

**A. INTRODUCTION**

As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” and Chapter 2, “Analysis Framework,” this SEIS analyzes whether Phase II of the Project under the Extended Build-Out Scenario and changed background conditions would result in any significant adverse impacts not previously disclosed and whether any additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the 2006 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and the Amended Memorandum of Environmental Commitments (MEC) would be warranted.

The purpose of the construction community facilities analysis is to assess the availability and adequacy of community facilities during the construction period for Phase II under the Extended Build-Out scenario. Consistent with *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, this analysis considers the potential for both direct and indirect impacts on community facilities during the prolonged construction of Phase II. The direct effects analysis considers whether construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario could displace or otherwise directly affect any community facilities such that the operation of the facility would be significantly impaired. The indirect assessment presented in this chapter considers the effects of the new population from Phase II of the Project on public school and child care facility utilization. The analysis applies the methodologies of Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” to determine when during the construction of Phase II of the Project the significant adverse impact on school utilization that was identified in Chapter 4B would be expected to occur, and how school and child care utilization in the study areas could change over the course of the Extended Build-Out Scenario.

**PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS**

With regard to indirect effects (i.e., the effect of the new population from Phase II of the Project on school utilization), assuming a construction start date in 2018, a significant adverse impact on study area elementary schools would first occur in 2021, with the completion of the first Phase II building, under any of the three construction phasing plans. As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities. The impact to public school capacity would gradually increase over time until Phase II is completed, as additional students are introduced to the study area by additional Phase II buildings. With regard to intermediate schools, a significant adverse impact would occur, beginning with the completion of the second Phase II building under both Construction Phasing Plan 1 and Construction Phasing Plan 3, in 2022 and 2027, respectively. The intermediate school impact would occur upon completion of the first Phase II building under Construction Phasing Plan 2, in 2021. The elementary and

intermediate school seat shortfalls would be partially mitigated by the construction of a new public school on the Phase II project site, should the New York City Department of Education (DOE) exercise its option for a school at the Phase II project site. There would not be a shortfall of high school seats in Brooklyn under any of the construction phasing plans.

Utilization of publicly funded child care services would steadily increase until such time as the 100 slots that the project sponsors are obligated to provide, as per the Amended Memorandum of Environmental Commitments (MEC), become operational. As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the analysis provided is conservative in that it likely overstates future enrollment deficits, since the analysis accounts for enrollment growth but no new capacity, in the Future Without Phase II. Also, factors that may reduce the number of children in need of publicly funded child care slots include: use of alternatives to publicly funded child care facilities (e.g., slots at homes licensed to provide family-based child care are not included in this analysis); and use of public child care centers outside of the study area, as parents of eligible children are not restricted to enrolling their children in child care facilities in a specific geographical area. Consistent with *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, a significant adverse impact on child care facilities may result if, in the Future With Phase II, there would be a 5 percent increase in utilization, compared with the Future Without Phase II, and overall utilization is above 100 percent. Prior to the completion of the new child care facility, utilization could increase by up to 5.98 percent, in 2032 under Construction Phasing Plan 1 and 2033 under Construction Phasing Plan 3. If a child care facility is provided in Building 6, with the completion of this building and its 100 new child care slots, utilization would decrease from 131 percent to 126 percent (in 2033 under Construction Phasing Plan 1 and 2034 under Construction Phasing Plan 3), which represents a 0.7 percent increase in utilization compared with the Future Without Phase II. Upon completion of Phase II in 2035, the increase in child care utilization attributable to the Phase II would be 1.56 percent. Therefore, during the construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario, there would be a temporary condition where the increase in child care utilization attributable to Phase II would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact of 5 percent for approximately two years. Due to the short duration of this shortfall of up to 655 slots (127 of which is associated with Phase II of the Project), and the 100 new child care slots that would be provided by the project sponsors, this temporary condition would not be considered a significant adverse impact. In addition, the project sponsors will monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to provide up to approximately 250 additional child care slots, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

With respect to direct effects, the construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out scenario would not displace any existing community facilities. As described in Chapter 3I, “Construction Air Quality,” no significant adverse impacts would result from construction of Phase II of the Project at any sensitive receptor locations, including community facilities. Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” includes an assessment of noise levels during the Phase II construction period.

The proposed on-site school and intergenerational community center would not experience significant construction noise impacts as indicated in Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise.”

In terms of community facilities in the surrounding study area, at limited times during the Phase II construction period, P.S. 753 (located at 510 Clermont Avenue) would be expected to

experience significant adverse noise impacts. Under Construction Phasing Plan 1, one or more floors along the south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to nine years. Under Construction Phasing Plan 2, one or more floors along the east, south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to seven years. Under Construction Phasing Plan 3, one or more floors along the south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to eleven years. The exceedances would be due to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). P.S. 753 has double-glazed windows and an alternate means of ventilation. The typical attenuation provided by double-glazed windows and the alternate ventilation would be expected to result in interior noise levels below 45 dBA L<sub>10(1)</sub> (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria for schools), except during an approximately one year period under Construction Phasing Plans 1 and 3 or an approximately two year period under Construction Phasing Plan 2, when noise levels were predicted to slightly exceed this threshold. Because interior noise levels would be acceptable except during limited periods when the acceptable threshold would be slightly exceeded, the temporary construction noise impacts on P.S. 753 would not impair the operation of the school, and therefore would not be considered a significant adverse community facilities impact.

## **B. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS**

At the time of the FEIS, all community facilities located in close proximity to the project site were at the western end of the site and would be affected only during the construction of the Phase I Project components (i.e., the arena block). As noted in the FEIS, the construction sites would be surrounded by construction fencing and barriers that would limit the effects of construction on nearby facilities. The FEIS noted that measures outlined in the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) Plan would ensure that lane closures and sidewalk closures are kept to a minimum and that adequate pedestrian access is maintained to community facilities in the vicinity of the project site. The FEIS further found that construction of the Project would not block or restrict access to any facility in the area, and would not affect emergency response times significantly. The FEIS also found that the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and the New York City Fire Department (FDNY) emergency services and response times would not be significantly affected due to the geographic distribution of police and fire facilities and their respective coverage areas. The FEIS also found the only community facilities that would experience a significant adverse noise-related impact were the Pacific Branch of the Brooklyn Public Library and the Temple of Restoration during Phase I construction; no community facilities would experience a significant adverse noise-related impact during Phase II construction. It was also noted in the FEIS that although other community facilities in the area could be temporarily affected by construction noise, they would not experience significant adverse impacts.

## **C. SCOPE OF SEIS CONSTRUCTION COMMUNITY FACILITIES ANALYSIS**

This chapter analyzes the potential for the construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario to result in both indirect and direct impacts on community facilities.

The indirect effects assessment presented in this chapter applies the methodologies of Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” to determine when during the Extended Build-Out Scenario the significant adverse impact on public elementary and intermediate schools would be expected to occur, and how school and child care utilization in the study areas could change over the course of the Extended Build-Out Scenario. As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” Phase II of the Project under the Extended Build-Out Scenario does not have the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts to public libraries, police and fire protection services, or health care facilities. Accordingly, the indirect effects assessment presented in this chapter analyzes potential impacts to public schools and child care facilities.

The direct effects assessment considers the potential for construction activities to displace or otherwise physically alter community facilities. Construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario would not result in the temporary or permanent closure or displacement of any community facilities. During the construction of Phase II, construction activities would not be expected to adversely affect any libraries, police or fire stations, publicly funded day care facilities, or health facilities, as none are located in close proximity to the Phase II construction sites. This chapter considers the results of the analyses presented in Chapter 3I, “Construction Air Quality,” and Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” to determine the potential for significant adverse direct impacts on community facilities.

As analyzed in Chapter 3I, “Construction Air Quality,” no significant adverse impacts would result from construction of Phase II of the Project at any sensitive receptor locations, including community facilities. Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” includes an assessment of noise levels during the Phase II construction period and finds that interior noise levels for the Phase II buildings (including the proposed school and the proposed intergenerational community center) would be within the acceptable CEQR range throughout most of the construction period; while interior noise levels would exceed the acceptable range during portions of construction activities, these limited exceedances would not be considered a significant adverse impact. As per the MEC, The proposed school will be constructed to provide adequate noise attenuation so that noise in the vicinity of the school (including Project-related traffic, general construction and the school playground) will not result in interior noise levels within the school in excess of 45 dBA L<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, the direct effects analysis in this chapter focuses on whether elevated noise levels associated with the construction of Phase II could impair the operation of any noise-sensitive community facilities located in the area surrounding the project site.

As described in Chapter 3A, “Construction Overview,” three illustrative phasing plans have been developed to illustrate how the timing of the construction of certain project components may vary and to provide for a reasonably conservative analysis of the range of environmental effects associated with a delayed build-out of Phase II. The potential for indirect significant adverse impacts on public schools and child care centers, and direct effects due to noise, during the construction period for Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario is analyzed below, for each illustrative construction phasing plan.

**D. FUTURE WITH PHASE II CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES**

**INDIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS**

The indirect effects analysis considers conditions during the construction period when new residential populations associated with each Phase II building would be introduced, and when new community facilities on the Phase II project site would become available. **Table 3D-1** presents the summary of assumptions for population changes associated with each Phase II building.

**Table 3D-1**  
**Summary of Phase II Population Changes for**  
**Schools Analysis and Child Care Analysis**

<b>Building</b>	<b>New Elementary School Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>New Intermediate School Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>New High School Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Children Eligible for Public Child Care<sup>2</sup></b>
5	168	70	81	17
6	117	49	57	14
7	199	82	96	19
8	138	57	67	14
9	181	75	88	18
10	124	51	60	15
11	97	40	47	10
12	104	43	50	16
13	106	44	51	16
14	83	34	40	4
15	114	47	55	17
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,430</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Notes:</b> <sup>1</sup> Calculated using the rates in Table 6-1a of the <i>CEQR Technical Manual</i> <sup>2</sup> Calculated using the rates in Table 6-1b of the <i>CEQR Technical Manual</i>				

As with Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the quantitative assessment provided below compares the Future With Phase II to the Future Without Phase II in order to determine the changes in community facility utilization that are attributable to Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario. As noted throughout this SEIS, Phase I is currently under construction, and therefore forms part of the baseline condition against which the effects of Phase II are determined (i.e., the Future Without Phase II condition). The expected public school students and children eligible for public child care services from three Phase I buildings—Buildings 2, 3, and 4—are therefore accounted for in the Future Without Phase II condition beginning in 2018. However, Building 1 and Site 5 are located outside of Sub-District 1 of CSD 13, which is the study area for the schools analysis, as set forth in the methodology of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. As these Phase I buildings are not within the study area for the schools analysis, the students that will be introduced by these buildings were not included in the Future Without Phase II condition. In addition, neither of these buildings are expected to include any affordable units. Therefore, Building 1 and Site 5 are not expected to result in any children that would be eligible for publicly-funded child care services. Thus, Building 1 and Site 5 are not pertinent to the public school and child care analyses presented below.

As described in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” and in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” if requested by DOE, the project sponsors will make space available for construction of an approximately 100,000 gsf public elementary and intermediate school, subject to approvals and requirements of the New York City Department of Education (DOE). DOE’s *2015-2019 Proposed Five-Year Capital Plan, February 2014* allocates funds towards the development of a new public school on the Phase II project site. Although the grade-level mix has not yet been determined, the Proposed Capital Plan assumes that 757 seats will be created through the opening of this new school. Because the school program and capacity is not finalized, DOE can better determine grade allocation when the school is designed, based on demand in CSD 13/Sub-District 1 at that time. Accordingly, these new school seats have not been included in the quantitative assessment of future school utilization. It is currently anticipated that, if built, this school would be located in Building 6 or Building 15.

In addition, the project sponsors are obligated to construct on the project site and arrange for the long-term operations of a licensed child care center that can accommodate at least 100 children with publicly funded vouchers. It is assumed for the purposes of analysis that this new child care facility would be located in Building 6. The project sponsors are also obligated to monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to provide up to approximately 250 additional children, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

#### **ANALYSIS WITH ILLUSTRATIVE CONSTRUCTION PHASING PLAN 1**

Under Construction Phasing Plan 1, the four buildings on Block 1129 would be built first, followed by Building 15 on Block 1128, the three buildings on Block 1121, and the three remaining buildings on Block 1120. **Table 3D-2** summarizes the utilization of schools in CSD 13/Sub-District 1 and the utilization of child care facilities in the 1.5-mile study area, during the construction period, including calculating the change in school utilization as each building comes online, in comparison to the Future Without Phase II.

#### *INDIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

As described in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” and as per the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a significant adverse impact on schools and/or child care services could occur when utilization of those facilities is greater than 100 percent and the percent increase in utilization in the future with an action would be 5 percent or greater than in the future without that action.

#### *Elementary Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-2**, elementary school utilization would steadily increase as Phase II buildings are constructed, and new elementary school students are introduced to Sub-District 1 of CSD 13. In 2021, upon the completion of Building 14, elementary school utilization would be 137 percent, and the percentage increase would be 5 percent, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Therefore, at that point in Phase II development under Construction Phasing Plan 1, there would be a significant adverse impact on elementary schools, which would gradually increase over time.

**Table 3D-2**

**Summary of Community Facility Conditions During Construction of Phase II  
—Illustrative Construction Phasing Plan 1**

Year	Building	Elementary Schools		Intermediate Schools		High Schools		Public Child Care Services	
		Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>
2021	14	137%	5%	103%	4%	91%	0%	125%	0.17%
2022	13	144%	12%	108%	9%	91%	0%	126%	0.92%
2024	12	150%	18%	113%	14%	91%	0%	127%	1.68%
2025	11	156%	24%	118%	19%	91%	0%	127%	2.15%
2026	15	163%	31%	124%	25%	91%	0%	128%	2.96%
2028	8	172%	40%	130%	31%	91%	0%	129%	3.62%
2029	9	183%	51%	139%	40%	91%	0%	129%	4.47%
2031	10	190%	58%	145%	46%	91%	0%	130%	5.18%
2032	5	201%	69%	153%	54%	92%	1%	131%	5.98%
2033	6	208%	76%	159%	60%	92%	1%	126%	0.70%
2035	7	220%	88%	169%	70%	92%	1%	127%	1.56%

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup>Utilization is calculated by dividing projected enrollment by capacity  
<sup>2</sup>Percent change is calculated by subtracting the Future Without Phase II percentage from the Future With Phase II utilization

As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities.

*Intermediate Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-2**, intermediate school utilization would steadily increase as Phase II buildings are constructed, and new intermediate school students are introduced to Sub-District 1 of CSD 13. In 2021, upon the completion of Building 14, intermediate school utilization would be 137 percent, and the percentage increase would be 4 percent, compared with the Future Without Phase II. In 2022, upon the completion of Building 13, intermediate school utilization would be 108 percent, and the percentage increase would be 9 percent, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Therefore, at that point in Phase II development under Construction Phasing Plan 1, there would be a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools, which would gradually increase over time.

As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities.

*Elementary and Intermediate Schools with Proposed School*

As noted above, Phase II would include, at the election of DOE, the provision of space accommodating an approximately 100,000 gsf elementary and intermediate public school to partially mitigate the significant adverse impacts on elementary and intermediate school capacity in CSD 13/Sub-District 1. It is currently contemplated that the new school would, if built, be located in

Building 6 or Building 15. Thus, if DOE elects to build the new school, it would partially mitigate the elementary school seat shortfall in 2026 (with the completion of Building 15) or 2033 (with the completion of Building 6). Chapter 5, “Mitigation,” provides a more detailed discussion of the timing of the public school mitigation.

### *High Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-2**, at no point during the build out of Phase II would there be an increase in high school utilization in Brooklyn attributable to Phase II approaching five percent, which is the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact.

### *Child Care Facilities*

As shown in **Table 3D-2**, utilization of publicly funded child care services would steadily increase until 2032 as Phase II is constructed, before declining in 2033. In 2032, Building 6 would come online, which is expected to include a 100-slot child care facility that the project sponsors are committed to provide, as per the MEC. Prior to the addition of this new child care capacity, child care utilization would increase by 5.18 percent in 2031, with the addition of Building 10, and by 5.98 percent in 2032 with the addition of Building 5, compared with the Future Without Phase II. As a result of background growth in the study area, including Phase I of the Project, and the assumption that no new child care slots would be provided in the study area in the Future Without Phase II, the deficit of slots in 2032 would increase to approximately 655, 127 of which would be associated with Phase II of the Project. These increases would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact of five percent or more, in cases when utilization is above 100 percent. However, upon the completion of Building 6 and its 100 new child care slots in 2033, utilization would decrease from 131 percent to 126 percent, which represents a 0.7 percent increase in utilization, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Upon completion of Phase II in 2035, the increase in child care utilization attributable to the Phase II would be 1.56 percent, which is below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact. Thus, during the construction of Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario, there would be a temporary shortfall beginning in 2031 and ending in 2033. Due to the short duration of this shortfall and the 100 new child care slots that would be provided by the project sponsors, this temporary condition would not be considered a significant adverse impact. In addition, the project sponsors will monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to accommodate up to approximately 250 additional children, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

Several factors may reduce the number of children in need of publicly funded child care slots in Administration for Children’s Services (ACS)-contracted child care facilities. Families in the study area could make use of alternatives to publicly funded child care facilities. There are slots at homes licensed to provide family-based child care that families of eligible children could elect to use instead of public center child care. Such facilities provide additional slots in the study area but are not included in the quantitative analysis. Parents of eligible children are also not restricted to enrolling their children in child care facilities in a specific geographical area and could use public child care centers outside of the study area.

*DIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

As discussed in Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” at limited times during the Phase II construction period, P.S. 753 (located at 510 Clermont Avenue) would be expected to experience significant adverse noise impacts. Under Construction Phasing Plan 1, one or more floors along the south, and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to nine years. The exceedances would be due to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3J examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels that would result from construction, and consequently is conservative in predicting significant increases in noise levels because the analysis assumes that peak hourly noise levels would persist for the entire year during most years.

P.S. 753 has double-glazed windows and an alternate means of ventilation. With these receptor control measures, except for an approximately one year period of time, interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels in rooms with windows along the south, and west façades of the school would be expected to be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for schools (i.e., during those time periods when exterior  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels due to construction are predicted to be less than 75 dBA, as shown in **Appendix B**). However, during approximately a one year period, the construction noise analysis predicts that construction activities would result in exterior noise levels of up to 76.0 dBA at one or more floors of the school. This would be expected to result in interior noise levels slightly above the 45 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  noise level recommended by CEQR for schools. The predicted noise levels described above are based on the assumption of 8-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue. An analysis using the assumption of 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue for Project buildings being constructed directly across from the school (Buildings 8 and 9) predicts that interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels throughout the school would be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for classroom use throughout the construction period. The project sponsors have committed to providing 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers adjacent to sensitive receptors, including across from the school, if they are determined to be practicable and feasible.

Even with 8-foot site perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue resulting in exterior noise levels up to 76.0 dBA and interior noise levels greater than the 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level at one or more floors of the west and south façades of the school for approximately one year, noise levels at the school would be comparable to those at schools along heavily trafficked roadways in New York City. Due to these factors, the temporary construction noise impacts on P.S. 753 would not be expected to impair the operation of the school and therefore would not be considered a significant adverse community facilities impact.

**ANALYSIS WITH ILLUSTRATIVE CONSTRUCTION PHASING PLAN 2**

Under Construction Phasing Plan 2, Building 15 on Block 1128 would be built first, followed by Building 5 on Block 1120, Building 14 on Block 1129, the remaining two buildings on Block 1120, and the remaining six buildings on Block 1121/1129. **Table 3D-3** summarizes the utilization of schools in CSD 13/Sub-District 1 and the utilization of child care facilities in the 1.5-mile study area, during the construction period, including calculating the change in school utilization as each building comes online, in comparison to the Future Without Phase II.

**Table 3D-3**  
**Summary of Community Facility Conditions During Construction of Phase II**  
**—Construction Phasing Plan 2**

Year	Building	Elementary Schools		Intermediate Schools		High Schools		Public Child Care Services	
		Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>
2021	15	139%	7%	105%	6%	91%	0%	126%	0.78%
2022	5	149%	17%	113%	14%	91%	0%	127%	1.58%
2023	14	155%	23%	117%	18%	91%	0%	127%	1.77%
2026	6	162%	30%	123%	24%	91%	0%	122%	-3.32%
2028	7	174%	42%	132%	33%	91%	0%	123%	-2.46%
2029	8	183%	51%	139%	40%	91%	0%	123%	-1.83%
2030	9	194%	62%	148%	49%	92%	0%	124%	-1.02%
2031	10	201%	69%	154%	55%	92%	1%	125%	-0.34%
2032	13	208%	76%	159%	60%	92%	1%	125%	0.38%
2034	12	214%	82%	164%	65%	92%	1%	126%	1.11%
2035	11	220%	88%	169%	70%	92%	1%	127%	1.56%

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup>Utilization is calculated by dividing projected enrollment by capacity  
<sup>2</sup>Percent change is calculated by subtracting the Future Without Phase II utilization percentage from the Future With Phase II utilization percentage

*INDIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

*Elementary Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-3**, elementary school utilization would steadily increase as Phase II buildings are constructed, and new elementary school students are introduced to Sub-District 1 of CSD 13. In 2021, upon the completion of Building 15, elementary school utilization would be 139 percent, and the percentage increase would be 7 percent, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Therefore, under Construction Phasing Plan 2, there would be a significant adverse impact on elementary schools beginning in 2021, which would gradually increase over time.

As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities.

*Intermediate Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-3**, intermediate school utilization would steadily increase as Phase II buildings are constructed, and new intermediate school students are introduced to Sub-District 1 of CSD 13. In 2021, upon the completion of Building 15, intermediate school utilization would be 105 percent, and the percentage increase would be 6 percent, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Therefore, under Construction Phasing Plan 2, there would be a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools beginning in 2021, which would gradually increase over time.

As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term

projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities.

### *Elementary and Intermediate Schools with Proposed School*

As noted above, Phase II would include, at the election of DOE, the provision of space for construction of an approximately 100,000 gsf elementary and intermediate public school to partially mitigate the significant adverse impacts on elementary and intermediate school capacity in CSD 13/Sub-District 1. It is currently contemplated that the new school would, if built, be located in Building 6 or Building 15. Thus, if DOE elects to build the new school, it would partially mitigate the elementary school seat shortfall in 2021 (with the completion of Building 15) or 2026 (with the completion of Building 6). As noted above, Chapter 5, “Mitigation,” provides a more detailed discussion of the timing of the public school mitigation.

### *High Schools*

As shown in **Table 3D-3**, at no point during the build out of Phase II would there be an increase in high school utilization in Brooklyn attributable to Phase II approaching five percent, which is the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact.

### *Child Care Facilities*

As shown in **Table 3D-3**, utilization of publicly funded child care services would gradually increase until 2023 as Phase II is constructed, before declining in 2026, and then steadily increasing until 2035. In 2026, Building 6 would come online, which is expected to include a 100-slot child care facility that the project sponsors are committed to provide, as per the MEC. Prior to the addition of this new child care capacity, child care utilization would rise between 2021 and 2023; this increase would reach 1.77 percent in 2033, compared with the Future Without Phase II, with the addition of Building 14. This 1.77 percent increase in 2033 would not exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact of five percent or more, in cases when utilization is above 100 percent. Following the completion of Building 6 and its 100 new child care slots in 2026, utilization would decrease from 127 percent to 122 percent, which represents a 3.32 percent decrease in utilization, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Due to the new capacity that would be added in 2026, Phase II would continue to represent an improvement in child care facility conditions until 2032, when the completion of Building 13 would result in a 0.38 percent increase in utilization, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Following the completion of the last Phase II building (Building 11) in 2035, the percent increase in child care utilization attributable to Phase II would be 1.56 percent. At no point during the build out of Phase II under Construction Phasing Plan 2 would there be an increase in utilization attributable to Phase II approaching five percent, which is the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact. This analysis accounts for background growth in the study area, including Phase I of the Project, and conservatively assumes that no new child care slots would be provided in the study area in the Future Without Phase II. As noted above, the project sponsors will monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to accommodate approximately 250 additional children, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

Several factors may reduce the number of children in need of publicly funded child care slots in ACS-contracted child care facilities. Families in the study area could make use of alternatives to

publicly funded child care facilities. There are slots at homes licensed to provide family-based child care that families of eligible children could elect to use instead of public center child care. Such facilities provide additional slots in the study area but are not included in the quantitative analysis. Parents of eligible children are also not restricted to enrolling their children in child care facilities in a specific geographical area and could use public child care centers outside of the study area.

### *DIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

As discussed in Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” at limited times during the Phase II construction period, P.S. 753 (located at 510 Clermont Avenue) would be expected to experience significant adverse noise impacts. Under Construction Phasing Plan 2, one or more floors along the east, south, and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to seven years.

The exceedances would be due to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3J examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels that would result from construction, and consequently is conservative in predicting significant increases in noise levels because the analysis assumes that peak hourly noise levels would persist for the entire year during most years.

P.S. 753 has double-glazed windows and an alternate means of ventilation. With these receptor control measures, except for an approximately two year period of time, interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels in rooms with windows along the east, south, and west façades of the school would be expected to be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for schools (i.e., during those time periods when exterior  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels due to construction are predicted to be less than 75 dBA, as shown in **Appendix B**). However, during approximately a two year period, the construction noise analysis predicts that construction activities would result in exterior noise levels of up to 77.7 dBA at one or more floors of the school. This would be expected to result in interior noise levels slightly above the 45 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  noise level recommended by CEQR for schools. The predicted noise levels described above are based on the assumption of 8-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue. An analysis using the assumption of 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue for Project buildings being constructed directly across from the school (Buildings 8 and 9) predicts that interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels throughout the school would be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for classroom use throughout the construction period. The project sponsors have committed to providing 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers adjacent to sensitive receptors, including across from the school, if they are determined to be practicable and feasible.

Even with 8-foot site perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue resulting in exterior noise levels up to 77.7 dBA and interior noise levels greater than the 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level at one or more floors of the east, west, and south façades of the school for approximately two years, noise levels at the school would be comparable to those at schools along heavily trafficked roadways in New York City. Due to these factors, the temporary construction noise impacts on P.S. 753 would not be expected to impair the operation of the school and therefore would not be considered a significant adverse community facilities impact.

### **ANALYSIS WITH CONSTRUCTION PHASING PLAN 3**

As described earlier in this chapter, Construction Phasing Plan 3 would result in the build out of Phase II of the Project under the Extended Build-Out Scenario in the same sequence as

Construction Phasing Plan 1, except that after the initial construction of certain buildings there would be a delay, followed by more intense construction activity to complete the Project by 2035. Thus, as shown on **Table 3D-4**, Construction Phasing Plan 3 would result in the same effects on community facilities in the study areas as Construction Phasing Plan 1, except that most changes would occur in later years.

**Table 3D-4**  
**Summary of Community Facility Conditions During Construction of Phase II**  
**—Construction Phasing Plan 3**

Year	Building	Elementary Schools		Intermediate Schools		High Schools		Public Child Care Services	
		Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>	Util. <sup>1</sup>	% Change <sup>2</sup>
2021	14	137%	5%	103%	4%	91%	0%	125%	0.17%
2027	13	144%	12%	108%	9%	91%	0%	126%	0.92%
2028	12	150%	18%	113%	14%	91%	0%	127%	1.68%
2029	11	156%	24%	118%	19%	91%	0%	127%	2.15%
2030	15	163%	31%	124%	25%	91%	0%	128%	2.96%
2031	8	172%	40%	130%	31%	91%	0%	129%	3.62%
2032	9	183%	51%	139%	40%	91%	0%	129%	4.47%
2033	10	190%	58%	145%	46%	91%	0%	130%	5.18%
2033	5	201%	69%	153%	54%	92%	1%	131%	5.98%
2034	6	208%	76%	159%	60%	92%	1%	126%	0.70%
2035	7	220%	88%	169%	70%	92%	1%	127%	1.56%

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup>Utilization is calculated by dividing projected enrollment by capacity  
<sup>2</sup>Percent change is calculated by subtracting the Future Without Phase II percentage from the Future With Phase II utilization

*INDIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

*Public Schools*

As with Construction Phasing Plan 1, there would be a significant adverse impact on elementary schools beginning in 2021 (upon completion of Building 14), that would increase over time. The significant adverse impact on intermediate schools would occur in 2027, with the completion of Building 13, whereas under Construction Phasing Plan 1 the intermediate school impact would occur in 2022. As noted in Chapter 4B, “Operational Community Facilities,” the delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on schools, and the magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not account for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or construction of additional school facilities.

If DOE elects to build a school on the project site, it would be built in 2030 (completion date for Building 15) or 2034 (completion date for Building 6). As with Construction Phasing Plan 1, there would be no adverse high school impacts under Construction Phasing Plan 3.

*Child Care Facilities*

With regard to child care facilities, child care utilization would increase by 5.18 percent and then 5.98 percent in 2033, with the addition of Buildings 5 and 10. As a result of background growth in the study area, including Phase I of the Project, and the assumption that no new child care slots would be provided in the study area in the Future Without Phase II, the deficit of slots in

2033 (following the completion of Building 10) would increase to approximately 655, 127 of which is associated with Phase II of the Project.

With the addition of Building 6 in 2034—and the 100 child care slots that it would be anticipated to provide—utilization would decrease from 131 percent to 126 percent, which represents a 0.7 percent increase in utilization, compared with the Future Without Phase II. Upon completion of Phase II in 2035, the increase in child care utilization attributable to the Phase II would be 1.56 percent, which is below the *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold for a significant adverse impact (when utilization is above 100 percent). Thus, during the construction of Phase II, there would be a temporary shortfall beginning in 2033 and ending in 2034. As with Construction Phasing Plan 1, this temporary condition would not be considered a significant adverse impact, due to the short duration of this shortfall and the 100 new child care slots that would be provided by the project sponsors. In addition, the project sponsors will monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to accommodate approximately 250 additional children, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

### *DIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS*

As discussed in Chapter 3J, “Construction Noise and Vibration,” at limited times during the Phase II construction period, P.S. 753 (located at 510 Clermont Avenue) would be expected to experience significant adverse noise impacts. Under Construction Phasing Plan 3, one or more floors along the south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to eleven years. The exceedances would be due to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3J examined the reasonable worst-case peak hourly noise levels that would result from construction, and consequently is conservative in predicting significant increases in noise levels because the analysis assumes that peak hourly noise levels would persist for the entire year during most years.

P.S. 753 has double-glazed windows and an alternate means of ventilation. With these receptor control measures, except for an approximately one year period of time, interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels in rooms with windows along the south and west façades of the school would be expected to be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for schools (i.e., during those time periods when exterior  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels due to construction are predicted to be less than 75 dBA, as shown in **Appendix B**). However, during approximately a one year period, the construction noise analysis predicts that construction activities would result in exterior noise levels of up to 75.2 dBA at one or more floors of the school. This would be expected to result in interior noise levels slightly above the 45 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  noise level recommended by CEQR for classroom use. The predicted noise levels described above are based on the assumption of 8-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue. An analysis using the assumption of 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue for Project buildings being constructed directly across from the school (Buildings 8 and 9) predicts that interior  $L_{10}$  noise levels throughout the school would be below the CEQR 45 dBA  $L_{10}$  recommended level for classroom use throughout the construction period. The project sponsors have committed to providing 16-foot site-perimeter noise barriers adjacent to sensitive receptors, including across from the school, if they are determined to be practicable and feasible.

Even with 8-foot site perimeter noise barriers along Atlantic Avenue resulting in exterior noise levels up to 75.2 dBA and interior noise levels greater than the 45 dBA L<sub>10</sub> recommended level at one or more floors of the west and south façades of the school for approximately one year, noise levels at the school would be comparable to those at schools along heavily trafficked roadways in New York City. Due to these factors, the temporary construction noise impacts on P.S. 753 would not be expected to impair the operation of the school and therefore would not be considered a significant adverse community facilities impact.

## **COMPARISON OF SEIS FINDINGS AND PREVIOUS FINDINGS**

### *INDIRECT EFFECTS*

#### *Public Schools*

The 2006 FEIS determined that the Project (including Phase I and Phase II) would result in a significant adverse impact (with respect to indirect effects) to both elementary and intermediate schools, but would not result in any significant adverse impact on high school capacity. To partially mitigate the significant adverse impact on public schools identified in the 2006 FEIS, the Project sponsors committed to provide adequate space for the construction and operation of a 100,000 gsf elementary and intermediate school in the base of one of the Phase II residential buildings. The 2006 FEIS stated that additional mitigation measures, such as shifting the boundaries of school catchment areas within the CSDs, creating new satellite facilities in less crowded schools, or building new school facilities off-site would be required to fully mitigate the significant adverse impacts on public schools identified in the 2006 FEIS.

The 2009 Technical Memorandum included a revised analysis to determine whether the changed background conditions (including new enrollment data and updated enrollment projections) and updated methodologies (i.e., a change to the CEQR generation rates for public school students and child care eligible children) would result in any new or different impacts than those previously identified in the 2006 FEIS. The revised analysis concluded that the Project would result in a significant adverse impact on elementary schools within the ½-mile study area but that it would no longer result in a significant adverse impact on intermediate schools in the ½-mile study area. However, the project sponsors' obligation to provide space for an elementary and intermediate public school did not change, and this obligation is included in the MEC.

Consistent with the 2006 FEIS, the SEIS analysis finds that Phase II of the Project under the Extended Build-Out Scenario would result in significant adverse impacts to elementary school and intermediate school capacity in the study area. The Future With Phase II utilization and deficit of elementary and intermediate school seats attributable to Phase II under the Extended Build-Out Scenario would be higher than was analyzed in the 2006 FEIS and 2009 Technical Memorandum. These changes are due to changed *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology (e.g., the reduction in the size of the study area and changed multipliers for estimating school children), changed background conditions (which project a shortage of seats in the No-Action condition), and a shift of approximately 208,000 gsf of floor area from Phase I to Phase II of the Project. The delayed completion of Phase II of the Project would not itself create additional demand on elementary schools in the sub-district. The magnitude of the significant adverse impact reflects conservative methodology that does not provide for long-term projections for increasing study area school capacity, possible future shifts in CSD boundaries or sub-district boundaries, or the construction of additional school facilities serving the sub-district under any of the four five-year Capital Plans that will be issued between the present day and the 2035 build

year. Therefore, the analysis provided is conservative in that it likely overstates future enrollment deficits, since the analysis year of 2035 falls within what would be covered by DOE's plan for 2035-2039.

The 2006 FEIS did not include a detailed analysis of community facility impacts during construction of the Project, but it did note that the significant adverse impacts on elementary and intermediate school utilization could have occurred as early as 2013. As analyzed above, this SEIS finds that under the Extended Build-Out Scenario, the significant adverse impact to elementary and intermediate schools from Phase II could occur as early as 2021, following the completion of the first Phase II building.

### *Child Care Facilities*

The 2006 FEIS did not identify any significant adverse child care impacts upon completion of the Project. However, the analysis of publicly funded child care facilities in the 2009 Technical Memorandum found that the updated background conditions and updated methodologies (i.e., new CEQR generation rates for child care eligible children) would result in additional demand for publicly funded child care facilities in the study area, which could result in a shortfall of child care slots in the 2019 future with the project. To meet the additional demand, the project sponsors are obligated to construct on the project site and arrange for the long-term operations of a licensed day care center that can accommodate at least 100 children with publicly funded vouchers and to assess child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the Project progresses and, if necessary, work with the Administration for Children's Services (ACS) to provide up to approximately 250 additional child care slots either on-site or in the vicinity of the site to meet Project-generated demand. With these commitments, included in the MEC, the 2009 Technical Memorandum concluded that there would be no new significant adverse impacts on publicly funded child care facilities in the study area.

As analyzed above, this SEIS finds that, prior to the completion of the new child care facility, utilization could increase by up to 5.98 percent, in 2032 or 2033, and remain above 5 percent for approximately two years. Due to the short duration of this shortfall and the 100 new child care slots that would be provided by the project sponsors, this temporary condition would not be considered a significant adverse impact. In addition, as noted above, the project sponsors will monitor child care enrollment and capacity in the study area as the project progresses, and to the extent necessary to avoid a significant adverse impact, make arrangements with one or more duly licensed day care providers for the long-term operation of a duly licensed child care center (or centers) to provide up to approximately 250 additional children, either on or in the vicinity of the project site.

### *DIRECT EFFECTS*

The 2006 FEIS found that no community facilities would experience a significant adverse noise-related impact during Phase II construction. The analysis in this SEIS concludes that under the Extended Build-Out Scenario, at limited times during the Phase II construction period, P.S. 753 (located at 510 Clermont Avenue) would be expected to experience significant adverse noise impacts. Under Construction Phasing Plan 1, one or more floors along the south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to nine years. Under Construction Phasing Plan 2, one or more floors along the east, south and west facades of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to seven years. Under Construction Phasing Plan 3, one or more floors along the south and west facades

of the school building would be expected to experience exterior noise level increments exceeding CEQR impact criteria for up to eleven years. The exceedances would be due to noise generated by on-site construction activities (rather than construction-related traffic). The noise analysis examined the worst-case peak hourly noise levels that would result from construction, and consequently is conservative in predicting significant increases in noise levels because the analysis assumes that the peak hourly noise levels would persist for an entire year during most years.

P.S. 753 has double-glazed windows and an alternate means of ventilation. The typical attenuation provided by double-glazed windows and the alternate ventilation would be expected to result in interior noise levels below 45 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  (the CEQR acceptable interior noise level criteria for schools), except during a one to two year period, when noise levels were predicted to slightly exceed this threshold. Because interior noise levels would be acceptable except during limited periods when the acceptable threshold would be slightly exceeded, the temporary construction noise impacts on P.S. 753 would not impair the operation of the school and therefore would not be considered a significant adverse community facilities impact. Therefore, consistent with the 2006 FEIS, this SEIS concludes that there would be no significant adverse impacts related to direct effects on community facilities from the construction of Phase II of the Project under the Extended Build-Out Scenario. \*