A. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

The New York State Urban Development Corporation, doing business as the Empire State Development Corporation (ESDC), is proposing to purchase the James A. Farley Building and the Western Annex (collectively referred to as the Farley Complex) from the United States Postal Service (USPS). The approximately 1.4-million-square-foot (sf) Farley Complex occupies a superblock over the Pennsylvania Station (Penn Station) rail yard between Eighth and Ninth Avenues from West 31st to West 33rd Streets (see Figure S-1). In 2002, the Moynihan Station Development Corporation (MSDC), a subsidiary of ESDC formerly known as the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Corporation (PSRC), entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with USPS for the sale of the Farley Complex. ESDC, as the parent corporation of MSDC, is undertaking this purchase for the purpose of redeveloping the Farley Complex into a new intermodal transportation facility supported by new commercial development. In July 2005, ESDC conditionally designated the Related Companies/Vornado Realty Trust developer team as the preferred developer of the project, subject to an ESDC/MSDC Designated Developer Selection Process.

The proposed Farley Post Office/Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project (Farley/Moynihan) has both public and private components, the combination of which will enable ESDC/MSDC to move forward with the development of a fully funded transportation facility. The public component of the proposed project would consist of approximately 300,000 sf of space for use as the new Daniel Patrick Moynihan Station (the Moynihan Station) and approximately 250,000 sf of space for USPS postal operations. To assist with the development of the public component of the project, ESDC/MSDC has secured federal, state and city funding. The private component of the proposed project would initially consist of approximately 863,000 sf of space available for private commercial development (including approximately 100,000 sf of space to be dedicated to private transit-oriented retail uses). The proposed project's private component would also include the option to purchase unused development rights of up to 1 million sf of zoning floor area that could be used for additional development on the project site or transferred to off-site parcels on adjacent blocks.

For the purposes of the environmental analyses, it is assumed that the proposed project would be constructed in up to two development phases. Phase I—development of Moynihan Station, USPS space, and the commercial uses within the Farley Complex—is expected to be completed by 2010. Phase II would consist of the utilization of the 1 million zoning square feet (zsf) of unused development rights. Two of the three developer teams that submitted proposals would construct a new commercial building over the Western Annex with those development rights—that overbuild would likely be completed by 2015. The third developer team (the conditionally designated preferred developer) proposed transferring the unused development rights to an adjacent site under their control in order to construct a primarily residential or mixed-use

building of up to 1.1 million gross square feet (gsf) on the eastern side of Eighth Avenue at West 33rd Street by 2010, concurrently with Phase I of the proposed project.

In order to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared in accordance with State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) regulations and guidelines (see Chapter 2, "Analytical Framework"). It also provides information needed for the USPS, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

B. PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The proposed Farley/Moynihan project is a comprehensive initiative conceived to address and fulfill the following specific needs and purposes: to create a major transportation hub that improves circulation and capacity for the entire Penn Station complex; to create a financially viable and dynamic mixed-use development opportunity; and to restore and preserve an important historic resource.

JAMES A. FARLEY COMPLEX

The Farley Complex is listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places and is a designated New York City Landmark. The Farley Building was constructed between 1910 and 1913 for the U.S. General Post Office, and it was expanded in 1934 to create the Western Annex. The Farley Building fronts on Eighth Avenue and covers the eastern half of the block. It sits atop an extensive track and platform system serving Penn Station as well as a former mail train operation that served the General Post Office. The building connects to the platforms of Penn Station below. Besides space originally built for mail sorting and distribution uses, the Farley Building contains public lobbies, retail windows, administration spaces, and the office of the New York City Postmaster. Constructed to relieve space inadequacies in the Farley Building, the Western Annex expanded the postal facility over the rail yard to Ninth Avenue. It is a fully integrated addition to the original structure. Much of the interior space has been used for truck loading and unloading, as well as for administration, carrier operations, and mail sorting. Truck entrances to this space are located on the Ninth Avenue end of the building off a service driveway with exits located on West 33rd Street. Back-in loading docks are located along the West 31st Street frontage near Ninth Avenue.

Although the annex provided a vital upgrade to Postal Service operations at the time it was built, periodic system and facility upgrades have been necessary in the intervening years. Furthermore, USPS eventually expanded and modernized its operations off-site at the Morgan General Mail Facility and Annex (the Morgan Facility), which is located at West 28th to West 30th Streets and Ninth to Tenth Avenues. Recently, USPS has dedicated considerable resources to creating a modern and efficient operation by consolidating its mail processing, sorting, and distribution operations into the nearby Morgan Facility and vacating considerable space in the Farley Complex, in part to facilitate the proposed project.

PROJECT HISTORY AND PREVIOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE PROJECT SITE

The Penn Station complex is America's busiest passenger transportation facility, handling over 550,000 people daily. Yet the present facility, a three-level, largely subterranean complex constructed after the demolition of the original station in 1963, is inadequate to meet the needs

of today's passengers. Already operating at capacity, Penn Station is expected to experience significant operational stress in coming years because of increasing demand for service and a rapidly growing passenger load. The intensive utilization of Penn Station and its projected ridership increases have led to the development of proposals to address these issues.

Planning for a new intermodal transportation facility began in 1991, when Amtrak initiated efforts to improve its New York City passenger facilities. In 1992 Amtrak proposed to convert portions of the Farley Building into the Amtrak passenger terminal with retail space and non-public uses. The FRA, as the lead federal agency, initiated environmental and historic preservation reviews as mandated by NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), and related laws and regulations. In 1995, FRA issued for public comment a Draft Environmental Assessment analyzing the environmental impacts of the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project.

Further refinement of the project scope and more detailed cost estimates revealed that the project could only succeed through a funding partnership among the federal, state, and city governments and the integration of a private development component. To lead and coordinate that relationship, the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Corporation (PSRC), a subsidiary of ESDC, was formed in 1995. PSRC and Amtrak agreed to work together to improve the Penn Station complex, and PSRC assumed lead responsibility for redeveloping the Farley Building as an intermodal transportation facility and commercial center and for securing the necessary funding to complete the project. In 1999, PSRC proposed to enter into a lease agreement with USPS for a portion of the Farley Building and to develop a new Penn Station intermodal transportation facility. As a result of that proposal, USPS agreed to consolidate its mail handling operations in the Western Annex. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared in 1999, and, based on its analyses, ESDC issued a Negative Declaration under SEQRA, and FRA issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA. Subsequent to issuance of the Negative Declaration and FONSI, funding for construction of the new station was secured.

In 2002, ESDC proposed to purchase the Farley Building and Western Annex from the USPS for the purpose of redeveloping the Farley Complex into a new Penn Station (renamed the Daniel Patrick Moynihan Station) and commercial center. In summary, the main differences between the 1999 project and the 2002 modified project were: ESDC would own the Farley Complex, leasing space to USPS, PSRC, renamed MSDC, and other entities; USPS would consolidate most of its existing Farley Complex operations at the Morgan Facility; USPS would upgrade systems and make some changes at the Morgan Facility to accommodate this consolidation; and the additional space in the Farley Complex made available by USPS would be redeveloped with office and retail space. In 2003, USPS and ESDC prepared a Draft Supplemental EA (SEA) for the modified project to identify and analyze the anticipated effects of the new project components. A Final SEA was not issued because of continuing project discussions and planning.

Phase I of the current proposed project essentially replaces the 2003 plan. In addition, the proposed project now includes, as Phase II, the potential development of up to 1 million zsf of unused development rights.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals, with associated objectives, for the proposed project are as follows:

GOAL 1: Create a major transportation hub that improves circulation and relieves capacity constraints in the entire Penn Station complex.

- Create a new rail facility in the Farley Building connected to and coordinated with passenger operations throughout the Penn Station complex.
- Ease congestion of rail traffic.
- Redirect pedestrian flow in and around Penn Station to reduce crowding and conflicting movements among intercity and commuter rail users within the passenger terminal and connecting passages.
- Improve access to the platforms used by New Jersey Transit (NJT), the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR), and Amtrak.
- Provide additional passenger amenities (e.g., commuter concourse, ticketing hall, taxi-drop-offs, shops, and restaurants).
- Provide state-of-the-art security and emergency response and egress measures.

GOAL 2: Create a dynamic mixed-use development opportunity in the Hudson Yards area and support city and state planning and development policy for the far West Side of Midtown Manhattan.

- Permit reuse of available space in the Farley Complex with a mix of uses that are compatible with the transportation center and land use patterns and policies in the surrounding neighborhood of Hudson Yards, Hell's Kitchen, and West Midtown.
- Permit development above the Western Annex or on an adjacent site with a mix of uses that are compatible with Moynihan Station and land use patterns and policies in the surrounding neighborhood.
- Support economic development through the creation of jobs and taxes.

GOAL 3: Restore and preserve an important historic resource.

- Restore and preserve the exterior of the Farley Building, particularly the Eighth Avenue entrance and monumental stairs. Limit other exterior changes to those that would not irretrievably alter the original design concept of the Farley Complex.
- Retain the historic use of the USPS retail lobby and other key interior spaces.
- Create a new intermodal transit hall filled with light and activity reminiscent of the original Pennsylvania Station.
- Ensure that the adaptive reuse of the Farley Complex references the original Pennsylvania Station/Farley Building role as transportation resource, civic gateway, and mail facility.
- Shift development of unused Farley Complex development rights off site or locate any potential overbuild on the Western Annex (and not on the Farley Building), and ensure that its orientation and design will be appropriate to the historic resource.

GOAL 4: Provide private as well as public funding to advance the project goals.

C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

In response to the Designated Developer Selection Process, three qualified development teams (identified as "A," "B," and "C" in this EIS) submitted development proposals to ESDC/MSDC—the Related Companies/Vornado Realty Trust developer team (the conditionally designated preferred developer) is Developer C. Although the EIS analysis framework has been structured to ensure that the various aspects of the Developer C proposal are fully examined in the EIS, it is noted that to preserve the conservative assessment of a range of potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project, the EIS utilizes "reasonable worst-case development scenarios" that reflect the range of development programs established by the three initial development proposals. This methodology is also intended to maintain flexibility to work with the other developers should any change occur in the conditional designation of the preferred developer. The formal designation occurs after SEQRA review is complete and the long-term lease with the selected developer is executed.

PHASE I REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO

The Phase I reasonable worst-case development scenario has been formulated based on the three developer proposals and the program included in the 2003 Draft SEA. As shown on Table S-1, the programs are similar in that they include the train station, some USPS space, and commercial development. The three developer proposals contain no office space in Phase I, unlike the 2003 proposal. Since office space has a lower trip rate than destination retail, which is the predominant use proposed for the Western Annex in all three proposals, commercial office space is not included in the reasonable worst-case development scenario for Phase I. Two of the proposals offer a hotel in the Farley Building, and so this use is included in the development scenario. Banquet use, which can be a high vehicular trip generator is included, but other uses, such as entertainment retail and a merchandise mart, which have lower trip rates than big-box retail, are not considered to be "reasonable worst cases" compared with commercial retail use. Although the merchandise mart proposed by Developer C could attract high daily attendances during trade shows, the peak hour trip generation rates would be equal to or less than rates for commercial office and still lower than that for destination retail. In any case, the merchandise mart only represents a small percentage of the total commercial development proposed by Developer C for the Farley Complex. Therefore, the merchandise mart is not included in the reasonable worst-case development scenario. The reasonable worst-case development scenario sums to 1,408,350 sf, which is comparable to the 2003 Draft SEA and No Action program for the building (described below).

The elements of the Phase I reasonable worst-case development scenario are as follows:

MOYNIHAN STATION

To develop the new train station, all or a portion of approximately 300,000 sf of the Farley Complex would, through a series of leases/subleases, be transferred through the designated developer to one or more railroad users, such as NJT and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), with NJT anticipated to be the primary end user. The developer selected by ESDC would be required to design and build the new station. The three proposals provide

Table S-1
Floor Area of Land Use Components: 2003 Draft SEA, Developer Proposals, and Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (in square feet)

Land Use Component	2003 EA	Developer Proposals			RWCDS
		A	B	C	
Train station	300,000	174,748	219,486	231,194	300,000
Transit retail	100,000	100,499	92,289	72,016	86,000
USPS	250,100	253,084	254,644	263,279	265,000
Commercial office	436,000	0	0	0	0
Hotel*	0	0	124,431	121,099	125,000
Commercial retail	248,000	538,296	302,470	478,020	518,100
Entertainment retail	0	120,121	75,223	0	0
Merchandise mart	0	0	0	86,025	0
Banquet facilities	0	0	33,412	0	35,000
Common areas	50,250	142,024	57,062	67,890	50,250
Docks/service	24,000	**	46,165	**	24,000
Office core/lobby	0	5,369	28,199	0	5,000
Total	**1,408,350**	**1,334,141**	**1,233,381**	**1,319,523**	**1,408,350**

Notes:
* Divide by 1,000 to estimate approximate number of hotel rooms.
** Service included in Common Areas value.

basically the same circulation plan and station layout composed of intermodal hall, a train concourse level below, and an expanded and widened West End Concourse (see Figures S-2, S-3, and S-4). Although the three developer proposals offer some alterations to the design of the station, none of the developers propose changing the transportation facilities from those proposed in the 2003 Draft SEA. The list of station elements below is therefore the same as that presented in the 2003 Draft SEA.

- New facilities for rail passengers. This would include a new main waiting area and a concourse. The concourse would be a large public space created in the Farley Building to serve both as the main passenger waiting area and railroad station passenger concourse.
- New intermodal hall. As currently contemplated, the hall would be characterized by a glass and metal skylight and would create midblock entrances to the Farley Building from both West 31st and West 33rd Streets.
- New entrances to the Farley Building from Eighth Avenue.
- An increase of the combined total of passenger stairs, escalators, and elevators; an approximately 50 percent increase in passenger circulation space; and direct access to the railroads.
- Improved access to trains/taxi. Access to some passenger/commuter trains would be expanded (it is envisioned that this would likely be an expansion of NJT service) from the existing Penn Station complex to the Farley Complex, and other improvements to aid accessibility would be implemented.
- Curb cuts for taxi access located on the mid-block of West 31st Street and/or West 33rd Street.
- Extension and widening of the West End Concourse to Track No. 5.
- Building systems and infrastructure improvements. The project would upgrade the building's mechanical systems to meet the needs of the reconfigured facility.

- Planned restoration program. The building would be comprehensively restored, with stonework and mortar cleaned and refurbished.
- Enhanced access to the Eighth Avenue A, C, and E subway line and significant access improvements to the Eighth Avenue subway entrance.
- A corridor for pedestrian circulation along the former West 32nd Street from the intermodal transit hall to Ninth Avenue. All three developer proposals include this corridor, although with differing designs.
- Approximately 86,000 sf of transit-oriented retail and commercial space. This space would be in addition to the approximately 300,000-sf train station and would be part of the floor area leased by ESDC to the designated developer. The development proposals all propose transit-oriented retail space in varying amounts; however, since the total amount of space to be leased would not change, a lower amount of transit retail means more commercial retail and vice versa. Since non-transit commercial space would not be linked to the station use, it would create a greater number of independent person trips than transit-oriented commercial use, including vehicular trips. Thus, a scenario that limits transit-oriented commercial space and includes the greatest non-transit commercial space is considered to be a worst case in this EIS.
- Mail truck access. With the proposed project, the interior configuration of the building's loading docks would be modified. Under two of the developer proposals, the first-floor loading bays would be removed, and new, modern USPS loading facilities would be built on the train concourse level of the Western Annex. The third developer proposal includes a combination of first-floor loading bays and a below-grade loading area. Under all three proposals, the reconfigured below-grade loading area would be accessible on West 31st Street by ramps leading from Ninth Avenue. The USPS loading docks on the exterior of the building at the West 31st Street/Ninth Avenue intersection would be removed under two developer proposals and reduced in number under the third.

USPS FACILITIES

As part of the proposed project, approximately 250,000 sf of the Farley Complex would be subleased to USPS for continued use. USPS would continue to occupy the historic postal lobby and upper floor offices in the Farley Building, carrier space in the Western Annex, and postal rail access facilities below the Western Annex. The area used by USPS would be part of the total floor area included in a master lease between ESDC and the designated developer; it would be subleased to USPS.

NEW JERSEY TRANSIT

As part of the Access to the Region's Core (ARC) project, NJT plans to extend Penn Station Platforms 1 and 2 as well as expand the West End Concourse under the Farley Building. This would provide NJT riders full access to all existing tracks serviced by NJT from the Farley Building. ESDC/MSDC have executed a Memorandum of Understanding with NJT to be a sub-tenant in Moynihan Station.

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

As noted above, the private development portion of the reasonable worst-case development scenario for Phase I would comprise retail, banquet facility, and hotel space. As shown on Table

S-1, the retail use would be 518,100 sf, the hotel would be 125,000 sf, or 125 rooms, and the banquet facilities would be 35,000 sf.

PHASE II REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO

There are two reasonable worst-case development scenarios for Phase II. They are described below.

OFFICE BUILDING OVERBUILD

The Developer A and Developer B proposals would result in the development of an office building of approximately 1 million zsf on the north side of the Western Annex (see Figure S-5). The commercial overbuild is assumed to be completed by 2015.

DEVELOPMENT TRANSFER SITE BUILDING

Under this illustrative development, Developer C would construct—concurrently with the Phase I development—either a primarily residential building or a mixed-use building of up to 1.1 million gsf on the east side of Eighth Avenue between West 33rd and West 34th Streets, the Development Transfer Site (see Figure S-6). Development of this site is assumed to be completed by 2010, and if the Development Transfer Site building is constructed, there would be no commercial overbuild on the Farley Complex.

Under the two options for the Development Transfer Site building, a primarily residential building would have approximately 940 units (940,000 sf) and 120,000 sf of retail space. A mixed-use building would contain a 310,000-sf hotel, 630 residential units (630,000 sf), and 120,000 sf of retail space. Either building is assumed to contain twenty percent of the residential rental units developed with low-income rental units provided under the 80/20 affordable housing program.

D. REQUIRED APPROVALS/LIST OF PRINCIPAL ACTIONS

All agencies of government at the state, county, and local level within New York, with the exception of the State Legislature and the courts, must comply with SEQRA. The proposed project is primarily under the jurisdiction of ESDC and its operating subsidiary, MSDC, which is why the proposed project is subject to SEQRA. Federal agencies are responsible for complying with NEPA. This SEQRA EIS will provide the basis for a subsequent NEPA Environmental Assessment by USPS, FRA, and FHWA. Accordingly, this SEQRA EIS has been conducted in a manner to ensure consistency with federal review requirements.

The proposed project would require several actions by ESDC and MSDC in order for it to be implemented. These actions are subject to review under SEQRA, and are as follows:

ESDC ACTIONS

- Adopt and affirm a General Project Plan, including overrides of the New York City Zoning Resolution for the use of the Farley Building for rail service and for the possible construction of 1 million zoning square feet of additional development on the east side of Eighth Avenue between West 33rd and 34th Streets.
- Acquire the Farley Complex from the USPS. (USPS will conduct a review under NEPA for the USPS action to upgrade mail processing operations that will allow for the sale of the

Farley Complex to ESDC. The FRA and FHWA, as Federal agencies involved in funding the train station component of the project, are participating in the NEPA process as a cooperating agency and as a consulting agency, respectively.)

- Enter into a series of real estate transactions that would involve, among other things, the creation of a condominium regime for the Farley Complex and the leasing and subleasing of portions of the premises, as summarized in Chapter 1, "Project Description."
- Approval, as required, of 1 million zsf of additional development as overbuild to the Farley Complex, or as development on the east side of Eighth Avenue between West 33rd and 34th Streets.

MSDC ACTIONS

- Enter into various real estate transactions as summarized in Chapter 1, "Project Description."

E. FRAMEWORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

For each technical area, the EIS provides a description of existing conditions for the year 2005, as well as an assessment of conditions in the Future Without the Proposed Action and the Future With the Proposed Action. Much of the baseline analysis of existing conditions reflects the original data gathering and surveys conducted for the Hudson Yards Rezoning and Redevelopment Plan (Hudson Yards project) Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS), which is based on a 2003 existing conditions analysis year. To the extent that information has been obtained to update the baseline, it is incorporated in the EIS. Several development projects were under construction at that time and have subsequently been completed. The existing condition descriptions of various study areas in technical chapters of this EIS have been updated to reflect this fact. For detailed quantitative analyses associated with traffic and transportation, air quality, and noise impact assessment, the 2003 data will continue to serve as the existing condition baseline unless otherwise noted in the EIS.

FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Future Without the Proposed Action is assessed for the same analysis years, 2010 and 2015, using existing conditions as a baseline and adding to it changes known or expected to be in place at various times in the future. For this EIS, there are two types of anticipated future development—those known projects that are expected to occur with or without the Hudson Yards project, and those projects anticipated to occur specifically as a result of the Hudson Yards project.

In addition, USPS has initiated the consolidation of mail processing to the Morgan Facility, and, if the proposed project does not go forward, USPS would not be expected to leave the Farley Complex in its current reduced state of occupancy or utilization. Therefore, it is anticipated that USPS would continue to optimize mail processing operations and development opportunities without the Proposed Action. For No Build analysis purposes, it has been assumed that the USPS would continue to occupy about 650,100 sf, or just under half the space in the Farley Complex. The uses would comprise roughly the same 265,000 sf of the USPS retail and office facilities included in the proposed project's reasonable worst-case development scenario, along

with approximately 400,000 sf of space for administrative and mail sorting uses, which is basically equivalent to the space that would be devoted to the proposed Moynihan Station under the proposed project. The USPS would use this space to consolidate administrative and mail sorting functions that currently are fragmented in smaller spaces and leased spaces elsewhere in Manhattan. The potential commercial component has been assumed to be the same as analyzed in the 2003 Draft SEA, namely, 436,000 sf of office space and 248,000 sf of retail space.

FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION

Since the preferred designated developer is expected to exercise the option to develop up to 1 million zsf in unused development rights within 10 years of the project start-up, the full development effects of the project could be realized as early as 2010 or at some point thereafter. For this reason, the EIS examines existing conditions as well as two future Build Years, 2010 and 2015. For purposes of analysis, the technical chapters of this EIS assess two reasonable worst-case development scenarios for the proposed project. Scenario 1 includes the development of Phase I by 2010 and the Phase II development of a commercial overbuild by 2015. Scenario 2 includes the development of Phase I by 2010 and the Phase II development of a residential or mixed-use building on the Development Transfer Site, which would be constructed concurrently with Phase I and completed by 2010.

ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives selected for analysis in the EIS were derived from options suggested during the public scoping process and identified through internal planning studies and initial feedback from potential site developers. The analysis of alternatives includes the No Action alternative and variations of the potential Phase II development. The No Action alternative was developed in coordination with the USPS as current and future owner if the proposed project were not to go forward. Under the No Action alternative USPS would continue to operate the main post office retail facility and would continue to occupy the space anticipated for the Moynihan Station with administrative and mail sorting functions, and most of the Western Annex would be used for mixed-use commercial development.

The EIS considers two alternatives that arose from the developer designation process. The first alternative is the possibility that the Phase I (2010) program could include, in addition to the Moynihan Station, an alternative use for the Western Annex and Farley building—a relocated Madison Square Garden (MSG). Like the proposed project, this alternative (Arena Alternative) would include the 1.1 million-gross-square-foot building on the Development Transfer Site, also completed in Phase I (2010). Because MSG would move from its present location, the Arena Alternative would include redevelopment of the current MSG site by 2015. The second alternative considers utilizing all of the unused development rights from the Farley Complex, which would add approximately one million square feet of additional development potential at an undetermined location. A station-only alternative has not been considered, because it is not financially viable at this time. (The 1999 EA describes the impacts that could occur if only a station were to be constructed within the Farley Building.)

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PROJECT AREA ACTIONS

No. 7 Subway Extension–Hudson Yards Rezoning and Redevelopment Plan

The Farley Complex is located within the Special Hudson Yards District and the proposed project uses—continued USPS presence, new Moynihan Station, and mixed-use development—

are consistent with the new zoning in place for Hudson Yards. In addition, the new mixed-use development is considered to be within the overall development envelope estimated by New York City for the Special Hudson Yards District and analyzed in the Hudson Yards FGEIS. As a result, this EIS examines site-specific potential environmental impacts by carefully integrating the comprehensive area-wide environmental studies that have been recently completed as part of the Hudson Yards project. Completed in November 2004, the Hudson Yards FGEIS incorporates several years of data gathering and environmental analyses and represents the most current assemblage of approved CEQR baseline descriptions of existing conditions and directly applicable impact assessment of future conditions. For these reasons, the specific study areas established for the Farley/Moynihan project EIS will utilize the relevant information from the Hudson Yards FGEIS, with updated information as appropriate.

Access to the Region's Core (ARC)

The ambitious plans for greatly improving trans-Hudson rail service, currently being examined by NJT and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, include a focus on the area immediately around Penn Station and the Farley Complex. A variety of options are being considered as part of the planning process, with the most directly relevant option to the proposed project including improved platform access of certain tracks used by NJT. The proposed improvements would enable full utilization by riders using the proposed Moynihan Station and are the same as examined in the 2003 Draft SEA prepared for the earlier version of the proposed project. As such, they are assumed to be fully in place by the 2010 analysis year of this EIS when the Moynihan Station is expected to be complete.

F. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2010

For analysis purposes, there are two development scenarios that have been assumed for the proposed project, as described above. For the 2010 analysis year, Scenario 1 assumes construction of Phase I of the proposed project. Under Scenario 2, an additional 1.1 million gsf of development would occur at the Development Transfer Site by 2010. This development would occur concurrently with Phase I.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

LAND USE

The proposed changes to the use, size, and scale of the Farley Complex under Phase I would be consistent with land use under existing conditions and in the Future Without the Proposed Action. The proposed project would support the transformation of the area around the Farley Complex into a major dense Manhattan district with a mix of office, residential, and hotel uses supported by the new Moynihan Station transportation hub. The primarily residential or mixed-use building that could be constructed on the Development Transfer Site would be consistent with the strong residential and mixed-use presence to the west of the Development Transfer Site in the 34th Street corridor, Hell's Kitchen neighborhood, and Garment Center. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the land use character of the project site or the study area in general and would not result in significant adverse land use impacts.

ZONING

To facilitate the use of the Farley Building for rail service, it is anticipated that ESDC would exercise its override power with respect to New York City zoning regulations. Although rail passenger stations are not as-of-right under the New York City Zoning Resolution, the proposed project would not conflict with overall zoning policy for the Farley Complex site. The proposed changes to the Farley Complex would simply extend existing rail passenger service westward. The proposed project would be consistent with the substantive requirements established by the New York City Zoning Resolution for the construction of railroad passenger stations. Phase I of the proposed project would be consistent with the goal of the Special Hudson Yards District to promote a high-density, predominantly commercial or mixed-use area link, and would therefore be consistent with the City's public policy.

With the Scenario 2 development of a primarily residential or mixed-use building on the Development Transfer Site, it is anticipated that ESDC would exercise its override power on portions of the New York City Zoning Resolution for waivers of bulk regulations. This would not change local zoning laws or conflict with the overall zoning policy for the site or area. The proposed development would be consistent with the goals of the Special Midtown District to promote high-density development. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the development of Scenario 2 would have a significant adverse impact on zoning.

In addition, development of Phase II under Scenario 2 would eliminate a portion of the public plaza area that was originally utilized as a zoning bonus in establishing the overall allowable floor area for One Penn Plaza. In coordination with the City, the property owner may pursue opportunities to integrate new public spaces and amenities to compensate for the loss of the plaza area.

PUBLIC POLICY

Public policy at the project site or in the study area is not expected to change in the Future With the Proposed Action by 2010. The proposed project would bring new activity to the Farley Complex block for the new Moynihan Station rail facility and commercial uses, and therefore it would be compatible with the goals of the 34th Street Partnership Business Improvement District (BID). The proposed project would have no influence on the recommendations or development in the Fashion Center BID or the Chelsea 197-a plan. Therefore, the proposed project would be compatible with these policies.

Phase I of the proposed project would be consistent with the public policy goal of federal, state, and city agencies to redevelop the Farley Complex as a safe, efficient, and contemporary intermodal transportation facility and commercial center to meet New York's future transportation needs.

Scenario 2 would be financed through the New York State HFA's 80/20 Taxable Bond Financing Program and would be consistent with public policy and that agency's goal of "improving the lives of New Yorkers by providing low cost, flexible financing for the creation and preservation of high quality, affordable multifamily housing."

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The proposed project would not directly displace any residents, businesses, institutions, or employment at the Farley Complex. Although the Scenario 2 development would displace three

businesses on the Development Transfer Site, there would be no anticipated socioeconomic impact as these businesses are typical of a midtown location.

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse socioeconomic impacts due to indirect residential displacement. The 940 apartments that could be introduced by the proposed project with the Scenario 2 development on the Development Transfer Site would be offered at rents comparable to residential rents for other modern, newly-constructed market-rate apartments in the surrounding area and housing that is expected to be built in the study area. The market-rate rents that are expected would reflect, rather than alter, existing conditions and trends within the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, the project's use of the 80/20 housing program can be expected to add up to 188 of the 940 units as affordable (conservatively assuming all units to be rental units). Since there is no direct loss of existing residential units as a result of the project, these represent new affordable units in the study area.

The population potentially vulnerable to indirect residential displacement within the study area is limited and consists primarily of residents of non-rent-regulated apartments and residents of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) dwellings. It is reasonable to assume that with effective enforcement of the laws regulating tenancy of SRO dwellings and against illegal actions on the part of landlords, effective protection against displacement would be afforded to these residents even with the elevated market pressures that already exist in the study area.

The incremental pedestrian flow from the proposed project would not have any effect on commercial property values within the study area east of the Farley Complex, where there are already heavy volumes of pedestrian traffic created by a multitude of uses. Commercial establishments within thoroughfares west of the Farley Complex, as well as immediately north along West 33rd Street and south along West 31st Street, could experience rent increases, as their property values could rise due to the increased pedestrian traffic. The commercial establishments that would be most vulnerable to indirect displacement would be those that may not be able to capitalize effectively from the increased pedestrian flow. However, due to increased development as a result of the Hudson Yards rezoning, these thoroughfares will experience upward rent pressures in the Future with or Without the Proposed Action. Therefore, the incremental pedestrian traffic generated by the unique elements of the proposed project would not significantly affect property values in the study area.

The proposed project would not significantly affect business conditions in any industry or any category of business within or outside the study area, nor would it indirectly reduce employment or adversely affect the viability of any industry or category of business. The 314 hotel rooms introduced by the proposed project under Scenario 1 would not be of an amount that could jeopardize the overall viability of the hotel industry. Overall, the proposed project would reinforce existing business sectors, and provide new office space to retain and attract businesses.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

In the Future With the Proposed Action, it is anticipated that there would be no significant adverse impacts on the New York Police Department's operations. The proposed project is not expected to displace existing fire station houses or related emergency medical service (EMS) facilities and, on its own, would be unlikely to result in impacts to these facilities at current service levels. In the context of the larger Hudson Yards project, it is noted that the New York City Fire Department believes it would need additional resources, including a new firehouse, to continue to provide adequate fire protection throughout Hudson Yards, which includes the Farley Complex. Therefore, now and into the future with this mitigation in place by or after

2010 in response to overall demand generated by the Hudson Yards project, no additional mitigation measures would be required to address the increased fire service demand resulting directly from the proposed project.

In Phase I of the project, no new residential population would be introduced to the study area and there would be no new student population or impacts to area schools. In 2010 with Scenario 2, it is estimated that about 102 elementary school students, along with 20 intermediate school students, and 32 high school students would be generated. This new demand of 154 students would be a modest contribution to the more than 3,700 new students anticipated between 2010 and 2025 with the introduction of residential development generated by the Hudson Yards and West Chelsea Rezonings and other known projects in the study area. Overall, as disclosed in the Hudson Yards FGEIS, this new enrollment would create a significant shortage of seats. Mitigation identified in the Hudson Yards FGEIS includes remedies to increase capacity through administrative actions, expansion, or new construction. No impacts or additional mitigation measures beyond those resulting from, or provided by, the Hudson Yards rezoning would occur with, or be required by, the proposed project.

OPEN SPACE

The new residents and workers that could be introduced to the study area as a direct result of the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources within the study area. By 2010, the open space ratios with the proposed project would increase slightly in the ¼-mile study area for Scenario 1, and would decrease by less than 5 percent in the ½-mile study area for Scenario 2. In addition, development of the Development Transfer Site by 2010 under Scenario 2 would result in the loss of approximately 0.40 acres of private publicly-accessible open space. These changes are below the CEQR threshold of the decrease of 5 percent or more that would warrant further analysis beyond the preliminary screening. In addition, it is noted that the proposed project itself helps to alleviate the deficiency by providing substantial and high quality areas of indoor public space. These interior public spaces are the light-filled intermodal hall and the 32nd Street pedestrian corridor between the intermodal hall and Ninth Avenue.

SHADOWS

The shadows cast by the Development Transfer Site building are not expected to have significant adverse impacts on any of the open spaces or historic resources with sunlight-dependent features in the surrounding area. The 720-foot tall building would cast incremental shadows on the Farley Complex train concourse and intermodal hall skylights, and the open space at One Penn Plaza; however these shadows would not be considered significant due to their short duration and limited coverage. The largest incremental shadows cast by the Development Transfer Site building would be on the proposed intermodal hall skylight. Since the skylight would not exist without the project, the shadows on this resource are not considered a significant adverse impact, in accordance with CEQR methodology.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

The adaptive reuse of the Farley Complex and the restoration program would have overall beneficial effects on the structure, which would become a vibrant mixed-use facility with a new train station reminiscent of the original Pennsylvania Station. Although the architectural design of the new station spaces, commercial facilities, and the pedestrian corridor would be modern,

the final design of Phase I would be developed in consultation among the preferred developer, ESDC/MSDC, and the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) to ensure that such design is compatible with the historic character of the Farley Complex. The framework for this ongoing consultation will be set forth in a Programmatic Agreement that will be entered into by FRA, ESDC, MSDC, OPRHP acting in its capacity as the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Developer C (contingent upon its final designation as the preferred developer), and perhaps the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (the Council). ESDC has provided OPRHP with the conceptual design for the project as proposed by Developer C, and has consulted with that office with respect to such design. In addition, ESDC has presented the conceptual design for the Developer C proposal to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. Based upon information received as a result of such consultation and discussions, ESDC and MSDC do not expect that any significant impacts would be caused to historic resources as a result of the Developer C proposal. As would be stated in the Programmatic Agreement, in the event that potential adverse impacts on historic resources are identified pursuant to that process, mitigation would be developed by or under the direction of ESDC/MSDC, in consultation with OPRHP. In addition, construction protection measures would be developed and implemented in consultation with OPRHP to avoid adverse effects on the Farley Complex exterior and interior spaces to be preserved as part of the project proposed by Developer C.

No adverse visual or contextual effects on surrounding architectural resources are expected from Phase I of the proposed project. To avoid adverse construction effects on three resources across West 33rd Street from the project site, a construction protection plan would be developed.

Under Phase II of Scenario 2, it is not expected that a new building on the Development Transfer Site would have adverse physical effects on architectural resources. It is also not expected to have adverse visual or contextual effects on architectural resources. It would be in keeping with the mixed-use character of the study area and would be similar in height, massing, and design to One Penn Plaza and the development projected for construction on Ninth Avenue on the Hudson Yards Projected Development Site 33. The proposed building would not eliminate or screen significant publicly accessible views of a resource, isolate an architectural resource from or alter its visual relationship with the streetscape, or introduce an incompatible visual element to a resource's setting. Further, construction of a building on the Development Transfer Site rather than an overbuild with the unused development rights has been proposed to preserve the architectural integrity of the Farley Complex. Although the new building would eliminate some existing views of the Farley Complex from the public plaza on the Development Transfer Site, the Farley Complex would continue to be prominent in views from Eighth Avenue.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The form of the Farley Complex would be altered in the Future With the Proposed Action by 2010. Under the Developer A and B proposals, the new intermodal hall would separate the two integrated buildings on the block with a new, modern interlayer. The glass and metal skylight above the intermodal hall would become a notable element of the building, making the building more visible and interesting at night when it is expected to be lit. The Developer C proposal includes a skylight that would not rise as high above the Farley Complex and would be set back from the north and south building façades, and thus would be less visible than the skylight envisioned in the proposals of Developers A and B. The glass and metal skylight of the new intermodal hall would not be visible from the majority of the study area. However, views of the

Farley Complex in which the skylight would be visible would change, as the skylight could become a notable element of the complex depending upon the final design

The restoration of the Farley Complex would be expected to enhance the appearance of the building. The creation of the intermodal hall and the midblock entrances to the Farley Complex at West 31st and 33rd Streets would alter the Complex's relationship to these streets. In the Developer C proposal, the midblock sections of the Farley Complex would be retained and restored at the new entrances, while those sections would be removed under the Developer A and B proposals. The streetscapes of Ninth and Eighth Avenues and West 31st and 33rd Streets surrounding the Farley Complex would also be expected to change considerably with the proposed project. Phase I of the proposed project would not involve any changes to block form, street pattern or hierarchy, building arrangement, bulk, use or type, topography, or natural features within the area surrounding the Farley Complex.

Under Scenario 2, the proposed residential or mixed-use building on the Development Transfer Site would be considerably taller and bulkier than the existing one-story commercial buildings that are currently located on the site. The building would be taller than any other building in the surrounding area, with the exception of One Penn Plaza and the new development on Hudson Yards Projected Development Site 33. The uses proposed for the Development Transfer Site would be consistent with existing uses in the area. The streetscapes surrounding the Development Transfer Site would also be expected to change, as the development would eliminate the elevated pedestrian circulation space that currently exists on the Development Transfer Site, would form stronger streetwalls at this location, and would bring greater pedestrian and vehicular activity to the area. In addition, the view corridor of Eighth Avenue would change dramatically with the development on the Development Transfer Site.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Under Phase I of the proposed project, the proposed changes to the use, size, and scale of the Farley Complex would be consistent with land use under existing conditions and in the Future Without the Proposed Action. The proposed project would improve the appearance and activity level of the Eighth and Ninth Avenue streetscapes. The proposed project would also be expected to attract new office workers, residents, or visitors to the project site and surrounding area who would utilize the neighborhood streets. These changes are anticipated to improve the neighborhood character of the area immediately surrounding the Farley Complex between West 31st and West 34th Streets and Eighth and Ninth Avenues. The proposed project provides for the beneficial reuse of the historic Farley Complex and while the rehabilitation will result in certain modifications to the structure, it is noted that the building exterior would be restored and the final design would be developed in consultation with OPRHP. Other analyses in this EIS indicate that while the Phase I component of the proposed project would bring physical changes to the existing building, new uses to the site, and generate increased activity at and around the site (i.e., additional traffic and pedestrian movements), these changes would not adversely affect neighborhood character. Although the proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic and pedestrian impacts, all of those impacts would be mitigated, and, therefore, there would be no significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

With the implementation of appropriate measures, including pre-construction surveys and Health and Safety Plans during demolition and construction, no significant adverse impacts related to

hazardous materials would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed project. Following construction, although hazardous materials would likely still remain in both the Farley Complex and the subsurface, with the continued implementation of appropriate procedures (to properly manage asbestos, lead paint, etc.), there would be no further potential for adverse impacts.

Although a garage with fuel tanks previously existed at and immediately east of the Development Transfer Site, any residual soil contamination from that or other previous uses would have been removed during the construction of the eight below grade levels of parking at the site, which extend well into bedrock. As such, even if new construction were to require additional excavation, there is a very low potential for encountering subsurface hazardous materials.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The proposed project's generated demand for water is not expected to significantly affect the local water pressures, and would represent an insignificant increase in the average amount of water consumed in Manhattan. As a result, this added demand is not expected to overburden the City's water supply or the local conveyance system. The proposed project would also comply with the City's water conservation measures as mandated by Local Law 19.

The study area would continue to be served by the North River WPCP in 2010. Under peak conditions, the combined sewage generated by either scenario would represent a relatively small increase in demand compared with the overall flow to the North River Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). Similarly, the proposed project is not expected to overburden the local conveyance system, particularly with the anticipated improvements in sewer mains associated with the larger Hudson Yards project.

It is estimated that the proposed project would generate an estimated peak demand of 19 and 92 tons per week (tpw) of municipal and commercial solid waste, respectively. These volumes would represent a small increase over the City's daily solid waste generation of 12,000 tons per day of municipal waste collected by the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) and 10,000 tons per day of commercial waste collected by private carters. This estimated increase would require five DSNY truck trips per week and three truck trips per week by private carters.

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to energy. Coordination with Con Edison would ensure that adequate electrical, gas, and potentially steam services would be in place to serve the project site. In compliance with the New York State Energy Conservation Code, the basic designs would incorporate all required energy conservation measures, including meeting requirements relating to energy efficiency and combined thermal transmittance. The proposed project would be substantially more energy-efficient than conventional pre-code buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse energy impacts, and does not require a detailed energy assessment.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

The traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project for the 2010 Build conditions indicated that there would be significant adverse impacts at 4, 4, 4, and 11 intersections during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively.

The intersections where significant adverse impacts have been projected are summarized in the table below.

Although there are anticipated to be significant adverse traffic impacts at several locations for 2010 Build conditions, there would be no significant adverse parking impacts. With signal retiming and other mitigation measures, there are not anticipated to be any unmitigatable adverse traffic impacts. The applicable mitigation measures are described in the "Mitigation" summary below.

Table S-2
2010 Traffic Impact Locations

Intersection	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Sixth Ave & W. 35th St	■	■	■	*NI*
Seventh Ave & W. 33rd St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Seventh Ave & W. 34th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 30th St	■	*NI*	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 31st St	*NI*	■	■	■
Eighth Ave & W. 33rd St	*NI*	■	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 34th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Ninth Ave & W. 30th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Ninth Ave & W. 31st St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Ninth Ave & W. 34th St	■	■	■	■
Dyer Ave & W. 31st St	■	*NI*	■	■
Tenth Ave & W. 31st St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Number of Intersections with Impacts	**4**	**4**	**4**	**11**

Notes:
NI= No Impact
■= Traffic Impact requiring mitigation

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

The transit and pedestrian analysis for the proposed project for the 2010 Build conditions indicated that there would not be any significant adverse subway impacts. However, there would be impacts at 14 pedestrian locations. With widening of the adversely impacted corners and crosswalks, among other mitigation measures, there are not anticipated to be any unmitigable significant adverse impacts as a result of the proposed project. The pedestrian mitigation measures are summarized in the "Mitigation" summary below.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would not have significant adverse impacts from mobile sources, regional emissions, or from industrial facilities. Carbon monoxide concentrations would not exceed the City's *de minimis* criteria. $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed the interim guidance criteria regarding $PM_{2.5}$ impacts, and there would be an overall decrease in total emissions of other potentially hazardous compounds. Thus, the proposed project would not have significant adverse impacts from mobile source or regional emissions, and would be consistent with the New York State Implementation Plan for the control for ozone and carbon monoxide. In addition, a screening analysis demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial facilities on the proposed project.

NOISE

Project-generated traffic would not be expected to produce significant increases in noise levels at any location. In addition, with the proposed building design measures, noise levels within the proposed buildings—the Farley Complex and the Development Transfer Site building—would comply with all applicable criteria. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

Although there would be localized, temporary disruptions from either project scenario, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse construction related impacts in the Future With the Proposed Action in the year 2010. Throughout construction, USPS retail uses and Penn Station operations would continue in the Farley Building. Some USPS administrative functions would also remain, but these functions would be relocated within the Farley Complex. NJT, the Long Island Railroad and Amtrak would continue their operations uninterrupted within Penn Station. The Eighth Avenue subway lines would remain in operation throughout the construction period. With the implementation of applicable controls and measures, no significant adverse impacts are expected as a result of the proposed project. In addition, prior to construction on any LIRR or NYCT controlled or shared areas within Penn Station, ESDC and the preferred developer will develop a construction agreement with MTA and its constituent agencies, which will include measures to minimize, to the extent practicable, temporary disruptions to transit and railroad operations and pedestrian circulation during the course of construction.

PUBLIC HEALTH

There are no anticipated adverse impacts to public health in the areas of Infrastruture, Noise, and Air Quality, and Construction. There are potential impacts with hazardous materials, but with appropriate measures in place including pre-construction surveys and Health and Safety Plans, no significant impact to public health is expected as a result of the proposed project.

G. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2015

In the Future With the Proposed Action in 2015, the construction of a 1 million-sf commercial overbuild on the Western Annex is the only project development scenario. The overbuild on the Western Annex would be in addition to the Phase I redevelopment. There would be no changes to the Development Transfer Site by 2015, which would continue to be occupied by the one-story retail buildings and public open space.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

LAND USE

The commercial overbuild would be consistent with future land uses in the study area. With a 1 million-sf office overbuild on the Western Annex, the proposed project would support a strong commercial presence on the blocks surrounding the Farley Complex, and development of a commercial overbuild would integrate the Farley Complex into the emerging 24-hour mixed-use character of Hudson Yards. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals to transform Hudson Yards into a vibrant, transit-oriented, mixed-use urban neighborhood.

In Scenario 1, the proposed project would support the transformation of the Farley Corridor Subdistrict of the Special Hudson Yards District into a major dense Manhattan district with a mix of office, residential, and hotel uses supported by the new Moynihan Station transportation hub. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the land use character of the study area and would not result in significant adverse land use impacts. The commercial overbuild scenario would also be consistent with the overall 43 million sf development projections for Hudson Yards. Although the Farley Complex was not identified as a specific projected development site, the 1 million sf of overbuild on the Western Annex would be within the overall development envelope for Hudson Yards. This development would establish a strong link between the high-density commercial corridor to the west and Midtown Manhattan to the east. It would also be consistent with the abutting land uses to the west, where mixed-use developments comprising office, hotel, residential, and open space are all projected to occur.

ZONING

The development of a commercial overbuild on the Western Annex would be consistent with the requirements of the Special Hudson Yards District and, specifically, the Farley Corridor Subdistrict. The proposed development would be consistent with provisions that permit high density commercial development. It is expected that ESDC would have to exercise its override powers on portions of the New York City Zoning Resolution. However, the use and size of the commercial overbuild would be consistent with the provisions of the Farley Corridor Subdistrict, in which high density development is permitted given the area's excellent access to the transit system. With the additional 1 million sf of overbuild, the Farley Complex would contain approximately 6.6 FAR of built floor area, which would be less than the maximum FAR of 10.0 permitted for commercial uses under current zoning.

PUBLIC POLICY

Public policy at the project site or in the study area is not expected to change in the Future With the Proposed Action. The potential commercial overbuild would bring new activity to the Farley Complex block and therefore would be compatible with the goals of the 34th Street Partnership. It would have no influence on the recommendations or development in the Fashion Center BID, or the Chelsea 197-a plan.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

There would be no direct or indirect residential displacement under Scenario 1. The construction of the overbuild would introduce approximately 1 million sf of commercial office space. While this is a substantial amount of office space, it would represent only a small fraction of the total office space in the socioeconomic impact study area. The study area already contains a critical mass of commercial office use such that any incremental effect of the proposed project on the residential desirability of the area would be negligible. Residential rents in the study area are already influenced by the area's close proximity to major office concentrations, including Penn Plaza and Midtown Manhattan's Central Business District.

The proposed project in the 2015 build year would not result in any direct business or institutional displacement. The study area already has a well-established commercial office presence such that the introduction of 1 million sf under the proposed project would not significantly alter existing economic patterns. In addition, in the Future Without the Proposed Action by 2015 at least 2.17 million and up to 3.91 million sf of office space will be developed

on the block immediately west of the Farley Complex, further strengthening the area's commercial identity. The commercial office space under the proposed project would reflect, rather than alter or accelerate, existing economic patterns in the study area.

If the 1 million sf of office space were to be developed as an overbuild on the Western Annex, it would create additional pedestrian flows in the immediate vicinity, which could increase commercial property values and thus rents. However, any potential indirect business displacement would likely have already occurred in the Future Without the Proposed Action. If, in fact, commercial businesses are indirectly displaced in the Future Without the Proposed Action, the retail uses that would re-occupy the storefronts of those displaced businesses would likely be compatible with the needs of the worker population generated by the proposed project. Therefore, businesses in the immediate vicinity could potentially benefit from increased worker pedestrian flows, increasing their overall sales and avoiding displacement in the Future With the Proposed Action.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The addition of a new commercial overbuild on the Farley Complex as the Phase II development under Scenario 1 would add additional workers to the study area and create a new building that could potentially create new demands on the fire fighting and emergency resources of the study area. However, the incremental demand created by the project is within the total projected demand as analyzed for the comprehensive Hudson Yards FGEIS. Mitigation measures planned for the Hudson Yards rezoning would provide for adequate fire protection levels for the proposed project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those provided by the Hudson Yards rezoning project would be required and no incremental significant adverse impacts would result.

OPEN SPACE

The proposed project would introduce 4,000 workers to the study area by 2015. With the population increase expected to result from the proposed project and no change in the open space inventory anticipated, the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 workers would be below DCP guidelines. However, as in the Future Without the Proposed Action in 2015, the open spaces immediately outside of the study area would continue to be a factor in relieving the deficiency of open space.

While all open space ratios would remain below the DCP guidelines in the Future With the Proposed Action in 2015, no significant adverse impacts are expected to result from completion of the proposed project. Open space ratios in the ¼-mile study area would decrease by less than 3 percent with completion of the project. Several large open spaces immediately outside the open space study area, such as Hudson River Park, would continue to relieve the deficiency in open space. With a less than 5 percent decrease in open space ratios and the availability of large nearby open spaces, it is not expected that there would be significant adverse open space impacts with the completion of the proposed project.

SHADOWS

The 800-foot-tall commercial overbuild would cast incremental shadows on the proposed intermodal hall skylight, the West Side Jewish Center (a historic resource with sunlight-dependant features), and the planned East Caemmerer Yards open space. The incremental shadows on the West Side Jewish Center, and the East Caemmerer Yards would not result in

significant adverse impacts due to their short duration and limited coverage. As in the Future with the Proposed Action in 2010, the largest shadows cast by the overbuild would fall on the proposed intermodal hall skylight. In general, while there are some incremental shadows generated on the proposed skylight, the extent and duration of the shadows would not be considered a significant adverse impact. Moreover, as a sunlight-dependent feature being introduced as part of the proposed project, the potential shadow effect on the proposed skylight created by another element of the project is not considered a significant adverse environmental impact.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

While the commercial use of the overbuild would be consistent with the overall adaptive reuse of the Farley Complex, a building constructed above it would have adverse visual and physical impacts on the historic resource. Therefore, the final design of the overbuild would be developed in consultation with OPRHP, along with a construction protection plan.

Since construction of an overbuild above the Farley Complex could cause inadvertent adverse physical impacts to architectural resources located within 90 feet of construction activities, a construction protection plan would be developed and implemented for three resources located directly across West 33rd Street.

It is not expected that development of an overbuild atop the Western Annex would have adverse contextual or visual effects on any of the architectural resources located in the study area. The use, height, and design of the overbuild would be in keeping with the character of development in the study area. Further, the proposed overbuild would not eliminate or screen publicly accessible views of a resource. Nor would it isolate an architectural resource from or alter its visual relationship with the streetscape. Nor would it introduce an incompatible visual element to a resource's setting.

URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The commercial overbuild on the Western Annex would involve considerable alterations to the Farley Complex. The Western Annex would become a base for the overbuild, which would become the focal point of this portion of the complex; however, through the choice of materials and style, and by setting the overbuild well back from the edges of the Western Annex, the proposed project could create a composition in which each component is clearly different from the other, allowing each to retain its individual identity and essential character. The expected use of glass and metal for the overbuild would serve to highlight and differentiate the modern layer from the historic masonry base. However, it is also possible that a portion of the West 33rd Street façade of the Western Annex could be concealed by a glass curtain wall for the overbuild, in which case, views of this portion of the façade would be lost and the differentiation of the historic masonry building from the modern structure above would be less clear.

In views from Eighth Avenue, the expected modern design of the new overbuild would be congruent with the new buildings on the Hudson Yards Projected Development Sites 32 and 33 across Ninth Avenue, forming a contrasting backdrop to the historic masonry structures of the Farley Complex. From the majority of the study area, views of the Farley Complex would be mainly of the overbuild alone as part of the new skyline of Ninth Avenue, and the juxtaposition of the historic masonry base and the tall, modern structure would not be disruptive.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The commercial overbuild would be in keeping with the study area, which encompasses portions of four districts and neighborhoods including a superblock corridor that contains the project site, Hell's Kitchen, the Garment Center/Herald Square commercial district, and the residential neighborhood of Chelsea. The proposed project would not introduce any new economic activities or alter existing economic patterns and would not directly displace any uses or properties. The proposed project would also not directly or indirectly displace residents, workers, or visitors who form the customer base of existing businesses in the study area or significantly affect business conditions in any industry or category of business within the study area. Therefore, the proposed socioeconomic effects of the proposed overbuild would not have a significant adverse impact on neighborhood character in the entire study area.

While the additional commercial use would be consistent with overall adaptive reuse of the Farley Complex, a tall building constructed above it would have an adverse impact on the historic resource. To partially mitigate the adverse impact on the Farley Complex, the final design of the overbuild would be developed in consultation with OPRHP. Where the selected proposal would have potential adverse impacts, mitigation would be developed and stipulated in the LOR to be executed with OPRHP. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any alteration of the historic character of the Farley Complex would significantly impact neighborhood character in the superblock corridor or other portions of the study area.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

With the implementation of appropriate measures, including pre-construction surveys and Health and Safety Plans during demolition and construction (and track-level excavation, if required for the overbuild), no significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials would be expected to occur as a result of the proposed project. Following construction, although hazardous materials would likely still remain in both the Farley Complex and the subsurface, with the continued implementation of appropriate procedures (to properly manage asbestos, lead paint, etc.), there would be no further potential for adverse impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE

In 2015, the proposed project would generate an insignificant increase in the average water consumption in Manhattan; therefore, no significant impacts to the City's water supply are expected as a result of the proposed project. Redevelopment of the project site would result in a net increase in sanitary sewage, which would represent a relatively small increase in demand compared with the overall flow to the North River WPCP, which would continue to operate within the permitted limit of 170 million gallons per day (mgd). The impervious coverage on the project site is not expected to change as a result of the proposed project, and therefore stormwater volumes from the project site would not increase. No significant adverse impacts related to sanitary sewage are expected.

The proposed project would result in an increased demand for private carter solid waste services. In 2015, the projected development would generate approximately 107 tpw of commercial solid waste. This amount would represent a small increase over the City's daily commercial solid waste generation. The proposed project would comply with the City's recycling program and would be designed to accommodate source separation of recyclables in conformance with City recycling regulations. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to solid waste streams or recycling in the City.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

The traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project for the 2015 conditions indicated that there would be significant adverse impacts at 9, 8, 10, and 15 intersections during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively.

The intersections where significant adverse impacts have been projected are summarized in Table S-3 below.

Table S-3
2015 Traffic Impact Locations

Intersection	Weekday AM	Weekday Midday	Weekday PM	Saturday Midday
Broadway/Sixth Ave & W. 34th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Sixth Ave & W. 31st St	■	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*
Sixth Ave & W. 35th St	■	■	■	*NI*
Seventh Ave & W. 30th St	*NI*	■	*NI*	■
Seventh Ave & W. 33rd St	*NI*	*NI*	■	■
Seventh Ave & W. 34th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 30th St	■	■	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 31st St	■	■	■	■
Eighth Ave & W. 32nd St	*NI*	■	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 33rd St	*NI*	■	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 34th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Eighth Ave & W. 35th St	*NI*	*NI*	■	*NI*
Ninth Ave & W. 30th St	*NI*	*NI*	*NI*	■
Ninth Ave & W. 31st St	*NI*	*NI*	■	■
Ninth Ave & W. 34th St	■	■	■	■
Dyer Ave & W. 31st St	■	*NI*	■	■
Tenth Ave & W. 30th St	*NI*	*NI*	■	*NI*
Tenth Ave & W. 31st St	■	*NI*	■	■
Tenth Ave & W. 33rd St	■	■	*NI*	■
Tenth Ave & W. 34th St	■	*NI*	■	*NI*
Number of Intersections with Impacts	**9**	**8**	**10**	**15**

NI= No Impact
■= Traffic Impact requiring mitigation

Although there are anticipated to be significant adverse traffic impacts at several locations for 2015 Build conditions, there would be no significant adverse parking impacts. With signal retiming and other mitigation measures, there are not anticipated to be any unmitigatable adverse traffic impacts. The applicable mitigation measures are described in the "Mitigation" summary below.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

The transit and pedestrian analysis for the proposed project for the 2015 Build conditions indicates that there would be no significant adverse impacts at subway stair locations. The proposed project would be designed to achieve the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) goals for pedestrian circulation (LOS C/D) in areas controlled by MTA or its constituent agencies, including the LIRR and MTA NYCT, to the maximum extent practicable. Final design of project components located in LIRR or NYCT controlled or shared areas are subject to the approval of the MTA and its constituent agencies, to the extent required under MTA's Joint Facilities Agreement with Amtrak. Moreover, the final design of the proposed project would be developed in consultation with MTA and its constituent agencies, as well as NJT and Amtrak, in order to ensure that such design provides for efficient transportation operations and pedestrian circulation.

There would be impacts at 18 street level locations (1 sidewalk and 17 corners/crosswalks). With widening of a portion of a sidewalk and the various crosswalks, among other mitigation measures, there are not anticipated to be any unmitigable significant adverse impacts as a result of the proposed project. Mitigation measures are summarized in the "Mitigation" summary below.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would not have significant adverse impacts from mobile sources, regional emissions, or from industrial facilities. Carbon monoxide concentrations would not exceed the City's *de minimis* criteria. $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations would not exceed the interim guidance criteria regarding $PM_{2.5}$ impacts, and there would be an overall decrease in total emissions of other potentially hazardous compounds. Thus, the proposed project would not have significant adverse impacts from mobile source or regional emissions, and would be consistent with the New York State Implementation Plan for the control for ozone and carbon monoxide. In addition, a screening analysis demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts from industrial facilities on the proposed project.

NOISE

The analysis concludes that project-generated traffic would not be expected to produce significant increases in noise levels at any location. In addition, with the proposed building design measures, noise levels within the proposed overbuild would comply with all applicable criteria. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

CONSTRUCTION

The commercial overbuild constructed over the Farley Complex would have no significant adverse construction impacts. With the implementation of applicable controls and measures, no significant adverse impacts in the area of historic resources, hazardous materials, transportation, air quality, and noise are expected during the construction period in the Future With the Proposed Action in the year 2015. In addition, prior to construction on any LIRR or NYCT controlled or shared areas within Penn Station, ESDC and the preferred developer will develop a construction agreement with MTA and its constituent agencies, which will include measures to minimize, to the extent practicable, temporary disruptions to transit and railroad operations and pedestrian circulation during the course of construction.

H. MITIGATION MEASURES

2010 BUILD YEAR MITIGATION MEASURES

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Overall, the adaptive reuse project and the restoration program established for the Farley Complex would have beneficial effects on the historic resource. However, to ensure compatibility with the historic character of the structure, and to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to the Farley Complex, the final design of the project would be developed in consultation with OPRHP, as stipulated in a Programmatic Agreement that will be entered into by FRA, ESDC, MSDC, OPRHP, Developer C (contingent upon its final designation as the preferred developer), and possibly the Council, in accordance with Section 106 regulations.

There has been ongoing consultation among ESDC/MSDC, Developer C, and OPRHP to reach an agreement on a Phase I design that would have no significant adverse impacts on the Farley Complex. In the event that any potential adverse impacts to the Farley Complex are identified, mitigation would be developed by ESDC/MSDC and/or the preferred developer under the direction of ESDC, in consultation with OPRHP, as stipulated in the Programmatic Agreement. Since construction of the Phase I development could have adverse physical impacts on three neighboring historic resources, the Programmatic Agreement will stipulate that a construction protection plan be developed and implemented in consultation with OPRHP.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Traffic impacts were identified for 2010 Build conditions at 4, 4, 4, and 11 intersections during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively. Measures were developed to mitigate these impacts that primarily involve retiming of signal controls to increase green time for impacted movements, and daylighting at intersection approaches to provide additional travel lanes or turn pockets. Table S-4 shows each of the locations with impacts, the mitigation measure suggested, and the resulting LOS at the intersection with the mitigation applied.

Table S-4
2010 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday AM Peak Hour

	2010 No Build				2010 Build				2010 Build Mitigation				
Analysis Locations	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Sixth Ave & W. 35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.93	47.8	D	TR	0.97	53.7	D+	TR	0.94	47.2	D	
Northbound	LT	0.68	11.5	B	LT	0.68	11.5	B	LT	0.70	12.4	B	
Intersection			*21.0*	*C*			*22.8*	*C*			*21.7*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W. 30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	1.05	66.5	E	LT	1.13	95.7	F+	LT	1.05	62.5	E	
Northbound	TR	0.77	19.5	B	TR	0.79	20.1	C	TR	0.85	24.9	C	
Intersection			*38.5*	*D*			*51.6*	*D*			*40.6*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	0.96	46.4	D	TR	1.07	75.6	E+	TR	0.97	45.8	D	
Westbound	DefL	0.59	37.0	D	DefL	0.60	40.0	D	DefL	0.60	37.8	D	
	T	0.40	15.0	B	T	0.38	14.7	B	T	0.36	12.8	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.88	28.2	C	LTR	0.89	29.1	C	LTR	0.98	42.1	D	
Intersection			*32.1*	*C*			*42.4*	*D*			*39.5*	*D*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	0.66	33.4	C	LTR	0.91	50.7	D+	LTR	0.85	41.0	D	
Northbound	LT	0.11	4.6	A	LT	0.11	4.6	A	LT	0.11	5.5	A	
Southbound	TR	0.40	10.2	B	TR	0.42	10.4	B	TR	0.44	11.5	B	
Intersection			*17.0*	*B*			*25.4*	*C*			*22.3*	*C*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service; "+" denotes significant adverse impact.

Table S-5*

2010 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday Midday Peak Hour

Analysis Locations	2010 No Build				2010 Build				2010 Build Mitigation				Mitigation Measures
	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	
Sixth Ave & W. 35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.94	48.2	D	TR	1.00	61.2	E+	TR	0.94	46.5	D	
Northbound	LT	0.59	10.3	B	LT	0.59	10.3	B	LT	0.61	12.0	B	
Intersection			*21.3*	*C*			*25.8*	*C*			*22.5*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.71	25.4	C	TR	0.68	24.2	C	TR	0.74	28.6	C	
Northbound	LT	1.03	47.6	D	LT	1.10	74.1	E+	LT	1.02	42.9	D	
Intersection			*43.1*	*D*			*64.5*	*E*			*40.1*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.24	13.6	B	TR	0.41	15.4	B	TR	0.43	16.9	B	
Northbound	LT	1.07	64.7	E	LT	1.10	79.1	E+	LT	1.04	55.0	D	
Intersection			*56.6*	*E*			*63.1*	*E*			*45.4*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	0.91	41.9	D	TR	1.05	72.4	E+	TR	0.95	44.1	D	
Westbound	DefL	0.74	43.9	D	DefL	0.76	47.7	D	DefL	0.76	45.9	D	
	T	0.53	16.8	B	T	0.53	16.9	B	T	0.50	14.6	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.76	23.9	C	LTR	0.78	24.4	C	LTR	0.86	29.8	C	
Intersection			*28.3*	*C*			*37.9*	*D*			*31.9*	*C*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

Table S-6*

2010 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday PM Peak Hour

Analysis Locations	2010 No Build				2010 Build				2010 Build Mitigation				Mitigation Measures
	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	
Sixth Ave & W. 35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.94	45.6	D	TR	0.99	55.3	E+	TR	0.94	42.6	D	
Northbound	LT	0.64	13.9	B	LT	0.64	13.9	B	LT	0.67	15.8	B	
Intersection			*23.9*	*C*			*27.5*	*C*			*24.6*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on west side of Eighth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane
Westbound	TR	1.12	94.2	F	TR	0.92	40.1	D	TR	0.92	40.1	D	
Northbound	LT	1.07	62.9	E	LT	1.14	88.9	F+	LT	0.86	22.7	C	
Intersection			*71.8*	*E*			*76.9*	*E*			*27.0*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	0.91	42.7	D	TR	1.07	77.1	E+	TR	0.93	40.6	D	
Westbound	DefL	0.47	29.8	C	DefL	0.48	33.1	C	DefL	0.47	29.5	C	
	T	0.43	15.4	B	T	0.41	15.1	B	T	0.37	12.5	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.61	20.9	C	LTR	0.63	21.2	C	LTR	0.71	26.0	C	
Intersection			*26.2*	*C*			*37.4*	*D*			*28.5*	*C*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	0.95	45.8	D	LTR	1.06	73.6	E+	LTR	0.96	44.0	D	
Northbound	LT	0.34	5.8	A	LT	0.34	5.8	A	LT	0.36	7.5	A	
Southbound	TR	0.11	7.9	A	TR	0.14	8.0	A	TR	0.14	9.4	A	
Intersection			*30.1*	*C*			*48.0*	*D*			*30.3*	*C*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

* Although this table appeared in Chapter 19, "Mitigation," in the DEIS, it was inadvertently left out of the Executive Summary. In this FEIS, only information that has changed as a result of revised analyses has been double underlined in the table.

Table S-7*

2010 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Saturday Midday Peak Hour

	2010 No Build				2010 Build				2010 Build Mitigation				
Analysis Locations	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Seventh Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.75	42.0	D	LT	0.91	55.5	E+	LT	0.83	44.5	D	
Southbound	TR	0.65	5.6	A	TR	0.78	7.3	A	TR	0.80	9.3	A	
Intersection			*11.2*	*B*			*15.9*	*B*			*15.6*	*B*	
Seventh Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on east side of Seventh Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	1.07	78.9	E	TR	1.17	113.9	F+	TR	1.07	75.4	E	
Westbound	LT	1.09	84.8	F	LT	1.17	115.1	F+	LT	1.02	60.7	E	
Southbound	T	0.89	21.6	C	T	0.99	33.7	C	T	0.81	20.2	C	
Intersection			*50.2*	*D*			*71.1*	*E*			*42.6*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	0.79	28.6	C	LT	1.02	58.7	E+	LT	0.97	44.3	D	
Northbound	TR	0.80	19.6	B	TR	0.86	21.9	C	TR	0.91	26.3	C	
Intersection			*22.3*	*C*			*34.4*	*C*			*32.4*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.85	31.5	C	TR	0.89	34.1	C	TR	0.91	37.4	D	
Northbound	LT	0.90	26.2	C	LT	1.02	46.0	D+	LT	1.00	38.3	D	
Intersection			*27.8*	*C*			*42.6*	*D*			*38.1*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.34	13.1	B	TR	0.62	17.1	B	TR	0.66	19.9	B	
Northbound	LT	1.10	78.7	E	LT	1.18	113.0	F+	LT	1.08	69.0	E	
Intersection			*66.6*	*E*			*85.4*	*F*			*54.9*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on west side of Eighth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from northbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	L	0.77	52.5	D	L	0.87	68.7	E+	L	0.78	50.3	D	
	T	0.73	24.7	C	T	0.83	29.1	C	T	0.77	24.2	C	
Westbound	TR	0.61	21.0	C	TR	0.62	21.2	C	TR	0.58	18.5	B	
Northbound	LTR	1.13	92.0	F	LTR	1.20	120.9	F+	LTR	1.02	53.0	D	
Intersection			*59.8*	*E*			*76.1*	*E*			*38.7*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	TR	0.84	36.3	D	TR	0.94	45.7	D+	TR	0.90	40.4	D	
Southbound	LT	0.79	17.5	B	LT	0.91	22.9	C	LT	0.93	25.7	C	
Intersection			*23.2*	*C*			*29.7*	*C*			*30.1*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.87	39.7	D	LT	1.03	69.6	E+	LT	0.94	44.8	D	
Southbound	TR	0.72	11.5	B	TR	0.84	14.3	B	TR	0.90	19.1	B	
Intersection			*19.0*	*B*			*29.3*	*C*			*26.1*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on east side of Ninth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from southbound to westbound only phase; shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	0.88	34.1	C	TR	1.03	60.7	E+	TR	0.97	44.1	D	
Westbound	DefL	1.31	190.7	F	DefL	1.33	200.6	F+	DefL	1.23	161.5	F	
	T	0.41	15.0	B	T	0.43	15.2	B	T	0.40	13.3	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.87	28.2	C	LTR	0.91	30.9	C	LTR	0.79	27.2	C	
Intersection			*38.7*	*D*			*49.0*	*D*			*39.1*	*D*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 5 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	1.19	131.0	F	LTR	1.40	220.0	F+	LTR	1.17	116.2	F	
Northbound	LT	0.30	9.2	A	LT	0.30	9.2	A	LT	0.33	11.9	B	
Southbound	TR	0.28	9.0	A	TR	0.30	9.2	A	TR	0.34	12.0	B	
Intersection			*65.2*	*E*			*112.5*	*F*			*63.0*	*E*	
Tenth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 5 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	R	1.27	165.0	F	R	1.48	254.2	F+	R	1.25	149.1	F	
Northbound	T	0.57	9.5	A	T	0.57	9.5	A	T	0.63	13.8	B	
Intersection			*60.7*	*E*			*98.3*	*F*			*62.9*	*E*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

* Although this table appeared in Chapter 19, "Mitigation," in the DEIS, it was inadvertently left out of the Executive Summary. In this FEIS, only information that has changed as a result of revised analyses has been double underlined in the table.

The development of feasible mitigation measures for the Future with the Proposed Action in 2010 primarily involved retiming of signal controls to increase green time for impacted movements, and daylighting at intersection approaches to provide additional travel lanes or turn pockets. With the recommended mitigation measures in place, all impacted intersection approaches/lane groups would operate at equal or better service conditions as compared to the Future Without the Proposed Action levels, or at acceptable service conditions. In addition, the implementation of these measures would not result in impacts to other intersection approaches/lane groups. The recommended mitigation measures would be implemented with appropriate City agencies and in coordination with the larger and more comprehensive Hudson Yards mitigation effort.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

Mitigation of significant corner and crosswalk impacts at 14 locations in the study area would involve the widening of painted areas to allow pedestrians additional crossing space and/or the removal of certain sidewalk obstructions. The recommended mitigation measures would be implemented with appropriate City agencies and in coordination with the larger and more comprehensive Hudson Yards mitigation effort.

A detailed list of the 2010 pedestrian mitigation measures appears below.

Corners

- A 5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at the northeast corner of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 20 feet (as described below) would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the midday peak period. Mitigation would also involve removal of all obstructions from the 20 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the east crosswalk. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a waste can.
- A 10-foot widening of the west crosswalk at the northwest corner of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 24 feet (as described below) would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 14 SFP), LOS E (with 10 SFP), LOS E (with 8 SFP), and LOS F (with 5 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively. Mitigation would also involve removing all obstructions from the 24 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the west crosswalk. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a fire hydrant.
- A 4.5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 14 SFP), LOS E (with 13 SFP), and LOS E (with 12 SFP) conditions in the midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.

Crosswalks

- A 0.5-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 16 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.
- A 5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 9 SFP) and LOS E (with 10 SFP) conditions in the midday and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 2.3-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 12 SFP), LOS E (with 8 SFP), LOS F (with

7 SFP), and LOS E (with 9 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.

- A 3-foot widening of the south crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 13 SFP) condition in the midday peak period.
- A 10-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 24 feet would improve the Build LOS F (with 6 SFP), LOS F (with 5 SFP), and LOS F (with 4 SFP) conditions in the AM, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the north crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 21 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 13 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.
- A 4-foot widening of the south crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 13 SFP), LOS E (with 12 SFP), LOS E (with 13 SFP), and LOS E (with 11 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 2-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 20.5 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 13 SFP) condition in the Saturday midday peak period.
- A 3-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 31st Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 16 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 12 SFP) and LOS E (with 14 SFP) conditions in the midday and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 5.5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 11 SFP) condition in the Saturday midday peak period.
- A 0.5-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 12 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 11 SFP) condition in the Saturday midday peak period.

2015 BUILD YEAR MITIGATION MEASURES

HISTORIC RESOURCES

The commercial overbuild constructed over the Farley Complex would have an adverse impact on the Farley Complex. The office overbuild would compromise the historic resource's architectural integrity by transforming it from a free-standing, monumental masonry building into a low-rise base for a modern office structure. Therefore, the final design of the overbuild, if constructed, would be developed in consultation with OPRHP and any mitigation measures would be stipulated in an agreement that would be executed among ESDC/MSDC and OPRHP. Further, to avoid adverse construction damage on three adjacent architectural resources, the agreement will stipulate that a construction protection plan would be developed and implemented in consultation with OPRHP.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Traffic impacts were identified for 2015 Build conditions at 9, 8, 10, and 15 intersections during the weekday AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively. Measures were

developed to mitigate these impacts that primarily involve retiming of signal controls to increase green time for impacted movements, and daylighting at intersection approaches to provide additional travel lanes or turn pockets. Table S-5 shows each of the locations with impacts, the mitigation measure suggested, and the resulting LOS at the intersection with the mitigation applied.

Table S-8
2015 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday AM Peak Hour

	2015 No Build				2015 Build				2015 Build Mitigation				
Analysis Locations	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Sixth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.77	27.4	C	TR	0.79	28.3	C	TR	0.81	30.1	C	
Northbound	LT	1.02	44.3	D	LT	1.04	51.6	D+	LT	1.02	42.8	D	
Intersection			*40.1*	*D*			*45.8*	*D*			*39.6*	*D*	
Sixth Ave & W.35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	1.06	77.1	E	TR	1.10	91.2	F+	TR	1.03	67.2	E	
Northbound	LT	0.71	11.9	B	LT	0.71	11.9	B	LT	0.74	13.9	B	
Intersection			*30.0*	*C*			*34.6*	*C*			*29.2*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	1.15	102.2	F	LT	1.26	151.4	F+	LT	1.14	96.6	F	
Northbound	TR	0.82	21.0	C	TR	0.85	22.1	C	TR	0.94	32.5	C	
Intersection			*54.2*	*D*			*77.1*	*E*			*59.7*	*E*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.93	39.1	D	TR	0.80	27.8	C	TR	0.83	29.9	C	
Northbound	LT	0.98	35.7	D	LT	1.03	48.9	D+	LT	1.00	40.7	D	
Intersection			*36.8*	*D*			*42.8*	*D*			*37.6*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on east side of Ninth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane
Eastbound	TR	1.08	79.3	E	TR	1.21	133.4	F+	TR	1.07	72.5	E	
Westbound	DefL	0.74	48.5	D	DefL	0.75	51.1	D	DefL	0.75	50.0	D	
	T	0.45	15.6	B	T	0.42	15.3	B	T	0.39	12.6	B	Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Southbound	LTR	0.97	37.0	D	LTR	1.00	42.7	D	LTR	0.90	32.1	C	
Intersection			*47.0*	*D*			*68.3*	*E*			*43.2*	*D*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 5 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	0.80	39.3	D	LTR	1.06	82.9	F+	LTR	0.88	40.9	D	
Northbound	LT	0.13	4.7	A	LT	0.13	4.7	A	LT	0.14	7.2	A	
Southbound	TR	0.42	10.3	B	TR	0.44	10.5	B	TR	0.48	13.7	B	
Intersection			*19.8*	*B*			*39.8*	*D*			*24.1*	*C*	
Tenth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	R	0.70	32.9	C	R	0.93	52.9	D+	R	0.87	42.1	D	
Northbound	T	0.70	10.9	B	T	0.70	10.9	B	T	0.73	12.8	B	
Intersection			*14.2*	*B*			*18.9*	*B*			*18.4*	*B*	
Tenth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.63	26.6	C	TR	0.74	29.7	C	TR	0.82	35.5	D	
Northbound	LT	1.04	44.8	D	LT	1.10	64.8	E+	LT	1.03	38.1	D	
Intersection			*41.0*	*D*			*56.8*	*E*			*37.5*	*D*	
Tenth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking/standing on west side of Tenth Ave for 100 feet
Eastbound	DefL	1.21	153.3	F	DefL	1.22	157.1	F+	DefL	1.18	141.9	F	
	T	0.45	23.1	C	T	0.50	23.9	C	T	0.49	23.0	C	Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to east/west phase
Westbound	TR	0.59	25.1	C	TR	0.56	24.6	C	TR	0.54	23.7	C	
Northbound	LT	1.00	33.0	C	LT	1.04	46.3	D+	LTR	1.01	37.3	D	
	R	0.53	17.5	B	R	0.68	22.0	C	R	0.69	23.4	C	
Intersection			*38.1*	*D*			*46.1*	*D*			*39.7*	*D*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

Table S-9*

2015 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday Midday Peak Hour

	2015 No Build				2015 Build				2015 Build Mitigation				
Analysis Locations	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Mitigation Measures
Sixth Ave & W.35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	1.01	63.1	E	TR	1.06	78.0	E+	TR	0.99	57.7	E	
Northbound	LT	0.61	10.6	B	LT	0.61	10.6	B	LT	0.63	12.3	B	
Intersection			*26.3*	*C*			*31.5*	*C*			*26.4*	*C*	
Seventh Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from southbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	TR	0.87	35.6	D	TR	0.97	49.6	D+	TR	0.94	43.7	D	
Southbound	LT	0.57	13.8	B	LT	0.56	13.6	B	LT	0.57	14.5	B	
Intersection			*22.0*	*C*			*28.3*	*C*			*26.4*	*C*	
Eighth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	0.84	29.2	C	LT	0.99	49.4	D+	LT	0.97	42.9	D	
Northbound	TR	0.90	25.7	C	TR	0.95	30.2	C	TR	0.97	35.0	C	
Intersection			*26.8*	*C*			*36.8*	*D*			*37.7*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.77	28.0	C	TR	0.75	26.8	C	TR	0.84	35.3	D	
Northbound	LT	1.06	60.5	E	LT	1.16	99.6	F+	LT	1.05	52.1	D	
Intersection			*53.6*	*D*			*85.1*	*F*			*48.7*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.32nd St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from pedestrian crossing to northbound phase
Northbound	T	1.02	48.1	D	T	1.04	54.8	D+	T	1.01	45.6	D	
Intersection			*48.1*	*D*			*54.8*	*D*			*45.6*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.26	13.9	B	TR	0.40	15.3	B	TR	0.41	16.0	B	
Northbound	LT	1.12	85.8	F	LT	1.15	98.3	F+	LT	1.12	84.2	F	
Intersection			*73.6*	*E*			*78.2*	*E*			*67.7*	*E*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	1.01	59.1	E	TR	1.15	109.4	F+	TR	1.00	54.8	D	
Westbound	DefL	0.84	55.8	E	DefL	0.86	59.3	E	DefL	0.86	57.8	E	
	T	0.55	17.1	B	T	0.55	17.1	B	T	0.50	14.1	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.83	25.9	C	LTR	0.85	26.9	C	LTR	0.97	41.0	D	
Intersection			*34.8*	*C*			*50.5*	*D*			*41.2*	*D*	
Tenth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.61	26.7	C	TR	0.75	31.0	C	TR	0.82	35.7	D	
Northbound	LT	1.06	50.7	D	LT	1.11	69.0	E+	LT	1.06	49.9	D	
Intersection			*46.3*	*D*			*61.1*	*E*			*46.9*	*D*	
Tenth Ave & W.34th St													No Impact.
Eastbound	DefL	1.16	139.4	F	DefL	1.16	139.4	F	DefL	1.16	139.4	F	Lane Restriping on northbound to mitigate weekday PM impact
	T	0.50	23.8	C	T	0.56	24.9	C	T	0.56	24.9	C	
Westbound	TR	1.03	68.8	E	TR	1.03	67.8	E	TR	1.03	67.8	E	
Northbound	LT	0.98	28.2	C	LT	1.03	41.1	D	LTR	1.03	41.1	D	
	R	0.72	26.1	C	R	0.85	36.8	D	R	0.85	36.8	D	
Intersection			*41.2*	*D*			*48.5*	*D*			*48.5*	*D*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

* Although this table appeared in Chapter 19, "Mitigation," in the DEIS, it was inadvertently left out of the Executive Summary. In this FEIS, only information that has changed as a result of revised analyses has been double underlined in the table.

Table S-10*

2015 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Weekday PM Peak Hour

Analysis Locations	2015 No Build				2015 Build				2015 Build Mitigation				Mitigation Measures
	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	
Sixth Ave & W.35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	1.01	60.0	E	TR	1.05	71.9	E+	TR	0.99	54.1	D	
Northbound	LT	0.67	14.2	B	LT	0.67	14.2	B	LT	0.70	16.3	B	
Intersection			*29.1*	*C*			*33.5*	*C*			*28.9*	*C*	
Seventh Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.70	39.5	D	LT	0.83	47.3	D+	LT	0.80	43.3	D	
Southbound	TR	0.52	4.4	A	TR	0.58	4.8	A	TR	0.59	5.5	A	
Intersection			*9.4*	*A*			*11.8*	*B*			*11.7*	*B*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	1.19	124.3	F	TR	1.12	96.3	F	TR	1.19	123.4	F	
Northbound	LT	1.13	87.3	F	LT	1.19	112.9	F+	LT	1.13	86.0	F	
Intersection			*97.9*	*F*			*108.5*	*F*			*96.1*	*F*	
Eighth Ave & W.35th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	TR	1.00	63.8	E	TR	1.02	68.2	E+	TR	0.99	59.0	E	
Northbound	LT	0.75	12.9	B	LT	0.77	13.1	B	LT	0.78	14.3	B	
Intersection			*25.6*	*C*			*26.9*	*C*			*25.4*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.92	41.5	D	LT	0.99	53.1	D+	LT	0.93	40.5	D	
Southbound	TR	0.71	11.2	B	TR	0.81	13.0	B	TR	0.84	15.5	B	
Intersection			*20.7*	*C*			*25.2*	*C*			*23.1*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	1.13	101.9	F	TR	1.27	157.5	F+	TR	1.10	87.2	F	
Westbound	DefL	0.52	35.6	D	DefL	0.52	36.0	D	DefL	0.52	34.9	C	
	T	0.43	15.4	B	T	0.43	15.3	B	T	0.39	12.7	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.69	22.1	C	LTR	0.71	22.4	C	LTR	0.80	28.0	C	
Intersection			*45.0*	*D*			*64.2*	*E*			*44.7*	*D*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	1.03	63.7	E	LTR	1.15	108.2	F+	LTR	1.04	63.4	E	
Northbound	LT	0.36	5.9	A	LT	0.36	5.9	A	LT	0.38	7.7	A	
Southbound	TR	0.12	7.9	A	TR	0.14	8.0	A	TR	0.14	9.4	A	
Intersection			*41.3*	*D*			*70.4*	*E*			*42.8*	*D*	
Tenth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	1.08	87.6	F	LT	1.11	95.3	F+	LT	1.07	80.8	F	
Northbound	TR	0.95	21.3	C	TR	0.96	22.0	C	TR	0.98	25.9	C	
Intersection			*37.0*	*D*			*39.6*	*D*			*39.1*	*D*	
Tenth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from northbound to westbound phase
Westbound	R	0.82	36.1	D	R	0.96	50.3	D+	R	0.92	43.5	D	
Northbound	T	0.58	9.4	A	T	0.58	9.4	A	T	0.59	10.2	B	
Intersection			*15.6*	*B*			*20.0*	*B*			*18.8*	*B*	
Tenth Ave & W.34th St													Lane Restriping: utilize the second lane from the right on northbound approach for shared through and right-turn movements
Eastbound	DefL	0.91	68.8	E	DefL	0.91	68.8	E	DefL	0.91	68.8	E	
	T	0.46	20.6	C	T	0.50	21.2	C	T	0.50	21.2	C	
Westbound	TR	0.54	21.6	C	TR	0.54	21.7	C	TR	0.54	21.7	C	
Northbound	LT	0.94	24.4	C	LT	0.98	29.2	C	LTR	1.00	35.3	D	
	R	0.88	40.6	D	R	1.02	67.6	E+	R	0.88	39.6	D	
Intersection			*26.7*	*C*			*32.6*	*C*			*33.5*	*C*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

* Although this table appeared in Chapter 19, "Mitigation," in the DEIS, it was inadvertently left out of the Executive Summary. In this FEIS, only information that has changed as a result of revised analyses has been double underlined in the table.

Table S-11*

2015 No Build, Build, and Mitigation Conditions Level of Service Analysis Results
Saturday Midday Peak Hour

Analysis Locations	2015 No Build				2015 Build				2015 Build Mitigation				Mitigation Measures
	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	Lane Group	V/C Ratio	Delay (spv)	LOS	
Broadway/Sixth Ave & W.34th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	T	0.89	41.1	D	T	0.95	47.2	D+	T	0.88	38.1	D	
Westbound	TR	0.78	34.2	C	TR	0.80	34.7	C	TR	0.74	31.2	C	
Northbound	T	0.98	50.0	D	T	0.98	50.0	D	T	0.98	50.0	D	
Southbound	T	0.70	35.9	D	T	0.70	35.9	D	T	0.77	40.1	D	
Intersection			*42.2*	*D*			*43.8*	*D*			*41.4*	*D*	
Seventh Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	TR	0.86	35.2	D	TR	0.98	52.5	D+	TR	0.93	40.7	D	
Southbound	LT	0.63	14.7	B	LT	0.62	14.4	B	LT	0.65	16.4	B	
Intersection			*21.7*	*C*			*28.9*	*C*			*25.7*	*C*	
Seventh Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.79	44.5	D	LT	0.90	54.4	D+	LT	0.83	44.0	D	
Southbound	TR	0.68	5.9	A	TR	0.77	7.3	A	TR	0.80	9.2	A	
Intersection			*12.0*	*B*			*15.4*	*B*			*15.2*	*B*	
Seventh Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking or standing on east side of Seventh Ave for 100 feet Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	TR	1.15	108.3	F	TR	1.21	130.4	F+	TR	1.14	101.5	F	
Westbound	LT	1.17	117.2	F	LT	1.23	140.8	F+	LT	1.12	94.9	F	
Southbound	T	0.92	24.0	C	T	1.00	35.3	D	T	1.02	42.0	D	
Intersection			*66.5*	*E*			*82.2*	*F*			*68.5*	*E*	
Eighth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from northbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	LT	0.86	33.0	C	LT	1.07	72.8	E+	LT	0.96	41.5	D	
Northbound	TR	0.83	20.7	C	TR	0.89	23.2	C	TR	0.98	38.1	D	
Intersection			*24.5*	*C*			*40.4*	*D*			*39.2*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.90	35.6	D	TR	0.90	35.9	D	TR	0.93	39.7	D	
Northbound	LT	0.94	29.6	C	LT	1.05	54.1	D+	LT	1.02	44.9	D	
Intersection			*31.4*	*C*			*48.9*	*D*			*43.4*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.32nd St													Signal Retiming: shift 1 second of green time from pedestrian crossing to northbound phase
Northbound	T	0.97	36.9	D	T	1.01	45.9	D+	T	0.99	38.4	D	
Intersection			*36.9*	*D*			*45.9*	*D*			*38.4*	*D*	
Eighth Ave & W.33rd St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from westbound to northbound phase
Westbound	TR	0.36	13.4	B	TR	0.56	16.1	B	TR	0.59	17.8	B	
Northbound	LT	1.14	96.3	F	LT	1.20	120.3	F+	LT	1.13	89.1	F	
Intersection			*80.6*	*F*			*92.4*	*F*			*69.9*	*E*	
Eighth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking or standing on west side of Eighth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane Signal Retiming: shift 3 seconds of green time from northbound to east/west phase
Eastbound	L	0.92	80.6	F	L	1.04	112.9	F+	L	0.94	79.0	E	
	T	0.79	27.1	C	T	0.85	30.3	C	T	0.79	25.0	C	
Westbound	TR	0.63	21.4	C	TR	0.64	21.6	C	TR	0.59	18.8	B	
Northbound	LTR	1.17	108.2	F	LTR	1.20	121.3	F+	LTR	1.02	53.2	D	
Intersection			*69.4*	*E*			*77.7*	*E*			*39.9*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.30th St													Signal Retiming: shift 2 seconds of green time from southbound to eastbound phase
Eastbound	TR	0.93	44.3	D	TR	1.01	61.3	E+	TR	0.94	44.3	D	
Southbound	LT	0.83	18.7	B	LT	0.94	25.0	C	LT	0.98	33.6	C	
Intersection			*26.7*	*C*			*36.3*	*D*			*36.9*	*D*	
Ninth Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from southbound to westbound phase
Westbound	LT	0.91	44.2	D	LT	1.06	78.8	E+	LT	0.94	43.5	D	
Southbound	TR	0.76	12.2	B	TR	0.87	15.2	B	TR	0.94	23.9	C	
Intersection			*20.7*	*C*			*32.4*	*C*			*29.2*	*C*	
Ninth Ave & W.34th St													Daylighting: prohibit parking or standing on east side of Ninth Ave for 100 feet to create an additional moving lane Signal Retiming: shift 1 s of green time from SB to WB only & 4 s of green time from SB to E-W phase
Eastbound	TR	0.96	43.0	D	TR	1.08	76.7	E+	TR	0.96	40.4	D	
Westbound	DefL	1.38	220.5	F	DefL	1.39	228.6	F+	DefL	1.29	184.1	F	
	T	0.42	15.1	B	T	0.42	15.1	B	T	0.37	11.9	B	
Southbound	LTR	0.93	32.8	C	LTR	0.97	38.1	D	LTR	0.90	33.9	C	
Intersection			*45.7*	*D*			*59.7*	*E*			*42.4*	*D*	
Dyer Ave & W.31st St													Signal Retiming: shift 4 seconds of green time from north/south to westbound phase
Westbound	LTR	1.23	145.6	F	LTR	1.42	229.0	F+	LTR	1.22	140.7	F	
Northbound	LT	0.31	9.3	A	LT	0.31	9.3	A	LT	0.33	11.4	B	
Southbound	TR	0.29	9.1	A	TR	0.31	9.3	A	TR	0.33	11.4	B	
Intersection			*72.1*	*E*			*116.9*	*F*			*74.8*	*E*	

Notes: L = Left Turn; T = Through; R = Right Turn; DefL = De Facto Left Turn; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service
"+" denotes significant adverse impact.

* Although this table appeared in Chapter 19, "Mitigation," in the DEIS, it was inadvertently left out of the Executive Summary. In this FEIS, only information that has changed as a result of revised analyses has been double underlined in the table.

The development of feasible mitigation measures for the Future with the Proposed Action in 2015 primarily involved retiming of signal controls to increase green time for impacted movements, and daylighting at intersection approaches to provide additional travel lanes or turn pockets. With the recommended mitigation measures in place, all impacted intersection approaches/lane groups would operate at equal or better service conditions as compared to the Future Without the Proposed Action levels, or at acceptable service conditions. In addition, the implementation of these measures would not result in impacts to other intersection approaches/lane groups. The recommended mitigation measures would be implemented with appropriate City agencies and in coordination with the larger and more comprehensive Hudson Yards mitigation effort.

TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

A detailed list of the 2015 pedestrian mitigation measures appears below. The recommended mitigation measures would be implemented with appropriate City agencies and in coordination with the larger and more comprehensive Hudson Yards mitigation effort.

Sidewalks

- A one-foot widening of the south sidewalk on West 33rd Street between the transit hall entrance and Eighth Avenue would improve the Build LOS E (18 PFM) conditions in the midday peak period.

Corners

- A 5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at the northeast corner of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 20 feet (as described below) would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 13 SFP) condition in the midday peak period. Mitigation would also involve removal of all obstructions from the 20 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the east crosswalk. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a waste can.
- Removal of all obstructions from 11 of the 15 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the south crosswalk at the southwest corner of West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a waste can and a traffic signal post. Removal of obstructions from 11 feet of sidewalk would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 11 SFP) and LOS E (with 13 SFP) conditions in the midday and PM peak periods, respectively.
- A 6-foot widening of the west crosswalk at the northwest corner of West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet (as described below) would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 10 SFP), LOS E (with 9 SFP), LOS E (with 7 SFP), and LOS E (with 6 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively. Mitigation would also involve removal of all obstructions from the 20 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the west crosswalk. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a fire hydrant.
- Removal of all obstructions from 14 of the 22 feet of sidewalk adjacent to the north crosswalk at the northeast corner of West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue. Currently, this sidewalk is obstructed by a newsstand. Removal of obstructions from 14 feet of sidewalk would improve the corner's Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.

Crosswalks

- A 4.5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the Saturday midday peak period.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 34th Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 17 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.
- A 5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Ninth Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 8 SFP) and LOS E (with 11 SFP) conditions in the midday and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 0.5-foot widening of the north crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 15 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.
- A 3.3-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 21 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 13 SFP), LOS E (with 10 SFP), and LOS E (with 9 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 4-foot widening of the south crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 21 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 12 SFP), LOS E (with 12 SFP), and LOS E (with 13 SFP) conditions in the AM, midday, and PM peak periods, respectively.
- A 2-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 16 feet would improve the Build LOS F (with 5 SFP), LOS F (with 5 SFP), and LOS F (with 4 SFP) conditions in the AM, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 2.5-foot widening of the north crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 22 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 12 SFP) condition in the PM peak period.
- A 2-foot widening of the south crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 18 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 10 SFP), LOS E (with 10 SFP), and LOS E (with 11 SFP) conditions in the AM, PM, and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 33rd Street and Seventh Avenue to a width of 20 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 9 SFP) and LOS E (with 12 SFP) conditions in the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the north crosswalk at West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 18 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) condition in the AM peak period.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the east crosswalk at West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 16 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 14 SFP) and LOS E (with 11 SFP) conditions in the midday and Saturday midday peak periods, respectively.
- A 1.5-foot widening of the west crosswalk at West 31st Street and Eighth Avenue to a width of 13 feet would improve the Build LOS E (with 11 SFP) condition in the Saturday midday peak period.

I. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

As required by SEQRA, this EIS includes an assessment of alternatives to the Farley/Moynihan project. The analysis first considers the No Action Alternative, in which the construction of the Moynihan Station and the disposition of the property to a designated developer are not undertaken. The No Action Alternative incorporates the reuse of currently vacant and underutilized space in the Farley Complex (consistent with USPS property management). As a result, the No Action Alternative represents an alternative to avoid or reduce project-related significant adverse impacts.

The EIS also considers two alternatives that arose from the developer designation process. The first alternative is the possibility that the Phase I program could include, in addition to Moynihan Station, an alternative use for the Western Annex that would be a new sports arena. This alternative would also include the redevelopment of the current Madison Square Garden (MSG) site and improvements to Penn Station. Under this alternative, it is assumed that the proposed project would continue to include the 1.1 million-gross-square-foot building on the Development Transfer Site. The second alternative considers utilizing all of the unused development rights from the Farley Complex, which would add approximately 1 million square feet of additional development potential at an undetermined location.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative, like the proposed project, is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated. The historic impact identified from the proposed project (only from the Scenario 1 overbuild Phase II option) would not occur with the No Action Alternative. Mitigated impacts for traffic, transit, and pedestrians identified from the proposed project could be reduced but not fully eliminated with the amount of development proposed in the No Action Alternative.

ARENA ALTERNATIVE

The Arena Alternative would be expected to add substantial new development to the area based on the redevelopment of the MSG site, which would occur as a result of the alternative. However, because the status of and plans for this alternative are unresolved it is treated in this EIS as an alternative. A detailed examination of impacts cannot be undertaken until a more complete development plan is proposed. As a result, for this alternative to be pursued, a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) would be required.

FULL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Full Development Alternative would seek to provide an additional 1 million square feet of development potential above that proposed in the future with the Proposed Action. This would likely occur from the off-site transfer of development rights similar to the proposed Phase II Development Transfer Site scenario. However, since no single receiving site for the additional development rights has been determined, the alternative would first have to define a comprehensive master plan identifying the location and amount of development to be transferred. Since this would involve substantially more development than the proposed project, and has the potential to result in a variety of new or different impacts than the proposed project, and since little is known about how the alternative could be implemented, it is assumed that for the Full Development Alternative to be pursued, an SEIS would be required. ✷