse air quality impacts to adjacent properties was determined to be approximately 86 feet assuming No. 2 fuel oil is used for the HVAC system (see Figure 2.6-2). The closest building of greater height to Retail A would be the proposed self-storage facility. Because the self-storage facility is not a sensitive use with operable windows, there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts from the proposed building’s HVAC system on the self-storage facility. Additionally, the 18-foot tall retail buildings, Retail B and Retail C, would be of similar height to Retail A. As Retail B and C are approximately 165 and 193 feet away from Retail A, respectively, the required distance for Retail A is met. Thus, there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts related to the Retail A’s HVAC system.
Additionally, a screening analysis was performed for Retail B assuming a total square footage of 20,000 and a height of 21 feet above grade. Based upon the proposed height and square footage, the minimum screening distance necessary to avoid potential adverse air quality impacts to adjacent properties was determined to be approximately 32 feet assuming No. 2 fuel oil is used for the HVAC system (see Figure 2.6-3). The nearest building of equal height to Retail B is Retail C. With the minimum source to receptor distance determined to be 37 feet, the screening distance requirement is met regardless of fuel type (natural gas or No.2 oil), and there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts related to the building’s HVAC system.

---

4 Retail B is 12,400 gsf. The screening curves for No. 2 fuel oil start just a little above 20,000 gsf, and thus, to be conservative, 20,000 gsf was assumed for the screening analysis.
Lastly, a screening analysis was also performed for Retail C assuming a total square footage of 20,000\(^5\) and a height of 21 feet above grade. Based upon the proposed height and square footage, the minimum screening distance necessary to avoid potential adverse air quality impacts to adjacent properties was determined to be approximately 32 feet assuming No. 2 fuel oil is used for the HVAC system (see Figure 2.6-4). The nearest building of equal height to Retail C is Retail B. With the minimum source to receptor distance determined to be 37 feet, the screening distance requirement is met regardless of fuel type (natural gas or No.2 oil), and there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts related to the building’s HVAC system.

\(^5\) Retail C is 8,224 gsf. The screening curves for No. 2 fuel oil start just a little above 20,000 gsf, and thus, to be conservative, 20,000 gsf was assumed for the screening analysis.
2.6-6 Conclusion

The proposed action would be below the CEQR Level 1 screening thresholds for vehicle trips. Therefore, traffic from the self-service storage facility would not result in a significant adverse impact on mobile source air quality.

A survey of existing residential land uses and other sensitive receptor sites within a 400-foot radius of the development site was conducted. The survey indicated that the tallest building within 400 feet of the development site is the With-Action self-storage facility. This building’s absolute roof elevation⁶ is approximately 91 feet.

A screening analysis was performed for the self-storage facility and the three retail buildings using the CEQR Technical Manual nomographs. Based on the gross square footages of the facility and the retail buildings, and the height of the facility and buildings’ stacks, the screening distance requirements were met regardless of fuel

---

⁶ Absolute roof elevation is a sum of the proposed building height above grade, the ground elevation, and 3 feet of stack height.
type (natural gas or No. 2 oil), and there would be no significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts related to the buildings’ HVAC systems.

Therefore, there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts as a result of the proposed action.
2.7 Noise

The goal of this section is to determine whether the proposed project may increase noise exposure at existing sensitive receptors and whether new receptors would be introduced into an acceptable ambient noise environment.

2.7-1 Introduction

The applicant is requesting a special permit pursuant to Section 74-932 to facilitate the development of a self-service storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development that would consist of a Home Depot store and two retail buildings. The purpose of the noise assessment under CEQR is to determine if:

› The proposed development would significantly increase sound levels from mobile and stationary sources at existing noise receptors adjacent to the development site, including residential, commercial, and institutional land uses; and

› New noise receptors introduced at the development site would be in an acceptable ambient sound level environment.

Per the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, a noise analysis is appropriate if an action would generate mobile or stationary sources of noise or would be located in an area with high ambient noise levels. Mobile sources include vehicular traffic; stationary sources include rooftop equipment such as emergency generators, cooling towers, and other mechanical
equipment. Because the proposed project would generate vehicular traffic, a preliminary noise assessment was conducted.

2.7-2 Preliminary Assessment

As indicated above, the proposed project would generate vehicular traffic. However, self-storage use is a low trip generator, and therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds outlined in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16, "Transportation," of the CEQR Technical Manual. Because the proposed project would not exceed CEQR Level 1 thresholds, the proposed project is not likely to result in significant adverse noise impacts due to vehicular traffic.

2.7-3 Conclusion

The proposed action would not introduce any new noise-sensitive receptor or any significant stationary noise source. Although the proposed project would introduce vehicular traffic, the proposed project is not located near sensitive receptors and self-storage use is a low trip generator and would not likely result in significant increase in traffic to warrant further analysis. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts.
2.8 Transportation

The objective of the transportation analyses is to determine whether a proposed project may have a potential significant impact on traffic operations and mobility, public transportation facilities and services, pedestrian elements and flow, safety of roadway users (pedestrians, cyclists, transit users or motorists), on- and off-street parking, or goods movement.

2.8-1 Introduction

This section summarizes the transportation screening analysis per the CEQR Technical Manual. It provides a detailed description of the travel demand assumptions used to determine the net number of trips generated by the proposed project as compared to the No Action condition.

The development site is located in the Maspeth section of Queens and is bounded by Borden Avenue to the north, Maurice Avenue to the east, 55th Drive to the south, and 58th Street to the west. Figure 2.8-1 shows the location of the development site. The applicant is requesting a special permit to facilitate the development of an approximately 136,853 square foot (sf) self-storage facility in conjunction with an as-of-right 154,854 sf retail facility which includes a Home Depot and two one-story retail buildings. Absent the project, an approximately 178,854 sf retail development could be developed as-of-right in the area of the proposed self-storage use. Table 2.8-1 shows the development increment analyzed.
As demonstrated in this analysis, the proposed project would result in a net decrease in vehicle, transit, and pedestrian trips generated as compared to the No-Action condition and the project would not exceed the Level 1 screening threshold set forth in the CEQR Technical Manual. Therefore, there would be no potential for significant adverse transportation impacts.

**Figure 2.8-1  Project Location**

![Project Location Diagram](image)

**Table 2.8-1  Development Increment for Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>No-Action Condition</th>
<th>With-Action Condition</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-storage</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>136,853 sf</td>
<td>+136,853 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Retail</td>
<td>178,854 sf</td>
<td>154,854 sf</td>
<td>-24,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8-2 Methodology

According to the CEQR Technical Manual procedures for transportation analysis, a two-tiered screening process is undertaken to determine whether a quantified analysis is necessary. The first step, the Level 1 (Trip Generation) screening, determines whether the volume of peak hour person trips and vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would remain below the minimum thresholds for further study.

These thresholds are:

› 50 peak hour vehicle trip ends;
› 200 peak hour subway/rail or bus transit riders; and
› 200 peak hour pedestrian trips.

If the proposed project results in increments that would exceed any of these thresholds, a Level 2 (Trip Assignment) screening assessment is usually performed. In a Level 2 assessment, project-generated trips that exceed Level 1 thresholds are assigned to and from the site through their respective networks (streets, bus and subway lines, sidewalks, etc.) based on expected origin-destination patterns and travel routes.

As demonstrated below, the proposed project would not exceed the Level 1 screening analysis thresholds, and no further analysis is warranted.

2.8-3 Level 1 Screening Assessment (Trip Generation)

Travel Demand Assumptions

The travel demand factors used to calculate the projected number of trips were obtained primarily from the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual and from other New York City environmental impact studies and assessments such as the Self-Storage Text Amendment FEIS (2017) and Willets Point Development FSEIS (2013). Table 2.8-2 provides the travel demand assumptions used for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours.
Table 2.8-2  Travel Demand Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Storage</th>
<th>Destination Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person Trip Gen Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.42/2.34(^1) per 1,000 SF</td>
<td>78.2/92.5(^2) per 1,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday AM Peak</td>
<td>4.9(^1)</td>
<td>3(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Midday Peak</td>
<td>12.3(^1)</td>
<td>9(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday PM Peak</td>
<td>8.6(^1)</td>
<td>9(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Midday Peak</td>
<td>12.4(^1)</td>
<td>11(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Split</strong> (Weekday/Saturday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>100%/100(^1)</td>
<td>74%/72(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0%/0(^1)</td>
<td>3%/5(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0%/0(^1)</td>
<td>18%/18(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0%/0(^1)</td>
<td>5%/5(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Occupancy</strong> (Weekday/Saturday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>1.20/1.20(^1)</td>
<td>2.05/2.49(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>1.20/1.20(^1)</td>
<td>2.05/2.49(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directional Split (In/Out)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday AM Peak</td>
<td>50%/50(^1)</td>
<td>61%/39(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Midday Peak</td>
<td>55%/45(^1)</td>
<td>55%/45(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday PM Peak</td>
<td>50%/50(^1)</td>
<td>47%/53(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Midday Peak</td>
<td>52%/48(^1)</td>
<td>51%/49(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truck Trip Gen</strong> (Weekday/ Saturday)</td>
<td>0/0(^1) per 1,000 SF</td>
<td>0.35/0.04(^3) per 1,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truck Temporal Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday AM Peak</td>
<td>0(^1)</td>
<td>8(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Midday Peak</td>
<td>0(^1)</td>
<td>11(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday PM Peak</td>
<td>0(^1)</td>
<td>2(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Midday Peak</td>
<td>0(^1)</td>
<td>11(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
1. Self-Storage Text Amendment FEIS, 2017
3. Willets Point Development FSEIS, 2013; subway mode trips were assumed to drive instead due to lack of subway transit in the development site vicinity

**Self-Storage**

Self-storage use travel demand assumptions were based on the Self-Storage Text Amendment FEIS (2017). Trip generation rates of 1.42 daily person trips per 1,000 sf for the weekday and 2.34 daily person trips per 1,000 sf for Saturday, and temporal distributions of 4.9 percent, 12.3 percent, 8.6 percent, and 12.4 percent for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, were used. All trips were assumed to be via auto to provide a conservative analysis, and a 1.20 person per auto vehicle occupancy was
used. The directional distributions used were 50 percent "in" during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, 55 percent "in" during the weekday midday peak hour, and 52 percent "in" during the Saturday midday peak hour. No truck deliveries were assumed for this use.

**Destination Retail**

For the commercial retail use, destination retail trip assumptions were used. Trip generation rates of 78.2 daily person trips per 1,000 sf for the weekday and 92.5 daily person trips per 1,000 sf for Saturday, and temporal distributions of 3 percent, 9 percent, 9 percent, and 11 percent for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, were obtained from the *2014 CEQR Technical Manual*. Modal splits, vehicle occupancy and directional distributions were based on the *Willets Point Development FSEIS (2013)*. For the weekday peak hours, modal splits of 74 percent by auto, 3 percent by taxi, 18 percent by bus, and 5 percent by walk, and vehicle occupancies of 2.05 persons per auto and taxi were used. For the Saturday peak hour, modal splits of 72 percent by auto, 5 percent by taxi, 18 percent by bus, and 5 percent by walk, and vehicle occupancies of 2.49 persons per auto and taxi were used. Due to the lack of subway availability in the development site vicinity, it is assumed that no subway trips would be made and instead these trips would drive to the site. The directional distributions used were 61 percent "in" during the weekday AM peak hour, 55 percent "in" during the weekday midday peak hour, 47 percent “in” during the weekday PM peak hour, and 51 percent “in” during the Saturday midday peak hour.

For commercial retail delivery trips, daily trip generation rates of 0.35 and 0.04 daily trucks per 1,000 sf for weekday and Saturday, respectively, and a temporal distribution of 8 percent, 11 percent, 2 percent, and 11 percent for the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively, were obtained from the *Willets Point Development FSEIS (2013)* for destination retail use.

**Level 1 Screening Results**

**Transit and Pedestrians**

The proposed project increment would result in a decrease of 10 to 44 bus trips, and a decrease of 13 to 56 walk trips (bus plus walk only trips) during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. The total number of person trips generated by the proposed project are provided in Table 2.8-3. Since the number of peak hour pedestrian trips would decrease as part of the proposed project, the *2014 CEQR Technical Manual* Level 1 thresholds for transit and pedestrian trips would not be exceeded and additional transit and pedestrian analyses are not warranted.
Table 2.8-3  Trip Generation Summary – Person Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday Midday Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Saturday Midday Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic

Table 2.8-4 summarizes the total peak hour vehicular volumes (“ins” plus “outs”) for the proposed project. The proposed project would generate 12 vehicles per hour (vph) less than the No-Action development during the weekday AM peak hour, 45 vph less in the weekday midday peak hour, 51 vph less in the weekday PM peak hour, and 45 vph less in the Saturday midday peak hour. Since the volume of vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would not exceed the 50-vehicle trip threshold during any of the peak hours analyzed, additional traffic analyses are not warranted.

Table 2.8-4  Trip Generation Summary – Vehicle Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday Midday Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Saturday Midday Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8-4 Conclusion

The proposed project would result in a decrease in vehicle, transit, and pedestrian trips as compared to the No-Action development. The volume of net incremental trips would be below the CEQR Level 1 screening thresholds for each of the travel modes analyzed and no additional analyses are warranted. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse transportation impacts.
2.9

Construction

Construction activities, although temporary in nature, can sometimes result in significant adverse impacts. A project’s construction activities may affect a number of technical areas analyzed for the operational period, such as air quality, noise, and traffic; therefore, a construction assessment relies to a significant extent on the methodologies and resulting information gathered in the analyses of these technical areas.

2.9-1 Introduction

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, construction activities, although temporary in nature, can sometimes result in significant adverse impacts. Consideration of several factors including the location and setting of the project in relation to other uses, and the intensity and duration of the construction activities, may indicate that a project’s construction activities warrant analysis.

The proposed action would result in the construction of a self-storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development. A preliminary construction assessment was conducted.
2.9-2 Preliminary Assessment

Construction activities related to the proposed project would be limited to construction of the as-of-right Home Depot and retail uses and the self-storage facility. Construction of the proposed project is expected to last 24 months. Governmental oversight of construction in New York City is extensive and involves a number of City, State, and Federal agencies, each with specific areas of responsibility, including the New York City Department of Buildings, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection, the New York City Fire Department, the New York City Department of Transportation Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination (DOT OCMC), New York City Transit, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the New York State Department of Labor, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

The project would comply with the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code, which limits construction activities to weekdays between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM (absent a permit), requires that a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan be implemented, and sets noise limits for specific pieces of construction equipment. All travel lanes would remain open during construction. In the event closure of any portion of sidewalk element(s) is needed, such temporary closures would be fully addressed through coordination with DOT OCMC.

Based on the project’s adherence to New York City’s stringent requirements related to construction, further analysis is not warranted.

2.9-3 Conclusion

The proposed project would result in the construction of a self-storage facility as part of a larger as-of-right development. Construction of the proposed project would last approximately 24 months. Because the proposed project would comply with New York City’s stringent requirements related to construction and would coordinate any potential sidewalk closures with DOT and OCMC, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse transportation impacts.
Attachment 1: LPC Determination Letter
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Project number: NO LEAD AGENCY / NL-CEQR-Q
Project: HOME DEPOT MASPETH
Address: 59-02 BORDEN AVENUE, BBL: 4026570040
Date Received: 12/11/2018

[X] No architectural significance

[X] No archaeological significance

[ ] Designated New York City Landmark or Within Designated Historic District

[ ] Listed on National Register of Historic Places

[ ] Appears to be eligible for National Register Listing and/or New York City Landmark Designation

[ ] May be archaeologically significant; requesting additional materials

Gina Santucci, Environmental Review Coordinator

File Name: 33865_FSO_DNP_12172018.doc
Attachment 2: Self-Storage Plans
SELF-STORAGE D
6-STORY BUILDING
[±24,500 SF]
USE GROUP 16D
SPECIAL PERMIT
Z-004.00
59-02 BORDEN AVENUE, MASPETH, NY 11378
BLOCK 2657, LOT 40, BOROUGH OF QUEENS,
COMMUNITY DISTRICT 2

UPPER FLOOR PLANS
SCALE: 1"=30'-0"

NOTES:
1. NOTES CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION WITHIN THE ZONING LOT. INFORMATION REGARDING THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES OUTSIDE OF THE ZONING LOT ARE SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY, AND MAY NOT BE EXACT.
2. AS-OF-RIGHT PROPOSED BUILDINGS WITHIN THE ZONING LOT BOUNDARY ARE SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
3. BUILDING ENTRANCES ARE SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

05/02/2019 ULURP SUBMISSION
REV DATE DESCRIPTION
1 05/02/2019 ULURP SUBMISSION

SCALE: 1"=30'-0"
1 15 0 30 15 60 90 120
Attachment 3: Filing Memo
This memorandum addresses comments responding to the submittal of the EAS.

**Transportation**

Comment:

Since Table 16-1 of the Transportation Chapter does not include thresholds for self-storage uses, please provide a transportation analysis that includes a preliminary trip generation analysis. For guidance, please refer to Table 1 of the Transportation analysis in the FEIS for Self-Storage Text Amendment (17DCP119Y).

Response:

Based on the analysis conducted for the Self-Storage Text Amendment FEIS (2017), the proposed project increment would not meet the minimum development densities that would require a transportation analysis for the EAS. The Self-Storage Text Amendment FEIS analyzed a 167,000 square feet (sf) Prototype 2 self-storage facility and concluded that a self-storage facility of this size would not exceed the CEQR Level 1 screening thresholds for vehicle, transit, or pedestrian trips. Since the proposed project increment of 136,853 sf of self-storage space is less than the 167,000 sf Prototype 2 self-storage facility, we can similarly conclude the proposed self-storage facility would not exceed the CEQR Level 1 screening thresholds and therefore no further Transportation analyses are needed.

**Hazardous Materials**

Comment:

See comment letter attached.

Response:

Per the request of New York City Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Sustainability (DEP), the client has provided the Soil Management Plan for the development site. Please see the attached documentation.
- Soils from grade to 4 feet below ground surface (BG) will be removed across the site for construction purposes.

- Soils from grade to 14 feet BG will be removed in the vicinity of the infiltration gallery.

- Soils in the area shaded yellow are below the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) soil cleanup objectives (SCOs) and are not regulated.

- Soils in the area shaded blue are above the NYSDEC SCOs for VOCs, SVOCs, and/or metals and will need to be disposed of at a regulated disposal facility.

- Soils in the area shaded pink exhibit hazardous level of one or more metals. These soils will need to be disposed of at a hazardous waste disposal facility.