

**A. INTRODUCTION**

As described in the 2014 *City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) Technical Manual*, alternatives selected for consideration in an environmental impact statement (EIS) are generally those that are feasible and have the potential to reduce, eliminate, or avoid any adverse impacts of a proposed action while meeting some or all of the goals and objectives of the action.

In addition to a comparative impact analysis, the alternatives in this chapter are assessed to determine to what extent they would meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project, which include: (1) maximizing economic impact; (2) creating recreational and community facilities; (3) creating programs and activities that promote and encourage public health and physical fitness; and (4) incorporating sustainable building practices and appropriate levels of LEED or Energy Star certification.

This chapter considers three alternatives to the proposed project:

- A No-Action Alternative, which is mandated by CEQR and SEQRA, and is intended to provide the lead and involved agencies with an assessment of the expected environmental impacts of no action on their part. Under this alternative, the Bronx Children’s Psychiatric, Thompson, and Parker Buildings have been vacated and their uses relocated to new Bronx Psychiatric Center (BPC) facilities located at the southern portion of the campus. It is assumed that in the future without the proposed project (the “No-Action” condition), these existing buildings would remain vacant. The steam-generating powerhouse, two metal shelters, and small storage building on the project site would also remain vacated and decommissioned. The ball fields would remain as in existing conditions.
- A No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative, which considers a project program that would eliminate the proposed project’s unmitigated significant adverse impacts in the area of transportation.
- A Reduced Density Alternative, described below, which considers a project program that would include less total square footage of development, including less commercial office, medical office, accessory use, retail, parking square footage, and open space than the proposed project.

**PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS**

The conclusion of the alternatives analysis is that the No-Action Alternative and No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternatives would not substantively meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project, while the Reduced Density Alternative would meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project to a substantially lesser degree than the proposed project. Each of the alternatives is summarized briefly below, followed by a more detailed chapter analysis.

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

### *NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE*

The No-Action Alternative assumes no discretionary actions would occur and the proposed project would not be implemented. The project site would remain underutilized. This alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant adverse impacts related to transportation, air quality, and construction impacts related to transportation. The No-Action Alternative would not meet the Empire State Development (ESD)'s development priorities of maximizing economic impact; creating recreational and community facilities; creating programs and activities that promote and encourage public health and physical fitness; and incorporating sustainable building practices and appropriate levels of LEED or Energy Star certification. Overall, the No-Action Alternative would fail to meet the proposed project's principal goals.

### *NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS*

The No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative considers several modifications of the proposed project to eliminate its unmitigated significant adverse impacts on traffic, and construction-period traffic. To eliminate all unmitigated significant adverse impacts, the proposed project would have to be modified to the point that its principal goals and objectives would not be realized.

### *REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE*

The Reduced Density Alternative considers a project program that includes less total square footage of development, including less commercial office, medical office, accessory use, retail, parking square footage, and open space than the proposed project. The Reduced Density Alternative would include one phase of development with approximately 232,500 gross square feet (gsf) less development than Phase I of the proposed project. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, there would be no second phase of development, unlike the proposed project. This alternative would include the development of the Parker Building; Thompson Building; retail building; amenities building; Parking Garage 3, 4, and 5; the surface parking lot between the Thompson Building and Parker Building; and the little league field. Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, their associated parking garages, and the regulation-size baseball field would not be constructed under this alternative. This alternative would avoid some of the significant adverse transportation impacts and the significant adverse air quality impact that would occur absent the proposed traffic mitigation measures with Phase II of the proposed project. This alternative would be less supportive of the goals and objectives of the proposed project, particularly the goal to maximize the economic impact of the project.

## **B. NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

The No-Action Alternative assumes no discretionary actions would occur and the proposed project would not be implemented. Independent of the proposed project, the Bronx Children's Psychiatric, Thompson, and Parker Buildings have been vacated and their uses relocated to new BPC facilities located at the southern portion of the campus. For the purposes of the EIS, it is assumed that in the future without the proposed project (the No-Action condition), these existing buildings would remain vacant. The steam-generating powerhouse, two metal shelters, and small storage building on the project site would also remain vacated and decommissioned. The ballfields would remain as in existing conditions.

For the purposes of the EIS, No-Action conditions are analyzed without the new Hutchinson River Parkway (HRP) connections for the 2023 Phase I analysis year and with the new HRP connections for the 2028 Phase II analysis year.

*LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*

In both the 2023 Phase I and 2028 Phase II of the No-Action Alternative, the project site would remain vacant and underutilized, and the zoning of the project site would remain M1-1 and R5. In the No-Action Alternative it is assumed that the Bronx Children’s Psychiatric, Thompson, and Parker Buildings would remain vacant and uses relocated to new BPC facilities located at the southern portion of the campus. It is also assumed that the powerhouse, two metal shelters, and small storage building on the project site would remain vacated and decommissioned. The ballfields would remain as in existing conditions.

Unlike the proposed project, the public policy goals relating to the project site would not be met in the No-Action Alternative. None of the objectives of the City’s *Waterfront Revitalization Program*, the *Vision 2020: New York City Comprehensive Waterfront Plan*, and the New York State *Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act* policies would be advanced by the No-Action Alternative since under this alternative the project site would not be redeveloped, and the project site would remain underutilized.

The No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, or public policy. However, the benefits of the proposed project, including the rehabilitation of the project site, introduction of complementary land uses to enliven the site, and advance various public policy goals, would not happen under the No-Action Alternative. Furthermore, the No-Action Alternative would not meet ESD’s development priorities of maximizing economic impact; creating recreational and community facilities; creating programs and activities that promote and encourage public health and physical fitness; and incorporating sustainable building practices and appropriate levels of LEED or Energy Star certification.

*SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*

The No-Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions in both the 2023 Phase I and 2028 Phase II analysis years. The No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts due to direct or indirect residential displacement. This alternative does not include any plans for development; therefore, without new office, biotech/research, hotel, college/trade school, retail, community facility, or accessory uses, this alternative would not have any significant adverse impact on any specific industries and would not result in direct business displacement. The proposed project would introduce new uses that would enliven the site and provide new uses that would serve the surrounding area and the City as a whole. Under the No-Action Alternative, these potential benefits would not be realized.

*COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

*Public Schools*

Neither the No-Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in a significant adverse impact to elementary schools, intermediate schools, or high schools in the 2023 or 2028 analysis years. The public elementary schools and intermediate schools in Community School District 11, Sub-district 1 would operate over capacity irrespective of development on the project site.

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

### *Public Libraries, Publicly Funded Child Care Centers, Outpatient Health Facilities, and Police and Fire Protection Services*

As with the proposed project, pursuant to *CEQR Technical Manual* guidelines, detailed analyses of public libraries, publicly funded child care centers, outpatient health facilities, and police and fire protection services are not warranted. The No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts to these community facilities in either the 2023 or 2028 analysis year.

### *OPEN SPACE*

As with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not remove any existing public open space resources on the project site, and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to open space. Unlike the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in the removal of the four private baseball fields on the project site and replacement with one private regulation-size baseball field and one private little league-size field by the completion of Phase I in 2023. The No-Action Alternative would not provide any new publicly accessible open space resources in the form of new walking/bike paths and new open space amenities, and it would not result in the approximately 3.9 acres of new publicly accessible open space that would be part of the proposed project with the completion of Phase II in 2028. Residential development would not occur on the project site under the No-Action Alternative, as it would with the proposed project. The ½-mile residential study area is underserved by total and active open space in existing conditions, and would continue to be underserved in either the No-Action Alternative or proposed project scenario. Neither the proposed project nor the No-Action Alternative would result in any significant adverse impacts to open space.

### *SHADOWS*

Under the No-Action Alternative, the project site would remain unchanged from existing conditions, and therefore there would be no change with respect to existing shadows. The proposed project would facilitate the development of new structures on the project site, which would cast new shadows on the Hutchinson River Greenway and Colucci Playground, sunlight-sensitive, publicly accessible open spaces, but would not result in shadows of sufficient duration to result in any significant adverse shadows impact on the Hutchinson River Greenway, Colucci Playground, or any other sunlight-sensitive resources. Therefore, neither the No-Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse shadows impacts.

### *HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES*

As the project site is not sensitive for archaeological resources, the No-Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on archaeological resources. In addition, there are no architectural resources on the project site or in the study area; therefore, the No-Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in adverse impacts to architectural resources.

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

Like the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on the urban design, view corridors, or visual resources in the ¼-mile study area. Under the No-Action Alternative the Bronx Children's Psychiatric, Thompson Building, and Parker Building will remain vacated and their uses relocated to new BPC facilities located at the southern portion of the campus. It is assumed that these existing buildings would remain vacant. The Powerhouse would also remain vacated and decommissioned and the ballfields would remain in their existing conditions. The No-Action Alternative would not result in additional development

on the project site or improvements to the campus, nor would it contribute to the improvement of the pedestrian experience of the project site and surrounding area, including improvements to the vitality, walkability and visual character of the area. However, as with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

#### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

As with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to groundwater, floodplains, water quality, aquatic biota, wetlands, terrestrial natural resources, and threatened or endangered species within the project site and ½-mile study area. No substantial changes are expected to the project site or the study area under the No-Action Alternative; therefore, floodplains and natural resources under the No-Action condition are expected to remain similar to the existing conditions within the study area. The reduced level of human disturbance as a result of the vacated buildings could result in a small shift in the wildlife assemblage composition toward a less human disturbance-tolerant assemblage. It is assumed that some ongoing maintenance and mowing would occur, particularly related to the active existing athletic fields within the study area. Although the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources within the project site and study area, it would also not incorporate green infrastructure and other design features that would be implemented under the proposed project and would be intended to minimize potential adverse impacts on natural resources.

#### *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*

There would be no construction on the project site in the No-Action Alternative. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Petroleum Bulk Storage and petroleum spill cleanup requirements would need to be followed under the No-Action Alternative. This would entail proper closure and/or removal of out of service tanks. In 2016, delineation of a petroleum spill related to Tank 17 was completed. A remedy for this spill was proposed to and has been approved by NYSDEC, but has not yet been implemented, and it is anticipated that the scope will be revised, subject to NYSDEC approval, prior to implementation.

Two transformer rooms in the Thompson Building are a State-listed Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Site (IHWDS) due to leaks from polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing electrical transformers. Under the No-Action Alternative, these areas would be remediated in accordance with the March 2019 Record of Decision issued by NYSDEC.

The site buildings are known to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and were constructed at a time when lead-based paint (LBP) was commonly used. Applicable regulatory requirements relating to maintenance/disturbance of these materials would need to be followed.

Therefore, the No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

#### *WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE*

The No-Action Alternative would not result in any increased demand on New York City's water supply from the existing conditions and would not result in any change in wastewater and sanitary sewage generation. Although there would be an increase in impervious surfaces under the proposed project, neither the No-Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in any significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, wastewater, or stormwater conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

### *SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES*

The No-Action Alternative would not generate additional solid waste. As with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts on solid waste and sanitation services.

### *ENERGY*

The No-Action Alternative would not increase demand for electricity, compared with the proposed project, which would generate an incremental increase in energy demand that would be negligible when compared with the overall demand within Con Edison's New York City and Westchester County service area. Neither the No-Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts with respect to the transmission or generation of energy.

### *TRANSPORTATION*

As detailed above, under the No-Action Alternative no substantial changes are expected to the study area for the 2023 Phase I analysis year. For the 2028 Phase II analysis year, access improvements to the southbound HRP are assumed to be completed for analysis purposes. Although the No-Action Alternative would not result in any of the travel demand associated with the proposed project (and would therefore not generate any new vehicular trips), traffic volumes in the study area would be expected to increase as a result of background growth and planned development in the study area. The overall levels of service would be expected to deteriorate in the No-Action Alternative, for both analysis years, as compared with the existing conditions. However, the No-Action Alternative would not result in the significant adverse traffic impacts identified for the proposed project, which would occur at a number of intersections and freeway facilities, nor would this alternative result in the bus line-haul impacts identified for the project.

### *AIR QUALITY*

The No-Action Alternative would not result in emissions from vehicle trips generated by the proposed project or the proposed parking facilities. The No-Action Alternative would not result in the significant adverse air quality impacts identified for the proposed project. The No-Action Alternative also would not result in incremental emissions from new heat and hot water systems associated with the proposed project. However, it should be noted with the proposed project, there would be no potential for significant adverse air quality impacts from heating and hot water systems for the proposed project.

### *GREENHOUSE GASES*

The No-Action Alternative would not result in an increase in energy use, fuel consumption, or vehicle trips, and would therefore not result in the increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the proposed project. However, the proposed project (which would not result in any significant adverse impacts to greenhouse gas emissions) would be consistent with PlaNYC/OneNYC GHG emissions reduction goals, benefits that may not be realized under the No-Action Alternative.

### *NOISE*

Like the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not generate sufficient traffic to have the potential to cause a significant adverse noise impact. As with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts to noise.

### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

Like the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in any significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. However, unlike the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in enlivening largely vacant and underutilized lots with new, mixed-use buildings with active ground-floor uses, nor would it add new publicly accessible open space. The benefits to neighborhood character that would result from the proposed uses and design of the proposed project would not be realized under the No-Action Alternative.

### *CONSTRUCTION*

Under the No-Action Alternative, no construction would occur on the project site. The buildings would remain in their current condition. The No-Action Alternative would not result in the additional vehicle trips or increased parking demand generated by the proposed project's construction activities. The No-Action Alternative would not result in increased pollutant emissions that would occur during construction of the proposed project. The No-Action Alternative also would not result in increased noise levels that would be associated with the construction of the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse construction impacts with respect to air quality, historic and cultural resources, hazardous materials, open space, socioeconomic conditions, community facilities, natural resources, and land use and neighborhood character.

### *PUBLIC HEALTH*

The No-Action Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts.

## **C. NO UNMITIGATED SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ALTERNATIVE**

### **ALTERNATIVE IDENTIFICATION**

In order to identify a No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impact Alternative, the full range of impacts identified for the proposed project was considered to determine what avoidance measures would be required for the different types of impacts. As discussed in Chapter 22, "Mitigation," the proposed project is anticipated to have significant adverse impacts that may not be able to be mitigated in the areas of transportation (traffic) and construction-period traffic. Therefore, those technical areas are considered below.

### **TRANSPORTATION**

As discussed in Chapter 22, "Mitigation," the proposed project could result in unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. Therefore, alternatives were developed to explore modifications to the proposed project that would allow for the mitigation of these impacts.

In the 2023 With-Action without HRP Improvements condition, the proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated at 13 intersections. These include the intersections of Waters Place and Marconi Street; Waters Place and BPC Driveway; Waters Place and Fink Avenue/HRP Southbound Off-Ramp; Waters Place and Westchester Avenue; Project Driveway and Marconi Street; East Tremont Avenue and Silver Street; Westchester Avenue and Ericson Place/Middletown Road; Westchester Avenue and Tan Place; Westchester Avenue and East Tremont Avenue; Westchester Avenue and Commerce Avenue; Westchester Avenue and Waters Avenue; Morris Park Avenue and Eastchester Road; and East Tremont Avenue and Ericson Place. In addition, queues extending from some of the above

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

impacted intersections could cause significant adverse impacts on their adjoining ramps and highway mainlines, including the northbound HRP mainline segment south of the East Tremont Avenue off-ramp (Exit 2), the East Tremont Avenue off-ramp, the southbound HRP mainline segment north of the Waters Place off-ramp (Exit 2), and the Waters Place off-ramp. Some of these impact also could not be fully mitigated.

In the 2028 With-Action with HRP Improvements condition, the proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated at 17 intersections. These include the 13 intersections identified for the 2023 With-Action without HRP Improvements condition and the intersections of Waters Place and Eastchester Road; Westchester Avenue and Blondell Avenue; Williamsbridge Road and Eastchester Road; East-West Road and HRP Service Road. In addition, as with the 2023 With-Action without HRP Improvements condition, there could be potential unmitigatable impacts on the East Tremont Avenue off-ramp and, south of this ramp, along the northbound HRP mainline segment.

Of the significant adverse transportation impacts identified for the proposed project that could not be fully mitigated, the traffic impacts at the intersection of Westchester Avenue and Ericson Place/Middletown Road were determined to be the most difficult to mitigate, due to multiple lane groups/movements at this intersection projected to operate at congested levels. Hence, even small increases in incremental project-generated traffic volumes at this intersection would result in significant adverse traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated during one or more analysis peak hours. Correspondingly, any development could result in unmitigated traffic impacts. Therefore, no reasonable alternative could be developed to avoid such impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's stated goals.

### **CONSTRUCTION**

#### *TRAFFIC*

The Phase I and Phase II peak construction traffic increments would be substantially lower than the operational traffic increments for the Phase I completion and Phase II full build-out under the proposed project in 2023 and 2028, respectively. However, these activities would still have the potential to cause significant adverse traffic impacts. During peak Phase I construction in 2022, five of the analyzed intersections would be significantly impacted during the weekday 6 AM to 7 AM construction peak hour and 12 of the analyzed intersections would be significantly impacted during the weekday 3 PM to 4 PM construction peak hour. The impacts identified at the intersections of Morris Park Avenue and Eastchester Road, Marconi Street and Project Driveway, and Waters Place and Westchester Avenue during the afternoon construction peak hour could not be fully mitigated. For peak Phase II construction in 2027, the corresponding number of impacted intersections would be six and 14, respectively, for the 6 AM to 7 AM and 3 PM to 4 PM construction peak hours. Among these, the impacts identified at the intersections of Morris Park Avenue and Eastchester Road, East Tremont Avenue and Silver Street, Waters Place and Marconi Street, Waters Place and Fink Avenue/HRP Southbound Off-Ramp, and Waters Place and Westchester Avenue during the afternoon construction peak hour could not be fully mitigated. Although these effects would be temporary and less intense during non-peak construction periods, as discussed above, no reasonable alternative could be developed to avoid such temporary impacts without substantially compromising the proposed project's stated goals.

## **D. REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the Bronx Psychiatric Center would be redeveloped with a total of approximately 782,900 gsf, approximately 232,500 gsf less development than Phase I of the proposed project. The Reduced Density Alternative would be constructed in one phase; unlike the proposed project, there would be no second phase of development.

The Reduced Density Alternative would include all of the same uses as the proposed project except accessory uses. The project site would continue to contain commercial office, medical office, biotech/research, hotel, college/trade school, retail, community facility, support and amenity space, parking, and open space. This alternative would include the development of the Parker Building; Thompson Building; retail building; amenities building; Parking Garage 3, 4, and 5; the surface parking lot between the Thompson Building and Parker Building; and the little league field. Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, their associated parking garages, and the regulation-size baseball field would not be constructed under this alternative. One of the four existing baseball fields currently located on the project site would remain and would continue to be used by local community athletic organizations; the other three existing baseball fields would be cleared to provide space for construction staging and parking under the Reduced Density Alternative.

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the northern portion of the BPC campus would be developed without the 250 accessory use dwelling units that the proposed project would include, as well as 300,000 gsf less commercial office space; 450,000 gsf less of medical office; and 14,000 gsf less of retail; for a total of approximately 1,014,00 gsf less than the full build out of the proposed project. The Reduced Density Alternative would also result in 2,010 fewer parking spaces and 5.3 fewer acres of open space (approximately 2.1 fewer acres of publicly accessible open space) (see **Table 21-1**).

Based on the analyses presented below, this alternative would avoid some of the significant adverse transportation impacts and the significant adverse air quality impact that would occur absent the proposed traffic mitigation measures with Phase II of the proposed project. This alternative would be less supportive of the goals and objectives of the proposed project, particularly the goal to maximize the economic impact of the project.

**Table 21-1**  
**Reduced Density Alternative Compared with the Proposed Project**

<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Reduced Density Alternative</b>	<b>Proposed Project—Phase I</b>	<b>Difference Compared with Proposed Project—Phase I</b>	<b>Proposed Project—Full Build Out</b>	<b>Difference Compared with Proposed Project—Full Build Out</b>
Commercial Office	167,000	217,000	-50,000	467,000	-300,000
Medical Office	250,500	325,500	-75,000	700,500	-450,000
Bio-tech/Research	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0
Accessory Use	0	100,000	-100,000	250,000	-250,000
Hotel <sup>1</sup>	124,300	124,300	0	124,300	0
College/Trade School	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0
Retail	26,000	33,500	-7,500	40,000	-14,000
Community Facility	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	0
Little League Field Support Building	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	0
Amenities Building	8,100	8,100	0	8,100	0
<b>Total, excluding parking<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>779,900</b>	<b>1,012,400</b>	<b>-232,500</b>	<b>1,794,000</b>	<b>-1,014,100</b>
Parking (accessory, surface and garage)	2,019	2,509	-490	4,029	-2,010
Open Space	148,500 (3.4 acres) <sup>4</sup>	309,700 (7.1 acres) <sup>3</sup>	- 161,200 (-3.7 acres)	380,900 (8.7 acres) <sup>3</sup>	-232,400 (-5.3 acres)

**Notes:**  
 1) Includes approximately 11,200 gsf of conference space.  
 2) Totals may not sum due to rounding.  
 3) Approximately 3.4 acres of the proposed open space with Phase I of the proposed project would be publicly accessible. Approximately 0.4 acres of the proposed open space with Phase II of the proposed project would be publicly accessible, for a total of approximately 3.9 acres (accounting for rounding) with Phase I and Phase II.  
 4) Approximately 1.8 acres of the proposed open space with the reduced density alternative would be publicly accessible.  
**Source:** Simone Development Companies.

**COMPARISON OF THE REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The effects of the Reduced Density Alternative in comparison to those of the proposed project are summarized below.

*LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY*

As described above, the Reduced Density Alternative would include all of the same uses as the proposed project except the accessory uses. As with the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would activate and enliven the underutilized project site. However, because the Reduced Density Alternative would include less overall development and no accessory use dwelling units, it would be less successful at enlivening the project site than the proposed project under either Phase I or Phase II. With the same mix of uses and similar zoning actions as the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and public policy.

*SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS*

As with Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in impacts related to either direct or indirect displacement of residences or businesses nor would it result in impacts on specific industries.

*COMMUNITY FACILITIES*

The Reduced Density Alternative, which would not introduce accessory use dwelling units, would result in 98 fewer elementary school students and 40 fewer intermediate school students than Phase II of the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Density Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to elementary or intermediate schools.

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to high schools, child care facilities, or police, fire, or healthcare services.

*OPEN SPACE*

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in fewer workers and fewer residents on the project site than either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed project. This would reduce demand for both passive and active open spaces compared with both phases of the proposed project. Compared with Phase I of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would introduce less publicly accessible open space and fewer workers and residents. Compared with Phase II of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in approximately 2.1 fewer acres of publicly accessible open space, and substantially fewer workers and residents. Both the Reduced Density Alternative and the proposed project would result in an increase in publicly accessible open space on the project site. As with the proposed project, the Reduce Density Alternative would not result in any significant adverse direct or indirect open space impacts. One of the four existing baseball fields currently located on the project site would remain available for use by local community athletic organizations but would not be considered publicly accessible open space under the Reduced Density Alternative.

*SHADOWS*

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would facilitate the development of new structures on the project site. Under both the proposed project and the Reduced Density Alternative, Parking Garage 5 would cast new afternoon shadows on the Hutchinson River Greenway, a sunlight-sensitive, publicly accessible open space. The Reduced Density Alternative would not include any development in Phase II, including no Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and would not result in any new shadow from these structures. The incremental shadows resulting from the proposed project would not substantially alter the usability of the open space resources or its ability to sustain vegetation. Neither the proposed project nor the Reduced Density Alternative would result in any significant adverse shadows impact on the Hutchinson River Greenway or any other sunlight-sensitive resource.

*HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES*

The Reduced Density Alternative, like the proposed project, would have no adverse impact on archaeological resources as the project site is not sensitive for pre-contact or historic period archaeological resources. The Reduced Density Alternative, like the proposed project, would have no adverse impact on architectural resources as there are no architectural resources located on the project site or in the study area.

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

### *URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES*

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in similar changes to urban design and visual resources as the proposed project. As with both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in substantial changes to the urban design of the vacant and underutilized project site, and would be in keeping with the uses, height, massing, and material of buildings in the study area. Like Phase I of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would replace a portion of the largely vacant and underutilized project site with new office, medical office, and community facility uses, as well as buildings containing active ground-floor retail uses and pedestrian amenities. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not include any Phase II development, and therefore would not activate the entire project site, nor would it provide new sidewalks, crosswalks, and landscaping throughout the entire site. Neither the proposed project under Phase I or Phase II, nor the Reduced Density Alternative, would result in significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

### *NATURAL RESOURCES*

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to groundwater, floodplains, water quality, aquatic biota, wetlands, terrestrial natural resources, and threatened or endangered species within project site and ½-mile study area. The Reduced Density Alternative would result in similar disturbance as Phase I of the proposed project, and would result in less disturbance than Phase II of the proposed project because this alternative would not include any development in a second phase. The reduced level of human disturbance under this alternative could result in a small shift in the wildlife assemblage composition toward a less human disturbance-tolerant assemblage. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would also incorporate green infrastructure and other design features intended to minimize potential adverse impacts on natural resources.

### *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS*

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, any construction involving soil disturbance on the project site could potentially increase pathways for human exposure to any subsurface hazardous materials present in those areas. As with the proposed project, potential adverse impacts would be avoided by performing testing and the required remedial measures in accordance with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) and the development agreement between ESD and the developer, as noted in Chapter 10, “Hazardous Materials.”

### *WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE*

With less office, housing, and retail floor area than the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less water demand and a reduction in sanitary sewage flows than both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project. Therefore, like the proposed project this alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to either the water supply or sanitary sewage systems.

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in a reduction in the runoff rate compared with Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project since Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and the associated parking would not be developed under this alternative. Like the proposed project, this alternative would introduce new infrastructure, including new sanitary sewers and stormwater Best

Management Practices, and would not result in significant adverse impacts to the stormwater conveyance system.

*SOLID WASTE*

The proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to solid waste management facilities. With less office, housing, and retail floor area than the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less solid waste generation than both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project. Therefore, like the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to solid waste.

*ENERGY*

The proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to energy transmission and generation. With less office, housing, and retail floor area than the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less demand for energy than both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project. Therefore, as with the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to energy transmission and generation.

*TRANSPORTATION*

Based on the trip generation assumptions detailed in Chapter 14, "Transportation," the Reduced Density Alternative would generate 1,472, 2,620, and 1,914 person trips and 929, 782, and 966 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, respectively. In comparison, the Phase I completion of the proposed project would generate 1,812, 3,255, and 2,392 person trips and 1,122, 941, and 1,180 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, respectively; and the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project would generate 3,116, 5,127, and 3,910 person trips and 2,037, 1,662, and 2,163 vehicle trips during the weekday AM, midday, and PM peak hours, respectively. As summarized in **Table 21-2**, compared with the Phase I completion of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would yield up to approximately 640 fewer peak hour person trips and 210 fewer peak hour vehicle trips. Compared with the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project, as summarized in **Table 21-3**, the Reduced Density Alternative would yield up to approximately 2,500 fewer peak hour person trips and 1,200 fewer peak hour vehicle trips.

**Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

**Table 21-2**

**Comparison of Proposed Project Phase I to Reduced Density Alternative**

Program	Peak Hour	In/Out	Person Trip									Vehicle Trip					
			Auto		Taxi	Subway	Bus	Shuttle Bus	Walk		Total	Auto		Taxi	Shuttle Bus	Delivery	Total
			Internal	External					Internal	External		Internal	External				
Reduced Density Alternative	AM	In	0	786	60	64	96	21	72	66	1,165	0	667	56	1	9	733
		Out	0	164	17	12	20	4	72	18	307	0	130	56	1	9	196
		Total	0	950	77	76	116	25	144	84	1,472	0	797	112	2	18	929
	Midday	In	5	390	40	31	42	14	675	63	1,260	4	313	51	0	9	377
		Out	7	405	35	34	41	16	754	68	1,360	6	339	51	0	9	405
		Total	12	795	75	65	83	30	1,429	131	2,620	10	652	102	0	18	782
	PM	In	0	256	30	16	34	4	240	39	619	0	201	64	1	2	268
		Out	0	746	59	63	93	22	240	72	1,295	0	631	64	1	2	698
		Total	0	1,002	89	79	127	26	480	111	1,914	0	832	128	2	4	966
Phase I Completion of Proposed Project	AM	In	0	948	70	82	114	27	93	78	1,412	0	809	64	0	10	883
		Out	0	204	18	30	27	5	93	23	400	0	165	64	0	10	239
		Total	0	1,152	88	112	141	32	186	101	1,812	0	974	128	0	20	1,122
	Midday	In	6	459	45	42	49	19	861	77	1,558	5	375	61	0	11	452
		Out	8	485	41	45	50	21	964	83	1,697	7	410	61	0	11	489
		Total	14	944	86	87	99	40	1,825	160	3,255	12	785	122	0	22	941
	PM	In	0	299	31	34	41	6	309	49	769	0	238	74	0	2	314
		Out	0	926	70	86	114	28	309	90	1,623	0	790	74	0	2	866
		Total	0	1,225	101	120	155	34	618	139	2,392	0	1,028	148	0	4	1,180
Net Difference	AM	In	0	-162	-10	-18	-18	-6	-21	-12	-247	0	-142	-8	1	-1	-150
		Out	0	-40	-1	-18	-7	-1	-21	-5	-93	0	-35	-8	1	-1	-43
		Total	0	-202	-11	-36	-25	-7	-42	-17	-340	0	-177	-16	2	-2	-193
	Midday	In	-1	-69	-5	-11	-7	-5	-186	-14	-298	-1	-62	-10	0	-2	-75
		Out	-1	-80	-6	-11	-9	-5	-210	-15	-337	-1	-71	-10	0	-2	-84
		Total	-2	-149	-11	-22	-16	-10	-396	-29	-635	-2	-133	-20	0	-4	-159
	PM	In	0	-43	-1	-18	-7	-2	-69	-10	-150	0	-37	-10	1	0	-46
		Out	0	-180	-11	-23	-21	-6	-69	-18	-328	0	-159	-10	1	0	-168
		Total	0	-223	-12	-41	-28	-8	-138	-28	-478	0	-196	-20	2	0	-214

**Table 21-3**

**Comparison of Proposed Project Phase II Full Build-Out with Reduced Density Alternative**

Program	Peak Hour	In/Out	Person Trip									Vehicle Trip					
			Auto		Taxi	Subway	Bus	Shuttle Bus	Walk		Total	Auto		Taxi	Shuttle Bus	Delivery	Total
			Internal	External					Internal	External		Internal	External				
Reduced Density Alternative	AM	In	0	786	60	64	96	21	72	66	1,165	0	667	56	1	9	733
		Out	0	164	17	12	20	4	72	18	307	0	130	56	1	9	196
		Total	0	950	77	76	116	25	144	84	1,472	0	797	112	2	18	929
	Midday	In	5	390	40	31	42	14	675	63	1,260	4	313	51	0	9	377
		Out	7	405	35	34	41	16	754	68	1,360	6	339	51	0	9	405
		Total	12	795	75	65	83	30	1,429	131	2,620	10	652	102	0	18	782
	PM	In	0	256	30	16	34	4	240	39	619	0	201	64	1	2	268
		Out	0	746	59	63	93	22	240	72	1,295	0	631	64	1	2	698
		Total	0	1,002	89	79	127	26	480	111	1,914	0	832	128	2	4	966
Phase II Full Build-out of Proposed Project	AM	In	0	1,734	120	155	197	60	111	129	2,506	0	1,501	110	1	19	1,631
		Out	0	328	25	61	42	10	111	33	610	0	276	110	1	19	406
		Total	0	2,062	145	216	239	70	222	162	3,116	0	1,777	220	2	38	2,037
	Midday	In	11	777	65	77	70	40	1,252	102	2,394	10	658	98	1	19	786
		Out	16	861	64	85	76	45	1,474	112	2,733	14	744	98	1	19	876
		Total	27	1,638	129	162	146	85	2,726	214	5,127	24	1,402	196	2	38	1,662
	PM	In	0	438	39	64	58	12	369	63	1,043	0	363	123	1	5	492
		Out	0	1,781	125	169	211	61	369	151	2,867	0	1,542	123	1	5	1,671
		Total	0	2,219	164	233	269	73	738	214	3,910	0	1,905	246	2	10	2,163
Net Difference	AM	In	0	-948	-60	-91	-101	-39	-39	-63	-1,341	0	-834	-54	0	-10	-898
		Out	0	-164	-8	-49	-22	-6	-39	-15	-303	0	-146	-54	0	-10	-210
		Total	0	-1,112	-68	-140	-123	-45	-78	-78	-1,644	0	-980	-108	0	-20	-1,108
	Midday	In	-6	-387	-25	-46	-28	-26	-577	-39	-1,134	-6	-345	-47	-1	-10	-409
		Out	-9	-456	-29	-51	-35	-29	-720	-44	-1,373	-8	-405	-47	-1	-10	-471
		Total	-15	-843	-54	-97	-63	-55	-1,297	-83	-2,507	-14	-750	-94	-2	-20	-880
	PM	In	0	-182	-9	-48	-24	-8	-129	-24	-424	0	-162	-59	0	-3	-224
		Out	0	-1,035	-66	-106	-118	-39	-129	-79	-1,572	0	-911	-59	0	-3	-973
		Total	0	-1,217	-75	-154	-142	-47	-258	-103	-1,996	0	-1,073	-118	0	-6	-1,197

Since the Reduced Density Alternative incremental trips would be lower than those the proposed project would generate, the potential transportation impacts (traffic and transit) would be within the envelope of significant adverse transportation impacts identified for the proposed project in Chapter 14, “Transportation.”

Compared with the Phase I completion of the proposed project, with the moderately lower magnitude of incremental trips, significant adverse transportation impacts under the Reduced Density Alternative could occur at comparable locations and magnitudes as those under Phase I of the proposed project. Some of these impacts could be mitigated with the same types of mitigation measures as with the proposed project. However, as with the proposed project, unmitigatable traffic impacts could also occur under the Reduced Density Alternative. For transit, with slightly lower incremental trips, the Reduced Density Alternative is expected to result in the same significant bus line-haul impacts as the Phase I completion of the proposed project and comparable increases in service frequency is expected to fully mitigate the potential bus line-haul impacts. As with the Phase I completion of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts. As for parking, the Reduced Density Alternative’s parking demand would be even lower than that of the 2023 Phase I completion of the proposed project. Therefore, as with the Phase I completion of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative’s on-site parking supply of 2,019 spaces would fully accommodate its parking demand and would not result in the potential for a parking shortfall or significant adverse parking impact.

The Reduced Density Alternative’s incremental trips would be approximately half of those of the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project. Potential significant adverse transportation impacts under the Reduced Density Alternative, when compared with the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project, would occur at fewer locations and at lesser magnitudes than the proposed project. Some of these impacts could be mitigated with the same types of mitigation measures as with the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 14, “Transportation” and Chapter 22, “Mitigation”, the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project would result in one additional impacted traffic intersection but two fewer freeway facilities as compared with the Phase I completion of the proposed project. The one additional impacted traffic intersection would not occur under the Reduced Density Alternative but neither would the two fewer impacted freeway facilities. As described above, compared with Phase II of the proposed project, unmitigatable traffic impacts could also occur under the Reduced Density Alternative at the same or slightly fewer locations. Therefore, when compared with the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project, unmitigatable traffic impacts under the Reduced Density Alternative could occur at most of the locations identified under the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project. For transit, the Reduced Density Alternative is expected to result in significant bus line-hauls impacts to the Bx24 but not to the Bx21, when compared with the Phase II full build-out of the proposed project. Comparable increases in service frequency on the Bx24 bus route is expected to fully mitigate the potential bus line-haul impacts. As with the Phase II completion of the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in any significant adverse pedestrian impacts. For parking, as concluded in the Phase I completion of the proposed project comparison presented above, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in the potential for a parking shortfall or significant adverse parking impact.

Lastly, the required post-approval traffic monitoring plan (TMP) described in Chapter 22, “Mitigation,” for the proposed project would also apply to the Reduced Density Alternative.

## **Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

### *AIR QUALITY*

Since the Reduced Density Alternative incremental trips would be of lower magnitudes than what the proposed project would generate in Phase I, it can be concluded that the Reduced Density Alternative, like Phase I of the proposed project, would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts with respect to mobile sources of emissions. The Reduced Density Alternative would not include any development in a second phase, and therefore would not result in the significant adverse air quality impacts that would occur with Phase II of the proposed project. Emissions from heating and hot water systems would be lower under the Reduced Density Alternative compared with the proposed project. The restrictions regarding fuel type and exhaust stack locations identified in Chapter 15, "Air Quality," for the Parker Building would be required for the Reduced Density Alternative as well as for the proposed project.

### *GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS*

Both the proposed project and the Reduced Density Alternative would be designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification at the LEED certified level and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Energy Star rating (for all buildings with the exception of parking garages and the small retail building). For both the proposed project and the Reduced Density Alternative, these commitments would result in energy expenditure lower than baseline buildings designed to meet but not exceed the minimum building code requirements by approximately 5 percent. The proposed project and this alternative would be consistent with the City's emissions reduction goals, as defined in the *CEQR Technical Manual*.

Regarding resilience to the impacts of potential climate change, the same resilience measures required for the proposed project as described in Chapter 16, "Climate Change," would be required for the Reduced Density Alternative.

### *NOISE*

Similar to the proposed project, under the Reduced Density Alternative buildings would be constructed using standard construction methods, including insulated glass windows and air conditioning as an alternate means of ventilation. The buildings' façades, including these elements, would be expected to provide a composite Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC) such that interior noise levels would satisfy the CEQR interior noise criteria mentioned above. Furthermore, because the measured exterior  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels at the project site would be less than 70 dBA, the *CEQR Technical Manual* does not impose a requirement for the level of window/wall attenuation. As with the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

### *NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER*

Like the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would activate and enliven an underutilized portion of the Bronx Psychiatric Center campus and better connect the project site to the surrounding area, and neither would result in significant adverse impacts to neighborhood character. Both the proposed project and this alternative would be consistent with the study area's institutional neighborhood character and would introduce a similar mix of new uses that would complement existing study area uses and improve the streetscape. Without the development of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, this alternative would be less successful than both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project at activating and enlivening the entire project site.

*CONSTRUCTION*

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, construction on the project site would be substantially shorter and less intense than what would occur under the proposed project. The Reduced Density Alternative would be constructed in one phase, compared with two phases for the proposed project.

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in the same level of additional vehicle trips generated by the proposed project's construction activities for approximately the first three years of the construction period, when the Parker Building, Thompson Building, retail building, amenities building, and little league field and support building would be under construction concurrently. After the first three years of construction, the anticipated vehicle trips for the Reduced Density Alternative would be substantially less than the proposed project.

The peak construction period for the Reduced Density Alternative would be the second quarter of Year 2 of construction. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the peak average number of workers would be 338 per day in the second quarter of Year 2, compared with a peak for Phase I of the proposed project of 453 workers per day (during the second quarter of Year 4). For truck trips, the peak average would also occur in the second quarter of Year 2 with 100 trucks per day (28 less than with the proposed project). The potential traffic impacts during peak construction under this alternative are expected to be within the envelope of significant adverse traffic impacts identified for constructing Phase I of the proposed project. Measures identified to mitigate the proposed project's Phase I construction traffic impacts could similarly be implemented to address construction traffic impacts for the Reduced Density Alternative's peak construction period. Similar to the proposed project's peak construction, there could also be significant adverse traffic impacts that could not be fully mitigated during one or more analysis peak hours during the Reduced Density Alternative's peak construction period.

The shorter duration and lower intensity of construction activities under the Reduced Density Alternative would result in lower air pollutant emissions compared with the proposed project. In particular, because the Reduced Density Alternative would involve less demolition, excavation, and foundation activities (the most intense construction activities in terms of air pollutant emissions), emissions would be expected to be lower than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Density Alternative would include measures to minimize pollutant emissions during construction in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and building codes. With these measures in place, and based on the duration and intensity of construction activities, the location of nearby sensitive receptors, and an examination of construction on-road sources, the Reduced Density Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse construction air quality impacts.

As with the proposed project, noise resulting from construction of the Reduced Density Alternative, in particular the activities at the Parker Building and Thompson Building, would result in exceedances of the initial construction noise screening threshold at the OMH Bronx Behavioral Health Center facility immediately adjacent to the project site as well as the Bronx Psychiatric Center sports fields (consisting of the Van Nest Little League, Bronxchester Little League, Parkchester Little League, and other multi-use fields) located immediately southwest of the project site along Marconi Street. The exceedances at these receptors would occur at times only during the demolition, excavation, and foundation stages of construction on immediately adjacent work areas. Since the exceedances of CEQR noise impact criteria would occur for a limited duration and the magnitude of the construction noise increments would be typical of building construction in New York City, they would not rise to the level of significance. Therefore,

**Bronx Psychiatric Center Land Use Improvement Project**

---

both the proposed project and this alternative would not result in significant adverse construction noise impacts.

*PUBLIC HEALTH*

The Reduced Density Alternative, like the proposed project, would not result in any significant adverse public health impacts. \*