

A. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of potential open space impacts follows the methodologies contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the first step in an open space assessment is to take an inventory of all publicly accessible recreational facilities within a defined study area. The study area is calculated based on the distance a person is assumed to walk to reach a neighborhood open space. Workers or other daytime populations are assumed to walk approximately 10 minutes (about a ¼-mile distance) and residents are assumed to walk about 20 minutes (about a ½-mile distance) to reach neighborhood open spaces.

As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” and for the purposes of this analysis, there are two scenarios for development of the proposed project. Scenario 1 includes development of Phase I by 2010 and construction of a commercial overbuild by 2015. Scenario 2 includes the concurrent development of Phase I and a building on the Development Transfer Site by 2010. Phase I would redevelop the Farley Complex with retail, hotel, banquet, and railway uses, thus introducing new daytime workers to the study area, and triggering a ¼-mile open space analysis of impacts on open space resources for the commercial population. In Phase II of Scenario 1, a 1 million zoning-square-foot office building would be developed over the Western Annex. In Scenario 2, the Farley Complex would be redeveloped with the same retail, hotel, banquet, and railway uses as in Scenario 1, and in addition, a 1.1 million-gross square-foot, primarily residential building would be constructed on the Development Transfer Site, across Eighth Avenue on the north side of 33rd Street, that would include 940 residential units and 120,000 square feet of retail space. While the Development Transfer Site scenario includes a mixed-use option (residential, retail, and hotel), the primarily residential option is the most conservative assumption in terms of potential open space resources. Residential development on the Development Transfer Site under Scenario 2 would trigger an analysis of the ½-mile residential open space study area, and thus a ½-mile open space analysis is also conducted.

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

As described in the following analysis, 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. By 2015, open space ratios in the ¼-mile study area would decrease by less than 3 percent with completion of Phase II of Scenario 1 of the proposed project (the commercial overbuild). 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.

B. METHODOLOGY

The open space study area for the daytime worker population comprises all census tracts that have 50 percent of their area located within ¼-mile of the project site. Within that open space study area, all publicly accessible open spaces are inventoried to determine their character, condition, and acreage. Open spaces located within ¼-mile of the project site but within a census tract having less than 50 percent of its area located within ¼-mile of the project site are not included quantitatively in the open space assessment, but are discussed qualitatively. Similarly, the study area for the residential population includes census tracts that have 50 percent of their area located within ½-mile of the project site.

The analysis differentiates between open space dedicated to active and passive recreation. Active open spaces have facilities for organized games, children's equipment, basketball and handball courts, ball fields, and playgrounds. Passive open spaces are characterized by gardens, walkways, and benches, perhaps with tables and board games (e.g., chess tables). The open space analysis for the worker population focuses on impacts to passive open space, whereas the open space analysis for the residential population considers both passive and active open space.

Next, the number of potential users of these open spaces is determined based on the most recent (2000) census data for the residential population and on reverse journey-to-work data from the 2000 census transportation planning package for the worker population.

With an inventory of available resources and potential users, the adequacy of open space is then assessed quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis computes the ratio of open space acreage to the population and compares this ratio with New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) guidelines. For nonresidential populations, New York City considers 0.15 acres of open space per 1,000 workers to represent a reasonable amount of open space resources for that population. For residential populations, DCP suggests a comparison with the median community district open space ratio in the City, which is 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. In addition, as an optimal planning goal, the City seeks to achieve a ratio of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents, of which 80 percent (2.0 acres) is active space and 20 percent (0.5 acres) is passive space. The needs of the residential population are also considered in combination with that of the nonresidential population, because it is assumed that both residents and workers will use the same passive open spaces. Therefore, a weighted average of the amount of open space necessary to meet the guidelines of 0.50 acres of passive open space per 1,000 residents and 0.15 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers is considered in this analysis. This ratio changes depending on the proportion of residents and workers in each study area. It is recognized that these goals are not feasible for many areas of the City, and they are not considered impact thresholds. Rather, these are benchmarks indicating how well an area is served by open space.

The determination of open space impacts is based on how the proposed project would change the open space ratios in the study area. If a potential decrease in an open space ratio approaches or exceeds 5 percent, it is generally considered to be a substantial change, warranting further analysis. In addition, if a study area exhibits a low open-space ratio (e.g., below 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents or 0.15 acres of passive space per 1,000 non-residential users), indicating a shortfall of open space, even a small decrease in that ratio as a result of the proposed project may

warrant further study. The percent decrease in open space ratios helps guide the analysis, but does not constitute an impact threshold.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

OPEN SPACE USER POPULATION

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA

Population data for the study area is presented in Table 6-1. As shown below, under existing conditions, there are approximately 9,602 residents and 69,900 workers in the 1/4-mile open space study area.

**Table 6-1
Existing Resident and Daytime Populations**

Tract	Resident Population	Worker Population
1/4-Mile Study Area (Scenario 1)		
97	4,852	3,535
101	239	38,890
103	1,463	14,465
111	3,048	13,010
Total Population (1/4-mile study area)	9,602	69,900
1/2-Mile Study Area (Scenario 2)		
76	2,493	29,525
91	4,553	10,405
93	8,714	2,225
95	2,694	18,035
99	1,155	13,890
109	208	37,930
113	322	33,975
115	1,467	8,585
117	340	1,230
Total Population (1/2-mile study area)	31,548	225,700
Sources: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 2000; 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package.		

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA

Under existing conditions, there are approximately 31,548 residents and 225,700 workers in the 1/2-mile open space study area (see Table 6-1).

OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA

The 1/4-mile open space study area contains a total of eight open spaces, with approximately 8.75 acres of open space. This includes approximately 4.93 acres of passive open space and 3.82 acres of active open space. The open space resources within the 1/4-mile study area are listed in

Farley Post Office/Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project

Table 6-2 and are shown on Figure 6-1. The open spaces consist of a City park, recreation areas at New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) developments, plazas outside of institutional and commercial buildings, and a community park.

**Table 6-2
Existing Open Space Inventory**

Map Ref.	Name/Address	Owner/ Agency	Acres of Open Space			Condition/ Utilization
			Total	Passive	Active	
Quarter-Mile Study Area						
1	Bob's Park: 456 West 35th Street	Clinton Housing West 40th Partners LP	0.05	0.04	0.01	Good/Low
2	1 Penn Plaza	One Penn Plaza LLC	1.15	1.15	0.00	Excellent/Good
3	Post Office Stairs: Eighth Avenue West 33rd to 34th Streets	United States Postal Services	0.38	0.38	0.00	Good/Moderate
4	2 Penn Plaza	Vornado Two Penn Plaza LLC, Madison Square Garden LP	0.42	0.42	0.00	Good/Moderate
5	Penn Station South Houses: West 23rd to 28th Streets between Eight and Ninth Avenues ¹	Mutual Redevelopment Houses, Inc.	1.42	1.05	0.37	Good/Moderate
6	Chelsea Park: West 28th Street between Ninth and Tenth Avenues	DPR	3.91	0.98	2.93	Good/Moderate
7	Elliot Houses: West 25th to West 27th Streets between Ninth and Tenth Avenues ¹	NYCHA	0.97	0.64	0.33	Excellent/Moderate
8	Chelsea Houses: West 25th to West 27th Streets between Ninth and Tenth Avenues ¹	NYCHA	0.45	0.27	0.18	Excellent/Moderate
Total			8.75	4.93	3.82	
Half-Mile Study Area						
9	Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT): West 27th Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues	FIT	0.04	0.04	0.00	Good/Moderate
10	FIT: West 27th Street at Seventh Avenue	FIT	0.05	0.05	0.00	Good/Moderate
11	FIT: 230 West 27th Street	FIT	0.07	0.07	0.00	Good/Moderate
12	Chelsea Recreation Center	DPR	0.39	0.00	0.39	Excellent/High
13	Penn Station South Playground	DPR	0.6	0.06	0.54	Good/Moderate
14	Chelsea Waterside Park	Hudson River Park Trust	2.5	1.25	1.25	Excellent/High
15	640 West 42nd Street Plaza	River Place I LLC	0.74	0.74	0.00	Excellent/Moderate
16	Jacob Javits Convention Center Plaza	National Railroad ETA	0.76	0.76	0.00	Fair/Low
17	Golda Meir Square	1412 Trizec Hahn-Swig LLC	0.38	0.38	0.00	Good/High
18	Herald Square	DPR	0.04	0.04	0.00	Excellent/High
19	Greeley Square	34th St. Partnership	0.18	0.18	0.00	Good/High
20	1250 Broadway Plaza	Carlyle/SL Green 1250 Broadway LLC	0.22	0.22	0.00	Good/Good
Subtotal			5.97	3.79	2.18	
Total			14.72	8.72	6.00	
Notes:						
¹ Park boundary extends beyond study area.						
DPR = New York City Department of Parks and Recreation						
FIT = Fashion Institute of Technology						
Source: DPR open space database; AKRF, Inc. field surveys, April 2003, June 2004.						

The 3.9-acre Chelsea Park, which is operated by the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), occupies an entire block between Ninth and Tenth Avenues, south of West 28th Street. Chelsea Park is devoted to both active and passive uses. Amenities include play equipment, such as swings and jungle gyms, a comfort station, basketball courts, and ball fields. In addition, the park has trees, planters, and lighting for passive users.

Penn Station South Houses, located between West 28th and West 23rd Streets and Eighth and Ninth Avenues, provides several open spaces for use by its residents and the public. Numerous sitting areas and landscaped paths are provided, along with play equipment for children.

NYCHA operates several open spaces in connection with the Elliott Houses and Chelsea Houses developments, which are located between West 25th and West 27th Streets and Ninth and Tenth Avenues. These open spaces have been recently refurbished and are equipped with jungle gyms, spray showers, benches, game tables, paths, and a garden.

Sitting areas are located outside of several institutional and commercial buildings in the study area. These sitting areas include the Farley Building steps along Eighth Avenue, the portion of the One Penn Plaza open spaces located on the Development Transfer Site, and the sitting areas at Two Penn Plaza. One community park—Bob’s Park—is located on West 35th Street between Dyer and Tenth Avenues. The park contains a landscaped sitting area and play equipment, and is accessible with a key obtained through the local Community Board.

½-MILE STUDY AREA

Within the ½-mile study area there are 12 open spaces, as shown in Table 6-2. Penn Station South Houses Playground—a City park—is located on West 25th Street between Eighth and Ninth Avenues. Most of this park is used for active recreation. Basketball courts and jungle gyms are available for play and paved walkways, benches, and landscaping are available for relaxing. The Chelsea Recreation Center—a DPR facility—opened at 430 West 25th Street in May 2004. The six-story building contains a swimming pool, full-court basketball court, arts and crafts space, gymnasium, and weightlifting and aerobics area. Chelsea Waterside Park, located between Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues and West 22nd and West 24th Streets, is another major open space located within the residential study area. This large park is equipped with a wide variety of amenities, such as basketball courts, soccer fields, a sprinkler area, a dog run, paved walkways, picnic tables, and benches. Jacob Javits Center Plaza, located directly east of the Convention Center, contains benches and sculptural seating. The lower level of the plaza is currently closed and the remainder of the park is not heavily utilized. Several landscaped sitting areas and plazas are located along Broadway: at Herald Square, Greeley Square, and 1250 Broadway; on 42nd Street between Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues; and outside several buildings at the Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) on West 27th Street. In total, the ½-mile study area has 14.72 acres of open space, including 8.72 passive acres and 6.0 active acres. These numbers include the 4.93 and 3.82 acres of passive and active open space, respectively, accounted for in the ¼-mile study area.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT (OPEN SPACE RATIOS)

¼-MILE STUDY AREA

Within the ¼-mile study area there are 4.93 acres of passive open space, the type of open space typically used by daytime populations. Based on the 2000 worker population of 69,900, the passive open space ratio is 0.071 acres per 1,000 workers, which is below the guideline of 0.15

Farley Post Office/Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project

acres per 1,000 workers. As shown in Table 6-3, the suggested combined ratio of acres of passive open space to residents and workers in the existing condition is 0.192 acres per 1,000 workers and residents. The ratio of passive open space to the existing combined population is 0.062 acres per 1,000 residents and workers, well below the suggested guideline.

**Table 6-3
Analysis of Adequacy of Existing Public Open Space Resources
in the ¼- and ½-Mile Study Areas**

¼-Mile Study Area (Scenario 1)		½-Mile Study Area (Scenario 2)
Population		
Residential	9,602	31,548
Worker	69,900	225,700
Total	79,502	257,248
Open Space Acreage		
Passive	4.93	8.72
Active	N/A	6.00
Total	N/A	14.72
Open Space Ratios (acres per 1,000 residents and/or workers)		
Passive	0.071/1,000 workers	N/A
Recommended Weighted Average Ratio for Passive	0.192/1,000 residents and workers	0.193/1,000 residents and workers
Combined Passive	0.062/1,000 residents and workers	0.034/1,000 residents and workers
Active/1,000 Residents	N/A	0.190
Passive/1,000 Residents	N/A	0.276
Total/1,000 Residents	N/A	0.467
Notes: <i>Planning Goal Ratios:</i> Passive: 0.15 acres/1,000 workers. Passive Combined: A weighted average ratio is used combining DCP's goals of 0.50 acres/1,000 residents and 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.		
Source: 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing.		

½-MILE STUDY AREA

The following analysis of the adequacy of open space resources within the residential study area takes into consideration the ratios of active, passive, and total open space resources per 1,000 residents, as well as the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 combined residents and non-residents. With a residential population of 31,548 and 14.72 acres of open space, the ratio of open space to 1,000 residents is 0.467, well below the suggested guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The ratio of active open space to 1,000 residents is 0.190, also below the guideline of 2.0 acres. Similarly, at 0.276 acres per 1,000 residents, the ratio for passive open space falls below the guideline of 0.5 acres. The ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents is 0.034 per 1,000 persons, and falls below the guideline of 0.193.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

As described above, the study area is deficient in the amount of open space needed to serve the daytime and residential populations, as well as both populations simultaneously. Nevertheless,

the open spaces in the ½-mile study area help to alleviate the deficit within the ¼-mile study area and several additional open spaces located immediately outside of the ½-mile study area help to alleviate the deficiency for the residential population. Among the large parks surrounding the ½-mile study area are three City parks north of 42nd Street: May Matthews Playground, Hell’s Kitchen Playground, and Ramon Aponte Park; one City park south of 42nd Street—the Clement Clarke Moore Playground; Worldwide Plaza, a private plaza at West 49th Street; and the open space at the Robert S. Fulton Houses. Additionally, there are numerous plazas located in the vicinity of the study area, predominantly along Sixth Avenue between West 42nd and 50th Streets.

D. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2010

NO ACTION PROJECT POPULATIONS

FARLEY COMPLEX

In the Future Without the Proposed Action, the Farley Complex would be expanded to include additional United States Postal Services (USPS) space, as well as 248,000 square feet of new retail space and 436,000 square feet of new office space. An anticipated 2,731 new workers would be introduced to the project site and study area, which includes 367 new USPS day-time workers, 620 retail workers and 1,744 office workers. In total, there would be approximately 500 new USPS workers, but 133 of those new employees would be evening and overnight employees who would not be expected to use the area’s open spaces.

¼-MILE STUDY AREA

Five new real estate development projects are expected to be completed in the Future Without the Proposed Action that would introduce new residential and daytime populations in the ¼-mile study area by the 2010 Analysis Year. These projects will add approximately 2,763 residents and 9,569 employees to the ¼-mile study area by 2010 as shown in Table 6-4. With the completion of the five No Action projects, the ¼-mile study area residential population will be 12,365 and the commercial population will be 82,200.

The largest of the proposed development projects is a site that would be developed as part of the No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program (the “Hudson Yards project”). A modified version of the Alternative S zoning proposal from the Hudson Yards project was approved by the DCP in November 2004 and by the New York City Council in January 2005. As a result of this rezoning, it is anticipated that much of the rezoned area will be redeveloped at higher densities. Specific reasonable worst-case development plans were developed to anticipate the development that would likely occur within the rezoned area prior to 2010 and 2025. Table 6-5 shows the projected 2010 development under Hudson Yards Alternative S for the sites located within the Farley/Moynihan project study area and Figure 6-2 indicates the locations of the sites contemplated in Alternative S for redevelopment. One of the identified sites—Site 33—is located within the ¼-mile open space study area and is anticipated to be developed by 2010, as indicated in Table 6-5.

Table 6-4
Estimated Residential and Daytime Population from Projects
Expected to be Completed by 2010

Project Name/Address	Projected Future Residents	Projected Future Worker Population
¼-Mile Study Area		
Baryshnikov Center for Dance 450 West 37th Street	0	23
FIT dormitory, West 30th Street, Ninth to Tenth Avenues	1,104	9
Friars Tower, West 31st Street between Seventh Avenue and Broadway	888	25
Hudson Yards (1 site)	771	8,792
435 Seventh Avenue	0	720
Subtotal New Population	2,763	9,569
No Action Farley Complex Development		2,731
Total ¼-Mile Study Area Population	12,365	82,200
½-Mile Study Area		
New York Times Headquarters, 8 Times Square	0	5,679
Eighth Avenue and 20th Street	61	18
11 Times Square	0	3,025
158 West 25th Street	0	297
One Times Square	0	4,012
35 West 33rd Street	267	0
One Bryant Park	0	8,475
Special West Chelsea District Rezoning	5,890	828
Hudson Yards (4 sites)	2,121	1,979
West 33rd Street Mixed-Use Development	815	0
River Place II	1,438	0
Total New Population	10,592	24,313
Total ½-Mile Study Area Population	44,903	262,313
<p>Notes: Employment estimates assume 1 employee per 400 square feet of retail space, 1 employee per 250 square feet of office space, 1 employee per 450 square feet of community facility space, 1 employee per 22.5 residential units, and 1 employee per 2.67 hotel rooms. Residential population estimates are based on the average household size for Census Tract in which the proposed project is located.</p>		

Table 6-5
Hudson Yards Projected Development in the ¼- and ½-Mile Study Areas
2010 Analysis Year

Site No*	Office (square feet)	Retail (square feet)	Residential (units)	Other (square feet)
¼-Mile Study Area				
33	2,173,983	38,580	514	N/A
½-Mile Study Area				
14	20,163	17,533	210	17,533 (community facility)
19	N/A	68,000	816	68,000 (theater)
22	N/A	8,300	116	68,000 (community facility)
37	332,164	7,406	N/A	N/A
<p>Note: * Corresponds to Figure 6-2. Source: No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS, Alternative S, excludes existing units on Site 22.</p>				

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA

The eleven projects anticipated to be completed in the 1/2-mile study area would introduce approximately 10,592 new residents and 24,313 new workers to the 1/2-mile study area (see Table 6-4). With the completion of these projects, the population in the study area would be 44,903 for the residential population and 262,313 for the daytime population. It is assumed that four sites within the 1/2-mile open space study area would be developed as part of the Hudson Yards project by 2010 (see Figure 6-2 and Table 6-5). Other large development projects in the 1/2-mile study area include the Special West Chelsea District Rezoning, which is anticipated to generate new residential, retail, and community facility space between West 30th and West 16th Streets between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues, the new commercial developments at One Times Square, 8 Times Square, 11 Times Square, One Bryant Park, and the new residential projects at River Place II and at the mixed-use development on the block between West 33rd and 34th Streets and Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues.

OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA

No new open spaces are expected to be added to the 1/4-mile study area by the 2010 analysis year.

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA

Several open space areas would be constructed as part of the Hudson Yards project by 2010 within the 1/2-mile study area. These include a new Midblock Park and Boulevard System between Tenth and Eleventh Avenues, from West 42nd Street to West 33rd Street. By 2010, it is expected that the 0.85-acre portion of this open space corridor between West 33rd and 34th Streets would be completed, providing passive open space with benches, plantings, and walkways. At the southern foot of the open space corridor would be a 7.5-acre public square with passive open space, located over the eastern portion of Caemmerer Yard. West of the square would be three additional open spaces. The first is a 1.25 acre open space area, including 0.5 acres of active open space, associated with the mixed-use development on the block between West 33rd and West 34th Streets and Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues that would provide views of the Hudson River. On the block bounded by West 29th to West 30th Streets between Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues, there would be 0.5 acres of active open space and 0.75 acres of passive open space. Along Eleventh Avenue and West 34th Street adjacent to the Jacob Javits Convention Center there would be 3.2 acres of passive open space. One existing open space would be eliminated in the Future without the Proposed Action. The 0.76-acre Jacob Javits Convention Center Plaza would be removed during construction of the Hudson Yards project. Finally, the High Line, an elevated, unused rail right-of-way west of the Farley Complex will be converted to open space use, with the first segment (in the Gansevoort area south of West 14th Street) expected to be open by 2008. The park will likely include a walkway, benches, gardens, event space, a sundeck, landscaping, and plazas. This project is expected to provide an additional 5.7 acres of open space within the 1/2-mile study area.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA

In the 1/4-mile open space study area, the residential population is expected to remain at 12,365 and the daytime population is expected to increase to 82,200 by the 2010 analysis year. The

Farley Post Office/Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project

acreage of passive open space will remain at 4.93 passive acres. As shown in Table 6-6, the worker population will continue to be underserved by passive open space. The passive open space ratio will be 0.060 acres per 1,000 workers, which is below the guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers. This represents a decrease of approximately 15.5 percent in the open space ratio from existing conditions. As the change in the residential and worker population in the Future Without the Proposed Action alters the weighted average passive open space guidance value, the new measure is 0.196 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers and residents. The combined passive open space ratio in the Future Without the Proposed Action will be 0.052 and will remain below the recommended weighted average ratio.

**Table 6-6
Analysis of Adequacy of Public Open Space Resources
in the 1/4-Mile Study Area (Scenario 1): 2010**

	Existing Conditions	Future Without the Proposed Action	Future With the Proposed Action
Study Area Population			
Residential	9,602	12,365	12,365
Worker	69,900	82,200	81,106
Total	79,502	94,565	93,471
Open Space Acreage			
Passive	4.93	4.93	4.93
Open Space Ratios (acres per 1,000 residents and/or workers)			
Passive	0.071/1,000 workers	0.060/1,000 workers	0.061/1,000 workers
Recommended Weighted Average Ratio for Passive	0.192/1,000 residents and workers	0.196/1,000 residents and workers	0.196/1,000 residents and workers
Combined Passive	0.062/1,000 residents and workers	0.052/1,000 residents and workers	0.053/1,000 residents and workers
Percent Change			
	Existing to Future Without		Future Without to Future With
Passive	N/A	-15.5	1.7
Combined Passive	N/A	-16.1	1.9
Notes:			
<i>Planning Goal Ratios:</i>			
Passive: 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.			
Passive Combined: A weighted average ratio is used combining DCP's goals of 0.50 acres/1,000 residents and 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.			
Source: 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing.			

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA

With a residential population of 44,903 and 36.06 acres of open space, the ratio of open space to 1,000 residents is 0.87 (see Table 6-7). While increasing by 72.1 percent, the ratio remains well below the suggested guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The ratio of active open space to 1,000 residents is 0.225, well below the guideline of 2.0 acres. With 25.96 acres of passive open

Table 6-7
Analysis of Adequacy of Public Open Space Resources
in the 1/2-Mile Study Area (Scenario 2): 2010

	Existing Conditions	Future Without the Proposed Action	Future With the Proposed Action
Study Area Population			
Residential	31,548	44,903	45,520
Worker	225,700	262,313	261,561
Total	257,248	307,216	308,081
Open Space Acreage			
Passive	8.72	25.96	25.56
Active	6.00	10.10	10.10
Total	14.72	36.06	35.66
Open Space Ratios (acres per 1,000 residents and/or workers)			
Active/1,000 Residents	0.190	0.225	0.217
Passive/1,000 Residents	0.276	0.578	0.549
Total/1,000 Residents	0.467	0.803	0.767
Recommended Weighted Average Ratio for Passive	0.193/1,000 residents and workers	0.201/1,000 residents and workers	0.203/1,000 residents and workers
Combined Passive	0.034/1,000 residents and workers	0.084/1,000 residents and workers	0.083/1,000 residents and workers
Percent Change			
	Existing to Future Without		Future Without to Future With
Passive	N/A	109.1	-5.0
Active	N/A	18.3	-3.6
Total	N/A	72.1	-4.5
Combined Passive	N/A	149.2	-1.2
Notes:			
<i>Planning Goal Ratios:</i>			
Passive: 0.5 acres/1,000 residents.			
Active: 2.0 acres/1,000 residents.			
Total: 2.5 acres/1,000 residents.			
Passive Combined: A weighted average ratio is used combining DCP's goals of 0.50 acres/1,000 residents and 0.15 acres/1,000 workers.			
Source: 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing.			

space the ratio per 1,000 residents will be 0.578. This will be an increase of 109.1 percent from existing conditions and will exceed the guideline of 0.5 acres. The ratio of passive open space for the combined worker and residential population is 0.084 acres per 1,000 persons, and falls below the guideline of 0.201.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

In the Future Without the Proposed Action, the open spaces immediately outside of the study area will continue to be a factor in relieving the deficiency of open space within the study area. Segment 6 of Hudson River Park, which will extend from West 26th Street and continue to West 44th Street by 2010, will include a large ecological habitat area, two boathouses, a rocky beach, and a major civic plaza with a fountain near West 42nd Street.

E. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2010

PROJECT POPULATIONS

SCENARIO 1

Farley Complex

In the Future With the Proposed Action in 2010 under Scenario 1, the expansion of the USPS would not occur; nor would the resulting worker population increase of 2,731 workers: 367 day-time postal workers, 620 retail workers, and 1,744 office workers. Approximately 265,000 square feet of the Farley Complex would continue to be used by the USPS and would not result in any additional employment over existing employment. In fact, there would be approximately 154 fewer day-time USPS workers under the proposed project compared to existing conditions.

The Phase I development under Scenario 1 would introduce a total 1,791 workers at the Farley Complex: 347 new transit-oriented retail employees, 1,295 destination retail employees, approximately 79 hotel employees, and approximately 70 employees at the banquet facility. Overall, there would be a net decrease from the Future Without the Proposed Action of 1,094 employees at the Farley Complex with Scenario 1 in the Future With the Proposed Action.

¼-Mile Study Area

The total commercial population with the completion of the first phase of the proposed project would be 81,106. The residential population would remain at 12,365 (see Table 6-6).

SCENARIO 2

Under Scenario 2, the same 347 new transit-oriented retail employees, 1,295 destination retail employees, approximately 79 hotel employees, and approximately 70 employees at the banquet facility associated with the Phase I development would be introduced to the Farley Complex as with Scenario 1 (with the same net decrease of 1,094 employees at the Farley Complex from the Future Without the Proposed Action).

Development Transfer Site

In addition to the workers associated with the Phase I development, 1,617 new residents and 342 workers associated with the Phase II primarily residential building would be introduced to the Development Transfer Site on the east side of Eighth Avenue at 33rd Street. With this development, the net decrease in employment is smaller, from 940 to 752 employees. It is also noted that the Development Transfer Site will result in the loss of approximately 0.40 acres of private but publicly accessible open space (the Eighth Avenue Plaza area at One Penn Plaza).

½-Mile Study Area

With the net commercial population decrease and residential population increase under Scenario 2 of the proposed project, the commercial population in the study area would be 261,561 and the residential population would be 46,520 (see Table 6-7).

OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA

No new open space would be added to the 1/4-mile study area as part of the proposed project by 2010. The inventory would remain at 4.93 acres of passive open space. It is noted that the completion of the proposed project will add a substantial area of indoor public space within the Farley Complex that includes the intermodal hall and the 32nd Street pedestrian corridor.

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA

No new open space would be provided in the 1/2-mile study area as a result of the proposed project by 2010. The inventory would drop slightly from 36.06 to 35.66 acres, with 27.21 acres of passive open space and 9.60 acres of active open space.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA (SCENARIO 1)

As shown in Table 6-6, the worker population would continue to be underserved by the passive open space inventory. The passive open space ratio would be 0.061 acres per 1,000 workers, which is below the guideline of 0.15 acres per 1,000 workers. This represents a slight increase in the open space ratio from the Future Without the Proposed Action. The weighted average passive open space guidance value would be 0.196 acres of passive open space per 1,000 workers and residents. The combined passive open space ratio in the Future With the Proposed Action would increase slightly to 0.053, which is also below the recommended weighted average ratio.

1/2-MILE STUDY AREA (SCENARIO 2)

In the 1/2-mile study area the ratio of open space to 1,000 residents would decrease to 0.767, which is well below the suggested guideline of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents (see Table 6-7). The ratio of active open space to 1,000 residents would decrease to 0.217, well below the guideline of 2.0 acres, and the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 residents would decrease to 0.549 and would continue to exceed the guideline of 0.5 acres. The ratio of passive open space for combined workers and residents would decrease slightly to 0.083 acres per 1,000 persons, and would fall below the guideline of 0.20.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

In both Scenarios 1 and 2, the proposed project would provide an intermodal hall, a 32nd Street pedestrian corridor, and a waiting area and concourse for railway passengers that would serve as a large indoor space that could be used for passive recreation, such as reading. Further, the intermodal hall would host public art exhibitions and performances. In addition, as in the Future Without the Proposed Action, the open spaces immediately outside of the study area (and within the 1/2-mile study area for the commercial population) would continue to be a factor in relieving the deficiency of open space.

CONCLUSION

While all open space ratios (with the exception of the amount of passive open space per 1,000 residents in Scenario 2) would remain below DCP guidelines in the Future With the Proposed Action in 2010, no significant adverse impacts are expected to result from the proposed project by 2010 with either Scenario 1 or 2. With Scenario 1, open space ratios in the ¼-mile study area would improve from those in the Future Without the Proposed Action. With Scenario 2, open space ratios in the ½-mile study area would decrease less than 5 percent from the Future Without the Proposed Action. Neighboring open spaces would continue to relieve the open space deficiency in the study area. In addition, the proposed project itself helps to alleviate the deficiency by providing substantial and high quality areas of indoor public space. In summary, under either scenario, the proposed project would not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources within the study area by the 2010 Build year.

F. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2015

NO ACTION PROJECT POPULATIONS

¼-MILE STUDY AREA

An additional 15 sites located within the ¼-mile open space study area are part of the Hudson Yards project’s Alternative S. These sites are anticipated to be redeveloped between 2015 and 2025, and, for the purposes of this analysis, are all expected to be completed by the 2015 analysis year. The earliest Hudson Yards development is more likely to occur in the eastern part of the Hudson Yards rezoning area where these sites are located (see Tables 6-8 and 6-9 and Figure 6-2). As a conservative measure, the reasonable worst-case development plans for these sites are included in the Future Without the Proposed Action, as it is likely that redevelopment at these locations could be completed by 2015. With the completion of these projects it is expected that an additional 6,456 residents and 13,578 workers would be introduced into the study area for a total of 18,821 residents and 95,778 workers (see Table 6-8). There would be no additional workers added to the proposed project workforce under the Future Without the Proposed Action.

Table 6-8
**Estimated Residential and Daytime Population Within the ¼-Mile Study Area
 from Projects Expected to be Completed by 2015**

Project Name/Address	Projected Future Residents	Projected Future Worker Population
Hudson Yards (15 sites)	6,456	13,578
Total ¼-Mile Study Area Population	18,821	95,778

½-MILE STUDY AREA

As no additional residential or worker population would be introduced in 2015 under Scenario 2, no assessment of open space impacts in the ½-mile study area is needed for this analysis year.

OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

¼-MILE STUDY AREA

No new open spaces are expected to be added to the ¼-mile study area by the 2015 Build year.

Table 6-9

**Hudson Yards Projected Development Located Within the ¼-Mile
Study Area: 2015 Build Year**

Site No*	Office (square feet)	Retail (square feet)	Residential (units)	Other (square feet)
23		18,170	330	
24		14,158	139	
25**		14,715	190	
26		5,925	163	
27**		18,301	224	
28		10,368	198	
29		12,753	135	
30**		13,145	194	
31	1,776,972		827	477,000 (hotel)
32	1,364,724	24,219	323	
40		4,938	54	
41		16,281	581	
42		5,760	63	
43		26,615	319	
44		8,666	69	
Total	3,141,696 square feet	194,014 square feet	3,809 units	477,000 square feet
Notes:				
* Site Numbers Correspond to Figure 6-2.				
** Existing development to remain is excluded from development projections.				
Source: No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS, Alternative S.				

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

¼-MILE STUDY AREA (SCENARIO 1)

By the 2015 analysis year the residential population of the study area is expected to increase to 18,821 and the daytime population is expected to increase to 95,778. No change in the open space inventory is anticipated. With this population increase, the ratio of passive open space per 1,000 workers would decrease to 0.051. The combined passive open space ratio would be 0.043 and would fall below the guideline of 0.207 (see Table 6-10).

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

In the Future Without the Proposed Action, the open spaces immediately outside of the study area would continue to be a factor in relieving the deficiency of open space in 2015. The large decline in the open space ratios in the ¼-mile study area is a result of the anticipated large increase in employment near the Farley Complex as a result of the Hudson Yards rezoning. This employment increase is somewhat offset by the comprehensive changes in the Hudson Yards area, with an overall increase in open space resources available in the ½-mile study area and beyond.

Table 6-10

Analysis of Adequacy of Public Open Space Resources in the 1/4-Mile Study Area: 2015

	Existing Conditions	Future Without the Proposed Action	Future With the Proposed Action
Study Area Population			
Residential	9,602	18,821	18,821
Worker	69,900	95,778	98,685
Total	79,502	114,599	117,506
Open Space Acreage			
Passive	4.93	4.93	4.93
Open Space Ratios (acres per 1,000 residents and/or workers)			
Passive	0.071/1,000 workers	0.051/1,000 workers	0.050/1,000 workers
Recommended Weighted Average Ratio for Passive	0.192/1,000 residents and workers	0.207/1,000 residents and workers	0.206/1,000 residents and workers
Combined Passive	0.062/1,000 residents and workers	0.043/1,000 residents and workers	0.042/1,000 residents and workers
Percent Change			
	Existing to Future Without		Future Without to Future With
Passive	N/A		-28.2
Combined Passive	N/A		-30.6
Notes: <i>Planning Goal Ratios:</i> Passive: 0.15 acres/1,000 workers. Passive Combined: A weighted average ratio is used combining DCP's goals of 0.50 acres/1,000 residents and 0.15 acres/1,000 workers. Source: 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing.			

G. FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION: 2015

1/4-MILE STUDY AREA (SCENARIO 1)

PROJECT POPULATIONS

For purposes of this analysis, Phase II of the proposed project under Scenario 1 is assumed to include a 1 million zoning-square-foot commercial building constructed on the Western Annex of the Farley Complex. Assuming one worker per 250 square feet of office space, the proposed project would introduce 4,000 workers to the study area by 2015. With the construction of the Phase II overbuild, the commercial population in the study area would be 98,685 and the residential population would remain at 18,821 for a total study area population of 117,506.

OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

No new open space would be added to the 1/4-mile study area as part of the proposed project by 2015. The inventory would remain at 4.93 acres of passive open space. As noted above for 2010, the study area would see new public spaces created as part of the proposed project.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

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 decrease to 0.050. The combined passive open space ratio would be 0.042 and would be below the guideline of 0.206 (see Table 6-10).

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

As in the Future Without the Proposed Action in 2015, the open spaces immediately outside of the study area (and within the ½-mile study area for the commercial population) would continue to be a factor in relieving the deficiency of open space.

CONCLUSION

While all open space ratios would remain below the DCP guidelines in the Future With the Proposed Action in 2015 under Scenario 1, 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. The addition of the light-filled intermodal hall and the 32nd Street pedestrian corridor within the Farley Complex would contribute new public spaces that help relieve the existing deficiency of open space resources in the study area. Overall, the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the adequacy of open space resources within the study area by 2010 (under either Scenario 1 or 2) or by 2015 (under Scenario 1). *