

A. INTRODUCTION

This section evaluates the transit and pedestrian conditions for areas potentially affected by the Project. A discussion of station circulation within the train station (including the corridors serving the Eighth Avenue subway) is presented separately, in Section 13. There have been a number of changes in the study area since the 2006 FEIS for the Project including changes in existing pedestrian volumes and transit riders, planned development projects, as well as changes in the No Action development for the Farley Complex. There have also been updates on transportation planning assumptions since the completion of the 2006 FEIS.

The 2006 FEIS provided detailed analyses of the 34th Street-Penn Station elements (stairways and control areas) serving patrons accessing the Seventh Avenue (1/2/3) and Eighth Avenue (A/C/E) subway lines and pedestrian elements (sidewalks, corner reservoirs, and crosswalks) at nine intersections in the immediate area of the Project site. The 2006 FEIS concluded that the development program analyzed for the 2010 Build condition would not result in any significant adverse impacts on subway stairways and control areas with the incorporation of proposed station improvements and mitigation measures outlined in the 2005 No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS). For pedestrian conditions, 14 corner or crosswalk locations were projected to be significantly impacted during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. Measures proposed to fully mitigate those impacts included widening of sidewalks and crosswalks and removal of sidewalk obstructions. The evaluation of the Project in this Technical Memorandum considers the same transit and pedestrian study areas and provides a summary of the current findings for the 2015 Build year and compares these findings with the related findings made for the 2010 Build year in the 2006 FEIS.

The purpose of this section is to assess the potential transit and pedestrian impacts of the Project, taking the changes that have occurred since the 2006 FEIS into account and comparing conditions with the proposed Project with those conditions described in the 2006 FEIS, which concluded that the Project would not result in any unmitigated significant adverse impacts to transit and pedestrian conditions in the study area.

The Project, which would be completed by 2015, is expected to generate similar or fewer incremental levels of transit and pedestrian trips in the study area than what had been projected in the 2006 FEIS. The completion of other development projects in the future without the Project is also expected to progress at a slower pace than previously anticipated, resulting in fewer incremental transit and pedestrian trips in the No Build. A comparison of background transit and pedestrian levels indicates that overall activities in the area have not changed materially as well. Therefore, the future Build transit and pedestrian levels would be lower than or comparable to those analyzed in the 2006 FEIS and would result in a comparable number or fewer significant adverse impacts of similar or lesser magnitudes. As a result, the corresponding mitigation measures required would also be comparable to or less than those detailed in the 2006 FEIS.

B. CHANGES IN BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

FUTURE TRAVEL DEMAND PROJECTION COMPARISONS

To determine whether the Project has the potential to result in new significant adverse transit and pedestrian impacts, it is essential to first compare the travel demand projections described above in Section 14, “Traffic and Parking” and those presented in the 2006 FEIS for future conditions with and without the Project. As demonstrated below, the Project would yield substantially fewer incremental person trips than those projected in the 2006 FEIS. Furthermore, the level of development from other projects in West Midtown that are expected to move forward without the proposed Project are less than what was anticipated in the 2006 FEIS.

FARLEY COMPLEX AND OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT

As detailed above and summarized in **Table 15-1**, the development of the Farley Complex in the No Action Alternative would generate 1,160, 7,344, 7,388, and 7,450 person trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, as compared to 2,544, 8,801, 5,175, and 12,959 person trips, as predicted in the 2006 FEIS analysis of the No Action condition, during the same time periods. For the Project, the Farley Complex and the new mixed-use off-site building would generate 1,606, 10,379, 9,291, and 10,188 person trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, as compared to 5,680, 21,592, 12,539, and 35,628 person trips, as predicted in the 2006 FEIS, during the same time periods.

Table 15-1

Person Trip Summary: The Project & 2006 FEIS

Analysis Year	Peak Hour	Auto		Taxi		Subway		Bus		Railroad		Walk		Total			
		In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	Total	
The Project	2015 Future without the Proposed Project	AM	155	6	13	1	591	25	143	6	174	7	37	2	1,113	47	1,160
		MD	302	255	149	130	682	578	299	259	0	0	2,479	2,211	3,911	3,433	7,344
		PM	263	468	114	144	782	1,533	234	422	67	264	1,425	1,672	2,885	4,503	7,388
		SAT	337	311	154	141	752	693	308	282	0	0	2,339	2,133	3,890	3,560	7,450
	2015 Future with the Proposed Project	AM	18	30	49	150	130	324	44	37	0	0	358	466	599	1,007	1,606
		MD	351	299	243	219	805	689	393	342	0	0	3,691	3,347	5,483	4,896	10,379
		PM	310	326	296	222	1,143	1,092	336	338	56	64	2,512	2,596	4,653	4,638	9,291
		SAT	372	343	248	235	982	915	380	350	0	0	3,274	3,089	5,256	4,932	10,188
	2015 Increment	AM	-137	24	36	149	-461	299	-99	31	-174	-7	321	464	-514	960	446
		MD	49	44	94	89	123	111	94	83	0	0	1,212	1,136	1,572	1,463	3,035
		PM	47	-142	182	78	361	-441	102	-84	-11	-200	1,087	924	1,768	135	1,903
		SAT	35	32	94	94	230	222	72	68	0	0	935	956	1,366	1,372	2,738
2006 FEIS	2010 Future without the Proposed Project	AM	169	25	37	20	765	96	168	47	140	11	569	497	1,848	696	2,544
		MD	84	85	126	127	252	255	252	255	0	0	3,663	3,702	4,377	4,424	8,801
		PM	52	211	57	76	180	915	123	256	13	154	1,529	1,609	1,954	3,221	5,175
		SAT	129	129	194	193	387	386	387	386	0	0	5,384	5,384	6,481	6,478	12,959
	2010 Future with the Proposed Project	AM	174	78	576	174	741	352	276	132	80	8	1,565	1,524	3,412	2,268	5,680
		MD	350	220	846	353	1,234	682	758	591	81	2	8,339	8,136	11,608	9,984	21,592
		PM	283	124	778	206	1,140	442	517	315	87	3	4,483	4,161	7,288	5,251	12,539
		SAT	487	360	1,051	561	1,692	1,153	1,180	1,016	83	5	14,107	13,933	18,600	17,028	35,628
	2010 Increment	AM	5	53	539	154	-24	256	108	85	-60	-3	996	1,027	1,564	1,572	3,136
		MD	266	135	720	226	982	427	506	336	81	2	4,676	4,434	7,231	5,560	12,791
		PM	231	-87	721	130	960	-473	394	59	74	-151	2,954	2,552	5,334	2,030	7,364
		SAT	358	231	857	368	1,305	767	793	630	83	5	8,723	8,549	12,119	10,550	22,669

Moynihan Station Development Project Technical Memorandum

The notable differences between the current and 2006 FEIS trip projections are largely attributed to changes in the transportation demand assumptions, as developed by the WRY FEIS working group (see Section 14, “Traffic and Parking” for a description of the WRY working group). In comparison with their respective No Action conditions, the Project would yield between 400 and 3,100 incremental peak hour person trips in 2015, as compared to the 3,100 to 22,700 incremental peak hour person trips projected in the 2006 FEIS for 2010.

OTHER PROJECTS IN WEST MIDTOWN

As shown in Section 14, “Traffic and Parking,” there would be approximately 1.2 million fewer square feet of commercial office space expected to be completed in the Project area between 2008 and 2015 than anticipated in the 2006 FEIS for the 2005 to 2010 period. However, at the same time, there would be approximately 550,000 more square feet of hotel space, 220,000 more square feet of retail space, and 2,760 more residential dwelling units. Compared to the No Action analysis in the 2006 FEIS, the aggregate floor area of the expected development without the Project considered in this Technical Memorandum is comparable in total. Nonetheless, similar to what was concluded for vehicular traffic, the change in the mix of development would result in fewer total incremental person trips from those No Build projects than what was considered in the 2006 FEIS.

TRANSIT

SUBWAY SERVICE

Subway service in the study area includes the Seventh Avenue line (1,2,3) at 34th Street-Penn Station, the Eighth Avenue line (A,C,E) at 34th Street-Penn Station, and the Sixth Avenue line (B,D,F,V), Broadway line (N,Q,R,W), and the Port Authority Trans Hudson (PATH) trains at 34th Street-Herald Square. The 2006 FEIS analyzed 19 subway stairway locations serving the A/C/E subway lines at the 34th Street-Penn Station along Eighth Avenue, and eight subway stairway locations serving the 1/2/3 subway lines at the 34th Street-Penn Station along Seventh Avenue. Updated volume information was obtained from the recently certified WRY FEIS (2009). In comparison, the 2008 aggregate peak hour stairway volumes analyzed in the WRY FEIS are higher by approximately 7 percent over the 2005 stairway volumes analyzed in the 2006 FEIS. Taking into account the transit trips generated by completed development projects between 2005 and 2008, the remaining transit trip increase would be in line with the *CEQR* background growth of 0.5-percent per year. The 2006 FEIS also analyzed five subway control areas serving the A/C/E subway lines at the 34th Street-Penn Station along Eighth Avenue, and two subway control areas serving the 1/2/3 subway lines at the 34th Street-Penn Station along Seventh Avenue. Similarly, the comparison of the 2006 FEIS and the 2009 WRY FEIS aggregate baseline volumes at these subway control areas shows a moderate increase of approximately 8 percent between 2005 and 2008.

As shown in **Table 15-1**, the Project would result in -162, 234, -80, and 452 incremental subway trips (total in/out) during the weekday AM, midday, and PM, and Saturday midday peak hours. These trips, spread among various station elements at the above stations, which is comparable to what was done in the 2006 FEIS, would not warrant a detailed analysis per the criteria in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that quantitative analyses could be warranted if a transit element is expected to incur 200 or more peak hour incremental trips resulting from a proposed action. Incremental transit trips during a peak hour at or below the CEQR threshold is considered imperceptible. The projected trips above, spread among various station elements at the two study area stations, which is comparable to what was done in the 2006 FEIS, would not result in any station element incurring more than the CEQR analysis

threshold of 200 transit trips. Therefore, a detailed analysis is not warranted, and the Project would not be expected to result in significant adverse subway impacts. Furthermore, the 2006 FEIS analyses, which considered substantially larger subway increments from the proposed Project (232, 1,409, 487, and 2,072 during the same time periods), concluded that no significant adverse impacts would result for the analyzed subway stairway and control area elements. With these lower Build incremental volumes coupled with a smaller No Action subway trip increase, the Project would not be expected to result in significant adverse subway impacts.

BUS SERVICE

There are various local and express bus routes serving the study area. The Project would result in -58, 177, 18, and 140 incremental bus trips (total in/out) during the weekday AM, midday, and PM, and Saturday peak hours. These trips, spread among numerous bus stops in the area, comparable to what was done in the 2006 FEIS, would not warrant a detailed analysis per criteria in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, and therefore would not be expected to result in significant adverse bus impacts. In comparison, the 2006 FEIS estimated the proposed Project's incremental bus trips to be substantially higher at 193, 842, 453, and 1,423 over the same time periods and also concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts.

PEDESTRIANS

STREET-LEVEL PEDESTRIAN OPERATION

The pedestrian study area is the same as the one studied in the 2006 FEIS (and shown on Figure 14-2 of the 2006 FEIS), which includes sidewalks, crosswalks, and corner reservoirs from West 30th to West 34th Streets between Sixth and Tenth Avenues and from West 34th to West 35th Streets between Seventh and Ninth Avenues. The 2006 FEIS analyzed physical changes to street-level pedestrian facilities, including project-related pedestrian improvements, proposed by the previous Farley Complex development program and proposed in the Hudson Yards FGEIS, as well as by other developments in the study area. Similar improvements, except for those stipulated in the Hudson Yards FGEIS, are expected to be in place for the Project. In addition, the 15 Penn Plaza project, which is currently undergoing environmental review under CEQR and would be constructed by 2014, is expected to result in the reconstruction and re-opening of the passageway under the south side of 33rd Street between Seventh and Sixth Avenues (sometimes referred to as the Gimbel's passageway) and related underground connections between Seventh and Sixth Avenues. The reconstructed passageway would accommodate pedestrian flows between Penn Station/the Seventh Avenue subway lines (1, 2, and 3) and the Sixth Avenue subway lines (B, D, F, N, Q, R, V, and W) and the PATH station and provide an alternative to pedestrians traveling along the 33rd Street corridor. The 15 Penn Plaza project would also improve several subway stairways and control areas serving the Seventh Avenue, Sixth Avenue, and Broadway subway lines, and the PATH station. The presence or absence of the Gimbel's passageway does not materially affect the assessment of the Project's pedestrian impacts.

In comparison, the 2008 aggregate peak hour pedestrian volumes analyzed in the WRY FEIS are higher by approximately 9 percent over the 2005 volumes analyzed in the 2006 FEIS for sidewalks, lower by approximately 28 percent for corner reservoirs, and lower by approximately 4 percent for crosswalks. Including the background growth of 0.5 percent per year outlined by the *CEQR Technical Manual* and additional pedestrian trips generated by other completed development projects over the three-year period within the study area, the amount of pedestrian growth realized

Moynihan Station Development Project Technical Memorandum

between 2005 and 2008 for sidewalks is in line with typical volume increases. The corner and crosswalk volumes were lower in 2008 than they were in 2005.

The 2006 FEIS concluded that there would not be any significant adverse sidewalk impacts resulting from the Project to be completed in 2010. With comparable baseline conditions, fewer additional trips resulting from development projects in the future without the Project, and relatively lower incremental trip generation, the Project would also not be expected to result in significant adverse sidewalk impacts.

For corners and crosswalks, the 2006 FEIS, however, concluded that significant adverse impacts would occur at certain locations, all of which could be mitigated as described below.

Corner Reservoirs

- Northeast corner of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue in the midday peak period – mitigated with a 5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at the northeast corner of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 20 feet, and removal of all obstructions from the 20 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the east crosswalk.
- Northwest corner of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 10-foot widening of the west crosswalk at the northwest corner of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 24 feet, and removal of all obstructions from the 24 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the west crosswalk.

Crosswalks

- East crosswalk of West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue in the midday, PM, and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 4.5-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.
- West crosswalk of West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue in the PM peak period – mitigated with a 0.5-foot widening to a width of 16 feet.
- West crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue in the midday and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 5-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.
- East crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 2.3-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.
- South crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue in the midday peak period – mitigated with a 3-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.
- West crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue in the AM, PM, and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 10-foot widening to a width of 24 feet.
- North crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue in the PM peak period – mitigated with a 7.5-foot widening to a width of 21.5 feet incorporating crosswalk width previously considered as Hudson Yards mitigation.
- South crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 4-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.
- West crosswalk of West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue in the Saturday peak period – mitigated with a 2-foot widening to a width of 20.5 feet.
- East crosswalk of West 31st Street and Ninth Avenue in the midday and Saturday peak periods – mitigated with a 3-foot widening to a width of 16 feet.
- East crosswalk of West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue in the Saturday peak period – mitigated with a 5.5-foot widening to a width of 20 feet.

- West crosswalk of West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue in the Saturday peak period – mitigated with a 0.5-foot widening to a width of 12 feet.
- North crosswalk of West 31st Street and Seventh Avenue mitigated to a width of 20 feet incorporating crosswalk width previously considered as Hudson Yards mitigation.

As summarized in **Table 15-1**, the No Build program and the Project program for the Farley Complex and the new mixed-use off-site building would result in substantially fewer person trips than those projected in the 2006 FEIS. Since both the 2008 baseline and future 2015 background pedestrian levels would also be lower or comparable to those analyzed in the 2006 FEIS, some of the significant adverse pedestrian impacts identified previously in the 2006 FEIS may no longer occur with the Project. For those impacts that would remain, they are likely to be lower in magnitude and require comparable or lesser mitigation measures. The mitigation measures set forth in the 2006 FEIS, described above, would be more than adequate to eliminate any significant adverse pedestrian impacts associated with the 2015 development program for the Project.

C. PROJECT DESIGN CHANGES

PHASE 1

Phase 1 of the Project would be constructed almost entirely in the train shed below grade and, therefore, would not be expected to have any adverse impacts on transit or pedestrians.

PHASE 2

Phase 2 of the Project would be constructed by 2015. Importantly, the changes in pedestrian volumes noted above in the “Changes In Background Conditions” portion of this Section are related to changes in the No Build condition, not changes related to the Project. In either the Amtrak Station or Open Station Options, as noted above, and also in the 2006 FEIS, the Project is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts. *