



**Taxi & Limousine
Commission**

**David Yassky
Commissioner**

**33 Beaver Street 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10004**

October 24, 2013

NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Taxi Medallion Increase

Project Identification

CEQR No. 12TLC026Y
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

Contact Person:

Conan Freud
Chief Operating Officer
(212) 676-1033
NYC Taxi & Limousine Commission

Lead Agency

New York City Taxi &
Limousine Commission
33 Beaver Street, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10004

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991, and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the action described below. Copies of the FEIS may be reviewed at office of the undersigned. A public hearing on the DEIS was held at the NYC Taxi & Limousine Commission at 33 Beaver Street in Manhattan on October 3, 2013. Comments were accepted at that hearing and throughout the public comment period, which remained open until October 15, 2013. This FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS and additional analysis conducted subsequent to the completion of the DEIS.

Introduction

As allowed under New York State Legislation (Chapter 602 of the Laws of 2011 of the State of New York and Chapter 9 of the Laws of 2012 of the State of New York), the New York City Taxi & Limousine Commission (TLC) proposes to issue by public sale up to 2,000 fully-transferable taxicab licenses (medallions) in addition to those already in existence, provided that all of these new licenses will be required to be used with taxicab vehicles that are accessible to individuals who use wheelchairs. Sale of the additional medallions would be at the discretion of the Mayor of New York City through TLC, an action subject to review under the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) found in Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) published as Chapter 5 of Title 62 of the Rules of the City of New York. In conformance with those requirements, this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) considers the environmental impacts of this discretionary action. This FEIS is an update to the DEIS previously issued by TLC in May 2012.

Project Identification

New York State Legislation (New York State Senate Bill S6118A-2011 and companion New York State Assembly Bill A8691A-2011) authorizes the City of New York to issue up to two thousand (2,000) new taxicab licenses to vehicles that are accessible to individuals in wheelchairs.

The legislation separately authorizes these additional actions by the City:

- Issue eighteen thousand (18,000) HAIL vehicle licenses, three thousand six hundred (3,600) of which must be accessible to persons in wheelchairs;
- Issue up to four hundred fifty (450) base permits to for-hire base stations wishing to affiliate HAIL-licensed vehicles;
- Amend the tax law, the administrative code of the City of New York, and the traffic law in relation to taxicabs and HAIL licenses in New York City; and
- Repeal certain sections of Chapter 602 of the Laws of 2011 relating to livery permits in the City of New York.

Only the issuance of the additional 2,000 taxicab licenses is subject to SEQRA/CEQR review.

The sale of the 2,000 taxicab licenses to vehicles that are accessible to individuals in wheelchairs would increase the number of yellow taxi licenses from the existing number of 13,237 licenses to a total of 15,237 licenses, an increase of approximately 15.1%. The legislation prescribes that the City of New York may, acting by the Mayor alone, administratively authorize the TLC or its successor agency to issue up to 2,000 additional taxicab medallion licenses provided that such licenses be restricted to vehicles capable of transporting persons in wheelchairs or that contain a physical device or alteration designed to permit access to and enable the transportation of persons in wheelchairs in accordance with the Americans with Disability Act (ADA), provided further that:

- Such additional medallion licenses are issued by public sale;
- The additional medallion licenses are fully transferable;
- No more than 400 of the taxicab medallion licenses authorized pursuant to the legislation, may be issued by TLC until a Disabled Accessibility Plan (DAP) is approved by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT); and
- Authorization for the public sale of the additional taxicab medallions is also conditioned upon the TLC making HAIL vehicle licenses available for issuance.

TLC anticipates that the public sale of the initial 400 taxicab licenses would occur by June 2014, and that the remaining 1,600 additional taxicab licenses would be issued by public sale through 2017, subject to approval of the DAP by NYSDOT.

Approvals Required

Although permitted to issue up to 2,000 additional licenses by the legislation, the actual issuance and sale of the additional taxicab medallion licenses would be a discretionary action by the City of New York under Subsection A of Chapter 65 (Sale of Taxicab Medallions) of the Rules of the TLC subject to review under SEQRA/CEQR requirements.

Project Purpose and Need

Fifty-four percent of New York City households do not own a car and rely heavily on public transportation, yellow taxis and other for-hire vehicles to make their daily trips. Yellow taxis are particularly essential to the 1.6 million residents of Manhattan, where only 24% of households own a car. Taxis are also used commonly by the 2.3 million people who work in Manhattan each day and the 48 million people who visit the City each year. New York City taxis provide approximately 500,000 trips each day. The projected increase in the population of the City to approximately 9.1 million residents by 2030, and the projected increase in the population to over 1.8 million residents in Manhattan in the same period, will increase the need for yellow taxicabs.

Additional yellow taxicabs will also be needed to serve the projected increase in employment in the City. Long-term occupational projections developed by the New York State Department of Labor indicate that employment in New York City will increase by 3.8% during the ten-year period between 2008 and 2018, a gain of over 150,000 new jobs.

Increases in the number of visitors to the City will also heighten the need for additional taxicab service. As documented by NYC & Company, visitation to the City has dramatically increased during the last twenty years from a total of 29.1 million visitors in 1991 to 35.2 million visitors in 2001 to 50.2 million in 2011. It is anticipated that the number of visitors to the City will continue to increase, as suggested by the increase in number of hotel rooms in the City. HVS Global Hospitality Services ("HVS" 2011 Manhattan Hotel Market Overview, June 2011) indicates that a total of 62 new hotels opened in Manhattan between March 2008 and February 2011, adding 11,285 rooms to the market (a 17.0% increase over the February 2008 level). By 2013, HVS projects an additional 8% increase in the number of hotel rooms over 2011 levels.

As compared to other cities that rely heavily on public transportation and taxi service, New York's taxi supply is relatively low. New York City's 8.4 million residents share 13,237 taxis, or one taxi for every 630 residents. In contrast, London has 22,000 black cabs that serve its 7.5 million residents, or one taxi for every 340 residents. Similarly, in Chicago, where the 71% household car ownership rate is significantly higher than New York City's 46% household car ownership rate, there is approximately one taxi for every 385 residents. Of course car services supplement the City's taxis in transporting the public; however, they cater to the prearranged rather than on-demand yellow taxi hail market.

The demand for taxis is reflected in the long hours of operation of the current taxi fleet. Approximately 75% of taxis in New York City currently operate two 12-hour shifts nearly every day, while the remaining 25% operate for one 12-hour shift nearly every day.

The demand for taxis is also reflected in the observed time that it takes to locate an unoccupied taxi. Passengers frequently report difficulty locating an unoccupied taxi when they need one. In

particular, passengers report shortages in the late afternoon, weekend evenings and instances of bad weather. This observation is supported by global positioning system (GPS) data on taxi utilization. Since 2009 (when TLC began collecting GPS data for the existing taxi fleet), the number of trips per cab per day increased from approximately 36.9 trips per cab per day in the first quarter (Q1) of 2009 to 38.5 trips per cab per day in Q1 of 2010 and 39.0 trips per cab per day in Q1 of 2011. The average number of hours each day a cab was occupied also increased during the same period. In Q1 of 2009, each taxi was hired (i.e., was unavailable to receive a street hail) approximately 6.8 hours each day. By Q1 of 2011, the number of hours each day when a cab was hired increased 13% to 7.7 hours each day.

To address the observed shortage in the number of taxis, the Proposed Action would authorize the issuance of 2,000 new medallions, an increase of approximately 15.1% above the existing number of medallions, all of which would be required to be used with taxicab vehicles that are accessible to individuals who use wheelchairs. This would increase the supply of wheelchair-accessible medallions from 231 wheelchair-accessible vehicles to 2,231 wheelchair-accessible medallions. The increase in the number of medallions restricted for use with vehicles accessible to persons with disabilities would foster increased access, mobility and independence of persons with disabilities, a major goal of the City's transportation system.

Probable Impacts of the Proposed Action

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would affect land use or change the zoning on a site could result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not directly displace any residential, commercial or other land use, would not accelerate a trend that would lead to the indirect displacement of any residential, commercial or other land use, and would not be inconsistent with any established public policy. Specifically, the Proposed Action would be consistent with PlaNYC 2030 Initiative 3 "Expand for-hire vehicle service throughout our neighborhoods". Furthermore, the Proposed Action is not a discretionary action requiring public review under ULURP. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact to land use, zoning, or public policy.

Socioeconomic Conditions

As defined in the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, the socioeconomic character of an area includes its population, housing, and economic activity. Socioeconomic changes may occur when a proposed action directly or indirectly changes any of these elements. Although socioeconomic changes may not result in impacts under CEQR, they are disclosed if they would affect land use patterns, low-income populations, the availability of goods and services, or economic investment in a way that changes the socioeconomic character of an area. According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, the five principal issues of concern with respect to socioeconomic conditions are whether a proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts due to: (1) direct residential displacement; (2) direct business and/or institutional displacement; (3) indirect residential displacement; (4) indirect business and/or institutional displacement; and (5) adverse effects on specific industries of importance to the City.

The 2012 *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that a detailed socioeconomic conditions analysis is not required if it can be demonstrated that a proposed action:

- Would not result in a significant direct or indirect displacement of residents, or businesses, and
- Would not have a significant adverse impact on an industry of importance to the City.

Since the Proposed Action would neither require any construction activities nor would result in any new development, it would not result in any direct or indirect displacement of residences or businesses. However, it could potentially result in an adverse effect on the yellow taxicab industry, the FHV industry, and industries that provide direct services to yellow taxicab and FHV businesses. All of these industries are of importance to the City. As a consequence, the socioeconomic conditions impact analysis includes an assessment of the impact of the Proposed Action on yellow taxicab businesses, livery car businesses (the FHV industry), and businesses that provide direct services to the yellow taxicab and livery businesses. Specifically, the socioeconomic conditions impact analysis includes assessments of the impact of the Proposed Action on the following:

- Value of a yellow taxicab medallion;
- Taxicab driver income;
- The livery car industry; and
- Overall New York City economy.

Since the Proposed Action has the potential to affect businesses throughout the City, the Study Area for the socioeconomic conditions impact assessment encompasses the entire City.

The Proposed Action would:

- Not have a significant adverse impact on the value of either an individual or mini-fleet medallion.
- Not have a significant adverse impact on the income of a yellow taxicab driver.
- Not have a significant adverse impact on the for-hire livery industry.
- Have an overall beneficial affect on the New York City economy.

These findings indicate that the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on the New York City taxi and livery industry.

Value of a Yellow Taxicab Medallion

Under the worst case scenario, the Proposed Action would result in a small (less than 4%) decrease in the anticipated future value of an individual medallion and a smaller (less than 3%) decrease in the anticipated future value of a mini-fleet medallion. The most likely impact predicted for both categories of medallions is even smaller (approximately 2%).

Historically medallion prices have increased during periods of medallion sales in part due to fare increases that have accompanied medallion sales. During 2004, 590 medallions were sold. In 2006, an additional 308 medallions were sold with smaller sales taking place in 2007 and 2008 of 63 and 87 medallions respectively. Fares increased (an estimated) 26% in May 2004 and by (an estimated) 10.5% in 2006¹ while no fares increases were implemented in 2005 or in 2007 (until the fare increase in 2012). During these periods of medallion sales, individual medallion prices rose 22% in 2004 and another 22% in 2005 while mini-fleet medallion prices rose 22% and 21% in 2004 and 2005 respectively. In 2006, individual medallion prices rose approximately 14% while mini-fleet medallion prices rose approximately 27%. Medallion prices rose in 2007 as well by an approximate 11% for individual medallions and 19% for mini-fleet medallions. In fact medallion prices rose throughout periods when medallions have been sold since 2004.

Medallion prices are more impacted by economic factors, for example medallion prices declined in 2000 (only mini-fleet medallions) and then in 2001 (both mini-fleet and individual medallion) primarily due to the 2001 recession. Other factors such as interest rates also play an important role in determining medallion prices. The analysis indicates that there would be a small impact on the value of the medallion and prices would be slightly lower than they would otherwise have been due to the Proposed Action. The value is expected to increase with or without the Proposed Action, though the increase is expected to be smaller in the analysis year with the Proposed Action in place. Historic trends indicate that value continues to increase at a high rate in the years following the medallion sale. In other words, the analysis identified impacts in *relative* terms (relative to the value of the medallion without the Proposed Action). In *absolute* terms medallions might well appreciate in value as they have done in the past.

Taxicab Driver Income

Gross revenue of an individual medallion driver (leasing for a 2nd shift) in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions is estimated to be approximately \$297 per shift (in 2012 dollars, assuming medium impacts due to the introduction of the additional medallions), using an average of 20.0 revenue trips per shift at an average fare of \$14.86 per trip. Net income of an individual medallion driver in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions is estimated to be approximately \$162 after netting out the cost of fuel, and health care fees. Net income of an individual medallion driver (leasing for a 2nd shift) is estimated to be approximately 1.9% less in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions than without the 2,000 additional medallions.

Gross income in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions of a driver who drives as part of a mini-fleet is estimated to be approximately \$297 (in 2012 dollars) per shift assuming the

¹ This fare increase was implemented by changing the charge incurred by passengers in slow moving or stopped traffic. Initial charge for the fare and the variable unit fare remained unchanged.

same average length of revenue trips as for the driver-owner operating arrangement. Net income in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions of a driver who drives as part of a mini-fleet is estimated to be approximately \$143 per shift (in 2012 dollars) after netting out lease costs and the costs of health care and credit card fees. Net income per shift of drivers who lease a fleet vehicle is estimated to be approximately 2.1% less in the future (2017) with the 2,000 additional medallions than without the additional medallions that are to be added under the Proposed Action.

Livery Car Industry

An increase in the supply of yellow taxis could result in increased competition from yellow cabs for passengers now served by livery cars. However, because of the degree to which the two industries serve geographically distinct markets, and also provide different types of service (street hails vs. pre-arranged pick-ups), the effects of an increase in the supply of yellow taxis on the livery industry are likely to be limited – and in particular, limited to the relatively small number of neighborhoods that are served by both industries.

The Proposed Action would not result in an increase in the level of competition with the for-hire livery industry. The increase in yellow taxicab trips is estimated to account for only 2.3% of the trips currently serviced by the livery industry on a daily basis. Although the Proposed Action could result in a small increase in the level of competition overall, in roughly 15 neighborhoods out of the 188 neighborhoods in New York City, impacts might result in modest increases in competition for passengers. These include portions of northern Manhattan, certain Brooklyn neighborhoods and certain neighborhoods in Queens. Many of these identified neighborhoods however have experienced significant growth in population. The proposed increase in the number of yellow taxis would be mitigated by the continued growth in population, likely increases in industrial and commercial development in these specific neighborhoods², further development and growth in Brooklyn and Queens outside these specific neighborhoods³ and the consequent demand for for-hire livery services in these areas (see Appendix C for details). In particular, the analysis does not take into account the impact of mode shift. Additional yellow taxicab trips might come from other modes such as subway or bus rather than livery vehicle trips. Given the small impact of additional yellow taxicab trips as a percentage of overall livery trips and their focus on a limited number of neighborhoods, it is most likely that livery cabs will increase service to other neighborhoods currently poorly served by yellow taxicabs and likely to remain poorly serviced by yellow taxicabs in the future (for example, currently 155 neighborhoods in New York City account for only 1.2% of yellow taxi cab trips). As a consequence, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on the for-hire livery industry in New York City.

² These include for example, Columbia University's new Mahattanville campus and the development of Barclays Center in Brooklyn

³ Examples of these include the revitalization of Coney Island, expansion of the Resorts World Casino and Flushing Commons and new developments in Flushing.

Overall New York City Economy

The Proposed Action would result in net overall benefits to the New York City economy as a consequence of the increase in income that would be derived by the additional drivers required to drive additional taxi vehicles that would be allowed under the Proposed Action, and the increase in economic activity that would be generated by the Proposed Action to medallion owners, medallion brokers, mechanics, and the broad range of businesses that support the taxicab industry. Based on these findings it is projected that the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on the overall New York City economy.

Community Facilities and Services

The Proposed Action would not physically alter or displace any existing or planned community facility, nor would it add new populations that would create demand for services greater than the ability of existing facilities to provide those services. Therefore, in conformance with *2012 CEQR Technical Manual* screening criteria, it would not have the potential to result in a significant impact on community facilities and services, and a preliminary and detailed analysis was not undertaken to determine if the Proposed Action would result in a significant adverse impact to community facilities and services.

Open Space

The Proposed Action would not eliminate or alter any existing or planned open space, nor would it add new populations that would overtax open space. Therefore, in conformance with *2012 CEQR Technical Manual* screening criteria, it would not have the potential to result in a significant impact on open space, and a preliminary and detailed analysis was not undertaken to determine if the Proposed Action would result in a significant adverse impact to open space.

Shadows

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would either result in (a) new structures (or additions to existing structures including the addition of rooftop mechanical equipment) of 50 feet or more; or (b) be located adjacent to, or across the street from, a sunlight-sensitive resource could result in significant adverse impacts related to shadows. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not result in any site specific development or a new structure. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact related to shadows.

Historic and Cultural Resources

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that require in-ground disturbance, construction of new structures, or the alteration of existing structures, could result in significant adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources. The Proposed Action would not result in any in-ground disturbance that could potentially affect archaeological resources. Nor would the Proposed Action result in:

- New construction, demolition, or significant physical alteration to any building, structure, or object;

- A change in scale, visual prominence, or visual context of any building, structure, or object or landscape feature;
- Construction, including but not limited to, excavating vibration, subsidence, dewatering, and the possibility of falling objects;
- Additions to or significant removal, grading, or replanting of significant historic landscape features;
- Screening or elimination of publicly accessible views; or
- Introduction of significant new shadows or significant lengthening of the duration of existing shadows on an historic landscape or on an historic structure.

Therefore, in conformance with the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact on historic and cultural resources.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects with the potential for a pedestrian to observe, from the street level, a physical alteration allowed by existing zoning, including modification of yard, height, and setback requirements; or an increase in built floor area beyond what would be allowed as-of-right or in future without the proposed project, could result in a significant adverse impacts on urban design and visual resources. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not require the construction of any new structure or the alteration of an existing structure. No modifications to the existing zoning, or changes in bulk and form would occur. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact to urban design and visual resources.

Natural Resources

The Proposed Action would not directly or indirectly affect natural resources since it consists of the addition of 2,000 taxis that would primarily operate on City roadways. Therefore, in conformance with *2012 CEQR Technical Manual* screening criteria, it would not have the potential to result in a significant impact on natural resources, and neither a preliminary or detailed analysis is required to determine if the Proposed Action would result in a significant adverse impact to natural resources.

Hazardous Materials

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would increase hazardous materials exposure to people or the environment would require impacts to be studied and mitigated or avoided. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not require any new construction or result in in-ground disturbance that would lead to human or environmental exposure. Consequently, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact regarding hazardous materials.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would affect the City's water supply, wastewater treatment, and stormwater management infrastructure could result in significant adverse impacts to the water and sewer infrastructure. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not affect these systems and would not result in a significant adverse impact to the City's water and sewer infrastructure.

Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would affect land use or change the zoning on a site could result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not result in solid waste generation associated with residential, institutional, commercial, and industrial uses, and would not affect the City's SWMP or any state policy related to the City's integrated solid waste management system. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact to solid waste and sanitation services in the City.

Energy

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would could result in the need to provide additional generation capacity or changes to electrical transmission and distribution systems could require an energy impact assessment. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not result in the need for additional electricity generation capacity nor would it affect the electrical transmission systems. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact to energy.

Transportation

Traffic

Significant adverse traffic impacts were identified by comparing the level of delay and LOS with and without the Proposed Action and comparing them to the criteria for identifying significant adverse traffic impacts in the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*. The CEQR impact thresholds for signalized intersection operations are:

1. A lane group that operates at LOS A through C in the without Proposed Action condition and deteriorates under the with Proposed Action condition to worse than mid-LOS D (greater than 45 seconds/vehicle) should be considered a significant impact.;
2. A lane group that operates at LOS D in the without Proposed Action condition and is projected to have a delay increase of 5.0 seconds/vehicle or more should be considered a significant impact if the with Proposed Action delay exceeds 45.0 seconds/vehicle;
3. A lane group that operates at LOS E in the without Proposed Action condition and is projected to have a delay increase of 4.0 seconds/vehicle or more in the Proposed Action condition should be considered a significant impact.

4. A lane group that operates at LOS F in the without Proposed Action condition and is projected to have a delay increase of 3.0 seconds/vehicle or more in the Proposed Action condition should be considered a significant impact.

The results of this assessment indicate that, in 2014, 21 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the AM peak hour, in 2015, 29 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the AM peak hour, in 2016, 35 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the AM peak hour, and, in 2017, 37 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the AM peak hour. The number of significant adverse traffic impacts also varies by peak hour. For example, in 2014, 15 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the midday peak hour and 12 of the 54 study intersections would have significant adverse traffic impacts in the PM peak hour.

Measures to mitigate identified significant adverse impacts were evaluated for each intersection at which a significant adverse impact was projected to occur. The goal of the mitigation measures is to reduce the impacts to a non-significant level, while not causing new impacts at other locations. Mitigation measures were developed for each individual year and peak period. The analysis took into consideration the affect that a proposed mitigation measure would have on nearby intersections. For example, timing changes at one location can affect downstream operations at subsequent locations. For this study, only signal timing changes (without phasing changes) were considered for the project mitigation measures. There are a number of locations, however, where signal timing improvements were either not possible, or were not sufficient to mitigate the identified impacts. If full mitigation could not be achieved, improvements were proposed to decrease impact to the extent possible. Locations that would be either unmitigatable or could not be fully mitigated are identified in Chapter 15: Transportation.

Parking

The Proposed Action is not expected to have a large effect on parking in the study area. Nearly all of the new taxis would be in active operation throughout the day, with very few taxis parked during the peak demand hours in the study area. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the few parked taxis would be spread around the city and not located in one area. Given the demand for taxis, and the need for taxi drivers to circulate looking for a fare, taxis in operation would spend little time standing and waiting curbside. Therefore, no significant parking impacts are expected because taxis would mainly be on the roadways and any parking or standing would be staggered and dispersed, allowing them to be absorbed by the available taxi-dedicated or other parking facilities.

Pedestrians and Bicycles

The Proposed Action would not generate sufficient pedestrian trips to meet the minimum CEQR threshold of 200 or more new pedestrian trips for preparation of a detailed pedestrian analysis. Furthermore, pedestrian trips required to gain access to the taxis included in the Proposed Action would be dispersed throughout the study area. The Proposed Action would not generate any new bicycle trips. Therefore, no significant pedestrian or bicycle impacts would occur with the Proposed Action.

Transit

The Proposed Action would not result in 200 or more new transit trips of any type (rail or bus), so, as indicated in the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, a detailed transit analysis of the impact of the Proposed Action was not required. Therefore, no significant adverse transit impacts would occur with the Proposed Action.

Safety

There were 25 intersections in the study area that would exceed the CEQR threshold of five or more pedestrian/bicyclist related accidents during any one year of the most recent 3-year period. There are number of changes in the study area in the past 3 years that have the potential to effect pedestrian and bicycle accident rates, including implementation of the Green Light for Midtown project being conducted by the NYCDOT to improve mobility and safety in the Midtown core area (Broadway from Columbus Circle to 42nd Street and from 35th Street to 26th Street). New crosswalks and new plaza spaces in the Times Square area and simplified crossings in Herald Square have resulted in noticeable improvements in the safety of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The Green Light for Midtown project includes safety features such as simplified intersections, shortened crosswalks, organized and defined traffic lanes and separation of conflicting movements. Additionally, NYCDOT has begun to implement a Safe Streets for Seniors campaign to increase safety by increasing pedestrian crossing time at wide avenues (to allow more green time for slow walkers to safely transverse the roadway), installing high visibility crosswalks and advance stop bars, and installing refuge islands and investigating the use of leading pedestrian intervals at selected locations. Lastly, NYCDOT is also planning to implement a bicycle protection system along Eighth and Ninth Avenues.

The proposed project would incorporate geometric/physical improvements that would enhance the overall operation of the study locations as well as overall safety along the corridors that include the study locations. Recommended improvements, combined with the measures that are being implemented by NYCDOT, are anticipated to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety in the study area such that the Future Conditions with the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in a significant increase in accidents in the study area.

Air Quality

The results of the detailed microscale analysis for the Proposed Action were below the applicable state and federal ambient air quality standards and CEQR thresholds for CO, PM₁₀ and 24 hour PM_{2.5} and annual PM_{2.5} neighborhood. In addition, the Proposed Action is not expected to significantly impact NO_x and NO₂ concentrations in New York City. Therefore, the proposed addition of 2,000 taxicab medallions would not result in a significant adverse impact to air quality with the proposed traffic mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed addition of 2,000 taxicab medallions would result in approximately 902,950 tons of CO_{2e} emissions, compared to the 784,430 tons of CO_{2e} emitted under Existing Conditions and Future Conditions without the Proposed Action. GHG emissions in the future with the Proposed Action would be approximately eight percent of the estimated 11.7 million tons of GHG emissions generated from the on-road vehicles in the City and less than two percent of the total 58.3 million tons of total GHG emissions generated in the City, based on a 2005 emissions inventory.⁴ Furthermore, the increase in GHG emissions of approximately 118,520 tons per year due to the Proposed Action would result in an increase of one percent to the 11.7 million tons of GHG emissions generated from on-road vehicles in the City and 0.2 percent to the 58.3 million tons of total GHG emissions generated in the City.

Noise

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects that would generate any mobile or stationary noise sources and/or be located in an area with high existing ambient noise levels could result in significant adverse impacts to sensitive noise receptors, including residential, commercial and institutional uses. The proposed sale of 2,000 taxi medallions would introduce mobile sources of noise to the City's roadways. However, the Proposed Action would not trigger the need for a detailed noise analysis since the existing noise PCE's would not be doubled by the project-generated traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact to noise sensitive receptors.

Public Health

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, a public health assessment is not warranted if a project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts related to air quality, water quality, hazardous materials, or noise, on public health. Since the proposed sale of 2,000 taxicab licenses would not result in a significant adverse impact related to these CEQR analysis categories, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse impact on public health.

⁴ Source: Inventory of New York City's Greenhouse Gas Emissions, April 2007, Mayor's Office of Operations, Office of Long Term Planning and Sustainability. http://www.nyc.gov/html/om/pdf/ccp_report041007.pdf

Neighborhood Character

According to the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, projects with the potential to result in a significant adverse impact, or combined moderate adverse effects, on defining elements that contribute a neighborhood's character could result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. The proposed sale of 2,000 medallions is a City-wide action, and not neighborhood or site specific. As described in this FEIS, no significant or "moderate" effects, i.e., effects considered reasonably close to the significant adverse impact threshold for a particular technical analysis area, on the following CEQR analysis areas would occur: land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; open space; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; shadows; air quality; and noise. Traffic related significant adverse impacts and related mitigation measures, where applicable, are described in Chapters 15, 16 and 25. However, traffic alone does not contribute to major characteristics that define New York City neighborhoods. Therefore, since the proposed sale of 2,000 medallions would not affect defining features of New York City neighborhoods, no significant adverse impact on neighborhood character would occur.

Alternatives

A No Action Alternative to the Proposed Action was considered. Under this alternative, the sale of 2,000 additional taxi medallions accessible to persons with disabilities would not be authorized. The No Action alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; natural resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; transportation; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; noise; public health; and neighborhood character.

A sale of fewer medallions alternative was also considered. Under this alternative, 400 additional medallions would be sold rather than the 2,000 additional medallions that would be allowed under the Proposed Action. This alternative would also incorporate the changes from existing conditions included in the No Action alternative.

As detailed in Chapter 15, traffic conditions in the future with this Alternative were evaluated with the same analytical techniques as with the evaluation of the proposed project. Traffic volumes were estimated by adding the increased number of vehicles that would occur with 400 additional medallions to the traffic volumes in the future without the Proposed Action, a 3.0% increase over the number of existing medallions. This percent increase was applied to each peak hour turning movement at each study intersection. The greatest increases in traffic volume increases with the addition of 400 taxis are projected to occur on Third Avenue, where there would be a projected increase of up to 35 vehicles at certain intersections, and on Seventh Avenue, where there would be a projected increase of up to 40 vehicles at certain intersections.

Based on traffic impact criteria included in the *2012 CEQR Technical Manual*, the addition of 400 taxis to the Study Area roadway network would result in one or more impacts at a total of 48 Study Area intersections. This would be a decrease of 63 impacts from the projected one or more impacts of 111 Study Area intersections with 2,000 additional medallions. When considering all lane groups, the addition of 400 taxis would result in a decrease of 123 Study Area intersections at

which there would be impacts from 181 intersections with 2,000 additional medallions to 58 intersections with 400 additional medallions.

As summarized in Chapter 16, the proposed project would not result in any air quality impacts from any pollutant for which a NAAQS has been established. It is conservatively assumed that the same, if not fewer, air impacts would result under this Alternative.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

An impact is not considered to be significant if in the future with the Proposed Action condition if the movement operates at mid-LOS D (45.0 seconds of delay) or better or if the increase from conditions in the future without Proposed Action is below the CEQR impact thresholds. As described in Chapter 25: Mitigation, the following intersections have approaches or overall intersection that could not be mitigated with reasonable mitigation measures.

- #1 – Third Avenue and 54th Street (2015 Midday, 2016 AM/Midday, 2017 Midday)
- #2 – Third Avenue and 55th Street (2017 AM)
- #3 – Third Avenue and 56th Street (2014 Midday/PM, 2015 Midday/PM, 2016 Midday/PM, 2017 Midday/PM)
- #4 – Third Avenue and 57th Street (2015 Midday, 2016 Midday/PM, 2017 Midday/PM)
- #5 – Third Avenue and 58th Street (2015 Midday, 2016 Midday, 2017 Midday)
- #6 – Third Avenue and 59th Street (2015 Midday, 2016 Midday, 2017 Midday)
- #7 – Third Avenue and 60th Street (2014 AM/Midday, 2015 AM/Midday, 2016 AM/Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #8 – Second Avenue and 57th Street (2014 Midday, 2015 AM/Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #9 – Lexington Avenue and 57th Street (2015 Midday, 2016 Midday, 2017 Midday)
- #12 – Seventh Avenue and 33rd Street (2014 AM, 2015 AM/PM, 2016 AM/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #13 – Seventh Avenue and 34th Street (2014 AM, 2015 AM/Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #14 – Seventh Avenue and 35th Street (2014 AM/Midday, 2015 AM/Midday, 2016 AM/Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #15 – Seventh Avenue and 36th Street (2016 Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #17 – Sixth Avenue and 34th Street (2014 PM, 2015 Midday/PM, 2016 Midday/PM, 2017 Midday/PM)

- #20 – Madison Avenue and 40th Street (2015 AM, 2016 AM/Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #21 – Madison Avenue and 41st Street (2016 AM/Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #22 – Madison Avenue and 42nd Street (2014 AM/Midday, 2015 AM/Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #23 – Madison Avenue and 43rd Street (2015 AM/Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #24 – Madison Avenue and 44th Street (2014 Midday, 2015 Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #25 – Madison Avenue and 45th Street (2014 Midday, 2015 AM/Midday, 2016 AM/Midday, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #26 – Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street (2014 PM, 2015 PM, 2016 PM, 2017 PM)
- #29 – Eighth Avenue and 33rd Street (2016 Midday/PM, 2017 Midday/PM)
- #30 – Eighth Avenue and 31st Street (2017 PM)
- #31 – Eighth Avenue and 41st Street (2014 PM, 2015 PM, 2016 AM/PM, 2017 AM/PM)
- #32 – Eighth Avenue and 42nd Street (2015 AM, 2016 AM, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #36 – Seventh Avenue and Central Park South (2014 AM /PM, 2015 AM/Midday/PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #37 – Sixth Avenue and 23rd Street (2015 AM, 2016 AM, 2017 AM/Midday)
- #39 – Sixth Avenue and 42nd Street (2014 PM, 2015 PM, 2016 PM, 2017 PM)
- #41 – Sixth Avenue and Central Park South (2014 PM, 2015 PM, 2016 Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #43 – Fifth Avenue and 57th Street (2014 AM, 2015 AM, 2016 AM, 2017 AM)
- #44 – Fifth Avenue and Central Park South (2014 AM, 2015 AM/PM, 2016 AM/PM, 2017 AM/PM)
- #45 – Madison Avenue and 57th Street (2016 PM, 2017 PM)
- #47 – Second Avenue and 36th Street (2017 AM)
- #49 – Queens Plaza S and Northern Boulevard (2015 PM, 2016 PM, 2017 AM/PM)
- #50 – Tillary Street and Adams Street (2015 PM, 2016 AM/Midday/PM, 2017 AM/Midday/PM)
- #52 – Tillary Street and Flatbush Avenue (2016 AM /PM, 2017 PM)

Growth Inducing Aspects

The term “growth-inducing aspects” generally refers to the potential for a proposed project to trigger additional development in areas outside the project site that would otherwise not have such development without the proposed project. The *2012 CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that an analysis of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed project is appropriate when the project:

- Adds substantial new land use, new residents, or new employment that could induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses, such as retail establishments to serve new residential uses; and/or
- Introduces or greatly expands infrastructure capacity.

The Proposed Action is City-wide in scope and would not introduce new land use or add new residents. As described in Chapter 4: Socioeconomic Conditions, the Proposed Action authorizes the sale of 2,000 taxi medallions and would not alter existing economic patterns in New York City. As such, the Proposed Action would not “induce” new growth in New York City.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

The Proposed Action would authorize the sale of 2,000 taxi medallions in New York City. There are a number of resources, both natural and built, that would be expended in the manufacturing, repurposing, and operation of the additional taxicabs that would operate on New York City streets. These resources include the materials used in automobile manufacturing and/or repurposing of vehicles for taxicab use, energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during manufacturing, repurposing, and operation of taxicabs, and the human effort (i.e., time and labor) required to manufacture and/or repurpose automobiles for taxicab use, and operate taxicabs. However, these resources could potentially be reused for purposes other than those related to the Proposed Action.



Conan Freud
Chief Operating Officer
New York City Taxi & Limousine Commission