

## A. INTRODUCTION

This section assesses whether changes in the Project and in background conditions since 2006 would result in any new or different significant adverse impacts to open space that were not previously identified in the 2006 FEIS. As with the 2006 analysis, this chapter generally uses methodologies and follows the guidelines of the 2001 *CEQR Technical Manual*.

As described below, changes to background conditions since the 2006 FEIS and the largely operational changes to the Project (i.e., the overall size of the project has not changed) would not substantially alter the conclusions presented in the 2006 FEIS that the Project is not anticipated to result in significant adverse open space impacts.

## B. CHANGES IN BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

The 2006 FEIS analyzed a No Action Alternative for future conditions in 2010, by which time the Project was expected to be complete; however, as described in Section 2, “Analytical Framework,” of this Technical Memorandum the Project is now anticipated to be fully complete in 2015. The 2015 build year provides a new baseline condition and list of No Build projects that were not included in the 2006 FEIS. This analysis incorporates those updated projects and also takes into account the attendant changes to worker and residential populations.

### OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

In the ¼-mile study area, no new open spaces would be added by 2015. Similarly, the 2006 FEIS did not include any new open spaces in the ¼-mile study area that would be added to the open space inventory by 2010 or 2015. For this Technical Memorandum, three projects within the ½-mile study area have been identified that would include new open space. These include:

- The portion of the High Line (between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues from West 20th Street to West 30th Street) that is currently under construction and expected to be completed at the end of 2010. The portion of the High Line south of West 20th Street that opened in 2009 has also been accounted for in the update to background open space conditions. The 2006 FEIS included the High Line project in the 2010 baseline condition for the ½-mile study area.
- Hudson Park and Boulevard, which will include a 4.0-acre mid-block park and boulevard system in the midblocks between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues from West 33rd Street to West 39th Street with a pedestrian bridge connecting to West 42nd Street (a portion of the project, approximately 2.12 acres of passive space, will be completed by 2013). The 2006 FEIS included this project in the 2010 baseline condition for the ½-mile study area.
- A small open space associated with the Wyndham Garden Inn on West 36th Street. This is a new project in the ½-mile study area.

Together, these spaces will add more than 6.5 acres of open space to the ½-mile study area.

With the addition of the portion of the High Line that has already opened, the existing open space inventory would also increase from levels in the 2006 FEIS. Including the High Line project, the open space inventory now shows 16.22 acres of total open space within ½-mile of the Project site, of which 10.22 acres are passive and 6.00 acres are active. Nonetheless, in the future with the Project, conditions assumed for this Technical Memorandum show considerably less public open space compared to those assumed in the 2006 FEIS. As shown in Table 6-1, below, passive, active, and total open space anticipated for 2010 in the 2006 FEIS were 25.96, 10.10, and 36.06 acres, respectively. Current estimates for 2015 anticipate 16.83, 6.00 and 22.83 acres of passive, active, and total open space. This difference is due to the inclusion in the 2006 FEIS of several spaces that were then expected to be completed by 2010, but are currently not expected to be built by 2015. For example, open spaces that have been removed from the analysis include 7.5 acres over the eastern portion of Caemmerer Yard and 3.2 acres associated with the Jacob Javits Convention center.

### **USER POPULATIONS**

This analysis also accounts for changes to the worker population resulting from changes in future background conditions, both for the Project site and for the surrounding area.

#### *CHANGES TO NO BUILD CONDITIONS ON THE PROJECT SITE*

As shown in **Table 2-1** of Section 2, “Analytical Framework” of this Technical Memorandum, if the Project does not go forward, it is assumed that the USPS would occupy 265,000 square feet of space, whereas in the 2006 FEIS it was assumed that the USPS would occupy 650,100 square feet. As a result, it is currently assumed that the Farley Complex would contain more commercial use in the No Build condition than was assumed in the 2006 FEIS. This would result in an estimated 746 fewer USPS workers, an increase in 460 office workers, and an increase of 675 retail workers. Taken together on the Project site, there would be an overall increase of 389 workers in the future without the Project when compared to levels expected in the 2006 FEIS.

#### *CHANGES TO NO BUILD CONDITIONS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA*

As shown in **Table 2-3** of Section 2, “Analytical Framework” of this Technical Memorandum, compared to conditions in the 2006 FEIS there is expected to be 1.2 million square feet less office space, 1,223 additional hotels rooms, 220,000 additional square feet of retail, 2,790 additional residential units, and 131,500 square feet less community facility space in the ½-mile study area. As a result, the open space user populations would change accordingly. Compared to the levels expected in the 2006 FEIS, there would be 12,325 more residents and 507 fewer workers in the future without the Project within the ½-mile study area.

### **OPEN SPACE RATIOS**

The 2006 FEIS reported that existing open space ratios were below *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, except for the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents, and that the Project as then proposed would not change these ratios relative to the guidelines. Specifically, the 2006 FEIS anticipated that in the ½-mile study area the ratio of total open space per 1,000 residents would decrease from 0.803 to 0.767 with the Project, well below the suggested guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. Similarly, the ratio of active open space per 1,000 residents would decrease from 0.225 to 0.217 with the Project, well below the guideline of 2.0 acres. The ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents would decrease from 0.578 to 0.549 and would continue

**Moynihan Station Development Project**

to exceed the guideline of 0.5 acres. However, the ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents would decrease slightly from 0.084 to 0.083 acres per 1,000 persons, and would be below the guideline of 0.20.

In terms of percentage change, the 2006 FEIS indicated that the ratio of total open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 4.5 percent, the ratio of active open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 3.6 percent, and the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 5.0 percent. The ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents would decrease by 1.2 percent.

The anticipated effects of the Project as now proposed, taking into consideration updated background conditions, would be similar to those identified in the 2006 FEIS. Although the future without the Project condition would have less open space and lower open space ratios, the change from No Build to Build conditions would be similar to those in the 2006 FEIS (see **Table 6-1**). In the ½-mile study area, the ratio of total open space per 1,000 residents would decrease from 0.388 to 0.371, remaining well below the suggested guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The ratio of active open space to 1,000 residents would decrease from 0.102 to 0.099, also remaining well below the guideline of 2.0 acres. Due to the significant increase in the study area residential population, the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents, which previously slightly exceeded the guideline, would decrease from 0.286 to 0.272, remaining well below the guideline of 0.5 acres. The ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents would continue to fall below the guideline of 0.20 acres per 1,000 persons, decreasing slightly from 0.053 to 0.052. The change in the background conditions between the 2006 FEIS and the Technical Memorandum are due to the decrease in open space inventory assumed for this analysis (described above) as well as the increase in residential population that is now expected in the area.

**Table 6-1  
Comparison of Open Space Resources  
in the ½-Mile Study Area: 2006 FEIS and 2010 Technical Memorandum**

	2006 FEIS Future Without the Project (2010)	2006 FEIS Future With the Project (Scenario 2: 2010)	2010 Tech Memo Future Without the Project	2010 Tech Memo Future With the Project
<b>Open Space Acreage</b>				
Passive	25.96	25.56	16.83	16.43
Active	10.10	10.10	6.00	6.00
Total	36.06	35.66	22.83	22.43
<b>Open Space Ratios</b>				
Active per 1,000 Residents	0.225	0.217	0.102	0.099
Passive per 1,000 Residents	0.578	0.549	0.286	0.272
Total per 1,000 Residents	0.803	0.767	0.388	0.371
Combined Passive per 1,000 residents and workers	0.084	0.083	0.053	0.052
<b>Percent Change from No Action to Action</b>				
Passive	N/A	-5.0	N/A	-5.0
Active	N/A	-3.6	N/A	-2.7
Total	N/A	-4.5	N/A	-4.4
Combined Passive	N/A	-1.2	N/A	-2.6
<b>Notes:</b>				
<i>Planning Goal Ratios:</i>				
Passive: 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.				
Passive Combined: A weighted average ratio is used combining DCP's goals of 0.50 acres/1,000 residents and 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.				
<b>Source:</b> 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing.				

In terms of percentage change, with the Project the ratio of total open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 4.4 percent, the ratio of active open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 2.7 percent, and the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents would decrease 5.0 percent. The ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents would decrease by 2.6 percent. These conditions are slightly better than what was disclosed in the 2006 FEIS.

### **QUALITATIVE CONSIDERATIONS**

As was identified in the 2006 FEIS, the Project would provide publicly accessible indoor spaces within the Farley Complex (the Train Hall and the Intermodal Hall) that could be used for passive recreation, such as reading, and may include public art exhibitions and performances. In addition, the open spaces immediately outside of the ½-mile study area would continue to help alleviate the deficiency in open space resources, as was concluded in the 2006 FEIS.

### **CONCLUSION**

Similar to the results of the 2006 FEIS, open space ratios in the ½-mile study area would decrease by 5 percent or less from the future without the Project. While all open space ratios would remain below *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines in the future with the Project in 2010, no significant adverse impacts are expected to result from the Project. Neighboring open spaces would continue to relieve the open space deficiency in the study area. In addition, the Project itself would provide high quality areas of indoor public space, as was identified in the 2006 FEIS.

In summary, as with the Project analyzed in the 2006 FEIS, the Project as currently proposed would not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources within the study area by the 2015 Build year.

## **C. PROJECT DESIGN CHANGES**

### **AMTRAK STATION OPTION**

As described in Section 1, “Project Description” of this Technical Memorandum, the changes to the Project under the Amtrak Station Option would be largely operational in nature. These changes are not expected to significantly affect user populations, open space conditions, or open space ratios. As such, the Project would not have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources.

### **OPEN STATION OPTION**

As described in Section 1, “Project Description” of this Technical Memorandum, the changes to the Project under the Open Station Option would be largely operational in nature. These changes are not expected to significantly affect user populations, open space conditions, or open space ratios. As such, the Project would not have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources. \*