



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Marisa Lago, *Director*  
Department of City Planning

June 7, 2021

**NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF  
THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Stevenson Commons**

**Project Identification**

CEQR No. 21DCP057M  
ULURP Nos. M030150AHOX, M040047AZSX  
SEQRA Classification: Type 1

**Lead Agency**

City Planning Commission  
New York, New York 10271  
120 Broadway, 31<sup>st</sup> Floor

**Contact Person**

Olga Abinader, Director (212) 720-3493  
Environmental Assessment and Review Division  
New York City Department of City Planning

---

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the DEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned as well as online at <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/planning/applicants/eis-documents.page>. A public hearing on the DEIS will be held at a later date to be announced. Advance notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. Written comments on the DEIS are requested and would be received and considered by the Lead Agency until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing.

**A. INTRODUCTION**

Camber Property Group, LLC (the "Applicant"), as property owner of 755 White Plains Road and 1850 Lafayette Avenue (Block 3600, Lot 4), is requesting discretionary actions to facilitate new residential and community facility development at Stevenson Commons in the Soundview neighborhood of Bronx Community District 9. The Stevenson Commons site (a.k.a. the "Project Area") at 1850 Lafayette Avenue (Block 3600, Lot 4) comprises the 679,000-square foot (sf) superblock bounded by Lafayette Avenue, White Plains Road, Seward Avenue, and Thieriot Avenue. The eastern portion of the site is currently developed with a mix of residential, retail, community facility, and accessory parking uses. The Proposed Actions would encompass the following discretionary approvals:

- Modification to the previously approved Stevenson Commons large scale residential development (LSRD) (CP-22380) to update the previously approved plans and zoning calculations to reflect a proposed mixed use development on Block 3600, Lot 4; and

- Amendment to the previously approved Stevenson Commons City-aided limited-profit housing project on Block 3600, Lot 4 pursuant to Article 2 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law (CP-22381) to reflect the Proposed Project. The Proposed Actions would facilitate new construction on the Stevenson Commons site that would result in an incremental (net) increase compared to No-Action conditions of approximately 735 affordable dwelling units (DUs), including 621 income-restricted housing units and 114 affordable independent residences for seniors (AIRS), 33,995 gross square feet (gsf) of community facility uses, approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space, and a net decrease of 104 accessory parking spaces (the “Proposed Project”). New development would be spread across six new buildings ranging in height from 65 to 138 stories on the Stevenson Commons site. The anticipated build year for the project is 2028.

## **B. BACKGROUND AND EXISTING CONDITIONS**

### **Project Area and Development Site**

The Stevenson Commons site comprises the 679,000-sf superblock bounded by Lafayette Avenue to the north, White Plains Road to the east, Seward Avenue to the south, and Thieriot Avenue to the west. The site is occupied by a nine-building Mitchell-Lama housing development and contains a total of 990,050 gsf, including approximately 914,634 gsf of residential uses (948 affordable rental DUs), 10,648 gsf of local retail uses, 36,214 gsf of community facility uses (health center), and 570 at-grade accessory parking spaces. Only 462 of the 570 spaces are currently functional, as a portion of the parking square footage is used for onsite maintenance and storage. The nine buildings are all located on the eastern portion of the block and are oriented around a central private open space. The western portion of the block is occupied by surface accessory parking spaces and private open spaces encompassing private tennis and handball courts. These private open spaces, which also include passive grassy areas, total approximately 3.1 acres, and are used exclusively by current residents, although the grass field is currently not accessible to the tenants due to safety concerns. Although the Project Area currently exists as Tax Block 3600, Lot 4, it is undergoing a proposed subdivision and will be apportioned into eight new tax lots to facilitate future residential development. The Proposed Project would occupy the western and southwestern segments of the overall Project Area (tentative future Tax Lots 4, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, and 50, the “Development Site”), with the existing Stevenson Commons development comprising the northeastern and eastern portion of the Project Area (tentative future Tax Lot 25). The development of Stevenson Commons was facilitated by two CPC approvals in 1973, including approval of a plan for a City-aided limited-profit housing project (Stevenson Commons) on Block 3600, Lot 4 pursuant to Article 2 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law (CP-22381, approved September 24, 1973), and approval of a NYC Housing and Development Administration’s application for a LSRD authorization pursuant to Article VII, Chapter 8 of the Zoning Resolution and Special Permit authorizations (CP-22380, approved September 24, 1973).

The Stevenson Commons site has an existing built FAR of 1.42, including a residential FAR of 1.35, a community facility FAR of 0.05, and a commercial FAR of 0.02. With a built FAR of 1.42, the Stevenson Commons site is underbuilt pursuant to existing zoning regulations; however, no new development can occur on the site, as its development is limited to the plan approved in the 1973 LSRD Special Permit.

### **Project Area Context**

Stevenson Commons was completed in the mid-1970s pursuant to the LSRD and housing project approvals. In 2003, an application was filed (ULURP No. M 040047 ZSX and M 030150 HOX) to modify the previously approved Mitchell-Lama Project Plan for Stevenson Commons and to modify the previously approved LSRD authorization to permit inclusion of the Bronx International

Youth Tennis Center. This minor modification application was approved, but the tennis center was never constructed. The site plan remains as configured in the 1973 approval. The Stevenson Commons site is currently located within an R6 zoning district that was established with the 1961 enactment of the Zoning Resolution (ZR). R6 zoning districts are widely mapped in built-up, medium-density areas of Brooklyn and the Bronx. The character of R6 districts can range from neighborhoods with a diverse mix of building types and heights to large-scale “tower in the park” developments. The existing buildings on the Stevenson Commons site were developed pursuant to Height Factor regulations. Under Height Factor zoning regulations, the residential floor area ratio (FAR) in R6 districts ranges from 0.78 (for a single-story building) to 2.43 at a typical height of 13 stories; the open space ratio (OSR) ranges from 27.5 to 37.5. While commercial uses are not typically permitted in R6 districts (absent the mapping of a commercial overlay), a limited amount of commercial use is allowed on the Stevenson Commons site pursuant to the LSRD Special Permit approved by the CPC in 1973. In R6 districts, off-street parking is generally required for 70 percent of DUs, although the required parking for income-restricted housing units (IRHU) is for 25 percent of DUs.

The project area is located on the Clason Point peninsula. The Clason Point peninsula in the South Bronx is separated from surrounding areas by various natural and manmade barriers, including the Cross-Bronx Expressway (I-95) and Bruckner Expressway (I-278) to the north, the Bronx River to the west, Pugsley Creek and Westchester Creek to the east, and the East River to the south. The peninsula is comprised of a number of predominantly residential neighborhoods including Soundview, Clason Point, Castle Hill, and Harding Park.

### **C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The Proposed Actions comprise minor modification to a large-scale residential development (LSRD) plan, and a modification to the previously approved Stevenson Commons City-aided limited-profit housing project pursuant to Article 2 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law (CP-22381), as detailed below.

As discussed previously, the development of Stevenson Commons was facilitated by a 1973 CPC-approval of a NYC Housing and Development Administration’s application for a LSRD authorization pursuant to Article VII, Chapter 8 of the Zoning Resolution and Special Permit authorizations. The applicant is requesting the following minor modifications:

1. Modification to the previously approved Stevenson Commons large scale residential development (CP-22380) to update the previously approved plans and zoning calculations to reflect a proposed mixed use development; and
2. Amendment to the previously approved Stevenson Commons City-aided limited-profit housing project pursuant to Article 2 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law (CP22381) to reflect the Proposed Project.

The proposed minor modifications are necessary to allow for the production of new housing at Stevenson Commons, which is not currently permitted without the requested modifications to the existing LSRD and housing project. Absent the approved special permit, the proposed development of six new residential and mixed residential and community facility buildings with approximately 735 total new income-restricted housing units could be developed as-of-right under R6 zoning.

In conjunction with the proposed actions, project approvals would also require an (e) designation for air quality and noise.

## **D. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The Proposed Actions are requested in order to allow the development of a significant number of affordable housing units in the Soundview neighborhood of the Bronx. Under the current LSRD Special Permit restrictions, no new housing can be constructed on the Stevenson Commons site, despite the site being underbuilt pursuant to its underlying R6 zoning. The requested minor modifications would facilitate the development of an additional 735 affordable income-restricted DUs, including 621 income-restricted housing units and 114 AIRS units, and 33,995 gsf of community facility uses. The proposed minor modifications would be consistent with the Stevenson Commons LSRD development, and would be compliant with the underlying R6 zoning district.

The Proposed Project facilitated by the Proposed Actions would also be consistent with existing developments to the north of the Project Area, including the 16-story Carol Gardens apartments to the north, the eight- to 15-story NYCHA Monroe Houses to the northwest, and the 21-story Park Lane Apartments to the northeast. It would allow new residential development on an underutilized property and would therefore support the City's goals of promoting affordable housing development by maximizing the use of vacant and underutilized land. The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the policy goals of the City's Housing New York: A Five Borough, Ten-Year Plan. The proposed residential development would help provide much-needed affordable residential units in an area in which population is increasing and there is increased demand for residential uses. According to the Department of City Planning's 2013 report New York City Population Projections by Age/Sex & Borough, the Bronx is anticipated to have the highest rate of growth in the City over the next several decades, estimated at 14 percent from 2010 to 2040.2 As population in the Bronx is expected to experience substantial and steady growth, additional housing is necessary to ensure adequate supply. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the creation of approximately 735 new affordable housing units in the Project Area within Bronx Community District 9, where, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 48.7 percent of households are rent burdened (spending 35 percent or more of their income on rent).

## **E. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the construction of a new approximately 826,209 gsf mixed-use development. New development would be spread across six buildings on the Stevenson Commons site (referred to as Buildings B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6) and would result in an incremental (net) increase of approximately 735 affordable DUs, including 621 income-restricted housing units and 114 AIRS units, approximately 33,995 gsf of community facility uses (including an approximately 19,879 gsf child care center and approximately 14,116 gsf of indoor recreational space (e.g., classrooms, locker rooms, etc.) for community recreational needs and in support of the adjacent tennis courts), and approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space and an additional 0.68 acres of private open space. The Proposed Project would also provide approximately 466 parking spaces in the Project Area (a net decrease of 104 spaces).

The proposed 735 additional DUs of affordable housing are anticipated to be marketed to households earning between 30 percent and 130 percent of Area Median Income (AMI). Accessory parking would be required for 25 percent of all DUs below 80 percent of AMI, including senior units, and 50 percent of all DUs above 80 percent of AMI, including all homeownership units. The proposed approximately 1.94 acres of publicly-accessible open space would be located on the western edge of the Stevenson Commons site along the Thieriot Avenue frontage between Buildings B1 and B4. The open space would be accessible to the public from Thieriot Avenue, Lafayette Avenue, Seward Avenue, and the private driveway. It is expected that the open space would include a variety of amenities and programming, including tennis courts, pathways, gardens, landscaping, and seating. Access to the open space would be available to the general public, but the playground and tennis court facilities would be locked during the evening hours. In addition to the proposed 1.94 acres of open space that would be publicly accessible, the Proposed Project would also include approximately 0.68 acres of private open space that would be available exclusively to the residents of the Proposed Project. This private open space would consist mostly of rooftop terraces and grassy areas.

A total of approximately 466 parking spaces would be provided at the Stevenson Commons site, including 206 spaces within below-grade garages and 260 surface parking spaces. These spaces would be distributed between two below-grade parking garages (referred to as P1 and P2) and four surface-level lots (referred to as P3, P4, P5, P6). The below-grade parking garages would be located beneath Buildings B2 and B3, respectively, with vehicle access provided from Seward Avenue or Lafayette Avenue via the private driveway. Vehicle access to surface lots P4 and P5 would also be provided from the private driveway, as well as a curbcut on Seward Avenue located approximately 112 feet west of White Plains Road. Surface lot P3 would service Building B4 and vehicle access would only be provided from Thieriot Avenue. Surface lot P4 would be located west of the private driveway in between Buildings B3 and B5, and Surface lot P5 would be located east of the private driveway to the north of Building B6. Surface lot P6 would be located in the north portion of the site to the east of the private driveway, and vehicle access would only be provided from Lafayette Avenue. Additional parking would be provided along the private driveway.

## **F. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK**

The Proposed Actions would change the regulatory controls governing land use and development at the Development Site. The 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual* serves as the general guide on the methodologies and impact criteria for evaluating the Proposed Actions' potential effects on the various environmental areas of analysis.

### **Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS)**

In order to assess the possible effects of the Proposed Actions and resulting Proposed Development, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) was established for both the future without the Proposed Actions (No-Action) and the future with the Proposed Actions (With-Action) for an analysis year, or Build Year, of 2028. The incremental difference between the No-Action and With-Action conditions will serve as the basis of the impact category analyses.

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

In the 2028 future without the Proposed Actions, it is expected that no new development would occur within the Project Area. As such, the Project Area would continue to be occupied by 948 DUs, 10,648 gsf of local retail uses, and 36,214 gsf of community facility uses (health center).

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

In the 2028 future with the Proposed Actions, six new buildings would be constructed within the Project Area. In the future with the Proposed Actions, the Project Area would be occupied by a total of approximately 1,683 affordable DUs (including existing units), including 114 affordable units for seniors, approximately 70,209 gsf of community facility uses (including an approximately 19,879 gsf child care center and approximately 14,116 gsf of indoor recreational space for community recreational needs and in support of the adjacent tennis courts), approximately 10,648 gsf of commercial uses, approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space, and approximately 466 parking spaces. The Proposed Actions would result in an incremental (net) increase of 735 DUs, including 114 affordable units for seniors, 33,995 gsf of community facility space, approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space, and a net decrease of approximately 104 parking spaces.

## **G. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**

### **Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated in the future with the Proposed Actions in the primary or secondary study areas in the 2028 analysis year. The Proposed

Actions would not directly displace any land uses so as to adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor generate land uses that would be incompatible with land uses, zoning, or public policy in the secondary study area. The Proposed Actions would allow a new development containing a mix of residential and community facility uses in an area where there is a strong demand for these particular uses, and which is well-served by infrastructure and public transportation. The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the Stevenson Commons LSRD plan, and would be built at a density and bulk compatible with the underlying R6 zoning. In addition, the Proposed Project facilitated by the Proposed Actions would be consistent with existing developments in the surrounding neighborhood, including the 16-story Carol Gardens Apartments, the eight- to 15-story NYCHA Monroe Houses, and the 21-story Park Lane Apartments, as well as neighboring planned projects, including the approved 14-story mixed-use development located at 1965 Lafayette Avenue, adjacent to the Project Area. As such, the Proposed Actions would result in a development that, in addition to being appropriate for the area, would complement the residential and community facility land use character of the secondary study area. As such, the Proposed Actions are not anticipated to result in significant adverse land use or zoning impacts. Finally, based on the Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) Consistency Assessment Form (CAF) completed for the Proposed Project (WRP #16-187), three policies require further assessment. The assessment found that the Proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable policies. The Proposed Actions would also be consistent with the public policies outlined in the Statement of District Needs and Community Board Budget Requests for Bronx Community Board 9, Housing New York, Vision Zero, OneNYC, and the Mitchell-Lama Housing Program. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable public policies.

### **Socioeconomic Conditions**

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the five socioeconomic areas studied under CEQR including direct residential, direct business/institutional displacement, indirect residential displacement, indirect business/institutional displacement, and adverse effects on specific industries, in accordance with CEQR Technical Manual guidance. The Proposed Actions would not result in the direct displacement of any residents or businesses or adverse effects on specific industries, and the incremental community facility uses would not represent a substantial new use warranting assessment of potential indirect business/institutional displacement. With respect to potential indirect residential displacement, a preliminary assessment finds that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse indirect residential displacement impact. The Proposed Project would introduce 735 affordable residential units; none of the proposed residential units would be market-rate units. Despite this fact, given the income levels of the residents in the ½-mile socioeconomic conditions study area, it is possible that residents introduced by the Proposed Actions could have incomes higher than those of the surrounding study area. However, as the Proposed Actions would only increase the study area's residential population by 4.6 percent, the Proposed Actions would not introduce a substantial new population that could substantially affect residential real estate market conditions in the study area. The Proposed Project would advance the goals of Housing New York, the City's ten-year strategy to build or preserve 200,000 units of high quality affordable housing to meet the needs of more than 500,000 people. The affordable housing added by the Proposed Actions would help to maintain a diverse demographic composition within the study area.

### **Community Facilities**

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse direct or indirect impacts to public schools, libraries, child care centers, health care facilities, or fire or police protection services.

### ***Public Schools***

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a significant adverse impact may occur if a project would result in both of the following conditions: (1) a utilization rate of the schools in the sub-district study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent in the future With-Action condition;

and (2) an increase of five percentage points or more in the collective utilization rate between the No-Action and With-Action conditions.

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:** Community School District (CSD) 8, Sub-District 2 elementary schools would continue to operate with available capacity in the future with the Proposed Actions (as in the future without the Proposed Actions). CSD 8, Sub-District 2 elementary schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 91.4 percent to 93.3 percent in the With-Action condition, with 455 available elementary school seats. As CSD 8, Sub-District 2 elementary schools would continue to operate below capacity in the future with the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse impacts to public elementary schools would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions.

**INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS:** In the future with the Proposed Actions, CSD 8, Sub-District 2 intermediate schools would continue to operate with available capacity, as under No-Action conditions. CSD 8, Sub-District 2 intermediate schools would increase from a No-Action utilization rate of 74.6 percent to 75.9 percent in the With-Action condition, with 1,002 available intermediate school seats. As CSD 8, Sub-District 2 intermediate schools would continue to operate below capacity in the future with the Proposed Actions, no significant adverse impacts would occur.

### ***Libraries***

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, if a project increases the study area population by five percent or more as compared to the No-Action condition, this increase may impair the delivery of library services to the study area, and a significant adverse impact could occur. The population of the Soundview Library's catchment area would not increase by more than five percent in the future with the Proposed Actions; the population would increase by 3.9%. Therefore, pursuant to CEQR guidance, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on public libraries.

### ***Child Care Centers***

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a significant adverse child care center impact could occur if a project results in: (1) a collective utilization rate greater than 100 percent in the With-Action condition; and (2) the demand constitutes an increase of five percent or more in the collective capacity of child care centers serving the study area over the No-Action condition. Child care facilities in the study area would continue to have a collective utilization rate below 100 percent in the future with the Proposed Actions. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts to publicly funded child care centers.

As the project would not introduce a new neighborhood, per the 2020 CEQR Technical Manual, impacts to healthcare, police services, or fire department services are not expected, and analysis of these community facilities is not warranted.

### **Open Space**

A detailed open space analysis was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. According to the 2020 CEQR Technical Manual, a proposed action may result in a significant impact on open space resources if (a) there would be direct displacement or alteration of existing open space within the study area that would have a significant adverse effect on existing users; or (b) it would reduce the open space ratio and consequently result in the overburdening of existing facilities or further exacerbating a deficiency in open space.

## **Direct Effects**

The Proposed Actions would not result in the physical loss of existing publicly accessible open space resources. The Proposed Actions would also not result in any significant adverse operational air quality, construction, noise, or shadow impacts affecting open space resources.

## **Indirect Effects**

The CEQR Technical Manual indicates that a decrease in the open space ratio of five percent or more is generally considered significant for a project located in an area that is currently below the City's median community district open space ratio of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. For areas that are extremely lacking in open space, a decrease of as little as one percent may be considered significant. Conversely, in areas that are well-served by open space, a greater percentage of change (more than five percent) may be tolerated. An open space impact assessment also considers qualitative factors. The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. In the 2028 With-Action condition, the total open space ratio in the study area would increase by approximately 8.5 percent, the passive open space ratio would increase by approximately 31.51 percent, and the active open space ratio would increase by approximately 2.61 percent, compared to No-Action conditions. The open space ratios in the study area would remain less than the Citywide median in the future with the Proposed Actions, same as under existing and No-Action conditions. The deficiency of open space resources within the study area would be offset by several factors, including the good condition of the open space resources and their low to moderate utilization levels, which would be able to absorb additional users generated by the Proposed Project. Furthermore, an additional 35.26 acres of open space (including approximately 3.73 acres located within the Project Area) were not included in the quantitative assessment (as they are not fully accessible to the public, have limited hours, or do not include seating or other amenities), although it is likely that they are used by people that live and work in the study area. Moreover, there are several significant open space resources located just beyond the boundaries of the open space study area, including the 205-acre Soundview Park and approximately 75 additional acres of Pugsley Creek Park; each of these open space resources are located within a 10-minute walk of the Project Area. Although these resources were excluded from the quantitative assessment, it is likely that existing and future residents within the study area would take advantage of these additional resources. Lastly, the Proposed Project would include an additional 0.68 acres of private indoor and outdoor recreation space (in addition to the approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space included in the quantitative analysis) that would be accessible to the residents introduced by the Proposed Project.

Therefore, as the Proposed Actions would increase the total and passive open space ratios, and given the existing good condition and low- to-moderate utilization of most of the study area's open spaces, the anticipated open spaces, both public and private, planned within the Project Area as part of the Proposed Project, and the availability of additional open spaces within and just outside the study area that were conservatively not included in the quantitative analysis, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on open space.

## **Shadows**

A detailed shadows analysis was conducted and found that the Proposed Actions would not have a significant adverse shadows impact. The Proposed Actions would result in incremental shadow coverage (i.e. additional, or new, shadow coverage) on portions of one sunlight-sensitive open space resource: Space Time Playground. The extent and duration of the incremental shadows on this open space resource would not significantly reduce or completely eliminate direct sunlight exposure on any of the open space resource's sunlight-sensitive features; nor would they significantly alter the public's utilization or enjoyment of the open space resource's facilities, or



threaten the viability of vegetation or other sunlight-sensitive features within the open space resource. The incremental shadow would be cast for a maximum of 1 hour and 50 minutes on the December 21 analysis day. Therefore, incremental shadows from the Proposed Project on Space Time Playground would not be considered a significant adverse impact, in accordance with CEQR Technical Manual methodology.

### **Historic and Cultural Resources**

An assessment was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on historic or cultural resources, as summarized below. As it was found that the Project Area does not have archaeological significance, an archaeological analysis was not warranted for the Proposed Actions. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse archaeological impacts.

#### **Direct (Physical) Impacts**

The Proposed Actions are site-specific, and the Project Area does not contain any designated or eligible historic resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any direct impacts to historic architectural resources.

#### **Indirect (Contextual) Impacts**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse indirect impacts on historic architectural resources. The Proposed Actions would not adversely alter the context or setting of the nearby S/NR-eligible P.S. 100 so as to affect those characteristics that make the building eligible for listing on the S/NR. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of six buildings in the Project Area, ranging in height from four to 14 stories. The Proposed Project would be visible when looking west at P.S. 100 from Taylor Avenue; however, this change in setting would not be adverse. The study area is a dense urban environment with multiple existing mid-rise and high-rise buildings that currently form the backdrop for P.S. 100. The school was built to accommodate the rapidly growing population of Soundview as a result of the newly constructed urban renewal housing of the mid-20th century, including the eight- to 15-story Monroe Houses immediately west of the S/NR-eligible historic resource and the 16-story Carol Gardens Apartments immediately east. As such, the mid- and high-rise buildings that would be constructed in the Project Area a result of the Proposed Actions would not be out of context in the backdrop of P.S. 100, and would not adversely alter the visual setting of the school. Additionally, in the future with the Proposed Actions, no incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements would be introduced to any historic resource's setting. The Proposed Project would not alter the relationship of P.S. 100 to the streetscape, as all streets in the study area would remain open and the S/NR-eligible historic resource's relationships to adjacent streets would remain unchanged in the future with the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Project would not eliminate or screen public views of P.S. 100, which would remain visible in view corridors on adjacent public streets and sidewalks. No primary facades, significant architectural ornamentation, or notable features of the S/NR-eligible school would be obstructed by the Proposed Project. The Proposed Actions would not result in development that would diminish the qualities that make the S/NR-eligible P.S. 100 historically and architecturally significant. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse indirect or contextual impacts on historic architectural resources.

#### **Construction-Related Impacts**

As there are no historic architectural resources located within 90 feet of the Project Area, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse construction-related impacts to historic resources.

## **Shadows Impacts**

The Proposed Actions would not generate incremental shadows on sunlight-sensitive features of surrounding historic resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse shadows impacts on historic resources.

## **Urban Design and Visual Resources**

A detailed assessment found that the Proposed Actions and subsequent development, while resulting in a notable change in the urban design of the primary study area, would not result in a significant adverse impact on the area's urban design and visual resources, as defined by the CEQR Technical Manual. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the construction of six new residential buildings comprised of 735 affordable dwelling units (DU), including 114 AIRS units, approximately 33,995 gsf of community facility uses, and approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space and an additional 0.68 acres of private open space. The Proposed Project would replace surface parking lots and underutilized areas, enlivening the streetscape and serving as an extension of the residential and community-oriented uses in the surrounding area. The Proposed Actions would also enhance the streetscape by introducing new street trees, plantings, and street walls along Seward, Lafayette and Thieriot Avenues, similar to the existing streetscapes to the south and west of the Project Area, and improving pedestrian access. While four of the buildings comprising the Proposed Project would be taller than many of the secondary study area buildings, the Proposed Project would be shorter than multiple residential developments in the northern portion of the secondary area. Moreover, the Proposed Project would be shorter than the existing Stevenson Commons buildings at the northeastern portion of the Project Area. As such, the Proposed Project would serve as a transition between the lower-scale buildings found to the south and west and existing buildings in northern portions of the Project Area and secondary area. The Proposed Project would fill an existing void by replacing existing underutilized land with active pedestrian-oriented uses that would complement those found in the primary and secondary study areas. The development facilitated by the Proposed Actions is being built on an existing superblock, and would not entail any changes to topography, street patterns, street hierarchy, block shapes, or natural features. In addition, the Proposed Project would not alter views of study area visual resources. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources.

## **Hazardous Materials**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials.

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared in November 2020 ("2020 ESA") in order to evaluate potential contamination in the portion of the Project Area that's proposed for development (the "Development Site"). The 2020 ESA was limited to the western and southwestern segments of the Project Area where proposed new Buildings B1 through B6 are proposed, which comprise tentative future Tax Lots 4, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, and 50 (the "Development Site"). The 2020 ESA did not identify any Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions (CRECs), Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions (HRECs), or De Minimis Conditions at the specified area evaluated as part of the 2020 ESA, and no additional investigation or action were recommended. However, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) determined that based on the historical on-site and/or surrounding area land uses, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II) is necessary to adequately identify/characterize the surface and subsurface soils,

groundwater and soil vapor of the Development Site, and to inform and disclose the measures necessary to avoid impacts from hazardous materials. Accordingly, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Work Plan and a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) were prepared and submitted to DEP for review and approval. DEP approved the Phase II Work Plan and HASP, and sampling activities on the Development Site have been conducted in accordance with the approved Work Plan. The Phase II Report along with a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) have been submitted to DEP for review and approval. The RAP incorporates a Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP). These plans set out procedures to be followed to avoid the potential for adverse impacts related to the hazardous materials identified by the Phase II investigation as well as other hazardous materials that could be unexpectedly encountered. The Applicant will commit to implementing the remedial activities outlined in the RAP and CHASP, which are anticipated to be approved by DEP in advance of the issuance of the FEIS, prior to construction. As such, no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Actions and resultant Proposed Development.

### **Water and Sewer Infrastructure**

The Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on the City's water and sewer infrastructure. Based on the methodology set forth in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, although the Proposed Actions would create new demand for water and treatment of sewage, the incremental increases would be well within the capacity of the City's systems, and the impacts would not be considered significant or adverse.

### **Water Supply**

The Proposed Project would generate an incremental water demand of approximately 198,980 gpd (including water related to sanitary and domestic uses) compared with the No-Action condition. While this would represent an increase in demand on the New York City water supply system, it does not meet the CEQR Technical Manual threshold requiring a detailed analysis. Therefore, an analysis of water supply is not warranted as it is expected that there would be adequate water service and existing infrastructure to meet the incremental water demand from the Proposed Project and there would be no significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) indicated that existing water infrastructure should be able to handle the estimated increase in water demand, and recommended that, as the Development Site fronts different streets, connections for water service be made to different water mains adjacent to the site.

### **Wastewater and Stormwater Conveyance**

Based on preliminary assessment, it was determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on wastewater treatment or stormwater conveyance infrastructure. The Proposed Project is expected to generate an additional 193,200 gallons per day (gpd) of sanitary sewage compared to No-Action conditions. This incremental increase in sewage generation is less than 0.1 percent of the average daily flow at the Hunts Point Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) and would not result in an exceedance of the plant's permitted capacity of 200 million gallons per day (mgd). Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact to the City's sanitary sewage conveyance and treatment system. ES-15 Stevenson Commons EIS Depending on the rainfall volume and duration, the total With-Action volume to the combined sewer system could be between 0.07 and 1.14 mg. Compared to existing conditions, this would represent an increase in combined sewer flows of up to 0.22 mg, depending on rainfall intensities. With the incorporation of selected stormwater source control best management practices (BMPs) that would be required as part of the site connection approval process, subject to the review and approval of DEP, the peak stormwater runoff rates would be reduced. Overall, the

Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on the City's sewage conveyance and treatment systems.

### **Transportation**

A detailed transportation analysis was conducted and determined that the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at several intersections near the Project Area, as well as significant adverse impacts to Bx39 local bus service, as summarized below. The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on subway services or pedestrian conditions, nor would they adversely impact vehicular and pedestrian safety or parking conditions.

### **Traffic**

Traffic conditions were evaluated for the weekday AM (7:45-8:45 AM), midday (12:30-1:30 PM) and PM (4:30-5:30 PM) peak hours, and Saturday (2:00-3:00 PM) peak hours at 13 intersections (nine signalized and four unsignalized) in the traffic study area where additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 50-trips/hour City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual analysis threshold. The traffic impact analysis indicates the potential for significant adverse impacts at 14 lane groups at seven intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, three lane groups at two intersections in the midday, seven lane groups at four intersections in the PM, and five lane groups at three intersections in the Saturday peak hour. The "Mitigation" section below discusses potential measures to mitigate these significant adverse traffic impacts.

### **Transit**

**SUBWAY:** The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 298 and 317 new subway trips during the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours. The analysis of subway station conditions focuses on New York City Transit's Parkchester (6) station on the Pelham Line as incremental demand from the Proposed Actions would exceed the 200-trips/hour CEQR Technical Manual analysis threshold at this station in the weekday AM and PM peak hours. In the future with the Proposed Actions, those stairs and fare arrays that would be used by project-generated demand are expected to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) A or B in both the AM and PM peak hours and would therefore not be significantly adversely impacted by the Proposed Actions based on CEQR Technical Manual criteria. The vicinity of the Project Area is served by one NYCT subway route – the No. 6 train. The peak direction of travel along the No. 6 route is typically Manhattan-bound (southbound) in the AM and Bronx-bound (northbound) in the PM. The Proposed Actions would generate a net increment of approximately 184 Manhattan-bound trips along the No.6 subway route during the weekday AM peak hour, and approximately 170 Bronx-bound trips during the weekday PM peak hour. As the Proposed Actions would not generate the CEQR Technical Manual threshold of 200 or more new peak hour subway trips in any one direction of the analyzed No. 6 train, an analysis of subway line haul conditions is not warranted as impacts are not expected.

**BUS:** Four New York City Transit local bus routes—the Bx5, Bx27, Bx36 and Bx39—operate within ¼-mile of the Project Area. It is estimated that the Proposed Actions would generate a net total of approximately 486 and 516 incremental bus trips on these routes during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. These would include trips that would use the bus to access the subway, as well as trips made solely by bus. Incremental demand is expected to meet or exceed the 50-trip per direction CEQR Technical Manual analysis threshold in the AM and/or PM peak hour at the maximum load points along two routes—the Bx36 and Bx39. Based on projected levels of bus service in the No-Action condition, the Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall of 89 spaces on the northbound Bx39 service and 1 space on the southbound Bx39 service in the AM peak hour. Therefore, northbound and southbound Bx39 service would be significantly adversely impacted in the AM peak hour based on CEQR Technical Manual criteria. As discussed in the "Mitigation" section below, the significant impact to Bx39 service could be mitigated by increasing the number of northbound buses from 15 to 17 and the number of

southbound buses from 11 to 12 in the AM peak hour. The general policy of the MTA is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

## **Pedestrians**

The Proposed Actions' RWCDS is expected to generate approximately 104 incremental walk-only trips in the weekday AM peak hour, 60 in the weekday midday peak hour, 117 in the weekday PM peak hour, and 71 in the Saturday peak hour. Persons walking to and from subway station entrances and bus stops would add approximately 486, 159, 516, and 294 incremental pedestrian trips to sidewalks and crosswalks in the vicinity of the Project Area during the weekday AM, midday and PM peak hours, and Saturday peak hour, respectively. Pedestrian conditions were evaluated during the weekday AM (8:30-9:30 AM), midday (12:15-1:15 PM), PM (4:30-5:30 PM), and Saturday (12:45-1:45 PM) peak hours at a total of six pedestrian elements (two sidewalks, one crosswalks, and three corner areas) where new trips generated by the Proposed Actions are expected to exceed the 200-trip/hour *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis threshold. These elements are located along White Plains Road and Lafayette Avenue in the immediate proximity of the Project Area. In the Future with the Proposed Actions, all analyzed pedestrian elements would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during each analyzed peak hours, and there would be no significant adverse pedestrian impacts based on 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual* impact criteria.

## **Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety**

The Vision Zero Bronx Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, released in 2015 and updated in 2019, identified White Plains Road, to the east of the Project Area, and Soundview Avenue, to the west of the Project Area, as Priority Corridors. There were no Priority Intersections or Priority Areas identified within the traffic or pedestrian study areas, and no analyzed intersections are located within a designated Senior Pedestrian Focus Area. Crash data for intersections in the traffic and pedestrian study areas were obtained from the New York City Department of Transportation for the three-year reporting period between January 1, 2015, and December 31, 2017 (the most recent period for which data were available for all locations). The data quantify the total number of crashes as well as the total number of crashes involving injuries to pedestrians or bicyclists. During the three-year reporting period, a total of 146 crashes and 36 pedestrian/bicyclist-related injury crashes occurred at analyzed study area intersections. None of these crashes involved fatalities. According to the 2020 *CEQR Technical Manual*, a high crash location is one where there were 48 or more reportable and non-reportable crashes or five or more pedestrian/bicyclist-related crashes in any consecutive 12 months within the most recent three-year period for which data are available. Based on these criteria, no intersections were found to have experienced 48 or more crashes in any one year. However, the intersection of White Plains Road and Story Avenue experienced five pedestrian or bicycle injury crashes in 2016 and 2017, and the intersection of White Plains Road and Bruckner Boulevard Westbound experienced five pedestrian or bicycle injury crashes on 2017. Additional measures that could be employed to increase pedestrian/bicyclist safety could include installation of additional high visibility crosswalks, where not already present, and improved street lighting.

## **Parking**

The parking analysis documents changes in parking supply and utilization within the Project Area. Under the Proposed Actions, no existing on-street or off-street public parking would be displaced. The Proposed Project would provide a total of 466 accessory parking spaces within the Project Area, resulting in a net decrease of 104 accessory parking spaces as compared to the No-Action conditions. The Proposed Actions would generate a peak overnight parking accumulation of approximately 463 spaces during the weekday overnight period, which would be fully

accommodated on-site. This includes the parking demand generated by the existing uses at the Development Site. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse parking impacts during the weekday overnight peak period for residential parking demand.

### **Air Quality**

An analysis of air quality determined that the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts related to mobile source or stationary source air quality. The maximum pollutant concentrations and concentration increments from mobile sources with the Proposed Project are projected to be lower than the corresponding CEQR de minimis criteria. The parking facilities assumed to be developed as a result of the Proposed Actions were analyzed for potential air quality effects, which found that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts. In terms of industrial sources, no businesses were found to have a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) air permit or New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) certificate of operation within the study area, and no other potential sources of concern were identified. Therefore, no analysis was required. Based on a detailed dispersion modeling analysis, there would be no potential significant adverse air quality impacts from emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and particulate matter (PM), from the proposed heat and hot water systems for the Proposed Project and the existing steam plants. An (E) Designation (E-626) would be mapped in connection with the Proposed Actions to ensure that future developments would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts from fossil fuel-fired heat and hot water systems emissions.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**

The Proposed Actions would be consistent with the applicable City GHG emissions reduction and climate change goals, and there would be no significant adverse GHG emission or climate change impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

It is estimated that the Proposed Project facilitated by the Proposed Actions would result in approximately 2,934 total metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) of annual emissions from building operations and approximately 3,054 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from mobile sources annually, for an annual total of approximately 5,988 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions. This represents approximately 0.01 percent of the City's overall 2017 GHG emissions of approximately 50.7 million metric tons. The Proposed Project would comply with either the 2016 or 2020 New York City Energy Conservation Construction Code (depending on the date of filing at DOB), which govern performance requirements of HVAC systems and require substantial energy efficiency of new buildings. The Proposed Project would also advance New York City's GHG reduction goals by virtue of its nature and location. The Proposed Actions would facilitate development of a medium-density mixed-use residential/community facility development on a site with existing urban infrastructure, including roadways, transit, sewer infrastructure, and water mains, thereby minimizing the need for extensive infrastructure development. By redeveloping a site that is located in an area supported by many transit options, including bus and subway service, as well as NYC Ferry, the Proposed Actions would support transit-oriented development in New York City. Therefore, based on the adherence to the City's energy efficiency requirements and by virtue of the Proposed Project's location and nature, the Proposed Actions would be consistent with the City's applicable emissions reduction goals of transit-oriented development and construction of new resource- and energy-efficient buildings.

The Project Area is not located within the currently applicable 100-year and 500-year floodplains, although portions of the Project Area (including a majority of the Development Site) are expected to fall within the projected 500-year floodplain by the 2020s and 2050s. Critical and vulnerable

components of the Proposed Project would be located above the elevation of the current one percent annual chance floodplain, and are projected to continue to be above the elevation of the one percent annual chance floodplain by the 2020s and 2050s. The Proposed Project would not be located on a waterfront site (the Project Area is located approximately four blocks (0.4 mile) north of Pugsley Creek), and is therefore susceptible to minimal flooding risk, and would continue to be so in the future according to projections by the New York City Panel on Climate Change (NPCC). As noted above, the Proposed Project would be constructed to meet the codes and any related resiliency requirements in effect at the time of construction.

### **Noise**

The Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts. An analysis was conducted to determine whether traffic generated by the Proposed Development would have the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors, and to determine the level of building attenuation necessary to ensure that interior noise levels for the Proposed Development satisfy applicable interior noise criteria. Analysis of mechanical equipment is not warranted because such mechanical equipment would be designed to meet all applicable noise regulations and, therefore, would not result in adverse noise impacts. Noise from the increased traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse noise impacts as the relative increases in noise levels would fall well below the applicable CEQR Technical Manual significant adverse impact threshold (3.0 dBA).

Based on the calculated With-Action L10 noise levels, window/wall attenuations would be required for future residential/community facility uses at the Development Site through an (E) designation (E-626) which would be established as part of approval of the Proposed Actions. Table ES-6 shows the minimum window/wall attenuation necessary to meet CEQR Technical Manual requirements for internal noise levels at each of the noise measurement locations based on the predicted With-Action L10 noise levels. To satisfy CEQR interior noise level requirements and ensure acceptable interior noise levels for residential/community facility uses, a minimum composite window/wall attenuation rating of 28 dBA for all facades fronting and within 50 feet of Lafayette Avenue and Thieriot Avenue would be required. Additionally, as a result of the proposed play area and tennis court, 31 dBA of attenuation would be required on Building B1's southern and eastern facades facing the play area and 28 dBA of attenuation would be required on Building B2's western and southern façades, Building B3's northern and western facades, and Building B4's northern facades facing the proposed play areas. With implementation of the attenuation levels described, the Proposed Actions and subsequent development would provide sufficient attenuation to achieve the CEQR Technical Manual interior noise level guidance. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to noise attenuation.

### **Public Health**

As described in the relevant analyses of the EIS, the Proposed Development would not have the potential for unmitigated significant adverse impacts in any of the technical areas related to public health (hazardous materials, water quality, air quality, or noise). Therefore, the Proposed Development would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts related to public health and no further analysis is warranted.

### **Neighborhood Character**

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts associated with neighborhood character. The Project Area is located in the Soundview neighborhood of the Bronx, an established residential community defined by a variety of low-density residential, commercial, and institutional building types developed in the 20th century, largely surrounded by yards, open

space, and accessory parking. Residential buildings in the area range from low-rise rowhouses set back from the street to highrise towers-in-the-park such as the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) Monroe Houses. Mean annual household incomes of residents living in the study area are lower than the Bronx and New York City, likely attributed in part to the substantial number of NYCHA housing developments in the vicinity of the Project Area. The abundance of street trees and public open space resources within and in close proximity to the secondary study area are defining features of the neighborhood surrounding the Project Area. There is also a substantial amount of surface parking in the secondary study area, both as accessory parking to residences and public facilities, and on-street parking options. The study area is also served by various public transit options.

The Proposed Actions would permit the development of affordable housing, community facility space, and public open space on the western portion of the Stevenson Commons site, which would remain underutilized absent the Proposed Actions. The requested minor modifications would facilitate the development of an additional 735 affordable income-restricted DUs, including 621 income-restricted units and 114 AIRS units, 33,995 gsf of community facility uses, and 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space. The proposed minor modifications would be consistent with the Stevenson Commons LSRD development, and would be compliant with the underlying R6 zoning district and compatible with the built character of the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, the Proposed Project would support the City's goals of promoting affordable housing development by maximizing the use of vacant and underutilized land. As described in the EIS and summarized herein, the Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts in the areas of land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; or noise. The significant adverse traffic and bus impacts that would occur as a result of the Proposed Actions would not affect any defining feature of neighborhood character, nor would a combination of moderately adverse effects (related to any of the above-mentioned technical analysis areas) affect such a defining feature. While the Proposed Actions would result in increased transportation activities and significant adverse traffic and bus impacts, these impacts would not result in a significant change to one of the determining elements of neighborhood character, and the resulting conditions would be similar to those seen in the study area and would not create levels of activity or service conditions that would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, the changes in transportation due to the Proposed Actions would not result in any significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character. In addition, while incremental vehicle volumes introduced as a result of the Proposed Actions would increase noise levels adjacent to the Project Area, the increases would not be perceptible to individuals (i.e., would be less than 3.0 dBA) and therefore, would not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

### **Construction**

Construction of projected developments assumed in the Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (RWCDS) developed for the Proposed Actions would result in temporary disruptions in the surrounding area. As described in detail below, construction activities associated with the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to transportation and noise. Additional information for key technical areas is summarized below.

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. Construction at the Development Site would be subject to government regulations and oversight described under Construction Regulations and General Practices in Chapter 15 and would employ the general construction practices described below. The Proposed Project would also comply with the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code, as well as Project Components Related to the Environment (PCRE) that would be incorporated into the project to reduce construction noise in the surrounding area. Chapter 15 of the DEIS,



Construction considers the potential for construction period activities to result in significant adverse impacts with these measures in place.

## **Transportation**

### *Traffic*

Peak construction conditions during the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2026 were considered for the analysis of potential transportation (traffic, transit, pedestrian, and parking) impacts during construction. Based on the anticipated numbers of vehicle trips from construction trucks and construction workers and operational trips from completed portions of the Proposed Project, incremental vehicle trips during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period are expected to be less than the incremental peak hour trips that would be generated during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with full build-out of the Proposed Development. In addition, there is typically less overall traffic on the study area street network during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM construction peak hours than during the analyzed 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM and 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM operational peak hours. Based on the results of a construction traffic screening analysis, seven intersections that would have one or more lane groups significantly adversely impacted by operational traffic in 2028 would also potentially have one or more lane groups adversely impacted by construction traffic in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours.

Given the lower overall study area traffic volumes during the construction peak hours compared to the operational peak hours used for the screening analysis, some lane groups impacted by operational traffic may not be impacted by construction traffic under 2026 Q4 construction conditions. Also, given the differences in directional distributions between operational and construction vehicle trips, some lane groups at these intersections may be significantly impacted by construction traffic in 2026 Q4 that would not be impacted by operational traffic in 2028. Between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS, further detailed analysis of traffic conditions in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period will be undertaken to confirm which, if any, lane groups at the seven intersections identified above would potentially experience significant adverse impacts due to construction traffic. If impacts are identified and no mitigation measures are found to be practicable, then construction traffic may result in temporary unmitigated significant adverse impacts at one or more of these seven intersections in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period.

### *Parking*

Incremental parking demand from both the construction workers and the completed buildings on the Development Site (Buildings B3, B4, B5 and B6) would total approximately 242 spaces during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period. As it is assumed that there would be 251 parking spaces provided on-site during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period, the site-generated parking demand would be fully accommodated on-site. Therefore, the Proposed Actions are not expected to result in significant adverse parking impacts during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period.

### *Transit and Pedestrians*

During the 2026 Q4 peak construction period, transit demand from construction workers on the Development Site would not meet the 200 trips/hour CEQR Technical Manual analysis threshold for a detailed subway analysis, nor the 50 trips/hour/direction analysis threshold for a detailed bus analysis during the AM and PM construction peak hours, and few if any operational transit trips would occur during these periods. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to subway and bus services are not expected to occur during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period. Similarly, during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period, pedestrian demand from construction workers on the Development Site (both walk-only trips and trips to/from area transit services) would not meet the 200 trips/hour CEQR Technical Manual analysis threshold for a detailed pedestrian analysis in either the weekday AM or PM construction peak hours, and few if any operational pedestrian trips would occur during these periods. Significant adverse pedestrian impacts are therefore not expected to occur during the 2026 Q4 peak construction period. During construction, where sidewalk closures are

required, adequate protection or temporary sidewalks would be provided in accordance with New York City Department of Transportation Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination (DOT-OCMC) requirements.

### **Air Quality**

An emissions reduction program would be implemented for the Proposed Project to minimize the effects of construction activities on the surrounding community. Measures would include dust suppression measures, use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel, idling restrictions, diesel equipment reduction, the utilization of newer equipment (i.e., equipment meeting at least the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] Tier 3 emission standard), and best available tailpipe reduction technologies. With the implementation of these emission reduction measures, the dispersion modeling analysis of construction-related air emissions for both non-road and on-road sources determined that particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), annual-average nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations would be below their corresponding de minimis thresholds or National Air Quality Ambient Standards (NAAQS), respectively. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts due to construction sources.

### **Noise**

Based on the construction predicted to occur at the Development Site, noise resulting from construction is expected to exceed the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual noise impact thresholds as well as result in "objectionable" and "very objectionable" noise level increases at some receptors. Twelve time periods were analyzed over the course of the Proposed Project's assumed construction schedule. Receptors where noise level increases were predicted to exceed the construction noise evaluation thresholds for extended durations were identified. The noise analysis results show that the predicted noise levels would exceed the CEQR Technical Manual construction noise impact criteria at numerous receptors adjacent to the Development Site as well as the proposed building B3, which would be completed and occupied while construction of the remaining proposed buildings would occur adjacent. The noise analysis examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels that would result from construction in a specific month selected for analysis, and consequently is conservative in predicting significant increases in noise levels. Typically, the loudest hourly noise level during each month of construction would not persist throughout the entire month.

## **H. MITIGATION**

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts related to transportation (traffic and transit) and construction (transportation and noise). Mitigation measures being proposed to address those impacts, where feasible and/or practical, are discussed below. If no possible mitigation can be identified, an unavoidable significant adverse impact would result.

### **Transportation**

#### **Traffic**

As described in the "Transportation" section above, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at seven study area intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 14 lane groups at seven intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, three lane groups at two intersections in the midday, seven lane groups at four intersections in the PM, and five lane groups at three intersections in the Saturday peak hour. Implementation of traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes and lane restriping would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the weekday AM peak hour, two lane groups at one intersection in the midday peak hour, two lane groups at one intersection during the PM peak hour and three lane groups at two intersections in the Saturday peak hour. Impacts to a total of 12 lane groups would remain

unmitigated at six intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, , one lane group at one intersection in the weekday midday peak hour, five lane groups at three intersections in the weekday PM peak hour and two lane groups at one intersection in the Saturday peak hour. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to review and approval by DOT. If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure may be identified.

### **Transit**

The Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall of 89 spaces on northbound Bx39 service and 1 space on southbound Bx39 service in the AM peak hour. This potential significant adverse impact to Bx39 local bus service could be fully mitigated by the addition of two standard buses in the northbound direction and one standard bus in the southbound direction in the AM peak hour. The general policy of NYCT is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

### **Construction**

#### **Traffic**

As discussed in the “Construction” section above, based on the results of a construction traffic screening analysis, seven intersections that would have one or more lane groups significantly adversely impacted by operational traffic in 2028 would also potentially have one or more lane groups adversely impacted by construction traffic in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours.

Given the lower overall study area traffic volumes during the construction peak hours compared to the operational peak hours used for the screening analysis, some lane groups impacted by operational traffic may not be impacted by construction traffic under 2026 Q4 construction conditions. Also, given the differences in directional distributions between operational and construction vehicle trips, some lane groups at these intersections may be significantly impacted by construction traffic in 2026 Q4 that would not be impacted by operational traffic in 2028.

Between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS, further detailed analysis of traffic conditions in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period will be undertaken to confirm which, if any, lane groups at the seven intersections identified above would potentially experience significant adverse impacts due to construction traffic. If impacts are identified and no mitigation measures are found to be practicable, then construction traffic may result in temporary unmitigated significant adverse impacts at one or more of these seven intersections in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period.

#### **Noise**

As discussed in the “Construction” section above, the Proposed Project would have the potential to result in significant adverse construction noise impacts at sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed construction work areas. There would be no feasible and practicable mitigation measures for the significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur at outdoor spaces or at buildings or units that already have insulated glass windows and air conditioning units. For impacted buildings that do not have insulated glass windows and alternate means of ventilation, the predicted impacts could be partially mitigated with receptor controls (i.e., storm windows and air conditioning units at residences that do not already have air conditioning).

## **I. ALTERNATIVES**

Two Alternatives were considered in the DEIS: The no-action alternative and the No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative.

The No-Action Alternative examines future conditions in the Project Area, but assumes

the absence of the Proposed Actions (i.e., none of the discretionary approvals proposed as part of the Proposed Actions would be adopted). Under the No-Action Alternative in 2028, it is expected that no new development would occur within the Project Area, which would continue to be occupied by the existing 948 DUs, 10,648 gsf of local retail uses, and 36,214 gsf of community facility uses (health center). The technical chapters of the EIS have described the No-Action Alternative as “the Future without the Proposed Actions.” The significant adverse impacts related to transportation and construction anticipated for the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. However, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals of the Proposed Actions. The benefits expected to result from the Proposed Actions — the development of an additional 735 units of affordable housing for families and seniors, community facility space (including a child care center), and publicly-accessible open space — would not be realized under this alternative.

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative examines a scenario in which the density and other components of the Proposed Development are changed specifically to avoid the unmitigated significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Actions. There is the potential for the Proposed Project to result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts related to transportation (traffic) and construction (traffic, noise). Overall, in order to eliminate all unmitigated significant adverse impacts, the Proposed Project would have to be modified to a point where the principal goals and objectives would not be realized.

## **J. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS**

According to the 2020 City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those that would occur if a proposed project or action is implemented regardless of the mitigation employed, or if mitigation is infeasible. As described in the “Mitigation” section, the Proposed Actions would potentially result in significant adverse impacts with respect to transportation (traffic, bus), and construction (traffic, noise). To the extent practicable, mitigation has been proposed for the identified significant adverse impacts. However, in some instances (a) no practicable mitigation was identified to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, and (b) there are no reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Actions, eliminate the impact, and not cause other or similar significant adverse impacts.

### **Transportation**

**Traffic:** As discussed in the “Transportation” section above, the Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at seven signalized study area intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours. Specifically, significant adverse impacts were identified to 14 lane groups at seven intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, three lane groups at two intersections in the midday, seven lane groups at four intersections in the PM, and five lane groups at three intersections in the Saturday peak hour. As discussed in the “Mitigation” section, implementation of traffic engineering improvements such as signal timing changes and lane restriping would fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts to two lane groups at one intersection in the weekday AM peak hour, two lane groups at one intersection in the midday peak hour, two lane groups at one intersection during the PM peak hour and three lane groups at two intersections in the Saturday peak hour. No practicable mitigation was identified for the impacts to a total of 12 lane

groups would remain unmitigated at six intersections in the weekday AM peak hour, one lane group at one intersection in the weekday midday peak hour, five lane groups at three intersections in the weekday PM peak hour and two lane groups at one intersection in the Saturday peak hour. Consequently, these impacts would constitute unavoidable significant adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions. Implementation of the recommended traffic engineering improvements is subject to review and approval by DOT. If, prior to implementation, DOT determines that an identified mitigation measure is infeasible, an alternative and equivalent mitigation measure may be identified. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would also remain unmitigated and would also constitute unavoidable adverse traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Actions.

### **Construction**

**Traffic:** As discussed in the “Construction” section above, based on the results of a construction traffic screening analysis, seven intersections that would have one or more lane groups significantly adversely impacted by operational traffic in 2028 would also potentially have one or more lane groups adversely impacted by construction traffic in the AM and/or PM construction peak hours. Given the lower overall study area traffic volumes during the construction peak hours compared to the operational peak hours used for the screening analysis, some lane groups impacted by operational traffic may not be impacted by construction traffic under 2026 Q4 construction conditions. Also, given the differences in directional distributions between operational and construction vehicle trips, some lane groups at these intersections may be significantly impacted by construction traffic in 2026 Q4 that would not be impacted by operational traffic in 2028. Between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS, further detailed analysis of traffic conditions in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period will be undertaken to confirm which, if any, lane groups at the seven intersections identified above would potentially experience significant adverse impacts due to construction traffic. If impacts are identified and no mitigation measures are found to be practicable, then construction traffic may result in temporary unmitigated significant adverse impacts at one or more of these seven intersections in the 2026 Q4 peak construction period.

**Noise:** The Proposed Actions would have the potential to result in temporary significant adverse construction noise impacts at several receptor locations surrounding the Development Site. Construction activities would follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code (also known as Chapter 24 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, or Local Law 113) for construction noise control measures. Specific noise control measures would be incorporated in noise mitigation plan(s) required under the New York City Noise Control Code. These measures could include a variety of source and path controls. However, the implementation of these measures would not eliminate all of the identified significant adverse construction noise impacts predicted to occur during hours when the loudest pieces of construction equipment are in use. Consequently, these temporary construction noise impacts would not be fully mitigated and would therefore constitute an unavoidable significant adverse construction noise impact.

## **K. GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS**


The term “growth-inducing aspects” generally refers to “secondary” impacts of a proposed action that trigger further development outside the directly affected area. The *2020 CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed action is appropriate when the project: (1) adds substantial new land use, residents, or new employment that could induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments, to serve new residential uses; and/or (2) introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity.

The Proposed Actions would result in more intensive land uses on the Development Site, however, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Actions would generate significant secondary impacts resulting in substantial new development in nearby areas. While the Proposed Project could add new population with a higher average household income as compared with the existing population in the study area, the Proposed Project would not directly displace existing residential tenants, and the Proposed Actions would not result in socioeconomic changes that would alter the residential market in a manner that would lead to notable project-generated rent pressures. The affordable housing added by the Proposed Project is expected to help maintain a more diverse demographic composition, including providing senior housing, within the study area and would further expand housing opportunities in an area where a strong demand for affordable housing exists. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to induce or accelerate a trend of changing socioeconomic conditions. Overall, the Proposed Actions are not expected to induce any significant additional growth beyond that identified and analyzed in the EIS.

## L. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

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

The Development Site does not possess any natural resource values and is currently occupied by surface accessory parking spaces and private open spaces encompassing private tennis and handball courts as well as passive grassy areas. Although the Proposed Project would result in an increase in new residential and community facility land uses and publicly accessible open space on the Development Site, the Proposed Project would constitute an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the Development Site as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible, at least in the near term. These commitments of materials and land resources are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Project, which would add approximately 735 affordable housing units in the Soundview neighborhood of the Bronx. This affordable housing would contribute to the housing production goals of the Mayor's Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan. The proposed residential development would help provide much-needed affordable residential units in an area in which population is increasing and there is increased demand for residential uses. The Proposed Project also would create approximately 1.94 acres of publicly accessible open space on the Development Site.



---

Olga Abinader, Director  
Environmental Review and Assessment Division  
NYC Department of City Planning

Cc:

Marisa Lago, Chair  
City Planning Commissioners  
Gale Brewer, Manhattan Borough President  
EJ Kalafarski, Chair, Community Board 5, Manhattan  
Wally Rubin, District Manager, Community Board 5, Manhattan  
Raju Mann, City Council

Anita Laremont  
Ezra Moser  
Edith Hsu-Chen  
Steven Lenard  
Ken Ramnarine  
Asha Greenidge

Hilary Semel, OEC  
Terrell Estesén, DEP  
Colleen Anderson, DPR  
Naim Rasheed, DOT  
Gina Santucci, LPC  
Amanda Sutphin, LPC  
Lisa Schreibman, MTA  
Krishna Omolade, IDA

Frank Ruchala  
John Mangin  
Susan Amron  
Howard Slatkin  
Stephanie Shellooe  
Mauricio Garcia  
Evan Lemonides  
Susan Wong