DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CITY OF NEW YORK

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW DIVISION

Marisa Lago, *Director*
Department of City Planning

September 13, 2019

NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Peninsula Hospital Site Redevelopment

Project Identification
CEQR No. 18DCP124Q
ULURP Nos. C 190251 MMQ, C 190325 ZMQ
N190364 ZRQ, C 190366 ZSQ
and C 190375 ZSQ

Lead Agency
City Planning Commission
120 Broadway, 31st Floor
New York, New York 10271
SEQRA Classification: Unlisted

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

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991 and the regulations of Article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) as found in 6 NYCRR Part 617, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared for the actions described below. The proposal involves actions by the City Planning Commission and Council of the City of New York pursuant to Uniform Land Use Review Procedures (ULURP). Copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the office of the undersigned, as well as online on the Department of City Planning's Website. A public hearing on the Draft EIS was held on August 14, 2019, in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's citywide public hearing pursuant to ULURP. Written comments were requested and received by the Lead Agency until August 26, 2019. The FEIS incorporates responses to the public comments received on the DEIS.

I. INTRODUCTION

Peninsula Rockaway Limited Partnership (the "Applicant") is requesting several discretionary actions from the City Planning Commission (CPC) to facilitate a proposal by the Applicant to redevelop an approximately 9.34-acre site located on Lot 1 of Block 15842, Lot 1 of Block 15843, (the "North Parcels") and Lot 1 of Block 15857 (the "South Parcel") in Queens Community District 14 (CD 14) (the North Parcels and South Parcel are collectively referred to as the "Project Site"). The discretionary actions being sought by the Applicant from the CPC are:

- Zoning map amendment to rezone the North Parcels and p/o Lot 100 on Block 15842 from R5 and R5/C1-2 zoning districts to a C4-4 zoning district, and to rezone p/o Lot 7 on Block 15857 and the South Parcel from a C8-1 zoning district to a C4-3A zoning district;
- City Map Amendment to establish a portion of Beach 52nd Street between Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Shore Front Parkway/Rockaway Freeway;
- Zoning Text Amendments to modify the following sections:
    - Appendix F (Inclusionary Housing and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas) of the Zoning Resolution (ZR) to designate the Project Site a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area;
    - ZR Section 74-744(a) to allow a Physical Culture Establishment (PCE) as-of-right within the Large Scale General Development (LSGD);
- a LSGD special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-743(a)(2) to allow the location of buildings without regard for the applicable yard requirements of Sections 35-54 (Special Provisions Applying Adjacent to R1 through R5 Districts) and 23-533 (Required rear yard equivalents for Quality Housing buildings);; and the height and setback regulations of Sections 35-654 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residence for seniors) and 23-644 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residence for seniors);
- a LSGD special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-744(c)(1) to allow signage that exceeds the total surface area prescribed in ZR Section 32-64 (Surface Area and Illumination Provisions.

These discretionary actions, along with the discretionary approvals for the use of public funds that may be sought by the Applicant, are collectively referred to as the "Proposed Actions," and are subject to environmental review pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) requirements.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate an approximately 2,371,000 gross square feet (gsf) development (the "Proposed Project") on the Project Site, comprised of 11 buildings with approximately 2,200 income-restricted residential dwelling units (DUs), of which approximately 1,927 DUs would be income-restricted up to 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) to include approximately 201 DUs set aside for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors (AIRS), with the remaining 273 DUs restricted to income levels not exceeding 130% of AMI. In addition to the residential DUs, the Proposed Project would include approximately 72,000 gsf of retail space, including a fitness center and a supermarket, approximately 77,000 gsf of community facility space, approximately 24,000 square feet (sf) of publicly-accessible open space, and approximately 973 accessory parking spaces.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Site Conditions plus Background and/or History of the Project Site

Land Use

The Project Site is in the Edgemere neighborhood of Queens and is comprised of three tax lots: Block 15842, Lot 1; Block 15843, Lot 1; and Block 15857, Lot 1, which have a total lot area of 409,928 square feet (sf) (approximately 9.34 acres). The North Parcels are comprised of two contiguous tax lots (Block

15842, Lot 1 and Block 15843, Lot 1), which form an "L"-shape partly bound by Beach 50th Street and an excluded property (Block 15842, Lot 100) to the east, Rockaway Beach Boulevard to the south, Beach 53rd Street to the west, and Beach Channel Drive to the north. The South Parcel occupies Block 15857, Lot 1 and is bound by Rockaway Beach Boulevard to the north, an adjacent lot (Block 15857, Lot 7) to the east, Beach 52nd Street to the west, and Rockaway Freeway to the south. Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Beach Channel Drive are both wide streets as defined in the Zoning Resolution; Beach 53rd and Beach 52nd Streets are both narrow streets, as defined in the Zoning Resolution.

The North Parcels were previously occupied by the 173-bed Peninsula Hospital Center. Founded in 1908, it closed operations in April 2012 after its lab failed a state examination and was shut down by the New York State Department of Health (DOH). In the spring of 2018, the North Parcels were cleared of all vacant hospital structures and the South Parcel was cleared of an unutilized warehouse. Both the North and South Parcels are presently vacant and enclosed with a perimeter fence. The Project Site continues to be served by water, sewer, and utility infrastructure that previously served the hospital center.

Zoning

The North Parcels are currently mapped with an R5 zoning district with a C1-2 commercial overlay mapped to a depth of 150 feet from Beach 50th Street, on Block 15842, Lot 1. A C8-1 zoning district is mapped on the South Parcel, which is located south of Rockaway Beach Boulevard**.**

R5 zoning districts allow a variety of housing types. The maximum FAR of 1.25 typically produces three- and four-story attached houses and small apartment buildings. The maximum street wall height in an R5 district is 30 feet and the maximum building height is 40 feet. Above a height of 30 feet, a setback of 15 feet is required from the street wall of the building; in addition, any portion of the building that exceeds a height of 33 feet must be set back from a rear or side yard line. Parking is required for 85% of the number of DUs.

A C1-2 commercial overlay district is typically mapped within residential districts on streets that serve local retail needs, such as neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants, and beauty parlors. Commercial uses in mixed-use buildings are limited to one or two floors and must always be located below the residential use. When commercial overlays are mapped in an R5 district, the maximum commercial FAR is 1.0. The depth of the C1-2 overlay district is 150 feet unless otherwise delineated on the zoning map.

C8-1 zoning districts, along with other C8 districts, bridge commercial and manufacturing uses and provide for automotive and other heavy commercial services that often require large amounts of land. Typical uses are automobile showrooms and repair shops, warehouses, gas stations and car washes—although all commercial uses (except large, open amusements) as well as certain community facilities are permitted in C8 districts. Residential uses are not permitted in C8 districts and performance standards are imposed for certain semi-industrial uses (Use Groups 11A and 16). The maximum FAR is 1.0 in C8-1 districts; off-street parking requirements vary with use but generally one parking space is required for every 300 sf of floor area.

Proposed Actions

The following discretionary approvals subject to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) and Section 200 of the City Charter are needed to facilitate the Proposed Project:

Zoning Map Amendment

- **Zoning map amendment to rezone the North Parcels and p/o Lot 100 on Block 15842 from R5 and R5/C1-2 zoning districts to a C4-4 zoning district, and to rezone p/o Lot 7 on Block 15857 and the South Parcel from a C8-1 zoning district to a C4-3A zoning district;**

  The existing R5 and R5/C1-2 zoning districts on the North Parcels allows for a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.25 for residential, 1.0 for commercial, and 2.0 for community facility. The proposed C4-4 zoning district is a R7-2 equivalent and produces a maximum 3.44 to 4.0 FAR for residential uses,3.4 FAR for commercial uses, and 6.5 FAR for community facility uses. Residential development under the Quality Housing program in an MIH designated area have a maximum 4.6 FAR and a maximum 5.01 FAR for AIRS. Quality Housing buildings within an MIH area have a maximum buildable height of 135 feet for buildings with a qualifying ground floor. Off-street parking is required for 50% of all DUs, or it can be waived if five or fewer spaces are required. In Queens CD 14 however, R6 and R7 zoning districts are subject to the accessory off- street parking regulations of an R5 district (required for 85% of all DUs), except for developments located within an urban renewal area established prior to August 14, 2008 or to income-restricted units. Outside the Transit Zone, off-street parking would be required for 15% of the income- restricted housing units and 10% of the AIRS housing units.

  The existing C8-1 zoning district on the South Parcel allows for a maximum FAR of 1.0 for commercial and 2.4 for community facility. The C4-3A district (R6A residential equivalent) would allow commercial uses a 3.0 FAR, residential uses a maximum of 3.0 FAR, and community facility uses a maximum 6.5 FAR. Residential buildings developed under the Quality Housingregulations in MIH designated areas have a maximum FAR of 3.6 FAR for residential use and 3.9 FAR for AIRS. The minimum and maximum base heights permitted in the C4-3A zoning district is 40 feet and 65 feet, respectively. The maximum building height in the C4-3A district is 85 feet. The C4-3A (R6A residential equivalent) requires off-street parking for 85% of the dwelling units. Outside the Transit Zone, off-street parking would be required for 15% of the income-restricted housing units. Outside the Transit Zone, AIRS have a parking requirement of 10%of the total number of the DUs.

  Through the LSGD plan, the Applicant requests waivers of the C4-4 and C4-3A zoning district regulations to enable greater design flexibility for the purpose of a better overall site plan. LSGDs are typically located in medium-density commercial districts and uses in an LSGD must adhere to the underlying zoning district. The waivers requested through the LSGD special permits as set forth below would allow for the creation of more affordable DUs within the Project Site and also allow for flexibility for retail development. Upon approval, the applicant will enter into a Restrictive Declaration, a legally binding mechanism tied to the Project Site that governs the provisions of the LSGD.

Zoning Text Amendments

The following text amendments, which are included in Appendix A, "Proposed Zoning Text Amendments," are proposed to the New York City Zoning Resolution:

- **Zoning text amendment to Appendix F (Inclusionary Housing and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Areas) of the ZR to designate the Project Site an MIH area;**

The zoning text amendment to Appendix F would designate the Project Site as a MIH area. While 100% of the DUs in the Proposed Project are intended to be restricted as affordable and moderate income housing units by a regulatory agreement, the MIH requirements ensures that a set percentage of the residential floor area for any future development within the MIH area be permanently affordable. Within an MIH area, all housing developments, enlargements, and conversions that meet the criteria set forth in the MIH program must comply with the requirements of one of four options, to be selected through the land use review process.

It is anticipated that the Project Site would be designated under MIH Option 1: 25% of the residential floor area shall be provided as housing affordable to households at an average of 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI), with no unit targeted at a level exceeding 130% AMI. The Proposed Development would provide approximately 1,927 affordable housing units and would comply with MIH Option 1 that 25% of the residential floor area would be permanently affordable. While 100% of the DUs would be restricted by a regulatory agreement as affordable and moderate income housing units, the MIH requirement ensures that these units and any future development within the MIH area are permanently affordable.

- **Zoning text amendment to ZR Section 74-744(a) (Use Modifications) to allow a PCE as-of-right within the LSGD;**

  The zoning text amendment would allow a PCE (fitness center) without obtaining a special permit from the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA), as currently required. The text amendment would permit the physical culture or health establishment use in the context of a LSGD within Queens Community District 14 as-of-right.

City Map Amendment

- **City Map Amendment to establish a portion of Beach 52nd Street between Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Shore Front Parkway;**

The proposed change in the City Map would establish a portion of Beach 52nd Street between Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Shore Front Parkway. The proposed City Map change would allow the new privately-owned, publicly accessible internal street network to connect with the City-owned Beach 52nd Street down to its intersection with Rockaway Freeway. This new connection would permit vehicular traffic to facilitate better circulation exiting the Project Site. The proposed City Map change would reestablish the street connection at the intersection of Beach 52nd Street and Rockaway Freeway providing greater access and movement throughout the Proposed Project and this part of the peninsula. The opening of the intersection at Beach 52nd Street and Rockaway Freeway provides more direct access to Rockaway Freeway from the proposed project through the newly proposed privately owned, publicly accessible open street network mapping Beach 52nd Street through the development. Currently, the only two roadways providing access to Rockaway Freeway are Beach 54th Street and Beach 47th Street so this will provide a new direct connection down to this major thoroughfare from the development. Additionally, the new street connection will connect Beach 52nd Street all the way through the Project Site from Beach Channel Drive all the way to Rockaway Freeway. It is intended that this new street connection will be limited to a right turn into Beach 52nd Street from Rockaway Freeway and a right-turn out of the Beach 52nd Street and Rockaway Freeway intersection. The change in the City Map will improve traffic and circulation throughout the surrounding area by reducing conflicting right-turning vehicles at the intersection of Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Beach 52nd Street and reducing conflicting left-turning vehicles at the intersection of Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Beach 54th Street.

Large-Scale General Development Special Permit

- **LSGD special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-743(a)(2) to allow the location of buildings without regard for the applicable yard requirements of Sections 35-54 (Special Provisions Applying Adjacent to R1 Through R5 Districts) and 23-533 (Required rear yard equivalents for Quality Housing buildings); and the height and setback regulations of Sections 35-654 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residence for seniors) and 23-644 (Modified height and setback regulations for certain Inclusionary Housing buildings or affordable independent residence for seniors);**

(i) Side Yard Requirement

ZR Section 35-54 requires that a side yard of at least eight feet wide be provided along the entire length of the zoning lots side lot line that is adjacent to zoning lots in R1 through R5 districts. Zoning Lot 1 has two common side lot lines that are adjacent to Block 15842, Lot 100, which will remain in an R5 district. One of the common side lot line intersecting Beach Channel Drive extends 420 feet and 11 inches and the other common side lot line intersecting Beach 50th Street is 260 feet. Building B would have a two-story base portion that encroaches into the side yard area and does not provide the required side yard along the entire length of the common side lot line. The required side yard is provided along the first portion of the common side lot line extending approximately 125 feet and 2 inches. A waiver of the required side yard applying adjacent to R1 through R5 districts is requested to allow the two-story base the Building B to be built out to the zoning lot line.

(ii) Rear Yard Equivalent

Zoning Lot 1 will not provide the rear yard equivalent required by Section 23-533. ZR Sections 35-53 and 23-533 require that a rear yard equivalent consisting of an open area with a minimum depth of 60 feet midway provided between two street lines upon which a through lot fronts. Zoning Lot 1 is comprised of three corner lots, two interiors lots and a through lot, which fronts on Beach Channel Drive and Rockaway Beach Boulevard. The through lot portion has a depth of 794 feet and 3 inches. Zoning Lot 1 would contain Buildings A, B, C, D, and E. Portions of Buildings A, B, C, and D would be located within the through lot portion. An open private street network with a minimum distance of 60 feet is also provided within the through lot portion. An open area of more than 60 feet is provided through the proposed open private street network between Buildings A and B, and Buildings C and D but such street network does not coincide with the rear yard equivalent area. Portions of Buildings A and B are located in the rear yard equivalent area and thus, a waiver of the required rear yard equivalent is requested.

(iii) Height and Setback Regulations (ZR Section 35-654 and 23-664(c))

Maximum Base Height and Setback

In the C4-4 district, ZR Sections 35-654 and 23-664(c) require a maximum base height of 75 feet and a front setback of at least 15 feet along narrow street. Along Beach 53rd Street, a narrow street, within 15 feet of the street line, Buildings A and C would rise up to a height ranging from 80 feet to 110 feet without providing a 15-foot front setback. Thus, a waiver of the maximum base height and setback is requested. Along Beach 50th street, a narrow street, within 15 feet of the street line, Building E would rise up to a height ranging from 80 feet, 110 feet

and 140 feet without providing a 15-foot front setback. Along Beach Channel Drive, a wide street, within 10 feet of the street line, Building B would rise up to a height of 100 feet without providing a 10-foot front setback. Along Rockaway Beach Boulevard, a wide street, Buildings C, D and E would rise to a height ranging from 80 feet, 90 feet, 110 feet and 120 feet without providing a 15-foot front setback. Thus, waivers of the maximum base height and setback are requested.

In the C4-3A district, ZR Sections 35-654 and 23-664, require a minimum base height of 40 feet, a maximum base height of 65 feet and a front setback of at least 15 feet along narrow street and 10 feet along wide street. Building E would rise to a height of 70 feet without providing the required front setback. Thus, a waiver of the maximum base height and setback is requested.

Maximum Building Height and Number of Stories

ZR Sections 35-654 and 23-664(c) permits, in C4-4 district, a maximum building height of 135 feet and maximum of 13 stories. Building A proposes maximum building heights ranging from 150 feet (14 stories), 170 feet (16 stories) and up to 200 feet (19 stories). Building B proposes maximum building heights ranging from 150 feet (14 stories), 160 feet (15 stories), 180 feet (17 stories), and up to 190 feet (18 stories). Building C proposes maximum building heights ranging from 150 feet (14 stories), 170 feet (16 stories), and up to 200 feet (19 stories). Building D proposes a maximum building height of 150 feet (14 stories). Building E proposes maximum building heights ranging from 150 feet (14 stories), 170 feet (16 stories), up to 200 feet (19 stories). Thus, a waiver of maximum building height and maximum number of stories is requested.

ZR Sections 35-654 and 23-664 permits, in C4-3A district, a maximum building height of 85 feet and a maximum of 8 stories. Building E proposes a maximum building height of 90 feet (8 stories). Thus, a waiver of maximum building height is requested.

The proposed waivers for yards, height, and setback are intended to facilitate a better overall site plan that is responsive to the urban design and surrounding community. The variation in heights would allow the applicant to shift bulk around the Project Site to allow for a new privately owned, publicly accessible internal street network with two new 60-foot wide publicly accessible, private streets including: (i) an extension of existing Beach 52nd Street north through the center of the Project Site to Beach Channel Drive and (ii) Peninsula Way a new east-west street from Beach 50th Street to Beach 53rd Street, breaking up the existing superblock. The applicant would raise this center to an elevation of 4 feet above base flood elevation to lift areas of the site out of the flood hazard area, this elevated area is known as Highpoint intersection. This new street framework creates an intersection that forms and highlights a core or central area for the development where heights are scaled up at the center of the site and scaled down around the periphery of the Proposed Project.

- **Large Scale General Development Special Permit Pursuant to Section 74-744(c)(1)**

  The requested special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-744(c)(1) would allow signs that exceed the surface area requirement of the applicable district signage regulations set forth in ZR Section 32-64 (Surface Area and Illumination Provisions). The proposed surface area waiver works in conjunction with the LSGD bulk waivers in order to develop a better overall site plan that creates a strong sense of place and existence to activate street life and enhance pedestrian experience within the Proposed Development and the immediate surrounding neighborhood.

ZR Sections 32-62 through 32-65, inclusive, provides signage requirements applicable in C4 districts. In general, C4 signage rules permit a total surface area of up to five times the street frontage but not to exceed 500 square feet for each retail establishment for illuminated non-flashing and non-illuminated signs, and up to a maximum height of 40 feet. Pursuant to ZR Section 32-67, C1 district signage regulations are made applicable within 100 feet of the street line of any street which adjoins a residential district. Consequently, within 100 feet of Beach Channel Drive, the proposed signage within Zoning Lot 1 must conform with C1 signage regulations as set forth in ZR Sections 32-62 through 32-68, inclusive. C1 sign regulations allow a total surface area of three times the street frontage but not to the exceed 50 square feet per retail establishment for illuminated non-flashing signs or 150 square feet per retail establishment for non-illuminated signs, and up to a height of 25 feet. All proposed signs are located below the height of 25 feet. However, signs located within 100 feet of Beach Channel Drive and the anchor super market sign exceed the maximum allowable total surface area. All other signs conform with the C4 district signage regulations. Thus, such signs require waiver of Section 32-64 (Surface Area and Illumination Provisions).

The proposed signage waivers will allow flexibility for marketing the Proposed Project to future retailers in an area in need of new commercial development.

In addition to the discretionary approvals listed above, the Applicant intends to seek public funding and/or financing from various City and New York State agencies and/or programs related to affordable housing development.

Restrictive Declaration

A Restrictive Declaration will be recorded at the time of approval of all land use-related actions required to authorize the Proposed Project. The Restrictive Declaration will, among other things:

- Require development in substantial accordance with the approved plans, which establish an envelope within which the building must be constructed, including limitations on street wall, height and setback, bulk, floor area, and signage;
- Require that the proposed project's development program be within the scope of the reasonable worst-case development scenarios (RWCDS) analyzed in the EIS;
- Provide for the implementation of "Project Components Related to the Environment" (i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of environmental impacts in the EIS) and mitigation measures, substantially consistent with the EIS.
- Establish requirements with respect to the construction of the privately owned, publicly accessible open space and internal street network;
- Provide for the implementation of "Project Components Related to the Environment" or "PCREs" (i.e., certain project components which were material to the analysis of environmental impacts in the EIS);
- Provide for mitigation measures that would be implemented by the Applicant to address the significant adverse impacts with respect to community facilities and services, open space, transportation, air quality, and construction, substantially consistent with the EIS; and
- To ensure the implementation of the PCREs and mitigation measures, an environmental monitor would be required for the Proposed Project to oversee and certify implementation of the

mitigation measures and PCREs set forth in the FEIS, which would ensure that project commitments are implemented as required in the Restrictive Declaration.

III. PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the development of an 11-building, approximately 2,371,000 gsf mixed-use affordable housing, retail, and community facility development on the Project Site. The 11 buildings would be distributed on six sub-sections of the Project Site (A, B, C, D, E, and F), with sub-sections A through E on the North Parcels and sub-section F on the South Parcel. The Proposed Project would provide a maximum of 2,200 DUs, of which approximately 1,927 DUs are intended to be restricted to household with incomes up to 80% of AMI (with 201 DUs set aside for AIRS senior housing) and 273 units are intended to be moderate income DUs not to exceed 130% of AMI (The distribution of uses and floor area for the Proposed Project are provided in **Figure S-5: Proposed Project Site Plan** and **Figure S-6: Proposed Project Rendering**). Additional uses would include approximately 72,000 gsf of retail space, with an anticipated fitness center and supermarket; approximately 77,000 gsf of community facility space programmed for medical offices[1]; and approximately 24,000 square feet (sf) of publicly-accessible open space. Retail and residential uses would be distributed across all six sub-sections of the Project Site, while community facility uses are anticipated to be located on sub-section E. Building heights for the Proposed Project would range from approximately 90 feet to 200 feet (8 to 19 stories). The 201 senior DUs are proposed to be located in Building D2.

Approximately 973 accessory parking spaces would be provided as part of the Proposed Project, comprised of 754 accessory parking spaces for residential use (pursuant to ZR Section 25-21), 144 accessory parking spaces for retail use (pursuant to ZR Section 36-21), and 75 accessory parking spaces for community facility medical office use (pursuant to ZR Section 36-21). Parking would include surface and covered parking facilities on sub-section A; surface, covered and uncovered parking facilities on sub-section B; and covered parking facilities throughout the remaining sub-sections C through F. Parking spaces provided in both parking lots and garages would be accessible 24/7 and would be self-serve.

The Proposed Project includes a privately owned, open internal street network with two new 60-foot wide publicly-accessible private streets. The first private street would be an extension of the existing Beach 52nd Street, which currently terminates at Rockaway Beach Boulevard. The extension of Beach 52nd Street would proceed northward from Rockaway Beach Boulevard, cut through the center of the Project Site and terminate to Beach Channel Drive. The second would be a new east-west street named Peninsula Way that would extend between Beach 50th Street and Beach 53rd Street. The two new streets would break up the superblock, intersect to form a core or central area for the development, and is intended to reorient pedestrians towards the water.

The 24,000 sf of publicly-accessible open space would be distributed across the Project Site and include two major public open spaces: (1) Pedestrian Plaza (Beach 51st Street open space area) and (2) Highpoint intersection, located at the intersection of Beach 52nd Street and Peninsula Way. Both would be designed to allow pedestrians to gather and socialize. The open spaces would be improved with planters and numerous social seating furniture options that can withstand flooding such as cast-in-place concrete planters, pre-cast concrete paving, HPDE composite material for all site furniture. The Beach 51st Street open space includes a children's play area to provide more play space within the larger context of the pedestrian plaza by providing a fun and safe alternative to a traditional playground. The design includes rubber play surface in the same language as the rest of the plaza with a mound, timber steppers, and timber balances beams. The edge of the play surface would be flush in some areas for accessibility and rise up in others to form benches.

[1] Consistent with the original land use application, the Proposed Project includes approximately 72,000 gsf of retail space and approximately 77,000 gsf of community facility space; however, after the DEIS was issued, the Applicant filed a revised application that would allow an increase the square footage for the non-residential uses by approximately 20,000 gsf as long as the total non-residential zoning square footage does not exceed approximately 169,000 square feet. The revised application is analyzed in the FEIS as a new alternative.

Beach 51st Street is an easement area which allows emergency access to the Peninsula Nursing and Rehabilitation Center adjacent the Project Site. The Proposed Project would design the Beach 51st Street easement area as a pedestrian plaza and play area with publicly-accessible amenities.

The Project Site is located within the one percent annual change flood zone (Flood Hazard Zone AE) according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's 2015 Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). The 2015 Preliminary FIRMs indicate that the base flood elevation (BFE) of the Project Site is 10 feet (NAVD88). Consequently, the intersection of Beach 52nd Street and Peninsula Way would be raised four feet above the BFE to an elevation of 14 feet. The additional project features comprising the Proposed Project would incorporate flood protection measures. Since the Proposed Project is located within the current floodplain, it is subject to review for consistency with the policies of the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) and as such, the Proposed Project would incorporate resiliency and flood management techniques into its design and site planning to an area that is currently paved with concrete and other impermeable surfaces. These measures would safeguard proposed residential, commercial, and community uses from the effects of climate change, including sea-level rise and more severe storm events.

The distribution of bulk in the Proposed Project is intended to fit into the context of the surrounding area with density focused towards the internal roadway to activate the open space network provided therein.

The phasing sequence for the Proposed Project details infrastructure improvements associated with the development of the Project Site which would consist of roadway improvements and sanitary and stormwater infrastructure improvements to facilitate operations of the mixed-use development.

Table S-1: Proposed Project

Sub-Section	Block/ Lot	Buildings	Residential (gsf)	Residential Units	Commercial (gsf)	Community Facility - Medical (gsf)	Parking (gsf)	Total Area (gsf)	Mechanical (gsf)	Height (ft)
A	15843/1	A1	161,000	181	23,000	-	50,000	234,000	5,000	180
		A2	179,000	205	5,000	-	54,000	238,000	5,000	200
B	15843/1	B1	212,000	230	13,000	-	46,000	271,000	6,000	160
		B2	224,000	246	7,000	-	45,000	276,000	6,000	190
C	15843/1	C1	219,000	269	-	-	53,000	272,000	6,000	150
		C2	261,000	320	10,000	-	30,000	301,000	7,000	200
D	15843/1	D1	104,000	139	6,000	-	6,000	116,000	3,000	150
		D2	128,000	201	8,000	-	12,000	148,000	4,000	130
E	15842/1	E1	194,000	217	-	40,000	30,000	264,000	5,000	200
		E2	115,000	123	-	37,000	29,000	181,000	3,000	150
F	15857/1	F1	61,000	69	-	-	9,000	70,000	2,000	90
TOTAL (Entire Project)			**1,858,000**	**2,200**	**72,000**	**77,000**	**364,000 (973 spaces)**	**2,371,000**	**52,000**	

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

Since the Since the closure of the Peninsula Hospital in 2012, the Project Site has remained vacant and unutilized. Population in Queens CD 14 increased by approximately 8% between 2000 and 2010, from approximately 106,700 to 115,000 people, respectively. Approximately 44% of households are rent-burdened, which means they spend 35% or more of their income on rent. Moreover, approximately 13.8% of residents in Queens CD 14 are age 65 and over, which is higher than both Queens and the City (13.4% and 12.7%, respectively). The redevelopment of the Project Site is intended to address the need to provide more housing for the observed and projected increase in population, more affordable housing for those who are currently rent-burdened, and more housing for the elderly by providing up to 2,200 DUs (of which approximately 1,927 DUs are intended to be restricted to households with income levels up to 80% of AMI with 201 DUs set aside for senior housing) near public transit options, including the elevated tracks of the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) New York City Transit (NYCT) Rockaway (A train) Line run along Rockaway Freeway, with subway stops at Beach 44th Street and Beach 60th Street. Additionally, the NYC Ferry shuttle operated by Hornblower for the Rockaway route stops just one block west of the site at Beach Channel Drive and Beach 54th Street and provides access to the ferry landing located at Beach Channel Drive and Beach 108th Street. The Rockaway ferry route is a new key connection for both visitors and commuters to and from the Rockaways to Sunset Park Brooklyn and Lower Manhattan. In addition, the Proposed Project is intended to advance the goals of Mayor Bill de Blasio's *Housing New York: A Five Borough, Ten-Year Plan*, which is a 10-year plan to build or preserve 200,000 affordable apartments across all five boroughs of NYC.

As described in Section II, "Project Description," there are limited commercial retail options near the Project Site. Existing commercial retail options are primarily situated along Beach Channel Drive and Rockaway, Beach Boulevard. The Proposed Project would provide approximately 72,000 gsf of additional retail uses, including a supermarket and PCE (fitness center), that would help address the need for such supportive uses, and provide local employment opportunities. The Proposed Project would also provide an additional 77,000 gsf of community facility uses, programmed for medical office space. The former Peninsula Hospital was closed and had been vacant since 2012, before the site was cleared of the former hospital structures in the spring of 2018. At present, the nearest medical facility to the Project Site is St. John's Episcopal Hospital – South Shore Division, located approximately 1.5 miles east-northeast, with an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) station located approximately 870 feet southeast of the Project Site. The closing of Peninsula Hospital and lack of nearby medical facilities creates a need for additional medical facilities on the Rockaway Peninsula.

The Queens CD 14 *Statement of Community Needs* identifies the high rate of unemployment in Queens CD 14 as a pressing concern. Approximately 10.2% of the civilian labor force in Queens CD 14 is unemployed, compared to only 8.6% in Queens and 9.5% in NYC. The Proposed Project would introduce local retail and medical office space, which would generate approximately 365 new permanent jobs on the Project Site.

In addition, the overall scale of the Proposed Project is intended to fit into the context of the nearby development. The NYCHA Ocean Bay Apartments (Bayside) are located directly north of the Project Site and include 24 buildings that range in height between seven and nine-stories. The Ocean Bay Apartments (Oceanside) are located one block west of the Project Site and contain seven buildings with heights of seven- to nine-stories. The Arverne View apartment complex is located approximately four blocks southwest of the Project Site and provides 1,100 DUs across 11 buildings, which range in height from four to 19 stories. The Proposed Project would consist of 11 buildings that would range in height between 8 and 19 stories.

The proposed increase in density is supportive of the City's goal to redevelop vacant and underutilized land to provide affordable housing. The Proposed Project would allow for the redevelopment of the unused land once occupied by the Peninsula Hospital with affordable housing. The rezoning of the Project Site to both C4-4 and C4-3A districts in conjunction with a zoning text change to provide MIH would result in permanently affordable housing on the Project Site. Under the anticipated MIH designation of Option 1, the Proposed Project would be required to develop 25% of its residential floor area as permanently affordable

housing units (approximately 550 units) averaging 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI), with no unit targeted at a level exceeding 130% AMI. Furthermore, as stated previously, the Proposed Project intends to provide additional affordable housing by restricting a total of 1,927 of its approximately 2,200 DUs to households with incomes up to 80% of AMI.

Zoning Map Amendment

The Applicant believes the proposed zoning map amendment would be appropriate to address the needs of the surrounding area and CD 14. Currently, the Project Site is zoned with R5, R5/C1-2, and C8-1 zoning districts, which are insufficient to achieve the needed level of affordability. The Proposed Project would transform the 9.34-acre vacant and unutilized Project Site into a vibrant and resilient mixed-use development by activating the pedestrian streetscape with ground floor retail and publicly-accessible open space amenities to serve the needs of the community. As described above in the description of the Project Site, the existing zoning would allow a maximum FAR of 1.25 for residential, 1.0 for commercial, and 2.0 for community facility uses. The Proposed Actions would rezone the Project Site to C4-4 (R7-2 equivalent) and C4-3A (R6A equivalent), and map an MIH area over the Project Site, which would be consistent with the existing zoning in the area surrounding the Project Site and would achieve the proposed level of affordability for the Project Site.

The proposed zoning districts would increase the maximum FAR in the C4-4 district to 4.6 for residential use, 5.01 for AIRS, 3.4 for commercial uses, and 6.5 for community facility uses. It would also increase the maximum FAR within the C4-3A district to 3.6 for residential use, 3.9 for AIRS, 3.0 for commercial uses and 6.5 for community facility uses. The increase in density is appropriate along two wide streets—Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Beach Channel Drive. Wide streets are generally better suited to accommodate increased density and commercial development than narrow streets. Furthermore, Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Beach Channel Drive serve as the main east-west corridors traversing the peninsula and are thereby apt to support the density of the Proposed Project.

The proposed C4-4 and C4-3A zoning districts permit a wider range of residential and commercial uses than would be permitted under the existing R5 and R5/C1-2 zoning districts, in which uses are primarily limited to local retail uses (Use Group 6). The proposed C4-3A zoning classification on the South Parcel would also extend the C4-3A contextual district that is already found east of the Project Site along Rockaway Beach Boulevard. The proposed C4-4 and C4-3A zoning districts would support new, mixed- use, mixed income development at medium densities that would provide retailers an additional customer base and the opportunity to capture more spending on the peninsula, diversify the mix of commercial offerings, and allow for additional uses to attract new employers.

Zoning Text Amendments

The zoning text amendments in conjunction with the zoning map amendment are intended to better address the needs of CD 14. The zoning text amendment to Appendix F (Inclusionary Housing and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Area) to designate the Project Site as a MIH area would ensure that any future residential development within the MIH area includes permanently affordable DUs.

The zoning text amendment to ZR Section 74-744(a) would allow a PCE (fitness center) as-of-right without obtaining a special permit from the BSA, as currently required. The addition of a PCE is intended to provide a needed amenity for the residents of the Proposed Project and the surrounding community.

Large-Scale General Development (LSGD)

The Applicant is seeking a LSGD special permit pursuant to ZR Section 74-743 to allow variations in the height and setback regulations on the Project Site. The LSGD text allows for flexibility from the rigidities of zoning district regulations to encourage the development of the best possible site plan. A LSGD Restrictive Declaration would be recorded at the time all land use-related actions required to authorize the proposed project's development are approved.

The Proposed Project would require LSGD special permits to allow for the distribution of floor area within the LSGD, waivers of height and setback requirements, side and rear yard equivalent, and zoning text amendments to permit a fitness center as-of-right. The LSGD special permits would allow for the development of a superior site plan through the distribution of bulk within the overall development beyond that permitted as-of-right.

The Applicant believes that the Proposed Project is of a scale that would be particularly appropriate for a LSGD. It would consist of 11 buildings built over 409,928 sf of lot area. The Applicant anticipates starting construction in December 2019. It is estimated that full build out of the Proposed Project would span approximately 10 to 15 years, as described further in Section V, Framework for Analysis. The LSGD plan would maximize the amount of space within the Project Site that could be devoted to open spaces and street network by permitting additional bulk to be placed closer to zoning lot lines, and at greater heights than would be permitted by the current or proposed zoning districts. The Proposed Project would include a privately owned and publicly accessibly street network that would bisect the Project Site from the north to south between Beach Channel Drive and Rockaway Beach Boulevard and from the east to west between Beach 50th Street and Beach 53rd Street. The street network is intended to break up the existing super block into four smaller portions each of which would contain approximately four buildings. The network of privately-owned, publicly-accessible streets and pedestrian walkways provided by the LSGD plan would provide internal traffic and pedestrian circulation within the residential development. Furthermore, the internal street network is well-connected to the existing roadway network to aptly connect the development with the surrounding community and create a new connection to Rockaway Freeway with the extension of Beach 52nd Street. Additionally, the approximately 24,000 sf of open space programmed for the Proposed Project would be in the form of a publicly-accessible plaza and play area designed to create an attractive space and streetscape for pedestrians to gather and encourage circulation through the Project Site. A LSGD special permit would allow for flexibility with the site design while also providing for a well-planned development that would create predictability for the development and infrastructure that would be provided for a project of this scale.

The waivers would permit the limited but necessary relief of height, yard, and setback regulations within an LSGD and allow for the creation of a superior site plan that accommodates the programming of the Proposed Project. The shift in floor area from the South Parcel to the North Parcels, under the LSGD, would provide for a better site plan that would better integrate publicly-accessible open spaces with the built environment.

V. FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

The analyses contained in the DEIS has been developed in conformance with CEQR regulations and the guidance of the 2014 *CEQR Technical Review Manual*. The EIS assesses whether development resulting from the Proposed Actions could result in significant adverse environmental impacts. This section outlines the analysis framework that was examined in the FEIS.

Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario

To assess the potential effects of the Proposed Actions, a reasonable worst-case development scenario (RWCDS) was developed for the Project Site. The RWCDS considers both the anticipated development that would occur in the future on the Project Site without the Proposed Actions (the future "No-Action" condition) and the development that would occur in the future on the Project Site with the Proposed Actions (the future "With-Action" condition). The incremental difference between the future No-Action and future With-Action conditions serves as the basis for the impact analysis in the environmental review.

Analysis Year

The 11 buildings that comprise the Proposed Project would be developed over several years. The Applicant expects to start construction December 2019 and estimates that construction of all buildings could take

approximately 10 years. As noted above, the Applicant intends to seek public funds and/or financing from various City and New York State agencies and/or programs related to affordable housing development and, as such, that administrative process could possibly extend full build out of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the analysis year for the Proposed Project is assumed to be 2034 for the bulk of the impact analyses and 2029 for purposes of construction-related analyses. The 2029 analysis year is more conservative for purpose of the construction-period analysis because it considers a greater overlap of construction activities. Build- out of the new roadway network would be coincident with the completion of the frontages of buildings A1 through F1. The former four-story Peninsula Hospital was demolished in June 2016. The land-clearing operations on the Project Site were completed independently of the Proposed Actions.

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

In the future absent the Proposed Actions (the "No-Action" condition) the Project Site would remain under the existing zoning designations, as described in Section II, "Project Description." Market-rate, residential development, along with supporting retail space, would be feasible on the Project Site and would be constructed as-of-right in conformance to existing zoning designations. The existing zoning of R5/C1-2 and C8-1 would allow a maximum residential FAR of 1.25, and a maximum commercial FAR of 1.0. The maximum FAR for all community facility use on the Project Site would be 2.0. As such, the total maximum FAR for mixed-use would be 1.25 for the Project Site, which would yield a total maximum floor area of 508,385 zoning square feet (zsf).

Absent the Proposed Actions, the Applicant would develop the Project Site would include 12 buildings, including approximately 482,523 gsf of residential space (providing 568 DUs), 21,659 gsf of local retail space, 800 gsf of community facility space, and 557 accessory parking spaces. Of the 557 parking spaces, 457 would be provided on surface parking lots and the additional 100 would be provided in an underground parking garage located in the center of the northern portion of the Project Site. The No-Action condition would result in approximately 544,982 gsf of development on the Project Site.

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

The development program and building design for the Proposed Project, as described above, would represent the With-Action condition for environmental analysis purposes. The proposed zoning districts, along with establishing the proposed MIH area, would allow an increase of maximum FAR on the North Parcels to 4.6 for residential use, 5.01 for residential use for seniors (AIRS), 3.4 for commercial uses, and 6.5 for community facility uses. It would also increase the maximum FAR to 3.6 FAR for residential use and 3.9 FAR for AIRS,

3.0 for commercial uses and 6.5 for community facility uses on the South Parcel. The LSGD restrictive declaration would not restrict specific Use Groups but would restrict the overall residential, commercial and community facility floor area as well as the maximum building envelope for the Proposed Project. Because the LSGD special permit would require the Proposed Project to be in substantial conformance with the approved plans and zoning calculations, which includes the overall maximum floor area for residential, commercial and community facility use, the Proposed Project would be the worst-case development scenario for the With- Action condition.

Table S-2: No-Action Condition

Block/Lot	Building	Residential (gsf)	Residential Units	Commercial – Local Retail (gsf)	Community Facility (gsf)	Structure Parking (gsf)	Total Parking Spaces (Surface Lots and Structure)	Total Area (gsf)	Height (feet)
15843/1	A	44,897	53	0	0	40,000	46	44,897	40
15843/1	B	44,433	52	0	0		45	44,433	40
15843/1	C	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	D	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	E	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	F	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	G	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	H	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15843/1	I	45,319	53	0	0		45	45,319	40
15842/1	J	44,319	53	0	800		47	45,319	40
15842/1	K	30,641	32	15,585	0		84	47,026	40
15857/1	L	0	0	6,074	0		20	6,074	15
TOTAL		**482,523**	**568**	**21,659**	**800**	**40,000**	**557**	**544,982**	

Increment

As described in Table S-3: Incremental Development Between No-Action and With-Action Conditions, the incremental difference between the No-Action condition and With-Action condition consists of approximately 1,826,018 gsf of development comprised of the following uses: approximately 1,375,477 gsf residential floor area (or approximately 1,632 DUs), approximately 50,341 gsf of retail space, approximately 76,200 gsf of community facility uses, 324,000 gsf of parking space, and 416 accessory parking spaces.

The Applicant intends to provide a substantial amount of affordable housing in the Proposed Project by targeting 1,927 of its approximately 2,200 DUs to households with incomes up to 80% of AMI. Furthermore, as stated above, under the anticipated MIH designation of Option 1, the Proposed Project would be required to develop 25% of its residential floor area as permanently affordable housing units (approximately 550 units). For purposes of the environmental review, whatever is the more conservative incremental basis of market-rate verses affordable DUs for an individual impact analysis was utilized as the basis for assessments in the FEIS.

Table S-3: Incremental Development Between No-Action and With-Action Conditions

RWCDS	No-Action (gsf)	With-Action (gsf)	Increment (gsf)
Residential gsf	482,523	1,858,000	**1,375,477**
Total DUs	*568*	*2,200*	***1,632***
Income-Restricted DUs above 80% AMI to not exceed 130% AMI	*568*	*273*	***-295***
Income-Restricted DUs up to 80% AMI	*0*	*1,927*	***1,927***
Commercial gsf	21,659	72,000	**50,341**
Community Facility gsf	800	77,000	**76,200**
Parking gsf	40,000	364,000	**324,000**
Parking spaces	*557*	*973*	***416***
Total gsf	544,982	2,371,000	**1,826,018**
Mechanical gsf	0	52,000	**52,000**
Open Space sf	0	24,000	**24,000**

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

The Proposed Actions described above are subject to public review under the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), Section 200 of the City Charter, as well as CEQR procedures. The ULURP and CEQR review processes are described below.

Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP)

The City's ULURP, mandated by Sections 197-c and 197-d of the City Charter, is a process especially designed to allow public review of a proposed project at four levels: the Community Board, the Borough President and (if applicable) Borough Board, the CPC, and the City Council. The procedure sets time limits for review at each stage to ensure a maximum total review period of approximately seven months.

The ULURP process begins with a certification by CPC that the ULURP application is complete, which includes satisfying CEQR requirements (see the discussion below). The application is then forwarded to the Community Board (in this case, Queens Community Board 14 [CB14]), which has 60 days to review and discuss the proposal, hold public hearings, and adopt recommendations regarding the application. Once this step is complete, the Borough President reviews the application for up to 30 days. CPC then has 60 days to review the application, during which time a ULURP/CEQR public hearing is held. Comments made at the DEIS public hearing (the record for commenting remains open for ten days after the hearing to receive written comments) are incorporated into a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS); the FEIS must be completed at least ten days before CPC makes its decision on the application. CPC may approve, approve with modifications, or deny the application.

In conformance with this process, the ULURP application for the Proposed Project (ULURP Nos. 190251 MMQ, 190325 ZMQ, N190364 ZRQ, 190366 ZSQ, and 190375 ZSQ) was certified as complete by CPC on May 6, 2019. The application was forwarded to Queens CB 14, which held a public hearing on the application on June 25, 2019. Queens CB 14 submitted comments in the form of a Formal Resolution dated July 3, 2019. Following its review by Queens CB 14, the application passed to the Queens Borough President who then held a public hearing on the application on July 11, 2019. The Borough President provided recommendations on the application to the CPC on August 8, 2019.

If the ULURP application is approved, or approved with modifications, it moves to the City Council for review. The City Council does not automatically review all ULURP actions that are approved by CPC. Zoning map changes and zoning text changes (not subject to ULURP) nevertheless must be reviewed by the City Council; the Council may elect to review certain other actions. The City Council, through the Land Use Committee, has 50 days to review the application and, during this time, will hold a public hearing on the proposed project. The Council may approve, approve with modifications, or deny the application. If the Council proposes a modification to the proposed project, the ULURP review process stops for 15 days, providing time for a CPC determination on whether the modification is within the scope of the environmental review and ULURP review. If it is, then the Council may proceed with the modification; if it is not, then the Council may only vote on the project as approved by CPC. Following the Council's vote, the Mayor has five days in which to veto the Council's actions. The City Council may override a Mayoral veto within ten days.

The review of a zoning text amendment pursuant to Section 200 of the City Charter follows the same time clock as described above when coupled with a ULURP application, and is subject to the same procedures governing CPC, City Council, and Mayoral action.

New York City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR)

Pursuant to the SEQRA and its implementing regulations found at 6 NYCRR Part 617, New York City has established rules for its own environmental quality review in Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and 62 RCNY Chapter 5, the Rules of Procedure for CEQR. The environmental review process provides a means for decision-makers to systematically consider environmental effects along with other aspects of project planning and design, to propose reasonable alternatives, to identify, and when practicable mitigate, significant adverse environmental effects. CEQR rules guide environmental review, as follows:

- ***Establish a Lead Agency***. Under CEQR, the "lead agency" is the public entity responsible for conducting the environmental review. The lead agency is typically the entity principally responsible for carrying out, funding, or approving the proposed action. In accordance with CEQR rules (62 RCNY Section 5-03), the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), acting as lead agency on behalf of the City Planning Commission (CPC), assumed lead agency status for the Proposed Actions.

- ***Determine Significance***. The lead agency's first charge is to determine whether the proposed action(s) may have a significant impact on the environment. To do so, DCP, in this case, evaluated an Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) dated March 15, 2018 for the Proposed Actions. Based on the information contained in the EAS, DCP determined that the Proposed Actions may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, as defined by statute, and issued a Positive Declaration on March 16, 2018 requiring that an EIS be prepared in conformance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the SEQRA, Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, CEQR Rules of Procedure of 1991, as well as the relevant guidelines of the CEQR Technical Manual.

- ***Scoping***. Once the lead agency issues a Positive Declaration, it must then issue a draft scope of work for the EIS. "Scoping," or creating the scope of work, is the process of establishing the type and extent of the environmental impact analyses to be studied in the EIS. The Draft Scope of Work was prepared in accordance with SEQRA, CEQR, and the CEQR Technical Manual; and, along with a Positive Declaration, the Draft Scope of Work was issued on March 23, 2018. CEQR requires a public scoping meeting as part of the process. A public scoping meeting was held on April 26, 2018 in the auditorium of Queens P.S. 105 located at 420 Beach 51st Street, Far Rockaway, New York 11691. The period for submitting written comments remained open until May 7, 2018. A Final Scope of Work was prepared, taking into consideration comments received during the public comment period, to direct the content and preparation of a DEIS. DCP issued the Final Scope of Work on May 3, 2019.

- ***Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).*** In accordance with the Final Scope of Work, a DEIS is prepared. The lead agency reviews all aspects of the document, calling on other City agencies to participate as appropriate. Once the lead agency is satisfied that the DEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion and circulates the DEIS for public review. When a DEIS is required, it must be deemed complete before the ULURP application can also be found complete. The DEIS was deemed complete and the Notice of Completion was issued on May 3, 2019.

- ***Public Review***. Publication of the DEIS and issuance of the Notice of Completion signals the start of the public review period. During this period, which must extend for a minimum of 30 days, the public may review and comment on the DEIS either in writing or at a public hearing convened for the purpose of receiving such comments. As noted above, when the CEQR process is coordinated with another City process that requires a public hearing, such as ULURP, the hearings may be held jointly. The lead agency must publish a notice of the hearing at least 14 days before it takes place and must accept written comments for at least ten days following the close of the hearing. All substantive comments become part of the CEQR record and must be summarized and responded to in the FEIS. A joint public hearing on the DEIS and ULURP application was held by the CPC on August 14, 2019, and the DEIS comment period remained open until August 26, 2019.

- ***Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).*** After the close of the public comment period for the DEIS, the lead agency prepares the FEIS. The FEIS must incorporate relevant comments on the DEIS, either in a separate chapter or in changes to the body of the text, graphics, and tables. Once the lead agency determines that the FEIS is complete, it issues a Notice of Completion and circulates the FEIS. The Notice of Completion for this FEIS was issued on September 13, 2019.

- ***Findings.*** To document that the responsible public decision-makers have taken a hard look at the environmental consequences of a proposed action, any agency taking a discretionary action

regarding a project must adopt a formal set of written findings, reflecting its conclusions about the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed action, potential alternatives, and mitigation measures. No findings may be adopted until ten days after the Notice of Completion has been issued for the FEIS. Once each agency's findings are adopted, it may take its actions (or take "no action"). This means that the CPC must wait at least ten days after the FEIS is complete to take action on a given application.

VII. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

No significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy are anticipated due to the Proposed Actions. The Proposed Actions would not adversely affect surrounding land uses, nor would the Proposed Actions generate land uses that would be incompatible with existing zoning and land uses. Furthermore, the Proposed Actions would not result in development that conflicts with adopted public policies.

The Proposed Actions would redevelop the Project Site that has remained vacant and underutilized since the closure of the Peninsula Hospital in 2012. The rezoning of the Project Site to C4-4 and C4-3A zoning districts and zoning text amendment to provide MIH would be compatible with existing zoning districts near the Project Site. The redevelopment of the Project Site would result in the provision of mixed income housing, including 1,927 DUs intended to be affordable including 201 DUs set aside for senior housing and 273 DUs restricted to income levels not exceeding 130% of AMI. Proposed community facility and retail uses, including the supermarket and physical culture establishment (fitness center), would help address the community's need for such supportive uses and provide local employment opportunities. The overall scale of the Proposed Project would be consistent with the context of the surrounding area, which includes higher density NYCHA developments.

The Proposed Project is located within the current one percent annual chance flood zone, or 100-year floodplain, and as such would incorporate resiliency and flood management techniques in its design and site plan to address potential flood risk. This would ensure that the new construction would provide the community with residential, commercial, and community facility programming that would be resilient when faced with a potential major storm event.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Based on a preliminary assessment, it was determined that the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on socioeconomic conditions due to indirect residential displacement. The Proposed Project would facilitate the development of a substantial amount of new housing within the study area. As under the No-Action condition, the Proposed Project would introduce populations with incomes up of to $60,360 for households occupying one-bedroom DUs restricted at 80% of AMI, and incomes up to $138,080 for households occupying three-bedroom units restricted at 130% of AMI. The Proposed Project would not introduce a trend toward increasing rents and new market rate development that is not already observable in or near the study area, including the Arverne Real Estate Market area.

Community Facilities

Based on a preliminary screening, the Proposed Project warrants analysis for indirect effects to elementary, intermediate, and high schools; libraries; and publicly funded child care centers.

Based on a detailed analysis, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on public high schools and libraries. The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools as well as publicly funded child care centers, warranting consideration of mitigation.

Estimates of future public school enrollment are based on NYC School Construction Authority (SCA) enrollment projections and data obtained from SCA Capital Planning Division on the number of new housing units and students expected at the sub-district and borough levels. The future utilization rate for school facilities shows overutilization at the public elementary and high school grade levels, without the introduction of students generated by the Proposed Project. A substantial portion of the new housing units would be introduced to Sub-district 1 of Community School District (CSD) 27 in Queens due to a large number of planned or ongoing development projects, not including the Proposed Project, resulting in overutilization of public schools.

Indirect effects on Public Schools

The Proposed Project is located within Sub-district 1 of CSD 27 in Queens. In the future with the Proposed Actions (the "With-Action" condition), the Proposed Project would result in the incremental development of 1,632 DUs on the Project Site compared to the future without the Proposed Actions (the "No-Action condition"). Of these, 201 DUs are intended to be set aside for AIRS senior housing, which would not generate school-age children. Therefore, the public school analysis assesses the impacts associated with the incremental increase of 1,431 non-senior DUs. Based on student generation rates according to borough and CSD as defined by the SCA, the Proposed Project would result in approximately 444 public elementary school students, 200 public intermediate students, and 186 public high school students.

Elementary Schools

Based on a detailed analysis of public elementary schools CSD 27, Sub-district 1 would operate at overcapacity for public elementary schools with a shortfall of 1,991 seats in the With-Action condition. The share of the shortage attributable to the Proposed Project would be 7.85%, due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 127.36% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 135.21% in the With-Action condition.

Since the collective utilization rate for public elementary schools in the With-Action condition would be greater than 100% and the collective utilization rate would be equal to or greater than 5% from the No-Action condition, the Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools and require consideration of mitigation.

Intermediate Schools

Based on a detailed analysis of public intermediate schools, CSD 27, Sub-district 1 would operate at overcapacity for public intermediate schools with a shortfall of 46 seats in the With-Action condition. The share of the shortage attributable to the Proposed Project would be 6.93%, due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 94.65% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 101.58% in the With-Action condition.

Since the collective utilization rate for public intermediate schools in the With-Action condition would be greater than 100% and the collective utilization rate would be equal to or greater than 5% from the No-Action condition, the Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools and require consideration of mitigation.

High Schools

Based on a detailed analysis of public high schools, high schools in Queens would be at overcapacity with a shortfall of 12,799 seats in the With-Action condition. The share of the shortage attributable to the Proposed Project would be 0.26%, due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 117.75% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 118.01% in the With-Action condition. Since the collective utilization rate would not increase by equal to or greater than 5% from the No-Action condition, the Proposed

Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on high schools.

Indirect effects on Libraries

As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact would occur if a project would increase the population of the library catchment area by 5% or more, and this increase would impair the delivery of library services in the study area. Although the Arverne Library catchment area population would increase by approximately 18% with the incremental development of 1,632 DUs from the Proposed Project, this increase would not be expected to impair the delivery of library services due to access to nearby libraries and the Queens Borough Public Library (QBPL) inter-library loan system. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on libraries.

Indirect effects on Child Care Centers

In the With-Action condition, the Proposed Project would result in the incremental development of 1,927 DUs intended to be affordable for households with incomes up to 80% of AMI compared to the No-Action condition. Of the 1,927 DUs, 201 DUs are intended to be set aside for AIRS senior housing, which would not generate children eligible for publicly funded child care and Head Start centers. Therefore, the analysis of publicly funded group child care and Head Start Centers was based on the incremental increase of 1,726 non- senior, affordable DUs. Based on the multipliers for estimating the number of children eligible for publicly funded child care and Head Start centers according to borough defined by the New York City (NYC) Administration for Children's Services (ACS), the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate the need for approximately 242 child care slots.

Based on a detailed analysis, child care/Head Start centers in the study area would be at overcapacity with a shortfall of 353 seats in the With-Action condition. The size of the shortage attributable to the Proposed Project would be 46.5%, due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 121.35% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 167.82% in the With-Action condition. Since the collective utilization rate for child care/Head Start centers would be greater than 100% and the collective utilization rate would increase more than 5% from the No-Action condition, the Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on publicly funded child care and Head Start Centers, and require consideration of mitigation.

Open Space

A detailed analysis was conducted, which found that the Proposed Project would result in an indirect significant adverse impact active open space resources in the residential study area. In addition, the analysis concluded that the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on passive open space resources in either the residential or non-residential study areas. The Proposed Project would not result in a direct impact on open space resources since there are no existing open space resources on the Project Site, nor would it result in a significant adverse shadows, air quality, noise, or other environmental impact that would affect the utilization of publicly-accessible open space resources.

The Proposed Project would result in a 16.20% decrease in the overall residential open space ratio (OSR), from 3.66 in the No-Action condition to 3.07 in the With-Action condition. The 3.07 residential OSR in the With-Action condition would be above the *CEQR Technical Manual* benchmark OSR of 2.50 and above the City median community district OSR of 1.50. The active OSR in the residential study area would decrease by 13.31%, from 0.84 in the No-Action condition to 0.73 in the With-Action condition; the active OSR benchmark noted in the *CEQR Technical Manual* is 2.00. The passive OSR in the residential study area would decrease by 17.05%, from 2.83 in the No-Action condition to 2.34 in the With-Action condition. Although the decrease in the passive OSR would be greater than 5%, the passive OSR of 2.34 in the With-Action condition would remain above the passive OSR benchmark of 0.50 for a residential study area.

The overall OSR in the non-residential study area would decrease by 11.96%, from 26.25 in the No-Action condition to 23.11 in the With-Action condition. The non-residential OSR of 23.11 in the With-Action condition would remain above the CEQR benchmark OSR of 0.15. Open space resources considered in the With-Action condition include approximately 0.55 acres of publicly-accessible open space that would be provided as part of the Proposed Project.

Though substantial open space resources located within one mile of the Project Site would be available to study area residents and were considered qualitatively, the 13.31% reduction in the active OSR in the residential study area, from 0.84 in the No-Action condition to 0.73 in the With-Action condition, would constitute a significant adverse impact on active open space resources within the residential study area.

Shadows

A detailed shadows analysis was conducted and found that the Proposed Project would not have a significant adverse shadows impact. The analysis did find that incremental shadows from the Proposed Project would have the potential to affect two potential sunlight-sensitive resources of concern: the Arverne Playground and the Conch Playground. However, the analysis determined that the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse shadows impact on these two open space resources on any of the four analysis days. New incremental shadows on the Arverne Playground would be of short duration and would not fall on any sunlight-sensitive features that would affect the utilization of the resource. New incremental shadows would be cast on the southern portions of the Conch Playground for less than a half-hour during the analysis period. However, since the new shadow coverage would move from west to east throughout the day and that the December analysis day falls outside of the plant growing season, it would not result in a significant adverse impact on the playground.

Historic and Cultural Resources

The Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to historic and/or cultural resources.

Archaeological Resources

Consistent with guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for archaeological resources is defined as the area that would be disturbed for project construction, which for the Proposed Project is identified as the Project Site itself. Consultation with the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) was undertaken to determine whether the Project Site may contain archaeological resources. In a comment letter dated March 19, 2018, LPC determined that the Project Site does not possess archaeological significance. Therefore, the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant adverse impact on archaeological resources.

Architectural Resources

The study area for the assessment of architectural resources consists of the Project Site and the 400-foot radius surrounding the Project Site. In a comment letter dated March 19, 2018, LPC determined that the Project Site does not possess architectural significance. Furthermore, in a comment letter dated April 18, 2018, LPC stated that there was no apparent designated, listed, or eligible architectural properties located within the 400-foot radius surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on architectural resources.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on urban design or visual resources.

The Proposed Actions would result in built forms and building types that are similar in height but of greater density than buildings that currently exist in the study area. The design of the Proposed Project would respond

to the existing built environment, such that the heights of the buildings are scaled up towards the center of the Project Site, with a decrease in height and density along the periphery. The arrangement of lower buildings on the periphery of the Project Site would conform with the lower heights of buildings to the east, west, and south of the Project Site along Beach Channel Drive and Rockaway Beach Boulevard.

The Proposed Actions would facilitate the mapping of three new street segments on the Project Site bisecting the Project Site in both north-south and east-west directions. The internal street network would act to break up the existing superblock and connect to the surrounding neighborhood by extending the existing street grid into the Project Site. New sidewalks on the Project Site would incorporate street trees and landscaped islands. In addition, the Proposed Project would feature several publicly-accessible outdoor plazas.

As compared with the No-Action condition, the site design of the Proposed Project would allow greater pedestrian access through the Project Site by breaking up the superblock with interior roadways that would provide pedestrian access to a publicly-accessible plaza. Buildings in the Proposed Project would provide a more continuous street wall and a more active streetscape with accessible lobby and commercial entrances than with the No-Action condition.

The MTA elevated train line south of the Project Site is a prominent manmade visual resource in the study area, views of which would be partially obstructed for a pedestrian standing immediately north of the Project Site due to the height of the proposed buildings. However, since the elevated train line has no or minimal unique visual characteristics, the Proposed Project impact on views of this visual resource would not be considered significant. The major natural visual resources in the study area include the dunes south of Rockaway Freeway, the Atlantic Ocean and associated Rockaway Beach and Boardwalk, Jamaica Bay, and the Rockaway Community Park. Views of these natural features would not be affected by the Proposed Project since views of these resources are currently obstructed by intervening buildings north and south of the Project Site and the elevated train line south of the Project Site.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Actions would not result in significant adverse impacts due to hazardous materials upon implementation of Brownfield Cleanup Agreement and placement of (E) designation. The presence of on-site hazardous materials was confirmed based on the findings of Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) investigations conducted on the North and South Parcels of the Project Site. Construction of the Proposed Project would require ground disturbance, in which presents the potential for disturbance of on-site hazardous materials. As of October 5, 2017, the North Parcels are accepted to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) (Site No. C241200) and a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) has been executed. Additionally, an (E) designation will be mapped on the North Parcels, pursuant to Section 11-15 of the NYC Zoning Resolution, to ensure that testing and mitigation will be provided as necessary prior to any future development and/or soil disturbance at the Project Site in the event the Applicant withdraws its participation in the BCP.

The South Parcel of the Project Site has not been enrolled into the BCP, and as such a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and site-specific Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) will be submitted to the Mayor's Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) for review and approval. Therefore, given the acceptance of the North Parcels into the BCP and the (E) designation mapped on the entire Project Site, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact related to hazardous materials.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Based on a preliminary assessment, it was determined that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply or wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Water Supply

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply system. The additional water usage due to the Proposed Project would total less than 500,000 gallons per day (gpd), compared to the No-Action condition. This incremental demand would represent less than 1% of the City's overall water supply and would not trigger the need for a preliminary or detailed assessment as demand would not be large enough to have a significant adverse impact on the City's water supply system. In addition, according to the NYC Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the existing water mains on Beach Chanel Drive and/or Rockaway Beach Boulevard would have sufficient capacity to handle the estimated increase in water demand from the Proposed Project.

Wastewater Treatment

The Proposed Project is located within a separated sewered area and would generate less than 500,000 gpd of sanitary sewage. This incremental increase in sanitary flow would not adversely affect the sewage system or the treatment capacity at the Rockaway WWTP as it is less than 0.1% of its current dry weather capacity of 19 mgd and, as such, the Rockaway WWTP would continue to have sufficient reserve capacity.

Consultation with DEP determined that the Proposed Project could result in a substantial increase in sanitary flow to the adjacent sewers. Consequently, a hydraulic analysis of the existing sewer system may be needed at the time of submittal of the site connection proposal application to determine whether the existing sewer system can support the proposed higher density development and related increase in wastewater flow, or whether there will be a need to upgrade the existing sewer system. DEP is currently in process of designing a new drainage plan for this area, which would account for the proposed zoning under the Proposed Actions.

Because of the available assimilative capacity of the Rockaway WWTP and based on consultation with DEP regarding upgrades to the existing drainage system, the projected increased flows to the City's separated sewer system would not have a significant adverse impact on water quality. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to local wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Stormwater Drainage and Management

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to stormwater management infrastructure. The Proposed Project would replace the vacant lot with an approximately 2.4 million gsf mixed-use development consisting of approximately 36% roof surfaces, 61% pavement surfaces, and 3% permeable surfaces such as grass and landscaping. Anticipated stormwater discharge from the Proposed Project would range between 0.09 MG to 0.57 MG depending on the rainfall volume and duration.

As part of an infrastructure capital improvement project, DEP plans to install new stormwater sewers along Rockaway Beach Boulevard. The project is anticipated to be completed in summer 2021. This sewer improvement project would provide additional capacity to convey the incremental increase of stormwater drainage emanating from the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would also incorporate selected best management practices (BMPs) that would be required as a part of the site connection approval from DEP, the peak stormwater runoff rates would be reduced by the release of stormwater with a slowed discharge rate. Therefore, with the incorporation of appropriate BMPs that would be required as part of the site connection approval process and the planned sewer infrastructure improvement project, the overall volume of stormwater runoff and the peak stormwater runoff rate would be reduced, and there would be no significant adverse impacts on stormwater conveyance infrastructure.

Solid Waste and Sanitation

A detailed analysis was conducted and concluded that the Proposed Actions would not result in a significant

adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services. The Proposed Actions would not directly affect a solid waste management facility and would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity. The development resulting from the Proposed Actions would generate an increment above the No-Action condition of approximately 50 tons per week of solid waste, of which approximately 67% would be handled by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY), and 33% would be handled by private carters. This translates to approximately three additional truckloads per week of solid waste handled by DSNY, and approximately one additional truckload per week handled by private carters. Although this would be an increase compared to the No-Action condition, the additional solid waste resulting from the Proposed Actions would be a negligible increase relative to the approximately 12,260 tons of solid waste handled by DSNY every day, or the 13,000 tons handled daily by private carters. As such, the Proposed Actions would not result in an increase in solid waste that would overburden available waste management capacity.

Transportation

Detailed transportation analyses were conducted and found that the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic, pedestrians, and public transit impacts as detailed below.

Traffic Flow and Operating Conditions

Table S-4: Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts at Signalized Intersections shows the signalized intersections that would experience significant adverse traffic impacts in 2034 ("analysis year"). As shown in **Table S-4**, the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts at 21, 16, 18, and 12 signalized intersections during the Weekday AM, Weekday MD, Weekday PM, and Saturday MD peak hours, respectively.

.

Table S-4: Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts at Signalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
1	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 116th Street	X	X	X	X
3	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 116th Street	X	X	X	
4	Beach Channel Drive & Rockaway Freeway	X	X	X	X
5	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 108th Street	X			
7	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 108th Street	X			
8	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 92nd Street/Beach 94th Street	X	X	X	X
13	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 73rd Street	X	X	X	
15	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 62nd Street	X	X	X	X
16	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 62nd Street	X	X	X	X
19	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 59th Street	X		X	
20	Rockaway Freeway & Beach 59th Street	X	X	X	X
21	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 59th Street	X	X	X	X
23	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 54th Street	X	X	X	X
24	Rockaway Freeway & Beach 54th Street			X	
25	Edgemere Avenue & Beach 54th Street	X	X	X	X
42	Rockaway Freeway & Seagirt Boulevard	X	X		
44	Rockaway Freeway & Cornaga Avenue	X			
46	Beach Channel Drive & Mott Avenue	X	X	X	X
47	Beach Channel Drive & Dix Avenue	X	X	X	
48	Beach Channel Drive & Birdsall Avenue	X		X	
49	Beach Channel Drive & Nameoke Avenue	X	X	X	X
50	Beach Channel Drive & Hassock Street	X	X	X	X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**21**	**16**	**18**	**12**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**33**	**21**	**30**	**18**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour

Table S-5: Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts at Unsignalized Intersections shows the unsignalized intersections that would experience significant adverse traffic impacts due in the analysis year. As shown in **Table S-5**, the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts at three, five, three, and two unsignalized intersections during the Weekday AM, Weekday MD, Weekday PM, and Saturday MD peak hours, respectively.

Table S-5: Significant Adverse Traffic Impacts at Unsignalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
26	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 53rd Street	X	X	X	X
27	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 53rd Street	X	X	X	X
28	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 52nd Street		X		
30	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 50th Street		X		
P8	Parking Garage 8 driveway, via Peninsula Way	X	X	X	
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**3**	**5**	**3**	**2**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**3**	**5**	**5**	**2**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour

Transit Facilities

Subway Stations

Under the With-Action condition, all analyzed subway station stairways and turnstile elements would operate at Level of Service (LOS) A during the Weekday AM and Weekday PM peak hours. Therefore, there would be no stairway- or control area-related significant adverse impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Subway Line-Haul

Under the With-Action condition, the A train would operate below guideline capacity in the peak direction during the Weekday AM, Weekday PM, Saturday MD, and Sunday MD peak hours. Therefore, there would be no subway line-haul-related significant adverse impact associated with the Proposed Project.

Bus

Under the With-Action condition, the Q22 bus would operate above capacity in the westbound direction in the Weekday AM and Weekday PM peak hours, and the Q52-Select Bus Service (SBS) bus would operate above capacity in the southbound direction in the Weekday PM peak hour. Therefore, there would be significant adverse bus line-haul-related impacts on the Q22 and Q52-SBS buses during the Weekday AM and Weekday PM peak hours.

Pedestrians

Sidewalks

Under the With-Action condition, all sidewalk elements are expected to operate at LOS C or better during all peak hours for the platoon condition except for the following four locations, which would experience significant adverse impacts due to the Proposed Project:

- The north sidewalk on the east leg of the intersection of Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard in the Weekday MD, Weekday PM, and Saturday MD peak hours.
- The south sidewalk on the west leg of Beach 53rd Street and Beach Channel Drive in the Weekday AM, Weekday MD, Weekday PM, and Saturday MD peak hours.
- The west sidewalk on the north leg of Beach 44th Street and Rockaway Freeway in the Weekday PM peak hour.
- The north sidewalk on the west leg of Beach 56th Street and Arverne Boulevard in the Weekday AM peak hour.

Crosswalks

Under the With-Action condition, all crosswalk elements would operate at LOS C or better during all peak hours except for the following two locations, which would experience significant adverse impacts due to the Proposed Project:

- The south crosswalk at Beach 54th Street and Beach Channel Drive during the Weekday MD, Weekday PM, and Saturday MD peak hours.
- The north crosswalk at Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard during the Weekday PM and Saturday MD peak hours.

Corners

Under the With-Action condition, all corner locations would operate at LOS C or better during all peak hours except for the following location, which would experience significant adverse impacts due to the Proposed Project:

- The northeast corner at Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard during the Weekday PM and Saturday MD peak hours.

Parking Conditions

The Proposed Project would provide approximately 973 parking spaces, including 744 spaces for residential use, 83 spaces for retail use, 75 spaces for community facility medical office use, with approximately 55 of the 75 medical office designated spaces in building E parking garage available overnight for residential use. Signage in building E parking garage would be installed to specify which parking spaces would be designated for overnight residential parking use and during which hours. There would be an additional 71 on-street parking spaces within the streets internal to the Project Site. The remainder of the parking demand generated by the Proposed Project would be accommodated on-street. As less than half of the available on-street parking spaces would be used by the Proposed Project, there would not be a parking-related significant adverse impact.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety Assessments

There was one study intersection identified as a high vehicular or pedestrian/bicycle crash location as per *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds. The intersection of Beach Channel Drive and Mott Avenue had five of more pedestrian/bike crashes in 2015 and 2016. It has been identified as a Priority Intersection in the *Vision Zero Queens Pedestrian Safety Action Plan* and is included in the Downtown Far Rockaway Urban Design and Streetscape Reconstruction Project. Measures identified as part of those efforts are expected to address pedestrian safety issues at this intersection. With those measures, the projected increase in vehicle and pedestrian trips associated with the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse safety impact at this location.

Air Quality

Air quality analyses addressed mobile sources, parking facilities, stationary HVAC systems, and air toxics. A screening assessment was completed to determine the potential impact of carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM) from the additional motor vehicles that would be generated by the Proposed Project. Multiple intersections failed the screen, such that three intersections were selected as worst cases to warrant a detailed analysis of CO, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. The maximum predicted $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at the Rockaway Beach Boulevard/Beach 54th Street/ Beach 53rd Street would exceed the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) annual de minimis value and result in a significant adverse air quality impact. However, with signalization of the Rockaway Beach Boulevard/Beach 53rd Street intersection as a

mitigation measure, no significant adverse impact on mobile air quality would occur. A detailed analysis was conducted for CO and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from the largest parking facility on the Project Site, Building E2. The analysis determined that emissions from that parking facility would not result in a significant adverse air quality impact. As the other parking facilities would result in lesser impacts than the largest parking facility, none of the parking facilities would have a significant adverse air quality impact.

An (E) Designation (E-532) will be mapped on the Project Site to require the use of natural gas and electric package terminal air conditioning (PTAC) units for the residential units. With these measures in place, the emissions from residential heating and cooling would not cause significant adverse air quality impacts to other buildings on the Project Site or any existing sensitive land uses in the area. A screening assessment was completed to determine the potential impact of on-site HVAC systems (hot water for whole buildings and heating for the common areas of the buildings). The results of this assessment indicated that emissions from the HVAC systems would not have any potential significant adverse air quality impacts to other buildings on the Project Site or existing sensitive land uses.

DEP and NYSDEC databases were reviewed to identify permitted industrial facilities within 400-feet of the Project Site, supplemented by field reconnaissance. A review of DEP and NYSDEC databases and field survey identified one source of industrial emissions within 400 feet of the Project Site, Singh Hardwoods at 50-01 Rockaway Beach Boulevard, An assessment of the potential impact of emissions from Singh Hardwoods in conformance to guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual* found that there would be no significant adverse impacts due to air toxics on the Proposed Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the City's GHG emissions reduction goals, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* and would be consistent with policies regarding adaptation to climate change identified in *OneNYC*.

The direct (building operation) energy use and indirect (motor vehicle) energy use associated with the Proposed Project would result in approximately 27,286 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) emissions per year, including approximately 15,428 metric tons/year from building operations and approximately 11,858 metric tons/year from on-road motor vehicle emissions. GHG emissions related to the construction phase or the extraction or production of materials or fuels would not be a significant part of total project emissions and were therefore not quantified. Consistent with guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual,* GHGs from solid waste management were not quantified since the Proposed Project would not fundamentally change the City's solid waste management system.

In addition, the Proposed Project would support the attainment of a 30% reduction in GHG emissions below 2005 levels by 2030 based on goals stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, including the promotion of transit-oriented development, generation of clean, renewable energy, construction of a resource- and energy-efficient building, and encouragement of sustainable transportation. The Proposed Project would be well-served by public transit including a subway station, several bus lines, and ferry service.

Since the Project Site is located within the 100-year coastal floodplain, the potential effects of global climate change have been considered and are presented in WRP assessment. That assessment considers the effects of climate change on rising sea levels, storm surge, and coastal flooding resulting from the Proposed Project. It was determined that the Proposed Project would support Policy 6.2 of the WRP.

Noise

A detailed analysis was conducted and found that there would be no significant adverse impacts due to noise due to the Proposed Project.

New residential development associated with the Proposed Project would be subjected to noise levels that exceed the threshold noise level for a significant adverse noise impact. However, no impacts would occur provided that the Proposed Project incorporates window/wall attenuation sufficient to result in interior noise

levels of 45 dBA or less. Consequently, an (E) designation, E-532, will be mapped on the Project Site. The (E) designation will require alternate means of ventilation for all sites with an exterior noise level of 70 dBA or higher. With the (E) designation mapped on the Project Site, no noise impacts would occur at buildings that would be built as part of the Proposed Project.

Public Health

The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse public health impacts. The Proposed Project would not result in unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the areas of air quality, water quality, or hazardous materials. However, the Proposed Actions could result in unmitigated construction period noise impacts as defined by *CEQR Technical Manual* thresholds. As such, it was determined that a public health assessment as to noise was appropriate.

Temporary increases in noise levels due to construction activities would occur during the daytime and, occasionally, early evening for some sensitive receptors and construction periods. While during some periods of construction the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts related to noise as defined by CEQR thresholds, the predicted overall changes in noise levels would not be large enough for a sufficient period of time to significantly affect public health.

Neighborhood Character

The Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character. Uses in the neighborhood surrounding the Project Site are primarily large-scale publicly-funded housing developments, with sporadic local retail and light industrial and manufacturing facilities closest to the elevated MTA A train line. The Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; historic and cultural resources, urban design and visual resources; or shadows.

While the Proposed Actions would have significant adverse impacts related to schools, publicly funded child care, open space, and transportation (traffic, public bus transit, and pedestrians), these elements do not define the study area's character and reflect baseline conditions such as high utilization levels in schools and physical condition of transportation infrastructure. Consultation with relevant agencies was conducted to identify reasonable and feasible mitigation measures that would fully or partially mitigate the significant adverse impacts. In addition, the Proposed Project would provide play areas and passive open space accessible to the public. The combination of the moderate effects from each of the other technical areas would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts on traffic and noise during peak construction periods. Construction-related activities are not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts on other technical impact areas evaluated in the DEIS.

Transportation

Traffic

The projected number of auto and truck trips generated during the construction peak hours would be less than those generated during operational peak hours of the Proposed Project. **Table S-6: Significant Adverse Impacts at Signalized Intersections** shows the signalized intersections that would experience significant adverse traffic impacts during the peak construction period. As shown in **Table S-6**, the construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts at zero, ten, zero, and seven signalized intersections during the Weekday AM, Weekday PM, Saturday AM, and Saturday PM peak hours during the peak construction period, respectively.

Table S-1: Significant Adverse Impacts at Signalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday AM Peak Hour	Saturday PM Peak Hour
1	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 116th Street		X		
15	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 62nd Street		X		X
16	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 62nd Street		X		
19	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 59th Street		X		
21	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 59th Street		X		X
23	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 54th Street		X		X
25	Edgemere Avenue & Beach 54th Street		X		X
46	Beach Channel Drive & Mott Avenue		X		X
47	Beach Channel Drive & Dix Avenue		X		X
50	Beach Channel Drive & Hassock Street		X		X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**0**	**10**	**0**	**7**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**0**	**10**	**0**	**7**

Table S-7: Significant Adverse Impacts at Unsignalized Intersections shows the unsignalized intersections that would experience significant adverse traffic impacts during the peak construction period. As shown in **Table S-7**, the construction of the Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts at zero, two, zero, and two unsignalized intersections during the Weekday AM, Weekday PM, Saturday AM, and Saturday PM peak hours during the peak construction period, respectively.

Table S-2: Significant Adverse Impacts at Unsignalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday AM Peak Hour	Saturday PM Peak Hour
26	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 53rd Street		X		X
27	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 53rd Street		X		X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour

Transit

A segment of construction workers is expected to take the bus or subway to travel to and from the Project Site. The projected number of transit trips generated during the construction peak hours would be less than those generated during the peak operation hours of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no construction-related transit impacts would occur due to construction of the Proposed Project.

Pedestrians

New pedestrian trips generated during the construction period would consist of construction workers walking between the Project Site and nearby residences and transit stops. The projected number of pedestrians generated during the construction peak hours would be less than those generated during the peak operation hours of the Proposed Project. However, since the operational analysis indicates potential significant adverse pedestrian impacts during all peak hours under the With-Action conditions, a detailed pedestrian analysis was conducted for the Weekday AM, Weekday PM, Saturday AM, and Saturday PM construction peak hours for all pedestrian elements. The detailed analysis did not identify additional pedestrian impacts. Therefore, no construction-related pedestrian impacts are expected due to construction of the Proposed Project.

Parking

Based on the off-street parking spaces available within the study area, there would be adequate parking capacity to accommodate the projected construction worker parking demand during the peak construction period. Therefore, no parking shortfalls are expected during construction of the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

Detailed dispersion modeling of construction-related activities indicated that pollutant emissions during peak periods of construction activity would not result in exceedances of NAAQS for CO, NO_2, PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$, or the NYC 24-hour or annual de minimis increments for "fine" particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). Therefore, no significant adverse construction air quality impact would occur.

Noise

Increases in noise levels due to construction activities would be limited to the daytime and, occasionally, the early evening. Consistent with guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, further analysis was carried out for construction noise because construction-related activities would exceed two years. The analysis included the Applicant's commitment to use equipment with noise levels quieter than typical noise levels for such equipment, as well as path controls placed between the equipment and specific sensitive receptors.

Analysis conducted in conformance with guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual* determined that for some sensitive receptors and construction periods, the duration and magnitude of the noise levels would constitute a significant adverse construction-period noise impact. However, no sensitive receptors would experience noise levels that exceed the criterion of an absolute L_{eq} of 85 dBA, but some would experience increases over ambient noise levels of 15 dBA or more. Source and paths controls to reduce or eliminate potential significant adverse construction noise impacts would be employed by the Applicant. However, there may be periods during construction where use of select controls would not be feasible; therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would have the potential to result in significant adverse noise impacts at one or more sensitive receptors.

Other Technical Areas

Land Use and Neighborhood Character

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would affect land use on the Project Site but would not alter surrounding land uses. Measures would be implemented to control noise, vibration, and dust throughout the construction period, including the erection of construction fencing and barriers. While construction activities and any subsequent disruptions at the Project Site would be evident to the local community, the limited duration of construction would not result in any significant or long-term adverse impacts on local land use patterns or the character of the nearby area.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse construction-related impacts on socioeconomic conditions since construction activities would directly or indirectly displace any residence or business, or adversely affect any major industry in the City. In addition, it would not block or restrict access to any residences or businesses in the area, affect the operations of any nearby businesses, or obstruct major thoroughfares providing access to residences or businesses.

Community Facilities and Services

No community facility would be directly displaced or altered by construction of the Proposed Project, nor would construction activities substantially restrict access to any community facility during the construction period. Therefore, no significant adverse construction-related impacts on community facilities would occur.

Open Space

No open space resources currently exist on the Project Site, nor would any open space resource be used for staging or other construction activities. Consequently, no open space resources would be directly displaced during the construction of the Proposed Project. In addition, construction activities would not limit access to any existing or proposed publicly available open space. Consequently, there would be no significant adverse construction-related impacts on open space resources.

Historic and Cultural Resources

An assessment of potential impacts on historic and cultural resources found that there are no archaeological or architectural resources located at the Project Site. It was determined that the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on archaeological or architectural resources following consultation with LPC. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts due to the construction of the Proposed Project related to Historic and Cultural Resources.

Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project would require ground disturbance to provide the foundation for the proposed buildings, and related improvements, thereby potentially disturbing on-site hazardous materials. The presence of on-site hazardous materials was confirmed based on the findings of Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) investigations conducted on the North and South Parcels of the Project Site. The greatest potential for human exposure to contaminants due to soil disturbance during construction would be during excavation.

Consequently, a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and site-specific Construction Health and Safety Plan (CHASP) will be prepared to establish procedures for all construction-related activities and ground disturbance at the Project Site. Construction management, site-specific controls, and monitoring procedures established therein would be submitted to the NYC Office of Environmental Remediation (OER) for review and approval. Documentation of the RAP is required prior to the issuance of NYC building permits to allow building occupancy on the Project Site.

To ensure remediation of the Project Site following the completion of the CEQR process, an (E) designation will be mapped on the North and South parcels of the Project Site as administered and overseen by OER pursuant to Section 11-15 (Environmental requirements) of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York and Chapter 24 of Title 15 of the Rules of the City of New York. Furthermore, as of October 5, 2017, the North Parcels of the Project Site have been accepted into the Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) (Site No. C241200) and a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) had been executed, which provides incentives for the remediation and redevelopment of urban "brownfields. The BCP is a voluntary and comprehensive program that includes or surpasses requirements of the City's hazardous materials (E) designation program. As a result, remedial actions performed in conjunction with the Proposed Project are subject to approval and oversight by NYSDEC and compliance with the requirements of the BCP, which would prevent significant adverse impacts from the Proposed Project due to the presence of contaminated materials. The (E) designation mapped on the North Parcels serves to ensure that testing and mitigation will be provided as necessary prior to any future development and/or soil disturbance at the Project Site in the event the Applicant withdraws their participation in the BCP.

With the implementation of the RAP and CHASP per the (E) designation mapped on the Project Site, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse construction-related impacts pertaining to hazardous materials.

VIII. ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Actions are intended to address the need to provide more housing for the observed and projected increase in population, more affordable housing for those who are currently rent-burdened, and more housing for the elderly. The Proposed Project would also provide retail uses, including a supermarket and fitness center, that is intended to help address the need for such supportive uses and provide local employment opportunities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would provide community facility uses programmed for medical office space intended to overcome in part the lack of nearby medical facilities. As summarized below, neither the Lesser Density Alternative nor the No Unmitigated Significant Impacts Alternative would meet the project goals to redevelop vacant and underutilized land to provide affordable and senior housing, along with supportive uses, to the same extent as would the Proposed Project. The Flexibility Alternative would meet project goals and provide additional opportunity to accommodate retail and/or community facility uses in response to local demand.

No-Action Alternative

The significant adverse impacts related to elementary and middle schools, child care, open space, transportation, and construction-period traffic and noise with the Proposed Actions would not occur under the No-Action Alternative. The No-Action Alternative assumes that the Project Site would be developed by the Applicant as-of-right, in conformance to existing zoning regulations, and include 12 buildings, comprised of approximately 482,523 gsf of residential space, providing 568 market-rate DUs; 21,659 gsf of local retail space, 800 gsf of community facility space, and 557 accessory parking spaces Of the 557 parking spaces, 457 would be provided on surface parking lots and the additional 100 would be provided in an underground parking garage located in the center of the northern portion of the Project Site. The No-Action Alternative would result in approximately 544,982 gsf of development on the Project Site. This alternative would not provide affordable or senior housing or medical office space on the Project Site, nor would it provide recreational opportunities for the community. Consequently, the No-Action Alternative would not meet the goals of the Proposed Project.

The No-Action Alternative would not promote policies of the WRP as it would not include flood mitigation measures to protect residents and businesses from flooding hazards in the CZB. Since the No-Action Alternative would only provide market-rate housing for households with incomes higher than those of the surrounding area, it would have the potential to increase areawide rents and result in indirect residential displacement. As with the Proposed Project, the No-Action Alternative would generate demand on public schools and publicly-accessible open space resources, and transportation elements, including traffic, pedestrian and transit elements.

No Unmitigated Significant Impacts Alternative

The Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts for which no practicable mitigation has been identified, including unmitigated impacts to community facilities and transportation. In the absence of the application of mitigation measures, the impacts would remain unmitigated. No reasonable alternative could be developed to eliminate the Proposed Project's unmitigated significant adverse impacts while meeting the project goals to redevelop vacant and underutilized land to provide affordable and senior housing to the same extent as would the Proposed Project and without substantially compromising the Proposed Project's stated purpose and need.

Lesser Density Alternative

The Lesser Density Alternative would reduce the number of DUs such that the building envelopes conform to the proposed rezoning sought under the Proposed Actions. The Lesser Density Alternative would result in an approximately 1,999,775 gsf development on the Project Site, comprised of 11 buildings with approximately 1,800 DUs, of which 1,577 DUs would be income-restricted up to 80% of AMI with approximately 201 DUs set aside for AIRS senior housing, with the remaining 223 DUs restricted to income levels not exceeding 130% of AMI. In addition to the residential use, the Lesser Density Alternative would include approximately 68,179 gsf of retail space, including a fitness center and a supermarket, approximately 75,443 gsf of community facility space, and approximately 800 accessory parking spaces. The Lesser Density Alternative would not provide publicly-accessible open space on the Project Site. The reduced number of affordable housing units under this alternative would compromise the Proposed Project's stated purpose and need.

As with the Proposed Project, the Lesser Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policies; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; or greenhouse gas emissions. However, the Lesser Density Alternative would not be sufficient to eliminate identified significant adverse impacts on community facilities, open space, and transportation (traffic, pedestrian, or transit) with the Proposed Project. While the Lesser Density Alternative would involve less construction overall, all of the excavation and foundation work would be the same as or similar to the construction with the Proposed Project. Given that the duration of construction would be shorter, the duration of potential construction impacts would be reduced.

Flexibility Alternative

The Flexibility Alternative would allow an increase in the commercial retail and/or community facility space by an additional 20,000 gsf (singularly or in combination) with the potential to result in the same or similar significant adverse environmental impacts except for transportation where greater significant adverse environmental impacts could result as compared with the Proposed Project. This alternative is consistent with the revised land use application that the Applicant filed after the DEIS was issued in response to issues raised during public review of the original application. According to the Applicant, the revised application is intended to provide flexibility in the future for the applicant to increase the amount of local retail or community facility use depending on community demand over the first 10 to 15 years of project operation.

Under Flexibility Alternative Scenario #1, the commercial retail space would increase by 20,000 gsf to a total of 92,000 gsf. Under Flexibility Alternative Scenario #2, the community facility space would increase by 20,000 gsf to a total of 97,000 gsf. For purposes of this alternative assessment, the other components of the development program with the Proposed Project would remain unchanged with the Flexibility Alternative.

As with the Proposed Project, the Flexibility Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policies; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; shadows; historic and cultural resources; urban design and visual resources; hazardous materials; water and sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation; or greenhouse gas emissions; or noise. However, as with the Proposed Project, the Flexibility Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on transportation (traffic, pedestrian, or transit), open space, community facilities, air quality, and those due to construction activities (traffic, pedestrian, and noise).

The significant adverse open space, community facilities, and air quality impacts with the Flexibility Alternative would be substantially the same as with the Proposed Project. However, since the Flexibility Alternative Scenarios #1 and #2 could generate a greater number of vehicle trips, transit trips, and walk-only pedestrian trips than the Proposed Project during all peak hours, it would result in new or greater significant adverse transportation impacts than with the Proposed Project. The Flexibility Alternative would be developed over the same construction timeline and phasing as with the Proposed Project. Consequently, the construction period impacts of the Flexibility Alternative would be the same as those with the Proposed Project and would not eliminate the construction-period significant adverse impacts that would occur under the Proposed Project.

As with the Proposed Project, to avoid significant adverse impacts, the Flexibility Alternative would have to be modified to eliminate or greatly reduce the major components of the proposed building program. Elimination or substantial reduction in the major components of the proposed building program would not meet the project goal to redevelop vacant and underutilized land to provide affordable and senior housing to the same extent as would the Proposed Project and without substantially compromising the stated purpose and need of the Proposed Project.

IX. MITIGATION

Community Facilities and Services

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools as well as publicly-funded child care centers. Mitigation measures as described below were explored by the Applicant in consultation with the NYC Department of City Planning (DCP), NYC Department of Education (DOE), SCA, and ACS.

To fully mitigate the significant adverse impact on public schools, 162 public elementary school seats and 57 public intermediate school seats would need to be provided in CSD 27, Sub-district 1. Alternatively, the Proposed Project would need to be reduced by 521 DUs, or 36% to reduce the number of public school children generated by the Proposed Project to below the significant impact threshold. Measures to mitigate the

significant adverse impacts on public schools were explored in coordination with DOE/SCA to determine the feasibility of potential mitigation measures as detailed below.

Upon consideration of all practicable and feasible mitigation measures, it was determined that the Applicant, or its successor(s) to fee title in the Project Site, would be required to either provide funding to the DOE and SCA or perform work in accordance with SCA specifications and procurement processes, or in accordance with DOE/SCA approval, provide off-site land and/or fit-out annex space (up to core and shell) to accommodate an increase of the school capacity by up to 162 public elementary and 57 public intermediate school seats at school(s) in the school study area where such capacity increase is warranted.

Under the terms of the Restrictive Declaration the Applicant may conduct an additional analysis, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, to determine whether, based on the data available at the time of the additional analysis, the extent of the impacts and/or timing of when the impacts on public schools are projected to occur varies from that which had been identified the FEIS. Where the additional analysis demonstrates, to the reasonable satisfaction of the SCA and DOE, in consultation with DCP, as lead agency, that the extent of the impacts and/or timing of when the impacts are projected to occur varies from that set forth in the FEIS, the public school mitigation measure shall be adjusted accordingly to reflect the modification of minimum number of public school seats necessary to reduce the increase in collective utilization of public schools in the study area to no greater than a 5 percent increase over the No-Action condition or a reduction of overall capacity to less than 100 percent.

The Applicant shall commence implementation of the mitigation measure selected by SCA and DOE, in consultation with DCP, prior to obtaining any excavation/foundation permits from NYC Department of Buildings (DOB) that would be associated with their phase 3 development program. Based on the Applicant's planned development phasing for the Proposed Project, the public-school impacts would occur at the completion of the Applicant's development phase 3 (i.e., upon development of 910 DUs for elementary and 1,030 DUs for intermediate schools). If funding is selected, such funds must be provided prior to the Applicant's acceptance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) for more than 910 dwelling units.

In conclusion, with the provision of mitigation as described above, the Proposed Project's significant adverse impact on public schools would be fully mitigated.

Open Space

The Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact due to increased demand on active open space resources located within the residential study area. Practicable and feasible measures to mitigate these projected impacts were identified in consultation with DCP and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation ("NYC Parks").

To fully mitigate the significant adverse impact on active open space resources an additional 1.67 acres of active open space would need to be provided within the residential study area. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the following on-site or off-site measures could potentially be applied to mitigate an active open space impact: a) create, on-site, new public active open space; b) create new public active open space elsewhere in the study area; c) improve existing active open spaces in the study area to increase their utility, safety, and capacity; d) provide maintenance equipment, to enable increased park usage within an existing open space resource; and/or, e) contribute capital improvements to an outdated/deteriorated open space to increase its usefulness.

Consultation with DCP and NYC Parks to identify practicable and feasible mitigation measures took place between the issuance of the DEIS and the FEIS. Based on that consultation, it was determined that the most practicable and feasible mitigation measure to address the active open space impacts of the Proposed Project would be for the Applicant, under direction and with approval from NYC Parks, to provide for active recreation improvements to 1.67 acres of Rockaway Community Park, consistent with the 2014 Rockaway Parks Conceptual Plan. These active recreation improvements could consist of, but are not limited to, tennis courts, basketball courts, handball courts, and/or ballfields. Alternatively, in the event that the Applicant is

able to create new publicly accessible active open space within the open space study area to serve the proposed population and offset the proposed project's impact on existing active open space, such new open space would, with the approval of NYC Parks, in consultation with DCP, also constitute partial mitigation.

The Applicant shall commence implementation of the mitigation measure selected by NYC Parks, in consultation with DCP, prior to obtaining any excavation/foundation permits from DOB that would be associated with their phase 3 development program. Based on the Applicant's planned development phasing for the Proposed Project, the active open space impacts would occur at the completion of the Applicant's development phase 3 (i.e., upon development of 1,244 DUs). If funding is selected, such funds must be provided prior to the Applicant's acceptance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) for more than 1,244 dwelling units.

In conclusion, with the provision of the mitigation measures as described above, the Proposed Project's significant adverse impact on active open space resources would be partially mitigated.

Transportation

The transportation analyses found that several elements in the study area would experience significant adverse traffic, transit, and pedestrian impacts resulting from the Proposed Actions. The discussion below outlines potential mitigation measures that would fully or partially mitigate the identified significant adverse impacts.

Traffic

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 22 signalized intersections and five unsignalized intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 33 lane groups at 21 signalized intersections and three lane groups at three unsignalized intersections during the Weekday AM peak hour, 21 lane groups at 16 signalized intersections and five lane groups at five unsignalized intersections during the Weekday Midday (MD) peak hour, 30 lane groups at 18 signalized intersections and five lane groups at three unsignalized intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour, and 18 lane groups at 12 signalized intersections and two lane groups at two unsignalized intersections during the Saturday MD peak hour. Mitigation measures such as signal timing changes, modifications to curbside parking regulations, lane geometry changes, and signalization of unsignalized intersections would mitigate or partially mitigate several of the significant adverse traffic impacts.

Table S-8: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Signalized Intersections shows that significant adverse impacts at signalized intersections would be fully mitigated at all but 20 lane groups at ten intersections during the Weekday AM peak hour, 14 lane groups at nine intersections during the Weekday MD peak hour, 22 lane groups at 12 intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour, and 11 lane groups at seven intersections during the Saturday MD peak hour. In total, significant adverse impacts to one or more lane groups would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 14 signalized intersections.

Table S-3: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Signalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
1	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 116th Street	X	X	X	X
3	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 116th Street	X	X	X	
4	Beach Channel Drive & Rockaway Freeway	X	X	X	X
5	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 108th Street	X			
7	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 108th Street	X			
8	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 92nd Street/Beach 94th Street	X	X	X	X
13	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 73rd Street	X	X	X	
15	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 62nd Street	X	X	X	X
16	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 62nd Street	X	X	X	X
19	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 59th Street	X		X	
20	Rockaway Freeway & Beach 59th Street	X	X	X	X
21	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 59th Street	X	X	X	X
23	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 54th Street	X	X	X	X
24	Rockaway Freeway & Beach 54th Street			X	
25	Edgemere Avenue & Beach 54th Street	X	X	X	X
42	Rockaway Freeway & Seagirt Boulevard	X	X		
44	Rockaway Freeway & Cornaga Avenue	X			
46	Beach Channel Drive & Mott Avenue	X	X	X	X
47	Beach Channel Drive & Dix Avenue	X	X	X	
48	Beach Channel Drive & Birdsall Avenue	X		X	
49	Beach Channel Drive & Nameoke Avenue	X	X	X	X
50	Beach Channel Drive & Hassock Street	X	X	X	X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**21**	**16**	**18**	**12**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**33**	**21**	**30**	**18**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Intersections:	**10**	**9**	**12**	**7**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Lane Groups:	**20**	**14**	**22**	**11**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour

Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Table S-9: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Unsignalized Intersections shows that significant adverse impacts at unsignalized intersections would be fully mitigated at all but one lane group at one intersection during the Weekday AM peak hour, two lane groups at two intersections during the Weekday MD peak hour, and one lane group at one intersection during the Weekday PM peak hour. All of the significant adverse traffic impacts at unsignalized intersections would be mitigated during the Saturday MD peak hour. In total, significant adverse impacts to one or more lane groups would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at two unsignalized intersections.

Table S-4: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Unsignalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
26	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 53rd Street	X	X	X	X
27	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 53rd Street	X	X	X	X
28	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 52nd Street		X		
30	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 50th Street		X		
P8	Parking Garage 8 driveway, via Peninsula Way	X	X	X	
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**3**	**5**	**3**	**2**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**3**	**5**	**5**	**2**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Intersections:	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Lane Groups:	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour
Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Transit

The Proposed Actions would result in a capacity shortfall on the westbound Q22 bus route in the Weekday AM and Weekday PM peak hours and on the southbound Q52-SBS in the Weekday PM peak hour. These significant bus line-haul impacts could be fully mitigated by the addition of four standard buses during the Weekday AM peak hour and one standard bus in the Weekday PM peak hour for the westbound Q22 bus route, and by the addition of one articulated bus in the Weekday PM peak hour for the southbound Q52-SBS bus route. The general policy of NYCT is to provide additional bus service where demand warrants, taking into account financial and operational constraints.

Pedestrians

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at a total of four sidewalks, two signalized crosswalks, and one corner during one or more peak hours, as shown in Table S-10 through **Table S-12.** Proposed mitigation measures would be subject to review and approval by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT).

Sidewalks

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts at four of the analyzed sidewalks. As shown in **Table S-10: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Sidewalks (Platoon** Conditions), significant adverse impacts would be fully mitigated at one sidewalk, while three sidewalks would remain unmitigated. The north sidewalk on the west leg of Beach 56th Street and Arverne Boulevard would be fully mitigated by paving with concrete one section of unpaved sidewalk. The north sidewalk on the east leg of Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard, the south sidewalk on the west leg of Beach 53rd Street and Beach Channel Drive, and the west sidewalk on the north leg of Beach 44th Street and Rockaway Freeway would remain unmitigated as no practicable or feasible mitigation was identified for these significant sidewalk impacts.

Table S-5: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Sidewalks (Platoon Conditions)

	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
Beach 59th St and Arverne Blvd (E leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 59th St and Rockaway Fwy (W leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 54th St and Beach Channel Dr (W leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 54th St and Arverne Blvd (E leg, N sidewalk)		X	X	X
Beach 54th St and Arverne Blvd (W leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 53rd St and Beach Channel Dr (E leg, S sidewalk)				
Beach 53rd St and Beach Channel Dr (W leg, S sidewalk)	X	X	X	X
Beach 53rd St and Rockaway Beach Blvd (N leg, E sidewalk)				
Beach 53rd St and Rockaway Beach Blvd (E leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 50th St and Rockaway Beach Blvd (E leg, S sidewalk)				
Beach 47th St and Rockaway Beach Blvd (E leg, S sidewalk)				
Beach 44th St and Rockaway Fwy (N leg, W sidewalk)			X	
Beach 44th St and Rockaway Fwy (W leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 56th St and Arverne Blvd (W leg, N sidewalk)	X			
Beach 57th St and Arverne Blvd (E leg, N sidewalk)				
Beach 52nd St and Beach Channel Dr (E leg, S sidewalk)				
Total Number of Impacted Sidewalks	**2**	**2**	**3**	**2**
Total Number of Unmitigated Sidewalks	**1**	**2**	**3**	**2**

X - denotes sidewalks significantly impacted in peak hour during Platoon Conditions.
Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Crosswalks

The Proposed Actions would result in significant adverse impacts at Beach 54th Street and Beach Channel Drive and at Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard, as shown in **Table S-11: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Signalized Crosswalks**. The south crosswalk at Beach 54th Street and Beach Channel Drive Crosswalk would be fully mitigated by widening the crosswalk by six feet. The north crosswalk at Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard would remain unmitigated as no practicable or feasible mitigation was identified for this significant sidewalk impact.

Table S-6: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Signalized Crosswalks

	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday MD Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday MD Peak Hour
Beach 54th St and Beach Channel Dr (S leg)		X	X	X
Beach 54th St and Arverne Blvd (N leg)			X	X
Total Number of Impacted Signalized Crosswalks	**0**	**1**	**2**	**2**
Total Number of Unmitigated Signalized Crosswalks	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**

X - denotes crosswalks significantly impacted in peak hour.
Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Corners

The Proposed Actions and traffic mitigation measures would result in significant adverse impacts at the northeast corner of Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard. No practicable or feasible mitigation was identified for the significant adverse corner impact; therefore, this significant adverse impact would remain unmitigated during one or more peak hours.

Air Quality

The maximum predicted $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at the Rockaway Beach Boulevard/Beach 54th Street/ Beach 53rd Street would exceed the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) annual de minimis value and result in a significant adverse air quality impact. However, with signalization of the

Rockaway Beach Boulevard/Beach 53rd Street intersection as a mitigation measure, no significant adverse impact on mobile air quality would occur.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts related to traffic, pedestrian, and noise during peak construction periods. The discussion below outlines potential mitigation measures that would fully or partially mitigate the identified significant adverse impacts.

Transportation

Traffic

The analysis as conducted found that peak construction activities during the third quarter in 2027 (Q3 2027) would result in significant adverse construction-related traffic impacts at ten signalized intersections and two unsignalized intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, ten lane groups at ten signalized intersections and two lane groups at two unsignalized intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour and seven lane groups at seven signalized intersections and two lane groups at two unsignalized intersections during the Saturday PM peak hour. Peak construction activities during Q3 2027 would not result in significant adverse construction-related traffic impacts at study locations in the Weekday AM or Saturday AM peak hours. Mitigation measures such as signal timing changes, lane geometry changes, and signalization of unsignalized intersections would mitigate several of the significant adverse traffic impacts. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures is subject to review and approval by NYCDOT.

Table S-12: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Signalized Intersections shows that significant adverse construction-related impacts would be fully mitigated at all but two lane groups at two intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour. In total, significant adverse impacts for one or more approach movements would remain unmitigated during the Weekday PM peak hour at two intersections.

Table S-7: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Signalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday AM Peak Hour	Saturday PM Peak Hour
1	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 116th Street		X		
15	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 62nd Street		X		X
16	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 62nd Street		X		
19	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 59th Street		X		
21	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 59th Street		X		X
23	Arverne Boulevard & Beach 54th Street		X		X
25	Edgemere Avenue & Beach 54th Street		X		X
46	Beach Channel Drive & Mott Avenue		X		X
47	Beach Channel Drive & Dix Avenue		X		X
50	Beach Channel Drive & Hassock Street		X		X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**0**	**10**	**0**	**7**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**0**	**10**	**0**	**7**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Intersections:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Lane Groups:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour
Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Table S-13: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Unsignalized Intersections shows that significant adverse construction-related impacts at unsignalized intersections would be fully mitigated at all lane groups at all intersections during the Weekday PM and Saturday PM peak hours. In total, no unmitigated significant adverse construction-related impacts would remain at unsignalized intersections in any peak hour.

Table S-8: Summary of Impacted and Unmitigated Intersections and Lane Groups – Unsignalized Intersections

#	Intersection	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour	Saturday AM Peak Hour	Saturday PM Peak Hour
26	Beach Channel Drive & Beach 53rd Street		X		X
27	Rockaway Beach Boulevard & Beach 53rd Street		X		X
	Total Number of Impacted Intersections:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**
	Total Number of Impacted Lane Groups:	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Intersections:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Total Number of Unmitigated Lane Groups:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

X - denotes intersection significantly impacted in the peak hour
Shading denotes unmitigated impact in peak hour.

Noise

Increases in noise levels due to construction activities would occur during the daytime and, occasionally, the early evening. For some construction periods, the duration and magnitude of the noise levels may constitute a significant adverse construction-period noise impact. The analysis included the Applicant's commitment to use equipment with noise levels quieter than typical noise levels for such equipment, as well as path controls placed between the equipment and specific sensitive receptors. Even with these measures, significant adverse noise impacts would occur to the Peninsula Nursing Home. No additional feasible and practicable mitigation measures were identified for this building, and the remaining significant adverse construction-period noise impacts would remain unmitigated.

X. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Community Facilities and Services

Public Schools

Public elementary schools in CSD 27, Sub-district 1 would remain above capacity with a shortfall of 1,991 seats in the With-Action condition. Approximately 7.85% of this shortfall would be attributable to the Proposed Project due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 127.36% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 135.21% in the With-Action condition. In addition, public intermediate schools in CSD 27, Sub-district 1 would remain above capacity with a shortfall of 46 seats in the With-Action condition. Approximately 6.93% of this shortfall would be attributable to the Proposed Project due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 94.65% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 101.58% in the With-Action condition. As the result, this would represent a significant adverse impact on both public elementary and intermediate schools.

To fully mitigate the significant adverse impact on public schools, 162 public elementary school seats and 57 public intermediate school seats would need to be provided in CSD 27, Sub-district 1. Alternatively, the Proposed Project would need to be reduced by 521 DUs, or 36% to reduce the number of public school children generated by the Proposed Project to below the significant impact threshold. The analysis of public elementary school conditions relies on conservative assumptions regarding both background growth in the student population and the development of new residential units in future conditions. Should this level of background growth in the sub-district and residential development in the study area not occur, the impact on elementary and/or intermediate schools in Sub-district 1 of CSD 27 could be substantially reduced. Measures to mitigate the significant adverse impacts on public schools were explored in coordination with DOE and SCA to determine the feasibility of potential mitigation measures as detailed below.

Upon consideration of all practicable and feasible mitigation measures, it was determined that the Applicant, or its successor(s) to fee title in the Project Site, would be required to either provide funding to the DOE and

SCA or perform work in accordance with SCA specifications and procurement processes, or in accordance with DOE/SCA approval, provide off-site land and/or fit-out annex space (up to core and shell) to accommodate an increase of the school capacity by up to 162 public elementary and 57 public intermediate school seats at school(s) in the school study area where such capacity increase is warranted.

Under the terms of the Restrictive Declaration the Applicant may conduct an additional analysis, in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, to determine whether, based on the data available at the time of the additional analysis, the extent of the impacts and/or timing of when the impacts on public schools are projected to occur varies from that which had been identified the FEIS. Where the additional analysis demonstrates, to the reasonable satisfaction of the SCA and DOE, in consultation with DCP, as lead agency, that the extent of the impacts and/or timing of when the impacts are projected to occur varies from that set forth in the FEIS, the public school mitigation measure shall be adjusted accordingly to reflect the modification of minimum number of public school seats necessary to reduce the increase in collective utilization of public schools in the study area to no greater than a 5 percent increase over the No-Action condition or a reduction of overall capacity to less than 100 percent.

The Applicant shall commence implementation of the mitigation measure selected by SCA and DOE, in consultation with DCP, prior to obtaining any excavation/foundation permits from NYC Department of Buildings (DOB) that would be associated with their phase 3 development program. Based on the Applicant's planned development phasing for the Proposed Project, the public-school impacts would occur at the completion of the Applicant's development phase 3 (i.e., upon development of 910 DUs for elementary and 1,030 DUs for intermediate schools). If funding is selected, such funds must be provided prior to the Applicant's acceptance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) for more than 910 dwelling units.

Absent the implementation of the above described mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would have an unmitigated significant adverse impact on public schools. With the implementation of the mitigation measure described above, the Proposed Project's impacts on public elementary and intermediate schools would be fully mitigated.

Publicly-Funded Child Care Centers

Publicly-funded child care and Head Start centers in the study area would remain above capacity with a shortfall of 353 seats in the With-Action condition. Approximately 46.5% of this shortfall would be attributable to the Proposed Project due to an increase in the collective utilization rate of 121.35% in the No-Action condition to a collective utilization rate of 167.82% in the With-Action condition. This would represent a significant adverse impact to publicly-funded child care centers.

To fully mitigate the significant adverse impact on publicly-funded child-care centers, 217 publicly-funded child care slots would need to be provided in the child care study area. Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse impacts to child care centers are being explored and will be developed in consultation with ACS, DOE, and SCA. The projected increase in demand for child care slots in the With-Action Condition could be offset by private day care facilities and day care centers outside of the child care study area; some parents may choose day care providers that are closer to their workplace rather than their home. While the analysis is limited to ACS-contracted child care facilities in accordance with *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, DOE also contracts with childcare providers to provide additional publicly-funded early education opportunities that are available to all residents, regardless of family income. Since 2014, the City has made significant investments to provide free, full-day, high-quality early childhood education through Pre-K for All and 3-K for All, as part of a broader effort to create a continuum of high-quality early care and education programs for New York City children from birth to five years old. Furthermore, all programs previously managed by ACS will shift to management by DOE, enabling consistent high-quality standards under a single agency by the second half of 2019. ACS will monitor the demand and need for additional publicly funded day care services in the area and identify the appropriate measures to meet demand for additional slots.

While the above measures could offset or would serve to at least partially mitigate the identified impact, in the event that the significant adverse impact on publicly funded child care facilities is not completely eliminated, an unavoidable significant adverse impact would result.

Open Space

The Proposed Project would result in a significant adverse impact on residential open space resources. The Proposed Project would increase the demand on nearby open space resources by introducing 5,819 residents and 365 workers on the Project Site, which would result in an incremental increase of 4,251 residents and 277 workers in the relevant study areas compared to the future No-Action condition. Consequently, the active open space ratio (OSR) in the residential study area would decrease from 0.84 in the No-Action condition to 0.73 in the With-Action condition, a decrease of 13.31%, and would result in an indirect significant adverse impact on active residential open space resources. While open space resources outside of the open space study areas were considered qualitatively, the 13.31% reduction in active OSR within the residential study area would represent a significant adverse impact on active open space resources.

The fully mitigate the significant adverse impact on active open space resources an additional 1.67 acres of active open space would need to be provided in the residential study area. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the following on-site or off-site measures could potentially be applied to mitigate an open space impact: a) create, on-site, new public active open space; b) create new public active open space elsewhere in the study area; c) improve existing active open spaces in the study area to increase their utility, safety, and capacity; d) provide maintenance equipment to enable increased park usage within an existing open space resource; and/or, e) contribute capital improvements to an outdated/deteriorated open space to increase its usefulness.

Consultation with DCP and NYC Parks to identify practicable and feasible mitigation measures took place between the issuance of the DEIS and the FEIS. Based on that consultation, it was determined that the most practicable and feasible mitigation measure to address the active open space impacts of the Proposed Project would be for the Applicant, under direction and with approval from NYC Parks, to provide for active recreation improvements to 1.67 acres of Rockaway Community Park, consistent with the 2014 Rockaway Parks Conceptual Plan. These active recreation improvements could consist of, but are not limited to, tennis courts, basketball courts, handball courts, and/or ballfields. Alternatively, in the event that the Applicant is able to create new publicly accessible active open space within the open space study area to serve the proposed population and offset the proposed project's impact on existing active open space, such new open space would, with the approval of NYC Parks, in consultation with DCP, also constitute partial mitigation.

The Applicant shall commence implementation of the mitigation measure selected by NYC Parks, in consultation with DCP, prior to obtaining any excavation/foundation permits from DOB that would be associated with their phase 3 development program. Based on the Applicant's planned development phasing for the Proposed Project, the active open space impacts would occur at the completion of the Applicant's development phase 3 (i.e., upon development of 1,244 DUs). If funding is selected, such funds must be provided prior to the Applicant's acceptance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) for more than 1,244 dwelling units.

In conclusion, with the provision of the mitigation measures as described above, the Proposed Project's significant adverse impact on active open space resources would be partially mitigated.

Transportation

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse impacts to traffic, transit, and pedestrians as summarized below.

<u>Traffic</u>

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at 22 signalized intersections and five unsignalized intersections during one or more analyzed peak hours; specifically, 33 lane groups at 21

signalized intersections and three lane groups at three unsignalized intersections during the Weekday AM peak hour, 21 lane groups at 16 signalized intersections and five lane groups at five unsignalized intersections during the Weekday Midday (MD) peak hour, 30 lane groups at 18 signalized intersections and five lane groups at three unsignalized intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour, and 18 lane groups at 12 signalized intersections and two lane groups at two unsignalized intersections during the Saturday MD peak hour. Mitigation measures such as signal timing changes, modifications to curbside parking regulations, lane geometry changes, and signalization of unsignalized intersections would mitigate or partially mitigate several of the significant adverse traffic impacts.

Feasible mitigation measures were not identified to mitigate the potential significant adverse impacts at ten signalized intersections and one unsignalized intersection during the Weekday AM peak hour, at nine signalized intersections and two unsignalized intersections during the Weekday MD peak hour, at 12 signalized intersections and one unsignalized intersection during the Weekday PM peak hour, and at seven signalized intersections during the Saturday MD peak hour. In total, significant adverse impacts to one or more approach movements would remain unmitigated in one or more peak hours at 14 signalized intersections and two unsignalized intersections. The significant adverse impacts identified at these intersections would be considered unavoidable adverse impacts of the Proposed Project.

Implementation of the recommended traffic improvement measures is subject to review and approval by NYCDOT prior to implementation.

Transit

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse bus line-haul impacts on the westbound Q22 bus route in the Weekday AM and Weekday PM peak hours and the southbound Q52-Select Bus Service (SBS) bus route in the Weekday PM peak hour. Four additional Q22 standard buses in the Weekday AM peak hour, one additional Q22 standard bus in the Weekday PM peak hour, and one additional Q52-SBS articulated bus in the Weekday PM peak hour would mitigate the bus line-haul impacts. Absent the implementation of this mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would result in an unavoidable significant adverse transit-related impacts.

Pedestrians

The Proposed Project would result in significant adverse pedestrian impacts at four sidewalks, two signalized crosswalks, and one corner. Proposed mitigation measures were identified for one sidewalk and one crosswalk. Those measures would be subject to review and approval by NYCDOT.

Feasible measures were not identified to mitigate the potential significant adverse impacts at the north sidewalk on the east leg of Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard, the south sidewalk on the west leg of Beach 53rd Street and Beach Channel Drive, the west sidewalk on the north leg of Beach 44th Street and Rockaway Freeway, the north crosswalk at Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard, and the northeast corner of Beach 54th Street and Arverne Boulevard. These significant adverse impacts would remain unmitigated and, therefore, would constitute unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in the potential for significant adverse construction-related impacts related to traffic, pedestrian, and noise during peak construction periods.

Traffic

Significant adverse construction-period traffic impacts were identified at ten signalized intersections and two unsignalized intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour and at seven signalized intersections and two unsignalized intersections during the Saturday PM peak hours of the peak construction period condition.

Measures such as signal timing changes, lane geometry changes, and signalization of unsignalized intersections would mitigate several of the significant adverse traffic impacts; however, feasible measures

were not identified to mitigate the potential significant adverse impacts at two signalized intersections during the Weekday PM peak hour. In total, significant adverse impacts to one approach movement at two signalized intersections would remain unmitigated in the Weekday PM peak hour during the peak construction period. These impacts would remain unmitigated during the peak construction period and therefore would constitute unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

Implementation of the recommended traffic improvement measures is subject to review and approval by the NYCDOT prior to implementation.

Noise

Increases in noise levels due to construction activities would occur during the daytime and, occasionally, in the early evening. For some construction periods, the duration and magnitude of the noise levels may constitute a significant adverse construction-period noise impact. The analysis included the Applicant's commitment to use equipment with noise levels quieter than typical noise levels for such equipment, as well as path controls placed between the equipment and specific sensitive receptors. Even with these measures, significant adverse noise impacts would occur to the Peninsula Nursing Home. No additional feasible and practicable mitigation measures were identified for this building; therefore, the significant adverse construction-period noise impacts would remain unmitigated.

XI. GROWTH-INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This assessment determines the potential growth-inducing aspects of the Proposed Project. According to guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the term "growth-inducing aspects" generally refers to the "secondary" impacts of a proposed project that trigger further development in areas outside the project site that would otherwise not have such development without the proposed project. Guidance in the *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that an assessment of the growth-inducing aspects of a proposed project is generally appropriate when a project would:

- Add substantial new land uses, new residents, or new employment and could potentially induce additional development of a similar kind or of support uses (e.g., stores to serve new residential uses); or
- Greatly expand infrastructure capacity (e.g., sewers, central water supply).

The Applicant is seeking a set of Proposed Actions in the form of discretionary approvals to include zoning map and text amendments, a large-scale general development special permit, a City Map Amendment to re-establish a portion of Beach 52nd Street south of Rockaway Beach Boulevard to reconnect with Rockaway Freeway, and public funding and/or financing from various City and New York State agencies and/or programs related to affordable housing development on the Project Site. The Project Site is situated in Queens Community District 14. The Proposed Actions would facilitate the Proposed Project to consist of an approximately 2,371,000 gsf development on the Project Site, comprised of 11 buildings with approximately 2,200 income-restricted DUs, of which 1,927 DUs would be income-restricted up to 80% of AMI, to include approximately 201 DUs set aside for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors senior housing, with the remaining 273 DUs restricted to income levels not exceeding 130% of AMI. In addition to the residential DUs, the Proposed Project would include approximately 72,000 gsf of retail space, including a fitness center and a supermarket; approximately 77,000 gsf of community facility space, approximately 24,000 square feet of publicly-accessible open space, and approximately 973 accessory parking spaces.

The Proposed Actions are site-specific. While the Proposed Actions would result in more intensive land uses on the Project Site than currently exist, the Proposed Project would not trigger further development that would generate secondary impacts. The Proposed Actions would not generate land uses that would be incompatible with existing zoning and land uses. The Proposed Actions would not result in development that conflicts with

adopted public policies. The Proposed Project would not introduce a new trend that is not already observable in or near the study area.

While the Proposed Project would require infrastructural improvements related to the sewer infrastructure, a significant expansion of infrastructure capacity would not be required. Local economic development engendered by the Proposed Project would not induce additional notable growth outside the Project Site. Overall, the Proposed Project would not induce any growth beyond that identified and analyzed in this EIS.

XII. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

As the Project Site has been previously developed, it does not possess any known natural resources of concern. The Proposed Project would constitute a commitment of the development as a built resource and the Project Site as a land resource.

These commitments are weighed against the benefits of the Proposed Actions. Since the closure of the Peninsula Hospital in 2012, the Project Site has remained vacant and unutilized. Population in Queens CD 14 has been increasing, and approximately 44% of households are rent-burdened. Moreover, approximately 13.8% of residents in Queens CD 14 are age 65 and over, which is higher than both Queens and the City as a whole (13.4% and 12.7%, respectively). The redevelopment of the Project Site would result in the provision of up to 2,200 DUs, approximately 1,927 of which would be restricted to household incomes up to 80% of AMI which includes approximately 210 DUs that would be reserved for seniors to help meet the need for additional affordable housing and senior housing in the community. Furthermore, the Applicant believes that the Proposed Project would substantially advance the goals of Mayor Bill de Blasio's *Housing New York: A Five Borough, Ten-Year Plan*, which is a 10-year plan to build or preserve 200,000 affordable apartments across all five boroughs of NYC. These proposed uses would be compatible with existing conditions and trends in the area as a whole and would be appropriate for the Project Site's location, which is well-served by existing infrastructure, public facilities, and residential amenities.

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

cc: Marisa Lago, Chair
City Planning Commissioners
The Hon. Melinda Katz, Queens Borough President
The Hon. Donovan Richards Jr., New York City Council, 31st District
Dolores Orr, Chair, Community Board 14, Queens
Jonathan L. Gaska, District Manager, Community Board 14, Queens
Raju Mann, City Council
Judith McClain, MTA
Alyson Grant, ACS
Terrell Estesen, DEP
Emily Hummes, DPR
Naim Rasheed, DOT
Callista Nazaire, HPD
Perris Straughter, HPD
Gina Santucci, LPC
Kelly Murphy, SCA

Anita Laremont
Susan Amron
Renee Ferguson
Sarah Goldwyn
Claudia Herasme
Allan Zaretsky
Frank Ruchala
Steven Lenard
Alison McCabe
Diane McCarthy
Michael Marrella
James Merani
Paul Power
Howard Slatkin
William Vidal
Stephen Everett
John Young
Pat Bussey
Mauricio Garcia
Evan Lemonides
Susan Wong