

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Proposed Modifications to Special West Chelsea District Zoning Map and Text Amendments Application at New York City Council (N 050161(A) ZRM)

June 22, 2005

The City Planning Commission (CPC), acting as lead agency, certified the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning and High Line Open Space project as complete on May 13, 2005. The FEIS assessed the effects of the proposed action as well alternatives to the proposed action, including Alternative F (the Revised Affordable Housing Alternative).

Subsequent to completion of the FEIS, a Technical Memorandum, dated May 25, 2005, was prepared to assess the potential effects of proposed modifications by the CPC to the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning ULURP No. (N 050161(A) ZRM). The CPC modifications generally related to height, setback and bulk regulations and did not change permitted density or floor area transfer mechanisms. They did not affect the total amount of development analyzed under Alternative F in the FEIS, which consisted of the following: 5,329 total dwelling units (DUs), of which 768 would be low-moderate income affordable housing units; 229,976 sf of retail; 198,726 sf of community facility; and decreases of 812,394 sf of office; 131,100 sf of hotel; 136,802 sf of storage/manufacturing; 228,409 sf of parking/auto; and 4,080 sf of vacant space. Additional changes to lot coverage and existing adult use establishments did not change permitted density or floor area transfers. Development under the CPC modifications occurred on the same 28 projected and 25 potential development sites as under Alternative F. Furthermore, the CPC modifications did not affect the creation and design of the proposed 5.9-acre public open space on the High Line. The May 25, 2005 Technical Memorandum concluded that the CPC modifications would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS.

On May 25, 2005, the CPC voted to adopt Alternative F, with the proposed modifications assessed in the May 25 technical memorandum.

Pursuant to the City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure, the New York City Council (the "Council") has now proposed certain additional amendments to the CPC-approved Special West Chelsea District Rezoning. These are described below and their potential for creating significant adverse environmental impacts not already identified in the FEIS is assessed herein.

I. DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL MODIFICATIONS

Zoning Text Amendments

1. Modifications of permitted maximum height

- Subarea C maximum building height would be reduced from 145 feet to 125 feet.

2. Modifications of density increases

The mechanisms to increase from base to maximum FAR would be modified from the CPC adopted application as follows:

- C6-2 districts: the inclusionary housing bonus (IHB) is eliminated for increasing from base FAR to maximum FAR.
- C6-3 districts: the base FAR would remain at 5.0; this could be increased to 6.25 through High Line Transfer (was 6.65); with High Line Transfer/IHB a maximum FAR of 7.5 would be allowed (no change in maximum FAR).
- C6-4 districts: the base FAR would be reduced from 7.5 to 6.5; FAR could be increased up to 9.5 through the High Line Transfer, same as under the CPC application; FAR could be further increased to 12.0 through the IHB, a change in the mechanism. The IHB would not apply to the C6-4 district in Subarea H, where the maximum FAR would remain 10.0.
- Subarea I: the High Line Improvement Bonus eligible in Subarea I would increase from 1.5 to 2.5 FAR.

These changes are summarized in tabular form below.

| CPC Adopted | C6-2 | C6-3 | C6-4* |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | FAR | FAR | FAR |
| Base FAR | 5 | 5 | 7.5 |
| Through High Line Transfer | 5.65 | 6.65 | 9.15 |
| Through High Line Transfer / IHB | 6 | 7.5 | 10 |
| Through IHB | | | 12 |
| | | | |
| Council Modifications | | | |
| Base FAR | 5 | 5 | 6.5 |
| Through High Line Transfer | 6 | 6.25 | 9.15 |
| Through High Line Transfer / IHB | | 7.5 | |
| Through IHB | | | 12 |
| | | | |

* Does not apply to C6-4 district in Subarea H

Additional changes to affordable housing provisions would include the following:

- * Permit City, State, and Federal programs in inclusionary program
- * Tiering of inclusionary bonus to higher income levels
- * Affordable housing fund – After 90 percent of the High Line Transfer Corridor floor area is transferred to receiving sites or is otherwise used, as an alternative to the High Line transfer, an increase in floor area would be permitted in exchange for contributions to an Affordable Housing Fund. The contribution amount per square foot would be determined by the City Planning Commission at the time that the fund is established.
- * Inclusionary bonus also applies to conversions.

The proposed Council modifications do not include any zoning map changes.

II. POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM PROPOSED CHANGES TO ALTERNATIVE F

Changes to Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario due to Council Modifications

There would be no change in the overall amount of net development expected to occur as a consequence of the Council modifications as compared to Alternative F and the CPC approved modifications. Development would occur at the same density on the 28 projected and 25 potential development sites identified for Alternative F and the CPC approved modifications. This includes increases of 5,329 DUs; 229,976 sf of retail; 198,726 sf of community facility; and decreases of 812,394 sf of office; 131,100 sf of hotel; 136,802 sf of storage/manufacturing; 228,409 sf of parking/auto; and 4,080 sf of vacant space.

However, the changes in FAR bonus mechanisms related to affordable housing units are expected to result in a higher number of affordable units. While Alternative F and the CPC approved modifications would generate 768 new affordable dwelling units, the Council modifications would generate 967 new affordable dwelling units. As the overall number of net dwelling units would remain at 5,329, the number of market rate units would be 4,362 as compared to 4,561.

Therefore, while the effects of the Council modifications would be generally similar to those of Alternative F and the CPC approved modifications, technical areas affected by the number of affordable housing units would experience somewhat different effects under the Council modifications. This would include technical areas affected by the size of the action-generated population, as low-moderate income units are expected to have somewhat larger household sizes than market-rate units.

The change in building heights in Subarea C, along Tenth Avenue, would result in changes to Sites 6, 8, and 11. These sites would be developed with 125-foot tall buildings rather than 145-

foot tall buildings anticipated under the CPC approved modifications. The height change would not affect Projected Development Site 9, also located along Tenth Avenue in Subarea C, which is currently occupied by an approximately 125-foot commercial building which would be converted to residential and retail uses under With-Action conditions.

A. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

The proposed modifications would alter height regulations in Subarea C. This would result in somewhat shorter buildings on some development sites than proposed under the CPC Modifications. Sites with the shorter maximum building heights would have the same regulations as originally contained in Alternative F in the FEIS. There would be no changes to the proposed zoning map amendment or to the proposed density regulations analyzed for Alternative F. The land uses expected as a result of these modifications would be the same as expected under Alternative F, except that there would be a greater number of affordable housing units. There would be 967 affordable housing units, 199 more than the 768 affordable housing units anticipated under Alternative F and the CPC modifications. The Council modifications would also result in the creation of a 5.9-acre publicly accessible open space on the High Line.

As the overall amount of projected development with the Council Modifications generally would be the same as Alternative F, although involving a higher number of affordable housing units, the land use, zoning, and public policy effects would be substantially similar. As was the case with Alternative F and the CPC modifications, the proposed Council modifications would have positive effects on land use and would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy.

B. Socioeconomic Conditions

The proposed Council modifications would result in the same general socioeconomic effects as would occur under Alternative F and the CPC modifications. Under the Council modifications, 199 more affordable housing dwelling units would be developed although the overall amount of residential development would be the same, with 5,329 net DUs. The increased number of affordable housing units would result in 172 additional residents, for a net total of 9,572 action-generated residents as compared to 9,400 for Alternative F and the CPC modifications. In addition, the net change in non-residential development would be the same as with Alternative F and the CPC modifications. Therefore, the socioeconomic benefits to businesses generated by the increase in residential development for the Council modifications would be very similar to those generated by Alternative F and the CPC modifications. The effects with respect to direct and indirect displacement effects on residents and businesses, and effects on specific industries would be the same.

As would be the case for Alternative F and the CPC modifications, the proposed Council modifications would have positive effects on socioeconomic conditions and would not result in significant adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions.

C. Community Facilities and Services

Although there would be no change in the overall number of net dwelling units, the proposed Council modifications would result in 967 affordable housing units, as compared to 768 for Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As a result, there would be 172 more residents generated, with 9,572 under the Council modifications as compared to 9,400 for Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As there would be more affordable housing units and a larger overall population, the Council modifications have the potential to have greater effects on community facilities and services than those previously identified for Alternative F in the FEIS. These effects are identified and assessed below.

Elementary and Intermediate Schools

Under the Council modifications, there would be 552 additional elementary school students, as compared to 548 for Alternative F. As a result, in Region 3 of CSD 2 the utilization rate for elementary schools would increase over No-Action conditions, from 125 percent with a shortfall of 649 seats, to a utilization rate of 147 percent with a shortfall of 1,201 seats (compared to 147 percent and a deficiency of 1,197 seats with Alternative F). In CSD 2 as a whole, the elementary school utilization rate would increase over No-Action conditions, from 109 percent with a shortfall of 1,334 seats, to a utilization rate of 112 percent and a deficiency of 1,886 seats. As with Alternative F, the Council modifications would result in a greater than 5 percent increase in the deficiency of available elementary schools seats over No-Action conditions (85 percent and 41 percent, respectively) and therefore it would result in a significant adverse impact on public elementary schools in Region 3 and CSD 2 as a whole.

Under the Council Modifications, there would be 116 additional intermediate school students, as compared to 114 for Alternative F. For intermediate schools in Region 3 of CSD 2, the utilization rate would increase over No-Action conditions, from 93 percent with 61 available seats, to a utilization rate of 107 percent with a shortfall of 55 seats (compared to 107 percent and a deficiency of 53 seats with Alternative F). As there is not expected to be a deficit under No-Action conditions, a percentage increase in deficiency cannot be calculated. However, the deficit in seats at intermediate schools in Region 3 under this alternative in 2013 would be relatively small both in absolute terms and as a percentage of total capacity, since it would be only 2 seats more than the Alternative F demand. Therefore, as with Alternative F, the Council modifications would not have a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in Region 3.

For intermediate schools in CSD 2 as a whole, the utilization rate would increase over No-Action conditions, from 117 percent with a shortfall of 1,164 seats, to a utilization rate of 119 percent with a shortfall of 1,280 seats (compared to 119 percent and a deficiency of 1,278 seats with Alternative F). As with Alternative F, the Council modifications would result in a greater than 5 percent increase in the deficiency of available intermediate school seats over No-Action conditions (10 percent) and therefore it would result in a significant adverse impact on public intermediate schools in CSD 2.

High Schools

With the Council modifications, there would be approximately 179 new high school students within the proposed action area. As a result, there would be a shortfall of 2,104 seats in Manhattan high schools, with utilization at 104 percent of capacity. This represents a 9 percent increase in deficiency of high school seats over the No-Action conditions. This is slightly higher than Alternative F, which would result in a shortfall of 2,100 seats, also with a utilization rate of 104 percent, and a 9 percent increase in deficiency of high school seats over the No-Action conditions. The Council modifications, like Alternative F, result in a greater than 5 percent increase in deficiency in high school seats, potentially indicating a significant impact. However, since students may elect to attend high schools throughout the city, and could be accommodated without constraining overall capacity, no significant adverse impact to high schools in Manhattan is expected to occur as a result of the Council modifications (as is the case for Alternative F).

Libraries

With a net increase of 4,362 market-rate and 967 affordable housing DUs, the Council modifications would generate 9,572 new residents in the Muhlenberg Branch catchment area. Under No-Action conditions, the population in the Muhlenberg Branch catchment area would be 154,420 new residents by year 2013. Under the Council modifications, the population would increase to 163,992. This represents an increase of 6.2 percent residents over the No-Action population. The Council modifications increase would be 0.1 percentage point higher than Alternative F, which would add 9,400 residents, a 6.1 percent increase over the No-Action population.

As discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, if a proposed action would increase the study area population by 5 percent or more over No-Action levels, a significant impact could occur if this increase would impair the delivery of library services. Significant impacts would warrant consideration of mitigation. However, as stated in the *No. 7 Subway Extension - Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS (November 2004, CEQR No. 03DCP031M)*, the New York Public Library (NYPL) has indicated that projected increases in local library population attributed to the Hudson Yards project (through complete build-out in 2025), the West Chelsea rezoning, and other developments in the area could be accommodated by the library system's existing resources (the Hudson Yards library analysis included the Columbus Branch library at 742 Tenth Avenue, as well as the Muhlenberg Branch). In addition, the proximity of the Jefferson Market Branch Library as well as Midtown Manhattan's Central Libraries, with their extensive resources, to the West Chelsea proposed action area would help to absorb demand on library resources in the proposed action area. Therefore, as with Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, no significant adverse impact to public libraries is expected to occur as a result of the Council modifications.

Health Care Facilities

With 967 affordable housing units, the Council modifications would generate 2,418 new residents to add to the health care facility demand in the outpatient health care facilities study area. The Council modifications would generate 1,581 visits, a 1.9 percent increase over No-

Action conditions compared to an increase of 1,256 emergency room (ER) visits, representing a 1.5 percent increase for Alternative F over No-Action conditions. As a result, it is expected that the number of ER visits would increase from 84,102 (No-Action conditions) to 86,758 (Council modifications) at study area hospitals. As is the case with Alternative F, because the increase in generated ER visits for this alternative is still less than a 5 percent increase over No-Action conditions and given the availability of many outpatient ambulatory facilities in the study area, no significant adverse impacts on health care services are expected as a result of the Council modifications.

Publicly Funded Day Care

With 967 affordable housing units, the Council modifications would generate 116 children under age 12 eligible for publicly funded day care. As a result, the net unmet demand in the study area would increase from 121 under No-Action conditions to 237 slots, a 49 percent increase in demand as a percentage of capacity over No-Action conditions (compared to a net unmet demand of 213 slots under the proposed action, and a 39 percent increase in demand as a percentage of capacity over No-Action conditions). As is the case with Alternative F, the Council modifications would result in an increase of five percent or more over capacity, and therefore a significant adverse impact to publicly funded day care service in the study area could occur in 2013 as a result.

Police and Fire Services

As noted in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, the NYPD and the FDNY routinely evaluate their resources in response to changes in population, crime levels and other local factors. Similar to Alternative F, the Council modifications would not displace or eliminate any existing NYPD or FDNY facilities and would not result in a significant adverse impact on police and fire protection in the study area.

Conclusion

As describe above, the Council modifications would result in significant adverse impacts to elementary schools in CSD 2 of Region 3 and in Region 3 as a whole, as well as to intermediate schools in Region 3 as a whole, and to publicly funded day care. These impacts would also occur under Alternative F (and the CPC modifications). The Council modifications' impacts would occur at a minimally higher magnitude but could be addressed by the same mitigation measures as identified in the FEIS. As also described above, the proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts to community facilities and services not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

D. Open Space

As discussed above, the Council modifications would generate 9,572 residents, 172 more than Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As there would be larger overall action-generated population, the Council modifications have the potential to have greater effects on open space

than those previously identified for Alternative F in the FEIS. These effects are identified and assessed below.

The Council modifications would generate up to 9,572 new residents, an increase of 172 over the 9,400 residents generated by Alternative F. These modifications would result in the same amount of open space as the proposed action, with 28.81 active acres, 64.11 passive acres, and 92.92 total acres.

With a study area population of 79,071, as compared to 78,899 under Alternative F, and the same amount of open space as Alternative F, the Council modifications would have 1.18 acres per 1,000 residents. This would be a decrease of 0.07 acres per 1,000 residents (6 percent) compared to the No-Action condition. This is the same open space rate as under Alternative F. The active open space ratio for the Council modifications would be 0.36 acres per 1,000 residents, a decrease of 0.05 acres (12 percent) compared to the No-Action condition. Under Alternative F, the active open space ratio was 0.37 acres per 1,000 residents. Under both Alternative F and the Council modifications, the percentage decrease would be approximately 12 percent. The passive open space ratio would be 0.81 acres per 1,000 residents, a decrease of 0.02 acres (3 percent) compared to the No-Action condition. Under Alternative F, the passive open space ratio and the percentage decrease are the same as the Council modifications (0.81 acres per 1,000 residents and a 3 percent decrease, respectively).

Like Alternative F, the Council modifications would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. Although the Council modifications would generate more residents as compared to Alternative F, the open space ratios would be very similar. As with Alternative F, significant adverse open space impacts are not expected because the proposed action would add approximately six acres of new publicly accessible open space on the High Line. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact to open space resources not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

E. Shadows

The proposed Council modifications would alter height, setback, and other bulk regulations in portions of the proposed action area as compared to the CPC modifications. Specifically, buildings on Projected Development Sites 6, 8, and 11 would be reduced from a maximum height of 145 feet to a maximum height of 125 feet. Consequently, the shadows cast from these development sites as a result of the Council modifications would be shorter as compared to the CPC modifications.

With the Council modifications, the same significant adverse shadow impacts expected under Alternative F would occur. The impacts to the Church of the Guardian Angel and the chapel located on the grounds of the General Theological Seminary are not attributed to buildings on Projected Development Sites 6, 8 and 11. The impacts to these resources are attributed to development sites located to the south and west of the resources. Therefore, no additional shadow impacts would occur with the Council modifications and they would not result in any significant adverse shadows impacts not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

F. Historic Resources

As there would be no change in the number, floor area, and type of construction on the 53 projected and potential development sites as a result of the proposed modifications, there would be no changes to the effects on historic resources as identified for Alternative F in the FEIS. The reduced heights on Sites 6, 8, and 11 and overall increase in the proportion of affordable housing units would not substantively change the effects on historic resources. With the proposed Council modifications, the same significant adverse historic resources impacts as expected for Alternative F would occur. The proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impact to historic resources not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

G. Urban Design and Visual Resources

Under the proposed Council modifications, some maximum permitted building heights would be changed from the regulations included in the CPC modifications. In Subarea C permitted heights would decrease from 145 to 125 feet.

The Council modifications would result in the same overall amount of net development, though a higher proportion of affordable housing units would be developed as compared to Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As a result, there would be a higher number action-generated residents and a commensurately higher level of sewage generated. As discussed below, the Council modifications would generate 1.21 million gallons per day (mgd) as compared to 1.19 mgd generated by Alternative F. This change in sewage generation is a negligible increase. As discussed in Chapters 11 and 23 of the FEIS, an assessment of future water quality conditions in 2010 and 2025 was prepared for the *Hudson Yards Final Generic Impact Statement (FEIS)*, to assess the effects of future development in the North River WPCP drainage area, including Hudson Yards related development and West Chelsea development. That analysis concluded that with increased CSO events, CSO volumes, and CSO pollutant loadings, these changes would have no significant adverse impacts on water quality and water quality conditions would continue to meet the standards and uses established, where applicable, for Class I waters. Therefore, like Alternative F, with the Council modifications, it is reasonable to conclude that occasional CSO discharges from outfalls serving the West Chelsea area and from effluent flows from the North River Water Pollution Control Plant (NRWPCP), even if discharging a higher concentration of sewage than under current conditions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to water quality in the Hudson River. Based on the amount of development anticipated under the Council modifications, as compared to Hudson Yards, even with the potential additional CSO events that may occur under future conditions, it would be reasonable to conclude that potential effects on water quality would be small and would not result in significant adverse impacts to water quality or wildlife in the Hudson River.

As was the case for Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, the proposed Council modifications would have significant and positive changes on urban design and visual resources and would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

H. Neighborhood Character

The proposed Council modifications generally would have the same effects on the elements that contribute to neighborhood character as Alternative F and the CPC modifications. The proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F on land use, urban design/visual resources, historic resources, socioeconomic conditions, traffic, and noise.

As was the case for Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, the proposed Council modifications would not result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character and would result in an overall improvement to neighborhood character.

I. Hazardous Materials

The proposed Council modifications would involve the same 53 projected and potential development sites and the same incremental development as under Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS (and under the CPC modifications). With the Council modifications, (E) designations for hazardous materials would be mapped on the same tax lots as identified for Alternative F in the FEIS (refer to Table 1). Therefore, as was the case for Alternative F, the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse impacts to hazardous materials.

J. Natural Resources

The Council modifications would result in development on the same 53 projected and potential development sites that would be affected by Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As Alternative F would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources due to site-specific effects, the Council modifications also would not result in significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

The Council modifications would result in the same overall amount of net development, though a higher proportion of affordable housing units would be developed as compared to Alternative F and the CPC modifications. As a result, there would be a higher number action-generated residents and a commensurately higher level of sewage generated. As discussed below, the Council modifications would generate 1.21 million gallons per day (mgd) as compared to 1.19 mgd generated by Alternative F. This change in sewage generation is a negligible increase. As discussed in Chapters 11 and 23 of the FEIS, an assessment of future water quality conditions in 2010 and 2025 was prepared for the *Hudson Yards Final Generic Impact Statement (FEIS)*, to assess the effects of future development in the North River WPCP drainage area, including Hudson Yards related development and West Chelsea development. That analysis concluded that with increased CSO events, CSO volumes, and CSO pollutant loadings, these changes would have no significant adverse impacts on water quality and water quality conditions would continue to meet the standards and uses established, where applicable, for Class I waters.

Therefore, like the proposed action and Alternative F, for the Council modifications it is reasonable to conclude that occasional CSO discharges from outfalls serving the West Chelsea area and from effluent flows from the North River Water Pollution Control Plant (NRWPCP), even if discharging a higher concentration of sewage than under current conditions, would not result in significant adverse impacts to water quality in the Hudson River. Based on the amount of development anticipated under the Council modifications, as compared to Hudson Yards, even with the potential additional CSO events that may occur under future conditions, it would be reasonable to conclude that potential effects on water quality would be small and would not result in significant adverse impacts to water quality or wildlife in the Hudson River.

As with Alternative F and the CPC modifications, the proposed Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse natural resources impacts.

K. Waterfront Revitalization Program

The Council modifications, like Alternative F, are compatible with the City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). The changes to building heights and affordable housing FAR bonus mechanisms contained in the proposed Council modifications would not alter the conclusion presented in the May 25 Technical Memorandum.

As was the case for Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, the proposed Council modifications would encourage appropriate land uses and open space amenities within the coastal zone and would be consistent with the 10 LWRP policies

L. Infrastructure

The Council modifications would result in a somewhat higher demand on the City's water supply and wastewater management systems compared to Alternative F; however, as under Alternative F and the CPC modifications, significant adverse impacts to infrastructure are not anticipated. With respect to stormwater management, the Council modifications are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts. Under both Alternative F and the Council modifications, the potential for CSO events would continue, given the increased sewage flows from projected development. However, these discharges are not likely to result in flooding in the basements of buildings, nor, as discussed above under "Natural Resources," are they likely to affect water quality and wildlife in the Hudson River.

With 172 more residents generated by the Council modifications as compared to Alternative F and the CPC modifications (9,572 compared to 9,400), there is a slightly greater demand placed on the City's water supply and wastewater management systems, as discussed below.

Water Supply

Under the Council modifications, total water usage on the projected development sites would be approximately 2,064,064 gpd (2.06 mgd), resulting in a net increase of approximately 1.62 mgd

over No-Action levels. This compares to a total water usage of 2.05 mgd and a net increase of 1.60 for Alternative F as analyzed in the FEIS. The Council modifications' incremental demand would represent an increase of 0.13 percent of the City's current water demand of 1.2 billion gpd (1,200 mgd). As with the 0.13 incremental increase associated with Alternative F, this relatively small incremental demand is not large enough to significantly impact the ability of the City's water system to deliver water. As such, the Council modifications, like Alternative F, would not result in significant adverse impacts upon the City's water supply nor would it affect local water pressure.

Wastewater Management

Under the Council modifications, sanitary sewage flows generated by the projected developments would be approximately 1.21 mgd (compared to 1.19 for Alternative F), an incremental increase of approximately 0.97 mgd over No-Action levels (compared to 0.95 mgd for the proposed action). This increment represents about 0.74 percent of the existing average wastewater flows at the North River WPCP and 0.57 percent of the its SPDES permitted flows (as compared to the proposed action's 0.72 percent and 0.56 percent, respectively). With North River WPCP operating substantially below capacity, the increase in sanitary sewage resulting from this alternative, as with the proposed action, is not anticipated to adversely impact WPCP operations nor cause it to exceed its design capacity or SPDES permit flow limit. As such, neither this alternative nor the proposed action would result in significant adverse impacts upon the City's sanitary sewage and wastewater management system.

M. Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

With 172 more residents generated by the Council modifications as compared to Alternative F and the CPC modifications (9,572 compared to 9,400), there is a potential for greater solid waste and sanitation services effects to occur. (As the non-residential development generated by the Council modifications would be exactly the same as Alternative F, the non-municipal solid waste generation would be the same and further assessment is not warranted.)

Under the Council modifications, it is estimated that the 28 projected development sites would generate approximately 163,605 pounds of municipal solid waste per week (81.8 tons), a net increase of 160,671 pounds per week (80.3 tons) over No-Action conditions. This would be somewhat higher than Alternative F, which would generate a net increase of 157,747 pounds of municipal solid waste per week (78.9 tons).

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the typical DSNY collection truck for residential refuse carries approximately 12.5 tons of waste material. Therefore, like Alternative F, the Council modifications would generate solid waste equivalent to approximately 1 truck load per day (assuming a seven-day week), which is not expected to overburden the DSNY's solid waste handling services. Accordingly, as with Alternative F, the Council modifications would not result in significant adverse impacts to municipal solid waste services.

N. Energy

The proposed Council modifications would not affect density. Therefore, energy demand would be the same as under Alternative F (energy demand is calculated by residential square footage rather than the number of residents). As was the case for Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse energy impacts.

O. Traffic and Parking

The proposed Council modifications would not affect density and result in new or different amounts of floor area on any development site. Therefore, the net vehicle trips and parking demand generated under the modifications would be the same as under Alternative F. Furthermore, there would be no change to traffic patterns or circulation. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse impacts to traffic and parking not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

P. Transit and Pedestrians

The proposed Council modifications would not affect density, and therefore would not change the net subway, bus, and pedestrian trips generated by Alternative F. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any significant adverse transit and pedestrian impacts not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

Q. Air Quality

Mobile Sources

As noted above, the proposed Council modifications would not affect the density and projected floor area on any identified development sites, and therefore would not change the net vehicle trips generated by Alternative F. The effects on air quality from mobile sources would not be affected by the Council modifications. Therefore, they would not result in any significant adverse mobile source air quality impacts not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

Stationary Sources

HVAC Source Impact Analysis:

Like Alternative F and the CPC modifications, the proposed Council modifications would entail (E) designations for stationary source air quality and therefore would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

Table 2 presents the results of the HVAC source impact analysis and is provided at the end of this memorandum. As shown in Table 2, with the proposed Council modifications, Projected

Development Site 5 would no longer require an (E) designation for emissions associated with HVAC systems. Provided below is a list of all properties which would receive (E) designations for air quality under the proposed modifications.

- Requires a minimum offset distance for the stack locations for either natural gas or No. 2 fuel oil, as specified in Table 2 --- (columns two and three):
 - Block 701; Lot 1 (Site 1)
 - Block 699; Lot 5 (Site 4)
 - Block 699; Lot 30*, 31*, 32*, 33, 37* (Site 6)
 - Block 698; Lot 1 (Site 7)
 - Block 696; Lot 58 (Site 10)
 - Block 692; Lot 57 (Site 14)
 - Block 691; Lots 43, 50 (Site 17)
 - Block 691, Lots 25, 27, 29, 33, 35, 37 (Site 18)
 - Block 690; Lot 29 (Site 20)
 - Block 715; Lots 1*, 2, 3, 60, 63, 64, 65 (Site 22)
 - Block 715; Lots 5,7 (Site 23)
 - Block 714; Lots 14,16 (Site 25)
 - Block 701; Lots 59,62,68,70 (Site 26)
 - Block 701; Lots 24,28 (Site 29)
 - Block 700; Lots 53,54,55,56,57,59,60,61 (Site 30)
 - Block 700; Lots 48,49 (Site 31)
 - Block 700; Lots 42,44,45,47 (Site 32)
 - Block 700; Lot 9 (Site 33)
 - Block 699; Lots 14,49 (Site 38)
 - Block 696; Lot 65 (Site 40)
 - Block 691; Lots 15,19,22,24 (Site 43)
 - Block 690; Lots 42,46 (Site 44)
 - Block 715; Lots 50,59 (Site 45)
 - Block 695, Lots 1,3,4 (Site 47)
 - Block 695, Lots 67, 68, 69, 70 (Site 52)
 - Block 694, Lot 47 (Site 53)
- Requires the exclusive use of natural gas (or a minimum offset distance for the stack location(s) if No. 2 fuel oil is used), as specified in Table 2 --- (columns four and five):
 - Block 701, Lots 30,33, 35*, 37,42,43 (Site 2)
 - Block 698, Lots 32,35,37, 40,41 (Site 8)
 - Block 697, Lots 27,31 (Site 9)
 - Block 6901, Lots 12,20,54 (Site 19)
 - Block 690; Lots 1,63 (Site 36)
 - Block 695, Lots 7, 12, 57 (Site 48)

Lots containing existing residential buildings, expected to remain under With-Action conditions, would not be mapped with an (E) designation for air quality. These properties are indicated with an asterisk (*).

The results of the analysis conducted for the Council modifications are provided in Table 2 below. Like Alternative F, the Council modifications would cause no violations of applicable air quality standards (i.e., maximum predicted total concentrations of each pollutant, including background, of NO_x, SO₂, and PM₁₀ are less than the corresponding NAAQS).

Cumulative Impacts from HVAC Sources:

The following four clusters were evaluated to determine the potential impact from the combined effects of the HVAC emissions from development sites on other nearby development sites.

Cluster #1: projected development sites 6, 8 – comprising a total floor area of 273,167 square feet with a stack height of 128 feet;

Cluster #2: projected development sites 12, 13, and 16 – comprising a total floor area of 356,688 square feet with a stack height of 253 feet.

Cluster #3: projected and potential development sites 22, 23, and 45– comprising a total floor area of 428,109 square feet with a stack height of 138 feet.

Cluster #4: potential development sites 46, 47, and 52 – comprising a total floor area 455,386 of square feet with a stack height of 253 feet.

The results of the analysis indicate that the potential air quality impacts of combined emissions from these HVAC clusters, using either No. 2 fuel oil or natural gas, would not be significant (i.e., would not cause a violation of an NAAQS).

Potential Impacts on Existing Land Uses

Like the results for Alternative F presented in the FEIS, the Council modifications would not cause significant adverse impacts to nearby sensitive land uses.

All buildings considered under the proposed Council modifications are either taller than existing land uses in the immediate vicinity of the rezoning area boundary or the change in building heights proposed under the Council modifications would not alter the conclusions (with respect to existing sensitive land uses) contained in the FEIS for Alternative F or the May 25, 2005 technical memorandum. As such, emissions from the heating systems of the projected or potential development sites would not impact existing residential buildings (i.e., would not cause a violation of an NAAQS).

Impacts of Existing Emission Source on Projected and Potential Development Sites

Like the results for Alternative F presented in the FEIS, with the Council modifications no significant adverse impacts are expected to any of the development sites from existing land uses.

The potentially significant combustion sources identified in the FEIS would not affect any projected or potential development sites identified under the Council modifications. The heights of the buildings that were identified as being potentially affected by existing emission sources either did not change or the height relationships between the projected and potential developments and existing land uses that were considered in the FEIS would not change.

Air Toxics Analysis:

Like Alternative F, under the Council modifications air toxic emissions from existing industrial or manufacturing sources in the study area would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts to any projected or potential development site. The manufacturing and industrial facilities identified in the FEIS for the proposed action would potentially affect the same development sites under Alternative F and the Council modifications.

R. Noise

With the proposed modifications, the same amount of development would occur at the same density on the 53 projected and potential development sites, as analyzed for Alternative F in the FEIS. With the proposed modifications, (E) designations for noise window wall attenuation would be mapped on the same tax lots as identified for Alternative F in the FEIS (refer to Tables 3 and 4). Therefore, as was the case for Alternative F, the proposed modifications would not result in significant adverse noise impacts.

S. Construction Impacts

The proposed Council modifications would result in the same development density on the 53 projected and potential development sites as analyzed for Alternative F in the FEIS. Apart from some changes in building height, setback, and related bulk regulations that would affect building envelopes, the constructions effects with the proposed modifications would be the same as for Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS. As these changes would not significantly change the nature of site construction, the Council modifications would not result in any significant adverse construction impacts not already identified in the FEIS for Alternative F.

T. Public Health

As with Alternative F analyzed in the FEIS, the proposed Council modifications would not result in significant adverse public health impacts, as they would not significantly impact the various technical areas that comprise public health, namely, air quality, hazardous materials, solid waste management, and noise. With the Council modifications, the hazardous materials testing and remediation requirements, air quality measures, and noise attenuation required by the proposed (E) designations would be implemented.

U. Mitigation

As the proposed Council modifications would result in the same significant adverse impacts identified under Alternative F, the same mitigation measures for community facility, traffic and transit impacts identified in the FEIS for Alternative F would apply to the proposed modifications.

V. Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The proposed Council modifications would result in the same unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the FEIS for Alternative F with respect to shadows and historic resources.

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 1 | 701 | 1 | Projected | Manhattan Mini-Storage 541 W29th St | Storage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 30 | Projected | Enterprise 30th Street Parking, LLC 505-509 W29th St | Parking Garage | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 33 | Projected | 505 W29th St | Storage/Vacant | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 35* | Projected | Terminal Food Shop 329 10th Ave | Deli | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 2 | 701 | 35* | Projected | 501 29th St | Residential / Commercial | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 2 | 701 | 36 | Projected | 331 Tenth Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 37 | Projected | 333 Tenth Ave | Auto Sales (lot) | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 42 | Projected | Enterprise 30th Street Parking, L.L.C. 343 10th Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 2 | 701 | 43 | Projected | 502 W30th St | Manufacturing /Vacant | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 3 | 700 | 1 | Projected | Kaz Systems 282 11th Ave | Parking Lot | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 3 | 700 | 1 | Projected | Davids Auto Service 282 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 3 | 700 | 1 | Projected | Brownfield Auto 298 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 4 | 699 | 5 | Projected | 547 W27th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 22 | Projected | 517 W27th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 23 | Projected | 515 W27th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 24 | Projected | Colin Construction 513 W27th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 25 | Projected | 511 W27th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Metal Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 26 | Projected | 509 W27th St | Scrap Metal Processing | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 27 | Projected | Central Iron & Metal 507-9 W27th St | Scrap Metal Processing | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 44 | Projected | Bungalow 8 518 W27th St | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 5 | 699 | 44 | Projected | Leonard Powers, Inc 514-20 W27th St | Industrial/Storage | Adjacent App A Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 6 | 699 | 30* | Projected | 503 W27th St | Residential | Adjacent App A Metal Processing | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 6 | 699 | 30* | Projected | Brite Bar 297 10th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Appendix A List Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | No |
| 6 | 699 | 31* | Projected | Bongo 299 10th Ave | Residential/Retail | Appendix A List Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | No |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 6 | 699 | 32* | Projected | Punjabi Food Junction 301 10th Ave | Residential/Retail | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 6 | 699 | 33 | Projected | City/Gas Auto Repair 303-309 10th Ave | Auto Gas/Service Repair | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 6 | 699 | 37* | Projected | 10th Ave Gourmet 311 10th Ave | Residential/Retail | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 7 | 698 | 1 | Projected | 246-60 11th Ave | Office Space | Adjacent App A Brass Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 8 | 698 | 32 | Projected | Firestone Bear Auto Center 279 10th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 8 | 698 | 35 | Projected | The Friendly Group 287 10th Ave | Taxi Mgmt | Appendix A List Automobile Rental | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 8 | 698 | 37 | Projected | Marquee 289 10th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Auto Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 8 | 698 | 40 | Projected | Paul Kasmin 293 10th Ave | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Auto Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 8 | 698 | 141 | Projected | 502 W27th St | Residential | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 9 | 697 | 27 | Projected | 501-9 W25th St | Parking/auto/ vacant | Adjacent App A Iron Works, Lumber Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 9 | 697 | 31 | Projected | Kantora Galley 259 10th Ave | Storage/ Commercial | Adjacent App A Iron Works, Lumber Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 10 | 696 | 58 | Projected | 550 W25th St | Auto/Pkg/Vacant | Adjacent App A Coal Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 11 | 696 | 28 | Projected | 511 W24th St | Commercial/Auto | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 32 | Projected | Kwik Farms 239 10th Ave | Gas Station | Appendix A List Gasoline Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 33 | Projected | Chandler Auto Repair 245-7 10th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 35 | Projected | 249 Parking Corp 249 10th Ave | Parking Garage | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 37 | Projected | Pepe Giallo 253 10th Ave | Restaurant | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 38 | Projected | World Class Audio 255 10th Ave | Auto Service | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 11 | 696 | 38 | Projected | Marty's Auto Body 500 W25th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 12 | 693 | 1 | Projected | 144-50 11th Ave | Building for Lease (office/commercial) | Adjacent lots to the north, lot 64, has a Glass Manufacture past use | 1934 Bromley, Jan 1955 Man Address Direct. | Yes |
| 12 | 693 | 64 | Projected | Chelsea Art Museum 150-54 11th Ave | Art Gallery | Glass Manufacture past use | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 13 | 692 | 7 | Projected | 545-7 W20th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Auto Service | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 13 | 692 | 7 | Projected | 120 11th Ave | Mixed Use (Residential/Office) | Appendix A List Metal Processing | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 13 | 692 | 61 | Projected | Lot 61 550 W21st St | Bar/Restaurant | Appendix A List Metal Processing | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 13 | 692 | 63 | Projected | 130 Eleventh Ave | Unknown (appears vacant) | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 14 | 692 | 53 | Projected | 540 W21st St | Office Space | Appendix A List Metal Processing | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 14 | 692 | 57 | Projected | Eyebeam 548 W21st St | Art Gallery | Appendix A List Metal Processing | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 15 | 692 | 28 | Projected | 521-527 W20th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 15 | 692 | 30 | Projected | 169-83 10th Ave | Construction Equipment Leasing | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 15 | 692 | 30 | Projected | Manhattan Collision 507 W20th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 16 | 691 | 11 | Potential | 100 11th Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 17 | 691 | 43 | Projected | 516 W20th St | Parking Garage | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 17 | 691 | 50 | Projected | Anton Kern 532 W20th St | Art Gallery | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 18 | 691 | 25 | Projected | W19th Street | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 18 | 691 | 27 | Projected | 505 W19th Street | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 18 | 691 | 29 | Projected | Mendon Truck Leasing 153 Tenth Ave | Retail/Auto | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 18 | 691 | 33 | Projected | Edison Park 161-5 Tenth Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 18 | 691 | 35 | Projected | 165 Tenth Ave | Parking Lot | Adjacent Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 18 | 691 | 37 | Projected | 504 W20th St | Parking Lot | Adjacent Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 19 | 690 | 12 | Projected | Corner W18th St | New Construction (Residential: Turner Construction) | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 19 | 690 | 20 | Projected | Roxy 515 W18th St | Bar/Restaurant | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 19 | 690 | 20 | Projected | Chelsea MTP Operating, LLC 511-25 W18th St | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 19 | 690 | 54 | Projected | 96 11th Ave | New Construction (Residential: Turner Construction) | Adjacent Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 20 | 690 | 29 | Projected | 131 Tenth Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 21 | 689 | 17 | Projected | 99-111 10th Ave | Parking Lot | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 1* | Projected | 457 W17th St | Residential/Retail | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | No |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 22 | 715 | 2 | Projected | Red Rock West Saloon 116 10th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 3 | Projected | The Park 118 10th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 60 | Projected | Lux 456 W18th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 63 | Projected | 464 W18th | New Development (128 10th Ave: restaurant) | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 63 | Projected | Star on 18 128 10th Ave | Restaurant | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 22 | 715 | 64 | Projected | 124 10th Ave | Parking Garage | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 23 | 715 | 5 | Projected | 453 W17th St | Commercial | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 23 | 715 | 7 | Projected | 447 W17th St | Unknown | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 24 | 714 | 1 | Projected | Bimmy's 455 W16th St | Deli | Appendix A List Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | Yes |
| 24 | 714 | 1 | Projected | Chelsea Garden Center 455 W16th St | Nursery | Appendix A List Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | Yes |
| 24 | 714 | 1 | Projected | 458 W17th St | Residential/Retail | Appendix A List Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | Yes |
| 24 | 714 | 1 | Projected | Atlantic Theater 453 W16th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 24 | 714 | 1 | Projected | Heavenly Body Works 441-55 W16th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 24 | 714 | 63* | Projected | 112 Tenth Ave | Residential/Retail | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 25 | 714 | 14 | Projected | 437 W16th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 25 | 714 | 16 | Projected | 437 W16th St | Auto Service | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 26 | 701 | 59 | Projected | Eurotech Construction/Painting 532 W30th St | Office Space | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 26 | 701 | 62 | Projected | Eastern Connection 534 W30th St | Shipping / Packing | Adjacent App A Sign Painting | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 26 | 701 | 68 | Projected | Cabinetry / Millwork 314 11th Ave | Industrial | Appendix A List Furniture Manufacture | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 26 | 701 | 68 | Projected | Midtown Neon Sign Corp 550 W30th St | Retail / Manufacturing | Appendix A List Sign Painting Shops | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 26 | 701 | 70 | Projected | CNC Auto Repair 312 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 27 | 701 | 45 | Potential | 506-526 W30th St | Hot Dog Vending/Storage | Appendix A List Metal Processing | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 27 | 701 | 52 | Potential | 518-522 W30th St | Auto/Pkg/Storage | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 27 | 701 | 55 | Potential | 524 W30th St | Parking | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 27 | 701 | 56 | Potential | 526-528 W30th St | Parking | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 27 | 701 | 58 | Potential | 530 W30th St | Parking | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 28 | 701 | 16 | Potential | Enterprise 30th St Parking, LLC 529-539 W29th St | Parking Garage | Appendix A List Furniture Manufacture | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 28 | 701 | 22 | Potential | Briggs Robinson Gallery 527 W29th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Furniture Manufacture | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 28 | 701 | 23 | Potential | Cabinet Maker 525 W29 St | Industrial / Commercial | Appendix A List Furniture Manufacture | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 29 | 701 | 24 | Potential | Tuck it 517 W29 St | Storage | Adjacent App A Furniture Manufacture | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 29 | 701 | 28 | Potential | Courier Network International Systems 515 W29th St | Retail / Art Gallery | Appendix A List Welding Shops | Aug 1934 Manhattan Address Directory | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 53 | Potential | Pentacostal Church 534 W29th St | Religious | Adjacent App A List Coal Storage | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 54 | Potential | John Young Studios 536 W29th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A List Coal Storage | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 55 | Potential | Elite Investigation 538 W29th St | Office Space | Adjacent App A List Coal Storage | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 56 | Potential | Alona Kagan Gallery 540 W29th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Garbage Reduction | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 57 | Potential | Action Carting 542 W29th St | Garbage Disposal | Appendix A List Garbage Reduction | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 30 | 700 | 59 | Potential | 546 W29th St | Auto Service Garage | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 60 | Potential | Avi Taxi Repair 546-8 W29th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 30 | 700 | 61 | Potential | 550 W29th Street | Office Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 31 | 700 | 48 | Potential | 524 W29th St | Office / Retail | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 31 | 700 | 49 | Potential | Sean Kelly Art Gallery 526-28 W29th St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A List Coal Storage | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 32 | 700 | 42 | Potential | 512 W29th St | Night Club | Adjacent App A Motor Freight Station | 1955 Bromley | Yes |
| 32 | 700 | 44 | Potential | Technik 1 516 W29th St | Auto Electronics | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 32 | 700 | 45 | Potential | 518 W29th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 32 | 700 | 47 | Potential | LA Ideal / Regent Maintenance Corp 522 W29th St | Manufacturing / Commercial | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 33 | 700 | 9 | Projected | NY Builders Supply Corp 545 W28th St | Masonry Yard | Appendix A List Lumber Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 33 | 700 | 9 | Projected | NY SUV Auto Body 547 W28th St | Parking Lot / Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 34 | 700 | 18 | Projected | Kamco Supply Corp 517 W28th St | Lumber Yard | Appendix A List Lumber Processing | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 35 | 700 | 29* | Potential | Taxi Mgmt, Inc 313 10th Ave | Residential/ Office Space | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 35 | 700 | 30* | Potential | Medina 315 10th Ave | Residential / Retail/ Restaurant | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 35 | 700 | 30* | Potential | 315 10th Ave | Residential | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 35 | 700 | 31* | Potential | IMP Mgmt 317 10th Ave | Residential/ Taxi Mgmt | Appendix A List Automobile Rental Establishments | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 35 | 700 | 31* | Potential | 317 10th Ave | Residential/ Retail Space | Adjacent App A Auto Rental | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 35 | 700 | 31* | Potential | 317 10th Ave | Residential / Retail Space | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 35 | 700 | 32 | Potential | Evan Auto, Inc 321 10th Ave | Auto / Towing | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 35 | 700 | 32 | Potential | Evan Auto, Inc 319 10th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 35 | 700 | 34 | Potential | 323 Tenth Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 35 | 700 | 36 | Potential | 10th Ave Tire Shop 327 10th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 36 | 699 | 1 | Potential | Manhattan Motors 270 11th Ave | Auto Dealer | Appendix A List Automobile Rental | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 36 | 699 | 63 | Potential | 554 W28th St | Commercial / Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Auto Rental | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 37 | 699 | 9 | Potential | 537 W27th St | Vacant Lot | Appendix A List Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 38 | 699 | 14 | Potential | CTX 538 W28th St | Industrial | Adjacent lot to the east, lot 49, has an Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 38 | 699 | 49 | Potential | Crobar 531 W27th St | Bar/Restaurant | Appendix A List Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 38 | 699 | 49 | Potential | Scores 533-35 W27th St | Bar/Restaurant | Appendix A List Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 39 | 697 | 1 | Potential | 220-40 11th Ave | Parking Lot | Lumber Yard, Adj Iron Works | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 40 | 696 | 65 | Potential | 210 Art 210 11th Ave | Art Gallery / Commercial | Appendix A List Coal Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 40 | 696 | 65 | Potential | Stricoff Fine Art 564 W25th St | Art Gallery / Commercial | Appendix A List Coal Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 41 | 696 | 1 | Potential | 202-8 11th Ave | Storage | Adjacent App A Coal Yard | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 42 | 694 | 30* | Potential | 505 W22nd St | Residential | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | 2004 Field Survey | No |
| 42 | 694 | 31* | Potential | West Chelsea Veterinary Hospital 203 10th Ave | Residential / Medical | Appendix 5, §24-04a | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | No |
| 42 | 694 | 32* | Potential | Tia Pol 205 10th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Motor Freight Station | 1934 Bromley | No |
| 42 | 694 | 32* | Potential | 205 10th Ave | Residential | Appendix A List Automobile Service | Jan 1955 Manhattan Address Directory | No |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 42 | 694 | 33 | Potential | 207 10th Ave | Construction / Auto | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 42 | 694 | 39 | Potential | Exxon 215 10th Ave | Gas Station | Appendix A List Gasoline Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 42 | 694 | 40 | Potential | 512 W23rd St | Parking Lot | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 43 | 691 | 15 | Potential | 531 W19th St | Art Gallery | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 43 | 691 | 19 | Potential | David Zwirner 525 W19th St | Art Gallery | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 43 | 691 | 22 | Potential | Sidney Samuels 517 W19th St | Commercial Heating Cooling | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 43 | 691 | 22 | Potential | Chelsea Studio Gallery 518 W19th St | Art Gallery | Appendix A List Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 43 | 691 | 24 | Potential | 515 W19th St | Art Gallery / Residential | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 44 | 690 | 42 | Potential | 516-22 W19th St | Warehouse / Commercial | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 44 | 690 | 46 | Potential | 524 W19th St | Art Gallery / Commercial | Adjacent App A Gas Storage | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 45 | 715 | 50 | Potential | Midtown Chelsea Center 436 W18th St | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 45 | 715 | 59 | Potential | Verizon 438-54 W18th St | Office/Commercial Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 46 | 694 | 58 | Potential | 536 W23rd St | Commercial Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 46 | 694 | 60 | Potential | 548 W23rd St | Commercial Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 46 | 694 | 61 | Potential | 522 W23rd St | Commercial Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 46 | 694 | 65 | Potential | Uhaul 170 11th Ave | Storage | Appendix A List Glass/Furniture Manufacture | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 47 | 695 | 1 | Potential | Privilege 182 11th Ave | Bar/Restaurant | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 1934 Bromley | Yes |

| Table 1, West Chelsea: Hazardous Materials (E) Designation for Alternative F With Proposed Modifications by the CPC | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Site | Block | Lot | Development Site | Address | Current Land Use | CEQR Reference | Source | (E) Designation Warranted |
| 47 | 695 | 3 | Potential | Chelsea Inn 184 11th Ave | Hotel/Deli | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 47 | 695 | 4 | Potential | 188 11th Ave | Office/Storage Space | Adjacent App A Auto Service | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 48 | 695 | 7 | Potential | New Construction | Residential/Retail | Adjacent App A Lumber Processing | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 48 | 695 | 12 | Potential | Bula Gallery 541 W23rd St | Art Gallery | Adjacent App A Lumber Processing | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 48 | 695 | 57 | Potential | 536 W24th St | Construction | Adjacent App A Lumber Processing | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 49 | 695 | 44 | Potential | MetroVision Production 508 W24th St | Office Space | Appendix A List Adj to RR ROW | 1934 Bromley | Yes |
| 50 | 695 | 47 | Potential | PlexiCraft 514 W24th St | Commercial | Appendix A List Lumber Processing | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 51 | 695 | 59 | Potential | W24th St | Construction | Adjacent App A Lumber Processing | 1897 Bromley | Yes |
| 52 | 695 | 67 | Potential | 200 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 52 | 695 | 68 | Potential | CC Auto 198 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 52 | 695 | 69 | Potential | 196 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 52 | 695 | 70 | Potential | Apple Auto 194 11th Ave | Auto Service Garage | Appendix A List Automobile Service Station | 2004 Field Survey | Yes |
| 53 | 694 | 47 | Potential | Manhattan Mini- Storage 530 W23rd St | Storage | Appendix A List Gasoline Service Station | 1934 Bromley | Yes |

(*) Lots indicated with an asterisk (*) are not expected to be redeveloped under the proposed action, as they contain existing residential buildings. Therefore, they would not be mapped with an (E) Designation. These lots would transfer air rights to adjacent lots within the development site. Note: as action-induced development is not expected on Site 14, the lots comprising this site would not receive hazardous materials (E) designations.

TABLE 2 – RESULTS OF HVAC SOURCE IMPACT ANALYSIS WITH PROPOSED COUNCIL MODIFICATIONS

| HVAC Source Identification | CEQR Screening Results for No. 2 Fuel Oil | CEQR Screening Results for Natural Gas | ISC3 Modeling Results for No. 2 Fuel Oil⁽¹⁾ | ISC3 Modeling Results for Natural Gas⁽¹⁾ |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Site 1 | 73 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 49 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 2 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Fail ⁽³⁾ | 79 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | Pass |
| Site 3 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 4 | 62 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 45 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 5 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 6 | 48 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 31 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 7 | 82 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 56 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 8 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Fail ⁽³⁾ | 63 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | Pass |
| Site 9 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Pass | 90 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | --- |
| Site 10 | 48 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 34 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 11 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 12 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 13 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 14 | 40 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 25 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 15 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 16 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 17 | 46 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 34 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 18 | 30 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 18 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 19 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Fail ⁽³⁾ | 80 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | Pass |
| Site 20 | 50 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 34 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 21 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 22‡ | 54 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 40 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 23‡ | 40 feet ⁽¹⁾ | --- | N/A | N/A |
| Site 24 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 25‡ | 40 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 26 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 26 | 85 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 65 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 27‡ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 28 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------|
| | | | | |
| Site 29 | 40 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 25 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 30 | 55 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 38 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 31 | 46 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 30 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 32 | 45 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 30 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 33 | 57 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 41 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 34 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 35 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 36 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Pass | 79 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | --- |
| Site 37 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 38 | 76 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 50 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 39 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 40 ⁽²⁾ ‡ | 29 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 17 feet ⁽¹⁾ | --- | --- |
| Site 41 ‡ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 42 ⁽²⁾ | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site 43 | 45 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 39 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 44 | 38 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 32 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 45 | 62 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 45 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 46 | Pass | Pass | --- | --- |
| Site 47 | 31 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 19 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 48 | Fail ⁽³⁾ | Fail ⁽³⁾ | 79 feet ⁽⁴⁾ | Pass |
| Site 52 | 24 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 17 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |
| Site 53 | 46 feet ⁽¹⁾ | 35 feet ⁽¹⁾ | N/A | N/A |

Notes:

1 Some sites are immediately adjacent to each other and the analysis could not be further refined without additional design data; therefore the minimum distance for which the source would pass the CEQR screening procedures was provided for these sites using CEQR monographs. The following (E) designation would be placed on these development sites: Any new development on the property must locate the HVAC stack no closer to the edge of roof than the distance indicated.

2 Building is taller than nearby buildings; no analysis is required.

3 For sites that failed the CEQR screening procedures, a detailed ISC3 modeling analysis was performed.

4 The following (E) designation would be placed on these development sites: Any new development on the property must either locate the HVAC stack no closer to the edge of roof (on the highest tier) as indicated or use natural gas as the type of fuel for the HVAC systems.

‡As explained in the memorandum to the project file dated 6/21/05, corrected (E) designation requirements, where applicable, have been provided above in Table 2.

Table 3, Required Attenuation Values for Alternative F With Proposed Council Modification: Projected Developmental Sites (the representative monitoring site is shown next to the address)

| Site Number | Address | Block Number | Lot(s) Number | Build Max L ₁₀ (dBA) | Attenuation Required |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 ** | 306-310 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 701 | 1 | 75.7 | 40 ** |
| 2 ** | 505 W 29 ST (S4) | 701 | 33 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 329 Tenth Ave (S4) | 701 | 35*** | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 331 Tenth Ave (S4) | 701 | 36 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 333 Tenth Ave (S4) | 701 | 37 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 337 Tenth Ave (S4) | 701 | 42 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 502-504 W 30 ST (S4) | 701 | 43 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 509 W 29 ST (S4) | 701 | 30 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| 3 ** | 282-298 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 700 | 1 | 75.7 | 40 ** |
| | 282-298 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 700 | 1 | 75.7 | 40 ** |
| 4 | 547-559 W 27 ST (S2) | 699 | 5 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 5 | 514-520 W 28 ST (S2) | 699 | 44 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 6 | 503 W. 27th St. (S4) | 699 | 30*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 299 Tenth Ave (S4) | 699 | 31*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 301 Tenth Ave (S4) | 699 | 32*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 303-309 Tenth Ave (S4) | 699 | 33 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 311 Tenth Ave (S4) | 699 | 37*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| 7 | 246-260 Eleventh Ave (S5) | 698 | 1 | 76.2 | 35 |
| 8 | 279 Tenth Ave (S4) | 698 | 32 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 285 Tenth Ave (S4) | 698 | 35 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 289 Tenth Ave (S4) | 698 | 37 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 293 Tenth Ave (S4) | 698 | 40 | 79.5 | 35 |
| 9 | 259 Tenth Ave (S4) | 697 | 31 | 79.5 | 35 |
| 10 | 550 W 25 St (S2) | 696 | 58 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 11 | 507 W. 24th St (S4) | 696 | 28 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 239 Tenth Ave (S4) | 696 | 32 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 245 Tenth Ave (S4) | 696 | 33 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 249 Tenth Ave (S4) | 696 | 35 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 253 Tenth Ave (S4) | 696 | 37 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 255 Tenth Ave (S4) | 696 | 38 | 79.5 | 35 |
| 12 | 144-150 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 693 | 1 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 154-160 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 693 | 64 | 82.7 | 40 |
| 13 | 130 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 692 | 63 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 550 W 21 ST (S8) | 692 | 61 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 550 W 21 ST (S8) | 692 | 7 | 82.7 | 40 |
| 14 | 542 W 21 ST (S6) | 692 | 57 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 540 W 21 ST (S6) | 692 | 53 | 73.3 | 30 |
| 15 | 169-183 Tenth Ave (S7) | 692 | 30 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 521-527 W 20 ST (S7) | 692 | 28 | 75.4 | 35 |
| 16 | 100 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 691 | 11 | 82.7 | 40 |
| 17 | 532-534 W 20 ST (S6) | 691 | 50 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 516-530 W 20 ST (S6) | 691 | 43 | 73.3 | 30 |
| 18 | 153 Tenth Ave (S7) | 691 | 29 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 161 Tenth Ave (S7) | 691 | 33 | 75.4 | 35 |

| Site Number | Address | Block Number | Lot(s) Number | Build Max L ₁₀ (dBA) | Attenuation Required |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | 165 Tenth Ave (S7) | 691 | 35 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 510 W 19 ST (S7) | 691 | 25 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 505 W 19 ST (S7) | 691 | 27 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 504 W 20 ST (S7) | 691 | 37 | 75.4 | 35 |
| 19 | 96 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 690 | 12 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 80-92 Eleventh Ave (S8) | 690 | 54 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 511-525 W 18 ST (S8) | 690 | 20 | 82.7 | 40 |
| | 511-525 W 18 ST (S8) | 690 | 20 | 82.7 | 40 |
| 20 | 131 Tenth Ave (S7) | 690 | 29 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 131 Tenth Ave (S7) | 690 | 29 | 75.4 | 35 |
| 21 | 99-111 Tenth Ave (S8) | 689 | 17 | 82.7 | 40 |
| 22 | 128 Tenth Ave (S7) | 715 | 63 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 124 Tenth Ave (S7) | 715 | 64, 65 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 118 Tenth Ave (S7) | 715 | 3 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 116 Tenth Ave (S7) | 715 | 2 | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 118 Tenth Ave (S7) | 715 | 1*** | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 456 W 18 ST (S7) | 715 | 60 | 75.4 | 35 |
| 23 | 453 W 17 ST (S9) | 715 | 5 | 74.9 | 30 |
| | 447 W 17 ST (S9) | 715 | 7 | 74.9 | 30 |
| 24 | 112 Tenth Ave (S7) | 714 | 63*** | 75.4 | 35 |
| | 96 Tenth Ave (S7) | 714 | 1 | 75.4 | 35 |
| 25 | 437 W 16 ST (S9) | 714 | 14 | 74.9 | 30 |
| | 437 W 16 ST (S9) | 714 | 16 | 74.9 | 30 |
| 26 | 314-316 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 701 | 68 | 75.7 | 35 |
| | 312 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 701 | 70 | 75.7 | 35 |
| | 534-538 W 30 ST (S1) | 701 | 62 | 75.7 | 35 |
| | 532 W 30 ST (S1) | 701 | 59 | 75.7 | 35 |
| 33 | 529-539 W 28 ST (S2) | 700 | 9 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 34 | 517-527 W 28 ST (S2) | 700 | 18 | 73.9 | 30 |

** The affect of additional trucks at the Morgan Annex was taken into consideration. Window / wall attenuation requirements were increased by 5 dBA along the assigned routes of Morgan Annex truck traffic.

*** These lots are not expected to be redeveloped under the proposed action, as they contain existing residential buildings.

Note: as action-induced development is not expected on Site 14, the lots comprising this site would not receive noise attenuation (E) designations.

Table 4, Required Attenuation Values for Alternative F with Proposed Council Modifications: Potential Development Sites (the representative monitoring site is shown next to the address)

| Site Number | Address | Block Number | Lot(s) Number | Build Max L ₁₀ (dBA) | Attenuation Required |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 27 ** | 530 W 30 ST(S2) | 701 | 58 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 526-528 W 30 ST(S2) | 701 | 56 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 524 W 30 ST(S2) | 701 | 55 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 518-522 W 30 ST(S2) | 701 | 52 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 506 W 30 ST (S2) | 701 | 45 | 79.5 | 35 ** |
| 28 ** | 529-539 W 29 ST(S2) | 701 | 16 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 527 W 29 ST(S2) | 701 | 22 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 525 W 29 ST(S2) | 701 | 23 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| 29 ** | 527 W 29 ST (S2) | 701 | 24 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 515 W 29 ST (S2) | 701 | 28 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| 30 ** | 550 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 61 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 548 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 60 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 546 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 59 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 542-544 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 57 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 540 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 56 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 538 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 55 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 536 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 54 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| 31 ** | 534 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 53 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 526-532 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 49 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| 32 ** | 524 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 48 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 522 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 47 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 518 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 45 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 516 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 44 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| 33 | 512 W 29 ST (S2) | 700 | 42 | 73.9 | 35 ** |
| | 529-539 W 28 ST (S2) | 700 | 9 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 34 | 517-527 W 28 ST (S2) | 700 | 18 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 35 ** | 313 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 29*** | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 315 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 30*** | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 317 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 31*** | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 319-321 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 32 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 323 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 34 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| | 327 Tenth Ave (S4) | 700 | 36 | 79.5 | 40 ** |
| 36 | 262-280 Eleventh Ave (S1) | 699 | 1 | 75.7 | 35 |
| | 554 W 28 ST (S1) | 699 | 63 | 75.7 | 35 |
| | 526-590 W 28 ST (S1) | 699 | 49 | 75.7 | 35 |
| 37 | 537 W 27 ST (S2) | 699 | 9 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 38 | 535-538 W 27ST (S2) | 699 | 14 | 73.9 | 30 |
| | 526-590 W 28 ST (S2) | 699 | 49 | 73.9 | 30 |
| 39 | 220-240 Eleventh Ave (S5) | 697 | 1 | 76.2 | 35 |
| 40 | 210-216 Eleventh Ave (S4) | 696 | 65 | 79.5 | 35 |
| 41 | 202-208 Eleventh Ave (S5) | 696 | 1 | 76.2 | 35 |
| 42 | 505 W 22 ST (S4) | 694 | 30*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 203 Tenth Avenue (S4) | 694 | 31*** | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 205 Tenth Avenue (S4) | 694 | 32*** | 79.5 | 35 |

| Site Number | Address | Block Number | Lot(s) Number | Build Max L ₁₀ (dBA) | Attenuation Required |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | 207 Tenth Avenue (S4) | 694 | 33 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 500 W 23 ST (S4) | 694 | 39 | 79.5 | 35 |
| | 512 W 23 ST (S4) | 694 | 40 | 79.5 | 35 |
| 43 | 527-533 W 19 ST (S6) | 691 | 15 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 521-525 W 19 ST (S6) | 691 | 19 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 517-519 W 19 ST (S6) | 691 | 22 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 515 W 19 ST (S6) | 691 | 24 | 73.3 | 30 |
| 44 | 524 W 19 ST (S6) | 690 | 46 | 73.3 | 30 |
| | 516-522 W 19 ST (S6) | 690 | 42 | 73.3 | 30 |
| 45 | 442 W 18 ST (S9) | 715 | 59 | 74.9 | 30 |
| | 436 W 18 ST (S9) | 715 | 50 | 74.9 | 30 |
| 46* | 536 W 23 ST | 694 | 58 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 548 W 23 ST | 694 | 60 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 522 W 23 ST | 694 | 61 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 170 Eleventh Ave | 694 | 65 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 47* | 182 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 1 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 186 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 3 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 188 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 4 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 48* | 549 W 23 ST | 695 | 7 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 543 W 23 ST | 695 | 12 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 536 W 24 ST | 695 | 57 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 49* | 508 W 24 ST | 695 | 44 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 50* | 514 W 24 ST | 695 | 47 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 51* | 540 W 24 ST | 695 | 59 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 52* | 200 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 67 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 198 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 68 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 196 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 69 | 77.5 | 35 |
| | 194 Eleventh Ave | 695 | 70 | 77.5 | 35 |
| 53* | 524 W 23 ST | 694 | 47 | 77.5 | 35 |

* Mixed-use development on Potential Development Sites 46 through 53 requires 35 dBA window-wall attenuation, as per the EAS for the *Chelsea Rezoning (CEQR No. 99DCP030M)*. In order to ensure that the 35 dBA noise attenuation is provided once the mixed-use zoning district is eliminated, the Max L₁₀ (77.5 dBA) recorded in the above referenced EAS is used for these potential development sites.

** The affect of additional trucks at the Morgan Annex was taken into consideration. Window / wall attenuation requirements were increased by 5 dBA along the assigned routes of Morgan Annex truck traffic.

*** These lots are not expected to be redeveloped under the proposed action, as they contain existing residential buildings.