**PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

**PROJECT NAME**  
American Museum of Natural History—Richard Gilder Center for Science, Education, and Innovation

### 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>16DPR004M</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, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2a. Lead Agency Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON</th>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Konon</td>
<td>Susan E. Golden, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Commissioner for Planning &amp; Parklands</td>
<td>Venable LLP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Arsenal, Central Park</td>
<td>Rockefeller Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>1270 Avenue of the Americas, 24th Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(212) 360-3402</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alyssa.cobb@parks.nyc.gov">alyssa.cobb@parks.nyc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2b. Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE OR CONTACT PERSON</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Golden, Esq.</td>
<td>Rockefeller Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venable LLP</td>
<td>1270 Avenue of the Americas, 24th Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(212) 370-6254</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgolden@venable.com">sgolden@venable.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Action Classification and Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQRA Classification</th>
<th>TYPE I: SPECIFY CATEGORY (see 6 NYCRR 617.4 and NYC Executive Order 91 of 1977, as amended): 617.4(b)(9) &amp; (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Type (refer to Chapter 2, “Establishing the Analysis Framework” for guidance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localized Action, Site Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Project Description:

The American Museum of Natural History (AMNH or the Museum) is seeking discretionary actions in connection with a proposed new building, the Richard Gilder Center for Science, Education, and Innovation (the Gilder Center). The Gilder Center would be a five-story, 180,000-gross-square-foot (gsf) addition located on the Columbus Avenue side of the Museum campus within Theodore Roosevelt Park. Because the building would be integrated into the Museum complex, an additional approximately 38,000 gsf of existing Museum space would be renovated to accommodate the program and make connections into the new building, for a total of 218,000 gsf of new construction and renovation. Alterations also would be made to adjacent portions of Theodore Roosevelt Park. The site for the proposed project is on the west side of the Museum complex facing Columbus Avenue, in the Upper West Side of Manhattan. See page 1a for more information.

### 5. REQUIRED ACTIONS OR APPROVALS (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Planning Commission:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAP AMENDMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING MAP AMENDMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE SELECTION—PUBLIC FACILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING PLAN &amp; PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type:</td>
<td>Modification:</td>
<td>Renewal:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Standards and Appeals:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE (USE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE (BULK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PERMIT (if appropriate, specify type:</td>
<td>Modification:</td>
<td>Renewal:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description

A. INTRODUCTION

The American Museum of Natural History (AMNH or the Museum) is seeking discretionary actions in connection with a proposed new building, the Richard Gilder Center for Science, Education, and Innovation (the Gilder Center). The Gilder Center would be a five-story, approximately 180,000-gross-square-foot (gsf) addition located on the Columbus Avenue side of the Museum campus. Because the building would be integrated into the Museum complex, an additional approximately 38,000 gsf of existing space would be renovated to accommodate the program and make connections into the new building, for a total of 218,000 gsf of new construction and renovation. Alterations also would be made to adjacent portions of Theodore Roosevelt Park. The Gilder Center, together with these other alterations, is the proposed project.

Approximately 80 percent of the square footage of the project would be located within the area currently occupied by the Museum. Three existing buildings within the Museum complex would be removed to minimize the footprint on land that is now open space in Theodore Roosevelt Park, to about 11,600 square feet (approximately a quarter acre).

The Museum is located on the superblock bounded by West 81st Street, West 77th Street, Central Park West, and Columbus Avenue, in the Upper West Side neighborhood of Manhattan (Block 1130, Lot 1). The Museum is located in Theodore Roosevelt Park, which is City-owned parkland under the jurisdiction of the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). The site for the proposed project is on the west side of the Museum complex facing Columbus Avenue. The site is located in Manhattan Community District 7.

AMNH, a not-for-profit educational corporation, was formed by the New York State Legislature in 1869 to establish a museum and library of natural history in New York City, to encourage the study of natural science, and to provide popular instruction and recreation with the goal of advancing general scientific knowledge. Since that time, the Museum has grown to become one of the most important centers for the study of natural history in the world. The Museum currently employs approximately 200 scientists and offers a master’s degree program in teaching science and a Ph.D. program in comparative biology. With annual attendance of approximately five million people, the Museum is one of the top visitor destinations in New York City. The purpose of the proposed project is to expand and modernize the Museum’s science and education programs, provide new exhibition space, improve circulation and operations throughout the Museum, and provide new visitor services.

The proposed project will require discretionary approvals from DPR and the New York City Public Design Commission (PDC) and a report and approval from the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). Funding for the project has been appropriated by the City of New York, through the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA), and by the State of New York, through the New York State Urban Development Corporation (d/b/a Empire State Development [ESD]). The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation’s Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) will also review the proposed project.

B. PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for the proposed project is driven by the Museum’s commitment to exploring new areas in scientific research, addressing key challenges in science education and enhancing the public understanding of and access to science at a time when science underpins so many of our most pressing societal issues—human health, climate change, and biodiversity conservation, among others.

Despite the importance of scientific knowledge for informed decision-making, our country faces challenges in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) fields, both in educating students and in supporting teachers. Over the past two decades the Museum has partnered with the City, State, and federal departments of education, private and foundation
supporters, and other science institutions to help develop and model programs that result in more STEM resources for more students and teachers.

The Museum employs approximately 200 working scientists who conduct their work through field expeditions and in laboratories using the Museum’s onsite collections and state-of-the-art scientific equipment. It houses collections containing more than 33 million objects and specimens, only a very small percentage of which are on display at any given time, and one of the most comprehensive natural history libraries in the United States. These unique assets must be made available to educate the next generation of teachers, scientists, and workers to ensure a scientifically literate nation, our nation’s workforce preparedness, and opportunities for young people.

The Museum administers important educational programs, such as the Urban Advantage Middle School Science Initiative, which serves over 62,000 students from more than 220 schools, making it the largest formalized science program in the country. In 2009, AMNH became the first non-university affiliated museum in the United States to grant a Ph.D., and in 2011 AMNH also became the first such museum to offer a master’s degree program in teaching science. Museum attendance has grown over the past 20 years, from approximately 2.77 million annual visitors in 19941 to approximately 5 million visitors in 2014, including about 500,000 visitors in school and camp groups.

As a result of this strong growth and expansion of programs, a portion of the Museum’s facilities are overcrowded and inefficient. There is a shortfall of instructional space and the current spaces are out of date, fragmented, and difficult to access. Collections need improvement in their housing and additional capacity. Visitor services are poorly located and insufficient to meet visitor demand.

Prior to making the decision to undertake the proposed project, the Museum undertook a comprehensive, multi-year space planning initiative, which included a detailed and extensive analysis of its existing spaces, highest priority needs, and alternatives for achieving some or all of those needs. The Museum made substantial investments in its facilities to renovate, reorganize, and revitalize existing space. Even with these improvements within the existing footprint of the Museum, the space planning effort identified the need for the construction of an addition to the Museum to effectively address the key deficiencies described above, as well as to meet the scientific, educational, and other programmatic needs of the Museum to continue to meet its mission. Accordingly, the proposed project has been developed to fulfill the following goals and objectives:

- Accommodate growth in science and education programming and exhibits;
- Provide multi-disciplinary and flexible space for science and education;
- Enhance and integrate the Museum’s science, exhibition and educational programming;
- Provide greater access to the Museum’s scientists and scientific resources;
- Provide greater access to library resources;
- Improve and expand collections storage and visibility;
- Enhance the sustainability features of the Museum;
- Improve the Museum’s circulation and connections;
- Provide a new entrance that activates the Columbus Avenue side of the Museum and welcomes visitors and the neighborhood; and
- Upgrade visitor and operational services.

The proposed project would make necessary improvements to the Museum’s ability to integrate scientific research, collections, and exhibition with its educational programming, and would also upgrade and revitalize the Museum’s facilities to address critical needs. Thirty new connections from the Gilder Center to ten existing Museum buildings would be created, improving circulation and flow for visitors, creating pathways without dead ends, and reinforcing the intellectual links among the Museum’s programmatic, exhibition, and collections areas. Utility connections and service areas, some original to the 1908 construction of the Museum’s service yard—and vital to the operation of the Museum

---

1 Fiscal Year 1994, i.e., from July 1, 1993 to June 30, 1994.
complex—would be replaced and/or improved. New state-of-the-art facilities for research, exhibition, and education would be provided.

Scientific learning is powerful when it is demonstrated and experienced and not just told. The Museum considers the colocation of science, education, and exhibition uses to be essential to achieving its mission. The educational program of the project is enveloped and fueled by the Museum’s onsite assets and resources. The proposed project would serve as a platform for the partnership between scientists and educators, offering spaces where students of all levels and ages can engage in the process of scientific research and discovery.

Within the framework of these needs and objectives, the proposed project is designed—and three existing buildings will be removed—to minimize the physical expansion of the Museum on Theodore Roosevelt Park.

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT SITE

The Museum is located within, and bounded by, Theodore Roosevelt Park, on the approximately 17.57-acre superblock formed by West 81st Street, West 77th Street, Central Park West, and Columbus Avenue.

The Museum complex consists of numerous interconnected buildings, covering an approximately 7.5-acre footprint. Uses within the Museum complex include science laboratories and research space; collections storage; a library; exhibit space; theater spaces such as the LeFrak Theater and the Hayden Planetarium Space Theater; classrooms, education space, lecture halls, and support space for visiting school groups; café and food court uses; the Ross Terrace; gift shops; a parking garage; and maintenance, administrative, and operational space. Vehicular access to the Museum’s parking garage is provided via a driveway that extends from West 81st Street. The main pedestrian entrance to the Museum faces Central Park West; additional entrances include the Weston Pavilion (facing Columbus Avenue), the Rose Center for Earth and Space (facing West 81st Street), and a restricted-access entrance on West 77th Street.

Beyond the Museum complex, open space uses in Theodore Roosevelt Park include bench-lined walking paths, fenced lawns and gardens, and a dog run. On the west side of the park, the Nobel Monument is located in a small square at the northwest corner of the Museum complex and The New York Times Capsule, designed by architect Santiago Calatrava, is located on a terrace adjacent to the Weston Pavilion. A protected bike lane runs along Columbus Avenue, adjacent to the western boundary of Theodore Roosevelt Park.

The development footprint of the proposed project is approximately 36,500 square feet below-grade, with a total footprint of approximately 44,700 square feet at grade. Of that, approximately 11,600 square feet of the at-grade footprint is outside the existing built area of the Museum. The portion of the development area that is inside of the existing Museum footprint contains the Weston Pavilion and adjacent corridors, two other Museum buildings and adjacent corridors, and the Museum’s service yard. The portion of the development area that is outside of the existing Museum footprint contains walkways, seating areas, fenced lawns, and landscaped areas.

PROPOSED PROJECT

BUILDING PROGRAM AND USES

The Gilder Center would be a five-story, approximately 180,000 gsf addition to the Museum. The proposed project would also include approximately 38,000 gsf of renovations to existing space and alterations to an approximately 31,100 square-foot adjacent area of Theodore Roosevelt Park.

The proposed project would be designed to reveal the behind-the-scenes work of the Museum and integrate it into the visitor experience, to create an authentic and direct encounter with science. Collection storage spaces, the research library, and laboratories for gene mapping, 3D imaging, and big data assimilation would be located adjacent to immersive galleries and interactive education spaces for children and adults in family and school groups, transcending traditional boundaries between scientific research, education and exhibition.

Among the major new features that would be included in the proposed project are:

- A physical articulation of the Museum’s full, integrated mission of science, education, and exhibition, that will provide visitors with cross-disciplinary exposure to the natural world;
New kinds of exhibition and learning spaces infused with the latest digital and technological tools, connected to scientific facilities and collections;

Innovative spaces devoted to the teaching of science—including for middle school, early childhood, family, and adult learners and teachers;

Spaces for carrying out cutting edge scientific research—particularly in natural sciences—and facilitating public understanding of this vital scientific field;

Increased storage capacity and greater visibility and access to the Museum’s world-class collections;

Exhibition facilities in new areas of scientific study;

Expansion of the natural history library from a world-class repository to a place of adult and public learning;

Thirty new connections into ten existing Museum buildings on multiple levels, improving circulation and better utilizing existing space;

Enhanced visitor experience and services;

Improved building services; and

A more visible and accessible entrance on the west side of the Museum complex

ARCHITECTURAL AND DESIGN PLAN

The architecture of the Gilder Center is intended to inspire a sense of discovery, through openings and natural light that echo the types of spaces in nature that are fluid, connective, and enticing to navigate. Visitors would see—and be invited to experience—more of the Museum’s collections which form an irreplaceable record of life and human culture. The design would advance crucial aspects of the Museum’s original master plan while reflecting a contemporary architectural approach that is responsive to the Museum’s needs and the character of the surrounding public park and neighborhood.

The Gilder Center would include five stories above grade (up to 105 feet tall), and one below-grade, situated between buildings of different heights, diverse architectural styles, and varied relationships to the surrounding park and city. The building mass and proportion would carefully respond to this multilayered context, maintaining the height and scale of the existing Museum buildings. Critical alignments—in both elevation and plan—would neatly weave the new building into its site, maximizing utility while minimizing impact on the historic surroundings.

In developing the architectural concept, Architect Jeanne Gang worked from the inside out, seeing an opportunity to reclaim the physical heart of the Museum complex at its center and to complete connections between and among existing Museum halls and the new space. From Columbus Avenue, visitors would access the building through the park at grade and enter a central exhibition hall that would link the west side of the Museum to all other parts of the campus, thereby enhancing accessibility and simplifying circulation. Functionally, the new building completes the east-west axis of circulation and exhibition spaces which was envisioned in the original master plan for the Museum, and only partly completed to date and creates a north-south connection on the west side of the campus for the first time. Overall, the proposed project is expected to improve the connectivity, spatial logic, and function of the Museum’s interior spaces.

LANDSCAPE PLAN

As noted above, the proposed project would result in the expansion of the Museum’s footprint by approximately 11,600 square feet at grade in Theodore Roosevelt Park. As part of the initial design effort, the Museum reduced the development footprint with the goal of minimizing the number of trees and the amount of public open space that would be impacted. It is expected that the proposed project would affect approximately ten trees, including nine canopy trees that would be removed and one understory tree that would be relocated. Any trees that are removed and cannot be transplanted would be replaced, consistent with DPR rules and regulations. The Museum anticipates planting eight new canopy trees and nine new understory trees in the vicinity of the development area.

Paths and landscaping in Theodore Roosevelt Park adjacent to the development area would be modified, removed, or relocated to accommodate the proposed project. The character of the park along Columbus Avenue is anticipated to be similar to the existing paths and landscaped areas, primarily designed for walking and quiet activities. In addition, the Museum proposes to increase the number of benches in this area from seven to seventeen. The area in front of the new entrance would (as it currently does), provide an entrance point to the Museum, although with the project it would at times
be more populated and active with Museum visitors. The paths and entrance would be designed to be accessible to children, strollers and the mobility-impaired.

*The New York Times* Capsule would be relocated as part of the proposed project. The existing dog run would not be altered or affected by the design, and the paths to the dog run and to the subway would remain.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

The proposed project is anticipated to achieve a LEED Silver rating, with state-of-the-art systems and controls, and a high-performance envelope that minimizes energy use. Alternative energy sources are under consideration and may be included in the proposed project, including photovoltaic panels, geothermal wells, storm water retention systems, and grey water recycling.

**PROPOSED ACTIONS**

The Museum and its original buildings were created pursuant to New York State statutes passed between 1869 and 1875; then, an 1876 State statute set aside the entire site of Theodore Roosevelt Park for the Museum and authorized the City’s then Department of Public Parks to enter into a contract (the Museum’s lease) granting the Museum exclusive use of the buildings erected or to be erected in the park. Thus, the Museum is a permitted park use, and no further legislative action or disposition of property is required. Since Theodore Roosevelt Park is City-owned mapped parkland, the project site does not bear a zoning designation and is not subject to the New York City zoning resolution.

However, the proposed project requires approval from DPR pursuant to the Museum’s lease, from DCLA for City funding, and from ESD for State funding. The new location of *The New York Times* Capsule requires the approval of PDC.

The Museum is a New York City Landmark (NYCL) and is listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR). Therefore, prior to making its determination, DPR must obtain a report and approval from LPC, and ESD is required to undertake a historic preservation review in consultation with SHPO.
**Department of Environmental Protection:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If “yes,” specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other City Approvals Subject to CEQR** (check all that apply)

- [ ] LEGISLATION
- [ ] RULEMAKING
- [ ] CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES
- [ ] 384(B)(4) APPROVAL
- [ ] OTHER: EXPLAIN

**Other City Approvals Not Subject to CEQR** (check all that apply)

- [ ] PERMITS FROM DOT’S OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION AND COORDINATION (OCM)
- [ ] LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVAL
- [ ] OTHER; explain:

**State or Federal Actions/Approvals/Funding:**

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
  - If “yes,” specify

**Empire State Development (ESD) funding**

**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.

**Site Location Map**

**Zoning Map**

**Sanborn or Other Land Use Map**

**Tax Map**

**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.): ±75,833 sf
- Waterbody area (sq. ft.) and type: 0
- Roads, building and other paved surfaces (sq. ft.): ±50,530 sf
- Other, describe (sq. ft.): ±25,303 sf
- Landscaped area

**Physical Dimensions and Scale of Project**

- Size of project to be developed (gross square feet): ±180,000 gsf net new space and ±38,000 gsf renovation of existing space
- Gross floor area of each building (sq. ft.): ±180,000 gsf net new space
- Number of buildings: 1
- Gross floor area of each building (sq. ft.): ±180,000 gsf net new space
- Height of each building (ft.): Up to 105 ft
- Number of stories of each building: 5
- Does the proposed project involve changes in zoning on one or more sites? NO
- If ‘yes,’ specify: The total square feet owned or controlled by the applicant: N/A
- The total square feet non-applicant owned area: N/A
- Does the proposed project involve in-ground excavation or subsurface disturbance, including but not limited to foundation work, pilings, utility lines, or grading? NO
- If ‘yes,’ indicate the estimated area and volume dimensions of subsurface disturbance (if known):
  - Area of temporary disturbance: TBD sq. ft. (width x length)
  - Volume of disturbance: TBD cubic feet (width x length x depth)
  - Area of permanent disturbance: TBD sq. ft. (width x length)

**Analysis Year** CEQR Technical Manual, Chapter 2

- Anticipated build year (date the project would be completed and operational): 2021
- Anticipated period of construction in months: 36
- Would the project be implemented in a single phase? YES
- If multiple phases, how many? NO
- Briefly describe phases and construction schedule:

**Predominant Land Use in the Vicinity of Project? (Check all that apply)**

- [ ] Residential
- [ ] Manufacturing
- [ ] Commercial
- [ ] Park/Forest/Open Space
- [ ] Other, specify: Museum

---

1 Physical setting is area of land development for the Gilder Center project.
2 Includes both the area of the development footprint and the additional area of parkland that would be affected by the proposed project.
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Project Site Photographs

View Facing North at the Museum’s West 77 Street Entrance

View Facing West at the Museum’s Central Park West Entrance
View of Development Area Facing East from Columbus Avenue

View Facing Northeast at Columbus Avenue Loading Entrance
View of Existing Building 17 and Weston Pavilion

View of Development Area Facing East within Theodore Roosevelt Park
View of Entrance to Theodore Roosevelt Park at Columbus Avenue and West 81 Street

View of Rose Center Facing South from West 81 Street
**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><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe type of residential structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of low-to moderate-income units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe type (retail, office, other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing/Industrial</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open storage area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any unenclosed activities, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facility</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Museum, Educational Facilities</td>
<td>Museum, Educational Facilities</td>
<td>Museum, Educational Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross floor area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>±1,800,000 gsf</td>
<td>±1,800,000 gsf</td>
<td>±1,980,000 gsf</td>
<td>180,000 gsf (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Land</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicly Accessible Open Space</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify type (mapped City, State, or Federal Parkland, wetland—mapped or otherwise known, other)</td>
<td>±10.07 acres of parkland</td>
<td>±10.07 acres of parkland</td>
<td>±9.8 acres parkland</td>
<td>-0.27 acres (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Land Uses</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of public spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of accessory spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours</td>
<td>10:00 am-5:45 pm</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended or non-attended</td>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lots</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (includes street parking)</strong></td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td>[□] Yes [□] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. 10.07 acres is the full area of Theodore Roosevelt Park outside of the current Museum footprint.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>NO-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>WITH-ACTION CONDITION</th>
<th>INCREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any, specify number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain how the number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of residents was calculated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Businesses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any, specify the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and type of workers by bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and type of non-residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain how the number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of businesses was calculated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Other (students, visitors,</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td>Yes □ No ■</td>
<td>0.5 million ticketed annual visitors (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concert-goers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any, specify number</td>
<td>±4.1 million ticketed annual visitors</td>
<td>±4.4 million ticketed annual visitors</td>
<td>±4.9 million ticketed annual visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain how the number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of students was calculated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by AMNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning classification</td>
<td>N/A (Parkland)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum amount of floor area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that can be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant land use and zoning</td>
<td>Park, Residential, Commercial, Community Facility; R7-2, R8B, R10A, C1-5, C1-8A, C2-5, C2-7A, C4-6A, Special Upper West Side Enhanced Commercial District</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classifications within land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study areas or a 400-foot radius of proposed project</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach any additional information as 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 attach supporting information, if needed) 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 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 either 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?
   (b) Would the proposed project result in a change in zoning different from surrounding zoning?
   (c) Is there the potential to affect an applicable public policy?
   (d) If “yes” to (a), (b), and/or (c), complete a preliminary assessment and attach. To be provided in the EIS.
   (e) Is the project a large, publicly sponsored project?
      - If “yes,” complete a PlaNYC assessment and attach.
   (f) Is any part of the directly affected area within the City’s Waterfront Revitalization Program boundaries?
      - If “yes,” complete the Consistency Assessment Form.

2. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS: CEQR Technical Manual, Chapter 5
   (a) Would the proposed project:
      - Generate a net increase of more than 200 residential units or 200,000 square feet of commercial space?
      - Directly displace 500 or more residents?
      - Directly displace more than 100 employees?
      - Affect conditions in a specific industry?
      - If “yes,” answer question 2(b)(v) below.
   (b) If ‘Yes’ to any of the above, attach supporting information to answer the relevant questions.
   (c) If ‘No’ was checked for each category above, the remaining questions in this technical area do not need to be answered.

   I. Direct Residential Displacement
      - If more than 500 residents would be displaced, would these displaced represent more than 5% of the primary study area population?
      - 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?

   II. Indirect Residential Displacement
      - Would expected average incomes of the new population exceed the average incomes of the study area populations?
      - If “yes:”
         - Would the population of the primary study area increase by more than 10 percent?
         - 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?
      - If “yes,” to either of the preceding questions, would more than 5 percent of all housing units be renter-occupied and unprotected?
### iii. Direct Business Displacement
- 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
- Is any category of business to be displaced the subject of other regulations or publicly adopted plans to preserve, enhance, or otherwise protect it? [ ] Yes [ ] No

### iv. Indirect Business Displacement
- Would the project potentially introduce trends that make it difficult for businesses to remain in the area? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Would the project capture the 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? [ ] Yes [ ] No

### v. Affects on Industry
- Would the project significantly affect business conditions in any industry or any category of businesses within or outside the study area? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Would the project indirectly substantially reduce employment or impair the economic viability in the industry or category of businesses? [ ] Yes [ ] No

### 3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES: CEQR Technical Manual, Chapter 6

#### (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? [ ] Yes [ ] No

#### (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) [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - 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? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **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) [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," would the project increase the study area population by 5 percent or more from the No-Action levels? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," would the additional population impair the delivery of library services in the study area? [ ] Yes [ ] No

- **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) [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - 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? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," would the project increase this collective utilization rate by 5 percent or more from the No-Action scenario? [ ] Yes [ ] No

- **iv. Health Care Facilities**
  - Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," would the project affect the operation of health care facilities in the area? [ ] Yes [ ] No

- **v. Fire and Police Protection**
  - Would the project result in the introduction of a sizeable new neighborhood? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," would the project affect the operation of fire or police protection in the area? [ ] Yes [ ] No

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

- Would the project change or eliminate existing open space? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Is the project located within an underserved area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If "yes," would the proposed project generate more than 50 additional residents or 125 additional employees? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Is the project located within a well-served area in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, or Staten Island? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If "yes," would the project generate more than 350 additional residents or 750 additional employees? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If the project is located within an area that is neither underserved nor well-served, would it generate more than 200 additional residents or 500 additional employees? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If "yes" to questions (c), (e), or (f) above, attach supporting information to answer the following:
  - If in an underserved area, would the project result in a decrease in the open space ratio by more than 1 percent? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - 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 percent? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - If "yes," are there qualitative considerations, such as the quality of open space, that need to be considered? Please specify: To be provided in the EIS. [ ] Yes [ ] No
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 reach any sunlight-sensitive resource at any time of the year. **To be provided in the EIS.**

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 archaeological resources. **To be provided in the EIS.**

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 questions above, please provide the information requested in Chapter 10. **To be provided in the EIS.**

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
  - o If "yes," list the resources and attach supporting information on whether the proposed project would affect any of these resources. **To be provided in the EIS.**
- (b) Is any part of the directly affected area within the Jamaica Bay Watershed? [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - o If "yes," complete the Jamaica Bay Watershed Form and submit according to its instructions.


- (a) Would the proposed project allow commercial or residential use 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., (E) designations or a 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
  - o If "yes," were Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) identified? Briefly identify. **To be provided in the EIS.**
- (i) Based on the Phase I Assessment, is a Phase II Assessment needed? [ ] Yes [ ] No


- (a) Would the project result in water demand of more than one million gallons per day? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (b) If the proposed project is located in a combined sewer area, would it result in at least 1,000 residential units or 250,000 sq. ft. or more of commercial space in Manhattan, or at least 400 residential units or 150,000 sq. ft. or more of commercial space in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island or Queens? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (c) If the proposed project is 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? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (d) Would the project involve development on a site that is 5 acres or larger where the amount of impervious surface would increase? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (e) If the project is located within the Jamaica Bay Watershed or in certain specific drain 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? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (f) Would the proposed project be located in an area that is partially sewered or currently unsewered? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (g) Is the project proposing an industrial facility or activity that would contribute industrial discharges to a Wastewater Treatment Plant or contribute contaminated stormwater to a separate storm sewer system? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (h) Would the project involve construction of a new stormwater outfall that requires federal and/or state permits? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- (i) If "yes" to any of the above, conduct the appropriate preliminary analyses and attach supporting documentation.
11. SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION: 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): ±1,266 lbs.

- Would the proposed project have the potential to generate 100,000 pounds (50 tons) or more of solid waste per week?  
  - Yes [ ] No [X]

(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?

- If “yes,” would the proposed project comply with the City’s Solid Waste Management Plan?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

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): ±43,872,500 mBTU

(b) Would the proposed project affect the transmission or generation of energy?  
  - Yes [ ] No [X]

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:

- Would the proposed project result in 50 or more Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) per project peak hour?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

- If “yes,” would the proposed project result in more than 200 subway/rail or bus trips per project peak hour?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

- Would the proposed project result in more than 200 pedestrian trips per project peak hour?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

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?

(c) Does the proposed project involve multiple buildings on the project site?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(d) Does the proposed project require Federal approvals, support, licensing, or permits subject to conformity requirements?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(e) Does the proposed project site have existing institutional controls (e.g., (E) designations or a Restrictive Declaration) relating to air quality that preclude the potential for significant adverse impacts?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(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?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(b) Would the proposed project fundamentally change the City’s solid waste management system?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(c) Would the proposed project result in the development of 350,000 square feet or more?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

(d) If “yes” to any of the above, would the project require a GHG emissions assessment based on guidance in Chapter 18?  
  - Yes [X] No [ ]

If “yes,” would the project result in inconsistencies with the City’s GHG reduction goal? (see Local Law 22 of 2008; § 24-803 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York). Please attach supporting documentation.

(a) Would the proposed project generate or reroute the 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. To be provided in the EIS.

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. To be provided in the EIS.

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. To be provided in the EIS.

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 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 service?  □    □
   - 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 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 Avoidable Technology for construction equipment or Best Management Practices for construction activities should be considered when making this determination. To be provided in the EIS.

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 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:

DATE:

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.
Additional Technical Information for EAS Part II

The proposed project would affect various areas of environmental concern and has the potential for significant adverse impacts. Therefore, as specified in the Draft Scope of Work, the proposed project will be the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Analyses will be conducted in accordance with the 2014 CEQR Technical Manual, and the details of such analyses are set forth in the Draft Scope of Work.

In support of the response to the screening checklist provided above in EAS Part II, a screening assessment is provided below for the technical areas of: socioeconomic conditions; community facilities; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; and greenhouse gas emissions.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The socioeconomic character of an area includes its population, housing, and economic activity. According to the CEQR Technical Manual, the six principal issues of concern with respect to socioeconomic conditions are whether a proposed project would result in significant impacts due to: (1) direct residential displacement; (2) direct business displacement; (3) indirect residential displacement; (4) indirect business displacement due to increased rents; (5) indirect business displacement due to retail market saturation; and (6) adverse effects on a specific industry.

There are no residential or business uses located on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any direct residential or business displacement impacts, and no further assessment of this issue is required. The proposed project would not introduce any residential units or business uses (the modest retail uses included in the proposed project would be ancillary to the Museum’s operations). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any indirect residential or business displacement impacts, and no further assessment of this issue is required. Finally, the proposed project would not affect any specific industries and therefore no further assessment of this issue is required. Overall, the proposed project would not have any significant adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions and no further analysis is needed. The EIS will not include a socioeconomic conditions analysis.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a project could affect community facility services by physically displacing or altering a community facility, or causing a change in population that may affect the services delivered by a community facility, as might happen if a facility is already over-utilized, or if a project is large enough to create a demand that could not be met by the existing facility. The potential for the proposed project to result in both direct effects and indirect effects on community facilities is discussed below.

DIRECT EFFECTS

A CEQR community facilities analysis examines potential impacts on existing facilities and generally focuses in detail on those services that the City is obligated to provide to any member of the community, including public schools, libraries, child care centers, health care facilities, and police/fire protection services. The proposed project would not directly affect any of these community facilities of concern noted in the CEQR Technical Manual. However, the proposed project would result in alterations to AMNH, an important community resource providing educational opportunities, including a library of natural science. These changes would be considered beneficial, as the proposed project would expand educational opportunities and Museum programming. As noted above under “Project Description,” the proposed project would include innovative spaces devoted to the teaching of science, including for middle school, early childhood, family, and adult learners; new exhibition and learning spaces with state of the art technology; expansion of the natural history library; spaces for carrying out cutting edge scientific research; and other important programming. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts on community facilities due to direct effects and no further analysis is needed.
INDIRECT EFFECTS

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, preliminary thresholds indicating the need for community facility analyses due to indirect effects are as follows:

- Public Schools: More than 50 new elementary/middle school or 150 high school students.
- Libraries: A greater than 5 percent increase in the ratio of residential units to libraries in the borough. For Manhattan, this is equivalent to residential population increase of 901 residential units.
- Child Care Facilities (publicly funded): More than 20 eligible children based on the number of new low/moderate-income residential units by borough. For Manhattan, an increase of 170 low/moderate-income residential units exceeds this threshold.
- Health Care Facilities and Police/Fire Protection: The creation of a sizeable new neighborhood where none existed before.

The proposed project would not result in any increase in residential population and, therefore, does not warrant an analysis of public schools, libraries, or child care facilities. In addition, the proposed project would not create a new neighborhood where none existed before. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any significant adverse impacts on community facilities due to indirect effects and no further analysis is needed. The EIS will not include a community facilities analysis.

WATER AND SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a water and sewer infrastructure assessment analyzes whether a proposed project may adversely affect New York City’s water distribution or sewer system and, if so, assesses the effects of such projects to determine whether their impact is significant, and present potential mitigation strategies and alternatives. Because the proposed project would not result in an exceptionally large demand for water or be located in an area that experiences low water pressure, an analysis of water supply is not needed. In addition, an analysis of wastewater and stormwater conveyance and treatment is not warranted because the proposed project would not exceed the threshold of 250,000 square feet of development requiring an analysis in Manhattan; and would not result in development on a site greater than five acres. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any significant adverse impacts on water and sewer infrastructure and no further analysis is needed. The EIS will not include a water and sewer infrastructure analysis.

SOLID WASTE AND SANITATION SERVICES

As described in the CEQR Technical Manual, a solid waste assessment determines whether a project has the potential to cause a substantial increase in solid waste production that may overburden available waste management capacity or otherwise be inconsistent with the New York City Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) or with State policy related to the City’s integrated solid waste management system. A project that would directly affect a component of the local integrated solid waste management system may require a detailed analysis to determine if it has the potential to cause a significant impact requiring mitigation.

The proposed project would not directly affect a component of, or result in an inconsistency with, the City’s SWMP. Consistent with the SWMP, the proposed project would include waste reduction measures including minimizing waste and recycling. When completed, the proposed project would generate approximately up to 1,266 pounds of waste per week, which would be handled by private carters. The additional waste generated by the proposed project would represent a negligible addition to the 50,000 tons of waste generated every day by public and private sector sources, and this minimal increase would not overburden existing commercial solid waste handling services. Therefore the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to solid waste and sanitation services, and no further analysis is warranted for the EIS.

ENERGY

As described in the CEQR Technical Manual, all new structures requiring heating and cooling are subject to the 2010 New York City Energy Conservation Code. Therefore, the need for a detailed assessment of energy impacts would be limited to projects that may significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy. According to the CEQR Technical Manual, a detailed assessment of energy impacts is only required for projects that would significantly affect the transmission or generation of energy or that would result in substantial consumption of energy. The proposed project
would not affect the transmission or generation of energy. It is expected that the proposed project, when in operation, would consume approximately 43,872,500 million British Thermal Units (mBTU) per year. This would not be considered a significant demand for energy. Therefore the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to energy supply or consumption, and no further analysis is warranted. The EIS will not include an energy analysis.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

According to the CEQR Technical Manual, GHG assessments are appropriate for projects in New York City being reviewed in an EIS that would result in the development of 350,000 square feet or greater. While funding for the project has been appropriated by the City of New York (through the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs), the proposed project does not exceed the CEQR Technical Manual threshold, and, therefore, an analysis of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project is not warranted. The EIS will not include a GHG analysis.
### 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 of 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>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design/Visual Resources</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are there any aspects of the project relevant to the determination 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 in 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>Assistant Commissioner</td>
<td>NYC Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Alyssa Cobb Krohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
<td>Alyssa C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>3/2/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>