

A. INTRODUCTION

Since the proposed project would introduce new demands on community resources due to the introduction of daytime users and new residents to the project site, an assessment of the community facilities servicing this new population, and the existing population, is an important consideration in this EIS. Following the methodology of the 2001 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, this analysis focuses on public or publicly funded community facilities, including: police and fire protection; public schools; libraries; outpatient and emergency health care facilities; and publicly funded day care centers. It describes existing conditions, and examines and compares the future with and without the proposed project to determine potential impacts for the 2010 and 2016 analysis years. Components of the proposed project that would have a direct or indirect effect on community facilities are also discussed (including, for example the proposed intergenerational community center offering child care and youth and senior activities and the closures of Pacific Street and 5th Avenue to vehicular traffic, respectively). Private facilities and services, such as private schools, are not assessed. Potential impacts on public open space and recreational facilities are analyzed separately in Chapter 6, “Open Space and Recreational Facilities.”

Particular attention is given to the need for additional public school capacity. This chapter identifies public schools serving the proposed project’s study area and assesses conditions in terms of enrollment and utilization during the current school year, noting any school capacity deficiencies. This analysis takes into consideration projected increases in future enrollment and plans to increase school capacity either through administrative actions on the part of the New York City Department of Education (DOE) or as a result of the proposed project, relative to available capacity that may exist in the future without the proposed project.

This assessment also considers the displacement of a privately operated facility located at 630 Pacific Street, which provides temporary housing for homeless families through contract with the New York City Department of Homeless Services, and a Fire Department of New York (FDNY) equipment cleaning/storage facility at 648 Pacific Street (it is expected that FDNY will relocate this facility or consolidate its services into other existing facilities).

This EIS analyzes the reasonable worst-case impacts on community facilities that may occur as a result of the proposed project for both the 2010 and 2016 analysis years. As discussed in Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework,” the proposed project would allow for variation in the program to allow for additional commercial use to substitute for the hotel and some residential use on the project site. The residential mixed-use variation represents the worst-case scenario for assessing community facility impacts, as it would result in the larger increase in residential population, which could affect utilization of area community services, such as schools and day care facilities that are dependent on the number of area residents. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on the residential mixed-use variation. However, as described throughout the chapter, the commercial mixed-use variation was also assessed to determine if it would result in a

reduction of impacts compared with the residential mixed-use variation, in areas where significant adverse impacts could potentially occur.

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

POLICE PROTECTION

The assessments for both 2010 and 2016 conclude that there would be no significant adverse impacts on police protection within the study area or on emergency service as a result of the proposed project. The New York Police Department (NYPD) would continue to evaluate its staffing needs and assign personnel based on population growth, area coverage, crime levels, and other local factors. The proposed project, including potential effects to police response times, would be taken into consideration during such routine evaluations of service adjustments to continue to provide adequate police coverage. The proposed project would not significantly affect NYPD response times because the four precinct headquarters are located throughout the project's study area and are not clustered around the project site. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on police response times due to the geographic distribution of the precinct headquarters and their respective coverage areas. NYPD has protocols to successfully police large venues, such as Madison Square Garden and Yankee Stadium, which have similar events to those that would take place at the proposed arena. Additionally, the proposed project would implement its own site security plan, which includes measures such as the deployment of security personnel and monitoring and screening procedures.

FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Significant adverse impacts on fire protection services are not expected as a result of the proposed project for either the 2010 or 2016 analysis year. There would be no significant adverse impacts from the relocation of the FDNY Special Operations Facility currently located on the project site. The loss of this facility would not impact essential fire protection services to the surrounding community. FDNY would continue to monitor its ability to provide fire and medical protection and would continue to provide these services per established standard FDNY operating procedures (see letter from FDNY Chief of Operations in Appendix A). There are a seven firehouses, two special operations facilities (one squad company and one non-response laundry facility), and one emergency response unit geographically distributed throughout the proposed project's study area; the nearest EMS unit is located at 39 Auburn Place north of the project site. The proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts on FDNY emergency services or response times. The proposed project is not expected to significantly affect the provision of services by fire and emergency vehicles.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The project site is located in two Community School Districts (CSDs): 13 and 15. To account for this condition, the schools assessment examined the effects on schools within ½ mile of the project, on schools within CSD 13—where most of the project site is located, on schools within CSD 15, and on all schools within CSDs 13/15 combined.

The assessment of potential impacts to school facilities indicated that for the 2010 analysis year the elementary and intermediate school-aged children that would be introduced as a result of the proposed project could be accommodated in the schools within each of the four previously

mentioned study areas (½ mile, CSD 13, CSD 15, and CSDs 13/15 combined); no significant adverse schools impacts are expected in 2010.

The analysis concludes that in 2016, if all school-aged children introduced by the proposed project were to attend the public schools within ½ mile of the project site, the elementary and intermediate schools would be over capacity and could not accommodate the increased student population, resulting in a significant adverse impact on schools in this (½-mile) study area. This shortfall would occur under either the commercial or residential mixed-use variation. There would be available capacity in the CSD 13, CSD 15, and CSDs 13/15 combined study areas and, therefore, no significant adverse impacts on schools in these larger study areas. The number of high school students introduced by the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in the boroughwide high school seat deficit; therefore, no significant adverse impacts to high schools would occur. Additional capacities at private schools are not accounted for in this analysis.

Thus, under either variation, there would be a projected shortfall in elementary and intermediate school seats for schools located within ½ mile of the project site, which would require one of, or a combination of, the mitigation measures discussed in Chapter 19, "Mitigation."

LIBRARIES

No significant adverse impacts to area libraries are anticipated in the study area in either the 2010 or 2016 analysis year as a result of the proposed project.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

Significant adverse impacts to hospitals or emergency rooms are not expected as a result of the proposed project in the 2010 or 2016 analysis year. The new residential population introduced by the proposed project would not overtax the existing hospital or health care resources in the surrounding area. The proposed project would also include a 20,000-square-foot health care facility that would provide a broad range of health care services to the community. This health center would be constructed during Phase I. Although the proposed project would include permanent roadway closures, thus possibly altering emergency vehicles' routes to hospitals, and would increase traffic in the area, these changes would not result in significant adverse impacts on provision of emergency services. There are service providers located at a number of different locations throughout the study area and provisions for emergency vehicle access have been incorporated into the site design.

DAY CARE CENTERS

Child care facilities in the area surrounding the project site would be able to accommodate the increased population of children 12 years old or younger, introduced by the proposed project in 2010. The proposed project in 2016 would include the development of an intergenerational facility that would contain a day care center with more than 100 seats, which would increase the future study area's day care capacity. In addition, day care facilities may also be opened within the study area by 2016 as the population within this area (unrelated to the proposed project) increases. No significant adverse impacts to day care center services are anticipated in the study area in either the 2010 or 2016 analysis year as a result of the proposed project.

B. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes existing conditions and future conditions without the proposed project, and it analyzes the probable impacts of the proposed project. The *CEQR Technical Manual*

recommends a community facility analysis for any project that adds 100 or more residential units. The proposed project, as detailed in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” would exceed this and other individual community facility thresholds (see Table 5-1). The individual catchment areas (e.g., police precincts for police protection and school district boundaries for public schools) for each type of service provider will serve as the study area boundaries for these analyses.

Table 5-1
Preliminary Screening Analysis Criteria

Community Facility	Threshold
Police protection	Direct effect only
Fire protection and emergency services	Direct effect only
Public schools	More than 50 elementary/intermediate school or 150 high school students
Libraries	Greater than 5 percent increase in ratio of residential units to libraries in borough
Hospitals and health care facilities (outpatient)	More than 600 low- to moderate-income units
Day care centers (publicly funded)	More than 50 eligible children based on number of low- to moderate-income units by borough
Source: 2001 <i>CEQR Technical Manual</i> .	

C. POLICE PROTECTION

Although the *CEQR Technical Manual* suggests that a detailed analysis of police services is generally conducted only in the case of direct impacts on facilities, potential impacts on service delivery were assessed due to the closing of streets that would result from the proposed project. The service areas for analyzing police coverage include the NYPD precincts that currently serve the project site and surrounding area. NYPD has been consulted as part of the assessment of police protection.

Impacts are identified if the proposed project would result in the direct displacement of an existing NYPD facility or if it would significantly and adversely affect NYPD operations.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Table 5-2 lists the NYPD precincts that serve the project site and the surrounding areas. As shown in Figure 5-1, the project site is located at the junction of several precincts. The 77th, 78th, and 88th Precincts each serve a portion of the project site and the surrounding areas. The 84th Precinct serves the area to the immediate west of the project site.

The 88th Precinct is located at 298 Classon Avenue in the Clinton Hill neighborhood of Brooklyn. The precinct serves an area of 1.42 square miles bounded roughly by Atlantic Avenue and Pacific Street to the south, Classon Avenue to the east, Flatbush Avenue and Prince Street to the west, and the East River to the north. The precinct includes the project site north of Pacific Street (Blocks 927, 1118, 1119, 1120, and 1121). The precinct is primarily residential with industrial and commercial activity along Atlantic and Flatbush Avenues and at the Brooklyn Navy Yard to the north. The precinct serves the Fort Greene and Clinton Hill neighborhoods, the Brooklyn Academy of Music (BAM), the Atlantic Center Mall, the Atlantic Terminal Mall/Bank of New York Tower, and the New York City Housing Authority’s (NYCHA) Ingersoll, Walt Whitman, and Atlantic Terminal Houses. With approximately 164 uniformed staff members assigned to the 88th Precinct, staffing levels are sufficient to meet the current needs of the community.

Table 5-2
Police Services

Map No. ¹	Police Department	Address	Facility Type	Police Personnel ²
1	78th Precinct	65 6th Avenue	NYC Police Station	170
2	77th Precinct	127 Utica Avenue	NYC Police Station	247
3	88th Precinct	298 Classon Avenue	NYC Police Station	164
4	84th Precinct	301 Gold Street	NYC Police Station	263
Notes: ¹ See Figure 5-1. ² Includes all uniformed police officers. Sources: Letter dated June 28, 2004, from John Gerrish, NYPD Deputy Chief Commanding Officer, Office of Management Analysis and Planning; NYPD website (http://home.nyc.gov/html/nypd/home.html); Lieutenant Abbassi, 77th Precinct, phone call of February 13, 2006, Captain Cosgrove, 88th Precinct, phone call of February 16, 2006; e-mail from Lieutenant Levine, OMAP, May 18, 2006.				

The 77th Precinct is located on Utica Avenue in the northern portion of the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. The precinct includes the project site located south of Pacific Street and east of 6th Avenue (Blocks 1128 and 1129). Covering a total area of 1.73 square miles, the 77th Precinct includes the neighborhoods of Prospect Heights and Weeksville, a combination of residential and commercial districts. The precinct service area is bounded by Atlantic Avenue to the north, Ralph Avenue to the east, Eastern Parkway to the south, and Flatbush and 6th Avenues to the west. Current staffing levels are sufficient to meet the needs of the community, with 247 uniformed officers and personnel assigned to the precinct.

The 78th Precinct is located immediately south of the project site at the corner of 6th Avenue and Bergen Street in Prospect Heights. The precinct serves an area of 2.2 square miles bounded roughly by Pacific and Warren Streets to the north, Flatbush and Washington Avenues to the east, Prospect Park Southwest and 15th Street to the south, and the Gowanus Canal to the west. The service area includes the project site south of Pacific Street and west of 6th Avenue (Block 1127). Grand Army Plaza, Prospect Park, the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens, and the Brooklyn Museum are all included in the 78th Precinct service district. The eastern and southern portions of the precinct are primarily residential with commercial areas located along Flatbush, 5th, and 7th Avenues. The western section is an industrial area of factories and warehouses with some residential buildings located among the industrial uses. Approximately 170 officers are assigned to the 78th Precinct, and current staffing levels are sufficient to meet the needs of the community.

With headquarters located at 301 Gold Street in Downtown Brooklyn, the 84th Precinct serves an area of 1.07 square miles bounded by Atlantic Avenue, Warren Street, and Wyckoff Street to the south, Flatbush Avenue and Prince Street to the east, and the East River to the north and west. The precinct serves the heart of Downtown Brooklyn, including Metrotech Center, the Fulton Street Mall, Borough Hall, FDNY Headquarters, the New York City Transit (NYCT) Headquarters, the New York City Transit Museum, and several courthouses, as well as the residential neighborhoods of Brooklyn Heights, Boerum Hill, and Vinegar Hill (including the increasingly residential neighborhood known as DUMBO [Down Under the Manhattan Bridge Overpass]). Approximately 263 police personnel are assigned to the 84th Precinct. Current staffing levels are sufficient to meet the needs of the community.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

In 2010 without the proposed project, new residential, commercial, and community facility development is anticipated in the areas surrounding the project site as described in Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework” (see Table 2-1). NYPD typically adjusts its allocation of personnel as needs arise. Increased allocations are considered when demand becomes apparent. It is NYPD policy not to make adjustments in advance of planned or potential development. Each year, the precinct could be assigned new recruits, but there are also losses due to transfers, promotions, and retirements. Further adjustments to the size and deployment of the police force according to demand-based needs or other policy decisions would be made by 2010 in the future without the proposed project.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

By 2010, the new worker, residential, and visitor population associated with the proposed project could increase the demand for police protection in the study area. As discussed earlier and illustrated in Figure 5-1, the project site is located at the junction of several NYPD precincts; the 78th Precinct is located immediately south of the project site at the corner of 6th Avenue and Bergen Street. The project site is well-served by NYPD services as precincts servicing the project site and the surrounding area are located on all sides and access to the project site is provided by the major thoroughfares of Atlantic, Flatbush, and 4th Avenues. It is expected that this potential increase in demand for police services as a result of the proposed project would be spread over these four precincts, minimizing demand on any one precinct.

NYPD would continue to evaluate its staffing needs and assign personnel based on a variety of factors, including demographics, calls for service, and crime conditions. According to the NYPD Office of Management, Analysis and Planning (OMAP), the allocation of NYPD staff citywide is routinely evaluated, accounting for changes in population and transportation. The proposed project would be taken into consideration in such routine evaluations of service adjustments, and adequate coverage would continue to be provided by the NYPD.¹ Furthermore, NYPD would investigate altering the precinct lines within Brooklyn if deemed necessary for the continued provision of adequate service.

According to OMAP, NYPD has protocols to successfully police large venues, such as Madison Square Garden and Yankee Stadium, which have similar events to those that would take place at the proposed arena. For large events, officers are brought in from throughout the city and do not detract from local precincts.¹ Thus, there would be no resulting impact to police services in the surrounding area from a drain on police resources during arena events, and large events would not disadvantage the local precincts.

Private security staff and security systems would also be provided for the project: additional security personnel at arena events, screening of office tenants and visitors, and private security for the residential and open space components of the proposed project.

There would be no direct displacement of existing NYPD facilities in 2010 with the proposed project. The proposed project would include the reconfiguration of 6th Avenue between Atlantic

¹ Meeting Minutes of Borough Board Atlantic Yards Committee Meeting of November 29, 2005, discussion with NYPD Inspector Joseph McKeever, Commanding Officer of NYPD’s Office of Management, Analysis, and Planning.

and Flatbush Avenues, resulting in the loss of angled police parking in front of the 78th Precinct House. Alternative off-site solutions are currently being explored with NYPD.

The project site is located at the junction of several police precincts as shown on Table 5-2 and Figure 5-1, with Atlantic Avenue and Flatbush Avenue forming the general boundaries among the precinct districts. Because in the future with the proposed project, the project site will generate significant activity that does not currently exist, the potential impacts on the ability of the police to respond to emergency calls are assessed below.

The proposed project's closure of portions of Pacific Street (between Flatbush and 6th Avenues and between Carlton and Vanderbilt Avenues) would not hinder the ability of NYPD to access the project site as the project's design accounts for the access needs of emergency vehicles. The proposed closure of Fifth Avenue between Flatbush and Atlantic Avenues would not adversely affect police response times as this is a relatively short north-south block and other nearby north-south connectors are available. The directional change in certain streets from one-way to two-way would provide additional routes for police access and would not adversely affect NYPD response times.

The increases in traffic associated with the proposed project would not significantly affect NYPD response times because the four precinct headquarters are located throughout the project's study area and are not clustered around the project site. Because of the precinct locations, they can respond to calls within their coverage areas without having to traverse through the blocks immediately surrounding the project site as there exist multiple routes to their destinations. Even the potential response from the 78th Precinct, located closest to the project site, would not be significantly affected since its precinct coverage extends principally to the southwest. Thus, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on police response times due to the geographic distribution of the precinct headquarters and their respective coverage areas.

With continued adjustments in deployment of personnel and equipment by NYPD, there would be no significant adverse impacts on NYPD operations from increased area population or the introduction of the proposed arena or other Phase I components of the proposed project.

As the commercial mixed-use variation would result in buildings of similar size and arrangement, significant adverse impacts to police protection services are not anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2010. The change of use would not affect the conclusion of the analysis. NYPD would continue to modify the deployment of personnel and equipment to service the project site as appropriate.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In 2016 without the proposed project, new residential, commercial, and community facility development is anticipated within the areas surrounding the project site as described in Chapter 2, "Procedural and Analytical Framework" (see Table 2-1). While no changes in police staffing by 2016 are projected at this time, it is expected that further adjustments to the size and deployment of the police force, based on need determination or other policy decisions, could be made by 2016 in the future without the proposed project.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In the future with the proposed project in 2016, there would be no direct displacement of existing NYPD facilities, and there would be no additional road closures. The new populations introduced by the proposed project would increase the demand for police coverage by 2016. As

discussed in “Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project—2010” above, the project site is located at the junction of several NYPD precincts and the potential increase in demand for police services as a result of the proposed project would be spread over these four precincts minimizing demand on any one precinct. Police response times are not expected to be significantly affected by the closing of local streets (during Phase I) or increased traffic as the project site is accessible by three of the borough’s major thoroughfares, and as noted above, service to surrounding areas is from precincts that have a broad geographic distribution.

As described above, NYPD would continue to evaluate its staffing needs and assign personnel based on a variety of factors, including demographics, calls for service, and crime conditions. As with the 2010 analysis, it is expected that further adjustments to the size and deployment of the police force could be made in 2016 in the future with the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts on NYPD operations.

Similarly, significant adverse impacts on police services or operations are not anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2016 (the Phase II development would be identical for both the residential and commercial mixed-use variations).

D. FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Although the *CEQR Technical Manual* suggests that a detailed analysis of fire protection services is generally conducted only in the case of direct impacts on facilities, the nature and scope of the proposed project warrants an examination of potential impacts on service delivery.

The service areas for analyzing FDNY coverage include both fire and emergency resources that currently serve the project site or would be assigned upon completion of the proposed project. Emergency Medical Service (EMS) is included in the FDNY analysis. This analysis does not include private emergency medical response units that could provide services for the project site or the surrounding study area. FDNY has been consulted as part of the assessment of fire protection and emergency services.

Impacts are identified if the proposed project would result in the direct displacement of an existing FDNY facility or if it would significantly and adversely affect FDNY operations.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

In New York City, FDNY engine companies carry hoses; ladder companies provide search, rescue, and building ventilation functions; and rescue companies specifically respond to fires or emergencies in high-rise buildings. In addition, the FDNY operates the City’s EMS system.

As shown in Figure 5-1 and Table 5-3, the study area for fire protection services—the area within approximately one mile of the project site—includes a total of seven firehouses, two special operations facilities (one squad company and one non-response laundry facility), and one emergency response unit, although units responding to a fire are not limited to those closest to it. Normally, a total of three engine companies and two ladder companies respond to each call, although initial responses to alarms from any given call box location are sometimes determined by the specific needs of the geographic location or use at that location. Each FDNY squad company is capable of operating as an Engine, Ladder, or Rescue company, ensuring the versatility of

Table 5-3
Fire Protection Services

Map No. ¹	Fire Department	Address	Facility Type
5	Special Operations Facility	648 Pacific Street	Laundry Facility
6	Engine 219, Ladder 105	494 Dean Street	NYC Firehouse
7	Engine 226	409 State Street	NYC Firehouse
8	Squad Company 1	788 Union Street	Special Operations Command
9	Engine 239	395 4th Avenue	NYC Firehouse
10	Engine 280, Ladder 132	489 St. Johns Place	NYC Firehouse
11	Engine 210	160 Carlton Avenue	NYC Firehouse
12	Engine 235, Battalion 57	206 Monroe Street	NYC Firehouse
13	Engine 207, Ladder 110, Battalion 31, Division 11	172 Tillary Street	NYC Firehouse
14	EMS—31 Cumberland Station	39 Auburn Place	NYC EMS
Note: ¹ See Figure 5-1.			

companies for incident commanders. Each squad is also part of the FDNY Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Response Group, with each company containing a HazMat Tech Unit. An FDNY battalion is the first (lowest) level of command and usually comprises five to seven companies (three to six engine companies and two to three ladder companies). There are five to six battalions in a division. FDNY can also call on units in other parts of the city as needed.

Approximately 25 personnel are staffed in each engine and ladder company. Therefore, if a firehouse contains one engine and one ladder company, a total of approximately 50 personnel are assigned to that facility. Typically, during one shift, each engine and ladder company is manned by five and six firefighters, respectively.

An FDNY Special Operations Facility is located at 648 Pacific Street on the project site. This building is a laundry facility for the department's bunker gear after a hazardous materials response.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

In 2010 without the proposed project, new residential, commercial, and community facility development is anticipated in the areas surrounding the project site as described in Chapter 2, "Procedural and Analytical Framework" (see Table 2-1). Like NYPD, FDNY does not allocate personnel based on planned development, but responds to demonstrated need. FDNY has no immediate plans to make any changes in stations or equipment in the study area. In 2010, FDNY will continue to evaluate personnel and equipment needs and make necessary adjustments to adequately serve the area.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

In the future with the proposed project, the FDNY Special Operations Facility at 648 Pacific Street would be relocated to Long Island City in a consolidated warehouse facility, or alternatively to a site in Corona, Queens. The location of this laundry facility is not central to its function and, thus, the relocation would not have any adverse effects on FDNY's support operations. The number of vehicular trips to the facility varies between 12 and 20 trips daily, depending on the number of calls that occur citywide. This nominal amount of anticipated

vehicular traffic would not be expected to result in any significant adverse impacts at the new location. FDNY is conducting a separate site selection review for the relocation of the Special Operations Facility.

The proposed project would not directly displace any FDNY firehouses; thus, no significant adverse impacts are expected as a result of the proposed project due to the displacement of resources. The proposed project would change certain roads from one-way to two-way operations and also include permanent roadway closures, including: Pacific Street (in two parts) between Flatbush and 6th Avenues and between Carlton and Vanderbilt Avenues; and 5th Avenue between Flatbush and Atlantic Avenues. The proposed project's closure of portions of Pacific Street (between Flatbush and 6th Avenues and between Carlton and Vanderbilt Avenues) would not hinder the ability of FDNY to access the project site, as the projects' design accounts for the access needs of FDNY and EMS emergency vehicles. The proposed closure of 5th Avenue between Flatbush and Atlantic Avenues would not adversely affect response times as this is a relatively short north-south block and there are multiple alternate routes in close proximity to the project site. FDNY would continue to monitor its ability to respond to emergencies and would be notified of any access obstructions in the study area as a result of the proposed project.¹ There are a number of full-service fire companies geographically distributed throughout the proposed project's study area; the nearest EMS unit is located at 39 Auburn Place north of the project site (see Figure 5-1). The conversion of 6th Avenue between Atlantic and Flatbush Avenues from one-way southbound to a two-way operation would also improve access to the project site. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts on FDNY emergency services or response times.

The new worker, residential, and visitor populations could increase the demand for FDNY services by 2010. Fire protection throughout the city is normally provided by multiple fire companies and fire protection in the study area will continue to be provided as per established standard FDNY operating procedures. FDNY regularly evaluates its staffing numbers, makes changes as appropriate, and will continue to evaluate its ability to provide fire and medical protection. Additionally, according to FDNY, all of its units are trained to respond to high-rise firefighting calls, and FDNY resources are adequate to cover the first phases of the proposed project; the firehouse at 172 Tillary Street houses equipment especially suited for high-rise fires. In addition, the proposed project would include a number of fire protection/prevention measures, including sprinkler systems, fire-retardant building materials, smoke ventilation systems, alarm systems connected to neighboring FDNY station houses, emergency exits per building code standards, and dedicated emergency access for fire and emergency vehicles. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts would result from the populations introduced by the proposed project in 2010.

As the commercial mixed-use variation would result in buildings of similar size and arrangement, significant adverse impacts to fire protection and emergency services are not anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2010.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In 2016 without the proposed project, new residential, commercial, and community facility development is anticipated within the areas surrounding the project site as described in Chapter

¹ See Appendix A, letter from FDNY's Chief of Operations, dated March 2, 2006.

2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework” (see Table 2-1). In 2016, FDNY would continue to evaluate the need for personnel and equipment and make necessary adjustments to provide adequate service at the project site and surrounding study area.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In the future with the proposed project in 2016, there would be no additional displacement of FDNY facilities and no new additional street closures would occur. By 2016, the new populations introduced by the proposed project could increase the demand for FDNY services. As discussed above, there are a number of full-service fire companies geographically distributed throughout the proposed project’s study area, whose response time in their respective coverage areas would not be significantly adversely affected by the proposed project. As is the case for project site buildings constructed during Phase I, Phase II buildings would also incorporate fire protection/prevention measures such as sprinkler systems and dedicated fire and emergency vehicle access routes on the project site. FDNY would continue to monitor and evaluate its fire and medical protection capabilities, and services in the study area would continue to be provided as per established standard FDNY operating procedures; therefore, no significant impacts to fire protection and emergency services are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Similarly, significant adverse impacts to fire protection and emergency services are not anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2016.

E. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As per Table 3C-1 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a detailed schools analysis is required if a proposed action would generate more than 50 elementary/intermediate (or middle) school students and/or more than 150 high school students. The proposed project’s residential component would generate enough students to exceed these thresholds. Therefore, an analysis of the potential impact of the proposed project on local public school conditions is warranted. Private schools are not included in this analysis.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Under the DOE 2003 reorganization plan, 10 instructional divisions have been established to oversee elementary, intermediate, and high schools within their boundaries. Each instructional division is composed of two, three, or four of the city’s 32 CSDs.

Almost the entire project site lies within the boundaries of CSD 13, which extends roughly from the East River north of Fulton and Union Streets, to Garvey Avenue. CSD 13 includes much of Downtown Brooklyn as well as Brooklyn Heights, Fort Greene, Prospect Heights, and Clinton Hill. A small portion of the project site lies within CSD 15. CSD 15 includes the nearby neighborhoods of Boerum Hill, Cobble Hill, and Park Slope, as well as other neighborhoods further south and west. CSDs 13, 14, 15, and 16 are part of Instructional Division 8.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the study area for an analysis of educational facilities generally coincides with the region within the CSD serving the proposed project. However, while most of the residential component of the project is located within CSD 13, the western part of the proposed project extends into CSD 15 (see Figure 5-2). Therefore, as determined in consultation with the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), this chapter uses a four-tiered analysis to assess the potential effects of the proposed project on elementary and intermediate schools located near the project site. The analysis will examine

effects (1) on schools within ½ mile of the project site; (2) on schools in CSD 13; (3) on schools in CSD 15; and (4) on all schools in CSDs 13/15 combined. Analysis beyond the ½-mile study area is necessary because students may attend schools within their districts but outside their immediate neighborhoods. High schools are assessed on a boroughwide basis.

It should be noted that, as population shifts within a school district over time, DOE can adjust attendance zones within the district to improve the affected school or schools' composition and utilization.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

½-Mile Study Area

Six elementary schools, serving grades K through 8, are located within ½ mile of the project site. The elementary school nearest the project site is P.S. 9, Teunis G. Bergen School, located in CSD 13. According to the most recent enrollment and capacity figures available from DOE, which are for the 2004-2005 school year, this school is operating at 76 percent capacity and has a surplus of 172 seats (see Table 5-4). The other CSD 13 elementary schools within the ½-mile radius from the project site are P.S. 133, William A. Butler School, operating at 70 percent capacity, with 110 available seats; P.S. 282, Park Slope Elementary School, operating at 57 percent capacity, with a surplus of 442 seats; P.S. 11, Purvis J. Behan School, operating at 64 percent capacity, with a surplus of 275 seats; and P.S. 56, Lewis H. Latimer School, operating at 72 percent capacity with 169 available seats. P.S. 38, Pacific Community School, located in CSD 15 and operating at 59 percent capacity with a surplus of 324 seats, is also located within ½ mile of the project site. Cumulatively, these six elementary schools are operating below capacity (65 percent) with 1,492 available seats.

CSD 13

Total enrollment at the elementary schools throughout CSD 13 is 7,995 students, or 64 percent of capacity, with 4,456 available seats.¹

CSD 15

Total enrollment at the elementary schools throughout CSD 15 is 15,006 students, or 91 percent of capacity, with 1,395 available seats.²

CSDs 13/15 Combined

Elementary schools in CSDs 13/15 combined operate below capacity (80 percent) with 5,851 available seats.³

¹ Based on DCP enrollment projections for Community School Districts (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014).

² Based on DCP enrollment projections for Community School Districts (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014).

³ Based on DOE enrollment projections (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014).

Table 5-4

Public Elementary and Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2004-2005 School Year

School ¹	Enrollment in Program	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Elementary Schools				
½-Mile Study Area				
P.S. 9, Teunis G. Bergen School (CSD 13)	545	717	172	76
P.S. 133, William A. Butler School (CSD 13)	261	371	110	70
P.S. 282, Park Slope Elementary School (CSD 13)	576	1,018	442	57
P.S. 11, Purvis J. Behan School (CSD 13)	486	761	275	64
P.S. 56, Lewis H. Latimer School (CSD 13)	431	600	169	72
P.S. 38, Pacific Community School (CSD 15)	472	796	324	59
Totals, ½-mile study area	2,771	4,263	1,492	65
Totals, CSD 13	7,995	12,451	4,456	64
Totals, CSD 15	15,006	16,401	1,395	91
Totals, CSDs 13/15	23,001	28,852	5,851	80
Intermediate Schools				
½-Mile Study Area				
M.S. 266, Park Place Community Middle School (CSD 13)	237	292	55	81
J.H.S. 113, Edmond Learning Center (CSD 13)	966	1,360	394	71
M.S. 571	204	405	201	50
I.S. 103, Satellite 3	327	400	73	82
Totals, ½-mile study area	1,734	2,457	723	71
Totals, CSD 13	5,196	6,435	1,239	81
Totals, CSD 15	6,568	6,369	(199)	103
Totals, CSDs 13/15	11,764	12,804	1,040	92
Note: ¹ Serves grades K through 8. Sources: Enrollment and capacity for individual schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . These figures include Pre-K enrollment in these buildings. Totals for CSDs 13/15 enrollments: DOE and DCP Enrollment Projections for Community School Districts (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014). DCP's actual enrollment does not include Pre-K enrollment as Pre-K programs are discretionary. Capacity numbers for CSDs 13/15: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> .				

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

½-Mile Study Area

Four intermediate schools, M.S. 266, Park Place Community Middle School; J.H.S. 113, Edmond Learning Center; M.S. 571, and I.S. 103/Satellite 3 school, all of which are in CSD 13, are located within ½ mile of the project site (see Figure 5-2 and Table 5-4)¹. According to DOE enrollment statistics for the 2004-2005 school year, M.S. 266, Park Place Community Middle School, has a utilization rate of 81 percent, with a surplus of 55 seats; J.H.S. 113, Edmond Learning Center, is operating below capacity (71 percent) with 394 available seats; and M.S. 571 and Satellite 3 are operating under capacity with 50 and 82 percent occupancy respectively, and 201 and 73 remaining seats. Overall, the intermediate schools within ½ mile of the proposed project are operating at 71 percent of capacity, with a surplus of 723 seats.

¹ M.S. 571 shares space with P.S. 9; I.S. 103 shares space with P.S. 56.

Atlantic Yards Arena and Redevelopment Project EIS

CSD 13

Total enrollment at the intermediate schools throughout CSD 13 is 5,196 students, or 81 percent of capacity, with a surplus of 1,239 seats.

CSD 15

Total enrollment at the intermediate schools throughout CSD 15 is 6,568 students, or 103 percent of capacity, with a deficit of 199 seats.

CSDs 13/15 Combined

Intermediate schools in CSDs 13/15 combined are operating below capacity (92 percent) with 1,040 available seats.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Under the DOE reorganization, each Instructional Division has responsibility for administering the high schools within its boundaries. However, high school students can usually elect to attend schools outside of their neighborhoods since they have considerable mobility and a variety of high school options, depending on admissions criteria and space availability. The public high schools within ½ mile of the project site include Brooklyn Technical High School, Metropolitan Corporate Academy, Brooklyn High School of the Arts, Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) Community High School, Brooklyn International High School, Urban Assembly School of Music and Art, and Science Skills High School.

In the 2004-2005 school year, these high schools combined were operating at 85 percent of capacity with approximately 7,185 enrolled students and a surplus of 1,300 seats (see Table 5-5).

Table 5-5
Brooklyn Public High School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization
2004-2005 School Year

School ¹	Enrollment in Program ²	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
High Schools				
Brooklyn Technical High School	4,075	4,475	400	91
Metropolitan Corporate Academy	369	462	93	80
Brooklyn High School of the Arts	754	1599	845	47
ACORN Community High School	661	642	(19)	103
Brooklyn International High School	329	462	133	71
Urban Assembly School of Music and Art	109	115	6	95
Science Skills High School	888	730	(158)	122
Totals, ½-mile study area	7,185	8,485	1,300	85
Totals, High Schools in Brooklyn	93,424	62,768	(30,656)	149
Notes: ¹ See Figure 5-2. ² DOE includes Long-Term Absentees (LTAs) in its enrollment projections and utilization profiles; DCP does not include LTAs. The term "long-term absentee" refers to those students who are registered but not in attendance at a city public school. In the 2004-2005 school year, Brooklyn high schools had 5,109 LTAs, and there were 14,160 citywide. Sources: Enrollment and capacity for individual schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . Enrollment total for all city high schools: DOE and DCP Enrollment Projections for High Schools (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014). Total capacity for Brooklyn high schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/ Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . High school capacity excludes other programs, such as intermediate schools and special education, housed in high school buildings.				

Overall, Brooklyn's public high schools were operating at a 149 percent utilization rate, with 93,424¹ enrolled students and a shortfall of 30,656 seats.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

The utilization rate for school facilities in the future without the proposed project is calculated by adding the estimated enrollment from known future proposed residential developments to the projected enrollment from DCP or DOE and then comparing that number to projected capacity.

In 2010 without the proposed project, new residential development is anticipated within the ½- and ¾-mile study areas, as described in Chapter 2, "Procedural and Analytical Framework." For most of these developments, it is not known whether they will include affordable housing units. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, it has been conservatively assumed that, unless otherwise known, 20 percent of all planned residential units will be developed as subsidized housing for low- to moderate-income households. Overall, approximately 1,650 market rate units and 500 affordable housing units are expected to be generated in the ½- and ¾-mile study areas within the CSD 13 and CSD 15 boundaries by 2010, independent of the proposed project.² These residential developments are summarized in Table 5-6.

The *CEQR Technical Manual's* Table 3C-2, "Projected Public School Pupil Ratios in New Housing Units of All Sizes," summarizes pupil generation rates, based on DOE's analysis of income mix and location (by borough) for new residential units. Table 5-7 shows the number of new public elementary, intermediate, and high school students expected to be generated in the future without the proposed project.

DCP and the DOE Division of School Facilities predict changes in enrollment by district up to 10 years in the future using cohort survival methodology based on birth rates and grade-retention ratios. Slight differences in methodology account for variations between the DOE and DCP enrollment projections. The *CEQR Technical Manual* suggests that both DCP's and DOE's enrollment projections may be considered in evaluating potential impacts, although the more conservative (higher enrollment and lower capacity) projections should be used for calculating numerical impacts. Enrollment projections were obtained from DCP and DOE, and the data were compared to determine which figures are more conservative in projecting future enrollment for CSDs 13 and 15. In this case, DCP's projections (approximately 18 percent decline compared with 22 percent decline) in 2010 are more conservative for elementary school students in CSD 13 and, therefore, provide the basis for assessing potential impacts. For CSD 15 both DCP and DOE projections assume a decline of approximately 4 percent for elementary school students. Intermediate school projections by DCP are for an approximately 30 percent decline, with DOE predicting an 18 percent decline in enrollment; for intermediate schools DOE projections represent the more conservative estimate. The enrollment projections do not account for discrete new residential developments planned for the area; the additional populations from the new projects planned for the study area within the CSD 13/15 boundaries are also included in predicting future enrollment and utilization.

¹ Based on DOE enrollment figures (Actual 2004, Projected 2005 to 2014).

² All known developments within ¾ mile of the project site are included in the future without the proposed project assessment for the schools within ½ mile of the project site as a conservative measure.

Table 5-6

**Expected Residential Development within $\frac{3}{4}$ Mile of the Project Site:
2010 Future Without the Proposed Project**

Project Location	Total Housing Units ¹	Market Rate Units	Low-Moderate Income Units ²
CSD 13			
Atlantic Terrace, Atlantic Avenue between South Portland Avenue and South Oxford Street	80	64	16
The Washington, 35 Underhill Avenue between Pacific and Dean Streets	39	39	0
17 Eastern Parkway (Union Temple site)	200	160	40
80 DeKalb Avenue between Hudson Avenue and Rockwell Place	538	430	108
Fulton Street/Ashland Place	100	80	20
620 Fulton Street	80	64	16
525 Clinton Avenue	30	24	6
Totals, CSD 13	1,067	861	206
CSD 15			
Williamsburgh Savings Bank Building	189	189	0
567 Warren Street between 3rd and 4th Avenues	20	16	4
Schermerhorn between Hoyt and Bond Streets (Block 171)	149	119	30
Fulton Street/Rockwell Place	140	112	28
ESDC/HS (Block 170, south of Schermerhorn Street between Smith and Hoyt Streets) ³	440	240	200
477 Atlantic Avenue	21	17	4
557 Atlantic Avenue	72	58	14
Atlantic Avenue and Smith Street (Block 176) ³	50	40	10
Totals, CSD 15	1,081	791	290
Totals, CSDs 13/15	2,148	1,652	496
Notes: ¹ When no specific development plan is known, this analysis conservatively assumes 800 sf unit size. ² When no specific development plan is known, this analysis conservatively assumes that 20 percent of all housing units will be developed as subsidized housing for low- to moderate-income households. ³ Project is located between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ mile from the project site.			
Sources: Downtown Brooklyn Council; EDC; DCP; HPD; AKRF, Inc.			

Table 5-7

**Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students Generated
Within $\frac{3}{4}$ Mile of the Project Site: 2010 Future Without the Proposed Project**

	Housing Units	Elementary School	Intermediate School	High School	Total Students Generated
CSD 13					
Market Rate	861	232	86	52	370
Low- to Moderate-Income	206	70	27	19	116
Totals, CSD 13	1,067	302	113	71	486
CSD 15					
Market Rate	791	214	79	47	340
Low- to Moderate-Income	290	99	37	26	162
Totals, CSD 15	1,081	313	116	73	502
CSDs 13/15					
Market Rate	1,652	446	165	99	710
Low- to Moderate-Income	496	169	64	45	278
Totals, CSDs 13/15	2,148	615	229	144	988
Note: Projected new housing units in CSDs 13/15 as shown in Table 5-6 and described in Chapter 2, "Procedural and Analytical Framework." Sources: Student generation rates are based on the <i>CEQR Technical Manual's</i> Table 3C-2: "Projected Public School Pupil Ratios in New Housing Units of All Sizes."					

According to the DOE's 2005 to 2009 five-year *Capital Plan Proposed 2006 Amendment*, no new school seats are planned for CSD 13. In CSD 15 there are plans for 630 P.S./I.S. seats. There are plans for 16,455 new elementary, intermediate, and high school seats boroughwide. There are also plans for a new law and justice high school and a new Urban Assembly Institute for Math and Science (grades 6 through 12) to occupy the renovated Kings County Family Court building at 283 Adams Street in Downtown Brooklyn. However, as no plans for school seats in the immediate vicinity of the project site are sufficiently advanced, as a conservative measure no increase in school capacity is anticipated in the quantitative assessment. As shown below, none of the elementary or intermediate schools in the ½-mile study area or throughout CSD 13 or 15 are expected to operate at or above capacity in 2010.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

DCP's CSD 13 and 15 projections indicate that (without taking new residential projects into account) the trend in the declining numbers of elementary grade students, evident in recent years, will continue through 2010. Applying the projected rates of decline to the schools within ½ mile of the project site results in an estimated 414 fewer public elementary school students in the five schools within ½ mile of the project site within CSD 13, and 19 fewer students in the elementary school within ½ mile of the project site in CSD 15. This represents approximately 18 percent and 4 percent net decreases, respectively, by 2010.

At the same time, residential development in the study area will add 615 elementary school students to CSDs 13 and 15. If all of these students were to attend the elementary schools within a ½ mile of the project site, the total enrollment in the six schools in 2016 would be 2,953, with a surplus of 1,310 seats (69 percent utilization). Overall in CSD 13, with the projected decreased enrollment and consideration of known development projects, schools will operate at 55 percent of capacity with 5,577 available seats. In CSD 15, schools will operate at 89 percent of capacity with 1,755 available seats. The elementary schools in CSDs 13/15 combined will operate at 75 percent of capacity with a surplus of 7,332 seats as shown in Table 5-8.

Table 5-8
Estimated Public Elementary/Intermediate School Enrollment,
Capacity, and Utilization: 2010 Future Without the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2010 ¹	Students Generated from New Residential Development ²	Total Future Enrollment in 2010	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Elementary Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	2,338	615	2,953	4,263	1,310	69
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	6,572	302	6,874	12,451	5,577	55
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	14,333	313	14,646	16,401	1,755	89
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	20,905	615	21,520	28,852	7,332	75
Intermediate Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	1,422	229	1,651	2,457	806	67
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	4,268	113	4,381	6,435	2,054	68
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	6,117	116	6,233	6,369	136	98
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	10,385	229	10,614	12,804	2,190	83
Notes: ¹ School enrollment is based on "target capacity" figures, which assume a class size of 20 children per class for grade K to 3. ² Includes projects within ¾ mile of the project site (see Table 5-6). Sources: Totals for CSD 13/15 projected enrollment: DCP Enrollment Projections (Actual 2003, Projected 2004-2013); DCP enrollment projections do not include Pre-K enrollment as Pre-K programs are discretionary. Capacity numbers for CSD 13/15: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i>						

Atlantic Yards Arena and Redevelopment Project EIS

Overall, available capacity is expected within the study area's public elementary schools in 2010.

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

Both DCP and DOE projections show a continuing trend of decreasing intermediate school enrollments through 2010 (30 and 18 percent, respectively). Using the more conservative DOE projections for intermediate schools in CSD 13, a net overall decline of 312 students by 2010 in intermediate school enrollment is expected in the four schools within ½ mile of the project site (all of which are located in CSD 13).

In the future without the proposed project, residential development in the study area would add 113 intermediate school students to CSD 13. If all of these students were to attend schools within ½ mile of the project site, total enrollment would continue to be below capacity (67 percent utilization) with a surplus of 806 seats. Throughout CSD 13, available capacity at public intermediate schools is expected in 2010, with intermediate schools operating at 68 percent of capacity, with a surplus of 2,054 seats. Residential development in CSD 15 would add 116 students to this school district; total enrollment at intermediate schools in CSD 15 would be near capacity at 98 percent with 136 available seats. There would be a surplus of 2,190 intermediate seats in CSDs 13/15 combined.

HIGH SCHOOLS

DCP and DOE do not provide projections of high school students on a local basis. Additional high school students generated by demographic shifts and future development projects in the area would be able to choose from among the City's high schools and are not likely to affect utilization at neighborhood schools. DOE projects a decrease in high school enrollment boroughwide by 2010, anticipating 11,914 fewer students, an approximately 13 percent decrease, from 2004 conditions. It is expected that 144 new high school students will be introduced to the area as a result of new residential projects by 2010. Brooklyn high school enrollment is estimated to be 81,654 by 2010, operating at 130 percent capacity with a deficit of 18,886 seats (see Table 5-9).

Table 5-9
Estimated Brooklyn Public High School Enrollment, Capacity,
and Utilization: 2010 Future Without the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2010	Students Generated from New Residential Development	Total Future Enrollment in 2010	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
High Schools						
Brooklyn	81,510	144	81,654	62,768	(18,886)	130
Sources: Totals for citywide high school enrollment: DOE Enrollment Projections (Actual 2003, Projected 2004-2013) Capacity numbers for Brooklyn Public High Schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . High school capacity excludes other programs, such as intermediate schools and special education, housed in high school buildings.						

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

In 2010, the residential mixed-use variation would introduce approximately 2,350 housing units to the study area. Approximately 1,600 units (1,196 would be market rate units; 404 units would be administered under an affordable housing program) would be located in CSD 13; approximately 750 market rate units would be located in CSD 15. Using the formula set forth in Table 3C-2 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an estimated 435 and 203 elementary and 164 and

75 intermediate school students would be introduced into CSD 13 and CSD 15, respectively (see Table 5-10). The residential mixed-use variation would introduce a total of 638 elementary, 239 intermediate, and 145 high students into CSDs 13/15 combined by 2010.

Table 5-10

**Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students
Generated on the Project Site: 2010 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project**

	Housing Units ¹	Elementary School	Intermediate School	High School	Total Students Generated ²
CSD 13					
Market Rate	1,196	312	116	69	497
Moderate- to High-Income	162	45	19	12	76
Low- to Moderate-Income	80	24	9	6	39
Low-Income	162	54	20	13	87
Totals, CSD 13	1,600	435	164	100	699
CSD 15					
Market Rate	750	203	75	45	323
Moderate- to High-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Low- to Moderate-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Totals, CSD 15	750	203	75	45	323
CSDs 13/15					
Totals, CSDs 13/15	2,350	638	239	145	1,022
Notes: ¹ See Chapter 1, "Project Description," for more details on proposed project housing unit breakdown. ² A reduction in the total number of students generated was taken to account for the 10 percent of rental units reserved for senior residents.					
Sources: Student generation rates are based on the <i>CEQR Technical Manual's</i> Table 3C-2: "Projected Public School Pupil Ratios in New Housing Units of All Sizes."					

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The approximately 638 elementary school students (435 in CSD 13 and 203 in CSD 15) that would be introduced into the ½-mile study area by new housing at the proposed project by 2010 would cause total enrollment at the elementary schools within the ½-mile study area to rise to 3,591, with a surplus of 672 seats (84 percent capacity), if all the new students were to attend these schools. Elementary schools in CSD 13, as a whole, would operate at 59 percent capacity in 2010, with 5,142 available seats and a total enrollment of 7,309. Elementary schools in CSD 15 would operate at 91 percent capacity with 1,552 available seats. Within CSDs 13/15 combined there would be a total enrollment of 22,158 and a surplus capacity of 6,694 seats (77 percent capacity). Thus, excess capacity exists in the ½-mile study area schools and CSD 13 and CSD 15 schools, and increased enrollment attributable to the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to public elementary schools (see Table 5-11).

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

The proposed project would introduce approximately 164 intermediate school students into CSD 13 and 75 intermediate school students into CSD 15 by 2010. Total intermediate school enrollment in the ½-mile study area would therefore rise to 1,890 with a surplus of 567 seats (77 percent capacity), if all students were to attend these schools. Intermediate schools in CSD 13, as

Table 5-11

Estimated Public Elementary/Intermediate School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2010 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2010	Students Generated from Proposed Project	Total Future Enrollment in 2010	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Elementary Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	2,953	638	3,591	4,263	672	84
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	6,874	435	7,309	12,451	5,142	59
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	14,646	203	14,849	16,401	1,552	91
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	21,520	638	22,158	28,852	6,694	77
Intermediate Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	1,651	239	1,890	2,457	567	77
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	4,381	164	4,545	6,435	1,890	71
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	6,233	75	6,308	6,369	61	99
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	10,614	239	10,853	12,804	1,951	85
Source: Capacity for individual schools: DOE, Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005. See Table 5-8 for derivation of enrollment numbers.						

a whole, would operate at 71 percent in 2010, with a surplus of 1,890 seats and a total enrollment of 4,545; CSD 15 intermediate schools would operate near capacity with a total enrollment of 6,308 and 61 available seats. Intermediate schools in CSDs 13/15 combined would operate at 85 percent in 2010, with 1,951 available seats and a total enrollment of 10,853. Overall, there would be sufficient capacity within intermediate schools within ½ mile of the project site, as well as within schools within CSDs 13 and 15.

HIGH SCHOOLS

With the 145 students introduced by the proposed project, the utilization of Brooklyn high schools would remain over capacity at 130 percent (see Table 5-12). The change in seat deficit would be less than 1 percent and would not result in a significant adverse impact to high schools boroughwide.

Table 5-12

Estimated Brooklyn Public High School Enrollment, Capacity, and Utilization: 2010 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2010	Students Generated from Proposed Project	Total Future Enrollment in 2010	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Brooklyn	81,654	145	81,799	62,768	(19,031)	130
Source: See Table 5-8 for derivation of enrollment numbers. Capacity numbers: DOE, Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005.						

COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE VARIATION QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION

The commercial mixed-use variation would generate a smaller number of elementary, intermediate, and high school students when compared with the residential mixed-use variation as analyzed above; therefore, the commercial mixed-use variation would also not result in any significant adverse schools impacts.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In 2016, without the proposed project, additional new residential development is anticipated within the study area, as described in Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework.” As discussed above, this analysis conservatively assumes that unless otherwise known, 20 percent of all planned residential units will be developed as subsidized housing for low- to moderate-income households. Overall, approximately 2,330 market rate units and 585 affordable housing units are expected to be generated in the study area between 2010 and 2016 independent of the proposed project (see Tables 5-13 and 5-14).

Table 5-13
Expected Residential Development within ¾ Mile of Project Site:
2010–2016 Future Without the Proposed Project

Project Location	Total Housing Units ¹	Market Rate Units	Low- to Moderate-Income Units ²
CSD 13			
Myrtle Avenue at Flatbush Avenue (Block 2060, Lots 22-27, 32 [part], and 122; Block 2061, Lot 1 [part]; Block 2062, Lot 6 [part]) ³	375	300	75
Myrtle Avenue between Fleet Place and Ashland Place (Block 2061, Lot 1 [part]) ³	324	259	65
Totals, CSD 13 2010 to 2016	699	559	140
CSD 15			
BAM LDC North (Block 2107 bounded by Ashland and Rockwell Places, Lafayette Avenue, and Fulton Streets)	713	570	143
Atlantic Center	1,060	850	213
254 Livingston Street	233	186	47
230 Livingston Street at the southwest corner of Bond Street (Block 165, Lots 17-19 and 58)	204	163	41
Totals, CSD 15 2010 to 2016	2,213	1,769	444
Totals, CSDs 13/15	2,912	2,328	584
Notes: ¹ When no specific development plan is known, this analysis conservatively assumes 800 sf unit size. ² When no specific development plan is known, this analysis conservatively assumes that 20 percent of all housing units will be developed as subsidized housing for low- to moderate-income households. ³ Project is located between ½ and ¾ mile from the project site. Sources: Downtown Brooklyn Council; EDC; DCP; HPD; AKRF, Inc.			

Table 5-14
Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students
Generated: 2010-2016 Future Without the Proposed Project

	Housing Units	Elementary School	Intermediate School	High School	Total Students Generated
CSD 13					
Market Rate	559	151	56	34	241
Low- to Moderate-Income	140	48	18	13	79
Totals, CSD 13	699	199	74	47	320
CSD 15					
Market Rate	1,769	478	177	106	761
Low- to Moderate-Income	444	150	58	40	248
Totals, CSD 15	2,213	628	235	146	1,009
CSDs 13/15					
Market Rate	2,328	629	233	140	1,002
Low- to Moderate-Income	584	198	76	53	327
Totals, CSDs 13/15	2,912	827	309	193	1,329
Note: Projected new housing units in CSDs 13 and 15 as shown in Table 5-12 and described in Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework.” Sources: Student generation rates are based on the <i>CEQR Technical Manual's</i> Table 3C-2: “Projected Public School Pupil Ratios in New Housing Units of All Sizes.”					

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

For CSDs 13 and 15, both DCP and DOE elementary school projections indicate a trend of decreasing enrollment. For the 2016 analysis year the DCP projection of a decline of CSD 13 elementary school students of approximately 19 percent (from 2004 levels) is more conservative than DOE's projections of a decline of 35 percent.¹ DCP projects a decline of approximately 3 percent in CSD 15 elementary schools for 2016, and DOE projects a decline of approximately 5 percent. Applying the projected rates of enrollment decline, the schools within ½ mile of the project site would be expected to have 2,320 elementary school students in 2016. With the anticipated increase in students from known development projects, elementary schools within ½ mile of the project site and within CSD 13, CSD 15, and CSDs 13/15 combined would remain below capacity (see Table 5-15).

Table 5-15
Estimated Public Elementary/Intermediate School Enrollment,
Capacity, and Utilization: 2016 Future Without the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2016	Students Generated from No Build Projects ¹	Total Future Enrollment in 2016	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Elementary Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	2,320	1,442	3,762	4,263	501	88
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	6,465	501	6,966	12,451	5,485	56
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	14,487	941	15,428	16,401	973	94
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	20,952	1,442	22,394	28,852	6,458	78
Intermediate Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	1,283	538	1,821	2,457	636	74
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	3,844	187	4,031	6,435	2,404	63
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	5,795	351	6,146	6,369	223	96
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	9,639	538	10,177	12,804	2,627	79
Note: ¹ Includes No Build projects located within ¾ mile from 2006 to 2016. Sources: Totals for CSDs 13 and 15 projected enrollment: DCP Enrollment Projections (Actual 2003, Projected 2004-2013). Rates for 2013 are assumed to hold constant for 2016. DCP enrollment projections do not include Pre-K enrollment. Capacity numbers for CSD 13 and CSD 15: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i>						

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

For both CSDs 13 and 15, both DCP and DOE intermediate school projections indicate a trend of decreasing enrollment. For the 2016 analysis year, the DCP projections of a decline of intermediate schools of approximately 33 percent (from 2004 levels) are less conservative than DOE's projections of a decline of 26 percent.¹ Applying the conservative projected rate of enrollment decline, the schools within ½ mile of the project site would be expected to have 1,283 intermediate school students in 2016. With the anticipated increase in students from known development projects, intermediate schools within ½ mile of the project site and in CSDs 13 and 15 (and thus CSDs 13/15 combined) would remain below capacity.

¹ As both DCP and DOE projections only go out to 2014, these projections are assumed to hold constant for 2016. This is a conservative assessment as both DCP and DOE school projections indicate a trend of decreasing enrollment.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Based on DOE projections, Brooklyn high schools are expected to continue to decrease in enrollment by 20 percent and, with the anticipated students to be introduced by known development projects, will operate at 119 percent capacity (see Table 5-16).¹

Table 5-16
Estimated Brooklyn Public High School Enrollment, Capacity,
and Utilization: 2016 Future Without the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2016	Students Generated from No Build Projects	Total Future Enrollment in 2016	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
High Schools						
Brooklyn	74,311	337	74,648	62,768	(11,880)	119
Sources: Totals for citywide high school enrollment: DOE Enrollment Projections (Actual 2003, Projected 2004-2013). Rates for 2013 are held constant for 2016. Capacity numbers for Brooklyn Public High Schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . High school capacity excludes other programs, such as intermediate schools and special education, housed in high school buildings.						

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

In 2016, the residential mixed-use variation would introduce approximately 6,860 housing units to the study area. Approximately 6,110 units (3,860 units would be market rate; 2,250 units would be administered under an affordable housing program) would be located in CSD 13; the remaining 750 market rate units would be located in CSD 15. Using the formula set forth in Table 3C-2 of the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an estimated 1,670 and 203 elementary and 635 and 75 intermediate school students would be introduced into CSD 13 and CSD 15, respectively (see Table 5-17). The residential mixed-use variation would introduce a total of 1,873 elementary, 710 intermediate, and 437 high students into CSDs 13/15 combined by 2016.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The approximately 1,873 elementary school students (1,670 in CSD 13 and 203 in CSD 15) that would be introduced into the ½-mile study area by the proposed project's housing component by 2016 would cause total enrollment at the schools within the ½ mile study area to rise to 5,635, if all students were to attend these schools, with a deficit of 1,372 seats (132 percent capacity). This represents a change from a surplus of 501 seats in the future without the proposed project in 2010. Elementary schools in CSD 13, as a whole, would operate at 69 percent capacity in 2016, with 3,815 available seats and a total enrollment of 8,636. Elementary schools in CSD 15 would operate at 95 percent capacity in 2016, with 770 available seats and a total enrollment of 15,631. Within CSDs 13/15 combined, there would be a total enrollment of 24,267 and a surplus of 4,585 seats (84 percent capacity). While all the elementary school students could not be accommodated in schools located within ½ mile of the project site, available capacity would remain in CSDs 13 and 15 (see Table 5-18).

¹ Projection rates are held constant from 2014 DCP enrollment projections.

Table 5-17

**Projected New Housing Units and Estimated Number of Students
Generated on the Project Site: 2016 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project**

	Housing Units ¹	Elementary School	Intermediate School	High School	Total Students Generated ²
CSD 13					
Market Rate	3,860	981	364	218	1,563
Moderate- to High-Income	900	251	105	65	421
Low- to Moderate-Income	450	138	53	36	227
Low-Income	900	300	113	73	486
Totals, CSD 13	6,110	1,670	635	392	2,697
CSD 15					
Market Rate	750	203	75	45	323
Moderate- to High-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Low- to Moderate-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Income	0	0	0	0	0
Totals, CSD 15	750	203	75	45	323
Totals, CSDs 13/15	6,860	1,873	710	437	3,020
Notes: ¹ See Chapter 1, "Project Description," for more details on proposed project housing unit breakdown. ² A reduction in the total number of students generated was taken to account for the 10 percent of rental units reserved for senior residents. Sources: Student generation rates are based on the <i>CEQR Technical Manual's</i> Table 3C-2: "Projected Public School Pupil Ratios in New Housing Units of All Sizes."					

Table 5-18

**Estimated Public Elementary/Intermediate School Enrollment,
Capacity, and Utilization: 2016 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project**

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2016	Students Generated from Proposed Project	Total Future Enrollment in 2016	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
Elementary Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	3,762	1,873	5,635	4,263	(1,372)	132
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	6,966	1,670	8,636	12,451	3,815	69
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	15,428	203	15,631	16,401	770	95
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	22,394	1,873	24,267	28,852	4,585	84
Intermediate Schools						
<i>Totals, ½-mile study area</i>	1,821	710	2,531	2,457	(74)	103
<i>Totals, CSD 13</i>	4,031	635	4,666	6,435	1,769	73
<i>Totals, CSD 15</i>	6,146	75	6,221	6,369	148	98
<i>Totals, CSDs 13/15</i>	10,177	710	10,887	12,804	1,917	85
Source: Capacity for individual schools: DOE, Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005. See Table 5-8 for derivation of enrollment numbers.						

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

The proposed development would introduce a total of 635 intermediate school students into CSD 13, and 75 intermediate school students into CSD 15 by 2016. Total intermediate school enrollment in the ½ mile study area would therefore rise to 2,531, if all students were to attend schools within a ½ mile of the project site, with a deficit of 74 seats (103 percent capacity). Intermediate schools in CSD 13, as a whole, would operate at 73 percent of capacity in 2016, with 1,769 available seats and a total enrollment of 4,666. Intermediate schools in CSD 15 would operate near capacity (at 98 percent) with 148 available seats and a total enrollment of 6,221. Intermediate schools in CSDs 13/15 combined would operate at 85 percent capacity in 2016, with 1,917 available seats and a total enrollment of 10,887.

HIGH SCHOOLS

With the additional estimated 437 high school students to be introduced by the proposed project in 2016, high schools citywide would operate at 120 percent capacity. This represents a change in seat deficit of less than 5 percent. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impact to high schools as a result of the proposed project (see Table 5-19).

Table 5-19
Estimated Brooklyn Public High School Enrollment, Capacity,
and Utilization: 2016 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project

Region/District	Projected Enrollment in 2016	Students Generated from Proposed Project	Total Future Enrollment in 2016	Program Capacity	Available Seats in Program	Program Utilization (Percent)
High Schools						
Brooklyn	74,648	437	75,085	62,768	(12,317)	120
Sources: Totals for citywide high school enrollment: DOE Enrollment Projections (actual 2003, projected 2004-2013). Capacity numbers for Brooklyn Public High Schools: DOE, <i>Utilization Profiles: Enrollment/Capacity/Utilization, 2004-2005</i> . High school capacity excludes other programs, such as intermediate schools and special education, housed in high school buildings.						

COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE VARIATION QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION

Although the commercial mixed-use variation would generate a smaller number of elementary, intermediate, and high school students when compared with the residential mixed-use variation, this reduction is not large enough to change the conclusions as identified above.

CONCLUSION

Under either variation in 2016, there would be a projected shortfall in elementary and intermediate school seats for schools located within ½ mile of the project site, but there would remain available capacity in both CSD 13 and 15 (and thus CSDs 13/15 combined). While the *CEQR Technical Manual* assesses capacity by CSD, the elementary school shortfall in the ½-mile study area would be substantial enough to create a significant adverse impact to elementary and intermediate schools in the vicinity of the project site. This impact would require one of, or a combination of, mitigation measures described in more detail in Chapter 19, "Mitigation."

F. LIBRARIES

The residential mixed-use variation would add approximately 6,860 new residential units in Brooklyn, exceeding the *CEQR Technical Manual* Table 3C-3 threshold of 734 units required for a library analysis (the commercial mixed-use variation would add approximately 5,790 units). Therefore, a detailed public library analysis is warranted. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual* criteria, residents will typically travel as much as ¾ mile to use library facilities; thus, the library service area for this analysis is defined as ¾ mile from the project site and all libraries located within this radius are included in the assessment.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Brooklyn Public Library (BPL) system serves all of Brooklyn and contains a central and a business library and 58 neighborhood branches throughout the borough. Five libraries are located within approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ mile of the project site (see Table 5-20 and Figure 5-3), including the Brooklyn Central Library at Grand Army Plaza. The Brooklyn Central Library houses the largest of all circulating and general reference collections in BPL. Each of the neighborhood library branches in the study area offers special programs and services to residents, including public education, health information services, job information centers, and internet workshops.

Table 5-20
Library Services within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile of the Project Site

Map No. ¹	Library	Location	Volumes
1	Central Library	Grand Army Plaza	1,098,045
2	Bedford Branch	496 Franklin Avenue	51,100
3	Clinton Hill Branch	380 Washington Avenue	40,826
4	Pacific Branch	25 4th Avenue	42,503
5	Walt Whitman Branch	93 St. Edwards Street	36,720
	Library Service Area²		1,269,194
	Total BPL System³		4,420,614

Notes:

¹ See Figure 5-3.

² Includes all libraries within ¾-mile radius of the project site.

³ BPL System consists of the Brooklyn Central Library, Business Library, and 58 neighborhood branches in Brooklyn.

Source: BPL.

The five libraries in the $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile study area have a combined total of 1,269,194 volumes. With a residential population of 132,871, the service area has a volumes-to-resident ratio of 9.6 to 1.¹ Boroughwide, the BPL system has a collection of approximately 4,420,614 volumes or a volume per resident ratio of 1.8 (the total population of Brooklyn is 2,465,326). The volume per resident ratio of the $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile service area is substantially greater than the ratio of the entire BPL system. This can be attributed to the fact that the largest library in Brooklyn (Central Library) is located within the library service area. It should be noted that residents can go to any BPL branch and/or order books from any of the other library branches.

The renovation of the Bedford Library branch was completed in late 2005. The library features a new children's reading room, new computers, meeting rooms, and an auditorium. Improvements also include new furniture, lighting, heating, and air systems, and full access for disabled persons. The renovation allows full use of the basement level, expanding the library's total occupancy by almost 25 percent.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

This analysis assumes that the number of volumes in the library service area in the future without the proposed project will remain the same as the number of volumes in the existing condition. However, it is likely that some of the libraries will increase the number of volumes in their collections by 2010.

¹ Includes 2000 U.S. Census tracts that have 50 percent or more of their area within a $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile radius of the project site.

In April 2001, BPL released “Taking Flight,” a five-year strategic plan through 2006 outlining specific goals and objectives to position itself as the center of knowledge for the borough of Brooklyn. These include the construction of a new visual and performing arts library near BAM, north of the project site. BPL also seeks to expand and strengthen its collections, educational programs, and research services, increase private and government funding, and improve facility structures, maintenance, and accessibility. As the details of the planned improvements to BPL facilities and resources are not known at this time, they are not included in the quantitative analysis discussed below. No other changes to libraries within the $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile library study area are expected.

New residential developments expected to be completed by 2010 would increase the population in the study area served by the five local libraries. In the future without the proposed project, the population is expected to increase in the study area by 4,510 residents due to new residential development projects expected to be completed by 2010 (see Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework”), for a total of 137,381 residents. As a result, the volume per resident ratio will decrease from 9.6 in the existing condition to approximately 9.2 in 2010.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

By 2010, the residential mixed-use variation would add approximately 4,940 new residents to the study area, resulting in a population increase of 3.6 percent. Since this increase is less than 5 percent, the threshold identified by the *CEQR Technical Manual* as a potentially significant increase in this context, no significant adverse impact to local library services is expected in 2010.

As the commercial mixed-use variation would result in fewer new residents, similarly, no significant adverse impacts to local library services are anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2010.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

Approximately 10,620 new residents are expected in the $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile study area as a result of new residential development in the future without the proposed project, increasing the total population in the study area to 143,491 residents. Assuming no increases in the number of BPL volumes available to the public, the volume per resident ratio will decrease from 9.6 in the existing condition to approximately 8.8 in the future without the proposed project in 2016.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

By 2016, the residential mixed-use variation would add approximately 14,410 new residents to the study area, increasing the total population of the study area to 157,901 residents. This would represent a population increase of 10 percent from the future without the proposed project in 2016. The volume per resident ratio would be 8.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, if the increase in population would impair the delivery of library services in the study area, a significant impact could occur, warranting the consideration of mitigation. The Brooklyn Central Library, with its extensive resources of over 1,098,045 volumes, is located within the study area and would help absorb the increased demand on library resources. In addition, Brooklyn residents have access to all circulating volumes within the entire 4,420,614-volume BPL system and can have requested volumes delivered to their local branches for pick-up. Furthermore, the 8 volumes per resident ratio in this study area is well above the existing average for Brooklyn residents, which is only 1.8 volumes per

resident. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts to library services in the study area as a result of the proposed project in 2016.

Similarly, no significant adverse impacts to local library services are anticipated as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation in 2016.

G. HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, an analysis of outpatient health care facilities is required if a project would result in more than 600 low- to moderate-income housing units. The proposed project would introduce approximately 242 new low- to moderate-income units by 2010 and a total of 1,350 new low- to moderate-income units by 2016 (see Chapter 1, “Project Description” for definitions of housing units administered under the proposed affordable housing program). Thus, an analysis for the 2016 analysis year is warranted. While the *CEQR Technical Manual* indicates that there is no specific study area designated for health care resources, it suggests that such facilities be mapped within a “mile-or-so” radius from the project site. The proposed project would also include a 20,000-square-foot health care facility that would provide a broad range of health care services to the community.

The focus of the analysis is on those facilities that accept public funds (usually in the form of Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements) that are available to any community member, and that could be affected by the introduction of a large low- to moderate-income residential population. Private medical offices and other similar resources are not identified. In accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the assessment focuses on emergency and outpatient services that could be affected by the introduction of a large low- to moderate-income population, which could rely heavily on nearby hospital emergency rooms and other public outpatient services.¹ For example, the National Center for Health Statistics has estimated that the uninsured make 393 emergency room visits annually per thousand persons, compared with 342 visits per thousand for the general population. Low-income people are more likely to be uninsured, and uninsured populations are more likely to use emergency rooms for their health care.² The population of the one-mile study area is 202,566 residents.³

Impacts are identified if the proposed project would result in an increase of 5 percent or more in the demand for services over the future without the proposed project, or would result in a facility exceeding its capacity.

¹ CEQR analysis of community facilities does not consider inpatient hospital and nursing home services impacts, as insured patients have access to such services citywide and, with substantial declines in the need for acute care hospital beds, the potential for overutilization of inpatient beds is rarely an issue.

² See Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s *Summary Health Statistics for U.S. Adults: National Health Interview Survey, 1999*, August 2003. Series 10, No. 212, p. 11; see also: *National Healthcare Disparities Report*, www.qualitytools.ahrq.gov; and “Differences in Access to Health Care Among the Moderate- and Low-Income Population Areas,” www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/pubs.

³ Includes 2000 U.S. census tracts within one mile that have 50 percent or more of their area within a one-mile radius of the project site.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

HOSPITALS AND EMERGENCY ROOMS

There are four major hospital centers, including emergency rooms, available to residents and workers within the approximately one-mile study area (see Figure 5-4 and Table 5-21). Hundreds of thousands of annual outpatient and emergency room visits were logged by these facilities in 2004. The nearest hospital is the Brooklyn Hospital Center at 121 DeKalb Avenue to the north of the project site. According to its chief of medicine, the Brooklyn Hospital Center has experienced a recent decline in inpatient numbers.

Table 5-21
Hospitals and Emergency Rooms within One Mile of the Project Site

Map No. ¹	Hospital Name	Address	Outpatient Department Visits	Emergency Room Visits
1	Brooklyn Hospital Center	121 DeKalb Avenue	144,978	92,032
2	New York Methodist Hospital	506 6th Street	119,129	65,293
3	Interfaith Medical Center	555 Prospect Place	130,447	42,515
4	Long Island College Hospital ²	339 Hicks Street	79,402	56,727
Total number of visits:			473,956	256,567
Notes: ¹ See Figure 5-4. ² Given that Long Island College Hospital is located one block west of the study area boundary, and is located within approximately one mile of the project site, it is included in the analysis. Source: United Hospital Fund Health Care Annual Update, 2004.				

OTHER OUTPATIENT FACILITIES

Table 5-22 includes the more detailed inventory of the 54 specific outpatient locations that have been identified within the one-mile area surrounding the project site (as inventoried in the DCP *Selected Facilities and Program Sites in New York City, 2002 to 2005*). These outpatient health care resources offer general medical care, alcohol, and substance abuse services, mental health services, and mental retardation and developmental disabilities services. These sites cover the entire study area, with the majority located to the northwest of the project site (see Figure 5-5).

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

In the future without the proposed project, several current and planned expansions and renovations will increase the capacity of New York Methodist Hospital. The hospital is currently constructing a 100,000-square-foot building on 7th Street between 7th and 8th Avenues. This new building will house an updated pediatrics unit, a cardiology facility, and medical-surgical patient care units with private rooms. Also underway at New York Methodist is the renovation of several brownstone buildings to serve as offices to house ancillary hospital services.

In the future without the proposed project, the low- to moderate-income population of the ¾-mile land use study area is expected to increase by 1,042 persons (496 new low- to moderate-income units at 2.1 persons per unit) as a result of planned residential developments. For the remaining area within the one-mile hospital and health care facilities study area, an annual background growth rate of 0.5 percent was applied to the existing residential population, resulting in a total of

Table 5-22

Summary of Outpatient Health Care Facilities Within One Mile of the Project Site

Map No. ¹	Facility Name	Address	Type
1	Boro Hall Planned Parenthood Center	44 Court Street	Health Clinic
2	Brooklyn Kidney Center Clinic	184 Sterling Place	Health Clinic
3	Family Health Center	208 Flatbush Avenue	Health Center
4	NYSA-ILA Medical Center of Brooklyn	340 Court Street	Health Center
5	Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services	51 St. Edwards Street 80 Underhill Avenue 26 Court Street 57 Willoughby Street 16 Court Street	Health Center
6	Helen Keller SVS For The Blind	57 Willoughby Street	Free Standing Health Center
7	Children's South Brooklyn Center	141 Nevins Street	Free Standing Health Center
8	Brooklyn Plaza Medical Center	650 Fulton Street	Free Standing Health Center
9	Nephrology Foundation of Brooklyn	342-44 Flatbush Avenue	Free Standing Health Center
10	Family Medicine	340 Court Street	Hospital Affiliated Health Center
11	Bishop Orris G. Walker Jr. Health Center	528 Prospect Place	Hospital Affiliated Health Center
12	JBFC AIDS Continuing Day Treatment Program	57 Willoughby Street	Health Clinic/Day Treatment
13	Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services	57 Willoughby Street	Free Standing Health Center/ Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
14	Phoenix Programs of New York Inc.	174 Prospect Place	Drug Rehabilitation Center
15	Bedford-Stuyvesant CMHC	1121 Bedford Avenue	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
16	Counseling Service of EDNY Inc.	186 Montague Street	Med Supervised Outpatient Svc-Alcohol/Sub Abuse
17	T. R. I. Center Inc.	10 Hanover Place 175 Remsen Street	Med Supervised Outpatient Svc-Alcohol/Sub Abuse
18	St. Vincent's Services, Inc.	415 DeGraw Street 333 Atlantic Avenue	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
19	Long Island College Hospital	255 Duffield Street	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
20	Daytop Village-Med Sup	401 State Street	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
21	NYC Dept. of Prob-Abuse	401 State Street	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
22	Villa OPC II-ALCSM/Drug Abuse	175 Remsen Street	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
23	Margaret Saunders Urban Center	937 Fulton Street	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
24	New Direction Brooklyn Center	206 Flatbush Avenue	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse
25	Interfaith Medical Center-Alcoholism	555 Prospect Place	Med Supervised Output Svc- Alcohol/Sub Abuse Methadone Treatment Clinic-Sub Abuse Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment Intensive Psychiatric Rehab Clinic/Day Treatment-MR/DD
26	ARTC Addiction Research and Treatment Co.	937 Fulton Street	Methadone Treatment Clinic-Sub Abuse
27	ARTC-Fort Greene MMTP and Sub Abuse Clinic	937 Fulton Street	Methadone Treatment Clinic-Alcohol/Sub Abuse
28	BIMC – MMTP Clinic – Cumberland	100 Flatbush Avenue	Methadone Treatment Clinic-Sub Abuse
29	BIMC-MMTP Clinic-Methodist	502 8th Avenue	Methadone Treatment Clinic-Sub Abuse
30	St. Vincent's Clinic/CLA	639 Classon Avenue	Methadone Treatment Clinic-Sub Abuse
31	N.Y. Methodist Psychiatric IP Unit	517 6th Street	Mental Health Center
32	Brooklyn Heights Center for Counseling	142 Joralemon Street	Mental Health Center
33	Brooklyn Psychiatric Center, Inc.	314 Pacific Street 317 Hoyt Street 350 5th Avenue	Mental Health Center
34	NY Methodist Hospital	517 6th Street	Mental Health Clinic
35	SBPC Baltic Street Continuing Day Treatment	250 Baltic Street	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
36	SBPC Heights Hill PHP	25 Flatbush Avenue	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment

Table 5-22 (cont'd)

Summary of Outpatient Health Care Facilities Within One Mile of the Project Site

Map No. ¹	Facility Name	Address	Type
37	Madeleine Borg Northern Brooklyn Clinic	57 Willoughby Street	Mental Health Clinic/ Day Treatment
38	St. Vincent's Mental Health Services	66 Boerum Place 333 Atlantic Avenue	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
39	Project Moving On	285 Schermerhorn Street	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
40	Louis E. Reinhold Mental Health	189 Montague Street	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
41	Blanton-Peale Brooklyn Heights	142 Joralemon Street	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
42	SBPC Heights Hill Continuing Day Treatment	25 Flatbush Avenue	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
43	Raices Casa Bien Estar	10 Hanover Place	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
44	Brooklyn Center for Psychotherapy	300 Flatbush Avenue	Mental Health Clinic/Day Treatment
45	Jewish Board of Family & Children's Services	57 Willoughby Street	Mental Health and Social Services
46	Puerto Rican Family Inst/Child	175 Remsen Street	Intensive Psychiatric Rehab
47	Young Adult Institute	175 Remsen Street	Day Rehabilitation-MR/DD ²
48	Carl Fenichel Community Services	540 Atlantic Avenue	Day Rehabilitation-MR/DD
49	CAY Community Services Organization	81 Willoughby Street	Day Rehabilitation-MR/DD
50	Heartshare Human Services	50 Court Street	Day Rehabilitation- MR/DD
51	Crime Victims Center	50 Court Street	Crime Victim Support Center
52	Nephro-Care	555 Prospect Place	Dialysis Center
53	Black Veterans For Social Justice	686 Fulton St	Vocational rehabilitation
54	Cumberland Treatment Center-Drug Abuse Clinic	100 North Portland Ave	Non-medically supervised chemical dependency outpatient service
Notes: ¹ See Figure 5-5. ² MR/DD: Mental Retardation/Developmental Disability.			
Sources: <i>Selected Facilities and Program Sites in New York City, 2002 to 2005 Edition, DCP</i>			

3,445 new residents expected in the remaining portion of this one-mile study area. Assuming 20 percent of the new housing units anticipated in the area between $\frac{3}{4}$ mile and one mile from the project site would be low- to moderate-income housing units, 20 percent of the total population increase (689 persons) would be of low- to moderate-income. Overall the increase in population in the one-mile study area would include 1,731 low- to moderate-income residents.

It is not expected that the increase in study area population would affect the overall provision of health care services, based on the extensive array of existing facilities serving the area. Assuming the national average of about 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income persons, the 1,731 new low- to moderate-income residents could add a total of about 675 annual visits, a small increase (less than 1 percent of all study area hospital emergency room visits in 2004). The incremental change in visits would be small compared with the hundreds of thousands of overall visits currently accommodated by the existing health care facilities in the study area.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

The proposed project would construct approximately 242 additional new low- to moderate-income housing units and introduce approximately 508 new low- to moderate-income residents to the study area by 2010. Based on the national average of 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income persons, the addition of approximately 508 low- to moderate-income residents could add an estimated 200 annual visits to study area emergency rooms. Given the hundreds of thousands of such visits in the study area currently, this additional low- to moderate-income population would generate a minimal change in demand over the future without the proposed project (less than 1 percent increase in study area hospital and emergency room visits in 2004). As this increase is less than the 5 percent increase in the demand for services listed in

the *CEQR Technical Manual* requiring additional analysis, no significant adverse impacts to hospitals and emergency rooms are expected.

The commercial mixed-use variation would include fewer additional new low- to moderate-income housing units, resulting in fewer annual visits to study area emergency rooms. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to hospitals and emergency rooms are expected in 2010 as a result of the commercial mixed-use variation.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

With the exception of the planned expansions and renovations at New York Methodist Hospital (which would be completed by the 2010 analysis year), there are no known planned changes to hospitals and health care facilities in the study area in the future without the proposed project.

By 2016, the low- to moderate-income population of the $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile land use study area in the future without the proposed project is expected to increase by 2,211 persons (1,053 new low- to moderate-income units at 2.1 persons per unit) as a result of anticipated residential developments. For the remaining area within the one-mile study area, an annual background growth rate of 0.5 percent was applied to the existing residential population. Using this estimation of growth, 5,596 new residents are expected in the remaining portion of this one-mile study area over existing conditions. Assuming approximately 20 percent of the new population anticipated in the area between $\frac{3}{4}$ mile and one mile from the project site would be low- to moderate-income housing units, it is expected that 20 percent of the total population increase (1,119 persons) would be of low- to moderate-income. Overall there would be an increase in the low- to moderate-income population of 3,383 persons.

It is not expected that the increase in study area population would affect the overall provision of health care services, based on the extensive array of existing facilities serving the area. Assuming the national average of about 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income population, the 3,383 new low- to moderate-income residents could add a total of about 1,319 annual visits, an insignificant increase (less than 1 percent of all study area hospital emergency room visits in 2004).

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

The proposed project would construct 1,350 additional new low- to moderate-income housing units and introduce approximately 2,835 new low- to moderate-income residents to the study area by 2016. Based on the national average of 390 annual emergency room visits per 1,000 low-income persons, the addition of 2,835 low- to moderate-income residents could add an estimated 1,106 annual visits to study area emergency rooms. This 0.43 percent increase in emergency room visits over the future without the proposed project condition (less than 5 percent increase in demand for services) is not expected to overburden health care facilities in the study area, and no significant adverse impacts on health care services are expected by 2016.

Similarly, the commercial mixed-use variation, which would construct fewer low- to moderate-income units, is also not expected to overburden health care facilities and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated in 2016.

H. DAY CARE CENTERS (PUBLICLY FUNDED)

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a publicly funded day care center analysis is required if a project would result in more than 50 eligible children, based on the number of low-

to moderate-income housing units provided. The proposed project would introduce approximately 242 and 1,350 new low- to moderate-income units by 2010 and 2016, respectively. Based on these numbers of new low- to moderate-income units, approximately 87 and 486 children under the age of 12 would be eligible for publicly funded day care in 2010 and 2016, respectively.

Publicly funded day care facilities within one mile of the project site are identified and examined; private day care facilities are not considered in the analysis. Impacts are identified if the proposed project would result in demand for slots in publicly funded day care centers greater than available capacity, and the increase in demand generated by the proposed project would be 5 percent or more of the collective capacity of the day care centers serving the study area in the future without the proposed project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Publicly funded day care for the children of income-eligible households in New York City is sponsored and financially supported by the Agency for Child Development (ACD) within the ACS, and Head Start, federally funded early childhood education and family support programs. The City of New York formerly operated public day care facilities, but now neither ACD nor the City operates day care programs. Most children are served through ACD contracts with hundreds of private, non-profit organizations that operate child care programs in communities across the city that are licensed by the New York City Department of Health (DOH). ACD also issues vouchers to eligible families to provide financial assistance in purchasing care from any legal day care provider in the city. ACD facilitates day care services for children between the ages of 2 months and 12 years, and publicly financed day care is used predominantly by children 5 years old and under. (Children over 5 often start kindergarten within elementary schools.) Head Start programs, administered by ACS throughout New York City, serve over 17,000 preschool-age children (ages 3 to 5) from low-income families.

To receive subsidized child care services, a family must meet specific financial and social eligibility criteria that are determined by federal, state, and local regulations. Eligibility is determined by a family's gross income, with consideration of family size. To meet the social eligibility for publicly funded day care, a family must also have an approved "reason for care," such as involvement in a child welfare case or participation in a "welfare-to-work" program. Parents must appear at an eligibility interview at an ACD borough office to be considered.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, publicly funded group day care centers within a one-mile study area should be identified for residential developments. Given that there are no location requirements for enrollment in day care centers, some parents/guardians may choose a day care center closer to a location of employment than their place of residence. Parents/guardians have the option of using ACD vouchers to purchase day care from public and private providers both within and outside the one-mile study area, potentially in neighborhoods close to parents' workplaces. The portability of ACD vouchers indicates that services beyond a one-mile study area can be and are used by eligible parents. However, as discussed in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the centers closest to the project site are more likely to be subject to increased demand. There are 41 public day care centers (34 contracted child care programs and 7 Head Start programs) located within the one-mile study area, with a total capacity of 5,141 slots (see Figure 5-6 and Table 5-23). These facilities are well-utilized with a current enrollment of 4,349 (85 percent) and with 888 available slots. For some individual day care facilities, enrollment exceeds capacity. As a result, total enrollment plus total available slots exceeds the total capacity number for all facilities combined.

Table 5-23

Public Day Care Centers within One Mile of the Project Site

Map No. ¹	Name	Address	Capacity	Enrollment	Available Slots ²
Child Care Programs					
1	Farragut Children Center	32 Navy Street	75	45	30
2	BBCS Duffield Childrens Center ³	101 Fleet Place	100	76	24
3	Warren Street Center for C & F	343 Warren Street	85	50	35
4	Our Children's Center	300 Jay Street	24	20	4
5	P932K Community School LYFE ⁴	67 Schermerhorn Street	30	15	15
6	BBCS Family Day Care Careers Program ³	285 Myrtle Avenue	208	148	60
7	BBCS Waverly ³	143 Waverly Avenue	175	167	8
8	Alonzo Austin Daughtry Day Care	30 3rd Avenue	30	26	4
9	Nat Turner Day Care Center	460 Atlantic Avenue	50	22	28
10	Nevins Day Care Center	460 Atlantic Avenue	155	121	34
11	Graham Windham	540 Atlantic Avenue	530	518	12
12	Police Athletic League Quincy Street Day Care Center	5 Quincy Street	135	105	30
13	Irving Place Child Development Center	81-87 Irving Place	115	85	30
14	Young Minds Day Care	972 Fulton Street	105	95	10
15	Associated Black Social Workers CDE	1005 Bedford Avenue	197	115	82
16	Tabernacle Church of God	34-52 Kosciusko Street	274	224	50
17	Billy Martin Child Development Center	333 Classon Avenue	72	52	20
18	David T. Bradley Memorial Day Care Center	172 Franklin Avenue	130	123	7
19	Bedford Avenue Day Care Center--Group	40 Brevoort Place	95	102	0
20	Bedford Avenue Day Care Center--Family	40 Brevoort Place	292	369	0
21	Child Development Support	352-358 Classon Avenue	143	130	13
22	Alonzo Austin Daughtry Day Care Center II	333 Second Street	95	91	4
23	Bethel Baptist Day Care	242 Hoyt Street	125	79	46
24	Strong Place Day Care	242 Hoyt Street	75	56	19
25	Helen Owen Carey Child Development	71 Lincoln Place	170	164	6
26	Court Street Children's Center	292 Court Street	87	74	13
27	Haitian American Day Care Center	1491 Bedford Avenue	95	67	28
28	Haitian American #3	813 Sterling Place	152	128	24
29	Friends of Crown Heights -- Family	671-675 Prospect Place	320	213	107
30	Friends of Crown Heights -- Group	671-675 Prospect Place	176	186	0
31	Friends of Crown Heights	671-675 Prospect Place	75	56	19
32	Martha Udeh EDC	505 St. Marks Avenue	140	112	28
33	Five Block Day Care Center	995 Carroll Street	145	142	3
34	Prospect Heights H.S. LYFE	883 Classon Avenue	18	12	6
	Totals:		4,693	3,988	799
Head Start Programs					
35	Builders	32 Navy Street	45	25	20
36	Bedford Stuyvesant Head Start	262 Lexington Avenue	63	57	6
37	Bedford Stuyvesant Head Start	5 Quincy Street	76	74	2
38	Medgar Evers Head Start	71 Lincoln Place	60	50	10
39	Medgar Evers College Site II	315 Vanderbilt Avenue	109	73	36
40	Police Athletic League Head Start	565 Baltic Street	52	37	15
41	Police Athletic League Head Start	5 Quincy Street	43	45	0
	Totals:		448	361	89
	Total Child Care Facilities		5,141	4,349	888

Notes:¹ See Figure 5-6.² For some individual day care facilities, enrollment exceeds capacity. As a result, total enrollment plus total available slots exceeds the total capacity number for all facilities combined.³ BBCS (Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service).⁴ LYFE (Leading Youth to Find Empowerment).**Sources:** ACS, 2006.

In addition to attending group day care centers, eligible children may also be cared for in the homes of family child care providers, also registered by DOH. Family child care providers are professionals who provide care for three to seven children in their residences. Group family child care providers are professionals who care for 7 to 12 children, with the help of an assistant, in their homes. The majority of family and group family child care providers in New York City are registered with a child care network, which provides access to training and support services. According to ACS, these home-based facilities tend to absorb unmet demand at day care centers, and more host households are added to the system as demand increases.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

No new publicly funded day care centers are planned in the study area by 2010. The growth in residential population discussed in Chapter 2, “Procedural and Analytical Framework,” could result in an increase in the number of low-income households, which could increase demand for publicly financed day care. The 496 new low- to moderate-income units in the future without the proposed project could generate approximately 184 children between the ages of 2 months and 12 years who could be eligible for publicly funded day care according to the CEQR methodology (see Table 5-24).

Table 5-24
Increased Demand for Publicly Funded Day Care Facilities—2010

	Capacity	Enrollment	Available Slots	Percent Capacity
Existing	5,141	4,349	888	85
2010 Future Without the Proposed Project	5,141	4,533	704	88
2010 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project	5,141	4,620	617	90

This would increase capacity to 88 percent in the future without the proposed project from 85 percent in existing conditions. Furthermore, many parents choose to take their children to other day care centers outside of the study area (e.g., closer to work). The full potential increment would also be somewhat reduced by the day care focus on children aged 5 and under, even though children up to age 12 are eligible. The school-age children (pre-K to 6th grade) would be unlikely to utilize the day care slots available in these facilities since they would be enrolled in public school. Any increased demand for slots could be substantially met with the slots currently available at the day care facilities in the study area, as well as family day care slots and vouchers for private day care centers.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2010

The proposed project could result in the addition of approximately 87 children under the age of 12 who would be potentially eligible for publicly funded day care (based on approximately 242 new units of affordable low- to moderate-income housing). According to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, a significant adverse impact could result if the proposed project results in: 1) a demand for slots greater than remaining capacity of day care centers, and 2) demand that constitutes an increase of 5 percent or more of the collective capacity of the day care centers serving the study area over the future without the proposed project. As shown in Table 5-23, in the future with the proposed project, day care facilities would operate at 90 percent capacity and there would thus be no significant adverse impact to day care facilities in the study area.

The commercial mixed-use variation would include fewer additional new low- to moderate-income housing units, resulting in less demand for day care center. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to day care facilities are expected in 2010.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

The additional 1,053 low- to moderate-income housing units expected in the study area by 2016 would add 383 eligible children under the age of 12 (including the 184 eligible children added by 2010). This would increase capacity to 91 percent in the future without the proposed project from 85 percent in existing condition, with 553 available slots at day care facilities in the study area.

PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT—2016

The proposed project would create 1,350 additional low- to moderate-income residential units by 2016. As per *CEQR Technical Manual* methodology, this would generate an estimated 486 children under the age of 12 who are potentially eligible for publicly funded day care (not all of these children may meet the income and social eligibility criteria for public day care). The proposed project includes the development of an intergenerational facility that would include a day care center with more than 100 seats, which would meet the study area demand for such services, increasing the capacity of day care facilities in the study area to 5,241. The *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines indicate that a demand for slots greater than the remaining capacity of day care centers and an increase in demand of 5 percent or more of the study area capacity could result in a significant adverse impact.

As shown in Table 5-25, day care facilities in the study area in 2016 would operate slightly below capacity with an 8 percent increase in demand when compared with the future without the proposed project. While this increase in demand is greater than the 5 percent *CEQR Technical Manual* threshold, there would be remaining day care capacity in the study area with the inclusion of the proposed intergenerational facility at the project site. In addition, this maximum potential increase in demand is offset by a number of limiting factors, including the fact that private day care facilities and day care centers outside of the study area (e.g., closer to parent's place of work) are not included in this analysis. Additional day care facilities may also be opened within the study area by 2016, as the population within the area increases. The full potential increment would also be somewhat reduced by the day care focus on children 5 and under, even though children up to age 12 are eligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to day care facilities in the study area.

Table 5-25

Increased Demand for Publicly Funded Day Care Facilities: 2016

	Capacity	Enrollment	Available Slots	Percent Capacity
Existing	5,141	4,349	888	85
2016 Future Without the Proposed Project	5,141	4,732	505	92
2016 Probable Impacts of the Proposed Project	5,241*	5,218	23	100
Note: * The proposed project would create more than 100 day care seats as part of its intergenerational facility.				

By 2016, the commercial mixed-use variation would include the same number of low- to moderate-income units and would generate the same number of children eligible for publicly

funded day care. Likewise, the commercial mixed-use variation would not result in a significant adverse impact to day care facilities.

I. OTHER COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Pacific Dean Residences, located at 603 Dean Street on the project site, is a publicly funded transitory homeless shelter. The City refers the homeless occupants, and provides the funding, to a private entity operator; the shelter includes approximately 93 units. The site opened in two phases—the first in September 2002 and the second in January 2003. As with all other family shelter sites, Pacific Dean Residences accepts families conditionally for up to 10 days while their application for shelter is being reviewed. In addition, if a family is deemed eligible for temporary shelter, they remain in the facility until permanent housing is found.

In June 2004, the City implemented *Uniting for Solutions Beyond Shelter*, a five-year action plan to end chronic homelessness, which included a commitment to reduce the family shelter census by two-thirds by 2009. The family census had been growing for a number of years, starting in Fiscal Year 1999. The census stabilized in Fiscal Year 2004 and began decreasing in Fiscal Year 2005. The New York City Department of Homeless Services (DHS) is currently undertaking a capacity needs assessment, which includes a resizing component. According to DHS, the capacity of this facility can be replaced, if needed. Furthermore, as implementation work continues on the five-year plan, including an increased focus on prevention work, shelter capacity needs are projected to continue to decrease in future years. As current City policy is focused on finding permanent housing for chronically homeless individuals, the future need for temporary shelter space, such as that provided by the Pacific Dean Residences, would continue to decrease. Any occupants not served by this facility, if it were to be displaced, would be relocated to the other existing interim facilities. As the facility does not provide permanent shelter, and occupants are there on a temporary rotation basis, the displacement and relocation to other facilities would not result in a significant adverse impact. *