Farley Post Office/Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project
Final Public Scoping Document for the Preparation of
an Environmental Impact Statement

A. INTRODUCTION

A Draft Scope of Work was prepared and circulated for public comment on January 31, 2005 that described the analyses and methodologies proposed for the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). Pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), a public scoping meeting was held on February 16, 2005 at the Farley Complex to afford the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft Scope of Work. The public comment period remained open through February 28, 2005. Comments on the draft scope received during this period were reviewed, and where deemed relevant, were incorporated into the Final Scope of Work.

The final scope has been prepared to guide preparation of the EIS. A Draft EIS (DEIS) will be published and distributed to interested agencies and interested members of the public for review. The lead agency will then hold a public hearing on the DEIS. At the close of the public hearing and comment period, a Final EIS (FEIS) will be prepared that incorporates the comments made on the DEIS during the public review. The lead agency will then use the FEIS to make SEQRA Findings, which address impacts and mitigation, before making its decisions on the proposed actions.

Since the issuance of the EAF and Draft Scope of Work, the proposed project has been further advanced. This Final Scope of Work has been updated to clarify and refine the description of the proposed development program. All changes to the Scope of Work are indicated as double-underlined text. The major revisions made between the Draft Scope of Work and Final Scope of Work include the following:

- A revised Future Without the Proposed Action 2010 scenario for the Farley Complex, which is also the No Action alternative. This revision was developed in coordination with USPS. In the Future Without the Proposed Action 2010 scenario to be analyzed in the EIS, the USPS would continue to occupy the main post office retail facility and would reoccupy much of the space anticipated for Moynihan Station. Also, it is assumed that the Western Annex would be privately redeveloped with 248,000 square feet of retail and 436,000 square feet of office space.
- Revised reasonable-worst case development scenarios for the two project phases based on three developer proposals that were submitted to ESDC/MSDC on February 18, 2005 and subsequently revised in April and May 2005.
- Refinement of the proposed project so that it does not include relocation of the USPS operations from the Farley Complex to the Morgan Facility. This process is well underway.

However, the potential effects of this relocation (which were assessed in the 2003 Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment) will be summarized in an appendix to the EIS.

- An additional project development scenario has been added in which unused Farley Complex development rights would be transferred to a site on the east side of Eighth Avenue between West 33rd and West 34th Streets (on the One Penn Plaza block). Under this scenario, a primarily residential or a mixed-use building of up to 1.1 million gross square feet would be constructed on the off-site location and there would be no overbuild on the Farley Complex.
- A new alternative has been added to analyze the development potential of an additional 1 million zoning square feet of unused development rights. Such additional development would be implemented possibly through the combination of one on-site building and one off-site building or through the transfer of all development rights to off-site receiving sites.
- In response to Community Board 4 comments, the traffic study area has been expanded to include West 35th Street between Sixth and Tenth Avenues.
- A Saturday peak period has been added to the traffic impact analysis.

B. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

The New York State Urban Development Corporation, d/b/a 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 Penn Station Rail Yard between Eighth and Ninth Avenues from West 31st to West 33rd Streets (see Figure A-1). In 2002, the Moynihan Station Development Corporation (MSDC), a subsidiary of ESDC formerly known as the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Corporation, 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.

A preferred developer was conditionally designated in July 2005 subject to an ESDC/MSDC Designated Developer Selection Process that included a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and a "Request for Developer Proposals" (RFP). Three qualified developers submitted proposals for consideration pursuant to the RFP. 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, while giving the private development community a unique opportunity to build one of the first new projects in the redevelopment of Far West Midtown. ESDC would retain ownership of the property and enter into a long-term land lease with the designated developer.

The public component of the proposed project consists of approximately 300,000 square feet of space for use as the new Daniel Patrick Moynihan Station (the Moynihan Station) and approximately 250,000 square feet of space for USPS postal operations, together with certain common areas and common building systems serving the Farley Complex. 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 square feet of space available for private commercial development (including approximately 100,000 square feet of space to be dedicated to private transit-oriented retail uses). The proposed project's private component also includes the option to purchase unused development rights of up to 1 million square feet of zoning floor area that could be used for additional commercial development on the project site or transferred to off-site parcels on adjacent blocks.

The environmental analyses will assume 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 of unused development rights, and two possible development scenarios will be considered in the EIS based on the three development proposals. Two of the developer teams proposed construction of 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. Instead of constructing a commercial overbuild on the Western Annex, the conditionally designated preferred developer would construct a primarily residential or mixed-use building on the eastern side of Eighth Avenue at West 33rd Street by 2010, concurrently with Phase I of the proposed project. In light of the project as currently proposed, ESDC has determined that there may be potentially significant short- or long-term environmental impacts, and that an EIS should therefore be prepared.

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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 of 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. This section describes the project site and its development history, and provides a brief history of the project, previous proposals for the project site, provides more detail related to the goals and objectives for the proposed project, and describes the proposed development program.

THE JAMES A. FARLEY COMPLEX

The Farley Building was constructed between 1910 and 1913 for the U.S. General Post Office. It was designed as a companion to the original Pennsylvania Station (completed in 1910 and demolished in 1963–64), which was located just across Eighth Avenue. In 1934, it was expanded to Ninth Avenue by construction of the Western Annex; together the annex and the original Farley Building comprise the Farley Complex. The architectural firm of McKim, Mead & White designed all three structures—Pennsylvania Station, the Farley Building, and the Western Annex. In 1966, the Farley Complex was designated as a New York City Landmark. It is also listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places.

The Farley Building fronts on Eighth Avenue and covers the eastern half of the block. It sits over an extensive track and platform system serving Penn Station as well as a former mail train operation that served the General Post Office. The Farley Building's Eighth Avenue façade (the primary façade) is a portico of 20 columns reached by a wide flight of stairs. The building plan consists of four four-story office blocks around a central skylight-covered atrium originally used

as a general work floor. 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. The building also connects to the platforms of Penn Station below.

Constructed in 1934 to relieve space inadequacies in the Farley Building, the Western Annex expanded the postal facility over the rail yard to Ninth Avenue. Also designed by McKim, Mead & White in a neo-classical style similar to that of the Farley Building, the Western Annex is a fully integrated addition to the original structure. Much of the interior space is used for truck loading and unloading, as well as for administration, carrier operations, and mail sorting. Truck entrances to this space are located on West 33rd Street and on the Ninth Avenue end of the building off of a service driveway. 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, 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 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, which is more than any airport in the United States, and more than Kennedy, LaGuardia and Newark Liberty combined. Yet the present terminal, 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 the new intermodal transportation facility began in 1991 when Amtrak initiated efforts to improve its New York City passenger facilities in a *Facility and Needs Assessment Report* that evaluated operations, safety, and accessibility in Penn Station. The report identified a need to better manage the movements of users in the station, and it recommended creating additional retail space to generate income for operational costs. In proposing a master plan for carrying out required renovations and proposed changes and upgrades to Penn Station, Amtrak learned that space might be available in the Farley Building and subsequently issued a feasibility study, which concluded that renovation of the Farley Building to include new Amtrak facilities and linkages to Penn Station had multiple benefits.

In 1992, Amtrak proposed to convert portions of the Farley Building into the Amtrak passenger terminal with retail space and non-public uses. Two years later, Congress appropriated the first of several Federal grants for the further development of plans. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), as the lead federal agency, initiated environmental and historic preservation reviews mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (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 Penn Station Redevelopment Project.

Further refinement of the project scope and more detailed cost estimates revealed that the project would only succeed through a funding partnership between 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. Those funds were to be Congressional appropriations to FRA that would be transferred through a series of grant agreements to PSRC. Additional funding was to come from state, city, and private sources. 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. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared in 1999, and, based on its analyses, ESDC issued a Negative Declaration under SEQR and FRA issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA. Subsequent to issuance of the Negative Declaration and the 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. At that time, modifications were proposed to the project. In summary, the main differences between the 1999 project and the modified project were: ESDC would own the Farley Complex, leasing space to USPS, MSDC, and other entities; USPS would consolidate most of its existing Farley Complex operations at the Morgan Facility three blocks to the south; 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 the consolidation of USPS operations was assumed to be redeveloped with office and retail space. The new retail space was planned to include destination retail space around a two-story arcade in the Western Annex and ancillary retail space (more than what was proposed in the 1999 EA) in the Farley Building.

In 2003, USPS and ESDC prepared a Draft Supplemental EA (DSEA) for the modified Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project. The purpose of the DSEA was to identify and analyze the anticipated effects of the modified project's new components and to assist the USPS, ESDC, and PSRC (renamed MSDC) in making a determination about the magnitude of impacts associated with the modified project. The DSEA was also to be used by ESDC as lead agency for conducting the environmental assessment of the modified project under SEQR, and by USPS for its specific actions related to the modified project under NEPA. A Final Supplemental EA was not issued because of continuing project discussions and planning.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of and need for the proposed project remain fundamentally unchanged from the project as envisioned in 1999—to create a contemporary, safe, and efficient intermodal transportation facility and commercial center by renovating a portion of the Farley Complex and incorporating it as part of the existing Penn Station complex. A new facility in the Farley Building would connect to the existing rail infrastructure and would be coordinated with passenger operations in other sections of Penn Station. The new station would be designed to help ease congestion of rail traffic, redirect pedestrian movements in the vicinity of the Penn

Station complex, and reduce crowding and conflicting movements of intercity and commuter rail users within the passenger terminal and connecting passages. It would also be designed to improve access to and egress from the platforms used by New Jersey Transit, the Long Island Rail Road, and Amtrak, and the connections between Penn Station and the Farley Complex. For commuter and inter-city passengers, the proposed project would provide additional stairs, escalators, and elevators to existing and expanded platforms to accommodate current and projected increases in ridership. Further, the intermodal facility, as currently envisioned, would meet traveler demands with a commuter concourse and a ticketing hall, covered taxi drop-offs, state-of-the-art security, and emergency response and egress measures.

A primary goal of the proposed project is the preservation of major portions of the historic Farley Complex, including the exterior, notably the Eighth Avenue entrance and monumental stairs, and certain interior spaces, such as the United States Post Office retail lobby. In conjunction with the preservation and restoration of much of the building's historic fabric, the proposed project aims to create a new intermodal transit hall filled with light and activity reminiscent of the original Pennsylvania Station.

By recreating a grand transportation hub to Manhattan's West Side, the adaptive reuse of the historic Farley Complex references the original Pennsylvania Station's role as a transportation resource, civic gateway, and mail facility, while preserving and restoring a designated local landmark and National Register property. The new transportation use would provide a needed increase in passenger circulation capacity, as well as enhanced safety, security and quality for the Penn Station environment. The USPS's continued occupancy of its historic postal lobby and certain other spaces in the building would continue the Farley Complex's original purpose.

Further, the ongoing consolidation of USPS postal sorting operations at the Morgan Facility with upgraded state-of-the-art efficient systems, combined with the retention of USPS's historic retail presence in the Farley Building, would increase the overall efficiency of USPS operations. The proposed project would also provide a key link for visitors to the Jacob K. Javits Convention Center and other proposed midtown west developments.

Development opportunities not heretofore available are currently emerging in the project area and the midtown west area in general. In recognition of these changing circumstances, ESDC intends to consider both the environmental impacts and economic opportunities afforded by the utilization of the unused development rights associated with the Farley Complex.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The proposed project would consist of four components developed in one or two phases. To be completed by 2010, Phase I would include the new Moynihan Station with related retail, space for continued USPS operations, and privately-sponsored commercial development within the Farley Complex. Phase II is assumed to include a new building constructed by 2010 on an adjacent site across Eighth Avenue or constructed by 2015 over the Western Annex using approximately 1 million zoning square feet of the Farley Complex's unused development rights.

As part of the preferred developer designation process (begun on October 28, 2004 with the issuance of the RFP), ESDC/MSDC received proposals from three candidates after issuance of the Draft Scope of Work and the public scoping meeting. These proposals include design approaches for Moynihan Station and offer a range of uses for the Farley Complex in Phase I and for the utilization of the unused development rights. These options have been used to refine the likely worst-case development scenario for analysis in the EIS, as it was presented in the

Draft Scope of Work. In addition, one of the proposals contemplates an option to develop the entire Western Annex for a sports arena; this option will be assessed as an alternative in the EIS (see Task 19, "Alternatives" below).

PHASE 1 REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT

A Phase I illustrative development scenario has been formulated based on the three developer proposals and the program included in the 2003 DSEA. As shown on Table 1-1, the programs included in the 2003 DSEA and the three development proposals are similar in that they include the train station, 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. Since two of the proposals offer a hotel in the Farley Building, this use is included in the reasonable worst-case development scenario; banquet use, which can be a high vehicular trip generator is also included, but other uses, such as entertainment retail and a merchandise mart, which have lower trip rates than destination retail, are not considered to be "reasonable worst cases" compared to 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 square feet, so that it is comparable to the 2003 DSEA program for the building.

Table 1-1

Floor Area of Land Use Components: 2003 DSEA, Developer Proposals, and Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario (in square feet)

		Developer Proposals			
Land Use Component	**2003 DSEA**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**RWCDS**
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.

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

Moynihan Station

To develop the new train station, ESDC would lease approximately 300,000 sf in the Farley Complex to MSDC, who would then sublease all or portions of the space to one or more railroad users, such as New Jersey Transit and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, with New Jersey Transit anticipated to be the primary sublessee. Amtrak has indicated that it is not interested at this time. The developer selected by ESDC would be required to design and build the new station. Although the three developer proposals offer some alterations to the design of the station, none of the developer teams propose changing the transportation facilities from those proposed in the 2003 DSEA. As currently proposed, the list of station elements includes:

- 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 an atrium that would create midblock entrances to the Farley Complex from both West 31st and West 33rd Streets and that would provide light to the train concourse below.
- 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. Passenger access to some passenger/commuter trains would be expanded (it is envisioned that this will likely be an expansion of New Jersey Transit service) from the existing Penn Station Complex to the Farley Complex, and other improvements to aid accessibility will be implemented.
- Porte cocheres and 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. 4.
- 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 square feet of Transit-Oriented Retail and Commercial Space. This space would be in addition to the approximately 300,000-square-foot 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 will be considered to be a worst case in the 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 new below-grade loading area. Under all three proposals, the new loading area would be accessible by ramps 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

USPS is currently consolidating its operations at the Morgan Facility, which consists of two buildings on the blocks between Ninth and Tenth Avenues and West 28th and West 30th Streets. This consolidation, which started during the summer of 2003, will reduce the amount of USPS space used in the Farley Complex while increasing the efficiency of postal operations. As part of the proposed project, approximately 250,000 square feet 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 (described below), New Jersey Transit plans to extend Penn Station Platforms 1 and 2, as well as expand the West End Concourse under the Farley Building. This will provide New Jersey Transit riders full access to all existing tracks serviced by New Jersey Transit from the Farley Building. ESDC/MSDC are working towards a Memorandum of Understanding with New Jersey Transit to be a sub-tenant in Moynihan Station. New Jersey Transit is the fastest growing commuter rail line in the United States.

Phase I Commercial Development

As shown in Table 1-1, the private development portion of the reasonable worst-case development scenario for Phase I comprises retail, banquet facilities, and hotel space. The retail use would be 518,100 square feet, the hotel would be 125,000 square feet, or approximately 125 rooms, and the banquet facilities would be 35,000 square feet.

PHASE II ILLUSTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Office Building Overbuild

Two of the developer team proposals offer an office building of approximately 1 million square feet built over the Western Annex. In each proposal, the building would be constructed on the

Western Annex's north (West 33rd Street) side. The commercial overbuild is assumed to be completed by 2015.

Eighth Avenue Off-Site Development

One of the developer teams controls an adjacent site on the One Penn Plaza block that could receive the approximately 1 million zoning square feet of the Farley Complex's unused development rights, which could otherwise be used for the Phase II overbuild development. Under this illustrative development, either a primarily residential building or a mixed-use building of up to 1.1 million gross square feet would be constructed on the east side of Eighth Avenue between West 33rd and West 34th Streets, concurrently with the Phase I development. In either building, twenty percent of the residential rental units would be developed with low-income rental units provided under the 80/20 affordable housing program. Development of the off-site building is assumed to be completed by 2010. If the Eighth Avenue off-site development were to be constructed, there would be no commercial overbuild on the Farley Complex.

REQUIRED APPROVALS

The proposed project would require several actions by ESDC and MSDC that are subject to review under SEQRA. These actions are as follows:

ESDC ACTIONS

- Adopt and affirm a General Project Plan, including overrides of the New York City Zoning Resolution for the possible transfer of unused development rights and waivers of bulk regulations with respect to the utilization of the unused development rights.
- Acquire the Farley Complex from the USPS. (USPS will also conduct a review under NEPA for the sale of the Farley Complex to ESDC. The FRA, as a Federal agency involved in funding the project, will participate in the NEPA process as a cooperating agency.)
- Lease a portion (approximately 300,000 square feet) of the Farley Complex to MSDC.
- Lease a portion (approximately 1.1 million square feet) of the Farley Complex to a private developer. A portion (approximately 250,000 square feet) of these premises will be dedicated for USPS use. The remaining portion (approximately 860,000 square feet) will be available for private commercial use.
- Approval, as required, of 1 million zoning square feet 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

- Lease a portion of the Farley Complex from ESDC.

D. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

The approvals of the proposed project are subject to SEQR regulations and guidelines. SEQR requires a lead agency to take a "hard look" at the environmental impacts of a proposed action and, to the maximum extent practicable, avoid or mitigate potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment, consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations. The

SEQR process begins with selection of a "lead agency" for the review. The lead agency is generally the governmental agency that is most responsible for the decisions to be made on a proposed action and that is also capable of conducting the environmental review. For the Farley/Moynihan project, ESDC is the SEQR lead agency.

The lead agency, after reviewing the attached Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), has determined that this proposed project has the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts and that an EIS must be prepared. A public scoping of the content and technical analysis of the EIS is the first step in its preparation. Following completion of scoping, the lead agency oversees preparation of a DEIS for public review.

The scoping process is intended to focus the EIS on those issues most pertinent to the proposed action. The process at the same time allows other agencies and the public a voice in framing the scope of the EIS. During the period for scoping, those interested in reviewing the draft EIS scope may do so and give their comments in writing to the lead agency or at a public scoping meeting. The meeting record normally remains open for 10 days following the meeting, at which point the scope review process is closed. The scoping meeting for this project was held on February 16, 2005 and the public review period was held open through February 28, 2005. The lead agency oversees the preparation of a final EIS scope, which incorporates all relevant comments made on the draft scope and revises the extent or methodologies of the studies, as appropriate, in response to comments made during scoping. The DEIS will be prepared in accordance with the Final Scope of Analyses for an Environmental Impact Statement.

E. PROPOSED SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

An EIS will be prepared in conformance with all applicable SEQR regulations and guidelines. The EIS will also follow the guidelines of the *New York City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, dated October 2001.

The EIS will contain:

- A description of the proposed actions, the proposed project, and its environmental setting;
- A statement of the environmental impacts of the proposed project, including indirect and cumulative effects, and the short- and long-term effects, and typical associated environmental effects;
- An identification of any adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented;
- A discussion of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project;
- An identification of irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented; and
- A description of mitigation proposed to minimize any significant adverse environmental impacts.

The analyses of the proposed project will be performed for the two expected years of completion—2010 for Phase I and the Eighth Avenue off-site development and 2015 for the Western Annex overbuild—except where a discussion of conditions in the year 2025 will provide (for the traffic and parking, transit and pedestrians, air quality, and noise analyses) an

analysis that more conservatively reflects the future condition. The analyses will include the cumulative impacts of other projects that would affect conditions in the study area.

Based on the preliminary screening assessments outlined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the following environmental areas would not warrant detailed analysis in the EIS:

- Natural Resources. The study area for the proposed project is fully developed and substantially devoid of natural resources, as defined by the *CEQR Technical Manual*. In addition, the study area does not contain "built resources" that are known to contain or may be used as habitat by a protected species as defined by the Federal Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17) or the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (6 NYCRR Parts 182 and 193). The disruption of the subsurface of the proposed development site would not affect the function or value of natural resources.
- Waterfront Revitalization Program. The proposed project site is not within the boundaries of the City's Coastal Zone. Therefore, no detailed assessment of the proposed project's conformance with the City's Waterfront Revitalization Program is necessary.

Thus, the specific areas to be included in the EIS, as well as their respective tasks, are described below.

TASK 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The first chapter of the EIS introduces the reader to the project and sets the context in which to assess impacts. The chapter will contain a project identification (description and location of the proposed Farley/Moynihan project); the background and history of the project; a statement of purpose and need for the proposed project; a description of the preferred developer designation process and the three developer team proposal submissions; and a description of the reasonable worst-case development scenarios. The chapter is the key to understanding the proposed project and proposed development programs and their impacts, and gives the public and decision-makers a base from which to evaluate the project against both the Build and the No Build options. The project description will consist of a discussion of key project elements, such as land use plans, site plans and elevations, access and circulation, and other project commitments.

TASK 2. FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

This chapter will discuss the framework for the EIS technical analyses. It will include a discussion of approvals required, procedures to be followed, and the role of the EIS in the process. It will identify the analysis years and project phasing, and identify reasonable worst-case development scenarios that will be assessed in the EIS. The section on required approvals will describe all public actions required to develop the project. The role of public agencies, such as ESDC, MSDC, and USPS in the approval process will also be described. The role of the EIS as a full disclosure document to aid in decision-making will be identified and its relationship to any other approval procedures will be described.

EIS ORGANIZATION AND METHODOLOGY

To identify and analyze the significant environmental effects of the proposed project and how those effects could be avoided or minimized, the EIS will be based on a conventional framework used for most EISs. For each area of technical analysis relevant to the examination of project impacts, the EIS contains a separate chapter. Each chapter defines the study area most appropriate for the type of effects being assessed, explains the methodology for analysis, and

presents current conditions relevant to the particular analysis. The existing conditions section of each EIS chapter generally reflects current conditions, and each analysis builds on the discussion to predict future conditions absent the proposed project.

Since the proposed project, if approved, would lead to development taking place in the future, the environmental setting is not the current environment, but the environment as it would exist in the future. This is known as the "future without the proposed project" or the No Build condition. For the proposed project, there are two years of analysis, 2010 and 2015. (For some analyses, the 2015 No Build condition will be conservatively assessed using growth projections anticipated through 2025, and will include a discussion of future conditions in the year 2025 based on the recently completed Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. For example, for the traffic analyses, this will provide for a more conservative No Build baseline that is better reflective of the area's anticipated future conditions because the project's incremental traffic would be layered onto more congested base traffic conditions.) The future No Build condition characterizes future baseline conditions most likely to occur without the proposed project, and includes the redevelopment of the project site and other developments anticipated in the surrounding area.

Finally, the future with the proposed project, also known as the "Build" condition, is assessed for the 2010 and 2015 Build years and compared with the No Build scenarios. This assessment is performed for the same technical areas, using the same study areas, as the existing and No Build assessments. Comparison of the future without and the future with the project allows the project's incremental impacts to be evaluated. An assessment is made whether those changes caused by the proposed project would constitute significant impacts, which are substantial changes in environmental conditions. The *CEQR Technical Manual* provides thresholds for many of the technical areas for what constitutes a significant impact; others require a more judgmental and qualitative assessment. Both qualitative and quantitative information is used, where possible, to determine the likelihood that an impact would occur, the time frame in which it would occur, and its significance. Where no quantitative thresholds exist, a determination of significance must consider magnitude, duration, geographic scope, number of people affected, and irreversibility. Where significant adverse environmental impacts are identified, options for mitigation are identified and evaluated.

In addition to the technical chapters, the EIS will contain a chapter summarizing proposed mitigation measures, a chapter identifying and analyzing alternatives to the proposed project (including a No Build Alternative), and several summary chapters, which examine the trade-offs between project benefits and impacts.

PROJECT ANALYSIS YEARS

As described above, there are two analysis years for the proposed project, 2010 for the completion of Phase I and the Phase II development scenario in which a residential or mixed-use building is constructed off-site, and 2015 for the completion of the Phase II development scenario in which a commercial building is constructed over the Western Annex. (As mentioned previously, for some of the EIS analyses, the 2015 future conditions will be assessed using growth projections anticipated through 2025 based on the recently completed Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, which already accounts for regional growth in the area, inclusive of the Farley/Moynihan project.) Although utilization of the Farley Complex's unused development rights is less certain and the preferred designated developer has more leeway in determining if, and when, a second phase of the project would be undertaken, the preferred designated developer is expected to exercise the option to develop up to 1 million zoning square feet in

unused development rights within 10 years of the project start-up. As a result, the full development effects of the project could be realized as early as 2010 or at some point thereafter.

PHASE I AND PHASE II ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIOS

For purposes of providing a conservative assessment of the range of potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project, the EIS will present "reasonable worst-case development scenarios" for the project. This methodology accounts for the preliminary status of the preferred designated developer's project plans and building designs, and the conditional nature of the developer designation by ESDC/MSDC.

The EIS will analyze a reasonable worst-case development scenario for Phase I that includes the new Moynihan Station with related retail, space for USPS operations, and privately sponsored commercial development within the Farley Complex that comprises retail, banquet facilities, and a hotel. For Phase II, the EIS will analyze two reasonable worst-case development scenarios for the utilization of the Farley Complex's unused development rights. Under Scenario 1, an approximately 1 million-square-foot commercial building would be constructed on the Western Annex by 2015. Under Scenario 2, a residential or mixed-use building of 1.1 million gross square feet would be constructed across Eighth Avenue from the Farley Complex by 2010, concurrently with the development of Phase I. Other options for Phase II, including the transfer of additional air rights and a potential arena built within the Western Annex, will be analyzed in the Alternatives chapter of the EIS (see Task 19, Alternatives").

RELATIONSHIP TO PRIOR PROJECT SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS

The Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project

As described above, an earlier version of the proposed project was reviewed in a 1999 EA and a 2003 DSEA prepared by the FRA and the USPS. Since the 2003 project was a modified version of the project analyzed in the 1999 EA, the DSEA only assessed impacts in certain environmental areas where the project modifications had the potential to result in new impacts. Those technical areas were neighborhood character, historic resources, traffic and parking, transit and pedestrians, air quality, noise, and construction impacts. Since the Moynihan Station configuration, transit-oriented retail, and USPS facility in Phase I of the proposed project are assumed to be the same as, or similar to, those elements as analyzed in 2003, the EIS will revise and update the impact analyses conducted for the 2003 DSEA, as appropriate. Those analyses will be revised to reflect more current information on background conditions, the future without the proposed project, and new program elements.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PROJECT AREA ACTIONS

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

The proposed Farley/Moynihan project is closely integrated with the recently approved Hudson Yards project. The Farley Complex is wholly located within the Hudson Yards Special Zoning District. Thus, along with the continued presence of the USPS and creation of the Moynihan Station, the new mixed-use development envisioned by the proposed project is not only consistent with the new zoning in place for Hudson Yards but is considered to be within the overall development envelope estimated by New York City and analyzed in the Hudson Yards FGEIS.

Completed in November 2004, that FGEIS presents detailed descriptions of existing conditions for the project study area that will be used for the EIS, with updated information as appropriate. Many of the analyses in the FGEIS are particularly relevant to the Farley/Moynihan project—such as projections of No Build conditions for 2010 and 2025[1], inclusion of the Phase I program (as outlined in the 2003 DSEA) in the 2010 baseline, examination of a scenario in which Madison Square Garden is relocated to Ninth Avenue and its existing site redeveloped, and analysis of the impacts of some 43 million square feet of future long-term development in a study area that includes the Farley Complex. For the technical analyses in the EIS, the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS 2025 analysis year analyses will be adjusted as necessary for the proposed project's 2015 analysis year, except for certain analyses—such as traffic and parking, transit and pedestrians, air quality, and noise—where the analyses for 2025 are more conservative, since they include substantial additional development by that later year.

Access to the Region's Core (ARC)

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

MORGAN FACILITY CONSOLIDATION

The proposed project does not include relocation of the USPS operations from the Farley Complex to the USPS Morgan Facility as this process is well underway with or without the proposed project. However, the potential effects of this relocation were assessed in the 2003 DSEA and will be summarized in an appendix (Appendix C) of the EIS.

TASK 3. LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY

The proposed change in use of most of the Farley Complex will raise issues concerning the project's compatibility with the surrounding community, the size and scale of the project, and consistency with long-range plans in the area. Further, information on existing land use now and in the future without the proposed project is important to set the context in which many of the other technical tasks are understood.

Using existing conditions and No Build data from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS in combination with relevant information from the 2003 DSEA, the work items for this task will include the following:

A. Provide a brief development history of the project site and study area (about a ¼-mile from the Farley Complex). Generally discuss land use and zoning at Pennsylvania Station, the Farley Complex, and the study area.

[1] As described above, 2025 projections from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS would be conservatively used for many of this project's 2015 analyses.

B. Describe conditions on the project site, including existing conditions and the underlying zoning.

C. Describe predominant land use patterns in the study area, including a description of recent development trends. Land use patterns in the blocks surrounding the project site will be highlighted.

D. Describe existing zoning and recent zoning actions in the study area.

E. Describe other public policies that apply to the project site and study area, including specific development projects and plans for public improvements.

F. Determine land use at the Farley Complex in the future without the project for 2010 and 2015.

G. Prepare a list of future projects in the study area and describe how these projects might affect land use patterns and development trends in the study area in the future without the project. Also identify pending zoning actions (including those associated with the proposed No Build projects) or other public policy actions that could affect land use patterns and trends in the study area as they relate to the proposed project.

H. Assess impacts of the proposed project on land use and land use trends, zoning, and public policy.

TASK 4. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The conversion of the Farley Building into a new transit hub will include the development of approximately 860,000 square feet of commercial space in the first phase, and potentially up to 1 million zoning square feet of additional commercial, residential, or mixed-use zoning floor area through the use of unused development rights. According to guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, commercial development greater than 200,000 square feet or residential development of more than 200 units has the potential to generate significant socioeconomic impacts requiring analysis. Since the proposed project would introduce commercial or residential uses well in excess of these thresholds, a socioeconomic assessment is required.

The analysis will follow the guidelines of the *CEQR Technical Manual* in assessing the proposed project's effects on socioeconomic conditions within a ¼-mile study area. According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the five principal issues of concern with respect to socioeconomic conditions are whether a proposed action would result in significant impacts due to: (1) direct residential displacement; (2) direct business and institutional displacement; (3) indirect residential displacement; (4) indirect business and institutional displacement; and (5) adverse effects on a specific industry. The project would not directly displace any residents or businesses, nor would the project have any adverse effects on specific industries in the area. Therefore, the analysis will focus on the potential for the project to result in indirect business, institutional, or residential displacement due to the introduction of a large amount of new commercial or residential space, and the potential effects of changes in pedestrian flows on existing businesses in the project area.

The scale and types of commercial space that will be developed under both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project would fall within the framework of the anticipated development analyzed as part of the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. Therefore, the analysis and data collection efforts conducted for that project can be utilized (as well as more recent market data).

It is assumed that a preliminary analysis will suffice to determine that there is no potential for significant adverse socioeconomic impacts. The preliminary analysis will include:

A. Description of existing and future no-build economic activity in the project area, including the number of types of business/institutions and employment by key sectors. The description of existing economic activity will also identify potentially vulnerable categories of businesses and institutions (i.e., those businesses that are located within or adjacent to the existing Penn Station).

B. Characterize the potential effect of the proposed project, including changes in the value of space that may result from increased commercial presence in the area, as well as potential indirect effects from the redistribution of vehicular and pedestrian trips in the study area.

C. Characterize the potential effect of the proposed project should it result in the introduction of new residences to the Eighth Avenue off-site location. Although the immediately surrounding area is largely characterized by transportation and commercial uses, residential areas are found along West 30th and West 29th Streets between Eighth and Ninth Avenues and along West 30th Street between Ninth and Tenth Avenues. Numerous SRO units are found south of the project site. In addition, the large Penn Station South complex is located south of West 29th Street between Eighth and Ninth Avenues. Therefore, the EIS will assess the potential for indirect residential displacement, but the analysis will focus primarily on whether new residential activity could alter commercial and retail patterns by increasing demand for new uses and creating conflicts with existing uses. This could potentially add to indirect displacement of existing commercial or institutional uses as described above.

TASK 5. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The analysis of community facilities and services in the EIS will be somewhat limited to a discussion of the provision of police, fire, and emergency services. Since Phase I of the proposed project was specifically included as a No Build project in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS and the proposed Phase II commercial development scenario would also have been considered in that EIS as part of the long-term projected commercial development, the conclusions of the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS will be summarized in this EIS. For the Phase II commercial development scenario, the EIS analysis, in conformance with CEQR guidelines, will not address impacts on public schools, libraries, health care facilities, and day care centers.

However, the Phase II off-site residential/mixed-use development scenario that would provide more than 100 residential units will trigger an analysis of impacts on public schools. Schools will be analyzed based on the potential for development to cause overcrowding (i.e., a deficiency of available seats for a particular age group within the district). The chapter will identify public schools serving the proposed project's study area and assess conditions in terms of enrollment and utilization during the current school year, noting any specific problems with school capacity. Conditions that will exist in the future without the proposed project will be identified, taking into consideration projected increases in future enrollment and plans to increase school capacity through administrative actions on the part of the Department of Education, relative to available capacity that may exist in the future without the proposed project.

Although the proposed project would directly affect one community facility, the U.S. General Post Office, it would not alter retail postal service at the Farley Complex, and all other USPS operations that would require relocation can be accommodated within the Morgan Facility, as described in the 2003 DSEA. Therefore, no adverse impact on postal service is anticipated. A

discussion concerning the effects of construction on the provision of postal services will be included as part of the Construction Impacts analysis (Task 17, below).

TASK 6. OPEN SPACE

The area around the project site, like most of Manhattan, is currently deficient in publicly accessible open space relative to the city's open space guidelines. The proposed project will trigger the thresholds in the *CEQR Technical Manual* requiring an open space analysis, because it would bring to the Farley site well over 500 new workers with the potential Phase II commercial overbuild scenario or more than 200 residents with the off-site residential/mixed-use development scenario. Therefore, this analysis will determine whether the proposed project would affect the quantitative and qualitative measures of open space adequacy within the ¼-mile study area recommended for commercial projects and the ½-mile study area recommended for residential projects in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Most of the critical data needs required for the open space analysis (i.e., up-to-date inventories of existing open space conditions, planned open space projects in the area, area employment, residential population, and no build projects) were compiled in the 2003 DSEA and in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. The data from these sources will be verified and updated as necessary in the open space analysis. Although the first phase of development would generate a substantial new worker and visitor population to the area, it is not expected to result in a new population that is substantially different from the populations assessed in the 2003 DSEA, which found no significant adverse open space impacts. The potential Phase II commercial overbuild and off-site residential or mixed-use developments would generate either a substantial new worker, or new residential population to the area, which could result in more substantial changes to open space ratios.

The analysis of open space and recreational facilities will:

A. Conduct a brief field survey to confirm existing inventories of open space and recreational facilities within the ¼-mile and ½-mile radii of the Farley Complex. Tally open space acreage for publicly accessible recreational facilities.

B. Estimate employment and residential population of the open space study area using 2000 Census data on population and reverse journey-to-work.

C. In conformance with *CEQR Technical Manual* methodologies, assess the adequacy of existing publicly accessible open space facilities by calculating the open space ratios and comparing them to guidelines established by the New York City Department of City Planning.

D. Assess expected changes in future levels of open space supply and demand in the Build years based on other planned development projects within the study area. This information is available in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS and will be updated as necessary. Develop open space ratios for future conditions and compare them with existing ratios to determine changes in future levels of adequacy.

E. Based on the population added by the proposed project, assess the project's effects on open space supply and demand. The assessment of project effects will be based on a comparison of open space ratios in the future without the project and open space ratios in the future with the project for both phases of development. Describe any improvements to nearby open spaces that are being considered as part of the proposed project.

TASK 7. SHADOWS

A shadows assessment is generally required if an action or project would result in new structures or additions to existing structures that are tall enough to cast shadows on a public open space, important natural resources, or historic resources with significant features that are sunlight dependent. The previously reviewed design for the proposed Moynihan Station would have only cast limited incremental shadows that would not have affected these identified types of sun-sensitive resources. Since the first phase of development as now proposed is expected to be similar to the previous project, it would, therefore, not have shadow impacts on sun-sensitive resources. However, development using the Farley Complex's unused development rights (if commenced) could include construction of a more sizable structure above the existing Farley Complex or across Eighth Avenue from the Farley Complex. Such a structure could potentially cast shadows on open spaces and historic resources with sun-sensitive features in the area, as well as on the proposed project's own Intermodal Hall and Train Concourse skylights, or on the Farley Building's Eighth Avenue colonnade. Therefore, a shadow analysis of a worst-case building envelope for the full development is warranted.

Following the guidelines in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, this analysis will:

A. Identify sun-sensitive public open spaces, important natural resources and historic resources within the path of the proposed project's shadows. In coordination with a survey for the open space and historic resources analyses, map and describe such resources. For open spaces, map active and passive recreation areas and features of the open spaces such as benches or play equipment. For historic resources identify sun-sensitive features.

B. Prepare a 3-dimensional CAD model of the project site and adjacent area that will include buildings as well as topographical data for the area within the shadow sweep of the proposed project. Add the form of the proposed building to the existing conditions CAD model in order to perform further shadow analysis.

C. Prepare shadow diagrams for time periods when shadows from the new building envelope could fall onto sun-sensitive resources. These diagrams will be prepared for the four analysis days (March 21, May 6, June 21, and December 21)—if shadows from the proposed building would cast shadows on any of the identified resources on that day.

D. Describe the effect of the incremental shadows on any public open spaces, natural resources, historic resources with significant sunlight-dependent features, and the project skylights based on the shadow diagrams for each of the analysis dates. Assess the effects of the project's incremental shadows on the users and vegetation in the open spaces and on the features and users of the historic resources.

E. Create a duration table that identifies entering and exiting times when an incremental shadow would fall on identified resources. The duration of the project's increment would be compared with the amount of sunlight on those areas under No Build conditions.

TASK 8. HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Farley Complex is a State and National Register property and a New York City Landmark. Pursuant to NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, the FRA reviewed preliminary designs for the proposed project in 1999 and determined that the proposed Moynihan Station and new retail uses would have No Adverse Effect on the Farley Complex. Since the Phase I plan for the project could include modifications to the station design and it includes redevelopment of the

Western Annex, which was not anticipated in FRA's previous finding of No Adverse Effect, the historic resources analysis assumes a review of the three developer team proposals, including preservation plans for the Farley Complex, and it assesses whether the proposed project could have impacts to the Farley Complex that are new or different from those identified in the 1999 EA.

The proposed Phase II development could include a new structure over the Western Annex, and this additional construction could potentially result in adverse impacts on the Farley Complex and surrounding resources. This task will, therefore, assess impacts of the Phase II commercial development and the off-site residential development on historic resources, and will coordinate consultation with the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP).

In 1995, FRA and OPRHP, acting in its capacity as the New York State Historic Preservation Office, determined that the site was not sensitive for archaeological resources. Therefore, consideration of archaeological resources is not included in this scope of work.

The following tasks will be undertaken as part of the historic resources analyses:

A. Using the extensive survey of architectural resources included in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, map and briefly describe designated architectural resources (New York City Landmarks or properties pending Landmark designation and properties listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places) within 400 feet of the project site.

B. Based on planned development projects and the No Build scenario for the Farley Complex, qualitatively discuss any effects on architectural resources that are expected in the future without the project.

C. Assess the project's effects on architectural resources, including visual and contextual changes, as well as any direct physical effects. Potential impacts on the Farley Complex will be the focus of the analysis. Plans for Phase I will be compared to the previously approved plans. Phase II plans will be assessed for new potential effects.

D. If applicable, develop, in consultation with OPRHP, feasible mitigation measures aimed at avoiding adverse impacts on architectural resources. The previously proposed preservation plans for the Farley Complex will be reviewed and coordination of their review with OPRHP will be facilitated.

TASK 9. URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES

This analysis assumes that the Farley Complex, an important visual resource, would be altered by the insertion of a new glass Intermodal Hall running between West 31st and West 33rd Streets in the midblock, as envisioned in the preliminary design that was previously reviewed and approved by the FRA in 1999. Since Phase II of the currently proposed project could include construction of a structure of up to 1 million zoning square feet above the Western Annex, it could create a more visible alteration of the existing building's fabric and the urban design character of the study area. Further, the potential Phase II off-site residential development would add a new, large structure to the study area. Therefore, the EIS analysis will consist of the following:

A. Based on field visits, describe the Farley Complex and the urban design and visual resources of the surrounding area, using photographs and text as appropriate. A description of existing

natural features, block forms, streetscape elements, street patterns and street hierarchy, as well as building bulk, use, type, and arrangement of the study area, will be included as per the *CEQR Technical Manual*. A description of view corridors and additional visual resources in the area will also be provided.

B. Based on planned development projects, describe the changes expected in the urban design and visual character of the study area that are expected in the future without the project.

C. Assess the changes in urban design characteristics and visual resources that are expected to result from the project on the Farley Complex and in the study area and evaluate the significance of the changes.

TASK 10. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The character of a neighborhood is established by numerous factors, including land use patterns, the characteristics of its population and economic activities, the scale of its development, the design of its buildings, the presence of notable landmarks, and a variety of other physical features that include noise levels, traffic, and pedestrian patterns. The proposed project—a new train station and approximately 860,000 square feet of commercial development in the first phase and up to 1 million additional zoning square feet of commercial or residential development in the second phase—represents a dramatic change that will affect the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the EIS analysis will consist of the following:

A. Based on the other EIS analyses, summarize the predominant factors that contribute to defining the character of the neighborhood.

B. Based on planned development projects, public policy initiatives, and planned public improvements, changes that can be expected in the character of the neighborhood in the future without the project will be described.

C. The project's impact on neighborhood character will be assessed and summarized.

TASK 11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Phase I of the development would convert existing space in the Farley Complex into a new intermodal transportation facility and develop additional space with office and retail uses. Some existing areas would be retained by USPS for retail postal uses. Phase II of the proposed development could include a commercial overbuild using development rights available on the project site. It is anticipated that both phases of development would involve excavation in the below-grade track area under the Farley Complex.

The hazardous materials assessment will include a detailed discussion of current environmental conditions at the Farley Complex site and will examine how the proposed project will affect these conditions. The discussion of current environmental conditions will rely on information provided in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that will be prepared for the Farley Complex site. Available information on the Eighth Avenue development site will be included in the analysis of potential hazardous materials issues. The Phase I ESA—which will be consistent with current industry standards, including ASTM E1527-00—and the EIS analysis will include the following:

A. Inspect the existing Farley Complex to identify on-site uses and assess existing conditions. Inspect the buildings for the on-site storage and use of chemicals, fuel oil storage tanks and for current site-uses that may involve petroleum and/or hazardous materials.

B. Review available documentation to determine previous uses on the site and in adjacent areas. The site history research will extend back to the first industrial and commercial development in the area, if possible. Review available records that may include, but are not limited to, historical maps and atlases and previously conducted environmental studies.

C. Obtain and review records maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC) to identify the use, generation, storage, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous materials and chemicals, or releases of such materials that may affect the project site. The database search areas will be at least as extensive as those listed in ASTM Standard E1527-00.

D. Obtain information on geological conditions from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and available existing environmental and/or geotechnical reports.

E. Assess the potential for impacts from on-site contamination based on observations of the property, information on past and current activities on and adjacent to the property, and review of previous studies and government records.

F. It is anticipated that subsurface disturbance may be required on the Western Annex site where new footings would be required for the potential Phase II commercial overbuild. In this area, excavation of ballast and underlying soil between rails may be necessary for column construction. Subsurface disturbance will also be required on the Farley Complex site for the Phase I development. Previous studies have been conducted that included sampling of ballast materials. As part of the EIS analysis, previous site assessments will be updated and existing conditions will be further assessed through site inspection and additional sampling, if warranted.

G. The EIS analysis will address the disruption of service, if any, from track removal activities to access the contaminated ballast, releases of contaminated materials to the air and stormwater during remediation, the potential mitigating methods proposed to minimize the risk from such potential releases to the general public using the yards and to the workers performing the remediation and operating the yards' usual activities, and the timing of this remediation in relation to the proposed project.

TASK 12. INFRASTRUCTURE, SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES, AND ENERGY

The 1999 EA examined infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, and energy, and concluded that the project, as envisioned in 1999, would increase energy use in the Farley Building by bringing additional uses into it, but that upgrades to the building's mechanical systems would reduce the amount of the increase. This EIS analysis will review and update the analysis of the 1999 EA, and it will assess the proposed project's demand on infrastructure, solid waste and sanitation services, and energy, because the project could result in a new, large development either on the Farley Complex or across Eighth Avenue. The EIS analysis will include the following:

WATER SUPPLY

A. Estimate the existing water use and the capacity of the distribution system serving the project area based on information obtained from New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) and the New York City Bureau of Water Supply.

B. Using water usage rates provided in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, project average and peak water demand for the future without the proposed project and the future with the proposed project, and characterize the effects on the existing system, taking into account water conservation measures that would be implemented by the analysis years.

C. Assess the effects of the incremental demand of the project on the water supply system and determine if there would be sufficient capacity to maintain adequate water supply and pressure.

SANITARY SEWAGE

D. Based on information obtained from NYCDEP, describe the existing sewer system serving the project area, including existing flows to the relevant Water Pollution Control Plant(s) (WPCP) for the latest 12-month period and present the average annual and maximum monthly flow.

E. Based on water usage estimates, estimate sanitary sewage generation for the future without the proposed project and the future with the proposed project.

F. Assess the effects of the incremental demand of the project on the sewer system and determine if there will be a significant impact on operations of the North River WPCP.

SOLID WASTE

G. Describe existing and future New York City sold waste disposal practices, including the collection system and status of landfilling, recycling, and other disposal methods.

H. Assess the incremental impacts of the development's solid waste generation on the City's collection needs and disposal capacity.

ENERGY

I. Describe the energy systems that would supply the proposed project with electricity and/or natural gas.

J. Estimate the energy usage for the proposed project, and assess the effect of this new demand on the energy supply systems.

TASK 13. TRAFFIC AND PARKING

It is assumed that the proposed project would be undertaken in up to two development phases—Phase I and Phase II, which could occur as a commercial overbuild or as an off-site development that occurs concurrently with Phase I. Both phases would have traffic issues that need to be analyzed in detail in the EIS. This analysis will make extensive use of the traffic databases and analyses completed as part of the 2003 DSEA and the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. The first phase of the proposed project has been analyzed within the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS 2010 build year traffic analyses; a more recent version of the proposed project may now be substituted for the earlier version. The off-site residential or mixed-use development is also assumed to be completed by 2010. The proposed Phase II commercial overbuild is assumed to be completed by 2015. Thus, it would occur between the 2010 and 2025 analysis years considered in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, and this analysis will utilize the 2025 build year analysis projections from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS for the proposed project's Phase II 2015 analyses. This is a more conservative assumption since the 2025 build year

analysis projections include all development considered in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, which would be reflected in the No Build conditions for this project's EIS, but it also reflects that the full development of the proposed project is within the overall build-out projections of the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS.

The following analytical tasks will be undertaken as part of the traffic and parking analyses for this EIS:

TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

A. Define the traffic study area for the EIS as bounded by West 28th Street on the south, West 35th Street on the north, Tenth Avenue on the west, and Seventh Avenue on the east, plus the intersections of Sixth Avenue at West 31st, West 32nd, and West 33rd Streets, West 34th Street's two intersections at Herald Square at Broadway and at Sixth Avenue, and West 35th Street's intersections with Broadway and Sixth Avenue at Herald Square. The intersections to be examined are shown in Figure A-2.

B. Use traffic volume networks and level of service analyses prepared for the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS to establish the existing conditions baseline for this project. All analyses will be done for weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hour conditions identified in the Hudson Yards EIS. In addition, original Saturday midday data will be collected to develop a weekend peak hour network and to assess the proposed project's potential weekend daytime impacts.

C. Prepare year 2010 No Build and Build volume networks and level of service analyses using information from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. (While the multi-use facility is no longer contemplated as part of the Hudson Yards Rezoning project, the validity of the analysis is not affected, because there is no stadium-generated traffic in the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak periods in the Hudson Yards FGEIS analysis.) These analyses will "extract" the traffic volumes assumed in the Hudson Yards FGEIS for the 2003 Penn Station Redevelopment Project as defined at the time that EIS was prepared, in order to establish a new 2010 No Build condition, and then add back in the appropriate trip generation for Phase I of the project, as currently proposed, as part of the year 2010 Build analyses (see "Trip Generation" task described below). Similarly, the Saturday analysis will account for projections made for other time periods to establish the corresponding future Saturday volume networks.

D. Determine anticipated trip generation—person trips and vehicular trips—for the proposed project's 2010 Build conditions based on available CEQR/SEQR sources (primarily trip generation databases used in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS). And, assign these Build trips to the street network in order to determine 2010 Build volumes and, subsequently 2010 Build intersection level of service analyses. (See "Trip Generation" task described below).

E. Prepare 2015 No Build and Build volume networks and level of service analyses using information from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS. These analyses will extract traffic volumes assumed in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS for the 2003 Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project, and then re-insert traffic generated by the proposed project in 2010 and in 2015 in order to establish new 2015 No Build and Build conditions. The Saturday assessment will rely on projections developed from the original baseline data and comparisons of trip estimates for other analysis periods.

F. Identify significant traffic impacts (if any) under both 2010 and 2015 Build conditions using *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, and then identify and evaluate traffic improvements that would be needed to mitigate those impacts. These identified traffic mitigation measures will be coordinated with those mitigation measures committed within the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS certification process.

PARKING CONDITIONS

G. Identify and inventory off-street parking lots and garages available to serve traffic demands generated by the proposed project. This parking analysis area will extend for approximately a half-mile (i.e., 10 minute walk) from the edge of the project site(s). The inventory of parking facility capacity and weekday/weekend utilization levels will be taken directly from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, supplemented with newly collected parking data.

H. Identify the prevalent on-street parking regulations within this parking analysis area, which will be summarized within a general description in the EIS, and any legal and available on-street spaces that could be used by the proposed project users.

I. Determine 2010 and 2015 project-generated parking demands, and determine parking availability. This comparison will assess whether any parking shortfalls can be expected to occur. The two Build year analyses will need to take into account any parking lot or garage removals resulting from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS, and any new parking added by it that might be able to accommodate the proposed project trips. It is not expected that the proposed project will generate a substantial level of parking demand.

J. Document all analyses and findings within the Traffic and Parking Chapter of the EIS.

TRIP-GENERATION AND VEHICULAR ASSIGNMENTS

Defining the trip making characteristics of the various project elements, particularly those related to rail system users, is critical to an accurate analysis of the potential traffic and transportation impacts of the proposed project, for both of its development phases. For the trip generation and project assignment portion of the analyses for this new two-phase project, the analyses will draw on work previously completed for the 1999 EA and 2003 DSEA to the fullest extent possible.

Trip Generation Characteristics

Determinations will be made of the trips generated by each component of the proposed project for Phase I uses and the Phase II overbuild and off-site development uses, their temporal distribution, and the modes of transportation used to access the sites. This analysis step is a key element of this particular traffic and transportation analysis.

Trip generation rates from the different land use categories will be taken from the 2003 DSEA (based on Amtrak passengers surveys, ridership estimates from New Jersey Transit and LIRR, and information from the 1999 EA and 2003 DSEA of the increased "draw" to rail services from having a new, commodious rail passenger terminal), and from other studies of similar land uses in different parts of the City, which can be supplemented as necessary with information from standard reference books (e.g., Urban Space for Pedestrians, ITE Trip Generation Manual, etc.).

Modal split information will be taken from the 2003 DSEA, the Hudson Yards FGEIS, and from available Census data, and where applicable, from other previous studies in the project area. This

task will also rely on the 2003 DSEA for information on the operation of the new station, and on information from USPS concerning their workers and truck movements.

TASK 14. TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

For this EIS, it is assumed that existing and future year pedestrian volumes and transit information from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS will be used as a basis for the pedestrian and transit analyses. To the extent that the anticipated ridership volumes of New Jersey Transit and/or Long Island Rail Road passengers that would be expected to use the new Moynihan Station are similar to the volumes projected in the 1999 EA for Amtrak, it may not be necessary to revisit the below-grade internal circulation analysis. However, if the passenger volumes from the new station users are significantly greater than those projections, an updated analysis of the internal circulation would be undertaken as discussed below.

MASS TRANSIT

A. If the trip-generation for Phase I and Phase II (commercial overbuild or residential/mixed-use off-site development) of the proposed project indicates that bus ridership would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis thresholds, a quantitative analysis of the impact of the proposed project on local bus services will be prepared for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Otherwise a semi-qualitative analysis will be presented in the EIS.

   For this analysis it is assumed that the project elements from the 2003 DSEA are essentially the same for this project's Phase I analysis. The peak hour transit trips from the new project will be estimated and assigned to the individual bus routes serving the site and deficiencies, if any, at the peak load point will be determined. The bus analysis will conform to the guidelines presented in the *CEQR Technical Manual* and any project generated impacts will be identified. Existing information from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS will be used to the greatest extent possible to establish baseline analysis conditions.

   Mitigation measures will be recommended and analyzed, as appropriate, for all impacted locations in the study area. Separate mitigation analyses would be undertaken for 2010 and 2015 conditions, as required.

B. If the trip-generation for Phase I and Phase II (commercial overbuild or residential/mixed-use off-site development) of the proposed project indicates that subway ridership would exceed the *CEQR Technical Manual* analysis thresholds, a quantitative analysis of the impact of the proposed project on subway services will be prepared for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Otherwise a semi-qualitative analysis will be presented.

   Again, it is assumed that the project elements from the 2003 DSEA are essentially the same for this project's Phase I analysis. The analysis will consist of an assessment of the key station elements, including stairways, control booths, and turnstile areas. Existing counts and the assignment of No Build and Build transit trips will be in accordance with the travel demand information collected in the tasks above. Project-generated impact criteria will be in accordance with the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Existing information from the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS will be used to the greatest extent possible to establish baseline analysis conditions. In addition, the assignments of transit riders from the project site to the various subway stations that were developed for the 2003 DSEA would be used as appropriate, particularly for the assessment of Phase I project impacts. For the 2010 and 2015 Phase II analyses, any project impacts to the extension of the No. 7 train examined in the Hudson

Yards Rezoning FGEIS will be identified. Since weekend usage of nearby transit facilities is considerably lower than that analyzed for the weekday commuter peak periods, a Saturday transit analysis will not be undertaken.

Mitigation measures will be recommended and analyzed, as appropriate, for all impacted locations in the study area. This includes potential mitigation measures to address impacts on transit facilities, including subway station stairway modifications. Separate mitigation analyses would be undertaken for 2010 and 2015 conditions, as required.

PEDESTRIAN CONDITIONS

Street-Level Pedestrian Conditions

An assessment of street-level pedestrian conditions will be undertaken. For Phases I and II of the proposed project, the analysis will focus on conditions with the proposed project in place particularly at the sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks surrounding the Farley Complex site and at the sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks surrounding the Eighth Avenue off-site location. The analysis will include a quantitative study of the existing, No Build, and Build conditions at the corners, sidewalks, and crosswalks of the selected pedestrian study locations. The assessment will focus on the impact of the trips generated and diverted by the proposed project on the pedestrian facilities that border the Farley Complex along Eighth Avenue between West 31st and West 33rd Streets, and along Ninth Avenue between West 31st and West 33rd Streets, where a new pedestrian building entrance has been proposed (there is also the potential for a new mid-block crossing at this location, corresponding to the location of West 32nd Street). The street-level pedestrian elements to be examined are shown in Figure A-3. The analysis of these elements will be conducted for the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak periods, as well as the Saturday midday peak period.

Mitigation measures will be recommended and analyzed, as appropriate, for all impacted locations in the study area. This includes potential mitigation measures to address impacts on pedestrian facilities, including sidewalk or crosswalk modifications. Separate mitigation analyses would be undertaken for 2010 and 2015 conditions, as required.

Below-Grade Circulation

Depending on the resulting trip-generation for the users of the proposed station, an assessment of the below-grade internal pedestrian circulation and conditions would be undertaken. A quantitative analysis of the impact of the proposed project on level of service at key elements within the Moynihan Station/Farley Complex will be prepared. Relying on data collection and studies performed previously for the 1999 EA and 2003 DSEA, project demand, diversions, and the incremental increase at corridors, stairways, escalators, platforms, and concourse waiting areas will be estimated. The analyses will reflect modifications being made to the Eighth Avenue subway complex as part of the project, the extension of the west end concourse, and provision of new vertical circulation at the Farley Complex. The analyses will utilize as much of the information from the previous environmental studies undertaken for this site as possible. Because there is also an active project involving the potential construction of a new rail facility for New Jersey Transit nearby that could link to this facility (ARC) being undertaken by New Jersey Transit and the Port Authority, the ARC project and its implications for Moynihan Station will be described in the EIS.

TASK 15. AIR QUALITY

For this EIS analysis, the primary issue is indirect effects caused by mobile sources traveling to or from the project site. Stationary source issues are anticipated to be minor, particularly in Phase I (if Con Edison steam is used for building heat). Stationary source emissions from fossil fuel-fired heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) sources will be analyzed depending on where the venting for these emissions are located. Since the proposed project would be located near manufacturing-zoned areas, consideration of industrial sources will be necessary for the Phase II off-site residential/mixed-use development scenario.

Existing and projected future traffic conditions in the project area are congested, which results in high predicted mobile source pollutant concentrations. The air quality studies for the EIS are required to determine whether the proposed project would result in any significant impacts.

The mobile source air quality impact analysis will address two distinct issues:

- What effect will traffic-generated emissions have on pollutant levels (i.e., carbon monoxide concentrations) at locations in the adjacent study area; and
- Will the proposed project be consistent with the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the area.

Using computerized dispersion modeling techniques, the analysis will determine the effects of both project- and non-project-generated traffic on carbon monoxide (CO) levels at intersection locations within the study area, and, where significant project impacts are predicted to occur, develop feasible traffic measures to alleviate those impacts. The analysis methodology is relatively straightforward—selection of appropriate receptor sites, calculation of vehicular emissions, calculation of pollutant levels using dispersion models that have been approved by the applicable air quality review agencies, and the determination of impacts. The intersection coding work that was performed for the 2003 DSEA will be utilized. However, due to projected background growth in the study area, coupled with the predicted traffic to be generated by this proposed project, there will most likely be locations where traffic conditions are sensitive enough so that the screening analyses could show the potential for exceedances of CO standards from the expected increases/changes in traffic volumes. For those intersections, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) CAL3QHCR refined simulation model will be used. In addition, since either the Phase II commercial overbuild scenario or the residential/mixed-use off-site development scenario will increase project-generated traffic and may alter travel patterns around the Farley Complex or the Eighth Avenue site, it is likely that it will be necessary to analyze an additional intersection for mobile sources.

MOBILE SOURCE ANALYSES

The specific work program for the mobile source air quality studies is as follows:

A. Gather existing air quality data. Collect and summarize existing ambient air quality data for the study area. Specifically, ambient air quality monitoring data published by the NYSDEC will be compiled for the analysis of existing conditions.

B. For each project phase, perform a corridor analysis of future year emissions for three future years to determine the critical analysis year: 1) the project's build year, also known as the Estimated Time of Completion (ETC); 2) ETC + 10 years; and 3) ETC + 20 years.

C. Determine receptor locations for CO microscale analysis. Select critical intersection locations in the study area, and outside the study area, based on data obtained from the project's traffic analysis as well as traffic planners and engineers for each phase of the project. At each intersection, analyze multiple receptor sites.

D. Select dispersion model. Because of the congested nature of the study area, coupled with the expected number of new vehicle trips, EPA's CAL3QHCR refined intersection CO model will be used at most locations. For this analysis, five years of meteorological data from LaGuardia Airport will be used for the simulation program. EPA's CAL3QHC screening model will be used for less congested locations.

E. Select emission calculation methodology and "worst-case" meteorological conditions. Vehicular cruise and idle emissions for the dispersion modeling will be computed using EPA's MOBILE6.2 model. For the "worst-case" analysis (at screening locations), conservative meteorological conditions to be assumed in the dispersion modeling are a 1 meter per second wind speed, Class D stability, 52.5°F temperature, and a 0.77 persistence factor.

F. At each mobile source microscale receptor site, calculate maximum 1- and 8-hour CO concentrations for existing conditions, the future conditions without the project, and the future conditions with the project. Concentrations will be determined for two peak periods and two analysis years. Concentrations will also be determined for the critical analysis year, if different from the project's build years. No field monitoring will be included as part of these analyses.

G. Examine mitigation measures. Analyses will be performed to examine and quantify ameliorative measures to minimize any significant adverse impacts of the proposed project.

H. Determine the consistency of the proposed project with the strategies contained in the SIP for the area. At any receptor sites where violations of standards occur, analyses would be performed to determine what mitigation measures would be required to attain standards.

STATIONARY SOURCE ANALYSES

This study will assess potential impacts, if necessary, from HVAC system emissions on nearby receptor sites.

I. Perform a screening analysis, based on the methodology in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, to determine whether HVAC emissions from the proposed project are below significance levels that would result in violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). If the project's HVAC system fails the screening analysis, more detailed stationary source analyses will be performed with the ISC3 model. In the event that violations of standards are predicted, project improvements and alternative design measures would be examined to reduce pollutant levels to within standards.

INDUSTRIAL SOURCE ANALYSES

J. For the Phase II off-site residential or mixed-use development scenario, an analysis of uses surrounding the off-site location will be performed to determine the potential for impacts on residential uses from industrial emissions. A field survey will be performed to determine if there are any manufacturing or processing facilities within 400 feet of the Eighth Avenue site. In addition, a search of federal and state air permits, and the New York City

Department of Environmental Protection's Bureau of Environmental Compliance (BEC) files will be examined to determine if there are permits for any sources of toxic air compounds from industrial processes. Facilities identified from the Envirofacts database that are also found in the NYSDEC Air Guide-1 database, which presents a state-wide compilation of permit data for toxic air pollutants, will also be evaluated. The ISC3 refined dispersion model will be used for each pollutant to estimate maximum potential impacts from different sources at various distances. Impact distances selected for each source will be the minimum distances between the property boundary of the Eighth Avenue site and the source. Predicted worst-case impacts will be compared with the short-term guideline concentrations (SGCs) and annual guideline concentrations (AGCs) recommended in the NYSDEC's DAR-1 AGC/SGC tables. These guideline concentrations present the airborne concentrations which are applied as a screening threshold to determine if the future residents of the Eighth Avenue site could be significantly impacted from nearby sources of air pollution.

TASK 16. NOISE

The issue of particular concern for this analysis is the increase in noise levels from project-related traffic, both within and around the Farley Complex. The noise study will examine potential impacts on sensitive land uses (including nearby residences and open spaces) that would be affected by both changes in traffic resulting from the proposed project and noise generated by operations at the Farley Complex and the Eighth Avenue development site. In addition, it will be necessary to examine the effects of ambient noise levels on the potential Phase II off-site residential/mixed-use development.

The proposed scope of work includes: selection of receptor sites, measurement of existing noise levels, prediction of future noise levels both with and without the proposed project, impact evaluation, specifying building attenuation needed to satisfy CEQR building attenuation requirements, and the examination of noise abatement measures (where necessary). The methodologies used for this analysis would be consistent with the methodologies contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. Specifically the scope of work would consist of:

A. Appropriate noise descriptors to describe the noise environment and the impact of the proposed project will be selected. Current city criteria regarding noise descriptors will be followed. Consequently, where and when appropriate, the L_{10}, and/or 1-hour equivalent ($L_{eq(1)}$) noise levels will be examined.

B. Select receptor locations for detailed analysis. Receptor sites analyzed would include locations where the proposed project would have the greatest potential to affect ambient noise levels. A screening analysis will be undertaken to identify locations where increases or changes in traffic resulting from the modified proposed project would be likely to cause significant increases in noise levels at sensitive receptors. Based on the results of the screening analysis, locations for noise monitoring could be selected for the more detailed analyses.

C. Determine existing noise levels primarily through noise monitoring. Measurements will be made during the following time periods: weekday AM, midday, PM, and evening. Hourly L_{eq}, L_1, L_{10}, L_{50}, and L_{90} values will be recorded. Measured noise levels will be supplemented by mathematically modeled values where necessary.

D. Determine future noise levels without the proposed project. At each receptor location identified above, noise levels without the proposed project will be determined using existing noise levels, acoustical fundamentals, and mathematical models. The methodology used will allow for variations in vehicle/truck mixes.

E. Existing noise levels and future noise levels, both with and without the proposed project, will be compared with various noise standards, guidelines, and other noise criteria, including the New York City Ambient Noise Quality Criteria, and the New York City CEPO-CEQR Noise Standards. In addition, future noise levels with the proposed project would be compared with future noise levels without the proposed project to determine project impacts (i.e., based on the criteria contained in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, a change of 3-5 dBA or more would be considered a significant impact).

F. When and if necessary, recommendations of project improvements necessary to attain acceptable interior noise levels and to reduce noise impacts to acceptable levels will be made.

TASK 17. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

The 1999 EA and 2003 DSEA examined construction-related impacts of the project. The analyses and findings in those documents will be updated to include the changes to schedule, phasing, affected areas, impacts, and mitigation resulting from the current Phase I plan and the two Phase II development scenarios.

A. Construction Program. A detailed discussion of the construction program for each phase (as appropriate) will be provided. The discussion will address duration, staging areas, type of construction equipment (and location and duration of use in the phase), lane and sidewalk closures and consequent traffic rerouting anticipated, number of trucks, truck routes, and environmental regulations affecting construction noise or traffic. In addition, estimating construction employment in each phase will be performed to allow estimating employee trips, particularly those made by auto, and employee parking demand.

B. Transportation Systems. Consider losses in lanes, sidewalks, and other transportation services during the various phases of construction, and identify the increase in vehicle trips from construction workers and equipment.

C. Air Quality. Qualitatively discuss both mobile source emissions from construction equipment and worker and delivery vehicles, and fugitive dust emissions. Discuss measures to reduce impacts.

D. Noise. Qualitatively discuss construction-related noise, and what is likely during each phase of construction activity.

E. Historic Resources. In coordination with the work performed for historic resources, above, summarize actions to be taken during project construction to protect the Farley Complex itself and other historic resources in the immediate area.

F. Community Facilities and Services. Qualitatively discuss the effects of project construction on the continued provision of postal services within the Farley Complex.

G. Hazardous Materials. In coordination with the work performed for hazardous materials, summarize actions to be taken during project construction to limit exposure of construction workers to potential contaminants at the Farley Complex.

H. Other Technical Areas. As appropriate, discuss the other areas of environmental assessment for potential construction-related impacts.

TASK 18. PUBLIC HEALTH

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, public health comprises the activities that society undertakes to create and promote a community's wellness. The *CEQR Technical Manual* states that a public health assessment may be warranted if a project would increase vehicular traffic or emissions from stationary sources; potentially increase exposure to heavy metals and other contaminants; create potentially significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors; or result in an exceedance of accepted federal, state, or local standards. Therefore, the public health analysis will summarize findings from the air quality, hazardous materials, and noise chapters.

TASK 19. ALTERNATIVES

The specific alternatives to be analyzed are typically finalized with the lead agency as project impacts become clarified. However, they would at least include an alternative in which the site remains in its current condition, a No Action alternative and an alternative that reduces any unmitigated significant impacts. The No Action alternative has been developed in coordination with the USPS as current and future owner if the proposed project were not to go forward. In this alternative, USPS would continue to operate the main post office retail facility and would re-occupy much of the space anticipated for the Moynihan Station with administrative and mail sorting functions. Major distribution activities would not be reintroduced to the Farley Complex in the No Action alternative. It is assumed that most of the Western Annex would be used for private mixed-use commercial development consisting of 248,000 square feet of retail and 436,000 square feet of office space. The No Action alternative is also considered in the 2010 Future Without the Proposed Project.

In addition, this analysis will examine variations of the potential Phase II development. The Phase II options that will be analyzed include: 1) an approximately 1 million-square-foot residential development on the Eighth Avenue off-site location and the development of a sports arena within the Western Annex; and 2) an alternative that examines the full utilization of the Farley Complex's unused development rights (up to 2 million zoning feet). These development rights could be transferred to multiple off-site receiving parcels or used to construct a 1 million-square-foot overbuild on the Western Annex and a development on the Eighth Avenue off-site location or on multiple off-site receiving locations.

It is presumed that the arena alternative would require a quantified analysis of certain technical areas such as traffic and parking, air quality, noise, and transit and pedestrians. That analysis would use the 2010 scenario in the Hudson Yards Rezoning FGEIS (with appropriate adjustments) that assumes relocation of Madison Square Garden to Ninth Avenue (across from the Farley Complex) and redevelopment of the existing Madison Square Garden site as a basis for the quantified analyses. Otherwise, the alternatives analysis is qualitative, except where impacts of the project have been identified.

TASK 20. MITIGATION

Where significant project impacts have been identified in the analyses discussed above, measures will be assessed to mitigate those impacts. This task summarizes the findings of the relevant analyses and discusses potential mitigation measures. Where impacts cannot be mitigated, they will be described as unavoidable adverse impacts.

TASK 21. SUMMARY CHAPTERS

Several summary chapters will be prepared, focusing on various aspects of the EIS, as recommended in the *CEQR Technical Manual*. They are as follows:

1. *Executive Summary*. Once the EIS technical sections have been prepared, a concise executive summary will be drafted. The executive summary will utilize relevant material from the body of the EIS to describe the proposed project, its environmental impacts, measures to mitigate those impacts, and alternatives to the proposed project.
2. *Unavoidable Adverse Impacts*. Those impacts, if any, that could not be avoided and could not be practicably mitigated will be listed in this chapter.
3. *Growth-Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Project*. This chapter will focus on whether the proposed project would have the potential to induce new development within the surrounding area.
4. *Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources*. This chapter focuses on those resources, such as energy and construction materials, that would be irretrievably committed should the project be built.
5. *Short Term Uses of the Environment vs. the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity*. This chapter will address the trade-off between the adverse impacts of the proposed project during construction and operation and its benefits as defined by the project purpose and need. ✷