January 4, 2019

Hilary Semel, Director
Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination
253 Broadway – 14th Floor
New York, NY 10007

ISSUANCE OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION
AND FILING OF CRITICAL AREA DESIGNATION

Re: CEQR Number: 17DPR008Q
Ridgewood Reservoir Critical Environmental Area Designation
Highland Park
Queens Block 3740, Lot 75; Brooklyn Block 3889, Lot 1

Dear Ms. Semel:

The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYC Parks) is the lead agency for the environmental review of the above-referenced action. The Ridgewood Reservoir is a former water supply reservoir located within Highland Park, straddling the Brooklyn-Queens border. The reservoir was constructed in 1858 and served as part of the water supply system for Brooklyn until 1959. The reservoir is divided into three basins separated by embankments and has been substantially drained for many years. In the years since being taken off-line as a water supply source, the reservoir has transitioned into a naturalized area that is unique within New York City and serves as an important ecological, historic, and public recreation resource. In recognition of its exceptional character, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation proposes to designate the reservoir as a Critical Environmental Area (CEA).

A Critical Environmental Area is a designation that may be applied pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) to identify a specific geographic area of exceptional or unique character. A CEA designation is not in itself a development or land use control (such as zoning) or prescriptive management plan, but rather an expression of an agency’s concern for the unique sensitivities and resources in that area. Once an area has been designated, the potential impacts on the characteristics of the CEA become relevant areas of concern for specific consideration during SEQRA review of future projects.

The proposed designation and Parts I and II of the associated Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) were circulated to involved and interested agencies and organizations in May 2017. In accordance with the provisions of Section 617.14(g) of Title 6 of the New York Codes, Rules and Regulations (6 NYCRR), a public hearing on the designation was also held on June 21, 2017.

Pursuant to Section 5.05 of the Rules and Procedures for the City Environmental Quality Review and Title 6 Section 617.7 of 6 NYCRR, based on its review of the analysis and criteria contained in the EAS, NYC Parks has determined that the designation will not
have a significant impact on the environment and hereby designates the Ridgewood Reservoir as a Critical Environmental Area.

Attached please find the written justification supporting the designation, including a map of the area boundaries, the EAS, and the Negative Declaration (Part III of the EAS form.) If you have any questions or comments related to this environmental review please contact Colleen Alderson, Chief of Parklands and Real Estate at colleen.alderson@parks.nyc.gov or the address listed above.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alyssa Cobb Konon
Deputy Commissioner
Distribution List:

Honorable Melinda Katz, Queens Borough President
Honorable Eric L. Adams, Brooklyn Borough President
Honorable Robert Holden, NYC Council Member, District 30
Honorable Rafael L. Espinal Jr., NYC Council Member, District 37
Honorable Michael Gianaris, NY State Senate, District 12
Honorable Julia Salazar, NY State Senate, District 18
Honorable Michael Miller, NY Assembly, District 38
Honorable Erik M. Dilan, NY Assembly, District 54
Gary Giordano, District Manager, Queens Community Board District 5
Melinda Perkins, District Manager, Brooklyn Community Board District 5
Kenneth Scarlatelli, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Jennifer Betsworth, Historic Preservation Specialist, NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation
Matt Malina, Director and Founder, NYC H2O
Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

INSTRUCTIONS: In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT CATEGORY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Adverse Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design/Visual Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials?

   If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

   - **Positive Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a Positive Declaration and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

   - **Conditional Negative Declaration:** A Conditional Negative Declaration (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

   - **Negative Declaration:** If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a Negative Declaration. The Negative Declaration may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

4. LEAD AGENCY'S CERTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Commissioner - Planning and Development</td>
<td>New York City Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
<td>January 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEGATIVE DECLARATION (Use of this form is optional)

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, New York City Parks and Recreation assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which finds the proposed project:

The proposed project consists of the application of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA) designation. The designation is a policy statement regarding the special characteristics of the site and establishment of an administrative requirement that these characteristics shall be given appropriate consideration during the development and environmental review of any future development proposals in or substantially contiguous to the area. As such, there are no specific physical components or activities associated with this action. As documented in the environmental assessment, the project would not have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the environment. The reasons supporting this determination are set forth below. As indicated in the EAS Part II checklist, since the project involves no physical changes to the site, the project does not include components or characteristics with potential to significantly affect technical areas such as socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; open space; shadows, urban design and visual resources; hazardous materials; water/sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; transportation; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; noise; public health; neighborhood character; or construction.

In terms of Land Use, Historic and Cultural Resource, and Natural Resource considerations, the CEA designation would be expected to support and protect current land use conditions. The Reservoir would continue to function as an open space resource within a larger Park context, which would remain consistent and compatible with the surrounding land use pattern.

The site has a unique history and designation would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of its historic features during the review of any development proposals. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and preserve the unique historic features of the site, no significant adverse impacts on historic resources would be anticipated.

The natural attributes of the reservoir are another key element that contributes to the site's significance as a CEA. Designation as a CEA would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of natural features during the review of development proposals. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and protect the unique ecology of the site, no significant adverse impacts on natural resources would be anticipated.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>New York City Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
<td>January 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURE
Ridgewood Reservoir

Justification for Critical Environmental Area Designation

Introduction

The Ridgewood Reservoir (Reservoir) is a de-commissioned reservoir located in New York City, on the Brooklyn-Queens border. More specifically, the Reservoir is located within the northeastern portion of Highland Park, and is a component of a larger green corridor formed by the park and several adjoining cemeteries.

The Reservoir is comprised of three basins, the easternmost at 9.95 acres, the middle basin at 11.85 acres and the westernmost basin at 21.17 acres, separated by embankments that measure 15’ in width. The perimeter embankment has a minimum width of 20 feet and extends roughly 1.5 miles in circumference.

The Reservoir became operational in 1858 and operated as a water supply for Brooklyn until 1959, after which only the middle basin remained in use as a backup water supply until 1989. Whereas the outer two basins were fully drained, the middle basin retains a shallow impoundment of approximately 3.5 feet in depth to this day. Since its decommissioning, the site has been reclaimed by both native and non-native vegetation, upland forest and freshwater wetlands. Approximately 25 acres within the three basins have been designated as New York State Department of Environmental Conservation regulated wetlands.

Since jurisdiction of the Reservoir was transferred from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection to the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation (NYC Parks) in 2004, NYC Parks successfully completed the construction of a joint bicycle and pedestrian pathway around the Reservoir, which is heavily used throughout the year.

The Reservoir qualifies as a Critical Environmental Area\(^1\) because it is:

- A unique natural open space with significant flora and fauna in an otherwise heavily urbanized area;
- A site with unique historic value;
- An open space resource bounded on all sides by a joint bicycle and pedestrian pathway, providing a benefit to human health; and
- An ecological area of significant social value with recreational and educational opportunities.

\(^1\) Pursuant to Title 6 New York Codes, Rules and Regulations Part 617.14(g) (SEQRA Regulations).
Natural Resources

The Reservoir is a natural area within this otherwise urbanized community. The nearest substantial natural areas are located within Forest Park, Spring Creek Park/Jamaica Bay, and Prospect Park, which are approximately three, five, and six miles distant, respectively. As such, the Reservoir provides unique opportunities for local residents to experience a natural setting, and it is highly valued as such by members of the surrounding communities for that purpose.

In addition, habitat connectivity is key to maintaining healthy populations of birds and other wildlife species. Because the Reservoir is situated among small patches of green space that run along the Jackie Robinson Parkway, it serves as a valuable, larger habitat patch and refuge for many species. The site is home to a variety of small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and fish, and provides critical habitat for migratory birds, as well as nesting and foraging habitat for resident species.

The Reservoir is located along the Atlantic Flyway, a migratory route for birds, and it is situated on an elevated ridge, which is an attractant for many birds of prey, both for foraging and for migration. Hawks, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons have all been observed on the site. The forested area attracts a wide variety of birds, including wrens, woodpeckers, vireos, sparrows, thrushes, and twenty-four species of warblers. The open water and wetland areas also provide habitat for a variety of ducks, wading birds, gulls, terns, and marsh birds, such as the American woodcock.

Based on information collected through eBird, an online resource launched by the Cornell Lab of Ornithology and National Audubon Society that is regularly updated by local observers, 156 species of birds have been sighted at the location as of February 22, 2017, 29 of which are listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) in the New York State Wildlife Action Plan.

Historical Significance

The Reservoir was a key component of the first central public water supply system for Brooklyn. Shortly after its incorporation as a City in 1834, Brooklyn initiated a search for a reliable public water supply to supplant the system of shallow wells, cisterns and springs that served its neighborhoods. After many years of public deliberation and investigation, groundbreaking for the Ridgewood Aqueduct and Reservoir System was on July 11, 1856 and water was first raised on November 18, 1858.

The original design called for three basins, but the project was altered and only a double basin was initially built. The system collected water from Long Island streams and, conveyed via the Ridgewood Aqueduct, water was pumped into the Reservoir by steam engines within the Ridgewood Pump Station located at the western terminus of the aqueduct. The engines pumped water through 36-inch force mains to the reservoir basins. Water from the Reservoir was then distributed out via gravity through a system of mains that fed into progressively smaller distribution pipes.
Over time, the supply system was expanded to incorporate additional streams and groundwater wells, and the distribution system was enlarged, including the addition of the third basin and an additional supporting pumping station in 1891.

The Reservoir was the major source of water for the City of Brooklyn until 1898, at which time Brooklyn merged with the City of New York and gained access to the New York City water supply system. With the completion of the Catskill Aqueduct and City Tunnel No. 1 in 1917, a high-quality water source from the Catskills became available. The Ridgewood system continued to be used during the first half of the 20th century, but the eventual development of additional upstate reservoirs and City Tunnel No. 2 increased availability to Brooklyn and ended the need for water from the Ridgewood System.

The Reservoir became a backup reservoir in 1959, and was last used during a drought period in the 1960s. The Reservoir was finally decommissioned in 1989. The east and west basins were drained. In 2004, the Reservoir was officially turned over to NYC Parks, and through a larger water main project managed by the NYC Department of Design & Construction, remaining pipes were fully disconnected from the reservoir by 2016.

The original pump stations have been removed, but historic structural elements remain, including the reservoir structure itself and the brick gate houses along the northern edge of the west and central basins, providing a tangible physical connection to the Reservoir’s prior role as an important public works that was integral to the development and public health of the City.

Recreation

Heavily used throughout the year, the paved bicycle and pedestrian pathway around the perimeter of the basins is an integral part of the Brooklyn–Queens Greenway, a bicycling and pedestrian route that connects neighborhoods in the two boroughs. The Greenway affords connections from the Reservoir and Highland Park to Forest Park to the east and to Prospect Park to the southwest. The route was developed under the joint auspices of the New York City Department of Transportation and NYC Parks.

As the Reservoir is sited atop a ridge formed by the Wisconsin ice sheet’s terminal moraine, the Harbor Hill Moraine, it rises more than 100 feet above the surrounding outwash plain, and affords pathway users commanding vistas over its surroundings to nearby cemeteries, East New York, Woodhaven, the Rockaways, Jamaica Bay and the Atlantic Ocean.

Because over 150 species of birds have been identified as using this area as habitat, birdwatchers from throughout New York City and beyond come to observe birds here throughout the year as well.
Opportunities

The reservoir is a substantial open space between Ridgewood, Cypress Hills, and East New York, neighborhoods that are generally underserved by open space. As such, it is a special resource with significant educational and other programmatic opportunities to be developed by NYC Parks in coordination with the local community. As an example, the water education organization NYC H₂O has an active field trip program that has brought over 2000 students to the Reservoir since 2014.

Already popular with walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and naturalists, the pathway could be served well by additional features, such as exercise stations and educational nodes, thereby expanding the park program within the existing framework.

Adaptive reuse of the historic structures for parks accessory uses, such as a comfort station or interpretive center, is another avenue that could be explored in an effort to support the expanded public use of the site, relay the story of the reservoir, and highlight the importance of the site's role in the growth and development of the City.

Looking more broadly, NYC Parks may investigate ways to further enhance the value of this important resource—providing a green refuge in a densely developed area and allowing more residents to connect with the natural world. Ecological restoration (meadow, woodland, wetland) and complementary recreational opportunities (i.e. nature trails, boardwalks, canopy walks, canoe/kayak access to open water) could be critical to achieving this.

Challenges

*Invasive Species*: The basin floors and walls have been colonized by and filled in with vegetation; however, much of the growth consists of invasive species. Critical to the maintenance of the site's biological integrity is the management of more than 20 exotic and invasive plant species, which may include controlling, removing and replacing these invasives with native plant species to enhance habitat quality and the overall diversity of native species that the site supports.

*Inaccessibility of Basin Interiors*: There is currently no means to enter the basins other than scrambling down the basin walls, which severely hampers the ability of the City to monitor and maintain the site, perform invasive removal/restoration, or clear debris and garbage. This is particularly problematic, as the reservoir has been subject to unsanctioned human activities within the basins, including illegal dumping, paintball, and encampments. The establishment of controlled access points into the basin from the existing perimeter multiuse pathway above could allow for more effective management and stewardship of the developing vegetative communities within the basins and improved ability to address trespassing and related damage.
Summary and Conclusions

Recognizing the unique features and management considerations of the site, NYC Parks is dedicated to sustaining, and, in direct coordination with the local community, exploring the expansion of the vision for the property in a manner that is sensitive to and serves to enhance the exceptional character of the Reservoir.

The Reservoir contains both upland forest and freshwater wetlands. It is also home to a wide variety of small mammals, amphibians, and reptiles, and is a birding hotspot, home to at least 156 species of birds, 29 of which are Species of Greatest Conservation Need within New York State.

In addition to its impressive ecology, the Reservoir is the only natural area within the local community, and one with great historic significance, having been a major water supply of the City of Brooklyn from 1858 until 1959. Its bicycle and pedestrian pathway is used heavily and offers a critical connection along the Brooklyn-Queens Greenway, linking public parks, museums and other public facilities.

Accordingly, the Ridgewood Reservoir meets the SEQR criteria for designation as a Critical Environmental Area and warrants designation as such. A map at an appropriate scale to readily locate the boundaries of the CEA is attached. For reference, the CEA boundary is defined by the embankment and pathway that encircles the three basins.
# City Environmental Quality Review

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATEMENT (EAS) FULL FORM

Please fill out and submit to the appropriate agency (see instructions)

### Part I: GENERAL INFORMATION

**PROJECT NAME**
Ridgewood Reservoir Critical Environmental Area Designation

#### 1. Reference Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQR REFERENCE NUMBER (to be assigned by lead agency)</th>
<th>BSA REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17DPR008Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULURP REFERENCE NUMBER (if applicable)</th>
<th>OTHER REFERENCE NUMBER(S) (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., legislative intro, CAPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2a. Lead Agency Information

**NAME OF LEAD AGENCY**
New York City Department of Parks and Recreation

**NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON**
Alyssa Cobb Konon

**ADDRESS**
830 5th Avenue

**CITY**
New York

**STATE**
NY

**ZIP**
10065

**TELEPHONE**
212-360-3402

**EMAIL**
alyssa.cobb@parks.nyc.gov

#### 2b. Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT</th>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Action Classification and Type

**SEQRA Classification**

- UNLISTED
- TYPE I: Specify Category (see 6 NYCRR 617.4 and NYC Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended): 617-4(b)(9) and (10)

**Action Type**

- LOCALIZED ACTION, SITE SPECIFIC
- LOCALIZED ACTION, SMALL AREA
- GENERIC ACTION

#### 4. Project Description

The Ridgewood Reservoir is a former water supply reservoir located within Highland Park, straddling the Brooklyn-Queens border. The reservoir was constructed in 1858 and served as part of the water supply system for Brooklyn until 1959. The reservoir is divided into three basins separated by embankments and has been substantially drained for many years. In the years since being taken off-line as a water supply source, the reservoir has transitioned into a naturalized area that is unique within New York City and serves as an important ecological, historic, and public recreation resource. In recognition of its exceptional character, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation proposes to designate the reservoir as a Critical Environmental Area (CEA). (See proposed designation report and map in Attachment 3.)

#### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOROUGH</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT(S)</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>TAX BLOCK(S) AND LOT(S)</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queens/Brooklyn</td>
<td>Queens 5 / Brooklyn 5</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>3740/75 - Brooklyn 3889/1</td>
<td>Queens - 11385 / Brooklyn 11208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Required Actions or Approvals (check all that apply)

- CITY MAP AMENDMENT: YES NO
- ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
- ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT
- SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY
- HOUSING PLAN & PROJECT
- SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type, modification; renewal; other): CONCESSION
- UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW PROCEDURE (ULURP)
- ZONING CERTIFICATION
- ZONING AUTHORIZATION
- ACQUISITION—REAL PROPERTY
- DISPOSITION—REAL PROPERTY
- OTHER, explain:
- EXPIRATION DATE:

**Board of Standards and Appeals:**

- YES NO
- VARIANCE (use)
6. Site Description: The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory controls. Except where otherwise indicated, provide the following information with regard to the directly affected area.

**Graphics:** The following graphics must be attached and each box must be checked off before the EAS is complete. Each map must clearly depict the boundaries of the directly affected area or areas and indicate a 400-foot radius drawn from the outer boundaries of the project site. Maps may not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size and, for paper filings, must be folded to 8.5 x 11 inches.

- SITE LOCATION MAP
- ZONING MAP
- SANBORN OR OTHER LAND USE MAP
- TAX MAP
- FOR LARGE AREAS OR MULTIPLE SITES, A GIS SHAPE FILE THAT DEFINES THE PROJECT SITE(S)
- PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE TAKEN WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF EAS SUBMISSION AND KEYED TO THE SITE LOCATION MAP

**Physical Setting** (both developed and undeveloped areas)

- Total directly affected area (sq. ft.): 53 acres
- Roads, buildings, and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): 3.5 acres
- Waterbody area (sq. ft.) and type: 5.5 acres
- Other, describe (sq. ft.): 44 acres - forest, grassland, lawn

7. **Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project** (if the project affects multiple sites, provide the total development facilitated by the action)

- SIZE OF PROJECT TO BE DEVELOPED (gross square feet): N/A - No physical activity. Proposed action is policy establishment.
- NUMBER OF BUILDINGS:
- HEIGHT OF EACH BUILDING (ft.):

  Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? YES NO

  If "yes," specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant:

  The total square feet not owned or controlled by the applicant:

  Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including, but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? YES NO

  If "yes," indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface disturbance (if known):

  AREA OF TEMPORARY DISTURBANCE: sq. ft. (width x length)
  VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE: cubic ft. (width x length x depth)

  AREA OF PERMANENT DISTURBANCE: sq. ft. (width x length)

8. **Analysis Year** CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 2

- ANTICIPATED BUILD YEAR (date the project would be completed and operational): N/A - Designation anticipated to go into effect 2018
- ANTICIPATED PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION IN MONTHS: N/A
- WOULD THE PROJECT BE IMPLEMENTED IN A SINGLE PHASE? YES NO IF MULTIPLE PHASES, HOW MANY?
- BRIEFLY DESCRIBE PHASES AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE: N/A

9. **Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of the Project** (check all that apply)

- RESIDENTIAL
- MANUFACTURING
- COMMERCIAL
- PARK/FOREST/OPEN SPACE
- OTHER, specify:
DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS

The information requested in this table applies to the directly affected area. The directly affected area consists of the project site and the area subject to any change in regulatory control. The increment is the difference between the No-Action and the With-Action conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>NO-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>WITH-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>INCREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe type of residential structures</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwelling units</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of low- to moderate-income units</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe type (retail, office, other)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of use</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open storage area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any unenclosed activities, specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; describe:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Accessible Open Space</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify type (mapped City, State, or Federal parkland, wetland—mapped or otherwise known, other):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City parkland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City parkland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Parkland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; describe:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of public spaces</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of accessory spaces</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended or non-attended</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of public spaces</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of accessory spaces</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes street parking)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; describe:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; specify number:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain how the number of residents was calculated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>EXISTING CONDITION</td>
<td>NO-ACTION CONDITION</td>
<td>WITH-ACTION CONDITION</td>
<td>INCREMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "yes," specify the following:

- No. and type
- No. and type of workers by business
- No. and type of non-residents who are not workers

Briefly explain how the number of businesses was calculated:

Other (students, visitors, concert-goers, etc.)

- □ YES  ❌ NO
- □ YES  ❌ NO
- □ YES  ❌ NO

If any, specify type and number:

Briefly explain how the number was calculated:

ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning classification</th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>NO-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>WITH-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>INCREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning: Park and R3-2</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>□ YES  ❌ NO</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use: Predominantly cemeteries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum amount of floor area that can be developed

- N/A

Predominant land use and zoning classifications within land use study area(s) or a 400 ft. radius of proposed project

- Zoning: Park and R3-2 Land Use: Predominantly cemeteries
- Zoning: Park and R3-2 Land Use: Predominantly cemeteries
- Zoning: Park and R3-2 Land Use: Predominantly cemeteries

No change

Attach any additional information that may be needed to describe the project.

If your project involves changes that affect one or more sites not associated with a specific development, it is generally appropriate to include total development projections in the above table and attach separate tables outlining the reasonable development scenarios for each site.
### Part II: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each of the analysis categories listed in this section, assess the proposed project’s impacts based on the thresholds and criteria presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. Check each box that applies.

- If the proposed project can be demonstrated not to meet or exceed the threshold, check the “no” box.
- If the proposed project will meet or exceed the threshold, or if this cannot be determined, check the “yes” box.
- For each “yes” response, provide additional analyses (and, if needed, attach supporting information) based on guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual to determine whether the potential for significant impacts exists. Please note that a “yes” answer does not mean that an EIS must be prepared—it means that more information may be required for the lead agency to make a determination of significance.

- The lead agency, upon reviewing Part II, may require an applicant to provide additional information to support the Full EAS Form. For example, if a question is answered “no,” an agency may request a short explanation for this response.

#### 1. LAND USE, ZONING, AND PUBLIC POLICY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 4

| (a) Would the proposed project result in a change in land use different from surrounding land uses? | YES | NO |
| (b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning? | YES | NO |
| (c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy? | YES | NO |
| (d) If “yes,” to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach. | YES | NO |
| (e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project? | YES | NO |
| o If “yes,” complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach. | YES | NO |
| (f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City’s Watertfront Revitalization Program boundaries? | YES | NO |
| o If “yes,” complete the Consistency Assessment Form. | YES | NO |

#### 2. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 5

| (a) Would the proposed project: | YES | NO |
| o Generate a net increase of more than 200 residential units or 200,000 square feet of commercial space? | YES | NO |
| o Directly displace 500 or more residents? | YES | NO |
| o Directly displace more than 100 employees? | YES | NO |
| o Affect conditions in a specific industry? | YES | NO |

(b) If “yes” to any of the above, attach supporting information to answer the relevant questions below.

**i. Direct Residential Displacement**

| o If more than 500 residents would be displaced, would these residents represent more than 5% of the primary study area population? | YES | NO |
| o If “yes,” is the average income of the directly displaced population markedly lower than the average income of the rest of the study area population? | YES | NO |

**ii. Indirect Residential Displacement**

| o Would expected average incomes of the new population exceed the average incomes of study area populations? | YES | NO |

(b) If “yes”:

| o Would the population of the primary study area increase by more than 10 percent? | YES | NO |
| o Would the population of the primary study area increase by more than 5 percent in an area where there is the potential to accelerate trends toward increasing rents? | YES | NO |
| o Would the population of the primary study area increase by more than 5 percent in an area where there is the potential to accelerate trends toward increasing rents? | YES | NO |

| o If “yes” to either of the preceding questions, would more than 5 percent of all housing units be renter-occupied and unprotected? | YES | NO |

**iii. Direct Business Displacement**

| o Do any of the displaced businesses provide goods or services that otherwise would not be found within the trade area, either under existing conditions or in the future with the proposed project? | YES | NO |
| o Is any category of business to be displaced the subject of other regulations or publicly adopted plans to preserve, | YES | NO |
### iv. Indirect Business Displacement
- Would the project potentially introduce trends that make it difficult for businesses to remain in the area? [ ] [ ]
- Would the project capture retail sales in a particular category of goods to the extent that the market for such goods would become saturated, potentially resulting in vacancies and disinvestment on neighborhood commercial streets? [ ] [ ]

### v. Effects on Industry
- Would the project significantly affect business conditions in any industry or any category of businesses within or outside the study area? [ ] [ ]
- Would the project indirectly substantially reduce employment or impair the economic viability in the industry or category of businesses? [ ] [ ]


#### (a) Direct Effects
- Would the project directly eliminate, displace, or alter public or publicly funded community facilities such as educational facilities, libraries, health care facilities, day care centers, police stations, or fire stations? [ ] [ ]

#### (b) Indirect Effects

##### i. Child Care Centers
- Would the project result in 20 or more eligible children under age 6, based on the number of low or low/moderate income residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6) [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project result in a collective utilization rate of the group child care/Head Start centers in the study area that is greater than 100 percent? [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project increase the collective utilization rate by 5 percent or more from the No-Action scenario? [ ] [ ]

##### ii. Libraries
- Would the project result in a 5 percent or more increase in the ratio of residential units to library branches? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6) [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project increase the study area population by 5 percent or more from the No-Action levels? [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the additional population impair the delivery of library services in the study area? [ ] [ ]

##### iii. Public Schools
- Would the project result in 50 or more elementary or middle school students, or 150 or more high school students based on number of residential units? (See Table 6-1 in Chapter 6) [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project result in a collective utilization rate of the elementary and/or intermediate schools in the study area that is equal to or greater than 100 percent? [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project increase this collective utilization rate by 5 percent or more from the No-Action scenario? [ ] [ ]

#### iv. Health Care Facilities
- Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood? [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project affect the operation of health care facilities in the area? [ ] [ ]

#### v. Fire and Police Protection
- Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood? [ ] [ ]
- If "yes," would the project affect the operation of fire or police protection in the area? [ ] [ ]

### 4. OPEN SPACE: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 7

#### (a) Would the project change or eliminate existing open space? [ ] [ ]

#### (b) Is the project located within an under-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island? [ ] [ ]

#### (c) If "yes," would the project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees? [ ] [ ]

#### (d) Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island? [ ] [ ]

#### (e) If "yes," would the project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees? [ ] [ ]

#### (f) If the project is located in an area that is neither under-served nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees? [ ] [ ]

#### (g) If "yes" to questions (c), (e), or (f) above, attach supporting information to answer the following:

- If in an under-served area, would the project result in a decrease in the open space ratio by more than 1 percent? [ ] [ ]
- If in an area that is not under-served, would the project result in a decrease in the open space ratio by more than 5 [ ] [ ]
5. **SHADOWS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 8
   (a) Would the proposed project result in a net height increase of any structure of 50 feet or more? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (b) Would the proposed project result in any increase in structure height and be located adjacent to or across the street from a sunlight-sensitive resource? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (c) If "yes" to either of the above questions, attach supporting information explaining whether the project's shadow would reach any sunlight-sensitive resource at any time of the year.

6. **HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 9
   (a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or National Register Historic District? (See the GIS System for Archaeology and National Register to confirm) [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (b) Would the proposed project involve construction resulting in in-ground disturbance to an area not previously excavated? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (c) If "yes" to either of the above, list any identified architectural and/or archaeological resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would potentially affect any architectural or archeological resources.

7. **URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 10
   (a) Would the proposed project introduce a new building, a new building height, or result in any substantial physical alteration to the streetscape or public space in the vicinity of the proposed project that is not currently allowed by existing zoning? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (b) Would the proposed project result in obstruction of publicly accessible views to visual resources not currently allowed by existing zoning? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (c) If "yes" to either of the above, please provide the information requested in Chapter 10.

8. **NATURAL RESOURCES**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 11
   (a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11? [ ] Yes [ ] No
      - If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the project would affect any of these resources.
   (b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed? [ ] Yes [ ] No
      - If "yes," complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form and submit according to its instructions.

9. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 12
   (a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential uses in an area that is currently, or was historically, a manufacturing area that involved hazardous materials? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (b) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to hazardous materials that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (c) Would the project require soil disturbance in a manufacturing area or any development on or near a manufacturing area or existing/historic facilities listed in Appendix 1 (including nonconforming uses)? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (d) Would the project result in the development of a site where there is reason to suspect the presence of hazardous materials, contamination, illegal dumping or fill, or fill material of unknown origin? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (e) Would the project result in development on or near a site that has or had underground and/or aboveground storage tanks (e.g., gas stations, oil storage facilities, heating oil storage)? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (f) Would the project result in renovation of interior existing space on a site with the potential for compromised air quality; vapor intrusion from either on-site or off-site sources; or the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury or lead-based paint? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (g) Would the project result in development on or near a site with potential hazardous materials issues such as government-listed voluntary cleanup/brownfield site, current or former power generation/transmission facilities, coal gasification or gas storage sites, railroad tracks or rights-of-way, or municipal incinerators? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (h) Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been performed for the site? [ ] Yes [ ] No
      - If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify: [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (i) Based on the Phase I Assessment, is a Phase II Investigation needed? [ ] Yes [ ] No

10. **WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 13
   (a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   (b) If the proposed project located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 square feet or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 square feet or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island, or Queens? [ ] Yes [ ] No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) If the proposed project located in a separately sewered area, would it result in the same or greater development than that listed in Table 13-1 in Chapter 13?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Would the project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drainage areas, including Bronx River, Coney Island Creek, Flushing Bay and Creek, Gowanus Canal, Hutchinson River, Newtown Creek, or Westchester Creek, would it involve development on a site that is 1 acre or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially severed or currently unsewered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant and/or contribute contaminated stormwater to a separate storm sewer system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) If “yes” to any of the above, conduct the appropriate preliminary analyses and attach supporting documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 14
   (a) Using Table 14-1 in Chapter 14, the project’s projected operational solid waste generation is estimated to be (pounds per week): 0
      o Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week? |    |    |
   (b) Would the proposed project involve a reduction in capacity at a solid waste management facility used for refuse or recyclables generated within the City? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the proposed project comply with the City’s Solid Waste Management Plan? |    |    |

12. ENERGY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 15
   (a) Using energy modeling or Table 15-1 in Chapter 15, the project’s projected energy use is estimated to be (annual BTUs): 0
   (b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy? |    |    |

13. TRANSPORTATION: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 16
   (a) Would the proposed project exceed any threshold identified in Table 16-1 in Chapter 16? |    |    |
   (b) If “yes,” conduct the appropriate screening analyses, attach back up data as needed for each stage, and answer the following questions:
      o Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the proposed project result in 50 or more vehicle trips per project peak hour at any given intersection? |    |    |
      **It should be noted that the lead agency may require further analysis of intersections of concern even when a project generates fewer than 50 vehicles in the peak hour. See Subsection 313 of Chapter 16 for more information.** |    |    |
      o Would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the proposed project result, per project peak hour, in 50 or more bus trips on a single line (in one direction) or 200 subway/rail trips per station or line? |    |    |
      o Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour to any given pedestrian or transit element, crosswalk, subway stair, or bus stop? |    |    |

14. AIR QUALITY: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 17
   (a) Mobile Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 210 in Chapter 17? |    |    |
   (b) Stationary Sources: Would the proposed project result in the conditions outlined in Section 220 in Chapter 17? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the proposed project exceed the thresholds in Figure 17-3, Stationary Source Screen Graph in Chapter 17? (Attach graph as needed) |    |    |
   (c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site? |    |    |
   (d) Does the proposed project require federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements? |    |    |
   (e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., CEQR designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? |    |    |
   (f) If “yes” to any of the above, conduct the appropriate analyses and attach any supporting documentation. |    |    |

15. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 18
   (a) Is the proposed project a city capital project or a power generation plant? |    |    |
   (b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City’s solid waste management system? |    |    |
   (c) Would the proposed project result in the development of 350,000 square feet or more? |    |    |
   (d) If “yes” to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on guidance in Chapter 18? |    |    |
      o If “yes,” would the project result in inconsistencies with the City’s GHG reduction goal? (See Local Law 22 of 2008: § 24- |    |    |

(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute vehicular traffic? ☐ ☒

(b) Would the proposed project introduce new or additional receptors (see Section 124 in Chapter 19) near heavily trafficked roadways, within one horizontal mile of an existing or proposed flight path, or within 1,500 feet of an existing or proposed rail line with a direct line of sight to that rail line? ☐ ☒

(c) Would the proposed project cause a stationary noise source to operate within 1,500 feet of a receptor with a direct line of sight to that receptor or introduce receptors into an area with high ambient stationary noise? ☐ ☒

(d) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designation or Restrictive Declaration) relating to noise that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts? ☐ ☒

(e) If "yes" to any of the above, conduct the appropriate analyses and attach any supporting documentation.

17. PUBLIC HEALTH: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 20

(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Air Quality; Hazardous Materials; Noise? ☐ ☒

(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of public health is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 20, "Public Health." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.

18. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 21

(a) Based upon the analyses conducted, do any of the following technical areas require a detailed analysis: Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy; Socioeconomic Conditions; Open Space; Historic and Cultural Resources; Urban Design and Visual Resources; Shadows; Transportation; Noise? ☐ ☒

(b) If "yes," explain why an assessment of neighborhood character is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 21, "Neighborhood Character." Attach a preliminary analysis, if necessary.

19. CONSTRUCTION: CEQR Technical Manual Chapter 22

(a) Would the project's construction activities involve:
   - Construction activities lasting longer than two years? ☐ ☒
   - Construction activities within a Central Business District or along an arterial highway or major thoroughfare? ☐ ☒
   - Closing, narrowing, or otherwise impeding traffic, transit, or pedestrian elements (roadways, parking spaces, bicycle routes, sidewalks, crosswalks, corners, etc.)? ☐ ☒
   - Construction of multiple buildings where there is a potential for on-site receptors on buildings completed before the final build-out? ☐ ☒
   - The operation of several pieces of diesel equipment in a single location at peak construction? ☐ ☒
   - Closure of a community facility or disruption in its services? ☐ ☒
   - Activities within 400 feet of a historic or cultural resource? ☐ ☒
   - Disturbance of a site containing or adjacent to a site containing natural resources? ☐ ☒
   - Construction on multiple development sites in the same geographic area, such that there is the potential for several construction timelines to overlap or last for more than two years overall? ☐ ☒

(b) If any boxes are checked "yes," explain why a preliminary construction assessment is or is not warranted based on the guidance in Chapter 22, "Construction." It should be noted that the nature and extent of any commitment to use the Best Available Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination.

20. APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I swear or affirm under oath and subject to the penalties for perjury that the information provided in this Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief, based upon my personal knowledge and familiarity with the information described herein and after examination of the pertinent books and records and/or after inquiry of persons who have personal knowledge of such information or who have examined pertinent books and records.

Still under oath, I further swear or affirm that I make this statement in my capacity as the applicant or representative of the entity that seeks the permits, approvals, funding, or other governmental action(s) described in this EAS.

APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE NAME
Alanna Cook

SIGNATURE

DATE 5/22/17

PLEASE NOTE THAT APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE RESPONSES IN THIS FORM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LEAD AGENCY SO THAT IT MAY SUPPORT ITS DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE.
### Part III: DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To Be Completed by Lead Agency)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In completing Part III, the lead agency should consult 6 NYCRR 617.7 and 43 RCNY § 6-06 (Executive Order 91 or 1977, as amended), which contain the State and City criteria for determining significance.

1. For each of the impact categories listed below, consider whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, taking into account its (a) location; (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT CATEGORY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Adverse Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design/Visual Resources</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination of whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment, such as combined or cumulative impacts, that were not fully covered by other responses and supporting materials?

   If there are such impacts, attach an explanation stating whether, as a result of them, the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

3. Check determination to be issued by the lead agency:

- Positive Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and if a Conditional Negative Declaration is not appropriate, then the lead agency issues a Positive Declaration and prepares a draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

- Conditional Negative Declaration: A Conditional Negative Declaration (CND) may be appropriate if there is a private applicant for an Unlisted action AND when conditions imposed by the lead agency will modify the proposed project so that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result. The CND is prepared as a separate document and is subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.

- Negative Declaration: If the lead agency has determined that the project would not result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, then the lead agency issues a Negative Declaration. The Negative Declaration may be prepared as a separate document (see template) or using the embedded Negative Declaration on the next page.

### 4. LEAD AGENCY’S CERTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Commissioner - Planning and Developmentn</td>
<td>New York City Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
<td>January 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
NEGATIVE DECLARATION (Use of this form is optional)

Statement of No Significant Effect

Pursuant to Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review, found at Title 62, Chapter 5 of the Rules of the City of New York and 6 NYCRR, Part 617, State Environmental Quality Review, New York City Parks and Recreation assumed the role of lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project. Based on a review of information about the project contained in this environmental assessment statement and any attachments hereto, which are incorporated by reference herein, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reasons Supporting this Determination

The above determination is based on information contained in this EAS, which that finds the proposed project:

The proposed project consists of the application of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA) designation. The designation is a policy statement regarding the special characteristics of the site and establishment of an administrative requirement that these characteristics shall be given appropriate consideration during the development and environmental review of any future development proposals in or substantially contiguous to the area. As such, there are no specific physical components or activities associated with this action. As documented in the environmental assessment, the project would not have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the environment. The reasons supporting this determination are set forth below. As indicated in the EAS Part II checklist, since the project involves no physical changes to the site, the project does not include components or characteristics with potential to significantly affect technical areas such as socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; open space; shadows, urban design and visual resources; hazardous materials; water/sewer infrastructure; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; transportation; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; noise; public health; neighborhood character; or construction.

In terms of Land Use, Historic and Cultural Resource, and Natural Resource considerations, the CEA designation would be expected to support and protect current land use conditions. The Reservoir would continue to function as an open space resource within a larger Park context, which would remain consistent and compatible with the surrounding land use pattern.

The site has a unique history and designation would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of its historic features during the review of any development proposals. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and preserve the unique historic features of the site, no significant adverse impacts on historic resources would be anticipated.

The natural attributes of the reservoir are another key element that contributes to the site’s significance as a CEA. Designation as a CEA would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of natural features during the review of development proposals. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and protect the unique ecology of the site, no significant adverse impacts on natural resources would be anticipated.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. This Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQRA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>New York City Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
<td>January 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SIGNATURE | |
|-----------|
ATTACHMENT 1
EAS SUPPLEMENT
New York City Environmental Quality Review  
Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) Full Form Supplement  
Ridgewood Reservoir Critical Environmental Area Designation

Introduction

The Ridgewood Reservoir is a former water supply reservoir located within Highland Park, straddling the Brooklyn-Queens border. The reservoir was constructed in 1858 and served as part of the water supply system for Brooklyn until 1959. The reservoir is divided into three basins separated by embankments and has been substantially drained for many years. In the years since being taken off-line as a water supply source, the reservoir has transitioned into a naturalized area that is unique within New York City and serves as an important ecological, historic, and public recreation resource. In recognition of its exceptional character, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation proposes to designate the reservoir as a Critical Environmental Area (CEA). See Designation Justification and proposed CEA boundary in Attachment 3. The only other existing CEA within New York City is Jamaica Bay, designated in 1990.

Critical Environment Area Designation

A Critical Environmental Area is a designation that may be applied pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) to identify a specific geographic area of exceptional or unique character. A CEA designation is not in itself a development or land use control (such as zoning) or prescriptive management plan, but rather an expression of an agency's concern for the unique sensitivities and resources in that area. Once an area has been designated, the potential impacts on the characteristics of the CEA become relevant areas of concern for specific consideration during SEQRA review of future projects.

The current proposed action (CEA designation) therefore reflects a policy statement regarding the special characteristics of the site and establishment of an administrative requirement that these characteristics shall be given appropriate consideration during the development and environmental review of any future development proposals in or substantially contiguous to the area. As such, there are no specific physical components or activities considered as part of the action or within this EAS.

Location

The Ridgewood Reservoir is located within the northeastern portion of Highland Park, and is a component of a larger green corridor formed by the park and several adjoining cemeteries. The site sits atop a ridge formed by the Wisconsin ice sheet's terminal moraine, the Harbor Hill Moraine. Rising more than 100 feet above the surrounding outwash plain, the reservoir affords dramatic views over its surroundings to nearby cemeteries, East New York, Woodhaven, the Rockaways, Jamaica Bay and the Atlantic Ocean. The Reservoir is formed by a compacted earthen fill embankment extending approximately 1.5-miles around the entire circumference of the reservoir. The top width of the embankment is a minimum of 20 feet. The reservoir is divided into three separate basins by slightly narrower embankments (top width of approximately 15 feet) similar in construction to the perimeter embankment. The eastern basin consists of approximately 9.95 acres, the central basin is approximately 11.85 acres, and the western basin is approximately 21.17 acres. An asphalt multi-use path encircles the outer rim of the basin. This perimeter path system is part of the Brooklyn-Queens Greenway and was completed in 2013 as part of a larger project that included the construction of ADA access ramps and the installation of fencing, lighting, seating and signage.
Although the reservoir has not been part of the City’s water supply system for decades, it is classified as a dam by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). While originally classified as a Class “C” or “High Hazard” dam, in March 2017 it was reclassified by NYSDEC as a Class “A” “Low Hazard” dam to reflect its current conditions and status (e.g., fully disconnected from the public water system.)

Supplemental Analyses
The following section provides additional information for each of the technical analysis categories that require supplemental information in response to “yes” responses within the EAS Full Form Part II.

1. Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy
(a) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?

The Ridgewood Reservoir is owned by the City of New York and is currently under the jurisdiction of NYC Parks. As City-owned parkland, the site is not subject to zoning and is managed by NYC Parks in support of the agency mission to create and sustain thriving parks and public spaces for New Yorkers. Direct management and control by a governmental agency affords substantial protection for the site compared to privately held land subject to market pressures and development forces.

As described above, the proposed project establishes an administrative requirement and policy related to the SEQRA review of projects within or substantially contiguous to the Ridgewood Reservoir. While the CEA designation in itself does not establish a new development control or permitting framework, the designation would supplement the protections afforded by public ownership and provide additional policy guidance on appropriate management of the resource to ensure that its unique qualities are protected and enhanced.

The CEA designation would be expected to support and protect current land use conditions. The Reservoir would continue to function as an open space resource within a larger Park context, which would remain consistent and compatible with the surrounding land use pattern. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to land use, zoning or public policy would be anticipated.

6. Historic and Cultural Resources
(a) Does the proposed project site or an adjacent site contain any architectural and/or archaeological resource that is eligible for or has been designated (or is calendared for consideration) as a New York City Landmark, Interior Landmark or Scenic Landmark; that is listed or eligible for listing on the New York State or National Register of Historic Places; or that is within a designated or eligible New York City, New York State or Nations Register Historic District?

The Reservoir was a key component of the first central public water supply system for Brooklyn. Shortly after its incorporation as a City in 1834, Brooklyn initiated a search for a reliable public water supply to supplant the system of shallow wells, cisterns and springs that served its neighborhoods. After many years

---

1 As explained in the SEQRA Handbook, designation does not grant any agency permitting authority or other jurisdictions that did not already exist before designation of the CEA, nor does it alter the classification of an action in terms of SEQRA Type. (See http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/45500.html).
of public deliberation and investigation, groundbreaking for the Ridgewood Aqueduct and Reservoir System was on July 11, 1856 and water was first raised on November 18, 1858.

The original design called for three basins, but the project was altered and only a double basin was initially built. The system collected water from Long Island streams, which was conveyed via the Ridgewood Aqueduct and pumped into the Reservoir by steam engines within the Ridgewood Pump Station located at the western terminus of the aqueduct. Water from the Reservoir was then distributed out via gravity through a system of mains that fed into progressively smaller distribution pipes. Over time, the supply system was expanded to incorporate additional streams and groundwater wells, and the distribution system was enlarged, including the addition of the third basin and an additional pumping station on the south side of Atlantic Avenue in 1891.

The Reservoir was the major source of water for the City of Brooklyn until 1898, at which time Brooklyn merged with the City of New York and gained access to the New York City water supply system. With the completion of the Catskill Aqueduct and City Tunnel No. 1 in 1917, a high-quality water source from the Catskills became available. The Ridgewood system continued to be used during the first half of the 20th century, but the eventual development of additional upstate reservoirs and City Tunnel No. 2 increased availability to Brooklyn and ended the need for water from the Ridgewood System.

The Reservoir became a backup reservoir in 1959, and was last used during a drought period in the 1960s. The Reservoir was finally decommissioned in 1989. The east and west basins were drained. In 2004, the Reservoir was officially turned over to NYC Parks, and through a larger water main project managed by the NYC Department of Design & Construction, remaining pipes were fully disconnected from the reservoir by 2016.

The original pump station has been removed, but historic structural elements remain, including the reservoir structure itself and brick gate houses along the northern edge of the west and central basins, providing a tangible physical connection to the Reservoir’s prior role as an important public works that was integral to the development and public health of the City.

In recognition of its unique history, the Ridgewood reservoir has been nominated for inclusion on the National and State Registers of Historic Places. The nomination was submitted by the water education organization NYC H2O, with support from NYC Parks, neighborhood organizations and elected officials. The New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) determined the reservoir to be eligible for listing in May 2017. The reservoir’s history is also one of the features of the site that contributes to its significance as a CEA. Designation as a CEA would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of historic features during the review of any development proposals and help shape management directions for the site. For example, adaptive reuse of the historic structures for park accessory uses, such as a comfort station or interpretive center, could be explored in an effort to support the expanded public use of the site, relay the story of the reservoir, and highlight the site’s role in the growth and development of the City. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and preserve the unique historic features of the site, no significant adverse impacts on historic resources would be anticipated.
8. Natural Resources

(a) Does the proposed project site or a site adjacent to the project contain natural resources as defined in Section 100 of Chapter 11?

The project site is an existing open space resource associated with Highland Park, and as such it contains and is adjacent to natural resources as defined by Section 100 of Chapter 11 of the CEQR Technical Manual. These resources include upland forest, waterbody, and wetland resources and the associated vegetation and wildlife that these habitats support.

Upland Resources

Upland Forests, Woodlands and Barrens - Forest, shrub and emergent plant communities have developed in the basin interiors and the slopes and crests of the surround embankments. Much of the vegetation in the basins are non-native and/or invasive species, such as black locust, mugwort and buckthorn. Much larger, older trees line the outer rim of the embankments. Further description of these habitats is presented below in the Vegetation and Wildlife section.

Water Resources

Water Bodies and Wetland Resources – The central basin contains a freshwater pond approximately 3.5 feet deep, which appears to have been established as a result of the basin not being fully pumped out. The portion of the central basin from the toe of the slope of the basin wall inward has been designated as a regulated wetland by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). The central portion is classified as palustrine, unconsolidated bottom, mud, artificially flooded (PUB3k), with a surrounding fringe of palustrine emergent Phragmites australis artificially flooded wetland (PEMSK). The total wetland area of Basin 2 is approximately 12 acres.

The majority of the eastern basin, as well as most of the southern half of the western basin have also been designated as regulated NYSDEC wetlands. These areas consist of approximately 8.1 acres within the eastern basin and 9.4 acres in the western basin that contain palustrine forested broad-leaved deciduous, seasonally flooded wetlands (PFO1C.)

Further description of these habitats is presented below.

Vegetation and Wildlife

A survey of the flora and fauna within the reservoir was conducted by Round Mountain Ecological LLC in the summer and fall of 2007 and spring of 2008. A total of 184 plant species and 150 bird species were observed, including 12 species listed as Threatened, Endangered or of Special Concern in New York State. Wetland habitats and plant communities of special conservation concern were also found.

Of the 184 plant species observed, three were listed as Threatened or Endangered in New York State. The bog-like open areas and forest fringes in the eastern basin, where thick carpets of Polytrichum mosses dominated the understory, also appeared to be unique within New York City. Areas of wetland and ecotonal habitats were present at the site, including the emergent marshes and open water of the central basin, as well as the eastern basin and a portion of the southern end of the western basin. A NYC Parks NRG entitation conducted in 2005 identified good-quality native plant communities and/or wetlands in
the southern end of the western basin, which is also the area where the majority of the Threatened or Endangered plants were found in this basin.

A total of 150 bird species were observed, including 92 species observed during spring and fall migration, and 58 additional species observed by local naturalists throughout the year. Nine of these species were listed as Endangered, Threatened or of Special Concern in New York State. A breeding bird survey conducted by local naturalists in 2007 found 38 bird species nesting at the site. The high diversity and abundance of bird and other wildlife species appeared to be due to the abundance of food resources present, the diversity, size and contiguity of habitats at the site, and its location on the ridge of the Harbor Hill glacial moraine, which puts it directly in the flight path of a large number of raptor and other species migrating through the area. The significance of the site for bird species is well-known, both presently and historically, it being listed among the top 500 places to see birds in all of New York State as far back as the 1970’s.

Based on the most recent field investigations performed in association with the NYSDEC wetland delineation, dominant plants within the overstory of the forested wetlands include gray birch (Betula populifolia), red maple (Acer rubrum), eastern cottonwood (Populus deltoides), honey locust (Gleditsia triacanthos), sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua), green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvatica), and pin oak (Quercus palustris). The understory is dominated by invasive European buckthorn (Rhamnus frangula) and multiflora rose (Rosa multiflora). The groundcover in the forested wetland areas are generally sparse, but dominated by seedlings of the tree and shrub species identified above, as well as invasive garlic mustard (Allaria petiolata). Common rush (Juncus effuses) and sedges (Carex spp) were present in some depressions. The non-wetland portion of the western basin is dominated by similar species as the eastern basin, as well as black cherry and sassafras in the overstory and understory. The groundcover in this portion of the western basin was dominated by mugwort (Artemesia vulgaris) and pokeweed (Phytolacca americana). The slopes of both outer basins were dominated by invasive vines, including European bittersweet and Japanese honeysuckle.²

Invasive Plant Species
A number of invasive species have colonized the reservoir. The central basin is open water surrounded by invasives, primarily Phragmites. As indicated in the attached photographs, over the past 20 years the Phragmites has encroached further into the center of the basin. In the forested floors of the outer basins, invasive species such as European buckthorn, multiflora rose, European bittersweet , Japanese honeysuckle and mugwort dominate the understory, groundcover, and vine layers. The slopes along the perimeters of the outer basins are also dominated by upland invasive shrubs, vines and trees.

As indicated, the Reservoir represents a unique natural area within an otherwise heavily urbanized community. The closest other substantial natural areas are located within Forest Park, Spring Creek Park/Jamaica Bay, which are relatively distant. As such, the Reservoir provides unique opportunities for local residents to experience a natural setting and is highly valued by members of the community for that purpose. In addition, habitat connectivity is key to maintaining healthy populations of birds and other

wildlife species. Because the Reservoir is situated among patches of green space that run along the Jackie Robinson Parkway, it serves as a valuable larger habitat patch and refuge for many species.

These natural attributes are key features that contributes to the site’s significance as a CEA. Designation as a CEA would supplement existing SEQRA requirements related to the consideration of natural features during the review of development proposals and help shape management directions for the site. As the CEA designation would serve to highlight and protect the unique ecology of the site, no significant adverse impacts on natural resources would be anticipated.

(b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed?

The project site is located along the northern edge of the Jamaica Bay Watershed. As discussed above, the proposed action is establishment of a CEA designation. There are no physical components or activities that would affect the watershed associated with this action. The CEA designation would be expected to support and protect the site’s current function as an open space resource within a larger Park context. No significant development activity that would substantially affect land coverage, land use patterns, or growth in the watershed would be expected.
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ATTACHMENT 3

CEA DESIGNATION REPORT
Ridgewood Reservoir

Justification for Critical Environmental Area Designation

Introduction

The Ridgewood Reservoir (Reservoir) is a de-commissioned reservoir located in New York City, on the Brooklyn-Queens border. More specifically, the Reservoir is located within the northeastern portion of Highland Park, and is a component of a larger green corridor formed by the park and several adjoining cemeteries.

The Reservoir is comprised of three basins, the easternmost at 9.95 acres, the middle basin at 11.85 acres and the westernmost basin at 21.17 acres, separated by embankments that measure 15' in width. The perimeter embankment has a minimum width of 20 feet and extends roughly 1.5 miles in circumference.

The Reservoir became operational in 1858 and operated as a water supply for Brooklyn until 1959, after which only the middle basin remained in use as a backup water supply until 1989. Whereas the outer two basins were fully drained, the middle basin retains a shallow impoundment of approximately 3.5 feet in depth to this day. Since its decommissioning, the site has been reclaimed by both native and non-native vegetation, upland forest and freshwater wetlands. Approximately 25 acres within the three basins have been designated as New York State Department of Environmental Conservation regulated wetlands.

Since jurisdiction of the Reservoir was transferred from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection to the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation (NYC Parks) in 2004, NYC Parks successfully completed the construction of a joint bicycle and pedestrian pathway around the Reservoir, which is heavily used throughout the year.

The Reservoir qualifies as a Critical Environmental Area\(^1\) because it is:

- A unique natural open space with significant flora and fauna in an otherwise heavily urbanized area;
- A site with unique historic value;
- An open space resource bounded on all sides by a joint bicycle and pedestrian pathway, providing a benefit to human health; and
- An ecological area of significant social value with recreational and educational opportunities.

---

\(^1\) Pursuant to Title 6 New York Codes, Rules and Regulations Part 617.14(g) (SEQRA Regulations).
Natural Resources

The Reservoir is a natural area within this otherwise urbanized community. The nearest substantial natural areas are located within Forest Park, Spring Creek Park/Jamaica Bay, and Prospect Park, which are approximately three, five, and six miles distant, respectively. As such, the Reservoir provides unique opportunities for local residents to experience a natural setting, and it is highly valued as such by members of the surrounding communities for that purpose.

In addition, habitat connectivity is key to maintaining healthy populations of birds and other wildlife species. Because the Reservoir is situated among small patches of green space that run along the Jackie Robinson Parkway, it serves as a valuable, larger habitat patch and refuge for many species. The site is home to a variety of small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and fish, and provides critical habitat for migratory birds, as well as nesting and foraging habitat for resident species.

The Reservoir is located along the Atlantic Flyway, a migratory route for birds, and it is situated on an elevated ridge, which is an attractant for many birds of prey, both for foraging and for migration. Hawks, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons have all been observed on the site. The forested area attracts a wide variety of birds, including wrens, woodpeckers, vireos, sparrows, thrushes, and twenty-four species of warblers. The open water and wetland areas also provide habitat for a variety of ducks, wading birds, gulls, terns, and marsh birds, such as the American woodcock.

Based on information collected through eBird, an online resource launched by the Cornell Lab of Ornithology and National Audubon Society that is regularly updated by local observers, 156 species of birds have been sighted at the location as of February 22, 2017, 29 of which are listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) in the New York State Wildlife Action Plan.

Historical Significance

The Reservoir was a key component of the first central public water supply system for Brooklyn. Shortly after its incorporation as a City in 1834, Brooklyn initiated a search for a reliable public water supply to supplant the system of shallow wells, cisterns and springs that served its neighborhoods. After many years of public deliberation and investigation, groundbreaking for the Ridgewood Aqueduct and Reservoir System was on July 11, 1856 and water was first raised on November 18, 1858.

The original design called for three basins, but the project was altered and only a double basin was initially built. The system collected water from Long Island streams and, conveyed via the Ridgewood Aqueduct, water was pumped into the Reservoir by steam engines within the Ridgewood Pump Station located at the western terminus of the aqueduct. The engines pumped water through 36-inch force mains to the reservoir basins. Water from the Reservoir was then distributed out via gravity through a system of mains that fed into progressively smaller distribution pipes.
Over time, the supply system was expanded to incorporate additional streams and groundwater wells, and the distribution system was enlarged, including the addition of the third basin and an additional supporting pumping station in 1891.

The Reservoir was the major source of water for the City of Brooklyn until 1898, at which time Brooklyn merged with the City of New York and gained access to the New York City water supply system. With the completion of the Catskill Aqueduct and City Tunnel No. 1 in 1917, a high-quality water source from the Catskills became available. The Ridgewood system continued to be used during the first half of the 20th century, but the eventual development of additional upstate reservoirs and City Tunnel No. 2 increased availability to Brooklyn and ended the need for water from the Ridgewood System.

The Reservoir became a backup reservoir in 1959, and was last used during a drought period in the 1960s. The Reservoir was finally decommissioned in 1989. The east and west basins were drained. In 2004, the Reservoir was officially turned over to NYC Parks, and through a larger water main project managed by the NYC Department of Design & Construction, remaining pipes were fully disconnected from the reservoir by 2016.

The original pump stations have been removed, but historic structural elements remain, including the reservoir structure itself and the brick gate houses along the northern edge of the west and central basins, providing a tangible physical connection to the Reservoir's prior role as an important public works that was integral to the development and public health of the City.

**Recreation**

Heavily used throughout the year, the paved bicycle and pedestrian pathway around the perimeter of the basins is an integral part of the Brooklyn–Queens Greenway, a bicycling and pedestrian route that connects neighborhoods in the two boroughs. The Greenway affords connections from the Reservoir and Highland Park to Forest Park to the east and to Prospect Park to the southwest. The route was developed under the joint auspices of the New York City Department of Transportation and NYC Parks.

As the Reservoir is sited atop a ridge formed by the Wisconsin ice sheet's terminal moraine, the Harbor Hill Moraine, it rises more than 100 feet above the surrounding outwash plain, and affords pathway users commanding vistas over its surroundings to nearby cemeteries, East New York, Woodhaven, the Rockaways, Jamaica Bay and the Atlantic Ocean.

Because over 150 species of birds have been identified as using this area as habitat, birdwatchers from throughout New York City and beyond come to observe birds here throughout the year as well.
Opportunities

The reservoir is a substantial open space between Ridgewood, Cypress Hills, and East New York, neighborhoods that are generally underserved by open space. As such, it is a special resource with significant educational and other programmatic opportunities to be developed by NYC Parks in coordination with the local community. As an example, the water education organization NYC H₂O has an active field trip program that has brought over 2000 students to the Reservoir since 2014.

Already popular with walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and naturalists, the pathway could be served well by additional features, such as exercise stations and educational nodes, thereby expanding the park program within the existing framework.

Adaptive reuse of the historic structures for parks accessory uses, such as a comfort station or interpretive center, is another avenue that could be explored in an effort to support the expanded public use of the site, relay the story of the reservoir, and highlight the importance of the site's role in the growth and development of the City.

Looking more broadly, NYC Parks may investigate ways to further enhance the value of this important resource—providing a green refuge in a densely developed area and allowing more residents to connect with the natural world. Ecological restoration (meadow, woodland, wetland) and complementary recreational opportunities (i.e. nature trails, boardwalks, canopy walks, canoe/kayak access to open water) could be critical to achieving this.

Challenges

Invasive Species: The basin floors and walls have been colonized by and filled in with vegetation; however, much of the growth consists of invasive species. Critical to the maintenance of the site's biological integrity is the management of more than 20 exotic and invasive plant species, which may include controlling, removing and replacing these invasives with native plant species to enhance habitat quality and the overall diversity of native species that the site supports.

Inaccessibility of Basin Interiors: There is currently no means to enter the basins other than scrambling down the basin walls, which severely hampers the ability of the City to monitor and maintain the site, perform invasive removal/restoration, or clear debris and garbage. This is particularly problematic, as the reservoir has been subject to unsanctioned human activities within the basins, including illegal dumping, paintball, and encampments. The establishment of controlled access points into the basin from the existing perimeter multiuse pathway above could allow for more effective management and stewardship of the developing vegetative communities within the basins and improved ability to address trespassing and related damage.
Summary and Conclusions

Recognizing the unique features and management considerations of the site, NYC Parks is dedicated to sustaining, and, in direct coordination with the local community, exploring the expansion of the vision for the property in a manner that is sensitive to and serves to enhance the exceptional character of the Reservoir.

The Reservoir contains both upland forest and freshwater wetlands. It is also home to a wide variety of small mammals, amphibians, and reptiles, and is a birding hotspot, home to at least 156 species of birds, 29 of which are Species of Greatest Conservation Need within New York State.

In addition to its impressive ecology, the Reservoir is the only natural area within the local community, and one with great historic significance, having been a major water supply of the City of Brooklyn from 1858 until 1959. Its bicycle and pedestrian pathway is used heavily and offers a critical connection along the Brooklyn-Queens Greenway, linking public parks, museums and other public facilities.

Accordingly, the Ridgewood Reservoir meets the SEQR criteria for designation as a Critical Environmental Area and warrants designation as such. A map at an appropriate scale to readily locate the boundaries of the CEA is attached. For reference, the CEA boundary is defined by the embankment and pathway that encircles the three basins.