

**A. INTRODUCTION**

This chapter first considers a No Build Alternative to the proposed project (the Build Alternative) and compares the environmental conditions and impacts under the proposed project with conditions under this alternative. Under the No Build Alternative, the high school facility would not be built and the land would remain occupied by a vacant building. It then discusses a hypothetical As-of-Right Commercial Alternative, under which the existing building on the project site would be redeveloped for commercial use in accordance with its C5-4 zoning. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and community character, shadows, air quality, noise, and soil and groundwater conditions. It is expected that this alternative would potentially have fewer traffic impacts as compared to the Build Alternative.

**B. NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE**

Under this alternative, the proposed high school facility would not be constructed and the existing building on the project site would remain vacant. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and community character, historic resources, urban design and visual resources, transit, parking, pedestrians, noise, air quality, and soil, groundwater, or infrastructure conditions. Unlike the proposed project, no additional traffic trips would be generated and therefore, no adverse impacts at seven signalized intersection approaches/lane-groups would occur.

**LAND USE, ZONING AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

Under this alternative, the project site would consist of a vacant courthouse building. No new school facility would be constructed. The existing building on the site is in conformance with existing zoning regulations. Like the proposed project, there would be no significant adverse land use, zoning, or community character impacts. However, the No Build Alternative, unlike the proposed project, would not provide additional high school facilities in Brooklyn.

**HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Under this alternative, it is assumed that the site would remain occupied by a vacant building, and no new development would occur on the site. As with the proposed project, there would be no adverse historic resources or archaeological impacts.

**URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

The urban design and visual character of the project area would remain unchanged under the No Build Alternative. This alternative would not add an approximately 40 foot addition to the building. The project site would retain its existing appearance with a vacant structure. Neither

## **Adams Street High School**

---

this alternative nor the Build Alternative would result in any significant adverse impacts to urban design and visual resources.

### **TRANSPORTATION**

In the No Build Alternative, there would be no new students, staff, or teachers traveling to the site, and the significant adverse traffic impacts would not occur. However, as described in Chapter 13, “Mitigation,” with the exception of the intersection of Tillary Street and Flatbush Avenue, the traffic impacts could all be mitigated. Like the proposed project, there would be no significant adverse impacts to pedestrians, parking, or transit.

### **AIR QUALITY**

Neither the No Build nor the Build Alternative would result in any significant adverse impacts on air quality or violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). As with the Build Alternative, the No Build Alternative would not result in exceedances of carbon monoxide (CO) standards at this location.

### **NOISE**

With this alternative, the increase in noise resulting from the proposed project would not occur. Like with the proposed project, there would be no significant adverse noise impact.

### **SOIL AND GROUNDWATER**

In the No Build Alternative, no construction activity would occur on the site and the potential for hazardous materials contaminating the site would remain unchanged.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

As no new student population would be introduced, there would be no increase in water or energy used at the site, or wastewater or solid waste generated at the site. Like the proposed project, the No Build Alternative would have no significant adverse infrastructure impacts.

### **CONSTRUCTION**

The No Build Alternative would avoid the temporary construction impacts attributable to the proposed project. However, in addition to being relatively short-term, construction impacts of the proposed project would be addressed (dust-control measures). The No Build Alternative would avoid the increase in truck traffic and construction-related noise, but would not provide the much needed new facilities.

## **C. AS-OF-RIGHT COMMERCIAL ALTERNATIVE**

Hypothetically, under this alternative, the project site would be redeveloped as of right in accordance with its C5-4 zoning. The building on the project site is approximately 140,000 square feet. Under this scenario, the existing building would be converted to commercial use. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use, zoning, and community character, shadows, air quality, noise, and soil and groundwater conditions. As with the Build Alternative, there would be significant adverse vehicular traffic impacts that could be mitigated.

## **LAND USE, ZONING AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

Under this alternative, the existing building on the project site would be converted to commercial use in conformance with the governing zoning district. There would therefore be no significant adverse impacts related to zoning. This alternative would also be consistent with the current land uses in the study area, primarily the commercial uses in Downtown Brooklyn. Like the proposed project, there would be no significant adverse land use, zoning, or community character impacts.

## **HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

There are two known architectural resources in the area surrounding the project site. As with the proposed project, the project site would be redeveloped, but there would be no adverse historic resources. Like with the proposed project, there would be no in-ground construction and thus no potential for resulting archaeological impacts.

## **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

Under the As-of-Right Development Alternative, the urban design and visual character of the alternative project area would not be altered, as the existing building exterior would remain but its interior would be redesigned. Activity would however be returned to the now vacant building.

## **SHADOWS**

Shadows from the as-of-right alternative would be less than with the proposed project, as the proposed 40 foot addition would not be added. As the building exterior would not change, like the proposed project it would not have the potential for any significant adverse shadow impacts.

## **TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

Under this alternative, the existing building on the project site would be converted to a commercial office building. As compared to the proposed school project, the office alternative would result in fewer peak hour person and vehicle trips. This is due to the fact that a commercial office has different trip generation characteristics as compared to school projects. Also, unlike school projects, trips generated by a commercial office are distributed over a longer period of time and are not concentrated in a single peak hour. Specifically, the commercial office alternative would generate an estimated 299 and 347 person trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively, compared with 945 peak hour person trips for the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would generate 35 and 33 vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, compared to 82 peak hour vehicle trips for the proposed project. Although the commercial office alternative would generate fewer peak hour trips than the proposed school project, it should be noted that the office trips would be consistently generated throughout the year as compared to the school trips, which would only be generated during the school year from September to mid-June.

Because the prevailing traffic conditions in the study area are already congested, the proposed office alternative is also anticipated to result in adverse traffic impacts at some of the study area's highly congested intersections. However, the magnitude of such impacts could be less severe than those identified for the proposed project. It is expected that mitigation proposed to address the adverse traffic impacts due to the proposed project would similarly address any impacts resulting from the commercial office alternative. In addition, it is a possibility that the

## **Adams Street High School**

---

eastbound approach of Tillary Street at Flatbush Avenue which experienced an unmitigated traffic impact—during the AM peak hour—under the proposed project could still remain unmitigated under the commercial office alternative.

### **AIR QUALITY**

Neither the As-of-Right Alternative nor the Build Alternative would result in any significant adverse impacts on air quality or violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). As with the Build Alternative, in the As-of-Right Alternative, impacts of mobile sources would not result in exceedances of carbon monoxide (CO) standards at intersection locations, and emissions from heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) sources would not result in violations of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) or nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).

### **NOISE**

With the As-of-Right Alternative, there would be lower traffic volumes and less associated mobile source noise. Thus, noise levels would be expected to be lower than with the proposed project. As with the Build Alternative the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.

### **SOIL AND GROUNDWATER**

Any as-of-right development proposed for the project site would be developed in accordance with applicable regulations and like the proposed project would result in no significant adverse soil and groundwater impacts.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

Like with the proposed project, the as-of-right alternative would increase demand for water, sanitation and solid-waste services. However, the increased demand would be minimal as compared to demand city-wide and would be met by existing infrastructure and utility systems. Like the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would have no significant adverse infrastructure impacts.

### **CONSTRUCTION**

The As-of-Right Alternative would result in temporary construction impacts attributable to the proposed project. However, like with the Build Alternative, in addition to being relatively short-term, construction impacts of the proposed project would be addressed (dust-control measures).\*