



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Joseph B. Rose, *Director*
Department of City Planning

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

May 11, 2001

Long Island City Zoning Changes and Related Actions

Project Identification:

CEQR No. 00DCP055Q
ULURP Nos. 000406 ZMQ, 000407 ZRQ, 000406(A) ZMQ,
000407(A) ZRQ, 000266 MMQ, 000483 ZSQ
and 010260 PPQ

SEQRA Classification: Type 1

Lead Agency:

City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street, 1 W
New York, NY 10007

Contact Persons:

Robert Dobruskin, Director (212) 720-3423
James P. Merani, R.A., Deputy Director (212) 720-3628
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, 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 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). A public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was held on April 11, 2001 and a continued public hearing was held on April 25, 2001. Written comments on the DEIS were requested and were received by the Lead Agency until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing. This FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS and additional analysis conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS.

Robert Dobruskin, *Director*
James P. Merani, R.A., *Deputy Director*
22 Reade Street, New York, N.Y. 10007-1216 Room 4E (212) 720-3420
FAX (212) 720-3495
<http://www.ci.nyc.ny.us/planning>

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED ACTIONS

The New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) proposes several zoning and map amendments in Long Island City. These applications are intended to promote the City's plan to create a fourth Central Business District (CBD) in Long Island City and strengthen the mixed-use character of the area by stimulating new commercial and residential development. (The City's other three CBDs are midtown Manhattan, downtown Manhattan, and downtown Brooklyn.)

Specifically, DCP proposes zoning map and text amendments and other related actions for 37 blocks generally located between 23rd Street, 43rd Avenue, 21st Street, the center line of the Queensboro Bridge approach, 23rd Street, 41st Avenue, 40th Road, Northern Boulevard, 41st Avenue, the Sunnyside Yard, Crane Street, and Jackson Avenue, and other related actions. The proposed zoning text amendments would:

- Create the Special Long Island City District (LIC District) and establish the Special Hunters Point, Court Square, and Queens Plaza Subdistricts within it. The LIC District would also include two blocks not located within any subdistrict and where underlying district provisions would not be changed.
- Establish special provisions for use (including two Special Permit provisions for bulk modifications), parking and loading, mandatory sidewalk widening, and other urban design requirements for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict, a 34-block area.
- Eliminate the special use provisions in the Court Square Subdistrict. These provisions prohibit the development of new residential and certain other commercial uses.
- Apply the provisions of the HP District to the proposed Hunters Point Subdistrict.

The proposed zoning map amendments would:

- Map the LIC District on portions of 3 blocks and 32 full blocks in an area generally located between 23rd Street, 43rd Avenue, 21st Street, the center line of the Queensboro Bridge approach, 23rd Street, 41st Avenue, 29th Street, 40th Road, Northern Boulevard, 41st Avenue, Sunnyside Yard, Crane Street, Jackson Avenue, 43rd Avenue, Hunter Street, and 44th Road;
- Rezone 34 blocks from M1-4, M1-5, and R7A/C2-5 to M1-5/R7-3, M1-5/R9, and M1-6/R10 (see Figure S-2) with new floor area ratios (FARs) of 5.0, 8.0, and 12.0, respectively;

- Change the name of the HP District to the LIC District on those blocks currently located within the HP District that are not proposed for zoning district changes; and
- Map (E) designations for hazardous materials, air quality, and noise. Specific text for (E) designations and blocks and lots to which they apply are described in greater detail below and in Chapter 11, "Hazardous Materials," Chapter 16, "Air Quality," and Chapter 17, "Noise" of the FEIS.

In addition, provisions for bulk, streetwall, height and setback would be set to ensure urban design features appropriate with the area's character, mandatory provisions for street tree planting, refuse storage, and sidewalk widenings would also be included. The parking and loading provisions of Article I Chapter 3 of the New York City Zoning Resolution would apply throughout the subdistrict, with an exception to allow a maximum of 200, rather than 100 spaces on commercial or industrial development on Blocks 263, 264, and 420. Certain curb-cut provisions would be enacted, as well.

Chapters 1 through 18 of this FEIS describe and analyze the proposed actions as originally filed. A modified map and text amendment application, as well as modifications to G&M Realty, L.P.'s application for the issuance of a Special Permit for construction on Block 86/72, were filed after the issuance of the DEIS. The map and text amendment modifications would change zoning densities, streetwall heights, parking requirements, and other elements of the proposed Queens Plaza Subdistrict of the Special Long Island City Mixed Use District. A full discussion of the modifications to the proposed zoning map and text actions and Special Permit Application, as well as an analysis of the environmental impacts of such changes can be found in Chapter 19, "Alternatives," in the section that discusses the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative. This discussion is summarized below. The full modified zoning map and text amendment application can be found in Appendix A of this FEIS.

In connection with zoning map and text amendments, three related actions are considered in this EIS:

- A private applicant, Outlet City, Inc., is requesting a change in the City map for the discontinuance and closing of West Street, a 60- by 100-foot street east of Jackson Avenue between Queens Boulevard and Orchard Street. This action would result in the elimination of West Street and the absorption of the 6,000-square-foot street bed into what would become a single site largely bordered by Queens Boulevard, Jackson Avenue, Orchard Street, and the Sunnyside Yard. (One parcel containing an MTA substation would be excluded from this site.) Under the proposed rezoning, the 6,000-square-foot area would yield up to 72,000 square feet of additional development. The action would permit development of commercial office structure(s) on the entire site, as assumed in the reasonable worst-case development scenario with the proposed zoning changes. The site occupies a critical Queens Plaza location convenient to mass transit.

- The New York City Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS) proposes to dispose of the Queens Plaza municipal parking garage (all of Block 420), which also includes office and retail space, to the New York City Economic Development Corporation (EDC). In anticipation of the disposition, EDC issued a Request for Proposals, inviting formal proposals for development of the garage site by January 8, 2001. Subsequent to the submission date, more information on the RFP process and the ultimate development plan will be known. Until then, this EIS assumes the disposition would facilitate the potential development of the site under the proposed zoning changes, as described in the section below. Any development on the site would be required to retain or replace on-site the approximately 1,150 public parking spaces that exist there now pursuant to a 1970 Special Permit.
- G & M Realty, L.P. is applying for a Special Permit pursuant to proposed Section 117-56 of the Zoning Resolution to modify the bulk provisions on Block 86/72, Lots 1 and 22, and Block 72, Lot 80 (all but two parcels on the block bounded by Jackson Avenue, Crane Street, the Sunnyside Yard, and Davis Street. The Special Permit would allow an additional 3.0 FAR on the site provided that the City Planning Commission (CPC) finds that a publicly accessible open space of at least 20,000 square feet will be provided that is designed to provide recreational opportunities to the community, in addition to other, related findings. This action would facilitate development of a commercial 8.0 FAR building on the site.

The proposed building would comprise 977,248 square feet of floor area primarily for office use, with retail use on the ground floor and parking for 100 cars. A total of 45,555 square feet of publicly accessible open space would be provided on all sides of the full block, with the largest area, of 18,325 square feet, set on the Sunnyside Yard side of the site. The open spaces would contain trees, plantings and seating.

The application for a Special Permit for Block 86/72 was modified subsequent to the issuance of the DEIS. A full discussion of the modifications to the Special Permit Application can be found in Chapter 19, "Alternatives," in the section that discusses the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative. A summary of that discussion is provided later in section C, "Alternatives."

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Since the peak of manufacturing activity in the 1950's, New York City's base of manufacturing jobs began a steady decline that continues to this day. Although total employment in New York City has stayed essentially the same since the early 1970's, white-collar jobs have risen dramatically and consistently, while blue-collar jobs in industries, such as manufacturing, have declined. This decline in manufacturing activity, coupled with the growth in office sector employment, has both eased the demand for industrial space in certain places, like downtown

Long Island City, and increased pressures on the office space market, which is primarily located in Manhattan. As a result, Manhattan has experienced a tremendous growth in new office space in the post World War II period (nearly 213 million square feet), and is now in a position where suitable office space is extremely difficult to find.

In 1993, DCP issued its Plan for Long Island City: A Framework for Development (Framework). The Framework recommended retaining low-density manufacturing zoning districts in the Hunters Point Industrial Core, Newtown Creek, and Sunnyside Yard East; facilitating moderate-to high-density mixed-use development on 36 blocks between Court Square and Queens Plaza to further the City's goal of increasing economic development opportunities in the boroughs other than Manhattan; creating new opportunities for housing, shops, and other moderate density mixed-use development in the Hunters Point mixed-use community; and attracting people to the waterfront by creating additional development opportunities at the northern Hunters Point waterfront for shops, open space, and recreational activities, as well as low to moderate density housing. In 1995 and 1997 the City approved actions that furthered the goals of the Framework by creating the Special Hunters Point Mixed-Use District and implementing public access provisions for the Northern Hunters Point Waterfront.

The proposed actions address the public policy to promote mixed-use, relatively dense development in downtown Long Island City and thereby initiate the creation of a fourth CBD for the City. This is key to preserving the City's position as the region's business center by offering affordable, accessible, and convenient office space as a strong alternative to business relocation or expansion outside the City.

Long Island City is an excellent location for New York City's fourth CBD. It is well-served by transit: the triangle bordered by 23rd Street, 41st Avenue, and Sunnyside Yard sits at the convergence of eight different subway lines and lies adjacent to one of the most heavily traveled commuter rail corridors in the entire country. The rezoning area also has several large unused or underused properties. Although this land is zoned for manufacturing, the core areas of manufacturing activity in Long Island City lie outside its downtown. Finally, the existing mix of land uses—including offices, small row houses, tenements, and light industry—provides an excellent base for the development of a 24-hour CBD community—an explicit policy goal here and in the other three CBDs in New York City.

DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE EIS ANALYSIS

LEVEL, TYPE, TIMING, AND LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

The potential for development over the next 10 years (to 2010) was assessed to frame a reasonable worst-case development scenario for evaluation in the EIS. Typically, CEQR assessments of large area-wide zoning proposals not associated with specific development projects assume a 10-year build period. This is the time frame that can be reasonably predicted without

engaging in potentially unrealistic speculation. While the scenario does not detail which sites would be developed first, or exactly when each site would be developed, it assumes all sites would be completed by 2010. For some of the EIS analysis, it is necessary to examine conditions in interim years.

Table S-1
2010 Development Scenario:
Potential Sites of New Residential Development

Block	Lot	Existing Lot Area (square feet)	Maximum Potential New Units
North of Queens Plaza: 41st Avenue from 23rd to 29th Streets			
413 (23rd to 24th Streets)	22	8,226	40
	27	7,575	38
	16	7,506	37
	32	6,307	31
	37	7,074	35
414 (24th to Crescent Streets)	23	30,102	150
	35	20,068	100
	17	7,523	37
415 (Crescent to 27th Streets)	24	5,000	25
	26	5,000	25
	28	5,000	25
416 (27th to 28th Streets)	28	10,017	50
	32	5,008	25
417 (28th to 29th Streets)	20	5,000	25
	14	5,000	25
South of Queens Plaza: Hunter Street			
432 (east side of Hunter Street)	47	7,500	37
	38	7,500	37
431 (west side of Hunter Street)	17	8,000	39
	7, 8, 27	5,060	25
422 (west side of 28th Street)*	31	9,000	40
Note: * Conversion, rather than new construction.			

The analysis concluded that the area would attract up to 300 new housing units and about 5 million square feet of office space (in addition to the 1 million square feet anticipated to be built in the Court Square Subdistrict independent of the proposed actions), plus about

250,000 square feet of upgraded space, additional retail, including a destination store, and a new large institutional use, such as a school. In the latter case, a school, such as Queens Law School, was assumed, because a school with adult students arriving during the evening peak hour presented a worst-case condition for traffic.

The identification of likely sites entailed field work and detailed analysis of lot utilization under existing and proposed zoning, proximity to transit, and orientation to like uses. The result, shown on Tables S-1 and S-2, identifies the parcels for denser commercial development near Queens Plaza and Court Square. Residential uses are assumed on 41st Avenue and on Hunter Street where there is some residential development now. An institutional site yielding about 180,000 square feet of floor area would be at the corner of Jackson Avenue and the Queensboro Bridge viaduct, and upgrading was assumed in the larger existing office buildings near Queens Plaza and Court Square.

Table S-2
2010 Development Scenario: Potential Sites of New Office Construction

Site	Block(s)	Lot(s)	Existing Lot Area	Potential New Office Space	Ground-Floor Retail Space	On-Site Parking Spaces
Queens Plaza Vicinity						
Municipal Garage Site	420	1	126,130	1,488,000	25,000	max 200**
QP Marketplace Site	263	1, 9	125,200	1,475,000	25,000	max 200
	264	1, 14, 17				
Court Square Vicinity						
Block 435 Site	435	13, 28, 29	49,333	577,000	15,000	max 100
Block 428 Site	428	1	37,000	286,000	10,000	max 100
Special Permit Site*	.86	1, 6, 7, 8, 22	128,127	1,000,016	25,000	max 100
	72	80				
Notes: All areas are given in square feet.						
* For purposes of EIS analysis the site includes the two lots that are on the block but not included in the current Special Permit application and assumes 25,000 sf of ground-floor retail use.						
** In addition, approximately 1,150 existing spaces would be replaced on-site.						

PUBLIC APPROVALS PROCESS AND STATUS

The proposed rezoning and related actions are subject to the City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR). The City's

ULURP is specifically designed to allow public review of proposed actions at four levels: Community Board, Borough President, CPC, and City Council. The procedure sets time limits for review at each stage to ensure a maximum total review period of approximately seven months. Environmental review under CEQR runs concurrently with ULURP. For this project, it began when CPC determined that the project might have a significant adverse effect on the environment and issued a Positive Declaration requiring that an EIS be prepared. A public scoping session on the scope of the EIS was held on April 24, 2000. This EIS, prepared in accordance with that scope of work, provides a means for decision-makers to systematically consider environmental effects along with other aspects of project planning and design, to evaluate reasonable alternatives, and to identify, and mitigate when practicable, any significant adverse environmental effects.

B. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

PUBLIC POLICY, ZONING, AND LAND USE

The proposed actions in Long Island City are significant public policy actions that would change the permitted uses and bulk regulations in the rezoning area (proposed Queens Plaza Subdistrict). The zoning map and text amendments and related actions would address two key objectives: they would reinforce the rezoning area's historic mixed residential and industrial character by establishing a mixed-use zoning district that would allow new mixed-use development, and they would use zoning changes to facilitate commercial development within a compact, pedestrian-oriented precinct, anchored by three subway stations.

The subdistrict's provisions were developed around the principles of mixed-use development, a strong relationship between density and transit, a variety of building types, and an active pedestrian environment through active ground floors and new sidewalk widenings. These principles reflect the goals set forth in DCP's Plan for Long Island City: A Framework for Development. By limiting zoning changes to the areas around Queens Plaza and Court Square, the zoning changes and related actions would support the Framework goals that seek to support industrial development in the Hunters Point, Newtown Creek, and Sunnyside Yard East industrial cores. Manufacturing zones in these areas would remain as such, protecting these vital industrial areas from the incursion of residential or larger office uses and associated industrial displacement.

By creating a sizable open space, the proposed Special Permit would concur with public policy to develop open space in conjunction with new development. Therefore, significant impacts on public policy or zoning would not occur as a result of the Special Permit.

The development expected as a result of the rezoning and related actions is expected to transform the downtown area of Long Island City from a low scale, mixed industrial/office/residential area, to a more dense CBD-type office center. The change, when viewed in light of related changes to the area's character and role in the economy of New York City, would have a positive impact on both the immediate vicinity and the City as a whole. While the proposed rezoning is not likely to trigger residential or office development in the area around the rezoning area, it would likely lead to a limited amount of upgrading/refurbishing of space—especially retail space—in immediately surrounding areas. This would most likely take the form of retail space upgraded to cater to the office market along streets just outside the

rezoning area yet close to new offices.

The analyses conclude that the proposed zoning and related actions would change land use on most blocks in the rezoning area and that these changes would be expected to have a positive land use impact on both the immediate area and the City as a whole. No significant adverse impacts on land use and zoning would result from the proposed actions.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Screening analyses found that the proposed actions and the resulting development in the rezoning area would have no adverse impact from direct or indirect displacement of residents or from direct displacement of businesses or from effects on specific industries. The rezoning area currently has very little residential use, and it is unlikely that direct displacement of one or two residences would substantially alter the character of the neighborhood. Similarly, the proposed action would not directly displace substantial numbers of businesses or employees, and the businesses affected are varied and do not define or contribute substantially to a defining element of neighborhood character.

The potential for indirect displacement of businesses was examined in more detail. This analysis concludes that existing trends toward a strong mix of uses, including a recent influx of lighter manufacturing and high tech uses, would continue in the rezoning and surrounding area, subject to future market conditions. Therefore, the proposed actions are not expected to create substantial development pressures that would result in significant indirect displacement of businesses.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The relevant issues for community facilities in connection with the proposed actions are provision of police and fire protection and accommodation of new public school students in neighborhood schools. Based on discussions with representatives of the Police and Fire Departments, sufficient capacity exists to address any increased demand and no significant impacts would result. The analysis of schools and schoolchildren indicates that the relatively small number of potential residential units assumed in the development scenario would generate fewer than 80 public elementary and intermediate school students, a small percentage of total enrollment in the catchment area, and no significant impacts on public schools would be expected.

OPEN SPACE

The open space assessment concludes that the population and employment triggered by potential development under the development scenario (without the Special Permit site building and open space) would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space resources within a ½ mile of the rezoning area. However, the addition of new workers under the development scenario alone would reduce the passive open space ratio for the area within ¼-mile of the rezoning area by nearly 38 percent, resulting in a significant adverse impact. With the potential office development and passive open space assumed with the proposed Special Permit, a significant adverse open space impact would also result in the ¼-mile study area. Between DEIS and FEIS, DCP and the New York City Department of Parks and

Recreation (DPR) examined the possibility of mitigating this impact by upgrading open spaces in the vicinity of the rezoning area. However, neither of the two primary open spaces in the vicinity—Court Square Park and Citibank Plaza—present opportunities for upgrading or improvement. They are both in good repair and contain ample seating areas and opportunities for passive recreation. Therefore, mitigation of this impact would not be feasible and it would remain an unmitigated adverse impact.

SHADOWS

To assess potential impacts of shadows on open space resources in Long Island City, a shadow screening was performed. The shadow screening was conducted for the residential sites, the potential institutional use site, and the four office sites that are included in the rezoning development scenario plus the Special Permit office site. No shadows on open spaces were identified from the residential and institutional sites. Of the five office sites, the screening identified potential shadow impacts on open spaces only from the building on the Special Permit site.

A full shadow analysis conducted for the Special Permit building indicated that the building currently proposed for the Special Permit site between Davis and Crane Streets would cast brief winter shadows on the Murray Playground during the morning, brief early-afternoon shadows during the winter on Court Square Park and Citibank Plaza, and shadows during much of the day in all seasons on the Special Permit open space. Because of the time, duration, and extent of shadows cast on the three existing open spaces, the shadows cast by the Special Permit building on those spaces would not constitute significant shadow impacts on these open spaces. Most of the open space proposed for the Special Permit site would be built on the Sunnyside Yard portion of the block, with smaller areas around the other sides of the building. Since the largest area of open space would lie adjacent to Sunnyside Yard, southeast of the proposed building, the building would not cast shadows on this large area. Due to the fact that the largest area of open space to be created would receive sun throughout the day and most other areas of open space would receive sun for some of the day, as well as the fact that the open space would not exist without the tall building constructed adjacent to it, the shadows cast by the Special Permit Building would not constitute a significant adverse impact on the Special Permit open space.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The development scenario and Special Permit building that would potentially result from the proposed actions would trigger substantial changes in urban design and visual resources. Building bulk, height, and setbacks would be noticeably altered. Street pattern and block forms would not change significantly, although one of the related actions would result in the demapping and closing of West Street. Proposed mandatory sidewalk widenings, ground-floor non-residential use, and glazing would enliven the street-level environment in the rezoning area. Overall, changes would be significant but would not constitute adverse impacts.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The change in visual character that would be expected to occur with future development in

the rezoning area would be gradual, and, in general, would not be anticipated to adversely affect historic resources in the study area. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has determined that the rezoning area is not sensitive for prehistoric archaeological resources. For the cemetery identified in the Preliminary Assessment and Stage 1A Documentary Study on Office Site B, mitigation measures including new borings and testing would be required prior to site development. The West Street demapping agreement shall state the following: that the map shall not be filed with the appropriate agencies until the applicant, subject to review and approval of the LPC has completed the testing, the necessary mitigation, if required, and LPC issues a Letter of Satisfaction to the Department of Buildings. The necessary mitigation measures must comply with the penal code and the New York Archaeological Standards 1994, which state that any lineal descendants must be contacted should any remains be encountered so that such remains may be properly handled.

Since neither the potential grist mill site on Queens Plaza or Block 403 are potential development sites, there would be no impacts to potential historic period resources in these locations as a result of the proposed rezoning or related actions. Since the Stage 1A documentary study prepared for the Special Permit site concluded that the site was not sensitive for either prehistoric or historic-period resources, there are no archaeological concerns associated with the site and, therefore, it does not warrant further archaeological consideration.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The analysis of neighborhood character focuses on changes to that character resulting from changes in land use, public policy, socioeconomic conditions, urban design and visual resources, and traffic and pedestrian activity. The analysis concludes that neighborhood character would change with new land uses and building types, increases in employees and residents, and increases in traffic and pedestrian activity—but the change would not be adverse.

One of the overarching goals of the proposed actions would be to provide the zoning framework for development of affordable and accessible office space. Long Island City would be a prime location for such development because of the convenient transit access and the large amount of unused or underused parcels of land. The proposed actions would result in a change in the character of Long Island City in general and specifically in the blocks and portions of communities that make up the rezoning area. Were the proposed actions not to change the character of the currently industrial and mixed-use blocks, it would fail to achieve its goals. The proposed actions would result in development that would result in changes to the area's character in a number of ways.

- **Land Use.** The area would continue as a mixed-use area, but office and residential uses would increase substantially and industrial uses would decline.
- **Urban Design and Visual Resources.** The proposed actions would result in significant changes to the bulk, size, and scale of buildings in the area and would change the visual landscape of the area greatly in the vicinity of Queens Plaza, because of the new buildings expected to result.

- Socioeconomic Conditions. Changes in land uses and scale of development would result in significant changes in socioeconomic conditions in the area. The number and type of jobs in the area would change, as would the residential population. Some jobs would be displaced, but jobs would increase substantially as a result of the project. Subsequently, retail uses would change to meet the demands of different types of workers.
- Traffic and Pedestrians. Traffic and pedestrian congestion would increase throughout; however, the streets in the vicinity of Queens Plaza are already burdened by high levels of traffic, and mitigation would be able to relieve much of that congestion. Overall, the unmitigated traffic impacts of the project, expected at some intersections in the vicinity of Queens Plaza; the increased levels of traffic on formerly quiet, light-industrial streets; and the significant increase in traffic throughout the Jackson Avenue corridor, would change neighborhood character. The increases in street-level pedestrian activity throughout the rezoning area would also change neighborhood character.

Overall, the proposed actions would result in significant beneficial changes in the character of these blocks with respect to urban design and visual resources, socioeconomic conditions, and street-level pedestrian activity. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character are not expected to result from the proposed actions.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The rezoning area is located within a fully developed portion of Queens that does not have significant natural resources. Consequently, the screening analyses conducted for natural resources concluded that the proposed actions would not result in significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Based on Phase I Environmental Assessments completed for the development sites, analyses have not ruled out the potential presence of hazardous materials on any of the development sites. The materials could include petroleum based, non-petroleum based, or both. Consequently, the proposed zoning map actions include (E) designations for all potential development including the lots on the Special Permit site, a total of 40 lots in all. A complete list of the affected sites and a summary of the basis for the designations is provided in Table S-3; more information is provided in Chapter 11, "Hazardous Materials." The placement of the (E) designations on the zoning map would eliminate the potential for significant adverse impact from hazardous materials and would ensure that appropriate testing and remediation, if needed, would be undertaken. The text of the (E) designation is as follows:

Due to the possible presence of hazardous materials on the aforementioned designated sites there is the potential for contamination of the soil and groundwater. To determine if contamination exists and perform any appropriate remediation, the following tasks must be undertaken by the fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation prior to any demolition or disturbance of soil on the lot.

TASK 1

The fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation will be required to prepare a scope of work for any soil, gas, or groundwater sampling and testing needed to determine if contamination exists, the extent of the contamination, and to what extent remediation may be required. The scope of work will include all relevant supporting documentation, including site plans and sampling locations. This scope of work will be submitted to NYCDEP for review and approval prior to implementation. It will be reviewed to ensure that an adequate number of samples will be collected and that appropriate parameters are selected for laboratory analysis.

No sampling program may begin until written approval of a work plan and sampling protocol is received from NYCDEP. The number and location of sample sites should be selected to adequately characterize the type and extent of the contamination, and the condition of the remainder of the site. 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 choosing sampling sites and performing sampling will be provided by NYCDEP upon request.

TASK 2

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be presented to NYCDEP after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such test results, a determination will be provided by NYCDEP if the results indicate that remediation is necessary.

If NYCDEP determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by NYCDEP.

If remediation is necessary according to test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to NYCDEP for review and approval. The fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation must perform such remediation as determined necessary by NYCDEP. After completing the remediation, the fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation should provide proof that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

A NYCDEP-approved construction-related health and safety plan would be implemented during excavation and construction 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 NYCDEP for review and approval prior to implementation.

Table S-3
Identified Potential for Contamination
on Development Sites

Potential Development Sites	Site No.	Block	Lot	Cluster	Identified Potential for Contamination	
					Petroleum	Non-Petroleum
Residential	1	413	16	1		X
	2	413	22	1	X	X
	3	413	27	1	X	X
	4	413	32	1	X	X
	5	413	37	1	X	X
	6	414	17	1	X	X
	7	414	23	1	X	X
	8	414	35	1	X	X
	9	415	24	1		X
	10	415	26	1		X
	11	415	28	1	X	X
	12	416	28	1		X
	13	416	32	1		X
	14	417	14	1	X	X
	15	417	20	1	X	X
	16	422	31	3	X	X
	17	431	7	3		X
	18	431	8	3		X
	19	431	17	3		X
	20	431	27	3		X
	21	432	38	3		X
	22	432	47	3	X	X
Office	23	263	1	2	X	X
	24	263	9	2	X	X
	25	264	1	2	X	X
	26	264	14	2	X	X
	27	264	17	2	X	X
	28	420	1	2	X	X
	29	428	1	4	X	X
	30	435	13	4		X
	31	435	28	4	X	
	32	435	29	4	X	
School	33	432	8	3	X	X
Retail	34	416	10	1	X	X
Special Permit (Office)	35-40	86 72	1, 6, 7, 8, 22 80	—	X	X

INFRASTRUCTURE, SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION, AND ENERGY

The infrastructure analysis concludes that existing infrastructure systems would be adequate to meet the demand of the residential and worker populations that would result from development under the proposed actions, and no significant adverse impacts would occur.

WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION

Proposed actions that are situated within the designated boundaries of New York City's Coastal Zone must be assessed for their consistency with the City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP), and the State's Coastal Management Program. The proposed rezoning area is not within the Coastal Zone, so no assessment of waterfront revitalization is required.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

The proposed actions would affect traffic at various intersections throughout the study area. Future traffic levels of service under the proposed actions are shown in Table S-4. As shown in Table S-4, the proposed actions would have significant traffic impacts at the vast majority of the signalized intersections analyzed—at 21 of the 27 intersections analyzed in the AM peak hour, 15 of the 28 analyzed at midday, and at 20 of the 28 analyzed in the PM peak hour. (One intersection—Thomson Avenue at the entrance to the upper level of the Queensboro Bridge—has no conflicts in the morning since the upper level is operated entirely inbound toward Manhattan, so it is not "analyzed" under that condition.) Seven of the eight unsignalized intersections would continue to operate at clearly acceptable level of service A, without any significant impacts; one unsignalized intersection (Jackson Avenue and 46th Road) would be significantly affected in all three analysis peak hours. A complete discussion of all of the impacted intersections can be found in Chapter 20, "Traffic and Parking." Mitigation for these impacts is discussed below (see "Mitigation").

The proposed actions would also result in a significant shortfall of 1,000 to 1,200 parking spaces throughout the study area beginning at about 9 AM, when most workers and commuters have arrived and continuing throughout the typical weekday until the majority of office workers and others in the area begin their trips home at the beginning of the afternoon/evening peak period (i.e., between about 4 and 5 PM). This would lead to unnecessary traffic circulation in the area, additional or new illegal double-parking, and other instances of illegal parking by cars lacking parking spaces. Parking shortfalls do not constitute significant adverse impacts for CEQR purposes, and mitigation is therefore not required. Nonetheless, to better serve the needs of those traveling to Long Island City by car, additional off-street parking spaces would be needed. A strategy of ringing the study area with intercept parking would not only reduce or eliminate the projected parking shortfall, but would also be beneficial in removing traffic from some of the most congested intersections that lie closer toward Queens Plaza.

Table S-4

**Traffic Level of Service Summary Comparison:
Future Conditions with and Without the Proposed Actions (Year
2010)**

Signalized Intersections	No Action			With Rezoning		
	AM	Midda y	PM	AM	Midda y	PM
Overall LOS A/B	5	10	8	4	8	5
Overall LOS C	3	7	5	1	5	5
Overall LOS D	0	2	1	0	2	0
Overall LOS E/F	19	9	14	22	13	18
Number of Movements at LOS E or F	42	21	38	57	27	47
Number of Signalized Intersections With Significant Impacts vs. Intersections Analyzed	N/A	N/A	N/A	21 of 27	15 of 28	20 of 28
Number of Unsignalized Intersections with Significant Impacts vs. Intersections Analyzed	N/A	N/A	N/A	1 of 8	1 of 8	1 of 8
Notes:						
<p>1. All eight unsignalized intersections analyzed operate at overall LOS A during all analysis hours under year 2010 conditions with the proposed actions. One unsignalized intersection (Jackson Avenue and 46th Road) would have one traffic movement at LOS F in the AM peak hour (overall LOS A), at LOS E in the midday peak hour (overall LOS A), and at LOS F in the PM peak hour (overall LOS F).</p> <p>2. There is one fewer intersection in the AM analyses than in the midday and PM since the "intersection" of Thomson Avenue with the ramps to the upper level of the Queensboro Bridge has no conflicts in the AM.</p>						

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Because of the large number of new workers brought to the area, the proposed actions would result in significant adverse impacts on transit and pedestrian conditions. It should be noted that the impacts identified in this assessment do not account for future subway station and train service improvements planned by MTA and NYCT. As future conditions change, actions required to mitigate these impacts may also change. Significant adverse impacts would occur at the following facilities or locations:

- Subway line-haul significant impacts on the Manhattan-bound E, F, N, and No. 7 trains in the AM peak hour, and on the Queens-bound E and N trains in the PM peak hour;

- Significant impacts at the Queensboro Plaza station on the S1 street-level staircase and the M1 mezzanine-level staircase in the AM peak hour;
- Capacity constraints on the Queens Surface Corporation Q102 bus routes;
- Pedestrian crosswalk significant impacts at the following locations:
 - The north crosswalks at 27th Street and Queens Plaza North in the AM and PM peak hours;
 - The north crosswalk at 28th Street and Queens Plaza North in the PM peak hour;
 - The south crosswalk at 28th Street and Queens Plaza South in the AM and PM peak hours; and
 - The east crosswalk at Jackson Avenue and 23rd Street in the AM and PM peak hours; and
- A pedestrian corner reservoir significant impact at the southwest corner of 28th Street and Queens Plaza South in both the AM and PM peak hours.

The mitigation measures proposed would fully mitigate all identified impacts (see "Mitigation," below).

AIR QUALITY

All of the maximum predicted carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations with the project would be lower than the corresponding ambient air standards. Therefore, the proposed actions would be consistent with the New York State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the control of ozone and CO. At one receptor site, the proposed actions would result in a significant impact as defined by the City's de minimis criteria. However, with implementation of the proposed traffic mitigation, the de minimis impact would be mitigated, and the proposed actions would not result in any significant adverse mobile source air quality impacts.

Parking facilities (of up to 200 spaces) associated with the proposed actions would not be expected to result in any significant air quality impacts in the study area. In order to quantify the potential emissions from project-related parking facilities, a prototypical garage was modeled. The analysis determined that parking facilities with the proposed actions would not result in any adverse air quality impacts.

With respect to stationary sources, a screening analysis and subsequent detailed dispersion modeling found that there would be no potential significant air quality impacts from the proposed HVAC systems of the projected development sites.

In addition, there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial facilities on sensitive residential and community facility receptors. An analysis of the effects of Filmtreat's dichloromethane emissions on the QP Marketplace Site (Office Site B), which is directly across Orchard Street, was conducted, particularly with respect to operable windows. This analysis found that the proposed actions have the potential to result in significant adverse industrial source air quality impacts on Office Site B from the Filmtreat facility. Therefore, the prevention of significant adverse industrial source air quality impacts at operable windows or air intakes will be achieved through an (E) designation. The text of

the (E) designation is as follows for Block 264:

In order to ensure there will be no potential adverse air quality impacts from adjacent industrial emissions, all windows on the Orchard Street face of development on Block 264, up to a height of 100 feet above local grade, must be inoperable. All windows on the Jackson Avenue face of development on Block 264, up to a height of 60 feet above local grade, from the corner of Jackson Avenue and Orchard Street to 150 feet northeast of the corner, must also be inoperable. Similarly, air intakes must not be located in these locations.

The (E) designation would ensure that there would be no significant adverse industrial source air quality impacts on Office Site B.

NOISE

The noise analysis concludes that changes in ambient noise levels with the proposed actions would be imperceptible and no significant adverse impacts would result and, further, that there would be no significant impact on the interior noise environment of the new buildings from ambient noise conditions in the surrounding area. Based on the EIS monitoring results, and in accordance with the provisions of the MX District, 35 dBA of attenuation would be required at the sites of potential residential development. At non-residential sites including the Special Permit site (see Table S-5 for list of locations), the required attenuation will be achieved through an (E) designation. The text of the (E) designation is as follows on Block 72, Lot 80; Block 86, Lots 1, 6, 7, 8, and 22; Block 263, Lots 1 and 2; Block 264, Lots 1, 4, 15, and 17; Block 420 Lot 1; and Block 428, Lot 1:

In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, at facades to Queens Plaza, 23rd Street, and Davis Street future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 45 dB(A), in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A); at facades to Crane Street, future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 25 dB(A); at facades to other roadways and Sunnyside Yard, future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 35 dB(A), in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A). The minimum window/wall attenuation at each facade must extend around the corner of the identified facade to include any windows located within 15 feet of the corner on adjacent facades. In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided. Alternate means of ventilation includes, but is not limited to, central air conditioning or air conditioning sleeves containing air conditioners.

The text of the (E) designation is as follows on Block 432 Lot 8, and Block 435, Lots 13, 28, and 29:

In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, at all

facades to roadways, future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 35 dB(A) as stated in the chart above, in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A). In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided. Alternate means of ventilation includes, but is not limited to, central air conditioning or air conditioning sleeves containing air conditioners.

Table S-5

Locations of (E) Designations for Noise Attenuation

Site	Block/Lot	Facade*	Site	dB(A)
Office Site B (QP Marketplace Site)	263/1, 2 264/1,4,15, 17	North (Queens Plaza)	R2	45
		East (Sunnyside Yard)	R7	35
		South (Orchard Street)	3	35
		West (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
Office Site A (Municipal Garage Site)	420/1	North (Queens Plaza)	R2	45
		East (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
		South (42nd Road)	3	35
		West (28th Street)	3	35
Office Site C (Block 435 Site)	435/13,28, 29	North (43rd Avenue)	R4	35
		East (Crescent Street)	R3	25
		South (44th Road)	R4	35
		West (24th Street)	R4	35
Office Site D (Block 428 Site)	428/1	North (Queensboro Bridge ramp)	R4	35
		East (24th Street)	R4	35
		South (43rd Avenue)	R4	35
		West (23rd Street)	2	45
Institutional Use Site	432/8	North (42nd Road)	3	35
		East (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
		South (Queensboro Bridge ramp)	3	35
		West (Hunter Street)	R3	25
Office Site E (Special Permit Site)	72/80 86/1,6,7,8, 22	North (Davis Street)	1	45
		East (Sunnyside Yard)	R7	35
		South (Crane Street)	R5	25
		West (Jackson Avenue)	R6	35
* Includes windows on identified facade and within 15 feet of corner of identified facade, on adjacent facades.				

The (E) designation would ensure that there would be no significant adverse noise impacts.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

For the most part, construction of development arising from the proposed actions, including the rezoning and related actions, would create temporary impacts similar to those typically experienced in the City's central business districts. Two areas would be somewhat different, however. Traffic conditions, particularly on Queens Boulevard and Queens Plaza, are sensitive, with problems occurring even today. Construction would have to avoid the usurping of any lanes on Queens Boulevard, Queens Plaza or Jackson Avenue, and it is possible that mitigation proposed for the completed developments would be necessary during construction of even the first building—particularly if that building were on a Queens Plaza site. The second issue is parking. Construction on the Municipal Garage site would require the temporary displacement of a number of parking spaces, which cannot be accommodated in the area. If the parcel on Northern Boulevard that is currently a construction staging area can be made available for relief parking during this time, the situation can be partially mitigated. In addition, some people who park in

the garage are actually commuters to Manhattan, and they will be able to relocate to Shea Stadium's park-and-ride lot.

C. ALTERNATIVES

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative assumes that the proposed zoning changes and related actions would not be implemented. This alternative is discussed and analyzed as "The Future Without the Proposed Actions" in each of the technical areas in Chapters 2 through 17. The No Action condition assumes no zoning map and text amendments and that the underlying zoning would remain unchanged. The proposed demapping of West Street, disposition of the Queens Plaza Municipal Parking Garage from DCAS to EDC, and granting of a Special Permit to allow the FAR of the Davis/Crane Street development site to increase from 5.0 to 8.0 would not occur.

The discretionary actions required to achieve the economic development goals of the proposed zoning changes and related actions would not be sought under the No Action Alternative. The existing mix of manufacturing, commercial and residential zoning would remain in the rezoning area. The conflicting requirements and permitted uses for these zoning districts would continue to constrain development, and the majority of lots in the immediate vicinity of Queens Plaza and Court Square would remain underutilized or vacant. This alternative would not fulfill the goals set forth in the Framework, as it would not facilitate moderate- to high-density mixed-use development or create new opportunities for housing and stores and other moderate density mixed-use development in the area's existing manufacturing districts.

Both with and without the proposed actions, significant adverse indirect displacement impacts are not expected to occur. Unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative

would not result in more than 18,000 new jobs in the rezoning area and Special Permit site and their associated economic activity, nor would it displace any existing businesses. The pattern of underutilization in the area, particularly the rezoning area, would continue.

Neither the proposed actions nor this alternative, would have an adverse effect on the ability of community facilities serving the rezoning area to meet any increase in demand. The projected significant adverse impact of the rezoning on open space in the ¼-mile open space study area would not occur in the No Action Alternative, and the potential shadow impact of the Special Permit building on nearby open space would not occur. In the No Action Alternative, the Queens Borough President's Office and the Department of City Planning would continue to study the possibility of acquiring additional open space in the rezoning area.

Unlike the proposed actions, the No Action Alternative would not result in potential significant adverse impacts to potential archaeological resources. Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed action (with mitigation) would have an adverse effect on known architectural resources in the surrounding area or on architectural resources further from the site.

With the No Action Alternative, it is anticipated that little change would occur in the urban design and visual quality of the zoning area. Under this alternative, West Street would not be demapped and would remain in its current form. Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources. Neighborhood character immediately near the rezoning area is not expected to change significantly under this alternative. Overall, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

Like the proposed action, the No Action Alternative would not create a significant hazardous materials impact. Infrastructure serving the rezoning area would be adequate to meet the projected demand from either the proposed actions or this alternative, and no adverse effects would result from either condition.

Exacerbation of poor traffic conditions that would occur with the proposed actions would not occur under the No Action Alternative. The number of analysis locations that operate at overall LOS E or F would not increase in the AM peak hour from 19 to 23, in the midday peak hour from 9 to 14, and in the PM peak hour from 14 to 19. Unlike conditions with the proposed actions, traffic conditions would not be improved through the implementation of traffic mitigation measures under this alternative. However, the unmitigated traffic impacts that would occur under the proposed actions would not occur under this alternative. The substantial parking shortfall that would occur with the proposed actions would not occur under this alternative.

The analysis of impacts of the construction of the Citicorp II building on subway station elements in the Court Square vicinity were corrected between DEIS and FEIS to account for the Court Square Subdistrict zoning regulations that require mandatory subway improvements with the construction of new buildings in the subdistrict. The corrected analyses show that the construction of the Citicorp II building in the No Action Alternative would not have an impact on the 23rd Street/Ely Avenue subway entrance on 23rd Street and

44th Drive as was disclosed in the DEIS, and that the associated mitigation identified in the DEIS for this entrance would not be required. The subway line-haul and bus capacity constraints under this alternative would be less severe than under the proposed actions. The station element impacts and pedestrian crosswalk and corner impacts that would occur under the proposed actions would not occur under this alternative. However, with proposed mitigation, neither the proposed actions nor this alternative would result in transit or pedestrian impacts.

Unlike the proposed action, the No Action Alternative would not have the potential to result in a de minimis adverse mobile source air quality impact at one receptor location. However, with the proposed traffic mitigation measures, neither the proposed actions nor the No Action Alternative would result in any exceedances of the 8-hour carbon monoxide (CO) standard of 9 parts per million (ppm). Both the proposed action and this alternative would be consistent with the New York State Implementation Plan (SIP). The No Action Alternative would not likely have any other impacts related to stationary sources or proposed parking garages. However, the proposed actions could possibly create the potential for air quality impacts requiring mitigation from parking garages and HVAC systems associated with development on Office Sites A and B and from industrial sources adjacent to Office Site B.

Neither the proposed action nor the No Action Alternative would have a negative impact on noise levels. Without the proposed action, there would be no impacts from construction activities. The potential traffic, parking, noise, and air quality impacts during construction that would occur with the proposed action would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

LESSER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, proposed zoning designations would be the same as those under the proposed actions, but the permitted floor area ratios (FARs) would be reduced by 25 percent. All other elements of the proposed actions would be undertaken under this alternative. The discretionary actions to dispose of the Municipal Garage site and to demap West Street are assumed under this alternative to facilitate development of those large, optimally located sites. The proposed Special Permit application is assumed to occur under this alternative, but with an additional FAR of 1.0, to bring total permitted FAR from 5.0 to 6.0. The open space that would be developed on the site under the proposed actions is assumed under this alternative as well. This alternative would result in approximately 3.7 million square feet of new commercial development, or about 75 percent of the approximately 4.9 million that would result from the proposed actions. The institutional use would be reduced by 25 percent, as well, to 135,000 square feet. Residential development would be unchanged. The same number and general locations of residential units would occur as with the proposed action. Building heights would also change; assuming the same base and approximate floor plates, the differences would range from a reduction of 9 stories on a single tower on Site A and Special Permit to 2 stories on the smaller building on Site D.

DCP does not believe that the lesser density alternative, with its smaller buildings, would be viable, given the costs of construction, the requirements of Class A office tenants, and the pioneering location at Long Island City. In general, this alternative would not eliminate the

project's impacts and would in many cases not even produce a reduction commensurate with the change in size.

By permitting less density, the types of buildings that would best create a CBD in Long Island City could not be developed under this alternative. However, the lesser density option would still reinforce the rezoning area's mixed residential and industrial character by establishing a mixed-use zoning district that would allow new mixed-use development, and facilitate commercial development within a compact, pedestrian-oriented precinct anchored by three subway stations. This alternative would support to a lesser degree the goals identified in the Framework.

This alternative would be expected to add an estimated 10,933 new employees to the area (including the Special Permit site), about 4,600 less than the proposed actions. The wages and salaries, economic activity, and associated tax revenues for the City and State would be proportionately fewer. In both cases, indirect displacement pressures on existing businesses and institutions would not be significant.

Similar to the proposed action, but to a lesser degree, the Lesser Density Alternative would increase demand on police and fire services and public schools, but still with no adverse impacts to these services. The same is true for demands on infrastructure.

Because this alternative would generate fewer employees and residents than the proposed actions, the effect on open space conditions would be proportionately less. The open space ratios under this alternative would generally be higher than or the same as those with the proposed actions. Under either alternative this impact would be unmitigated. Since the size of the buildings permitted under the lesser density alternative would be smaller, none of the worst-case development sites would cast shadows on sensitive receptors at any time of day and/or year. Similarly, changes to the visual character of the rezoning area and its relationship to the study area that would occur with the proposed action, would also occur under this alternative. The development sites would be developed with new structures, although they would not be as large as those under the proposed actions.

Development under the Lesser Density Alternative would have the same potential to disturb subsurface conditions and potential archaeological resources on Office Site B and would require the same mitigation measures as identified for the proposed action. Neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would have an adverse effect on known architectural resources in the surrounding area or on architectural resources farther from the site.

Under this alternative, there would be proportionally fewer vehicle trips than the proposed action. However, the addition of even minor amounts of traffic at critical study area intersections would result in significant impacts. This alternative would have proportionately smaller, but still substantial parking shortfall compared with that with the proposed actions. Given the existing and future no action transit conditions in the vicinity of the rezoning area, subway, bus, and pedestrian impacts under this alternative would be similar to those with the proposed actions.

ALTERNATIVE WITH ACCESSORY PARKING

Under this alternative, an additional 800 parking spaces would result beyond the 600 assumed under the proposed actions, for a total of 1,400 spaces. This would substantially reduce the shortfall in parking spaces that would otherwise occur—up to a peak shortfall of 1,000 to 1,200 spaces—under the proposed rezoning action. This, in turn, would greatly reduce unnecessary traffic circulation, double parking, and illegal parking that could occur under the proposed action since auto traffic would be accommodated at the parking destination of choice to a far greater extent. The Parking Alternative, however, would not by itself reduce traffic mitigation needs required under the proposed action. The same parking improvement recommendations set forth in Chapter 14, "Traffic and Parking," with respect to developing parking areas just outside the core areas of Long Island City would also address the parking shortfall resulting from this alternative, but would be needed to a lesser extent. In all other aspects, this alternative would have the same impact as the future with the proposed actions.

QUEENS PLAZA SUBDISTRICT ZONING ALTERNATIVE

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative consists of the modified ULURP zoning map and text amendments C000406A ZMQ and N000407A ZRQ filed March 30, 2001; the modified Special Permit application C00483A ZSQ filed April 6, 2001. The components of the alternative with increased accessory parking (discussed in section D, above), are incorporated into the modified zoning text amendments (N000407A ZRQ). A summary of mitigation measures that would be required, should the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative be selected as the preferred alternative, can be found in the below Mitigation section.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative was developed in response to concerns raised by the Queens Borough President's Office regarding density in the vicinity of Queens Plaza. The DCP has proposed that the ULURP for the proposed action be modified to reflect this alternative. This new alternative would include the components of the alternative with increased accessory parking (discussed in section D, above), increase the area proposed to be mapped with zoning districts that permit FARs of 12.0, and reduce the area proposed to be mapped with zoning districts that would permit FARs of 8.0 and 5.0, as follows:

- Area A-1 (12.0 FAR) would be expanded to include all of Block 422, between Queens Plaza South and 42nd Road, 27th Street, and 28th Street. Under the proposed action, a portion of Block 422 (39,380 sf) would be located in Area B (8.0 FAR) and the remaining portion (20,000 sf) in Area C (5.0 FAR).
- Area A-2 (12.0 FAR) would be expanded to include all of Block 433, between Crescent Street and 43rd Avenue, Hunter Street, and Jackson Avenue. Under the proposed action, approximately half of Block 433 would be located in Area A-2, one quarter in Area B, and one quarter in Area C.
- Area B (8.0 FAR) would be expanded to include all of Block 418, between 29th Street,

41st Avenue, and Queens Plaza North. Under the proposed action, Block 418 would be located in Area A-1 (12.0 FAR).

In addition to these zoning map changes, all other elements of the proposed actions would be undertaken under this alternative, including the discretionary actions to dispose of the Municipal Garage site and to demap West Street, and the proposed Special Permit application on Blocks 86/72 (as revised on April 6, 2001, see below). In addition, certain other changes are also included in this alternative, as follows:

- All elements of the Alternative with Increased Parking (described in section D, above) including a modified, 250-space public parking requirement for special permits to allow bulk modifications on Blocks 86/72 and 403 (see below).
- A reduction in the minimum base streetwall height for buildings on narrow streets (streets less than 75 feet wide), from 60 feet and 100 feet to 23 feet; and retention of the proposed action's minimum base heights for buildings on wide streets and within 50 feet of wide streets (greater than 75 feet wide), of 60 feet and 100 feet.
- Revisions to the proposed Special Permit application on Blocks 86/72, to reflect the following: a shift in the site plan of the building, predominantly to move the ground-floor retail component of the building from the Jackson Avenue side of the site to the Sunnyside Yard side of the site; a decrease in the size of the open space surrounding the site and a shift in its location; and an increase in the amount of parking provided on the site.

DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

Office Uses

Similar to the development scenario formulated for the proposed actions, a reasonable worst-case development scenario was also framed for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Alternative. Under this alternative, new office towers are projected for development on Block 422 and Block 433, while the office towers projected for development under the proposed action on Blocks 428 and 435 would not occur.

The additional office towers on Blocks 422 and 433 would add more than 1.5 million square feet to the development scenario, while the elimination of Blocks 428 and 435 from the development scenario would reduce the amount of projected development by under 900,000 square feet. Thus, the alternative could increase development by approximately 661,596 square feet of office space and 15,000 square feet of retail development (see Table S-6). In total, approximately 5.5 million square feet of office development is projected to occur under this alternative (versus 4.9 million under the proposed actions), and 115,000 square feet of local ground-floor retail development (vs. 100,000 under the proposed actions). (See Illustrative Bulk Configurations section, below, for details on the size and shape of the new buildings that would result from the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative.)

The development framework for this alternative anticipates the construction of approximately 660,000 additional square feet over that of the proposed actions, on the conservative assumption that the potential FAR on each site would be fully utilized. Such development

would not result in construction of a greater number of buildings, but rather in larger buildings that would be more marketable. The same number of office sites would be developed—like in the proposed actions’ development scenario, this alternative’s scenario would construct office towers on five sites.

Table S-6
**2010 Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative:
Sites of New Office Construction**

Site	Block(s)	Lot(s)	Existing Lot Area (sf)	Potential Change in Office Development (sf)	Potential Change in Retail Development (sf)
Queens Plaza Vicinity					
Block 422 Site**	422	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 21, 30, 31	59,380	+692,560	+20,000
Court Square Vicinity					
Block 435 Site*	435	13, 28, 29	49,333	-577,000	-15,000
Block 428 Site*	428	1	37,000	-286,000	-10,000
Block 433 Site**	433	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 3, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41	71,003	+832,036	+20,000
Net Change in Development Versus Proposed Action:				+661,596	+15,000
Notes:					
* Development Site Projected under Proposed Actions					
** Development Site Projected Under Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative					

The actual amount of new development that takes place in Long Island City depends on the overall growth of demand for Class A space in the region, the relative competitiveness of this area in comparison with the competing business areas, and the ability to market space and finance and undertake development. Given these considerations, it is unlikely that the amount of development anticipated for the proposed action would be exceeded by 2010. However, the possibility of a positive variation in the level of development of approximately 10 percent, as in this alternative, cannot be excluded and is therefore evaluated in this alternative.

Special Permit Site

G & M Realty, L.P. has modified their application for a Special Permit pursuant to proposed Section 117-56 of the Zoning Resolution to modify the bulk provisions on Block 86, Lots 1 and 22, and Block 72, Lot 80. The Special Permit would continue to allow an additional 3.0 FAR on the site and a modification of the streetwall location provisions provided that CPC finds that a publicly accessible open space of at least 20,000 square feet will be provided that meets the recreational needs of the community.

In contrast to the "full-buildout" Special Permit building that was analyzed for the proposed actions, this building would be smaller (977,248 square feet compared to 1,025,016 square feet) and would have less open space (34,911 square feet compared to 45,500 square feet).

ILLUSTRATIVE BULK CONFIGURATIONS

To assess the visual and contextual impacts of the proposed actions, bulk configurations that conform to the zoning proposed for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative were formulated to illustrate the development that could be created on Block 422 and Block 433 as a result of this alternative. Block 422 and Block 433 would be developed with new office towers on 4-story bases as a result of this alternative, while the buildings projected for development on Office Sites A and B, and the institutional site would be the same as in the proposed actions.

As a result of modifications to the Special Permit application, the building proposed for construction on the Special Permit site would differ slightly in bulk from that assumed for development under the proposed actions as well. Due to the reduction in minimum streetwall height on narrow streets to 23 feet, residential buildings projected for development under this alternative could be somewhat taller than those projected for the proposed action.

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF THIS ALTERNATIVE

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

Like the proposed actions, this alternative would support the goals identified in DCP's Plan for Long Island City: A Framework for Development. By permitting greater density in close proximity to the area's two transit nodes—Queens Plaza and Court Square—the critical mass of buildings that would create a Central Business District in Long Island City could be developed under this alternative. By increasing the permissible maximum FAR on two blocks in close proximity to transit, this alternative is likely to substantially increase the degree to which public policy goals are supported.

Both the proposed actions and this alternative would permit greater maximum FARs than are currently permitted, require new developments to have minimum streetwall heights, and permit the highest densities on blocks in close proximity to major streets and major transit hubs. This alternative would provide even greater capacity than would the proposed actions, to promote high-density development along Queens Plaza South and Jackson Avenue and in close proximity to the Queens Plaza/Jackson Avenue and Court Square transit hubs. Thus, the zoning of the proposed actions would result in benefits substantially greater in regards to satisfying public policy goals than that of the proposed actions.

Overall, this alternative would result in more intense development but a similar mix of land uses than the proposed action. Office uses would increase as a result of both the proposed actions and this alternative, and the area would take on the land-use characteristics of a central business district in either case. The alternative would, however, increase the density of office development near the Queens Plaza/Jackson Avenue and Court Square transit hubs to a greater extent than the proposed actions. It would thereby have the potential to increase the chances for creation of a fourth CBD in Long Island City and has a greater likelihood of resulting in land use benefits in the form of CBD creation than would the proposed actions.

Socioeconomic Conditions

The additional office and retail development associated with the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would increase the amount of development expected in the rezoning area by approximately 13 percent. This alternative is likely to result in similar effects on socioeconomic conditions as the proposed actions. Overall, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions are expected to create substantial development pressures that would result in significant indirect displacement of businesses. Subject to future market conditions, existing conditions are likely to continue with or without this alternative.

Two additional blocks in the study area (Blocks 422 and 433) are projected for development under this alternative. It is likely that all of the properties in these two blocks would be assembled under competitive fair market conditions. If the blocks were developed without the assistance of any city, state, or federal agency, no relocation benefits or assistance would be mandated by law for commercial and industrial owners and tenants.

Community Facilities

Similar to the proposed action, the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning alternative would increase demand on police and fire services, and schools. This alternative would have the same effects on schools as would the proposed actions, since it would include the same number of residential units. It would also result in similar effects on police and fire services. Neither this alternative nor the proposed action would have a significant adverse impact on community facilities in the area.

Open Space

The increased office space and retail development that would result from this alternative compared to the proposed actions would bring approximately 2,700 more employees to the area, an increase of approximately 13 percent over the proposed actions. It is assumed that an open space of approximately 35,000 square feet is developed on the Special Permit Site for this alternative, compared to a 45,500-square-foot open space for the proposed actions.

Neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would have a significant adverse impact on residential open space ratios. In the commercial study area, the additional new workers would decrease the area's passive open space ratios below those of the proposed actions, as follows:

- The passive open space ratio in the ¼-mile study area would be 0.062 acres per 1,000 workers, versus 0.072 for the proposed actions. This would be a 26 percent decline over no-action conditions, compared to a 14 percent decline under the proposed actions with

the Special Permit.

- The combined passive open space ratio in the ¼-mile study area would be 0.056 acres per 1,000 workers and residents, versus 0.064 for the proposed actions. This would be a 31 percent decline over no-action conditions, compared to a 22 percent decline under the proposed actions with the Special Permit.

These declines would exacerbate the proposed action's significant adverse impact to passive open space resources. To fully meet the needs of the net increase of 2,696 workers, the proposed actions with the zoning alternative would need to include 3.18 acres of open space (which is 0.40 acres more than the 2.78 that would be needed to meet the needs of the workers under the proposed actions).

Between DEIS and FEIS, DCP and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) examined the possibility of mitigating this impact by upgrading open spaces in the vicinity of the rezoning area. However, neither of the two primary open spaces in the vicinity—Court Square Park and Citibank Plaza—present opportunities for upgrading or improvement. They are both in good repair and contain ample seating areas and opportunities for passive recreation. Therefore, mitigation of this impact would not be feasible and it would remain an unmitigated adverse impact.

Shadows

This alternative would result in the construction of office towers on two new blocks that would not see construction under the proposed actions. Each of these buildings has been screened for its potential to cast shadows on open spaces in the vicinity. Overall, the screening analysis concluded that the new building on Block 433 would cast new shadows on Citibank Plaza during the very early morning during summer months that would last for just over one hour and cover no more than half the area at its greatest extent. This is not likely to result in an effect on either the growth of vegetation in the open space or the users of this open space, and therefore would not result in a significant adverse shadow impact on Citibank Plaza.

The modifications to the Special Permit Application would not result in a building tower that would differ substantially in height or form from that analyzed for the original Special Permit Application as part of the proposed actions. Therefore, as under the proposed actions, the revised building proposed for construction on the Special Permit Site would not result in significant adverse shadow impacts on existing open space resources. The open space proposed for construction on the Special Permit site would, however, differ somewhat from the space originally proposed for construction. Nonetheless, all areas of the open space would still receive sunlight during some of the day, and all areas that include shrubs, trees, and lawns would still receive sunlight during most of either the morning hours or the afternoon hours—a sufficient duration to allow the growth of vegetation. Due to the fact that the open space would never be cast entirely into shadow, vegetative features of the open space would not be adversely affected by shadows, and the open space would not exist without the proposed actions and the tall building constructed adjacent to it, the shadows cast by the Special Permit Building would not constitute a significant adverse impact on the Special Permit open space.

Cultural Resources

While the new development on Block 433 would be visible from the New York State Supreme Court building (listed on the State and National Registers and a New York City Landmark), which is there is no meaningful contextual relationship between the court building and the majority of the structures on Block 433.

Demolition of the former Daily Star Building located on Block 422, if it is developed, would constitute a significant adverse effect on historic resources, since this building has been determined eligible for the State and National Registers of Historic Places and for designation as a New York City Landmark. To mitigate these effects, in consultation with and approval by LPC, a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) level photographic documentation and an accompanying narrative outlining the history and significance of the building was prepared. The scope of work for the mitigation was approved by LPC on April 18, 2001. As requested by LPC, additional research was undertaken at the LPC archives, the Queens Historical Society, and the Local History (Long Island) Division of the Queens Public Library. In addition, other repositories were also consulted, including the Queens Department of Buildings, Avery Library at Columbia University, and the Municipal Archives. As requested by LPC, two sets of the HABS level archival photos and the historical narrative were submitted to LPC for archival storage, and one set submitted to the Local History Division of the Queens Public Library. In comments dated May 8, 2001, LPC approved the HABS-level documentation as mitigation for the significant adverse impact on the Daily Star Building.

Elsewhere, it is anticipated that the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Alternative would have similar general contextual effects as those of the proposed actions. These would not result in significant adverse effects on any other historic resources.

The potential development sites have been determined not sensitive for prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources. Therefore, this alternative would not have impacts greater than those identified for the proposed actions. The potential cemetery relating to the Van Alst Family, located on Office Site B (Block 264), would require additional testing under both this alternative and the proposed actions, to ensure that no adverse impacts occur. Like for the proposed actions, the demapping will require that the applicant follow the recommendations set forth in the Stage 1A Documentary Study prepared for the West Street/Block 264 site in regards to testing and mitigation of any identified archaeological resources on West Street/Block 264.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

Like the proposed actions, this alternative would substantially alter the urban design and appearance of the rezoning area. The proposed alternative would not result in significant adverse effects on street patterns or transportation elements, streetscapes, or block shapes. Neither street patterns, transportation elements, nor block shapes would be altered. The streetscape may potentially be improved by the creation of street-level amenities and sidewalk widenings at the potential development sites. The urban design effects of the addition to the development scenario of Blocks 433 and 422 would be similar to those described for the proposed actions and, therefore, these changes would not be expected to

be significantly adverse.

The tall groupings of buildings would be visible for miles around; however, this would contribute to the creation of a diverse, visually interesting skyline, and this change would not be expected to adversely affect visual resources.

The modifications to the Special Permit application would not alter the conclusions of the urban design analysis presented for the proposed actions; neither the modified Special Permit building or the building analyzed under the proposed actions would adversely affect the urban design of the area.

Neighborhood Character

This alternative would have similar but more pronounced effects on neighborhood character than the proposed actions. The concentration of new office construction along Jackson Avenue and Queens Plaza South would increase activity along those streets—in the form of additional workers, visitors, etc.—and change the design, visual appearance, socioeconomic make-up, traffic, and noise of these streets and the surrounding areas in ways similar to the proposed actions. However, by adding another large office tower along Queens Plaza South, and by effectively shifting development from two buildings in the vicinity of 23rd Street (on Blocks 248 and 235) to one large tower along Jackson Avenue, this alternative would increase levels of activity along the major boulevards of Long Island City to a greater extent than would the proposed actions. Overall, this alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. On the contrary, this alternative would result in development that positively changes neighborhood character in targeted areas, according to stated public policy goals.

Hazardous Materials

Both additional potential development sites in the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative—on Blocks 433 and 422—have potential environmental impairments resulting from previous on-site industrial or manufacturing uses, and/or petroleum storage. Consequently, the proposed zoning map actions for this alternative would include (E) designations for all lots on Blocks 433 and 422, in addition to the (E) designations discussed above for the proposed actions. (In addition to those lots listed above in Table S-3, this alternative would add the lots listed below in Table S-7.) The text of the (E) designations is as follows:

Due to the possible presence of hazardous materials on the aforementioned designated sites there is the potential for contamination of the soil and groundwater. To determine if contamination exists and perform any appropriate remediation, the following tasks must be undertaken by the fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation prior to any demolition or disturbance of soil on the lot.

TASK 1

The fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation will be required to prepare a scope of work for any soil, gas, or groundwater

sampling and testing needed to determine if contamination exists, the extent of the contamination, and to what extent remediation may be required. The scope of work will include all relevant supporting documentation, including site plans and sampling locations. This scope of work will be submitted to NYCDEP for review and approval prior to implementation. It will be reviewed to ensure that an adequate number of samples will be collected and that appropriate parameters are selected for laboratory analysis.

No sampling program may begin until written approval of a work plan and sampling protocol is received from NYCDEP. The number and location of sample sites should be selected to adequately characterize the type and extent of the contamination, and the condition of the remainder of the site. 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 choosing sampling sites and performing sampling will be provided by NYCDEP upon request.

TASK 2

A written report with findings and a summary of the data must be presented to NYCDEP after completion of the testing phase and laboratory analysis for review and approval. After receiving such test results, a determination will be provided by NYCDEP if the results indicate that remediation is necessary.

If NYCDEP determines that no remediation is necessary, written notice shall be given by NYCDEP.

If remediation is necessary according to test results, a proposed remediation plan must be submitted to NYCDEP for review and approval. The fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation must perform such remediation as determined necessary by NYCDEP. After completing the remediation, the fee owner(s) of the lot restricted by this (E) designation should provide proof that the work has been satisfactorily completed.

A NYCDEP-approved construction-related health and safety plan would be implemented during excavation and construction 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 NYCDEP for review and approval prior to implementation.

Infrastructure

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would increase the demand for water and energy, and result in an increased generation of sewage and solid waste over that of the proposed actions. Overall, the alternative would increase water and energy consumption by

approximately 13 percent over the proposed actions. As this would be a small increase in service demand over the proposed actions, the area's infrastructure would be able to accommodate those changes. Thus, the infrastructure serving the rezoning area would be adequate to meet the projected demand from either the proposed actions or the zoning alternative, and no adverse effects would result from either condition.

Traffic and Parking

This alternative would generate additional person trips and vehicle trips beyond the volumes generated under the proposed action. This alternative would generate approximately 150 more vehicles in the AM peak hour, about 90 more vehicles per hour in the midday peak hour, and about 135 more vehicles in the PM peak hour. This would represent about an 8 to 9 percent increase in traffic volume over the volume generated by the proposed action in the AM and PM peak hours, and about a 7 percent increase in the midday peak hour.

Because of the high volumes of traffic and adverse levels of service already occurring in the study area, this additional traffic would generate increased impacts within the traffic study area, even though the amount of additional traffic would be relatively modest at many locations. Eight intersections in the traffic study area were analyzed for potential additional significant traffic impacts under this alternative: Queens Boulevard/Jackson Avenue/Queens Plaza East; Northern Boulevard/Queens Plaza East/Queens Plaza North; Queens Plaza North and South at 28th Street; Queens Boulevard/Skillman Avenue; Thomson Avenue/Skillman Avenue; Jackson Avenue/44th Drive; Jackson Avenue/21st Street; and Northern Boulevard/31st Street. These analysis locations provided a representative set of potentially critical intersections (i.e., eight of the most critical, or significantly impacted intersections) for detailed level of service analyses, and were analyzed in the critical AM and PM peak hours. The findings at these eight locations are not representative of all intersections analyzed for the proposed action, since most of the unaffected intersections under the proposed actions would also be unaffected by this alternative.

The analyses at these eight locations showed that at most analysis locations, the same mitigation measures that would be sufficient to mitigate significant impacts under the proposed action would be sufficient for this alternative as well, but that this alternative would: (1) generate significant traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated (they could be partially mitigated) at some locations where the proposed action had significant impacts that could be fully mitigated; and (2) would increase the magnitude of impacts at some locations where the proposed action would be able to only partially mitigate its impacts.

Under this alternative, which includes the revised Special Permit application and incorporates the provisions of the alternative with increased accessory parking, the amount of parking to be provided would be increased from 600 spaces under the proposed action to 1,750 spaces (250 spaces are assumed to be developed at the Block 422, Block 433, and Special Permit sites, and 500 spaces are assumed to be developed at the QP Marketplace and Municipal Garage Sites). This would significantly reduce and potentially eliminate the projected parking shortfall (projected at 1,000 to 1,200 spaces with the proposed actions) in the area in the future with new development fully in place. This would also substantially reduce and may eliminate the amount of unnecessary circulation of traffic, and potential illegal parking, in the post-AM peak since there would be greater opportunities for those who

drive to the study area to find off-street or on-street parking spaces.

Table S-7

**Potential Contamination for Additional
Projected Development Sites,
Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative**

Potential Development Sites	Site Ltr.	Block	Lot	Cluster	Identified Potential for Contamination	
					Petroleum	Non-Petroleum
Block 422 Site	A	422	1	—	X	X
		422	4	—		X
		422	6	—		X
		422	7	—	X	X
		422	9	—	X	
		422	21	—	X	X
		422	30	—		X
		422	31	—	X	X
Block 433 Site	B	433	1	—	X	
		433	2	—	X	
		433	3	—	X	
		433	4	—	X	
		433	5	—	X	
		433	6	—	X	X
		433	8	—	X	X
		433	12	—	X	X
		433	31	—	X	X
		433	35	—	X	
		433	36	—	X	
		433	37	—	X	
		433	38	—	X	X
		433	39	—	X	X
433	41	—	X	X		

Like for the proposed actions, this alternative will require the implementation of the traffic monitoring plan such as that outlined for the proposed actions. The traffic monitoring plan is described below in the section on Mitigation for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative.

Transit and Pedestrians

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would result in an increase in the number of peak hour subway, bus, LIRR, and walk trips. The increase in trips under this alternative increases the severity of impacts at some locations:

- **Subway Line-Haul Analysis.** This alternative and the proposed actions would affect subway line haul in the same way as the proposed actions, resulting in significant adverse impacts on the Manhattan-bound E, F, N and the No. 7 trains in the AM peak hour, and on the Queens-bound E and N trains in the PM peak hour.
- **Station Elements:** The station elements analysis identified three new impacts at the Queens Plaza station in addition to the impacts identified for the proposed actions. These impacts would occur: at the S3 staircase in the AM peak hour; at the S3 staircase in the PM peak hour; and at the P5 staircase in the AM peak hour. Further measures to mitigate these station element impacts would be needed at the Queen Plaza station: the S3 staircase would require 14-inch widening to absorb the additional trips generated by the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative and the P5 staircase would require a 7-inch widening to alleviate the impact at that location.

In terms of pedestrian elements, this alternative would result in the same significant adverse impacts as the proposed actions, and would add the following impacts:

- A potential pedestrian crosswalk impact at the south crosswalk at 27th Street and Queens Plaza South, which would operate at unacceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours. Because no conflicting traffic movement, other than right turns, pass through the crosswalk, the pedestrian has the right-of-way for the entire signal cycle, so that the actual operation at this intersection would be at an acceptable LOS and no significant adverse impact would occur.
- A new significant pedestrian corner impact location at the southwest corner of 27th Street and Queens Plaza South in the AM and PM peak hours. Removing the obstructions on the southwest corner and widening the west sidewalk of 27th Street by 8 inches would mitigate the impact in the AM and PM peak periods.

Air Quality

The air quality analysis conducted for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Alternative, with proposed traffic mitigation, would not result in any violations of the CO standard or any significant adverse impacts at the receptor locations. With this alternative, CO levels would be the same as or similar to levels under the proposed actions. Therefore, neither this alternative nor the proposed actions would result in any significant adverse impacts on air quality or in any violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would not result in any impacts related to industrial source air emissions beyond those identified for the proposed actions. This alternative, like the proposed actions, would have the potential to result in significant adverse industrial source air quality impacts on Office Site B from the Filmtreat facility. Therefore, like for the proposed actions, the prevention of significant adverse industrial source air quality impacts at operable windows or air intakes will be achieved through an (E)

designation, as outlined above for the proposed actions

The only stationary source of air pollutants associated with the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would be the emissions from the gas-fired HVAC systems. Based on the methodologies in the CEQR Technical Manual, a screening analysis was performed for the HVAC systems of buildings projected for development on Blocks 422 and 433. This analysis determined that there would be no potential significant air quality impacts from the proposed HVAC systems of this alternative's projected development sites.

Noise

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative, similar to the proposed actions, would not significantly increase noise levels at receptor sites in the area. As a busy area with high traffic volumes and elevated rail, noise levels at most locations in the study area are relatively high. Because of the high No-Build traffic volumes and noise levels, this alternative, like the proposed action, would increase noise levels by less than 3 dBA, which would be an insignificant increase based upon CEQR noise impact criteria.

With regard to building attenuation, noise measurements taken for the proposed actions were applied to buildings projected for construction on Blocks 422 and 433. The analysis indicates that buildings on Blocks 422 and 433 would require attenuation to achieve acceptable interior noise levels. Like for the projected non-residential development sites in the proposed action, these blocks would receive (E) designations. Table S-8 lists the attenuation requirements for the sites that would receive (E) designations with the Queens Plaza Zoning Alternative. With these levels of attenuation, noise levels will satisfy CEPO-CEQR noise standards.

The text of the (E) designation is as follows on Block 422, Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 21, 30, and 31; Block 433, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41; Block 72, Lot 80; Block 86, Lots 1, 6, 7, 8, and 22; Block 263, Lots 1 and 2; Block 264, Lots 1, 4, 15, and 17; Block 420 Lot 1, and Block 428, Lot 1:

In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, at facades to Queens Plaza, 23rd Street, and Davis Street future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 45 dB(A), in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A); at facades to Crane Street, Crescent Street, and Hunter Street, future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 25 dB(A); at facades to other roadways and Sunnyside Yard, future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 35 dB(A), in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A). The minimum window/wall attenuation at each facade must extend around the corner of the identified facade to include any windows located within 15 feet of the corner on adjacent facades. In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided.

Table S-8

Locations of (E) Designations for Noise Attenuation

Site	Block/Lot	Facade*	Site	dBA
Locations of (E) Designations for Noise Attenuation under the Proposed Actions				
Office Site B (QP Marketplace Site)	263/1, 2 264/1,4,15,17	North (Queens Plaza)	R2	45
		East (Sunnyside Yard)	R7	35
		South (Orchard Street)	3	35
		West (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
Office Site A (Municipal Garage Site)	420/1	North (Queens Plaza)	R2	45
		East (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
		South (42nd Road)	3	35
		West (28th Street)	3	35
Office Site C (Block 435 Site)	435/13,28,29	North (43rd Avenue)	R4	35
		East (Crescent Street)	R3	25
		South (44th Road)	R4	35
		West (24th Street)	R4	35
Office Site D (Block 428 Site)	428/1	North (Queensboro Bridge ramp)	R4	35
		East (24th Street)	R4	35
		South (43rd Avenue)	R4	35
		West (23rd Street)	2	45
Institutional Use Site	432/8	North (42nd Road)	3	35
		East (Jackson Avenue)	3	35
		South (Queensboro Bridge ramp)	3	35
		West (Hunter Street)	R3	25
Office Site E (Special Permit Site)	72/80 86/1,6,7,8,22	North (Davis Street)	1	45
		East (Sunnyside Yard)	R7	35
		South (Crane Street)	R5	25
		West (Jackson Avenue)	R6	35
Additional Locations of (E) Designations for Noise Attenuation under Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative				
Site	422/1,3,4,5,6, 7,9,21,30,31	North (Queens Plaza)		45
		East (28th Street)		35
		South (42nd Road)		35
		West (27th Street)		35
Site	433/ 1-6,8,12,31, 35,36,37,38, 39,41	North (43rd Avenue)		35
		East (Jackson Avenue)		35
		South (44th Drive/Road)		35
		West (Hunter Street)		25
* Includes windows on identified facade and within 15 feet of corner of identified facade, on adjacent facades.				

The text of the (E) designation would remain as follows on Block 432, Lot 8 and Block 435, Lots 13, 28, and 29:

In order to ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, at all facades to roadways future uses must provide a closed window condition with a minimum window/wall attenuation of 35 dB(A) as stated in the chart above, in order to maintain an interior noise level of 45 dB(A). In order to maintain a closed-window condition, an alternate means of ventilation must also be provided.

The (E) designations would ensure that there would be no significant adverse noise impacts as a result of the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative.

Construction

Potential noise and air quality impacts during construction would occur with either the proposed actions or this alternative, but in neither case would they be considered significant. Traffic mitigation with the start of the large-scale construction would be required under this alternative as well as the proposed actions. This alternative would also temporarily displace parking from the Municipal Garage, creating the same temporary problem as with the proposed actions. Construction activities in this alternative, as in the proposed actions, would be of limited duration

D. MITIGATION

In a number of areas (described above), additional studies were conducted between the DEIS and FEIS to define or refine appropriate mitigation measures for significant adverse impacts projected to occur as a result of the proposed actions. Mitigation measures are as follows.

OPEN SPACE

As described in Chapter 5, the proposed rezoning and other related actions would bring a large number of new workers as well as some new residents to an area that is currently experiencing a severe shortage of open spaces according to the city's guidelines. The new population brought by the actions would increase the demand for passive open spaces in an area where few such spaces exist. With the proposed actions, the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 workers for the ¼-mile study area would decrease by nearly 40 percent, to 0.01 acres per 1,000. Thus, the addition of new workers as a result of the proposed actions would result in a significant adverse impact on open space resources.

Between DEIS and FEIS, DCP and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) examined the possibility of mitigating this impact by upgrading open spaces in the vicinity of the rezoning area. However, neither of the two primary open spaces in the vicinity—Court Square Park and Citibank Plaza—present opportunities for upgrading or improvement. They are both in good repair and contain ample seating areas and opportunities for passive recreation. Therefore, mitigation of this impact would not be feasible and it would remain an unmitigated adverse impact.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

To the extent that archaeological resources remain, significant impacts would potentially only result from site disturbance associated with development of Office Site B (QP Marketplace), which is in the vicinity of West Street, which would be demapped as one of the proposed actions. Specifically, portions of West Street and Block 264 on Site B may be sensitive for a cemetery relating to the Van Alst family. Since the cemetery is on a potential development site, it is not likely that the cemetery site could be avoided during project construction. If there are burials on the cemetery site, proposed construction could result in significant adverse impacts to these resources. Therefore, additional work, first in the form of new continuous soil borings, and then Stage 1B testing, would be undertaken at the site to avoid any significant adverse impacts. Soil borings would be conducted to determine subsurface conditions, such as fill layers, with the locations of borings approved by an archaeologist prior to their execution. Based on these results, Stage 1B testing would be undertaken in the potentially sensitive areas. The testing phase would first include the preparation of a testing protocol by a professional archaeologist, to be reviewed and approved by LPC prior to implementation. Testing would be conducted by a professional archaeologist, and appropriate research issues would be formulated in the event of a discovery. Since it would not be possible to test the entire potentially sensitive area, it is likely that on-site monitoring by an archaeologist during foundation construction would be required by LPC.

To ensure that the recommendations set forth in the Stage 1A Documentary Study prepared for the site and described above are followed, the mapping agreement in connection with Map No. 4953 eliminating, discontinuing and closing West Street, east of Jackson Avenue, shall state the following: that the map shall not be filed with the appropriate agencies until the applicant, subject to review and approval of LPC, has completed the testing, the necessary mitigation, if required, and LPC issues a Letter of Satisfaction to the Department of Buildings. The necessary mitigation measures must comply with the penal code and the New York Archaeological Standards (NYAC) 1994, that state that any lineal descendants must be contacted—should any remains be encountered—so that such remains may be properly handled.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

During the period between the DEIS and the FEIS, mitigation measures required re-examination due to changed traffic operational patterns for the Queensboro Bridge, and the following additional analyses were conducted:

- A signal warrant analysis for the proposed signal at Jackson Avenue and 46th Road.
- Assessment of the need for a signalized crossing at the proposed midblock crosswalk on Northern Boulevard between 40th and 41st Avenues.
- A signal progression analysis for locations where signal cycle changes are proposed as mitigation.
- A map of all proposed traffic and related mitigation measures for inclusion in the FEIS.

- Identification of specific on-street posted parking regulation changes for inclusion in the mitigation package.
- Preparation of a mitigation monitoring plan for inclusion in the FEIS, focusing on evaluating conditions and responding with mitigation as development proceeds over the next 10 years.

Table S-9 summarizes impacted locations and their ability to be mitigated. The mitigation measures are summarized below.

**Table S-9
Significant Traffic Impact Mitigation Summary**

Signalized Intersections	AM	Midda y	PM
No Significant Impact	7	12	8
Mitigated Impact	16	14	13
Partially Mitigated Impact	3	1	4
Unmitigated Impact	2	1	3
Notes: Seven of the eight unsignalized intersections would not be significantly impacted during any of the analysis hours. One unsignalized intersection (Jackson Avenue and 46th Road) would be significantly impacted during all three analysis hours and could be mitigated by the installation of a traffic signal; projected volumes on the "minor street" (46th Road) do not appear to be sufficient to warrant a traffic signal, in which case the impact would be unmitigated.			

SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES

- Jackson Avenue/11th Street/Pulaski Bridge. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) direct all traffic making right turns from the Pulaski Bridge to exit off of the bridge onto the service road adjacent to it, and provide these right turns with sufficient green time to accommodate them; (b) make the left lane approaching Jackson Avenue on the bridge into a left turn only lane; (c) add north- and westbound lead phases to the signal phasing, change the signal cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds in the AM peak period, and re-allocate signal timings; (d) re-stripe the westbound Jackson Avenue approach to provide three 10-foot travel lanes; and (e) prohibit parking along the eastbound Jackson Avenue approach and re-stripe it for a left turn only lane and two other lanes. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measure in place.
- Jackson Avenue/21st Street. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) shift the centerline of the avenue slightly to allow for three 12-foot lanes in each direction (including the existing left-turn lanes); (b) add an eastbound/westbound Jackson Avenue left turn phase, change the signal cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds during the AM peak period, and re-

allocate signal timings; and (c) prohibit parking along eastbound Jackson Avenue and enforce parking prohibitions along southbound 21st Street. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measure in place.

- Jackson Avenue/23rd Street. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) prohibit parking along northbound Jackson Avenue to gain an additional travel lane, with each approach having a left turn only lane and two general travel lanes; (b) shift the Davis Street centerline and re-stripe its approach from one 13-foot lane to two 10-foot lanes; and (c) add an exclusive left turn phase for Jackson Avenue left turns, change the cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds in the AM peak period, and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measure in place.
- Jackson Avenue/42nd Road. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) prohibit parking along northbound Jackson Avenue to gain an exclusive left-turn lane in addition to the two regular travel lanes; (b) re-stripe the southbound Jackson Avenue approach to provide one exclusive right-turn lane (onto 42nd Road and toward the garage entrance) and two regular lanes; (c) prohibit parking along eastbound 42nd Road and re-stripe the eastbound approach from one 19-foot lane (including parking) to two 11-foot travel lanes (without parking); and (d) add a new lead left turn signal phase for northbound Jackson Avenue, allow right turns from eastbound 42nd Road to proceed concurrently with the northbound left turn lead phase, change the signal cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds in the AM peak period, and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Jackson Avenue/43rd Avenue/Purves Street. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) prohibit parking along northbound Jackson Avenue and shift the centerline of the street to provide left-turn lanes in each direction; and (b) change the signal cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds in the AM peak period and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Jackson Avenue/44th Drive. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) prohibit parking along northbound Jackson Avenue and shift the centerline to add a left-turn lane along each approach; (b) re-stripe the lanes on east- and westbound 44th Drive so that the eastbound approach has an exclusive left turn lane and two general traffic lanes, and the westbound approach has one shared left turn/through lane and one right turn only lane; and (c) add a lead southbound Jackson Avenue signal phase and a lead eastbound 44th Drive signal phase, change the signal cycle length from 120 to 60 seconds in the AM peak period, and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Jackson Avenue/46th Road. This unsignalized intersection would require installation of a traffic signal to process left turns from eastbound 46th Road onto Jackson Avenue. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated. However, a signal warrant analysis was conducted according to NYCDOT procedures. It was determined that projected traffic volumes on the "minor street" (46th Road) would not be sufficient to warrant a traffic signal.
- Jackson Avenue/Queens Plaza East/Queens Boulevard. Proposed mitigation includes:

(a) prohibit all left turns (currently, only left turns from northbound Jackson Avenue and eastbound Queens Plaza South are prohibited) and prohibit right turns from southbound Queens Plaza East onto Queens Plaza North; (b) designate the right-most lane on northbound Jackson Avenue as a shared through/right-turn lane rather than as an exclusive right-turn lane; (c) prohibit parking along the east side of Queens Plaza East on the far side of the intersection so that there would be three northbound through lanes available at all times; and (d) eliminate the lead westbound signal phase and the lag southbound signal phase, which would no longer be necessary without left turns from these approaches, and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.

- 21st Street/44th Drive. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) re-stripe the southbound 21st Street approach to provide two 12-foot travel lanes; and (b) change the signal cycle from 120 to 90 seconds and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- 21st Street/Queens Plaza South. Proposed mitigation includes adding a lead southbound 21st Street lead signal phase and re-allocating signal timings in the PM peak period. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Queens Plaza North at Crescent Street, 28th Street, and JFK Commuter Plaza, and Crescent Street at 41st Avenue. The proposed actions would generate a relatively modest volume of traffic through these intersections oriented to the retail uses anticipated to emerge along 41st Avenue. Due to the level of congestion prevalent in this area, it is either not possible to mitigate conditions at all four intersections or, if mitigation is theoretically needed at just one or two of these intersections, it would be unrealistic to assume that "real" mitigation exists if the incremental volume of traffic is merely processed a few hundred feet ahead to another intersection where it could not be processed.
- Queens Plaza North and 23rd Street. Signal timing changes could mitigate impacts at this location, which are anticipated only for the midday peak hour.
- Northern Boulevard/Queens Plaza North/Queens Plaza East. A substantial mitigation package has been tested at this location and could only partially mitigate traffic impacts during each of the three analysis hours. This set of mitigation measures includes: (a) re-channelize southbound Northern Boulevard to separate the two right-turn lanes heading toward the Queensboro Bridge from the two through lanes proceeding directly south toward the Jackson Avenue corridor, allowing traffic enforcement agents posted at this location to advance the through traffic lanes while holding the right-turn lanes, and allowing the through lanes to utilize unused green signal time otherwise allocated to 41st Avenue traffic or northbound Queens Plaza East traffic; (b) relocate the pedestrian crosswalk from the immediate north side of the intersection to a midblock location slightly north of the intersection, with signal control of the new pedestrian crossing location; and (c) prohibit southbound left turns toward 41st Avenue in the PM peak hour. Significant traffic impacts could only be partially mitigated, unless other capital-cost or policy-oriented measures are enacted that would reduce or divert traffic from this location (described further below).

- Northern Boulevard/31st Street. Proposed mitigation at this location would include: (a) re-stripe the westbound Northern Boulevard approach to create three 11-foot travel lanes by using a portion of the painted median; (b) designate the left-most lane of the westbound approach for through traffic not destined to the Queens Plaza/Queensboro Bridge area (for the AM and midday periods) so these through traffic volumes to sites south of Queens Plaza would not be subjected to the congested conditions characterizing access to the bridge (this would require a variable-message sign that can change the designated use of this lane by time of day); and (c) re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Van Dam Street at Borden Avenue and at the LIE Westbound Exit Ramp. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) re-stripe the westbound exit ramp from the LIE to provide a right turn only lane along with two regular travel lanes; (b) post a traffic enforcement agent at this location to enforce the "No Left Turn" prohibition from the westbound LIE exit roadway onto southbound Van Dam Street; and (c) change the signal cycle from 120 to 90 seconds and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated.
- Hunters Point Avenue/Greenpoint Avenue. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) eliminate the 6-foot-wide cross-hatched area that narrows Hunters Point Avenue down to a single westbound lane approaching Greenpoint Avenue, and provide a 10-foot-wide shared left turn/through lane and a 10-foot-wide right turn only lane; and (b) change the signal cycle length from 90 to 60 seconds, modify the signal timings, and add a southbound lead phase in the AM peak hour and an eastbound lead phase in the PM peak hour. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated.
- Van Dam Street/Hunters Point Avenue. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) offset the Hunters Point Avenue centerline to provide a second westbound travel lane; (b) offset the Van Dam Street centerline to provide a northbound left-turn lane in addition to the existing travel lanes; (c) prohibit parking along the southbound Van Dam Street and eastbound Hunters Point Avenue approaches; and (d) change the signal cycle length from 120 to 90 seconds during the AM peak hour, adding a new northbound lead phase, and re-allocating signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these measures in place.
- Hunters Point Avenue/Skillman Avenue. Proposed mitigation at this location includes: (a) re-stripe Hunters Point Avenue to provide two west- and one eastbound lane (in place of the existing one west- and two eastbound lanes); (b) add a new eastbound lead phase and re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated.
- Hunters Point Avenue/21st Street. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) shift the Hunters Point Avenue centerline and re-stripe the eastbound approach from one 15-foot-wide travel lane to an 11-foot-wide lane and the westbound approach from two 10-foot-wide lanes to two 12-foot-wide lanes; (b) shift the 21st Street centerline and re-stripe the northbound approach from one 17-foot-wide lane to one 12-foot-wide lane, and the southbound approach from one 11-foot-wide lane to two 10-foot-wide lanes; (c) prohibit parking along the east side of 21st Street north of Hunters Point Avenue; and (d) re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated with these

measures in place.

- Van Dam Street/Thomson Avenue/Queens Boulevard. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) offset the centerline of Van Dam Street south of Thomson Avenue to add a northbound lane, thus providing two left-turn lanes and two general traffic lanes; (b) prohibit parking along the west side of Van Dam Street to effect the offset centerline; (c) increase the signal cycle length from 120 to 135 seconds and modifying the signal phasing and timings; (d) install signage along northbound Van Dam Street at intersections preceding Thomson Avenue that advise motorists to make left turns off of Van Dam Street before reaching Thomson Avenue to avoid congestion ahead. A significant volume of left turns are already being made at 47th Avenue (which then divert back to westbound Thomson Avenue via northbound 31st Street); this "detour" or a similar detour onto westbound 48th Avenue could be promoted to better distribute traffic heading toward the upper level of the Queensboro Bridge in the AM peak hour; and (e) manually offset the Thomson Avenue centerline via traffic cones to provide a fourth eastbound travel lane in the PM peak period and channelize the curb lane for buses and right turns only. Implementation of these measures would mitigate impacts generated by the proposed actions.
- Queens Boulevard/Skillman Avenue. Proposed mitigation includes: (a) shift the Skillman Avenue centerline to gain an additional southbound travel lane; (b) prohibit parking along the east and west sides of Skillman Avenue on both sides of Queens Boulevard to accommodate the additional southbound travel lane through the intersection; and (c) station a traffic enforcement agent to ensure that left turns are not made from east- and westbound Queens Boulevard as per posted traffic regulations. Impacts could only be partially mitigated in the AM and PM peak hours.
- Thomson Avenue/Skillman Avenue. Proposed mitigation at this location includes: (a) manually offset the Thomson Avenue centerline via traffic cones to provide a fourth westbound travel lane in the AM peak hour; (b) prohibit parking along southbound Skillman Avenue to create an additional travel lane designated for right turns only; (c) shift the centerline of northbound Skillman Avenue and re-stripe the northbound approach for one 11-foot-wide left turn-only lane and one 11-foot-wide general travel lane; and (d) re-allocate signal timings. Significant traffic impacts would be fully mitigated in the AM and midday peak periods, but not in the PM peak period, with these measures in place.
- Thomson Avenue at Ramps to/from the Upper Level of the Queensboro Bridge. During the AM peak period there are no impacts because the upper roadways are operated toward Manhattan, so there are no conflicting movements at Thomson Avenue. In the midday period, minor signal timing adjustments are all that would be needed to mitigate any impacts. During the PM peak, however, traffic impacts at this location could not be mitigated since both southbound traffic off of the bridge and eastbound Thomson Avenue traffic would operate at LOS F conditions. The only possible measure at this location would be to allocate additional time to Thomson Avenue traffic at the expense of Queensboro Bridge traffic.

MITIGATION SUMMARY

At several analysis locations along the routes to/from the upper and lower levels of the Queensboro Bridge, significant traffic impacts generated by the proposed actions could not be mitigated in full; at some locations, partial mitigation would be achievable. Additional mitigation may be achievable through much more costly measures than those outlined above or through measures that alter the nature of traffic patterns into and through the area. The overall traffic mitigation and parking improvement plan for the proposed actions would consist of the following components:

1. A package of standard traffic engineering improvements, including shifting centerlines of streets at specific locations to provide left-turn lanes or an additional general traffic lane at key intersections, prohibiting curb parking where necessary (peak period prohibitions at some locations; all-day prohibitions at other locations), signal phasing and timing changes, prohibition of left turns at problem locations (and a right turn prohibition at one specific location), deployment of traffic enforcement agents at key locations, enforcement of existing left turn prohibitions or curb parking prohibitions at specific locations, and channelization improvements to better separate through traffic from turning traffic at some locations. One new traffic signal would also be needed to mitigate impacts at an unsignalized intersection, but since a signal warrant analysis indicated that projects volumes would not warrant the signal, it is not proposed as part of the mitigation of the package unless actual future volumes demonstrate otherwise.
2. A parking strategy plan that intercepts through commuter traffic and local commuter traffic at new park-and-ride facilities before it passes through and congests problem intersections, most notably problem intersections along the Queens Plaza approach to the lower level of the Queensboro Bridge and feeder routes to the Queens Plaza area.
3. If necessary, a plan to better distribute Manhattan-bound through traffic to alternate routes to the Queensboro Bridge and reduce volume demands to the lower level. This would be accomplished using existing ITS technology and real-time communication with a comprehensive traffic enforcement agent deployment plan. This could also serve as part of an overall plan to promote more diversions or transfers from auto trips to public transportation at newly created park-and-ride intercept facilities.
4. The parking plan should seek to accommodate the projected shortfall of up to 1,200 parking spaces under the proposed actions, as well as replace most or all of the curb parking spaces that would be lost due to parking prohibitions required to mitigate adverse traffic conditions. On the other hand, by not providing additional parking spaces to mitigate the full parking shortfall, motorists would be given a greater inducement to not drive to work but to use public transportation instead. It may be necessary, or at least advisable, to create new bus routes, express bus services, and/or increased frequency of bus service to Long Island City from other sections of Queens to help encourage transit use rather than auto use. The projected parking shortfalls would be substantially reduced and potentially eliminated under the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative (see the discussion above in section C, "Alternatives.")

A comprehensive, fully integrated plan combining the above strategic actions could help mitigate all significant traffic impacts generated by the proposed actions. The initial

component of this plan—a package of standard traffic engineering improvements—would be able to mitigate most impacts, but not all. The park-and-ride intercept strategy could reduce the magnitude of unmitigated or partially mitigated impacts, but would most likely not fully mitigate those impacts. Reduction of the amount of development density envisioned under the proposed actions could also reduce the magnitude of unmitigated or partially mitigated impacts, but also could not by itself fully mitigate those locations because the level of background traffic activity and congestion is such that even a modest increase in traffic would create difficult-to-mitigate conditions. A comprehensive traffic, parking, and transit-promotion plan would be needed to fully mitigate all impacts.

As more than one development site is built out (especially more than one office site), the need for implementation of the full traffic mitigation package would become more imminent, especially, for example, regarding offsetting the center line of the Jackson Avenue corridor with its left-turn lanes and significant parking restrictions. This would need to be monitored to determine the appropriate timing for the mitigation plan. Maintaining traffic enforcement agents at locations where they are currently deployed by the New York City Police Department will be needed throughout the development period, beginning with the first new development project.

The traffic analysis indicates that a traffic signal would need to be installed at the unsignalized intersection of Jackson Avenue with 46th Road, but only if future traffic volumes warrant it. This would probably also be needed upon completion of the first major new office tower along or near the Jackson Avenue corridor. On-street parking restrictions and signal re-timings would be phased in as development proceeds. Implementation would adhere to the findings of the traffic monitoring program.

A traffic monitoring program would also be beneficial in identifying other locations that could be impacted by the proposed actions. The detailed traffic impact analyses completed as part of the EIS focused on the most critical corridors as well as on key intersections along secondary, less trafficked, corridors. Monitoring future conditions along these corridors would inform City transportation officials as to whether or not (and when) additional locations would need capacity enhancements. The purpose of the monitoring plan will be to determine the extent to which projected traffic volumes and conditions occur, and the timing for the implementation of traffic mitigation measures.

The traffic monitoring plan will be the responsibility of a task force—the Long Island City Mitigation Implementation Task Force—that will be created for this assignment, and will include representatives of NYCDOT, DCP, MTA/NYCT, and others. NYCDOT has agreed to fund and implement all studies and recommendations of the task force in regards to traffic mitigation measures (see Appendix D, which includes a letter of agreement from NYCDOT).

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIAN IMPACTS

A reassessment of the No Action and Action conditions at the 23rd Street/Ely Avenue station was completed between issuance of the DEIS and FEIS to account for mandatory subway improvements required as part of the Court Square Subdistrict zoning regulations. This reassessment indicated that there would no longer be significant adverse impacts at the 23rd Street/Ely Avenue station, and mitigation for such impacts identified in the DEIS has been

removed from the FEIS. It should be noted that the impacts outlined below do not account for future subway station and train service improvements planned by MTA and NYCT. As future conditions change, actions required to mitigate these impacts may also change.

Mitigation measures were explored according to the methodologies outlined in the CEQR Technical Manual, and are recommended as follows:

- All project-related line-haul impacts could be eliminated with the addition of one Manhattan-bound train on each of the E, F, N, and No. 7 lines in the AM peak hour, and one train each on the N and E lines during the PM peak hour.
- The CEQR Technical Manual provides thresholds to determine the required mitigation for subway stairways. For a stairway with a Build LOS D condition, a required widening of 6 inches or more is considered significant and would require mitigation. For a stairway with a Build LOS E condition, a required widening of 3 inches or more is considered significant, and for a Build LOS F condition, a required widening of 1 inch or more is significant. Project impacts at locations that do not meet these thresholds should be disclosed but are not explicitly considered significant impacts and therefore may not require mitigation.
- The S1 and M1 staircases at Queensboro Plaza station require a 7-inch widening to restore operations to reasonable conditions.
- The Q102 bus line is estimated to operate below capacity in the 2010 Action condition. The addition of one bus to the Q102 route in the PM peak hour would reduce the congestion that would result from project-generated trips and would restore operation to its No Action condition.
- With adjustments to the pedestrian crosswalk striping and in one case signal timing, conditions at the four impacted crosswalks could be restored to their No Action operations or better. The following mitigation would work at each location:
 - The north crosswalk of 27th Street and Queens Plaza North requires a mitigation of widening the crosswalk 4 feet. This improvement would be possible if the parking meters (and related stalls) along the east side of the street were shifted north. Only the first two stalls and meters would need to be modified in order to make room for the widened crosswalk. The other side of the street has no stopping/standing regulation and would therefore not be affected.
 - The north crosswalk of 28th Street and Queens Plaza North requires a 4-foot widening of the crosswalk for mitigation. This would impact the NYCDOT Authorized Parking on the east side of the street; no meters would have to be moved. The west side would not be affected because it is a no parking 7 AM to 7 PM zone. During other times, one parking space would fit between the existing hydrant and the widened crosswalk.
 - The south crosswalk of 28th Street and Queens Plaza South can be mitigated by

widening the crosswalk 5 feet and extending the pedestrian crossing time by 4 seconds only during the PM peak period. This mitigation is possible because during the PM peak, southbound through traffic is not permitted, and therefore the required green time is determined based on the northbound right turn volume.

- The east crosswalk of 23rd Street and Jackson Avenue requires a 6-foot widening and a reallocation of the pedestrian demand. The 6-foot widening would not affect parking on either side of Jackson Avenue. During the AM peak, a reallocation of 30 percent (180 pedestrians) to the west crosswalk in addition to the widening would mitigate this intersection. The resulting redistribution would have 324 pedestrians in the west crosswalk and 394 in the east. During the PM peak, a reallocation of 30 percent (150 pedestrians) to the west crosswalk in addition to the widening would mitigate this intersection. The resulting redistribution would have 303 pedestrians in the west crosswalk and 403 in the east. Both of these redistributions are reasonable in that pedestrian volumes will tend to balance between two adjacent crossings.
- The southwest corner of 28th Street and Queens Plaza South requires mitigation in the Action condition to maintain reasonable operations. With the removal of street furniture and a 1.1-foot widening of the corner on both sides, the corner would operate reasonably.

In terms of the timing of transit mitigation, mitigation at the Queensboro Plaza Station would be required when the two office developments on Queens Plaza are completed. Recommended mitigation at the Queens Plaza station would be needed when the Municipal Garage site was developed.

As described for the traffic mitigation package discussed above, implementation of transit mitigation measures will be monitored by the Long Island City Mitigation Implementation Task Force, a task force that will be created by DCP for this assignment, and will include representatives of the NYCDOT, DCP, MTA/NYCT, and possibly others.

AIR QUALITY

Except for at Sites 1 and 5 where de minimus impacts would occur, the actions would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The proposed actions with the proposed traffic mitigation would not result in any violations of the CO standard or any significant adverse impacts at all the receptor locations.

QUEENS PLAZA SUBDISTRICT ZONING ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION

The mitigation measures required for the proposed actions—in the technical areas of open space, cultural resources, traffic and parking, and transit and pedestrians—would also be required for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative. Like for the proposed actions, implementation of traffic, transit, and pedestrian mitigation will be the responsibility of a task force—the Long Island City Mitigation Implementation Task Force—that will be created for this assignment, and will include representatives of NYCDOT, DCP, MTA/NYCT, and others. NYCDOT and MTA/NYCT have agreed to fund and implement all studies and recommendations of the task force in regards to traffic, transit, and pedestrian mitigation

measures.

A complete discussion of mitigation measures that would be required, should the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative be selected as the preferred alternative, can be found in Appendix E. The following is a summary of mitigation measures that would be required:

OPEN SPACE

To fully meet the open space needs of the employees expected to result from this alternative, a total of approximately 3.18 acres of passive open space would be required, which is approximately 2.38 acres more than that which would be provided. Therefore, approximately 2.38 acres of passive open space would be required to fully mitigate the significant adverse impact to passive open space resources for the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative. As described above, under mitigation for the proposed actions, mitigation of this impact would not be feasible and it would remain an unmitigated adverse impact.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Like for the proposed actions, significant impacts would potentially result from site disturbance associated with development of Office Site B (QP Marketplace). The same mitigation measures would be required under this alternative as under the proposed actions.

Demolition of the former Daily Star Building located on Block 422, which would not occur under the proposed actions, is projected to result from the alternative and would constitute a significant adverse effect on historic resources. To mitigate these effects, in consultation with and approval by LPC, a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) level photographic documentation and an accompanying narrative outlining the history and significance of the building was prepared. In comments dated May 8, 2001, LPC approved the HABS-level documentation as mitigation for the significant adverse impact on the Daily Star Building. No further mitigation will be required.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

The Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative will require a comprehensive package of mitigation measures to address significant traffic impacts that are expected to accompany the developments projected to occur under this alternative. This package of mitigation measures will need to consist of the base mitigation measures as outlined for the proposed actions, above, plus additional mitigation measures due to generation of additional person trips and vehicle trips beyond the volumes generated under the proposed action.

While traffic mitigation needs under the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative would be generally the same as those needed for the proposed actions, the alternative could require additional measures at some locations. Overall, about 7 to 9 percent more traffic is expected to be generated by this Alternative above that expected to be generated by the proposed action. Many or most of the analysis locations that were determined not to be significantly impacted under the proposed actions, would likely also not be significantly impacted under this alternative; some may need signal timing changes or more restrictive parking regulations. Other analysis locations that were determined to be significantly impacted under the proposed actions might be fully mitigated by the same mitigation measures needed for

the proposed actions, or a very comparable set of measures; some additional mitigation may be needed.

The analyses at eight representative intersections showed that at most analysis locations the same mitigation measures that would be sufficient to mitigate significant impacts under the proposed action would be sufficient for this alternative as well, but that this alternative would: (1) generate significant traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated (they could be partially mitigated) at some locations where the proposed action had significant impacts that could be fully mitigated; and (2) would increase the magnitude of impacts at some locations where the proposed action would be able to only partially mitigate its impacts.

Like for the proposed actions, implementation of the traffic monitoring plan, as described for the proposed actions, will help determine the extent to which projected traffic volumes and conditions occur, the need for additional mitigation, and the timing for implementation of mitigation measures.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

The following mitigation measures above and beyond those identified for the proposed actions, would be required for the alternative:

The S3 staircase at the Queens Plaza station would require a 14-inch widening to absorb the additional trips generated by the alternative and the P5 staircase would require a 7-inch widening to alleviate the impact at that location.

The pedestrian corner analysis revealed one new significant impact location in addition to the significant impact identified in the proposed actions—at the southwest corner of 27th Street and Queens Plaza South. At this corner, removing the obstructions on the southwest corner and widening the west sidewalk of 27th Street by 8 inches would mitigate the impact in the AM and PM peak periods.

Depending on actual development that results from the Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative, the need for the mitigation measures outlined above and/or other mitigation measures will need to be monitored, as discussed above, for the proposed actions.

AIR QUALITY

Table E-3 shows the effect of this alternative on the maximum predicted 8-hour CO concentrations at the analysis sites. The values shown are the highest predicted concentrations for each receptor location for any of the time periods analyzed.

The results show that this alternative, with proposed traffic mitigation, would not result in any violations of the CO standard or any significant adverse impacts at the receptor locations. With this alternative, CO levels would be the same as or similar to levels under the proposed actions. Therefore, this alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts on air quality or in any violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Table E-3

**Future (2010) Maximum Predicted 8-Hour
Average Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (parts per
million):
No Action, Queens Plaza Subdistrict Zoning Alternative, and
Alternative with Mitigation**

Recept or Site	Location	Time Period	Concentration		
			No Actio n	Action	Action with Mitigati on
1	Queens Boulevard/Jackson Avenue/ Northern Boulevard	AM	6.9	8.4*	7.1
4	Queens Boulevard/Thomson Avenue/ Van Dam Street**	AM	6.4	7.0	6.4
6	Jackson Avenue/44th Drive	PM	4.8	5.5	5.4
Notes: 8-hour standard is 9 ppm. * De minimis impact. ** CAL3QHCR results.					

Project Identification:

CEQR No. 00DCP055Q
ULURP Nos. 000406 ZMQ, 000407 ZRQ,
000406(A) ZMQ, 000407(A) ZRQ,
000266 MMQ , 000483 ZSQ
and 010260 PPQ

SEQRA Classification: Type 1

Lead Agency:

City Planning Commission
22 Reade Street, 1W
New York, NY 10007

Robert Dobruskin

Robert Dobruskin, Director
Environmental Assessment and
Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning

cc: Joseph B. Rose
City Planning Commission
Hon. Claire Shulman
Alessandra Sumowicz
Gail Benjamin
Barbara Rosen
Lance Michaels
John Young
Ed Helenius
Pat Bussey
Queens C.D. 1 Chairperson
Queens C.D. 2 District Manager
Erin M. Crotty
Ronda Wist
Gina Santucci
City Record
Julian Misiurski
Rachel Belsky
Jodie McDonald
Sheila Metcalf

Jennifer Raab
Glen Price
James Merani
Susan Wong
Eric Kober
Lawrence Parnes
Phil Sperling
Marjorie Bryant
Naim Rasheed
Jane Cleaver
Queens C. D. 1 Chairperson
Queens C.D. 2 District Manager
Mary Ellen Kriss
Mehdi Amjadi
ENB
Joseph Ketas
Hardy Adasko
Barry Dinerstein
Joshua Laird