



City of New York  
Parks & Recreation

Adrian Benepe  
Commissioner

The Arsenal  
Central Park  
New York, New York 10021

Joshua R. Laird  
Chief of Planning

(212) 360-3402  
joshua.laird@parks.nyc.gov

**NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF THE  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
for the  
YANKEE STADIUM REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

**DATE ISSUED:** September 23, 2005

**CEQR No.** 05DPR006X

**ULURP No.** 060056MMX, 060057MMX, 060058MMX, 060059MMX, 060149ZSX,  
060150ZSX, 060144PPX, 060145PPX, 060146PPX, 060147PPX,  
060148MCX

**SEQR Classification:** Type I

**Lead Agency:** New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR)

**Location:** Bronx, New York

Block 2499 Lots 1, 100, and 108; Block 2354 Lots 20 and 65; Block 2492 Lot 1, Block 2493 p/o Lot 9; Block 2357 Lot 100; Block 2490, Lot 1; Block 2539 p/o Lot 2; Block 2485 Lot 1; Block 2486 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 6; Block 2491 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 25; Block 2483 Lot 1; A portion of East 161<sup>st</sup> Street between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach; A portion of Jerome Avenue between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and the south side of East 164<sup>th</sup> Street;

The project area is generally bounded by East 164<sup>th</sup> Street, East 151<sup>st</sup> Street, East 157<sup>th</sup> Street, River Avenue, and the Harlem River.

---

Pursuant to City Environmental Quality Review, Mayoral Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, and the City Environmental Quality Review Rules of Procedure found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York (CEQR), and the State Environmental Quality Review Act, Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and its implementing regulations found in Part 617 of 6 NYCRR (SEQRA), a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared for the action described below and is available for public inspection at the office listed on the last page of this notice. An Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) for the project was prepared and the lead agency (NYCDPR) issued a *Positive Declaration*, including a Draft Scope of Work for the EIS, on June 15, 2005. A public scoping meeting was held on July 18, 2005 at the Bronx Museum of the Arts at 1040 Grand Concourse in the Bronx, to accept oral and written comments. Written comments on the proposed project's Scope of Work were accepted through August 17, 2005. The Final Scope of Work for this project's EIS, including

a summary of comments received and responses to those comments, was issued on September 21, 2005. A public hearing on the DEIS will be held in conjunction with the City Planning Commission's public hearing pursuant to the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP). Written comments on the DEIS should be forwarded to the contact office listed on the last page of this notice, and will be accepted by the NYCDPR until the 10th calendar day following the close of the public hearing. Subsequent notice will be given as to the time and place of the public hearing and the close of the public comment period.

## **A. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project that is the subject of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) consists of the following elements: (1) construction of a new Yankee Stadium one block north of its existing location at East 161st Street and River Avenue in The Bronx (the "proposed stadium"); (2) construction of four new parking garages containing approximately 5,254 spaces in the vicinity of the proposed stadium (the "proposed garages"); and (3) development of new and replacement recreational park facilities for a net increase of approximately 4.63 acres of parkland within the facility of the proposed stadium (referred to, as appropriate, as the "proposed parkland" or "replacement facilities;" collectively, these elements are the "proposed project").

The proposed stadium would be built on land currently in recreational use (portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks) and on one block of East 162nd Street, which would be closed and mapped as parkland. The proposed project would also add to and better consolidate the off-street parking inventory in the area, by constructing four new parking garages, thus greatly relieving the overflow of parking scattered throughout the neighborhood in both legal and illegal parking spots. Three of the garages would occupy existing parkland in portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks. One garage, located on the north and south sides of East 151<sup>st</sup> Street and east of River Avenue, will be created on two existing surface parking lots that currently serve the existing Yankee Stadium. This garage would offer retail space at street level, as well.

The recreational facilities to be displaced by construction of the proposed stadium and garages would be replaced as part of the proposed project—with similar or improved facilities for active recreation (e.g., softball, baseball, tennis, basketball, handball, track) and for passive enjoyment of the park (e.g., seating, plantings, paths, food concessions, etc.). New parkland and public open space would be created along the Harlem River waterfront. The site of the existing Yankee Stadium would be a major feature of the recreation plan, providing Heritage Field on the site of the existing Yankee Stadium playing field for the public's use. Ruppert Place would also be mapped as parkland and reconfigured as part of the parkland provided south of the proposed stadium. Two passive parks will be created on the north and south sides of East 157<sup>th</sup> Street, east of River Avenue

The project area is located in the Concourse Village neighborhood of the Bronx on Block 2499 Lots 1, 100, and 108; Block 2354 Lots 20 and 65; Block 2492 Lot 1, Block 2493 Lot 9 (part); Block 2357 Lot 100; Block 2490, Lot 1; Block 2539 Lot 2 (part); Block 2485 Lot 1; Block 2486 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 6; Block 2492 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 25; and Block 2483 Lot 1. Additionally, a portion of East 161<sup>st</sup> Street between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, a portion of Jerome Avenue between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and the south side of East 164<sup>th</sup> Street, East 162<sup>nd</sup> Street between River and Jerome Avenues, and Ruppert Place between East 161<sup>st</sup> and East 157<sup>th</sup> Streets are also part of the project area. The project area consists of several blocks, and consists of the existing Yankee Stadium located at East 161st Street and River Avenue; portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks, located between East 157th and East 164th Streets and River and Jerome Avenues; several surface parking lots located on the eastern side of River Avenue at East 151st and East 157th Streets and along the waterfront west of Exterior Street; the sites of existing parking facilities in the area; and a portion of the Bronx Terminal Market complex, west of Exterior Street between East 150th and East 153<sup>rd</sup> Streets.

The project site is owned by the City of New York, except for two parcels on the west side of the project site that are owned by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT).

Public actions required to permit the proposed project to go forward include disposition of City-owned property in the form of long-term leases (including lease of existing parking facilities); acquisitions by the City of interests in the proposed Yankee Stadium and Garage B; mapping actions to map new parks and demap portions of East 161st Street, Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, and Jerome Avenue; administrative actions to demap portions of two streets (East 162nd Street, Ruppert Place, and a volume of space located above East 151st Street); approval of a concession to operate tennis courts; a special permit for a public parking garage (not located on parkland) and a special permit to allow modification of rear yard requirements for that garage; and State and City funding for the nonstadium portions of the proposed project. Certain State and Federal permits may be required for activities in connection with construction of the waterfront park. Further, the location of the proposed stadium is on the portion of Macomb's Dam Park that was improved with funds from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). As a result, the proposed project would trigger a parkland conversion under Section 6(f)(3) of the LWCF Act that requires federal review and decision by the Secretary of the Interior (delegated to the National Park Service).

The leasing of City-owned property, including inalienable property, for the new stadium and parking garages has been authorized by Chapter 238 of the 2005 Laws of New York State. The Administrative amendment of the City Map for the removal of the bed of East 162<sup>nd</sup> Street between Jerome and River Avenues and Ruppert Place between East 161<sup>st</sup> and East 157<sup>th</sup> Streets was also authorized by Chapter 238 of the 2005 Laws of New York State. Lastly, the legislation allows the State to dispose of and the City to acquire two parcels of waterfront property owned by the State and authorizes the disposition and use of a volume of air space over East 151st Street for one of the garages.

The disposition and acquisitions, parkland mapping, approval of a concession, parking garage special permit actions, and realignment of boundaries of East 161st Street, Macombs Lane, and Jerome Avenue in the vicinity of the proposed stadium site are subject to the City's Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), and all of the actions require environmental review.

If approved, the proposed stadium is expected to be completed by spring 2009 for opening day of the New York Yankees 2009 season. The Yankees would continue to play at the existing stadium while the proposed stadium is under construction. All four proposed garages are also expected to be completed by 2009. It is expected that all proposed parkland development would occur by 2009, except for Heritage Field on the site of the existing stadium which will be operational as public parkland in 2011.

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the reasonable worst-case scenario for the Proposed Project as described above.

## **PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The project will require approvals from the City, State, and Federal agencies. Several of these are discretionary actions requiring review under CEQR and SEQRA. Others are ministerial and do not require environmental review; nonetheless, they are subject to review under each relevant agency's public mandate, as discussed below.

New York State legislation enacted in June 2005 and part of Chapter 238 of the 2005 Laws of New York authorizes the alienation of certain areas of currently mapped parkland—portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks—to allow for its disposition by the City, through leases, for operation of the proposed stadium and several parking garages. Following that disposition, however, these areas would remain mapped parkland. The legislation allows the State to dispose of and the City to acquire two parcels of waterfront property owned by the State. The legislation also allows for the demapping of East 162nd

Street and Ruppert Place as an administrative action by the Mayor and authorizes the disposition and use of a volume of air space over East 151st Street.

*New York City–ULURP Actions*

The following actions will require approval through Uniform Land Use Review under City Charter Section 197(c).

Disposition of City-Owned Property:

- Stadium/Stadium Site (Long-Term Lease).
- Parking Facilities/Parking Facilities Sites (Long-Term Lease).

Acquisition:

- Acquisition of property by the City to enable it to acquire leasehold and subleasehold interest in the new Yankee Stadium, and to assure clear title.

Amendments to City Map:

- Map as parkland: former East 162nd Street as part of John Mullaly Park.
- Map as parkland: Ruppert Place as part of Macomb’s Dam Park.
- Map as parkland: proposed waterfront ballfields and open space on former Bronx Terminal Market property.
- Map as parkland: proposed passive recreational facilities at River Avenue and 157th Street.
- Map as parkland: existing Yankee Stadium, and adjacent City-owned property.
- Demap the portion of Jerome Avenue between the north side of East 161st Street and the south side of East 164th Street and the portion of East 161st Street between the east side of Jerome Avenue and the Macomb’s Dam Bridge Approach and the west side of River Avenue.

The areas to be demapped would vary in width from approximately 10–20 feet, totaling approximately 0.3 acres. This area would be mapped as parkland and incorporated into the footprint of the proposed Yankee Stadium site.

Concessions:

- Approval of a major concession to operate a tennis facility.

Special Permit:

- A special permit pursuant to Zoning Resolution Section 74-512 to allow construction and operation of a public parking garage not located in parkland (Parking Garage D), to allow the parking garage to contain rooftop parking, and to permit the portion of the garage located above the adjusted base plane and below a height of 23 feet above curb level to be exempt from the definition of floor area.
- A special permit pursuant to Zoning Resolution Section 74-54 to allow for modification of rear yard requirements for Garage D.

*New York State*

- State funding of parking facilities within the proposed project.
- Possible Tidal Wetlands permit from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC).
- Possible Protection of Waters permit and water quality certification from NYSDEC.

**ADDITIONAL CITY AND STATE ACTIONS**

As described above, New York State legislation enacted in June 2005 authorizes the alienation of certain areas of currently mapped parkland, to allow for its disposition by the City, through

leases, for operation of the proposed stadium and several parking garages, and the demapping of East 162nd Street and Ruppert Place as an administrative action. The State legislation also requires that the City dedicate the existing stadium site as parkland and acquire additional parklands and/or dedicate land for park and recreational purposes which are equal to or greater than the fair market value of the parkland being alienated.

#### *New York City*

- Administrative action to amend the City map to demap East 162nd Street, Ruppert Place, and a volume above East 151st Street as City streets.
- Possible New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) permits for de-watering activities associated with construction.
- Review and approval of the Art Commission of the City of New York for the design of landscaping and buildings/structures constructed on or over City Property.
- Coastal Zone consistency determination from the New York City Planning Commission.
- City funding and construction of the proposed park improvements.

#### *New York State*

- Possible NYSDEC State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities. SPDES permit for operations is not required, because all wastewater would be discharged through the NYCDEP permitted sewer system.
- Possible Coastal Zone consistency determination from the New York State Department of State.

#### *FEDERAL ACTIONS*

Under the LWCF, 16 U.S.C. § 4601-4 et seq., the National Park Service (NPS) provides matching grants to states, and through states to local governments, for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Section 6(f) of the LWCF requires that no property acquired or developed with LWCF assistance can be converted to other than public outdoor recreation use without the approval of the NPS and the substitution of other recreational properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location. Because prior improvements to a portion of Macomb's Dam Park within the project area were funded under the LWCF, the NPS is required to approve of the proposed conversion of that portion of Macomb's Dam Park to non-public recreational uses and the substitution of replacement facilities pursuant to Section 6(f). Consistent with the State's role under the LWCF, the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) must first provide the NPS with its recommendation concerning the proposed Section 6(f) conversion.

The proposed project also requires authorization under Nationwide Permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) for in- or above-water construction activities. In addition, as described below, the OPRHP recently determined that several buildings in the project area are eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. The buildings determined eligible for listing on the Registers are the Bronx Terminal Market Buildings G, H, and J.

Because elements of the proposed project will involve discrete discretionary actions by Federal agencies (i.e., the NPS and the USACOE), there will be a review of those elements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as implemented by Federal regulations appearing at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its implementing regulation, as well as any applicable executive orders (e.g., Executive Order 12898 [relating to environmental justice] and Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 [relating to the protection of floodplains and wetlands]).

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would develop a new Yankee Stadium one block north of its current site, across East 161st Street at River Avenue. The proposed stadium would be built on land currently in recreational use (portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks) and on one block of East 162nd Street, which would be closed and mapped as parkland. Ample space would be provided on site to accommodate all functions related to the team and game-day operations, including off-street loading, adequate areas for fans to congregate at entrances, which would be arranged along three sides of the building, and sufficient space for circulation within. State-of-the-art seating and amenities for fans and the media would be combined with modern facilities for the players, to make game going a comfortable and exciting experience for all.

The proposed project would also add to and better consolidate the off-street parking inventory in the area, by constructing four new parking garages, thus greatly relieving the overflow of parking scattered throughout the neighborhood in both legal and illegal parking spots. Three of the garages would occupy existing parkland in portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks, two of which would include open space on the roofs. A garage with frontage on River Avenue at East 151st Street would offer retail space at street level, as well. The garages, along with existing parking facilities in the area, would be operated under a long-term lease.

The recreational facilities to be displaced by the construction of the proposed stadium and garages would be replaced as part of the proposed project—with similar or improved facilities for active recreation (e.g., softball, baseball, tennis, basketball, handball, track) and for passive enjoyment of the park (e.g., seating, plantings, paths, food concessions, etc.). New parkland and public open space would be created along the Harlem River waterfront, providing new public waterfront access, as well. The site of the existing Yankee Stadium would be a major feature of the recreation plan, providing Heritage Field on the site of the existing Yankee Stadium playing field for the public's use. Ruppert Place would also be demapped and reconfigured as part of the parkland provided south of the proposed stadium. Additionally, two small passive parks will be created at 157<sup>th</sup> Street and River Avenue. Fuller descriptions of the project's elements, including the proposed stadium, proposed garages, traffic and pedestrian circulation, new parkland, and recreational facilities, are provided below.

### *Proposed Stadium*

The proposed stadium would be developed in portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks, and would require that East 162nd Street be closed and mapped as parkland between River and Jerome Avenues. The proposed stadium's playing field would be positioned in an orientation similar to the existing stadium. The fan experience would be greatly enhanced by appropriate sidewalk widths, which allow enough space for queuing and a pedestrian-friendly environment. An efficient security screening system would be incorporated into the entry process. In addition to providing adequate space around the stadium for fans, service vehicles would park off-street in a service drive between the north side of the proposed stadium and proposed parking Garage B, and River and Jerome Avenues.

The height of the proposed stadium, at its tallest point—the top of the canopy—would be on average approximately 138 feet above grade. Field light towers would extend above this canopy. This structure would be visible above the facade, which itself would range from 70 feet to 95 feet above the sidewalk elevation at the main entrance. The total built floor area for the proposed stadium would comprise approximately 1.3 million square feet.

Approximately 53,000 seats for viewing baseball are planned at a split of approximately 65 percent lower bowl to 35 percent upper bowl seating, the reverse of current conditions. Specified standing room for 1,000 spectators would also be provided, bringing the capacity of the stadium to 54,000 spectators. Disabled seating areas complying with applicable code requirements and current requirements of the

ADA would be distributed throughout all seating categories at all levels. These seating areas would provide spaces for wheelchairs and companion seating, and would be located on an accessible route. Ticket windows and pedestrian entries to the proposed stadium would be on three sides: East 161st Street, River Avenue, and Jerome Avenue. This arrangement would help distribute spectators entering and leaving the proposed stadium and thus take full advantage of its perimeter in providing access capacity.

Approximately 60 suites would be provided, which would have fixed-seating capacities of 12 to 16, plus some additional room. In addition, Premium Seat Lounges, would be incorporated into the new stadium. Concession stands would be located throughout the concourses. The main team store selling Yankees' merchandise would be at two levels in a prominent location, allowing entry from both the street and from within the stadium. It would be open on event and non-event days, and would be located near a high-traffic area to attract the maximum number of customers. Two smaller satellite stores selling Yankees' merchandise would be located away from each other and from the main retail store to allow for better access to retail outlets for fans throughout the stadium. Novelty stands would also be provided throughout the concourses, distributed proportionately at high-traffic areas. An approximately 150-seat restaurant located at street level would provide year round operation with direct entry from outside the stadium, as well as access to the stadium concourse. There would also be a themed restaurant accessible from within the stadium seating an additional 100 patrons. It is anticipated that the restaurants would also be open to the general public on non-game days.

All day-of-game employees and staff would use the same entry to the stadium, which would be located near the subway. The stadium would provide space for staging New York City Police, and a building command center. The New York Yankees administrative offices would be located within the proposed stadium, as they are now.

#### *Proposed Garages and Transportation Elements*

The transportation components of the proposed project have been designed to ease access to the proposed stadium. Truck and bus loading and operation of service vehicles have been removed from public streets, entry areas have been designed with enough capacity to handle crowds entering and leaving the proposed stadium, a basic plan to manage traffic and pedestrian flows at game time has been developed, and parking capacity has been expanded to reduce overflow parking on local streets and help reduce the walk from parking facilities to the stadium, as discussed below. The existing ferry landing and service would be maintained at its current location and capacity.

The proposed stadium would have several loading docks for food service deliveries, team and other deliveries, and trash storage and pickup. They would be located at the northern edge of the proposed stadium in a dedicated area in the vicinity of former East 162nd Street, which would be used as a service driveway. Access to the driveway would be from River and Jerome Avenues. Team parking for private cars and buses would be located within the building and would have a designated access off River Avenue. In addition, the proposed stadium would provide space in the loading area for 10 large mobile media trucks with hookups.

Ticket windows and pedestrian entries to the proposed stadium would be on three sides: East 161st Street, River Avenue, and Jerome Avenue.

#### *TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS*

Traffic and pedestrian improvements have been included as part of the proposed project where the need for such improvements is readily apparent to maintain the safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian flows. These improvements include:

- Similar to today, a portion of East 157th Street between Ruppert Plaza and the eastern entrance to Parking Garage A would be closed to vehicular traffic to create a pedestrian-only walkway. Vehicular traffic west of Ruppert Plaza would remain open to access the western entrance to Parking Garage A.
- Ruppert Plaza between East 161st Street and East 157th Street would be converted to parkland use as part of the proposed project's parkland replacement. It would be closed to vehicular traffic at all times and function as a north-south pedestrian promenade on game days directly across from the proposed main stadium entrances along East 161st Street.
- An at-grade, controlled crossing of East 161st Street at Ruppert Plaza would be created. The existing T-intersection would be reconfigured for a wide, mid-block crosswalk with signals controlling East 161st Street traffic. Since Ruppert Plaza would no longer accommodate vehicular traffic under the proposed project, this crossing would make possible a continuous pedestrian-way between the existing Garage 8 (located between East 157th Street, East 153rd Street, and River Avenue) and points south and the proposed stadium.
- A game-day pedestrian crossing area would be maintained at Babe Ruth Plaza along East 161st Street immediately west of the columns that encase the subway stairs in the roadway medians. TEAs would be charged with directing vehicular and pedestrian flow at this location. This crossing would only be available during game days.
- An improved crossing would be provided at the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach intersections with the East 161st Street service roads. This crossing would include a new signal at the eastbound service road intersection, and wider crosswalks and sidewalks.
- Under the traffic management plan for the existing stadium, River Avenue between East 157th and East 161st Streets is either partially or fully closed during certain periods on game days. The transportation analyses assume that this stretch of roadway could remain open at all times with the proposed project.
- As necessary, TEAs would be deployed as they are today to facilitate vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow at the above and other strategic locations.

### *PUBLIC PARKING*

Four new public parking garages would be developed on existing surface parking lots and parkland surrounding the proposed stadium and existing Yankee Stadium Lots 13A and 13B located along the Harlem River would be repaired, restriped, and extended south to replace the spaces lost to create the esplanade. Parking would be available at existing lots and garages (except for the two existing lots located at East 157th Street and River Avenue that would become new parkland) and the four proposed new garages, all of which are anticipated to be leased to private operators. In total, approximately 10,101 parking spaces would be available for stadium patrons in existing and new facilities. Pedestrian circulation to the proposed stadium would originate from garage access points, from the existing ferry landing, and from the existing subway station at East 161st Street and River Avenue.

Parking Garage A would be a two-level garage located partially below-grade between East 157th and East 161st Streets and the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and the site of the existing stadium. Garage A would be located in the southern portion of Macomb's Dam Park, which currently contains recreational facilities and surface parking associated with the existing Yankee Stadium. New recreational facilities that could be accessed at garage would be located on its roof.

Parking Garage B would be a five-level garage, with one level located below-grade, four levels above-grade, and rooftop parking. This garage would be located south of East 164th Street at the northern end of the proposed stadium and north of the service road. Garage B would be located in the southern portion of John Mullaly Park, which currently contains tennis and handball courts. Parking Garage C would be a four-level garage located west of East 161st Street between Jerome Avenue, Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, and the Major Deegan Expressway. Pedestrian access for Garage C would be provided to the



new roof-top recreational facilities, adjacent to the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach intersection with East 161<sup>st</sup> Street.

Parking Garage D would be a five-level above-grade garage (including one level of roof parking) located south of the proposed stadium at East 151st Street between River and Gerard Avenues. Parking Garage D would extend over East 151st Street at the 3rd, 4th, and roof levels.

Existing Yankee Stadium Parking Lots are located west of Exterior Street between the Bronx Terminal Market and the Macombs Dam Bridge. The proposed project would repave and restripe these existing lots and create new surface parking, as a southern extension. This new southern parking extension would be located on property that contains paved areas and an abandoned power house building associated with Bronx Terminal Market (Building J), which would be demolished. These surface parking changes would replace the spaces lost to create the new esplanade (described below).

## **PROPOSED PARKLAND AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES**

As noted above, the proposed stadium and three of the four proposed parking garages would occupy approximately 22.42 acres of parkland containing recreational facilities (13.5 acres for the stadium and 8.92 acres for the garages), but would replace the facilities and open space lost, and create a net increase of 4.63 acres in recreational acreage, as described below.

### *EXISTING FACILITIES*

The proposed project would occupy the portion of Macomb's Dam Park north and south of East 161st Street and east of Jerome Avenue (21.42 acres), plus the southern portion of John Mullaly Park between East 162nd and East 164th Streets (3.9 acres). The affected areas contain a substantial number of active recreational facilities, including 16 tennis courts and 8 handball courts in John Mullaly Park; and two baseball fields with 90-foot infields, one little league baseball field with a 60-foot infield, a softball field, a soccer field surrounded by a 400-meter track and bleachers, 24 handball courts, and two basketball courts in Macomb's Dam Park. There are two ballfields, each on the portions of Macomb's Dam Park located north and south of East 161st Street, which have overlapping outfields. Macomb's Dam Park also contains a NYCDPR District Office building, which also provides public restrooms and open areas, which are used for pick-up football games, ball tossing, etc.

Several of the facilities in the portion of Macomb's Dam Park bounded by East 161st Street to the south, Jerome Avenue to the west, East 162nd Street to the north, and River Avenue to the west, were improved and rehabilitated with funds from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). As a result, this portion of Macomb's Dam Park is subject to the provisions of Section 6(f) of the LWCF Act. Section 6(f) requires that property improved or developed with LWCF assistance shall not be converted to any use other than public outdoor recreation use without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior (delegated to the Director of the National Park Service [NPS]). Therefore, NPS approval is required for the conversion of this portion of Macomb's Dam Park for the proposed stadium.

In addition to the use of parkland described above, Garage C would be built in a portion of Macomb's Dam Park on 2.89 acres of mapped parkland currently containing a parking lot. Parking facilities are permitted on lands dedicated as parkland and are consistent with the park designation, and are authorized by State legislation.

### *REPLACEMENT FACILITIES*

A total of 27.05 acres of replacement recreational facilities and new parkland would be provided as part of the proposed project. As described below, these facilities would all be located within existing and new parkland and public open space. The replacement acreage includes: 15.82 acres of new mapped parkland, 2.89 acres on currently mapped parkland that contains an existing surface parking lot,

7.33 acres on existing parkland, and 1.01 acres of new open space (not mapped as parkland). For purposes of the Federal LWCF conversion, the proposed Section 6(f) replacement parks would be developed on the existing stadium site, Ruppert Plaza, and along the Harlem River waterfront. As currently contemplated, NYCDPR would replace directly most of the existing facilities to be displaced by the proposed project. However, NYCDPR may choose to vary the new facilities to provide replacements that are not exactly the same as those displaced, but are equal or greater in use and value. For example, NYCDPR may replace some of the existing handball courts with alternative recreational facilities that meet current community needs. To this end, NYCDPR would undertake a broad community outreach program before deciding on a final plan for the new parkland and recreational facilities. The anticipated new facilities, which may be modified, are presently anticipated to include the following elements:

- The proposed project would retain the playing field, dugouts, and locker rooms under the field seats of the existing stadium and adapt it to a public baseball field called “Heritage Field.” It is anticipated that some of the field seats in the existing stadium would be retained for the replacement ball field (no more than 3,000 seats), while most of the existing stadium would be demolished. Also on the site of the existing Yankee Stadium would be areas of landscaped, passive recreational open space. In total, this area would be 8.9 acres of new parkland. A portion of the existing Yankee Stadium site, approximately 0.75 acres along East 157th Street, would not be mapped as parkland. This area would contain passive open space until future plans for the parcel are defined. This acreage (0.75 acres) is not included in the 8.9 acres of replacement parkland and recreational facilities on the existing stadium site.
- A full-size, artificial turf soccer field would be located south of East 161st Street between Jerome Avenue and the existing stadium site in the southern portion of what is currently Macomb’s Dam Park. A 400-meter athletic track would encircle the soccer field. A grandstand would overlook these two facilities. A comfort station with restrooms would be located beneath the grandstand. Adjacent to the track on its south would be an artificial turf little league field and nine handball courts, and to its west would be two basketball courts (one with stands) and two tennis courts. A tot-lot, with climbing and play equipment, drinking fountain, and benches would be located at the corner of Macomb’s Dam Bridge Approach and East 161st Street. These facilities would be built atop a new subterranean garage (Parking Garage A) but would be accessible at street level along Ruppert Place. In total, they would comprise 7.33 acres.
- Between Heritage Field and the soccer field and athletic track would be a passive park with an alley of trees on re-aligned Ruppert Place. Renamed “Ruppert Plaza,” it would comprise 1.13 acres of new parkland. The design of Ruppert Plaza would include significant landscaping, including shaded areas and passive park amenities, such as benches, resting areas, and pedestrian walkways. Ruppert Plaza would be an important recreation element within Heritage Field, and would also function as the main thoroughfare from the existing parking facilities, as well as proposed Parking Garage A, to the proposed stadium.
- Passive park/civic space is proposed east of River Avenue on either side of East 157th Street and would contain benches and unique paving landscapes. The northern park parcel would contain sculptured play elements. Together these parks would act as a gateway to Heritage Field. These facilities would constitute 0.68 acres of new parkland.
- Fourteen tennis courts would be built in Macomb’s Dam Park atop Parking Garage C, south of East 161st Street, west of Jerome Avenue and north of a ramp from the Major Deegan Expressway. Adjacent to the tennis courts would be a pavilion building with restrooms and

other amenities serving the tennis court program. The total area would be 2.89 acres. Although the courts would be on the roof of a four-story garage, the elevation of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach in this location would lower their relative height considerably. This facility would be accessed from East 161st Street and would operate as a concession.

- One little league baseball field and one softball field (both artificial turf) would be located along the waterfront, approximately ½-mile from the existing facilities, and would reclaim a currently degraded pier. New passive recreational open space and a pedestrian esplanade would surround these waterfront ballfields. A comfort station with restrooms would be constructed to the south of the ballfield. These ballfields and open space would be located on property currently associated with the Bronx Terminal Market. Currently, the site contains paved areas for parking, an abandoned power house, and two low-scale, partially occupied warehouse buildings (Bronx Terminal Market Buildings G and H) that would be demolished. The fields would add 5.11 acres to the inventory of new parkland.
- In addition to the replacement recreational facilities, the proposed project would also create a new 0.71-acre esplanade that would extend from the northern end of the waterfront park, wrap around the waterfront to the existing ferry landing, and extend east to the pedestrian connection at Exterior Street beneath the Major Deegan Expressway. Although it would not be mapped as parkland, the esplanade would provide an important corridor between the recreational facilities of the Harlem River waterfront and the new recreational facilities in the eastern portion of the project area. In total, the proposed project would create more than 5.82 acres of new public open space along the Harlem River waterfront. The proposed waterfront park and esplanade would provide waterfront access and recreational opportunities that are currently not available in the surrounding community. The new park and esplanade would establish physical and visual public access to the Harlem River waterfront and result in waterfront uses that would attract the public and enliven a waterfront area that is currently composed of degraded piers.
- In addition to the active facilities cited above, public passive open space would surround Parking Garage B along East 164th Street (0.3 acres).

#### *Retail Development*

Parking Garage D could be developed with a non-destination retail component of approximately 12,000 gross square feet along the street level of the garage.

#### *Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements*

The proposed project would also make improvements along River Avenue and in the area of the existing pedestrian bridge over the Metro-North Railroad tracks. Access to the existing pedestrian bridge would be improved and made ADA compliant. New urban design elements, such as unique paving, signage, and pedestrian lighting would be implemented at the western end of the pedestrian bridge. These new elements would direct pedestrians between the parking areas west of the Major Deegan Expressway and the existing bridge. In addition, Ruppert Place would be closed and mapped as parkland, and used as a pedestrian-way leading to the proposed stadium. Streetscape improvements would be made along River Avenue between proposed Parking Garage D and East 164<sup>th</sup> Street. Sidewalks currently in poor condition would be replaced, existing trees would be retained and supplemented with new trees, and pedestrian lighting would be improved.

## **B. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

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

The proposed reconfiguration of the locations of the parking, open space and stadium facilities and the net increase in overall open space would be consistent with land uses in the area under existing conditions and in the future without the proposed project. The proposed project would be consistent with zoning and other public policies affecting the project area and surrounding area. Overall, the proposed project would have no significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy.

### **SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

The analysis concludes that the proposed project would not cause significant adverse impacts to the socioeconomic character of the project's study area. The proposed project would not directly displace any residential population, and it would not directly displace any businesses or institutional uses. The proposed project would not foster a change in residential market conditions that would lead to indirect residential displacement, nor would it significantly alter existing economic patterns in the study area. The proposed project would not significantly affect business conditions in any specific industry or category of business in The Bronx or the City as a whole. In addition, the proposed project would result in considerable economic and fiscal benefits to New York City and New York State during both the construction and operating periods.

### **OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION**

The Federal Land & Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCF), 16 U.S.C. §§ 4601-4 to 4601-11 is commonly referred to as Section 6(f), as the provision was originally contained in Section 6(f)(3) of the LWCF, Public Law 88-578 of 1962, before codification. This statute regulates the future use of parklands or open spaces that have been improved with funds received through the LWCF, and is applicable in this case because LWCF funds were used for the improvement of portions of Macomb's Dam Park.

The United States Department of the Interior (DOI), through the National Park Service (NPS), provides funding under the LWCF for State and local efforts to plan, acquire, or develop land to advance outdoor recreational activities. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) serves as the New York State agency that administers LWCF funds received from DOI. Using LWCF funds, however, creates certain limitations on future changes to LWCF-funded projects. Once LWCF funds are utilized for a particular recreation project, conversion of that park facility for any non-recreational purpose is prohibited unless alternatives are assessed and steps are taken to identify, evaluate, and supply replacement parkland. NPS must grant prior approval of the conversion and replacement parkland.

In particular, under the LWCF, a conversion of parkland may be approved if NPS finds that: (1) all practical alternatives to the proposed conversion have been evaluated; (2) the fair market value of the park property to be converted has been established and the property proposed for substitution is of at least equal fair market value, as established by an approved appraisal in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition, excluding the value of structures or facilities that will not serve recreational purposes; (3) the proposed replacement property is of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location as the converted property; and (4) the proposed conversion and substitution are in accordance with the applicable Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). The LWCF regulations further require that the project comply with applicable Federal statutes, regulatory requirements, and policies, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NPS must approve the conversion and consider the environmental evaluations in its review.

The location of the proposed stadium is on a portion of Macomb's Dam Park north of East 161st Street and east of Jerome Avenue that was improved with LWCF funds in the early 1980s. For purposes of the Federal LWCF conversion, the proposed Section 6(f) replacement parks would be developed on the existing stadium site, Ruppert Place, and along the Harlem River waterfront.

New York State legislation enacted in June 2005 authorizes the alienation of certain areas of currently mapped parkland to allow for its disposition by the City, through leases, for operation of the proposed stadium and three of the proposed parking garages. Following that disposition, however, these areas would remain mapped parkland. The State legislation also requires that the City dedicate the existing Yankee Stadium site as parkland and acquire additional parklands and/or dedicate land for park and recreational purposes which are equal to or greater than the fair market value of the parkland being alienated.

As the recreational facilities that would be displaced by the proposed project would be replaced with similar and new recreational facilities, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to open space. Furthermore, as there would be a net increase in the area's open space, and older, and in some cases worn facilities, would be replaced with new, modern facilities, as well as new waterfront access, there would be a positive impact on the project area in terms of open space. The proposed project would also comply with the requirements of Section 6(f) and the State authorizing legislation.

## **SHADOWS**

The proposed project would cast incremental shadows on portions of Macomb's Dam Park throughout the year. The triangular portion of the park bounded by East 161st Street, Jerome Avenue, and the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, which contains walkways and a large rock outcropping surrounded by trees, would be in the shadows of the proposed stadium for most of the morning throughout the year. Additional shadows would be cast on Macomb's Dam Park in the afternoon from fall through spring by Parking Garage C. The proposed project would also cast shadows on the proposed Parking Garage A rooftop open space (located in Macomb's Dam Park) and the proposed open space entrance plaza to Heritage Field (to be mapped as parkland as part of Macomb's Dam Park). John Mullaly Park would also receive shadows from the proposed project. Incremental shadows from proposed Parking Garage B along East 164th Street would fall on the southern portion of the park in the afternoon for about three hours during the early spring and early fall months. During the winter months, proposed Parking Garage B as well as the proposed stadium would cast incremental shadows on the southern portion of John Mullaly Park throughout the entire analysis period. The portion of John Mullaly Park affected by shadows contains a skate park, a recreation center, a playground, and a passive park area.

No significant adverse impacts are expected to occur to any open spaces as the duration and coverage of shadows are not long enough or large enough to affect vegetation or park usage. Portions of the parks that would be in shadow contain mostly active recreation uses, which are less affected by shadow than passive uses. In addition, several other portions of these parks are available for recreational use during the times the incremental shadows from the proposed project would occur. New parklands would not experience significant shadows.

## **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

The proposed project would result in the construction of a new park with ballfields, esplanade, and surface parking on the west side of Exterior Street at the Bronx Terminal Market in the area of Buildings G, H, and J (State/National Historic Register-eligible). The analysis concludes that the proposed project could result in significant adverse impacts on Buildings G, H, and J of the Bronx Terminal Market should the proposed project move forward and these buildings are not demolished by the Gateway Center at Bronx Terminal Market project. If this is the case, the proposed project would undertake mitigation measures in consultation with OPRHP to mitigate any significant adverse effects on architectural resources, which would be set forth in a Memorandum of Agreement.

The analysis also found that the proposed stadium could result in adverse impacts to the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach span between the Major Deegan Expressway and East 161st Street through the development of Parking Garages A and C. However, these impacts are not expected to be significantly adverse. As currently planned, these garages would be set back approximately 12 feet to the east and west of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, essentially eliminating the visibility of this section of the landmarked structure within the project area. However, the most prominent features of the Macombs Dam Bridge roadway system—the Macombs Dam Bridge Pratt truss spanning the Harlem River and the camelback truss spanning the Metro-North Railroad right-of-way—would remain unaltered by proposed Parking Garages A and C. Changes to the approach structure itself include widening the existing pedestrian walkways at East 161st Street and constructing vehicular and pedestrian access between the approach and Parking Garages A and C. To avoid adverse impacts to these portions of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, these new elements would be designed in consultation with OPRHP and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC).

Within the study area, it is not expected that the proposed project would have significant adverse impacts to any architectural resources. Where there is potential for a construction-related impact, a Construction Protection Plan would be developed in consultation with OPRHP and LPC, and would be implemented prior to construction to protect resources within 90 feet of proposed construction activities, including architectural resources in the project area and study area; and to ensure that adverse impacts do not occur.

Apart from the anticipated, non-significant adverse impact to the section of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach identified above, the proposed project would not block significant views of any other known or potential historic resources, significantly alter the visual setting of any other resource, or introduce incompatible contextual elements to any other historic resource's setting in the project area or study area.

## **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

The proposed project would develop buildings and recreational facilities of a comparable design as those presently found in the area. As such, the proposed project would have no adverse impacts on the urban design of the study area. In general, the proposed project would have a positive effect on visual resources; it would remove two segments of Macomb's Dam Park and one of John Mullaly Park that together constitute a visual resource for the area, but it would introduce new visual resources. These include new waterfront elements along the Harlem River, including the baseball fields, landscaped areas, and an esplanade, providing new public amenities and locations from which to view the river and its shorelines. The proposed stadium would constitute a new visual landmark in the area, and the proposed new green areas and public plazas to be developed at the former and new stadium sites would also generate new visual resources in the area.

However, it is expected that the removal of mature trees, which are approximately 40 feet tall, within of Macomb's Dam Park and John Mullaly Park could result in unavoidable adverse impacts. Some of these trees would have to be removed due to the scope of the construction. Although the replacement trees would not achieve comparable size for several decades, the number of replacement trees would be extremely large and equivalent in total mass to the trees that would be lost. The addition of a significantly expanded canopy of trees to the project area and surrounding neighborhoods, in addition to the mature trees that would be retained, would mean that the change would not be significantly adverse. In addition, the proposed project would remove green areas within portions of Macomb's Dam Park and John Mullaly Park, affecting views east from Jerome Avenue. However, since views on Jerome Avenue north of East 164th Street of the northern portions of John Mullaly Park would not be altered, and new visual resources would be created in the project area, this change is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to visual resources.

It is also expected that the development of Parking Garages A and C would obscure the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach between the Major Deegan Expressway and East 161st Street, resulting in adverse impacts to visual resources. Since the most prominent and distinguished portions of the bridge—namely, its two differently configured truss structures that are west of the project area—would remain unaffected, this change would not be expected to be significantly adverse. The development of Parking Garages B and D is not expected to result in adverse impacts to visual resources.

It is anticipated that the proposed stadium would use the latest technology for lighting. It is anticipated that the lighting at the proposed stadium would control glare and light spill in a more efficient manner than currently exists, with light spill during night games anticipated to be an indirect glow. In addition to the programming of illumination for night games, the lighting system would also allow for a reduction in the illumination of the exterior of the stadium when there is no event, with lighting during non-game times anticipated to consist only of discrete downlighting and illumination of the stadium entrances. Therefore, it is not expected that the lighting at the proposed stadium, either for night games or non-event periods, would not significantly adversely impact the visual character of the study area.

### **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER**

The analysis concludes that as a result of the proposed project, there would be no change in the types of land uses or design and scale of development located in the study area; however, the location of the various uses would be reconfigured in different locations. The proposed project would not result in an increase in traffic and pedestrian trips over existing conditions. Rather, these trips would be redistributed within the transportation network, largely due to the future location of the proposed stadium, the addition of nearby parking facilities, and the provision of a dedicated pedestrian spine along Ruppert Plaza. This redistribution would result in increases in traffic and pedestrian congestion in some locations and improvements in others.

Due to the location of the proposed stadium and Parking Garages A, B, and C, several of the traffic and pedestrian impacts would occur along Jerome Avenue and the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach near East 161st Street. However, the increase in traffic and pedestrian levels in this largely residential area would, for the most part, be similar to existing conditions and those in the future without the proposed project and be of limited duration, occurring only during Yankees games. A comprehensive game day traffic management plan would also be developed to address all impacts in the pre- and post-game peak periods in as effective a manner as possible. Therefore, these changes overall would not have significantly adverse impacts on neighborhood character. Similarly, noise levels would increase in locations closer to the proposed stadium and decrease in locations closer to the existing stadium, and overall would not result in a significant adverse noise-related impact on neighborhood character.

The proposed project would also have positive effects on the character of the area. The proposed project would improve the area's open space overall, and replace older, and in some cases worn recreational facilities, with new, modern facilities. It would also create new access to the waterfront, in a waterfront park and esplanade, beyond what would have been provided in the future without the proposed project. The proposed project would also increase and better organize parking and help eliminate existing parking shortfalls that cause fans driving to games to circulate excessively in search of hard-to-find parking spaces, often ending up parking illegally near the stadium, on local streets, and on the service road of the northbound Major Deegan Expressway. As a result of the proposed project, the New York Yankees, an important asset to the neighborhood and The Bronx, would remain in its historical Bronx location.

### **NATURAL RESOURCES**

The proposed project would result in the displacement of recreational facilities and hence, limited wildlife habitat in the form of shade trees, lawn, and patches of successional woodland in portions of the parks inaccessible to park users, and street trees in Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks. The existing weedy vegetation along the edge of the piers in the area of the proposed Harlem River waterfront park and esplanade, which is of limited wildlife value, would also be removed as part of shoreline improvement activities. Wildlife using the areas to be displaced would be limited to those tolerant of urban conditions. The loss of some individuals of these urban-tolerant species would not result in a significant adverse

impact on the bird and wildlife community of the New York City region. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to terrestrial resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

All trees removed as a result of the proposed project would be replaced in accordance with NYCDPR requirements. To minimize potential adverse impacts resulting from the loss of 373 trees (includes street trees and trees lost from the recreational facilities that would be displaced), NYCDPR would require the replanting of trees in accordance with the NYCDPR basal area tree replacement formula. The removed trees, which total a basal area of approximately 584 square feet, would be replaced with trees of a size totaling an equal basal area, or from between 8,356 trees of a 3 ½-inch caliper to 29,248 trees of a 2-inch caliper within the replacement recreational facilities and along streets. These replacement trees would create natural screening and areas of shade for relaxation and passive enjoyment for park visitors and habitat for wildlife. Should there be insufficient space to plant the calculated number of trees within the replacement recreational areas, the remaining replacement trees would be planted as street trees within the vicinity of the project area or as nearly as possible.

Areas of passive open space would be landscaped with trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants consistent with NYCDPR's green park design of using native trees, shrubs, and groundcover to the extent possible. These landscaped passive recreational areas would benefit wildlife by providing improved habitat with a greater diversity than currently present within the displaced recreational facilities. The two rooftop replacement recreational facilities developed on Parking Garages A and C would incorporate natural soil wells in open areas between the active recreational facilities that would support a sufficient depth of growing media to permit the planting of trees and other vegetation. The new open space areas developed within the recreational facilities on newly mapped parkland, such as the passive open space areas associated with the 5.11-acre Harlem River waterfront park and surrounding Heritage Field at the 8.90-acre site of the existing stadium, would provide even greater opportunity for the development of green park landscaping that would provide improved habitat for birds and other wildlife.

Significant adverse impacts would not occur to the floodplain, wetlands, water quality or aquatic biota of the Harlem River, or to the only endangered species with the potential to occur in the vicinity of the project area, the shortnose sturgeon. The proposed Harlem River waterfront park and esplanade, the new parking area north of the waterfront park, and the Yankee Stadium Parking Lots 13A and 13B that would be repaved and restriped are the only portions of the project area within the floodplain. The development of the waterfront park would result in an increase in pervious cover with stormwater retention, which would result in beneficial effects to the floodplain by decreasing stormwater discharges during rainfall events. Improvements to the shoreline stabilization as part of the Harlem River waterfront park design, such as replacement of existing timber crib bulkhead with a softer shoreline stabilization structure (e.g., gabion wall system) that would increase the complexity of the shoreline habitat and establishment of tidal wetland vegetation at the shoreward portion of the coves, would improve wetland resources within the project area. Potential impacts to wetlands during construction of the shoreline improvements would be minimized through the implementation of measures identified during the permitting process for these shoreline enhancements by Federal and State agencies.

In addition, any effects on water quality resulting from shoreline improvement activities, such as increased suspended sediment and resuspension of contaminated sediment, would be temporary and localized and would not result in significant adverse impacts to aquatic biota. The temporary loss of some benthic habitat and of some macroinvertebrates during replacement of the concrete masonry bulkhead and timber crib bulkhead, and improvement of the riprapped areas, would not result in significant adverse impacts to populations of benthic macroinvertebrates using this portion of the Harlem River, nor would it significantly impact the food supply for fish foraging in the area. The proposed gabion wall system and creation of vegetated tidal wetland habitat as part of the waterfront park design would benefit aquatic resources by increasing the diversity of aquatic habitat for benthic macroinvertebrates and fish within the project area. Because water quality impacts would be limited to the immediate area of activity along the shoreline, which consists of shallow water habitat, adverse impacts would not occur to shortnose sturgeon



that may occur in the deeper channel area of the Harlem River. Potential adverse effects to water quality resulting from the discharge of stormwater during construction and operation of the proposed project would be minimized through implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include stormwater detention facilities, and implementation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategy that would manage landscaped areas with minimal application of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers. Therefore, the discharge of stormwater from the project area would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts to Harlem River water quality.

## **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

All on-site structures potentially contain asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. PCBs could be present in electrical equipment found throughout the project area. Known or suspected underground petroleum storage tanks are present at the existing stadium, the Macomb's Dam Park Field House, Parking Lot 6, and along the Harlem River waterfront, west of the Bronx Terminal Market warehouse buildings. Semi volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) and/metal concentrations exceeding NYSDEC standards were detected in soil samples from throughout the project area, and petroleum contamination was identified in soil and groundwater samples from beneath Parking Lots 5 and 6.

As described in this chapter, any hazardous materials in structures to be demolished would be handled, removed, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local regulations, thus avoiding any significant adverse impacts. In addition, areas containing petroleum-related contamination from spill sites would be investigated and remediated under the NYSDEC Spills program, including preparation and approval of a Work Plan, Health and Safety Plan (HASP), and/or Remedial Action Plan (RAP), as appropriate. Further, the proposed development would be conducted under NYCDEP-approved RAP, including a HASP, designed to protect site workers and the surrounding community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction activities in areas where soil excavation and/or remediation would occur. Therefore, if all State- and City-approved HASPs and RAPs are properly implemented the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

## **WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM**

The components of the proposed project that are within the coastal zone—the proposed Harlem River waterfront park, esplanade, and existing Yankee Stadium Parking Lots 13A and 13B—would be consistent with the City's 10 Waterfront Revitalization Program (WRP) coastal policies, and the WRP's guiding principle of maximizing the benefits derived from economic development, environmental preservation, and public use of the waterfront while minimizing conflicts among these objectives. It would also be consistent with the Bronx Waterfront Plan issued by the Bronx Borough President, Adolfo Carrion, Jr., in March 2004, and its objectives to improve existing parkland, develop pedestrian connections to the Harlem River waterfront, and redevelop the Bronx Terminal Market to include a waterfront open space. The Harlem River waterfront park and esplanade would create new open space and ballfields along the Harlem River, would re-establish physical and visual public access to the Harlem River waterfront, and result in waterfront uses that attract the public and enliven the waterfront as well as benefit the surrounding community.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

The incremental water demand from the proposed project would be a minimal increase over existing demand and would not be large enough to significantly impact the water supply system's ability to deliver water reliably. Demand for water is not expected to affect local water pressure. Although the proposed project would involve the relocation of a 36-inch water main and a 48-inch sewer line, these relocations are not expected to cause interruption to water supply or sewerage in the area. The additional sanitary sewage expected to result from the proposed project would not cause the Wards Island Water Pollution Control Plant to exceed its design capacity or its New York State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit flow limit. The volume of stormwater from the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the Harlem River or on New York City's combined sewer system. Therefore, the

proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the existing water supply, sewage treatment, or stormwater discharge systems.

### **SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES**

The total solid waste generated from the proposed project would be a minimal increase over the amount generated by the existing stadium and park users. The increase is not expected to overburden New York City's solid waste handling services, and the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on solid waste and sanitation services.

### **ENERGY**

The proposed project would increase energy consumption over the existing uses in the project area. The incremental increase in energy demand would be caused primarily by the four new parking garages replacing surface parking, which uses less energy. Compared to the overall energy consumption in New York City, however, this increase is minimal. An existing substation next to the site of the proposed stadium would be used, and a new distribution system is not expected to be needed. Further, this additional demand from the proposed project is not expected to overburden the energy generation, transmission, and distribution systems and would not cause a significant adverse energy impact.

### **TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

The proposed stadium would be relocated across East 161st Street from the existing stadium, on a site bounded by East 161st Street on the south, Jerome Avenue on the west, the equivalent of about East 163rd Street on the north, and River Avenue on the east. East 162nd Street would be closed and demapped between River Avenue and Jerome Avenue, and would essentially serve as an entry/exit for one of the new parking garages (Parking Garage B) being proposed as part of the proposed project. Ruppert Place would also be demapped; this is a very low traffic street passing along the western side of the existing stadium, and which is closed to vehicular traffic on game days. East 157th Street between River Avenue and Ruppert Place, which is currently closed, would be re-opened to vehicular traffic. On game days, part of this street would be designated for pedestrian use only (as it is currently), but vehicular access and egress for one of the new garages (Parking Garage A) proposed on that block would be permitted.

The proposed stadium is expected to be slightly smaller than the current stadium in terms of the amount of seating. Thus, the number of fans and attendees at sold-out ballgames will be slightly less than currently attending games at the stadium. The four proposed garages that would provide a total of approximately 5,254 parking spaces as part of the proposed project—representing a net addition of approximately 3,022 spaces above existing parking supplies—would make it easier for fans driving to games to park closer to the stadium, resulting in less circulation on local streets in search of the currently often hard-to-find parking spaces. Decreased traffic circulation on local streets in search of available parking and parking garage spaces, and less parking on the local streets themselves, would also provide a benefit to the local community and local residents in particular.

The creation of 5,254 parking spaces in the four proposed garages would also create a shift in motorists' travel patterns to and from the stadium since some would now exit the Major Deegan Expressway when arriving, and enter the expressway when leaving, further north than they do today. There would be a greater concentration of traffic on East 157th Street, Jerome Avenue, the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, and a portion of East 161st Street near Jerome Avenue, where two of the four proposed parking garages would be located, and on segments of the expressway that lead to East 157th and East 161st Streets. There would be less traffic on Exterior Street and on the northbound expressway exit ramp to East 149th Street, since much of the traffic that now parks south of the existing stadium is expected to shift northward to park in the proposed garages located closer to the proposed stadium.

The key findings of the traffic impact analyses are as follows: (1) the proposed project would provide Yankees fans with thousands of new parking spaces close to the proposed stadium, thus relieving the area of excessive traffic circulation pre-game as motorists would no longer have to circulate on local streets in

search of hard-to-find parking spaces, especially on sellout game days; (2) the proposed project would also eliminate some illegal parking on local streets and on the service road of the northbound Major Deegan Expressway since the parked cars could now be accommodated within off-street parking lots and garages; (3) the proposed project would result in a shift of vehicular traffic from some currently used traffic routes to others, primarily to streets such as Jerome Avenue, the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, River Avenue, and others; (4) the streets and intersections affected would experience significant adverse impacts—11 to 13 intersections on weeknights and 15 to 16 intersections on weekends—and would require traffic capacity improvements to mitigate projected impacts, including a game-day traffic management plan to accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian flows; and (5) significant impacts on some sections of the Major Deegan Expressway would also require improvements and/or game-day traffic management planning to mitigate significant adverse impacts, as motorists shift from some currently used exit and entrance ramps to others.

Some traffic and pedestrian improvements have been included as part of the proposed project (the “Build” condition), where the need for such improvements is readily apparent to maintain safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian flows. These improvements include wider crosswalks, sidewalks, and additional green time at signals for pedestrians to access the new stadium, a new signalized midblock crossing of East 161st Street leading to the new stadium, and others. Where significant adverse traffic impacts would still result, additional improvements needed to mitigate these impacts are identified and evaluated in “Mitigation,” including lane re-striping, modified signal phasing and timing patterns, parking restrictions, and other standard traffic engineering improvements. For those significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated through such standard measures, additional game-day operational measures may be implemented. A primary objective of these analyses is to inform City and State agencies of the location and possible magnitudes of potential impacts that could require additional game-day traffic operations improvements, so that a game day traffic management plan encompassing all these elements—proposed project elements, standard traffic mitigation measures, and game-day traffic operations improvements (i.e., an additional set of game day mitigation measures)—can be developed to address those impacts. An initial evaluation of a “package” of project-related improvements, standard traffic engineering mitigation measures, and additional game-day traffic management plan measures is provided in “Mitigation.”

## **TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS**

The operating conditions of critical transit and pedestrian elements that would be most affected by the proposed project were analyzed. As with vehicular traffic, the proposed project would not result in a net increase in transit and pedestrian trips over existing conditions. Rather, these trips would be redistributed within the transportation network, largely due to the future location of the proposed stadium, the addition of nearby parking, and the provision of a dedicated pedestrian walkway along Ruppert Plaza.

Transit service to the study area is expected to remain the same as currently exist. However, with the demapping of East 162nd Street between Jerome and River Avenues to accommodate proposed Parking Garage B, a portion of the Bx13 bus route would need to be rerouted northward to East 164th Street. In connection with this rerouting, several bus stops would also need to be relocated. New York City Transit (NYCT) would determine the specific requirements of this rerouting and the appropriate locations for the future new bus stops. It is expected that these minor changes to the Bx13 bus route would not significantly impact bus operations during game-day or non-game-day conditions.

In addition, analysis results show that significant adverse transit and pedestrian impacts are anticipated for eight (8) stairways at the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium station and five (5) crosswalks along East 161st Street. These crosswalk locations include the two new project design elements at Ruppert Plaza and along the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, where congested levels are anticipated during critical game-day travel periods experienced in very large part almost entirely by persons traveling to and from a game.

In addition, significant adverse crosswalk impacts at the River Avenue and East 161st Street intersection would result for the following crosswalks:

- The north crosswalk during all four analysis time periods;
- The south crosswalk during the weekday post-game time period; and
- The westbound service road east crosswalk during the weekend pre-game time period.

The game-day crosswalk extension incorporated at Babe Ruth Plaza on the west side of the River Avenue and East 161st Street intersection is expected to operate at acceptable levels. While several significant adverse crosswalk impacts have been identified at this intersection, some of the intersection's crosswalks, most noticeably the east crosswalks at the mainline and at the eastbound service road, would experience noticeable improvements in level of service.

At the new 60-foot-wide Ruppert Plaza crossing under both weekday and weekend conditions, pre-game levels were projected to be marginal at approximately mid-level of service (LOS) D, while post-game levels would be congested at LOS E. Similarly, at the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, pre-game levels for the widened east crosswalk were projected at LOS C and near mid-LOS D, while post-game operations were determined to be congested at LOS E. While these elements are part of design components incorporated as part of the proposed project, the operating levels of service projected during peak game-day analysis time periods would still constitute significant adverse pedestrian impacts, unless the project's design can provide additional capacity and alleviate the adverse operating levels.

In total, significant adverse impacts attributable to the proposed project were determined at five (5) pedestrian crosswalks. Mitigation measures of these significant adverse impacts are described in "Mitigation." As with the analysis of traffic and parking conditions, these findings are intended to better assist decision-makers to design and implement appropriate transportation management strategies and measures to facilitate safe and efficient transit and pedestrian access for the proposed Yankee Stadium. These strategies and measures will be evaluated in further detail for the FEIS.

## **AIR QUALITY**

The results of the analysis indicate that in the future with the proposed project, there would be no potentially significant adverse air quality impacts from mobile sources. With or without the proposed project in 2009, the maximum predicted ambient carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at the intersections analyzed would be lower than the corresponding ambient air quality standards. In addition, CO impacts from the proposed garages were found to be substantially below the applicable standard of 9 parts per million (ppm). Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed garages would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

The primary stationary source of air pollutants associated with the proposed project would be emissions from the combustion of natural gas by heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment from the proposed stadium. The primary pollutant of concern when burning natural gas is nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). The analysis determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant stationary source air quality impacts because the project would be well below the maximum size permitted by CEQR guidelines.

The industrial source screening analysis showed that there would be no exceedance of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) annual guideline concentrations for potential contaminants at the proposed project sites. Therefore, based on the data available on the surrounding industrial uses, the proposed project would not experience significant air quality impacts from industrial facilities.

Finally, maximum predicted pollutant concentrations with the proposed project would be less than the corresponding ambient air standard. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the New York State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the control of ozone and CO. The proposed project would therefore not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

## **NOISE**

Future noise levels with the proposed project at all sites would be less than 3.0 dBA (A-weighted decibels) higher than noise levels without the proposed project. Change of this magnitude would be barely perceptible, and based upon CEQR impact criteria, the changes would not be significant. At some sites there would be a decrease in noise levels, generally attributable to a decrease in vendor/crowd noise at the location, and/or changes in traffic.

Noise levels within the new parks proposed at River Avenue and at the Harlem River waterfront would be above the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  noise level for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet contained in the CEQR noise exposure guidelines.  $L_{10(1)}$  noise levels at these locations would be approximately 70.2 and 73-78 dBA, respectively. These high predicted noise levels are primarily a result of the noise generated by the elevated subway trains and vehicles on the elevated Major Deegan Expressway. These noise sources are independent of the proposed project, but based on CEQR criteria, the noise levels at these new parks would result in potentially significant noise impacts on users of these new parks. There are no practical and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce these noise levels to below the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  guideline noise level. Noise levels in these new parks would, however, be comparable to noise levels in a number of existing parks in New York City that are also located adjacent to heavily trafficked roadway, including Central Park, Hudson River Park, Riverside Park, and Van Cortlandt Park, Pelham Bay Park, and Macomb's Dam Park in The Bronx. While 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  is a worthwhile goal for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet, due to the level of activity present at most New York City parks, except for park areas far away from traffic and other typical urban activities, this relatively low noise level is often not achieved. In addition, in park areas with active recreation (i.e., with basketball courts, baseball fields, soccer fields, etc.) typically noise generated by these activities is above the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  guideline level. In addition, at most New York City parks traffic from nearby streets and roadways and noise from typical urban activities result in noise levels which are above the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  guideline level.

## **CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

The construction of the proposed project is expected to begin in 2006 and be completed in 2010, with the opening of the proposed stadium anticipated in 2009, and all proposed garages operational at that time. Different construction techniques would be employed for the different elements of the proposed project. The upland elements, including the stadium, parks, parking garages, and recreational facilities, are expected to use conventional construction techniques with cranes, earth movers, and other heavy equipment. The equipment and storage areas would be land based. The in-water elements associated with rehabilitation of the bulkhead would likely employ marine construction techniques. Materials would likely be transported and stored on waterborne barges. For certain waterfront areas that may be inaccessible to barges due to inadequate water depth, the equipment may have to be land based.

As with most construction projects, construction activities would cause increases in traffic, fugitive dust, emissions from equipment and vehicles, and noise. Construction activities could also result in temporary increases in potential exposure pathways to hazardous materials. A site-specific HASP and Construction Protection Plan would be developed for the site to protect construction workers and the public from adverse environmental conditions during construction. Construction activities for the proposed project also have the potential to affect open space, economic conditions, air quality, water quality and natural resources, and infrastructure. However, it is not expected that significant adverse impacts to these resources would result. In addition, during construction of the proposed project, appropriate measures would be closely followed to minimize fugitive dust emissions, control noise and vibration levels, control the rodent population, and thus reduce impacts to the surrounding area. Mobile source  $PM_{2.5}$  impacts at intersection from construction activities were analyzed and determined to be insignificant.

As described in Chapter 19, "Construction Impacts," it is anticipated that construction activities would have the potential for significant adverse noise impacts at one or more locations in the study area. In the time period between the Draft and Final EIS, detailed construction noise analyses will be performed and

should those analyses confirm the potential for significant adverse noise impacts, an assessment will be made of feasible mitigation measure that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate such significant impacts. In addition, one or two intersections would experience significant adverse traffic impacts for a period of about two years. Further mitigation will be studied for the Final EIS.

Three categories of noise mitigation measures will be considered—design consideration and project layout, sequence of operations, and alternative construction methods. The result of these studies will be presented in the Final EIS.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH**

The proposed project would not meet any of the thresholds warranting a public health assessment. However, to address comments made during the scoping of the proposed project, an analysis of asthma—its prevalence in New York City and its possible causes and triggers—was performed, and an assessment of the potential public health effects from the proposed project was presented. This analysis concludes that potential emissions of fine particulate matter (i.e., PM<sub>2.5</sub>) from mobile and stationary sources related to the proposed project are not expected to result in adverse public health impacts. Nonetheless, NYCDPR and the Yankees are sensitive to the community’s concerns with respect to the incidence of asthma among the local population. Accordingly, the project sponsors are working and will continue to work with the community to develop measures to address those concerns.

## **MITIGATION**

### **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

The proposed project would result in the construction of a new park with ballfields, esplanade, and surface parking on the west side of Exterior Street at the Bronx Terminal Market in the area of Buildings G, H, and J (S/NR-eligible). If this is the case, the sponsors of the Gateway Center at Bronx Terminal Market project would not build the portion of the planned retail space proposed in the location of Buildings G, H, and J. Therefore, to build the new park and ballfields, esplanade, and surface parking associated with the proposed project, these buildings would be demolished, resulting in a significant adverse impact on historic resources. Measures to mitigate this impact would be developed in consultation with OPRHP. The mitigation measures would be expected to include a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-level photographic documentation and accompanying narrative. The mitigation measures developed with OPRHP would be recorded in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and implemented in order to partially mitigate the effects of the proposed project on historic resources.

### **TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

#### *Overview and Summary of Findings*

The proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at local intersections within the traffic study area and along sections of the Major Deegan Expressway near the proposed stadium site.

A total of 34 intersections were analyzed for Build conditions, including intersections analyzed under existing and No Build conditions plus additional intersections created at proposed garage entrances/exits. Significant impacts can be fully mitigated at many, but not all, of the locations analyzed. A comprehensive game day traffic management plan would seek to address all impacts in as effective a manner as possible. However, it is possible that not all significant adverse impact locations would be fully mitigated, just as occurs today with several congested locations resulting from traffic accessing and leaving the area before and after games. Mitigation measures would consist of signal phasing and timing changes, implementation of physical measures to better delineate travel lanes, parking regulation changes (“No Parking, Stadium Event” restrictions), lane signage changes, and the use of variable-message signs (VMS) to inform motorists about traffic conditions. To fully mitigate significant adverse impacts, conventional traffic capacity improvements would need to be combined with other measures to reduce traffic volumes approaching key intersections, and which would be evaluated comprehensively as part of an overall game day traffic management plan. Measures that would be considered and which would be

evaluated further as game-day traffic planning proceeds are described later in this section, including diverting traffic away from problem locations.

Implementation of the standard traffic mitigation measures described above would result in all significant adverse traffic impacts being mitigated with the following exceptions: the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach/East 161st Street intersection would be unmitigated in both the weeknight and weekend pre-game arrival peak hours and in both post-game analysis hours; the River Avenue/East 161st Street intersection would be partially mitigated in both peak hours; the Jerome Avenue/East 161st Street intersection would be partially mitigated in the weeknight pre- and post-game peak hours; the intersection of Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and the exit ramp from the southbound Major Deegan Expressway would be partially mitigated during both peak hours; and the intersection of Jerome Avenue/Ogden Avenue would be partially mitigated in the weeknight post-game peak hour. Additional game day traffic operations improvements, including traffic diversion strategies that would have effects at several other intersections in the study area, will be investigated between the Draft and Final EIS for their ability to fully mitigate impacts.

It should also be noted that the determination of significant adverse traffic impacts, traffic improvements needed to mitigate those impacts, and the ability of those improvements to mitigate in full, have been determined for 54,000-person sellout games. Games with a significantly lower level of attendance would have a lesser level of impact, a lesser level of mitigation needs, and a lesser likelihood of having unmitigated impacts.

#### *Major Deegan Expressway*

Significant traffic impacts were identified for the following sections of the Major Deegan Expressway:

- During the weeknight pre-game arrival peak hour, northbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline south of the 138th Street on-ramp merge and between this on-ramp and the 149th Street off-ramp; and between the 157th Street exit that leads to the existing stadium and the Service Road on-ramp merge north. Southbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline north of Exit 6 (Bronx Terminal Market off-ramp diverge) and between Exit 6 and Exit 5 (Macombs Dam Bridge/East 161st Street), both of which would experience very substantial travel speed reductions.
- During the weekend pre-game arrival peak hour, northbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline between the 157th Street exit and the Service Road on-ramp merge north; and immediately north of the Service Road on-ramp, north of Jerome Avenue.
- During the weekend pre-game arrival peak hour, northbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline between the 149th Street off-ramp and the 157th Street off-ramp. Southbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline north of Exit 6 (Bronx Terminal Market off-ramp diverge) and between Exit 6 and Exit 5 (Macombs Dam Bridge/East 161st Street), both of which would experience very substantial travel speed reductions, similar to the weeknight pre-game arrival peak hour.
- During the weekend post-game departure peak hour, northbound Major Deegan Expressway mainline immediately north of the Service Road on-ramp, north of Jerome Avenue.

To partially or fully mitigate projected impacts northbound approaching the exits at East 149th Street and East 157th Street, it would be necessary to use a viable message sign (VMS) to advise through traffic to stay to the left and minimize last-minute weaving movements near exit ramps. Partial mitigation of the southbound mainline would require re-striping of the Exit 5 ramp approach to the intersection with the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach road. It should be noted that even under existing conditions, sections of the Major Deegan Expressway operate under congested conditions during the pre-game and post-game peak hours. It is the shifting of traffic within the corridor—shifts from existing conditions rather than increased traffic volumes—that contribute to these impacts and need for mitigation.

### *Game-Day Traffic Management Plan*

In order to mitigate conditions where standard traffic capacity improvements applied at individual intersections would not be sufficient, a comprehensive game day traffic management plan would need to be developed and implemented. Such measures are deployed for the existing stadium by NYPD, seeking to optimize traffic conditions to the extent possible. Possible measures that could be considered as part of this plan for the proposed stadium, and which will be evaluated between the Draft and Final EIS, include:

- Closing River Avenue post-game from the north side of East 161st Street to East 162nd Street (just south of existing Parking Garage 3). Post-game traffic exiting from Parking Garages B and 3 onto River Avenue would need to proceed northbound on River Avenue. This measure would be similar to the closure of River Avenue between East 157th and East 161st Streets that occurs today to allow for better pedestrian access to and from the stadium.
- Prohibiting left turns from southbound Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach onto the eastbound East 161st Street service road, to eliminate conflicts between these left-turning vehicles and northbound traffic, as well as pedestrian activity, at this location.
- Prohibiting right turns from the westbound East 161st Street service road onto northbound Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach/Jerome Avenue to eliminate conflicts with pedestrians to and from the stadium.
- Building a pedestrian walkway from proposed Parking Garage C along the west side of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach viaduct, and cross pedestrians to the proposed stadium along the east side of the westbound East 161st Street service road. This would reduce frictions between vehicular and pedestrian traffic at this key location.
- Employing traffic diversion strategies using portable VMSs to reduce traffic volumes, and potentially eliminate significant adverse impacts, at key locations such as the intersections of Jerome Avenue/East 161st Street and Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach/East 161st Street. These strategies could also help reduce or eliminate potential impacts on the northbound and southbound Major Deegan Expressway. They could include directing traffic exiting proposed Garage B post-game to use northbound Jerome Avenue to eventually access the northbound Major Deegan via Edward Grant Highway and University Avenue. These strategies could also include VMSs on the southbound Major Deegan Expressway directing stadium-bound traffic to use Exit 6 (to parking facilities south of the stadium) rather than Exit 5, which would reduce traffic at both key intersections cited above, in addition to avoiding or reducing potential impacts on the Major Deegan Expressway. As noted above, traffic diversion strategies such as these and others will be developed and evaluated between the DEIS and FEIS.

Initial analyses indicate that these strategies have considerable potential to fully mitigate significant adverse impacts identified in this DEIS, or to at least reduce the magnitude of any impacts. This plan would be developed along with input from NYCDOT, NYPD, and NYSDOT.

### TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS

The proposed project is expected to result in similar overall transit use and pedestrian levels as currently exist in the surrounding area of the project site. However, localized significant adverse impacts on several subway and pedestrian elements are anticipated due to the change in terms of access patterns and the redistribution of pedestrian flow. In addition, the two new crosswalks at Ruppert Plaza and along the east side of Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach were anticipated to be insufficient to provide adequate capacity. The following sections present a summary of potential measures that could mitigate the identified significant adverse impacts or further improve pedestrian flow. As with the assessment of vehicular traffic, the mitigation analysis for transit and pedestrians is intended to illustrate the level of improvements needed to eliminate projected impacts under the CEQR guidelines. City and State agencies are expected to then evaluate the magnitudes of improvements needed, and make the appropriate determination on the implementation of physical or operational measures. Since the adverse conditions



that are typical of peak game-day conditions are currently alleviated with various game-day management strategies, it is likely that decision-makers would continue to make use of similar efforts in combination with some of the measures identified in this EIS to facilitate reasonable operations at the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium Station and at key crossing locations along East 161st Street between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and River Avenue.

#### *Subway Station Elements*

While the total demand could be met by the combined capacity of all stairways serving Yankees patrons at the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium Station, the shift in pedestrian flow would result in improved conditions at some stairways and deteriorations at others. Because of the magnitude of the total pedestrian demand at the station, reasonable stairway widenings could not be achieved to avoid significant adverse impacts. Therefore, absent major station modifications, the significant adverse impacts identified for the eight subway station stairways would remain unmitigated.

#### *Pedestrian Elements*

Mitigation of significant crosswalk impacts would typically involve the temporary (on game days with coning or TEA controls) or permanent widening of painted areas to allow pedestrians additional crossing space. The additional crossing space could also be achieved by implementing partial roadway closures during peak arrival and departure periods. The River Avenue and Ruppert Plaza intersections at East 161st Street would experience significant adverse impacts with the proposed project, but could be mitigated with the augmentation of pedestrian crosswalks. At the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach reconfigured intersection with the East 161st Street service roads, the 10-foot-wide east crosswalk that necessitates a bridge widening of approximately 5 feet was also determined to be inadequate to accommodate peak game-day pedestrian flow. A crossing width of 15 feet would be necessary to achieve mid-LOS D operating conditions. Design alternatives, such as creating a bridge walkway along the west side of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach or providing different access options for potential parking at Parking Garages A and C, will be evaluated for the FEIS. Absent such physical modifications, the identified significant adverse impacts could be mitigated with additional TEA control and override of the signal timings at the East 161st Street service road intersections, as well as the potential turn prohibition alluded to earlier as part of a comprehensive traffic management plan.

## AIR QUALITY

The air quality analysis showed that under the 2009 Build year, impacts on carbon monoxide (CO) would be well below ambient air quality standards and the City's *de minimis* criteria. The proposed weeknight and weekend post-game traffic mitigation measures, which include new roadway configurations, physical restrictions, and signal timing adjustments, were evaluated to determine the potential effects on air quality in the study area.

The analysis was performed for the three analyzed intersections where mitigation measures were proposed. The CO values shown are the highest predicted concentrations for these intersections (East 157th Street and River Avenue, East 161st Street and Jerome Avenue, and Macombs Dam Bridge and the Major Deegan southbound off-ramp) for the time periods analyzed. However, the maximum predicted 8-hour CO concentrations for the analyzed sites with the proposed traffic mitigation measures would be below the NAAQS and would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The proposed traffic mitigation measures would also not affect the stationary or industrial source analyses discussed above which determined that there would be no significant air quality impacts resulting from the proposed project.

The proposed project would include emergency generators, which would be fueled by No. 2 diesel fuel. The primary pollutants of concern associated with diesel-fuel-fired emergency generators are particulate matter (PM) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). The results of the analysis determined that maximum impacts from emergency generators, when added to background concentrations, are substantially below ambient air

quality standards. The air quality modeling analysis also determined that the maximum 24-hour and annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> incremental impacts would be less than the applicable NYCDEP interim guidance criteria.

## Noise

As discussed in the “Noise” section, noise levels within the new parks proposed at River Avenue and East 157th Street and within the new proposed Harlem River waterfront park located west of Exterior Street and the Major Deegan Expressway, would be above the 55 dBA L<sub>10(1)</sub> noise level for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet contained in the CEQR noise exposure guidelines. There are no practical and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce noise levels within these parks to below the 55 dBA L<sub>10(1)</sub> guideline noise level. Noise barriers and/or berms would not be practicable and, according to CEQR impact criteria would represent an unmitigated significant noise impact from the proposed project on users of these new parks. Noise levels in these new parks would, however, be comparable to noise levels in a number of existing parks in New York City, including Macomb’s Dam Park.

## ALTERNATIVES

The DEIS analysis examines reasonable and practicable options to avoid or reduce project-related, significant adverse impacts and still meet the proposed project’s stated goals and objectives. These include: several alternative locations considered but discarded as infeasible or otherwise unsuitable for the new stadium; the No Action Alternative, in which the new stadium is not constructed as proposed; a stadium renovation alternative; a stadium rehabilitation alternative; and an alternative that adds a garage on the waterfront in an effort to reduce the proposed project’s identified significant adverse impacts, including those related to traffic.

### *ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISCARDED*

Over the past decade, as part of the current planning process, and in response to comments made at the scoping meeting for the DEIS, other options for the stadium were considered, including three locations outside the neighborhood (including Van Cortlandt Park and Pelham Bay Park, both in The Bronx, and the Caemmerer Yard (rail yard) on Midtown Manhattan’s West Side) and several suggested locations near the existing Yankee Stadium, but south of East 161st Street. Also considered were additional renovations to the existing stadium and the possibility of demolishing the existing stadium and rebuilding using the current site, expanded by the inclusion of Ruppert Place and portions of Macomb’s Dam Park adjacent to Ruppert Place. None of these alternatives proved feasible for a variety of reasons, as discussed below.

### *Locations Outside the Local Neighborhood*

*Van Cortlandt Park.* The use of Van Cortlandt Park was not recommended because of inadequate highway access given the traffic expected and very poor transit access. Only a small percentage of fans could use public transportation to get to a stadium at this site. Large areas for parking would be required, so that, in the aggregate, a stadium at this location would displace substantially more landscaped parkland than the proposed project, including 12 acres of high-quality wetlands. Since conducting the analysis, the City has begun clearing the site for the construction of a water filtration plant and the site is no longer available. The City will replace the driving range and clubhouse on top of the completed facility, and thus it would be unavailable for stadium use.

*Pelham Bay Park.* This site is also poorly served by public transit, and it is expected that only 5 percent of visitors would arrive by mass transit. Substantial parking would also therefore be required at this location. The existing vehicular transportation network would not be sufficient to accommodate the demand from a stadium use. Additional ramp connections to the Hutchinson River Parkway and the New England Thruway, new interchanges, and peripheral roads would be needed to access the site. As with Van Cortlandt Park, the much larger area required for the stadium and its parking (compared to the

proposed project) would result in greater displacement of recreational facilities and would involve the loss of 12 acres of wetlands.

*West Side Rail Yard.* This site was considered in the late 1990s, and was determined to be a feasible alternative, but was not pursued because of a lack of funding at the time. Subsequently, and during the proposed project's planning process, the site was committed by the City and State for the development of a new multi-use facility, including a stadium to be used by the New York Jets football team and the 2012 Olympics. While these two projects are no longer under consideration, the City and State will likely continue to pursue development of the site that would not contemplate a new Yankee Stadium. Furthermore, the use of this site would not be consistent with the project objective of remaining in a location near the Yankees' traditional home in The Bronx.

#### *Other Sites Near the Existing Yankee Stadium*

The project sponsors also considered other sites near Yankee Stadium, particularly locations to the south of the stadium. Three areas were identified and assessed, as discussed below. These included the portion of Macomb's Dam Park adjacent to Ruppert Place (Site I), the site of existing Garage 8 and its surroundings, south of East 157th Street (Site II), and the Harlem River waterfront (Site III). Other locations south of Yankee Stadium, primarily in the Bronx Terminal Market area, are slated for other development and therefore would not be available as alternative stadium sites. All three sites were found to be too small to accommodate a new stadium, and two of them would require a reduction in the number of parking spaces available to Yankees fans. The waterfront site would also be too distant from parking and transit.

#### *Renovation*

The renovation alternative would involve all possible improvements to the existing stadium to achieve project goals and objectives, short of major reconstruction. This alternative was found to be infeasible because just modifying the existing structure alone would not be enough to substantially improve conditions and adequately support baseball and stadium operations consistent with the project's goals and objectives. Many back-of-the-house functional areas are seriously out-of-date or simply do not exist and would have to be added. For the stadium to function properly and provide a comfortable experience for fans, players, and the press, a nearly 100 percent increase in public concourse and fan amenity areas would be required. With intense competing demands for the very limited space in the stadium, it would not be possible to expand space for the players, which is currently badly constrained. Adequate practice space and batting cages are lacking, and there is only one weight room, which must be shared by both the Yankees and visiting teams. In addition, although new seats could theoretically be provided as part of a renovation, the decks could not be reconstructed to orient the seats to the field properly, and with more than 41 percent now in the steeply raked upper deck, it would be impossible, as part of a renovation, to alter the location of this seating to provide better views and comfort.

#### *Reconstruction*

Reconstruction of the stadium on the existing site was also considered. To modernize the stadium and provide adequate area for pedestrian concourses, back-of-the-house operations, and improved facilities for fans, players, and the media, the footprint would need to be expanded by 3.9 acres. This area could not be provided as an expansion of the existing stadium, since it would entail creating a 65-foot-wide ring around the existing stadium and would effectively shut down East 161st Street, River Avenue (and the No. 4 elevated subway), and East 157th Street. Thus, any "reconstruction" of the stadium on its current site would require complete demolition of the existing stadium and construction of a totally new stadium on a site that included the current site, Ruppert Place, and the portion of Macombs Dam Park adjacent to Ruppert Place. This alternative was found infeasible and unacceptable, as follows:

- A stadium on the south side of East 161st Street between River and Jerome Avenues might be large enough to meet stadium criteria, but the result would be sharply inferior to the proposed project and

would not meet several key project objectives. First, the House that Ruth Built, the 1923 stadium, would be entirely obliterated. The original field could not remain, nor could any of the stands, and the opportunity to save this portion of the existing stadium and open it as a publicly accessible ballfield would be foregone. In addition, Garage A could not be built, so this alternative would either fail to provide adequate off-street parking, would require that a parking structure be built along the waterfront, which, as discussed below, conflicts with public waterfront policies and would result in unmitigable impacts not associated with the proposed project, or would have to be built on other parkland.

- Demolition and reconstruction of the stadium in an area containing today's Yankee Stadium site would require the relocation of the Yankees to another venue for approximately four years. Of the various sports venues in the City, only Shea Stadium could accommodate a major-league baseball team. Thirty years ago, when the Yankee Stadium was undergoing major reconstruction, the Yankees played for three seasons at Shea Stadium. This is not possible today. The Mets are poised to build a new Shea Stadium next to the existing facility, which is widely acknowledged to be out of date. Having the Yankees play along with the Mets during construction of the new stadium would greatly exacerbate the parking impacts of the Shea Stadium project during its construction. Instead of games on 81 days, there would be games on 162 days during the approximately six-month baseball season.

The current plans for parking during Shea construction include use of grassy areas and parking lots in the park, use of land beneath the Van Wyck Expressway, and the parking area for the former Ederle Theater; all of these areas are distant enough from the stadium to require shuttle buses. The likelihood of games at Shea Stadium conflicting with the U.S. Open at the Tennis Center in Flushing Meadow-Corona Park would be substantially increased. Use of the park fields for parking would displace recreational uses in those areas. Given the addition of the Yankees' schedule to that of the Mets and the U.S. Open, these areas would be effectively lost to park users during the warm weather seasons for as much as four years or more. In addition, the relocation would be particularly disruptive to the Yankees, and could be achieved only at a great cost—not only the cost of relocation, but also the costs related to loss of revenue from team sponsors who could not be accommodated at Shea. These cost penalties would likely be reflected in a substantial increase in public sector contributions to the projects. For all of these reasons, any option requiring relocation of the team is completely unacceptable to the Yankees.

#### No Action Alternative

With the No Action Alternative, a new stadium would not be constructed within portions of Macomb's Dam and John Mullaly Parks, and the existing stadium would remain in its current location. Regular maintenance of the existing stadium would occur, but there would be no investment to expand or upgrade the facility. Furthermore, the Yankees would not build new parking structures, and Lots 12 and 13D would be removed with the construction of Gateway Center at Bronx Terminal Market, resulting in a loss of parking as compared to today. Existing parkland would not be displaced, but new and renovated parkland would not be provided.

#### *Alternative Compared with the Proposed Project*

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy. The No Action Alternative would not result in an increase in parking facilities or parklands in the vicinity of Yankee Stadium. The waterfront would not be developed under the No Action Alternative, so that approximately 261,000 square feet of retail space would be constructed on this site, as proposed in the *Bronx Terminal Market Draft Environmental Impact Statement*. Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy.

*Socioeconomic Conditions.* Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in direct or indirect displacement of residents and businesses. With the No Action Alternative, New York City would continue to collect rent on the existing stadium, but would spend money for stadium upkeep, leading to a direct deficit of \$77 million over a 30 year period under the No Action Alternative. With the proposed project, the City would not collect rent on the new stadium, but it would also not expend funds for stadium upkeep. The new stadium would generate approximately \$58 million more annually in direct expenditures than the existing stadium. Construction of a new stadium, new garages, and new parks as planned with the proposed project would produce 15,484 new construction jobs, \$2.05 billion in direct and indirect construction expenditures, and \$73.3 million in new tax revenues. Compared with the existing stadium, the proposed project would result in 1,200 new jobs, \$14.3 million in new tax revenues, and a total of nearly \$116 million in new spending. Neither the proposed project nor the No Action Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions. However, the No Action Alternative would not produce the fiscal benefits that would be realized with a new stadium.

*Open Space.* The No Action Alternative would not displace parkland, nor would it create a 4.63-acre net increase in parklands. Therefore, although the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on open space, it would not provide new and enhanced recreational facilities and would, therefore, not provide open space benefits that would be realized with the proposed project.

*Shadows.* Because the No Action Alternative would not result in new parking structures, it would not increase shadows on parklands as compared to today, but the existing stadium would continue to cast shadows on surrounding parks. However, similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts from stadium shadows.

*Historic Resources.* The No Action Alternative would have the same significant adverse impacts on Buildings G, H, and J of the Bronx Terminal Market as the proposed project. In the No Action Alternative, these buildings would be demolished by the Gateway Center at Bronx Terminal Market project. Like the proposed project, mitigation measures would be developed in the No Action Alternative in consultation with the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) for demolition of these historic resources. However, since the No Action Alternative would not result in construction of Parking Garages A and C, it would not obstruct some views of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach that would be obscured with the proposed project.

*Urban Design and Visual Resources.* Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts on urban design or visual resources. Since the No Action Alternative would not result in the construction of Parking Garages A and C, it would not result in the contextual impacts on the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach that would occur with the proposed project. However, since the No Action Alternative would not provide new public open space along the Harlem River, it would not provide for the new visual resources that would be realized with the proposed project.

*Neighborhood Character.* Although the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on neighborhood character on game days as compared to today, it would not provide for the same benefits to the overall neighborhood character that would be realized with the proposed project.

*Natural Resources.* With the No Action Alternative, parking facilities along the waterfront would not be replaced with parkland. The No Action Alternative would not result in the removal of mature street trees or the alteration of existing parkland, both of which may serve as terrestrial habitats. However, the No Action Alternative would not result in an increase in parkland, which would increase natural habitats.

*Waterfront Revitalization Program.* The No Action Alternative would not provide new public waterfront access or recreational opportunities and, therefore, would not offer the same benefits to the coastal zone as the proposed project.

Infrastructure, Solid Waste and Sanitation, and Energy. Neither the No Action nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts on the City's water supply, sanitary sewage systems or solid waste and sanitation services. Similarly, neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project would result in significant adverse energy impacts.

Traffic and Parking. Under the No Action Alternative, new parking concentrated near the stadium would not be provided, and traffic would remain more dispersed throughout the area. The current shortage of parking spaces would remain and, on game days, Yankees fans driving to the stadium would continue to circulate excessively through the area in search of hard-to-find parking spaces on-street. Illegal parking would continue to occur at several locations including, for example, along the service road of the northbound Major Deegan Expressway.

Overall traffic volumes in the area would be the same under the No Action Alternative and the proposed project since the proposed project would not be expected to generate new traffic. There would be some shifting of traffic patterns to routes and intersections closer to the new stadium's proposed parking garages under the proposed project, creating significant adverse traffic impacts at 11-13 locations in the weeknight pre-game and post-game traffic analysis hours, and at 15-16 locations in the weekend pre-game and post-game traffic analysis hours, which would not occur under the No Action Alternative. Many of these impacts could be mitigated by a range of measures. Under the No Action Alternative, adverse traffic levels of service in the area would remain even with traffic operations measures in place on game days. Significant adverse traffic impacts generated by the proposed project however, resulting from the shifting of traffic patterns, would not occur.

With the No Action Alternative, the Major Deegan Expressway would continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service E and F during all four traffic analysis periods throughout the corridor adjacent to the existing stadium. With the proposed project, nearly all levels of service would remain the same as with the No Action Alternative, but there would be significant impacts at a number of locations where traffic densities (i.e., the volume of traffic per mile per lane) would be expected to increase beyond CEQR thresholds. It is anticipated that there would be significant impacts at up to three locations on the northbound Major Deegan during the four traffic analysis periods, and that there would be significant impacts on the southbound Major Deegan at two locations during two of the four time periods.

Transit and Pedestrians. For the weekday and Saturday pre-game period, the No Action Alternative would produce a lower level of congestion on stairways A, C, D, E, P12, and P16 at the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium station than the proposed project; however, stairways F1, F2, and G1 would have a poorer level of service (LOS) compared to the proposed project. In the post-game periods, under the No Action Alternative operation of stairways A, C, D, E, P11, and P15 would be substantially less constrained, compared to the proposed project, but the operation of F1, F2, G1, H1, H2, P1, P3, P7, and P8 would be much worse. This variance in the operation of subway stairways results from the shifting of passengers between the north side and south side of East 161st Street, depending on the stadium's location.

With the No Action Alternative, pedestrian travel would be concentrated south of East 161st Street. With the proposed project, pedestrian activities would shift north of East 161st Street near subway entrances and west and north of the proposed stadium where new parking facilities would be located. As a result, the proposed project would result in substantially more pedestrians crossing East 161st Street; however, the proposed project would include a widening of the west crosswalk at the intersection with River Avenue and new crosswalks at Ruppert Plaza and Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach. Generally, the proposed project would result in substandard operation of the north and east crosswalks while the No Action Alternative would result in substandard operations on the east, west, and south crosswalks. With the No Action Alternative, there would be no significant adverse impacts at Ruppert Place or the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, as are predicted for the proposed project. In addition, the No Action

Alternative would not require substantial widening of the north crosswalk at River Avenue and East 161st Street or closing a portion of River Avenue north of the intersection, and additional reconfiguration of the new crossings at Ruppert Plaza and Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach. At other crosswalk locations, game-day congestion and widening requirements would be similar for the No Action Alternative and the proposed project.

*Air Quality.* As described above, the No Action Alternative would disperse traffic and parking as compared to the proposed project; therefore, it is anticipated that emissions would be less concentrated in the vicinity of the project area. However, these emissions would be dispersed elsewhere throughout the neighborhood since patrons would use other access routes and remote parking facilities. Furthermore, the heating ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system of the existing system would not be modernized with the No Action Alternative; therefore, associated emissions could be greater than with a new, modern HVAC system, which would be constructed with the proposed project. Overall, similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

*Noise.* Similar to the proposed project, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts from increased noise levels at sensitive receptors. However, because the No Action Alternative would not result in increased vehicular traffic in the vicinity of Macomb's Dam Park and because the No Action Alternative would not locate a new stadium in closer proximity to residences, it would result in slightly improved noise levels at these locations as compared to the proposed project.

*Construction.* No construction would occur on the site and at all other locations in the No Action Alternative, and the significant adverse noise and traffic impacts associated with the construction of the proposed project would not occur.

*Public Health.* Neither the No Action Alternative nor the proposed project is expected to result in significant adverse impacts to public health.

#### Waterfront Garage Alternative

The EIS impact analyses have identified significant traffic and pedestrian impacts associated with the concentration of parking spaces in proposed Parking Garages A and C. Therefore, this chapter considers an alternative that would reduce the capacity of proposed Parking Garages A and C and attempt to transfer the parking spaces to another site, specifically Parking Lots 13A and 13B on the waterfront.

Similar to the proposed project, the Waterfront Garage Alternative would include a new stadium in Macomb's Dam Park on the north side of East 161st Street. Parking Garage B would also be constructed in John Mulally Park; however, Parking Garages A and C would be reduced in size and structured parking would be built on the waterfront in the location of Parking Lots 13A and 13B. Under the Waterfront Garage Alternative, it is estimated that 1,000 to 1,500 spaces would be removed from Parking Garages A and C as compared to the proposed project. Thus, the waterfront garage would need to accommodate the 852 spaces currently available in Parking Lots 13A and 13B as well as the spaces that would be removed from Parking Garages A and C for a total of 1,852 to 2,352 spaces. The long, narrow shape of the waterfront site, which is confined by the Major Deegan Expressway and its ramps, the Macombs Dam Bridge, and the Oak Point rail link (which runs above the river parallel to the shoreline), would constrain the footprint of the garage and would require at least a four-story garage at this location to fully accommodate the 1,852 to 2,352 spaces. It would also require that the garage be built over a small inter-pier area at the southern end of the site. This would cover approximately 0.36 acres of littoral tidal wetlands, which would likely require mitigation. Additional approvals in the form of individual permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) would be necessary.

Like the proposed project, under the Waterfront Garage Alternative, recreational facilities would be constructed atop Parking Garages A and C and a new waterfront park would be constructed south of the existing Parking Lots 13A and 13B. Furthermore, a publicly accessible ballfield would be constructed on the site of the existing Yankee Stadium. Therefore, all of the effects associated with the new stadium, reuse of portions of the existing stadium and replacement of recreational facilities would be essentially the same as with the proposed project. The discussion below concentrates only on those elements that differ from the proposed project.

#### *Alternative Compared with the Proposed Project*

Open Space. Both the Waterfront Garage Alternative and the proposed project would result in benefits to parklands and recreational facilities. However, because the size of Parking Garage C would be reduced with the Waterfront Garage Alternative, it would be possible to locate its rooftop recreational facility at the level of the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, which would improve access to this facility as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would have the same impact on open space, due to its loss of recreational facilities during construction, as the proposed project.

Shadows. The construction of new parking structures along the waterfront would create transient new shadows on the Harlem River and the Macombs Dam Bridge, which would not occur with the proposed project. However, since neither resource is considered a sun sensitive receptor, these new shadows would not constitute a significant adverse impact.

Historic Resources and Urban Design and Visual Resources. The construction of Parking Garages A and C and the waterfront parking structure under the Waterfront Garage Alternative would obstruct views of the entire historic Macombs Dam Bridge approach from the south as well as half of the approach from the north. It would block views of nearly all of the bridge's camelback truss. This would constitute a significant adverse impact on the historic resource that could not be fully mitigated. Such an impact was not identified for the proposed project, because although Parking Garages A and C would block views of half of the approach, the remaining half including the truss, would remain visible.

Neighborhood Character. As described above, the construction of a waterfront parking garage in combination with Parking Garages A and C would substantially obstruct views of the Macombs Dam Bridge approach and the bridge's camelback truss, which would result in a significant adverse impact, and would adversely affect views of the river from other locations, which would be detrimental to the visual quality of the Harlem River. These significant adverse impacts on visual resources would not occur with the proposed project, and would be unmitigated under the Waterfront Garage Alternative.

Natural Resources. The Waterfront Garage Alternative would cover approximately 0.36 acres of a small inter-pier basin, which, like the basins along the waterfront to the south, is probably classified as a NYSDEC littoral zone tidal wetland. Even though it would not be considered to be a high-quality wetland and the garage would deck over it rather than fill it, the permanent cover would constitute an adverse impact requiring mitigation in the form of a replacement wetland of higher quality. This impact and mitigation requirement would not occur with the proposed project.

Waterfront Revitalization Program. Although, like the proposed project, the Waterfront Garage Alternative would improve public access to the waterfront, it would significantly adversely impact views of the Macombs Dam Bridge structure and camelback truss from this new waterfront park and would block views of the river from other locations, which is detrimental to the visual quality of the Harlem River. Furthermore, although the Waterfront Garage Alternative would not change the use of this waterfront parcel, the bulk of the structure that would be needed to house the requisite number of parking spaces would result in significant new construction on the Harlem River that is inconsistent with the City's current policy for development of this waterfront area. Overall, both the proposed project and the



Waterfront Garage Alternative would improve public access to the waterfront; however, the Waterfront Garage Alternative would diminish the historic and visual quality of the waterfront, would intensify a use on the waterfront that is neither water-dependent nor water-enhancing, and therefore would be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the Waterfront Revitalization Program.

Traffic and Parking. The Waterfront Garage Alternative would have the potential to reduce significant traffic impacts at intersections along Jerome Avenue and the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach that would be expected to occur under the proposed project. Under this alternative, up to 2,352 cars would reach their parking spaces via southbound Exit 6 off the Major Deegan Expressway to "Bronx Terminal Market," and would not circulate on the local street network. Return trips to the northbound expressway would be made via a U-turn onto the ramp from Exterior Street that leads to the expressway, near East 157th Street, also avoiding the local street network. Thus, a substantial portion of stadium traffic that would have used Jerome Avenue and Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach with the proposed project would not pass through these critical locations. Although this shift in parking may not fully mitigate the impacts of the proposed project that were identified at these locations, it would decrease the anticipated vehicle delays, and would require, at most, a less stringent mitigation package than the proposed project.

Transit and Pedestrians. Under the Waterfront Garage Alternative, transit service and usage would be similar to conditions under the proposed project, but pedestrian routes to the proposed stadium would vary. More pedestrians would need to cross over to the east side of the Metro-North Railroad tracks via the enclosed pedestrian bridge, which currently accommodates patrons traveling via the Yankee Clipper Ferry or parking at Parking Lots 13A, 13B, 13C, and 13D. With a new parking garage constructed at existing Parking Lots 13A and 13B, an estimated 4,125 additional pedestrians during game-day peak hours could be traversing this pedestrian bridge. This level of pedestrian volume increase could result in the need to expand the capacity of the existing pedestrian bridge or to construct one or more new grade-separated crossings elsewhere.

Under the Waterfront Garage Alternative, more pedestrians would need to travel the length of Ruppert Plaza and cross East 161<sup>st</sup> Street there than with the proposed project. It is expected that Ruppert Plaza would be designed to meet the increased demand. However, at the proposed at-grade East 161st Street crossing at Ruppert Plaza on peak game days, which is projected to be congested under the proposed project, would be further exacerbated. At the same time, conditions at the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, which were also identified as a critical vehicular and pedestrian location under the proposed project, would realize a lower level of activity, with resulting improvements in both vehicular and pedestrian traffic flows as compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality. Under Like the proposed project, the Waterfront Garage Alternative would not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

Noise. Like the proposed project, traffic from the Waterfront Garage Alternative would not result in significant increases in noise levels at sensitive receptors. The impact of ambient noise levels on the proposed new parkland would be the same for this alternative and the proposed project.

Construction. The The Waterfront Garage Alternative would result in the loss of Parking Lots 13A and 13B during construction, which would temporarily reduce the supply of Yankee Stadium parking. Construction at this location may also require restricted access or lane closures on the Major Deegan Expressway and its ramps at 161st Street. Therefore, the Waterfront Garage Alternative may have greater construction period impacts on traffic circulation and parking than the proposed project. The potentially significant construction noise impacts identified with the proposed project would be the same with this alternative.

## *Conclusion*

The Waterfront Garage Alternative would be inferior to the proposed project and was not selected for the following reasons:

- It would result in significant adverse impacts on historic and visual resources that could not be mitigated.
- It would be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the Waterfront Revitalization Program.
- It would cover a littoral zone tidal wetland, constituting an adverse impact requiring mitigation.
- It would likely have greater traffic and parking impacts during construction than the proposed project.
- Although it would relieve traffic congestion on Jerome Avenue and the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and reduce impacts at the intersections of those two streets and East 161st Street, some mitigation would still likely be required. This benefit would not outweigh the additional unmitigated impacts and the unacceptable contravention of current City policy regarding development of this waterfront that would result from the Waterfront Garage Alternative.

## **UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS**

Most of the potential impacts identified for the proposed project could be fully mitigated; however, in the following areas, significant, adverse and unmitigated impacts would remain.

### **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

The proposed project would result in the demolition of Bronx Terminal Market Buildings G, H, and J (S/NR-eligible), resulting in a significant adverse impact on historic resources. Measures to mitigate this impact would be developed in consultation with OPRHP. The mitigation measures would be expected to include a HABS-level photographic documentation and accompanying narrative. The mitigation measures developed with OPRHP would be recorded in a MOA and implemented in order to partially mitigate the effects of the proposed project on historic resources. The impact could not be completely eliminated, so it is considered an unavoidable significant adverse impact of the proposed project.

### **TRAFFIC**

The proposed project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts at local intersections within the traffic study area and along sections of the Major Deegan Expressway near the proposed stadium site. Proposed traffic mitigation measures such as standard capacity improvements applied to individual intersections (e.g., signal retiming), would mitigate all but three local intersections. These traffic locations are: (1) River Avenue and East 161st Street, where the confluence of pedestrian volumes with only moderate volumes of vehicular traffic would produce traffic impacts; (2) Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and East 161st Street where higher vehicular and pedestrian volumes would also create significant impacts; and (3) Jerome Avenue and East 161st Street, where substantial volumes of traffic heading to proposed garages could not be accommodated by local intersection and capacity improvements. The Major Deegan Expressway's southbound off-ramp at Macombs Dam Bridge would also remain only partially mitigated.

For the significant adverse traffic impacts that cannot be mitigated through such standard measures, additional game-day operational measures may be implemented, such as street closures, turn prohibitions, and traffic diversion strategies that will be more fully developed during the period between the Draft and Final EIS, as they are evaluated for their overall effectiveness in improving projected traffic and pedestrian conditions. If it is determined that any of the traffic impacts would not be fully mitigated, they would constitute unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

### **TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIANS**

The proposed project is expected to result in significant adverse transit and pedestrian impacts at eight (8) stairways at the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium station and five (5) crosswalk locations. The significant adverse impacts identified for the eight station stairways would remain unmitigated and would constitute

unavoidable significant adverse impacts unless major modifications are made to the 161st Street-Yankee Stadium station. Significant adverse impacts would occur at three crosswalks along River Avenue and East 161st Street, at the following locations:

- The north crosswalk during all four analysis time periods;
- The south crosswalk during the weekday post-game time period; and  
The westbound service road east crosswalk during the weekend pre-game time period.

Significant adverse pedestrian impacts would also occur at the new 60-foot-wide Ruppert Plaza crossing and at the widened crosswalks along the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach, under post-game weekday and weekend conditions. It is anticipated that the proposed mitigation measures, along with game-day management strategies including TEA controls similar to those utilized today as part of a comprehensive traffic management plan would mitigate the pedestrian impacts at these crosswalk locations. Mitigation strategies and measures will, however, be further evaluated between the Draft and Final EIS. If it is determined that any of the transit and pedestrian impacts would not be fully mitigated, they would constitute unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

## NOISE

The noise levels within the new parks proposed at River Avenue and at the Harlem River waterfront would result in potentially significant noise impacts on users of these new parks. Noise levels at these parks would be approximately 70.2 and 73-78 dBA, respectively, and above the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  noise level for outdoor areas requiring serenity and quiet contained in the CEQR noise exposure guidelines. These high predicted noise levels are primarily a result of the noise generated by the elevated subway trains and vehicles on the elevated Major Deegan Expressway. These noise sources are independent of the proposed project, but based on CEQR criteria, the noise levels at these new parks would result in potentially significant noise impacts on users of these new parks. As there are no practical and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce these noise levels to below the 55 dBA  $L_{10(1)}$  guideline noise level, this is an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

## CONSTRUCTION

A scenario in which construction workers would be provided with parking at one of the Yankee Stadium garages was evaluated, as well as a scenario in which construction workers would instead park in on-street parking spaces. The analysis concludes that there would be significant adverse traffic impacts under both scenarios, for which only partial mitigation has been identified at this time. Measures to mitigate these impacts will be further evaluated between the Draft and Final EIS. If it is determined that any potentially significant adverse impacts would not be fully mitigated, they would constitute unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

It is also anticipated that construction activities would have the potential for significant adverse noise impacts at one or more locations in the study area. In the time period between the Draft and Final EIS, detailed construction noise analyses will be performed, and should those analyses confirm the potential for significant adverse noise impacts, an assessment will be made of feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or eliminate such significant impacts. Absent the development of mitigation measures, and the commitment to implement such measures, it is currently assumed that construction of the proposed project would result in unavoidable significant noise impacts at some locations.

## IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

The resources that would be expended in the construction and operation of the proposed project include the materials used in construction; energy in the form of gas and electricity consumed during construction and operation; and the human effort (time and labor) required to develop, construct, and operate various components of the proposed project. They are considered irretrievably committed because their reuse for some purpose other than the proposed project would be highly unlikely. Although the proposed project would result in a net overall increase in open space and parkland, the land use changes associated with the

development of the proposed project may also be considered a resource loss. The proposed project constitutes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the project area as a land resource, thereby rendering land use for other purposes infeasible.

**CEQR No.** 05DPR006X

**ULURP No.** 060056MMX, 060057MMX, 060058MMX, 060059MMX, 060149ZSX, 060150ZSX, 060144PQX, 060145PPX, 060146PPX, 060147PPX, 060148MCX

**SEQR Classification:** Type I  
**Location:** Bronx, New York


Block 2499 Lots 1, 100, and 108; Block 2354 Lots 20 and 65; Block 2492 Lot 1, Block 2493 p/o Lot 9; Block 2357 Lot 100; Block 2490, Lot 1; Block 2539 p/o Lot 2; Block 2485 Lot 1; Block 2486 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 6; Block 2491 Lot 1; Block 2482 Lot 25; Block 2483 Lot 1; A portion of East 161<sup>st</sup> Street between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach; A portion of Jerome Avenue between the Macomb's Dam Bridge Approach and the south side of East 164<sup>th</sup> Street;

**Contact Person:**

Joshua Laird  
Director of Planning  
Tel: (212) 360-3402  
Fax: (212) 360-3453

**Address:**

New York City Department of Parks and Recreation  
The Arsenal, Central Park  
830 Fifth Avenue, Room 403  
New York, NY 10021



Joshua Laird, Chief of Planning  
City of New York/Parks and Recreation

9-23-05

Date