

## Appendix X:

## DSNY Facilities and NYPD Tow Pound Alternative Siting Studies

---

### A. SINGLE DISTRICT MULTI-SITE ALTERNATIVES TO CONSTRUCTING A TWO-DISTRICT SANITATION COMPLEX ON BLOCK 675

#### INTRODUCTION

The New York State Hudson River Park Act, which created the Hudson River Park, requires that the City of New York use its best efforts to relocate New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) garage operations and vehicle storage facility from the former Gansevoort Incinerator (Block 651, Lot 1), located between Gansevoort and Bloomfield Streets west of Route 9A. These DSNY uses, which are neither water dependent nor water related, are considered incompatible with the planned development of the Park. Relocation of this function would allow for the demolition of the existing structure and the development of a large upland parcel within the Park.

The Proposed Action evaluates the construction of a two-district sanitation garage complex on a single site providing DSNY service to Manhattan Community Districts 2 and 5 at Block 675 (the Proposed Action), between West 29<sup>th</sup> and West 30<sup>th</sup> Streets and Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues, in Community District 4. This analysis considers an alternative to Block 675 which would contain two district garages at separate locations: (1) a District 2 garage at Block 596, in Community District 2; and (2) a District 5 Garage at Blocks 1092, 1093 or 1094, in Community District 4. While it is generally DSNY's preference to house a district garage within the community district it serves, sites in other districts are considered when the number of suitable sites within the district is limited. It is DSNY policy that every community district have a garage operation dedicated to providing sanitation services to that community district, regardless of where the garage may actually be located.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, alternatives are considered in order to determine whether they would reduce or eliminate impacts of the Proposed Action while substantively meeting its goals and objectives.

Under this Alternative, Block 596, Lot 50 (between Washington and West Streets, north of Spring Street), which is currently used by the UPS as an at-grade storage yard for semi trailers, would house a multi-story building for the DSNY Manhattan District 2 garage (District 2), which would be shared with existing UPS operations. A site on either Block 1092, 1093 or 1094, (between West 44<sup>th</sup> Street and West 47<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Eleventh Avenue) would house the DSNY Manhattan District 5 garage (District 5). If Block 1092 were to be used, the constructed multi-story facility would be shared with UPS. Block 1093 or 1094 would have a building dedicated solely to DSNY operations.

The sites analyzed under this Alternative were identified as a result of a search for potential garage locations between Canal Street and West 59<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Tenth Avenue. Sites east of Tenth Avenue were not considered because of the proximity of residential uses and other sensitive

---

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

receptors. Block 596 was the only suitable alternative site for District 2. Blocks 1092, 1093 and 1094 were deemed equally acceptable as an alternative location for the District 5 facility.

**LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY**

Like the Proposed Action, the alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use and would be compatible with zoning and public policy.

**DISTRICT 2 AT BLOCK 596**

Land uses in the vicinity of Block 596 include manufacturing, residential, auto-related uses, and retail uses. Residential and retail uses are found primarily along Spring and Greenwich Streets and in the area south of Spring Street. The area north of Spring Street and east of Greenwich Street contains a mix of commercial, residential and industrial uses, as well as parking and vehicle storage uses. Warehousing and office space can be found north and east of Block 596. Across Route 9A is Hudson River Park, an open space. The development of a combined DSNY/UPS facility on Block 596 would be consistent with the area's surrounding mix of land uses and would not be expected to result in any land use conflicts.

Block 596 is currently zoned M2-4. The maximum allowable FAR in this zoning district is 5.0. This zoning district would permit the development of a multi-story garage on the site. If developed to the maximum allowed FAR, a building at this site would allow sufficient storage space to meet the needs of DSNY and the site's current occupant, UPS. Preliminary discussions with UPS indicated that UPS must maintain use of this site to support its full-block facility located directly east across Washington Street. A four-story garage could be constructed here with UPS occupying the lower two floors and DSNY occupying the upper two floors.

The development of a joint DSNY/UPS garage at this site would be compatible with the area's zoning and with public policy, as reflected in the recent Hudson Square Rezoning, which maintained the M2-4 zoning at this location while rezoning adjacent areas, in order to maintain the integrity of this manufacturing district. It would also allow for relocation of the Manhattan 2 District Garage within Community District 2, the area serviced by Manhattan 2 operations.

**DISTRICT 5 AT BLOCK 1092, 1093 OR 1094**

Blocks 1092, 1093 and 1094, between West 44<sup>th</sup> Street and West 47<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Eleventh Avenue, in Community District 4, were each considered as a potential location for District 5. The three blocks generally contain auto-related uses, parking lots and garages, commercial and industrial uses. Land uses in the vicinity of these blocks include a mix of residential, commercial, manufacturing/industrial and parking uses. The blocks north of West 47<sup>th</sup> Street are occupied by transportation, utility and industrial uses such as a Con Edison substation and a FedEx distribution facility. The area east of Eleventh Avenue and north of West 45<sup>th</sup> Street contains primarily commercial, industrial and auto-related uses. A few residential buildings are located in the midblocks between West 48<sup>th</sup> and West 49<sup>th</sup> Streets. Residential uses are primarily located to the south, along West 42<sup>nd</sup> and West 43<sup>rd</sup> Streets and include the River Place I development on West 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and the Riverbank West development between West 42<sup>nd</sup> and West 43<sup>rd</sup> Streets. North of West 44<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Eleventh Avenue, the area contains primarily manufacturing and auto-related uses. The development of the DSNY facility on either of these sites would be consistent with the area's surrounding zoning, would not be expected to result in any land use conflicts, and is consistent with public policy governing the area.

**Appendix X: DSNY Facilities and NYPD Tow Pound Alternative Siting Studies**

Blocks 1092 and 1094 are currently zoned M2-3 (2.0 FAR). Block 1093 is zoned M3-2 (2.0 FAR) within 250 feet east of Twelfth Avenue (Route 9A) and M2-3 (2.0 FAR) for the remainder of the block. A minimum FAR of 5.0 would be required for developing a garage on Block 1092. A significant portion of the property considered on that block is owned by UPS, which will require use of space on the block in the future. A shared, multi-story facility would contain four to five floors of space. An FAR of 5.0 could be achieved by rezoning the portion of Block 1092 considered for the Alternative to M1-5, M2-2 or M2-4, or possibly through the use of a municipal zoning override. (An M1-5 zone currently exists directly east of Block 1092). The M2-3 zoning classification, and accompanying 2.0 FAR, is sufficient for constructing a District 5 facility on Block 1093 or 1094.

**SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

Like the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

Like the garage facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in some direct displacement of existing businesses on either Blocks 1094, 1093 or 1092. The table below indicates the numbers of industrial and non-industrial firms on the three blocks. As the table indicates, employment on the three blocks is dominated by non-industrial firms.

**TABLE X-1: HUDSON YARDS – DSNY ALTERNATIVE RELOCATION SITES  
PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT ONLY THIRD QUARTER 2002 BY NAICS CATEGORIES**

Block	Industrial Sector		Non-Industrial Sector	
	Firms	Jobs	Firms	Jobs
1092	9	77	5	102
1093	1	*	9	369
1094	3	189	10	299

Source: New York State Department of Labor, ES-202 data geocoded by the Department of City Planning.  
\* Information on individual firms withheld

Like the garage facility under the Proposed Action, displacement of these uses would not constitute a significant adverse impact under the criteria of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The development of the garage facility on any of these blocks would not directly displace businesses or institutions that have a substantial economic value or contribute substantially to the regional economy. Acquisition of either of the sites considered in the Alternative would not affect economic conditions in a specific industry. The Alternative would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of businesses or employees that define the character of a neighborhood. Under the Alternative, Block 596 would be developed as a joint DSNY/UPS facility, and therefore would not result in the displacement of the UPS facility on the site or adversely affect its operations.

Neither the garage facility considered under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative would result in any of the conditions that could result in the potential for indirect businesses displacement. Like the facility under the Proposed Action, the operation of a DSNY garage facility at either Block 596 or Blocks 1092, 1093 or 1094 would not alter existing economic patterns or add to the concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to alter or accelerate an ongoing trend to alter existing economic patterns.

The Block 596 garage facility would be located in proximity to residences located south of Spring Street. The recently-rezoned area between Spring and Canal Streets has evidenced a strong residential market. The facility is not expected to create a critical mass of adverse land uses that is

---

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

large enough to offset trends in that area, to impede efforts to attract investment to the area, or to create a climate for disinvestment. Rather, it would be consistent with other industrial land uses in the manufacturing districts north of Spring Street.

In conclusion, the multi-site garage Alternative would have no significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES/SERVICES**

Like the garage facility included in the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities. The garage would not add a residential population to the area, resulting in increased demand for services and potential effects on service delivery. Neither would it affect the physical operations of, or access to and from a police precinct house or fire station. While the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse impacts related to public schools, day care centers and fire protection services, none of these impacts are attributed to the garage on Block 675.

### **OPEN SPACE**

Similar to the garage under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. Neither the Alternative nor the garage component of the Proposed Action would generate 200 residents or 500 employees, typically the populations that could result in indirect open space impacts. Under the Alternative, shadows could result from the development of a garage on Block 596 and 1094; however, the incremental shadows would not result in significant adverse impacts. Shadows that would reach across Route 9A from both sites to Hudson River Park would not physically change, diminish or eliminate the open space resource or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. Therefore, neither would result in significant adverse open space impacts.

### **SHADOWS**

While the garage under the Proposed Action consists of a three-story facility that is substantially below street grade, the Alternative would include elements that could be 120 feet above street grade. As a result, and as discussed below, the Alternative on Blocks 596 and 1094 would cast more shadows on Hudson River Park than the Proposed Action; however, the incremental shadows would not result in significant, adverse impacts. Incremental shadows would not fall on sunlight-sensitive features of any historic resource or open space, nor would the shadows diminish the usability of an open space resource.

### **DISTRICT 2 AT BLOCK 596**

Shadows cast by a facility at Block 596 would be greater than shadows under existing and no build conditions because the site is currently occupied by vehicle parking and contains no structures.

The Alternative would result in a four-story, 120 foot high garage structure on Block 596. The longest shadow that could be cast from this building during the year is 516 feet. There are two publicly accessible open spaces within a 516 foot radius of the site. The Hudson Square Park is being developed at the intersection of Canal and West Streets. The Hudson River Park has been established west of Route 9A. Within the Hudson River Park, Pier 34 has been rebuilt and is accessible to the public.

Since the Hudson Square Park's location south of Block 596 is within an area greater than 108E from true north, it is unlikely that park would ever fall within shadows cast by the garage on Block 596.

Early morning shadows from a garage on Block 596 would extend westward towards the Hudson River Park and Pier 34. However, the garage on Block 596 would be separated from the Hudson River Park by Route 9A, which, at this location, consists of four northbound traffic lanes, one northbound parking lane, three southbound traffic lanes, two southbound turning lanes and a landscaped center median. In addition, the developed Hudson River Park between Pier 34 and Pier 40 (Houston Street and Canal Street) is predominantly a bikeway and walkway with no significant areas sensitive to sunlight. There are no known sunlight-sensitive historical resources which would be cast in shadow by a garage on Block 596. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts.

#### **DISTRICT 5 AT BLOCK 1092, 1093 OR 1094**

A garage on any of these blocks would not result in significant adverse shadow impacts. A four-story garage facility constructed on Block 1092 would create a shadow of up to 516 feet, however, the shadow cast by the proposed garage on Block 1092 would fall within the shadows cast by three existing, 6- to 9-story buildings located directly west and southwest of the proposed garage, therefore, no incremental shadows to historic or open space resources (Hudson River Park, U.S.S. Intrepid) located west of the site, would result from a garage in Block 1092. A garage constructed on either Blocks 1093 or 1094 would maximize the 2.0 FAR and be no taller than 60 feet. Many of the structures located on these blocks are between 5- and 6-stories in height. Shadows from a garage on Block 1093 would generally fall within the shadows cast by intervening buildings. Incremental shadows from a garage on Block 1094 would be approximately 258 feet long and would fall upon portions of Hudson River Park and the U.S.S. Intrepid (S/NR-listed, NHL). The shadows cast on Hudson River Park would not change, diminish or eliminate the open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. The U.S.S. Intrepid does not contain sunlight-sensitive features. Therefore, significant adverse shadow impacts are not expected from development of a garage at any of these sites.

#### **ARCHAEOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Unlike the garage under the Proposed Action, this Alternative has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to archaeological and architectural resources. As described below, development of a garage on Block 596 would disturb potential archaeological resources on Block 596, Lot 50 and could also result in traffic/construction-related impacts to a nearby NYCL-designated and S/NR-listed building. However, with implementation of protective measures as part of the garage construction specifications, accidental construction damage to the architectural resource would be avoided.

#### **DISTRICT 2 AT BLOCK 596**

##### ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

A NYCL-designated, S/NR-listed building at 326 Spring Street, could experience construction- and traffic-related vibration effects should a combined DSNY/UPS garage be constructed on Block 596. As discussed above, it is anticipated that the DSNY would implement protection measures as part of their construction specifications to avoid accidental construction damage to the resource. There are no listed or potential architectural resources on Block 596 itself. None of the buildings on this block are deemed to be eligible for S/NR designation.

##### ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The development of a garage at Block 596 has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts. The environmental review for the UPS Manhattan South Facility Project (NYCLPC, 87-090M)

concluded that Block 596, Lot 50 has the potential to contain significant archaeological resources. Further investigation would be necessary if this site were to be selected for a proposed garage

### **DISTRICT 5 AT BLOCK 1092, 1093 OR 1094**

#### ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

There are no listed or potential architectural resources on these blocks, and no impacts are expected as a result of construction-related activities. None of the buildings on these blocks are deemed to be eligible for S/NR designations. Incremental shadows from a garage on Block 1094 would be approximately 258 feet long and could potentially be cast on the U.S.S. Intrepid (S/NR-listed, NHL). The U.S.S. Intrepid does not contain sunlight-sensitive features and significant adverse shadow impacts are not expected. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to historic resources are anticipated.

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Blocks 1092, 1093 and 1094 do not contain the potential for archaeological resources, therefore, no significant adverse archaeological impacts would result from development of a garage at any of these sites.

### **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

Like the garage facility accommodated under the Proposed Action, this Alternative is not expected to result in impacts related to visual character and urban design. Neither the garage facility under the Proposed Action or the Alternative would block views to visual resources from publicly accessible locations.

### **DISTRICT 2 AT BLOCK 596**

Development on Block 596 would occur in accordance with the height and setback regulations of the underlying M2-3 zoning district. Due to the relatively high floor-to-floor heights (approximately 30 feet) required for a DSNY garage utilizing ramped access between floors, the facility would be approximately 120 feet tall and present a uniform and fairly high street wall. The building form would be compatible with the built form in the surrounding area. The facility would not block significant views or vistas from any publicly accessible location.

### **DISTRICT 5 AT BLOCK 1092, 1093 OR 1094**

Development on Block 1092 would be approximately twice as high as development on either Block 1093 or 1094. This would result from the ceiling heights that would be required to construct a multi-story facility that could accommodate DSNY and UPS operations. However, the building's bulk would be compatible with the built form of buildings in the surrounding area. Development of a garage on Block 1092, 1093 or 1094 would not impede views of visual resources from publicly accessible locations.

### **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

Under the Alternative, overall effects on neighborhood character would be similar to the effects of the garage facility under the Proposed Action. Development on any of the Alternative sites would not result in a noticeable change in neighborhood character. While the proposed development would be compatible with existing neighborhood character, additional workers would be brought into the areas, leading to increased pedestrian traffic and street activity. Neither the Proposed Action, nor the Alternative sites, would result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

## **NATURAL RESOURCES**

Similar to the garage facility under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources. Neither the garage under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative is expected to affect natural resources because the sites that could be developed are substantially devoid of natural resources. Consequently, no significant adverse impacts on natural resources are anticipated.

## **HAZARDOUS MATERIAL**

This Alternative has the potential to result in hazardous materials impacts given the types of past and current uses identified on the sites. Historic uses on portions Blocks 596, 1092, 1093 and 1094 include motor vehicle storage, maintenance and/or fueling. The potential for subsurface petroleum contamination from the storage and use of motor vehicle fuels and related products exists at these locations. Under the Alternative, there is also the potential for the existence of asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in buildings that would be demolished on Blocks 1092, 1093, and 1094.

Unlike the garage facility under the Proposed Action, development of a District 2 garage on Block 596 would require no demolition of buildings. Like the garage facility under the Proposed Action, development of Blocks 1092, 1093 or 1094 would require the demolition of numerous buildings. Prior to demolition, a site investigation would be conducted to identify toxic, hazardous and ACMs requiring removal.

As in the case of the garage facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would not result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts because preventative and management procedures would be followed in order to minimize human contact with contaminants and eliminate the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts. Any such required action, investigation or management would be conducted in accordance with applicable law, and any additional regulatory requirements of NYSDEC or the NYCDEP, as appropriate.

## **WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM**

The Proposed Action and this Alternative comply with New York State's Coastal Management Program as expressed in New York City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program, pursuant to New York State's Coastal Management Program.

Both the garage under the Proposed Action and this Alternative are within New York City's designated coastal zone. The garages under both the Proposed Action and this Alternative are separated from the waterfront and the water's edge by Route 9A. Like the garage under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in a physical alteration to a waterfront site, including land along the shoreline, land underwater or coastal waters. The garages considered under this Alternative would be constructed as-of-right on Blocks 596, 1093 and 1094 (and pursuant to a zoning map amendment or other action on Block 1092) and would be compatible with adjacent land uses. Further, they would not block view corridors to the Hudson River or restrict access to the water or Hudson River Park.

The garages under both the Proposed Action and this Alternative would result in the closure of the DSNY facility at Gansevoort Street, potentially resulting in expanded public access to coastal waters and the proposed Hudson River Park between Gansevoort Street and Bloomfield Street, west of Route 9A. These underutilized sites are appropriate for development of a sanitation garage and would generally be consistent with uses found on neighboring blocks.

---

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

Incremental shadows from a garage on Blocks 596 and 1094 would fall upon portions of Hudson River Park, however, these shadows would not be considered significant or adverse. The shadows cast on Hudson River Park would not change, diminish or eliminate the open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. Shadows from a garage on Block 1094 would also fall on a portion of the U.S.S. Intrepid (S/NR-listed, NHL); however, the U.S.S. Intrepid does not contain sunlight-sensitive features and impacts are not anticipated.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

This alternative would place the same demand on the City's water supply, sewage treatment and stormwater management systems as the garage facility under the Proposed Action, since the bulk of the development would be comparable to that of the Proposed Action. The Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on infrastructure.

**SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**

Under this Alternative, DSNY demands on solid waste and sanitation services would be the same as for the garage under the Proposed Action. The Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on solid waste and sanitation services.

The garages under both the Proposed Action and the Alternative would enhance the ability of DSNY to deliver refuse collection, street cleaning, recycling collection and winter emergency services to Community District 2 and 5. The proposed garage facilities would allow improved storage and maintenance of the Department's vehicle fleet, increasing the reliability and the availability of equipment required to provide these services. Under the Alternative, District 2 would benefit by having its garage operation within Community District 2, reducing travel time between the garage and service areas. The District 5 garage would be located outside of Community District 5 under both the Proposed Action and Alternative. Benefits of providing service delivery from either location are comparable.

**ENERGY**

The garages accommodated under the Proposed Action and the Alternative would generate the same demand on energy. Development on any of the sites under the Alternative would be required to comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Code, including: energy conservation measures, energy conserving building materials, including meeting the code's requirements related to energy efficiency and combined thermal resistance. Like the garage under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy.

**TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

The Alternative would generate similar vehicle and person trips as the garage under the Proposed Action. Peak AM and PM DSNY operations at the Proposed Action and Alternative would occur during non-peak commuting times. Overall traffic impacts at the Alternative would be less than the Proposed Action since traffic would be dispersed to two locations.

While the Alternative would generate similar demand for parking spaces as the garage under the Proposed Action, this demand would also be dispersed between two sites. The garages under both the Proposed Action and Alternative would provide a similar number of off-street parking spaces for DSNY employees. These spaces will not accommodate all employees who would drive to the garages. The inability to provide sufficient parking in the Manhattan Central Business District is



considered a parking shortfall. Unsatisfied demand for parking would result in vehicles parking further from the garage(s) and workers walking greater distances.

Neither the garages under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to the traffic or parking systems.

### **TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS**

The Alternative would generate the same overall number of person and transit trips as the garage under the Proposed Action. Neither would generate more than 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders. Under the Alternative, these trips would be divided between two sites instead of one. Therefore, actual impacts at any one location would most likely be less under the Alternative. Neither this Alternative, nor the garage under the Proposed Action, would result in any significant adverse impacts to mass transit or pedestrians.

### **AIR QUALITY**

The Alternative would result in lower mobile source emissions and greater significant adverse stationary source impacts when compared to the garage under the Proposed Action.

Mobile source emissions under the Alternative would be lower than for the garage under the Proposed Action because DSNY truck trips would be distributed between a garage on Block 596 and another facility on either Blocks 1092, 1093, or 1094. However, significant adverse mobile source impacts are not expected under the Proposed Action at Block 675 or this Alternative.

A mobile source garage analysis was conducted for the garage under the Proposed Action, and no significant adverse impacts were found. As compared to the Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in lower emissions from DSNY trucks within the garage since the size of the garage would be smaller due to the redistribution of traffic between one garage at Block 596 and another at either Blocks 1092, 1093, or 1094. The analysis for the Alternative did not assume a combined contribution from DSNY and UPS trucks on Blocks 596 and 1092. If the contribution from UPS trucks is included in the garage analysis, it is likely that emissions would be somewhat higher, but generally comparable to those for the garage under the Proposed Action. In either case, significant adverse impacts are not likely.

In terms of stationary sources, the Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts as compared to the Proposed Action because existing receptors (residential uses) would be located within close proximity to boiler stacks on the garages located on Block 596 and either Blocks 1092, 1093 or 1094. Possible mitigation measures would include restrictions on the type of fuel used for the garages' HVAC systems and/or location of the exhaust stack. Under the Proposed Action, no existing receptors would be located close enough to the proposed garage stack on Block 675 to result in significant adverse impacts.

### **NOISE**

Both the garages under the Alternative and under the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse noise impacts which could be mitigated by providing window-wall attenuation. Under the Proposed Action, development at Block 675 would require 40 dBA window-wall attenuation at residential receptors. At Block 596 and Blocks 1092, 1093 and 1094, it is assumed that similar attenuation would be required for nearby existing and anticipated residential uses.

## **CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

The Alternative could result in greater construction-related impacts than the garage under the Proposed Action due to the proximity of Block 596 to an NYCL-designated, S/NR-listed building at 326 Spring Street, as discussed in the Historic Resources section above; however, the DSNY would implement protection measures to avoid construction-related impacts. Construction activities are otherwise generally expected to be comparable to those for the garage under the Proposed Action. The type of impacts and duration would vary between the two because of the increased excavation required by the garage under the Proposed Action. Both the Alternative and the garage under the Proposed Action would generate potential traffic, noise and air quality impacts during various construction phases typical of construction projects in Manhattan. In neither case would these impacts be considered significant. Construction activities associated with the garages under both the Proposed Action and this Alternative would be of limited duration (less than three years) and not result in any adverse impacts.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH**

Unlike the garage under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in significant adverse stationary source air quality impacts due to the close proximity of residential land uses, as discussed above in the Air Quality section. Possible mitigation measures include restricting the type of fuel used for HVAC systems and/or location of the exhaust stack. Impacts related to mobile source air quality would be less than the Proposed Action because DSNY truck trips would be distributed between a garage on Block 596 and another facility on either Blocks 1092, 1093, or 1094. Like the garage Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in significant adverse noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (residential land use), which could be mitigated by providing window-wall attenuation and alternate means of ventilation. Like the garage under the Proposed Action, past and present land uses on Blocks 596, 1092, 1093 and 1094 have the potential to result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts; however, preventative and management measures would be followed in order to eliminate the potential for significant adverse impacts, as described above in the “Hazardous Materials” section.

## **B. ALTERNATIVE TO CONSTRUCTING A NYPD TOW POUND ON BLOCK 675**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The New York State Hudson River Park Act, which created the Hudson River Park, requires that the City of New York use its best efforts to relocate the New York City Police Department (NYPD) Violation Tow Pound from Pier 76, located east of the Jacob K. Javits Convention Center in line with West 39<sup>th</sup> Street west of Route 9A. This NYPD use, which is neither water dependent nor water related, is considered incompatible with the planned development of the Park. Relocation of this function would allow for the demolition of the existing structure and the development of a large upland parcel within the Park.

The Proposed Action evaluates the construction of a replacement NYPD violation tow pound on a site at Block 675 (the Proposed Action), between West 29<sup>th</sup> and West 30<sup>th</sup> streets and Eleventh and Twelfth avenues, in Community District 4. This analysis considers an alternative to Block 675 which would site the NYPD violation tow operations at either: (1) Block 1093, Lots 21, 28, 129, 29, 31, 33, 36, and 42 or (2) Block 1094, both located in Community District 4. A facility on Block 1093 (between West 45<sup>th</sup> Street and West 46<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Eleventh Avenue) would consist of a 40- to 50-foot, four- to five-story mechanical parking structure, while a facility on Block 1094 (between

West 46<sup>th</sup> and West 47<sup>th</sup> Streets from Eleventh to Twelfth Avenues) would be an approximately 50-foot, two-story structure, similar to the existing facility at Pier 76.

According to the *CEQR Technical Manual*, alternatives are considered in order to determine whether they would reduce or eliminate impacts of the Proposed Action while substantively meeting its goals and objectives.

The sites analyzed under this Alternative were identified as a result of a search for potential tow pound locations in Manhattan that were located in appropriately zoned areas, excluding residential zones, and proximate to arterial roadways.

### **LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY**

Like the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use and would be compatible with zoning and public policy.

Blocks 1093 and 1094, between West 45<sup>th</sup> Street and West 47<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Eleventh Avenue, in Community District 4, were each considered as a potential location for the NYPD facility. The two blocks generally contain auto-related uses, parking lots and facilities, and commercial and industrial uses. Land uses in the vicinity of these blocks include a mix of residential, commercial, industrial and parking uses. The blocks north of West 47<sup>th</sup> Street are occupied by transportation, utility and industrial uses, such as a Con Edison transmission substation and a Federal Express distribution facility. The area east of Eleventh Avenue and north of West 45<sup>th</sup> Street contains primarily commercial, industrial and auto-related uses. A few residential buildings are located in the midblocks between West 48<sup>th</sup> and West 49<sup>th</sup> Streets. Residential uses are primarily located to the south, along West 42<sup>nd</sup> and West 43<sup>rd</sup> Streets and include the River Place I development on West 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and the Riverbank West development between West 42<sup>nd</sup> and West 43<sup>rd</sup> Streets. North of West 44<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Eleventh Avenue, the area contains primarily manufacturing and auto-related uses. The development of the NYPD facility on either of these sites would be consistent with zoning and the area's surrounding mix of land uses, and would not be expected to result in any land use conflicts.

#### **BLOCK 1093**

Block 1093 is zoned M3-2 (2.0 FAR) within 250 feet east of Twelfth Avenue (Route 9A) and M2-3 (2.0 FAR) for the remainder of the block. A minimum FAR of 5.0 would be required for developing an NYPD facility on the portion of Block 1093 currently zoned M2-3. A mechanical parking/storage facility on Block 1093 would contain four to five floors of space. An FAR of 5.0 could be achieved by rezoning the portion of Block 1093 considered for the Alternative to M1-5, M2-2 or M2-4, or possibly through the use of a municipal zoning override.

#### **BLOCK 1094**

Block 1094 is currently zoned M2-3 (2.0 FAR). The M2-3 zoning classification, and accompanying 2.0 FAR, is sufficient for constructing a full block, two-story NYPD facility on Block 1094.

### **SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

Like the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

Like the two pound facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in some direct displacement of existing businesses on either Block 1093 or 1094. The table below indicates the

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

numbers of industrial and non-industrial firms on the two blocks. As the table indicates, employment on these blocks is dominated by non-industrial firms.

**TABLE X-2: HUDSON YARDS – NYPD ALTERNATIVE RELOCATION SITES  
PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT ONLY THIRD QUARTER 2002 BY NAICS CATEGORIES**

Block	Industrial Sector		Non-Industrial Sector	
	Firms	Jobs	Firms	Jobs
1093	1	*	9	369
1094	3	189	10	299

*Source: New York State Department of Labor, ES-202 data geocoded by the Department of City Planning.*

*\* Information on individual firms withheld*

As in the case of the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, displacement of these uses would not constitute a significant adverse impact under the criteria of the *CEQR Technical Manual*. The development of the facility on any of these blocks would not directly displace businesses or institutions that have a substantial economic value or contribute substantially to the regional economy. Acquisition of either of the sites considered in the Alternative would not affect economic conditions in a specific industry. The Alternative would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of businesses or employees that define the character of a neighborhood.

Neither the NYPD facility considered under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative would result in any of the conditions that could result in the potential for indirect business displacement. Like the facility under the Proposed Action, the operation of a NYPD facility at either Block 1093 or 1094 would not alter existing economic patterns or add to the concentration of a particular sector of the local economy enough to alter or accelerate an ongoing trend to alter existing economic patterns.

In conclusion, the Alternative would have no significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

**COMMUNITY FACILITIES/SERVICES**

Like the NYPD facility included in the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to community facilities. The facility would not add a residential population to the area, resulting in increased demand for services and potential effects on service delivery. Neither would it affect the physical operations of, or access to and from a police precinct house or fire station. While the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse impacts related to public schools, day care centers and fire protection services, none of the impacts are attributed to the facility on Block 675.

**OPEN SPACE**

Similar to the tow pound facility included in the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse open space impacts. Neither the Alternative nor the NYPD facility component of the Proposed Action would generate 200 residents or 500 employees, typically the populations that could result in indirect open space impacts. Under the Alternative, incremental shadows could result from the development of a NYPD facility on Block 1094; however, the incremental shadows would not result in significant adverse impacts. Shadows that would reach across Route 9A from a garage on Block 1094 to the bikeway/walkway and Hudson River Park would not physically change, diminish, or eliminate this open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. Therefore,

development of a garage on either of these sites would not result in significant adverse open space impacts.

## **SHADOWS**

Like the Proposed Action, the Alternative on Blocks 1093 and 1094 would not result in significant adverse shadow impacts, as described below.

### **BLOCK 1093**

A four-story, 40 to 50 foot high, NYPD facility constructed on Block 1093 would create a shadow of up to 215 feet. There are no architectural or open space resources that would fall within the shadow created by the proposed garage. Therefore, no significant adverse shadow impacts are anticipated from a garage on Block 1093.

### **BLOCK 1094**

A NYPD facility constructed on Block 1094 would be no taller than 50 feet. Incremental shadows from a garage on Block 1094 would be approximately 215 feet long and would fall upon portions of Hudson River Park. The shadows cast on Hudson River Park would not change, diminish or eliminate the open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. Therefore, significant adverse impacts are not expected.

## **ARCHAEOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Like the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to architectural historic or archaeological resources, as described below.

### **ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES**

There are no listed or potential architectural resources on these blocks, and no impacts are expected as a result of construction-related activities. There would be no adverse impacts to historic resources on Blocks 1093 or 1094.

### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Blocks 1093 and 1094 do not contain the potential for archaeological resources, therefore, no significant adverse archaeological impacts would result from development of a garage at either of these sites.

## **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

Like the facility accommodated under the Proposed Action, this Alternative is not expected to result in impacts related to visual character and urban design. Neither the facilities under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative would block views to visual resources from publicly accessible locations.

Building bulk of a 40 to 50 foot garage on either Block 1093 or 1094 would be compatible with the built form of buildings in the surrounding area. Development of a facility on Block 1093 or 1094 would not impede views of visual resources from publicly accessible locations and no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

Under the Alternative, overall effects on neighborhood character would be similar to the effects of the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action. Development on either of the Alternative sites would

---

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

not result in a noticeable change in neighborhood character. Neither the facility under the Proposed Action, nor that on the Alternative sites, would result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character.

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

Similar to the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources. Neither the facility under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative is expected to affect natural resources because the sites that could be developed are substantially devoid of natural resources. Consequently, no significant adverse impacts on natural resources are anticipated.

**HAZARDOUS MATERIAL**

This Alternative has the potential to result in hazardous materials impacts given the types of past and current uses identified on the sites. Historic uses on portions Blocks 1093 and 1094 include motor vehicle storage, maintenance and/or fueling. The potential for subsurface petroleum contamination from the storage and use of motor vehicle fuels and related products exists at these locations. Under the Alternative, there is also the potential for the existence of asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in buildings that would be demolished on Blocks 1093 and 1094.

As in the case of the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would not result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts because preventative and management procedures would be followed in order to minimize human contact with contaminants and eliminate the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts. Any such required action, investigation or management would be conducted in accordance with applicable law, and any additional regulatory requirements of NYSDEC or the NYCDEP, as appropriate.

**WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM**

The Proposed Action and this Alternative comply with New York State's Coastal Management Program as expressed in New York City's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program, pursuant to New York State's Coastal Management Program.

Both the NYPD facility in the Proposed Action and this Alternative are within New York City's designated coastal zone. The facilities under the Proposed Action and this Alternative are separated from the waterfront and the water's edge by Route 9A. Like the facility under the Proposed Action, this Alternative would not result in a physical alteration to a waterfront site, including land along the shoreline, land underwater or coastal waters. The facility considered under this Alternative on Block 1094 would be constructed as-of-right; whereas, the facility on Block 1093 would be pursuant to a zoning map amendment or similar action. An NYPD facility on either Block 1093 or 1094 would be compatible with adjacent land uses. Further, the facility would not block view corridors to the Hudson River or restrict access to the water or Hudson River Park. Incremental shadows from a garage on Block 1094 would be approximately 215 feet long and would fall upon portions of Hudson River Park. The shadows cast on Hudson River Park would not change, diminish or eliminate the open space or reduce its utilization or aesthetic value. Development of the facilities under both the Proposed Action and this Alternative would result in the closure of the NYPD Manhattan vehicle tow pound facility at Pier 76 (West 39<sup>th</sup> Street and Route 9A), potentially resulting in expanded public access to coastal waters and the proposed Hudson River Park and commercial uses on Pier 76, west of Route 9A. These underutilized sites are appropriate for development of a NYPD Manhattan vehicle tow pound facility and would generally be consistent with uses found on neighboring blocks.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

This alternative would place the same demand on the City's water supply, sewage treatment and stormwater management systems as the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, since the bulk of the development would be comparable to that of the Proposed Action. The Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on infrastructure.

## **SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**

Under this Alternative, NYPD demands on solid waste and sanitation services would be the same as for the facility under the Proposed Action. The Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on solid waste and sanitation services.

## **ENERGY**

The NYPD facility accommodated under the Proposed Action and the Alternative would generate the same demand on energy. Development on any of the sites under the Alternative would be required to comply with the New York State Energy Conservation Code, including: energy conservation measures, energy conserving building materials, including meeting the code's requirements related to energy efficiency and combined thermal resistance. The Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy.

## **TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

The Alternative would generate similar vehicle and person trips as the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action. Peak AM and PM employee trips at the facilities under both the Proposed Action and Alternative would occur during non-peak commuting times. Therefore, overall traffic impacts at the Alternative sites would be similar those for the facility under the Proposed Action.

The Alternative would generate similar demand for parking spaces as the facility under the Proposed Action. The facilities under the Proposed Action and Alternative would provide a similar number of off-street parking spaces for NYPD employees. These spaces will not accommodate all employees who would drive to the garages. Currently employees utilize existing parking facilities in the study area. These employees would continue to park in facilities in the study area. As a result, there is no projected increase in demand compared to the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action.

Neither the tow pound facilities under the Proposed Action nor the Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to the traffic or parking systems.

## **TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS**

The Alternative would generate the same overall number of person and transit trips as the facility under the Proposed Action. Neither would generate more than 200 peak hour rail or bus transit riders. Neither this Alternative, nor the facility under the Proposed Action, would result in any significant adverse impacts to mass transit or pedestrians.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Like the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to either mobile sources or stationary sources.

---

**No. 7 Subway Extension—Hudson Yards Rezoning and Development Program FGEIS**

---

Mobile source emissions under the Alternative would be similar to the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action because NYPD facility trips would be generated from a single site. Significant adverse mobile source impacts are not expected under the Proposed Action or this Alternative.

A garage analysis was conducted for the tow pound facility on both Blocks 1093 and 1094, assuming the same floor area (233,000 square feet) for both facilities, under both the Proposed Action and this Alternative. No significant adverse impacts were found below an 8 hour CO concentration at street level receptors located near the exhaust vent and across from the entrance of the garage at the far sidewalk.

A worst-case boiler analysis was conducting assuming oil #2 as the type of fuel to be used for heating and hot water for the Alternative. Three pollutants were included in the analysis (SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub>) and the results were compared with their corresponding standard (NAAQS). The closest possible distance from the boiler stacks to taller buildings in order not to have an air quality impact is 150 feet. This is a conservative assumption since the stacks are not physically at the boundaries of the site. There are no buildings with similar or greater height (50 feet) within 150 feet from the boiler stack; therefore, the Alternative like the tow pound accommodated under the Proposed Action, would not have a significant stationary source impact to the surrounding properties.

## **NOISE**

Both the facilities under the Alternative and under the Proposed Action would result in significant adverse noise impacts which could be mitigated by providing window-wall attenuation. Under the Proposed Action, development at Block 675 would require 40 dBA window-wall attenuation at residential receptors. At Blocks 1093 and 1094, it is assumed that similar attenuation would be required for nearby existing and anticipated residential uses.

## **CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

Construction activities are generally expected to be comparable to those for the NYPD facility under the Proposed Action; however, the type of impacts and duration would vary between the two because of the increased excavation required by the Proposed Action. Both the Alternative and the tow pound facility under the Proposed Action would generate potential traffic, noise and air quality impacts during various construction phases typical of construction projects in Manhattan. In neither case would these impacts be considered significant. Construction activities associated with the tow pound facilities under the Proposed Action and this Alternative would be of limited duration (less than 3 years) and not result in any adverse impacts.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH**

Like the Tow Pound facility under the Proposed Action, the Alternative would not result in significant adverse mobile or stationary source air quality impacts on either Block 1093 or 1094. Like the Proposed Action, the Alternative would result in significant adverse noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (residential land use), which could be mitigated by providing window-wall attenuation and alternative means of ventilation. Like the facility under the Proposed Action, past and present land uses on Blocks 1093 and 1094 have the potential to result in significant adverse hazardous materials impacts; however, preventative and management procedures would be followed in order to eliminate the potential for significant adverse impacts, as described above in the “Hazardous Materials” section.